

1 Rapid antigen testing for SARS-CoV-2 infection in a university setting in

2 Ireland: learning from a 6-week pilot study.

3 Gerald Barry¹, Catherine McCarney, Marc Farrelly, Rory Breathnach, Carmel Mooney, Simon J. More²

4 School of Veterinary Medicine, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin D04 W6F6, Ireland

5 1. gerald.barry@ucd.ie

6 2. simon.more@ucd.ie

7

8 **Abstract**

9 Objectives

10 With the ongoing circulation of SARS-CoV-2 in countries across the world it is essential to
11 identify effective ways to reduce the risk of infection while allowing society to function as
12 close to 'normal' as possible. Serial testing using rapid lateral flow antigen tests is a possible
13 way to do this by screening populations in a targeted way, identifying infectious (both
14 symptomatic and asymptomatic) people and removing them from circulation while
15 infectious. To make rapid antigen testing effective, high levels of participation are
16 important. This study was designed to evaluate the establishment of a testing programme in
17 a university setting and assess some of the factors that impact participation in such a study
18 among both staff and students.

19 Study Design

20 Observational, survey

21 Methods

22 A trial period of SARS-CoV-2 rapid testing using the Abbott Panbio rapid antigen test was set
23 up and staff and students based in the University College Dublin Veterinary Hospital were
24 asked to take part voluntarily for 6 weeks. Following the trial period, we used a
25 questionnaire to evaluate satisfaction and to understand some reasons behind participation
26 or lack thereof.

27 Results

28 Overall, almost all respondents to the survey stated that they were happy with having a
29 testing programme present in the workplace and it helped to reduce anxiety associated with
30 COVID-19. Findings indicated that staff and students did not participate equally in the
31 voluntary testing programme. The findings also highlighted that intrinsic motivations and
32 extrinsic motivations for participation differ. For example, participation among staff was
33 much higher than among students, motivational messaging focused on protecting others did
34 not resonate with students as much as staff, convenience was a key factor driving
35 participation in both cohorts and the pressure of being forced to miss class (if positive) close
36 to exam time provided motivation to students to avoid testing.

37 Conclusions

38 Introducing antigen testing into a workplace helped to reduce overall anxiety associated
39 with the potential impact of COVID-19, but achieving good participation was challenging.
40 Participation is key to a successful, campus wide antigen testing programme but reaching
41 high levels of participation is not straightforward and can not be taken for granted. Different
42 motivations drive participation in different cohorts and different messaging/incentivisation
43 is needed to encourage participation in those different cohorts. The findings reported here
44 should inform any SARS-CoV-2 testing programme that will run in these types of settings in
45 the future.

46

47 **1. Introduction**


48 The COVID-19 pandemic that started in China in late 2019 has caused disruption to the whole world
49 in one form or another. The betacoronavirus, SARS-CoV-2, that causes COVID-19, primarily transmits
50 between people in aerosol droplets, so close contact in poorly ventilated indoor environments are
51 areas of high risk of transmission if an infected person is present. In Ireland, as elsewhere, the
52 isolation of infectious individuals is central to efforts to limit SARS-CoV-2 transmission. People with
53 symptoms are asked to self-isolate, however, this does not remove the risk posed by pre-
54 symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. Pre-symptomatic transmission is known to be
55 substantial¹ and asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic individuals may also shed virus at levels
56 sufficient to infect others². There is considerable heterogeneity in estimates of relatively
57 infectiousness of symptomatic and asymptomatic people, and no conclusive evidence of difference³.
58 Further, SARS-CoV-2 does not shed from infected people equally, with approximately 2% of infected

59 people carrying approximately 90% of the total virus load in a population at any one time. The
60 distribution of viral loads, by PCR test, cannot be distinguished according to symptoms suggesting
61 that people shedding large amounts of virus are as likely to be asymptomatic as symptomatic⁴. Viral
62 load is associated with increased likelihood to shed infectious virus, so those people with the most
63 virus in their upper respiratory tract are the most likely to infect others and to be associated with
64 superspreading events⁵. Collectively, in the context of effective disease control, these factors
65 highlight the need to identify those with the highest virus loads, regardless of their clinical
66 presentation.

67 Antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDTs) offer a means to rapidly identify infected
68 individuals, with the potential to substantially reduce the risk of onward SARS-CoV-2 transmission.
69 However, like every diagnostic test, rapid antigen tests are not perfect and there are both strengths
70 and weaknesses with them. An Ag-RDTs using a lateral flow device (LFD) has a lower sensitivity than
71 PCR. In a detailed review, sensitivity of Ag-RDT was estimated to be 72.0% (95% confidence interval
72 63.7-79.0) and 58.1% (40.2-74.1) for symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals⁶, respectively, but
73 noting that sensitivity does vary between test manufacturers⁷ and will be operator-dependent⁸.
74 Although Ag-RDTs have a higher risk of false negatives than PCR, infected people test positive by LFD
75 during a relatively narrow window of the infectious period, coincident with the period of highest
76 viral load (see figure 1⁸) when individuals are likely most infectious⁹. Ag-RDT results are informative
77 at a single point in time, and will not, for example, test positive for those in their latent period (0-3
78 days following initial infection approximately). On the other hand, most Ag-RDTs have very high
79 specificity, recently estimated at 99.5% (98.5-99.8) and 98.9% (93.6-99.8) in symptomatic and
80 asymptomatic individuals respectively⁶.

81 The World Health Organisation recommends the use of Ag-RDTs in specific situations, including
82 outbreak investigation/contact tracing, monitoring trends in disease incidence, widespread
83 community transmission and to test asymptomatic contacts of cases (World Health Organisation,
84 2020). In contrast, the use of Ag-RDTs can be problematic in populations with low infection
85 prevalence and low pre-test probability. In these settings, the positive predictive values will be low
86 (leading to a high proportion of false positive results) when testing is conducted at large-scale⁷. In
87 situations where the pre-test probability is low-to-moderate, Ag-RDT results must be interpreted
88 with care. In these settings, a Ag-RDT positive should be considered preliminary, with individuals
89 isolating until a PCR test result is known. Ag-RDT negative individuals should continue to comply with
90 conventional risk mitigation measures¹⁰. Ag-RDTs will be most effective when used regularly, with
91 high levels of participation.

92 In the UK, Ag-RDTs have been used in universities, schools and care homes^{11,12} to rapidly identify –
93 and remove – those asymptomatic people who are shedding high amounts of virus. Early results
94 from a pilot at the University of Liverpool were disappointing, with approximately half of cases
95 missed (a sensitivity in comparison to the PCR of 48.9%, specificity of 99.93%)¹¹. In Ireland, there is
96 now considerable experience in the use of Ag-RDTs to detect SARS-CoV-2 infection in meat
97 processing plant workers, which is recognised as a high-risk setting. In these situations, once or
98 twice-weekly Ag-RDTs has been suggested as a viable alternative to once-monthly RT-PCR serial
99 testing, specifically with the aim to identify and isolate asymptomatic individuals¹³.



100

101 Figure 1. An illustration of the average time taken to reach peak viral load and its association with
102 symptoms and the sensitivity of both the PCR test and the antigen test. Taken from⁸

103 This study was conducted to investigate the feasibility and limitations of an antigen testing
104 programme conducted in a university environment which was considered at higher risk of SARS-CoV-
105 2 transmission.

106 2. Methods:

107 a. The setting

108 University College Dublin (UCD) Veterinary Hospital is a critical teaching resource for the UCD School
109 of Veterinary Medicine staffed with approx. 120 clinicians and postgraduate students. It also
110 accommodates a series of clinical rotations for approximately 170 final year veterinary and
111 veterinary nursing students for much of the academic year. The veterinary hospital remained open
112 throughout the pandemic, handling almost 10,000 cases in 2020, but was considered at higher risk
113 of SARS-CoV-2 introduction and spread, in part due to the density of staff and students and the
114 nature of the work (in terms of close contact with staff and animal owners) when handling and
115 treating animals appropriately. A pod-based approach was implemented in early 2020 but could not
116 be sustained once hospital caseload returned towards normal levels, in large part because of

117 broader health and safety concerns associated with limited staff numbers. From March 2020, a
118 range of mitigation measures were put in place following detailed risk assessment, including a
119 review of student rotations, PPE, physical distancing etc. From 2021, further measures were
120 considered, given the serious national picture (7-day incidence, levels of community transmission),
121 the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants, and in light of staff anxieties in the context of returning
122 student rotations. As a consequence, and in the interests of business continuity, there was further
123 evaluation of final year teaching, changes to teaching timelines, the introduction of higher
124 specification face masks and the strategic placement of air purifying units. Further, as reported here,
125 a pilot study of testing using a Ag-RDT was conducted with veterinary hospital staff and students
126 over a 6-week period from 24 March to 29 April 2021, coinciding with a national 14-day incidence of
127 confirmed COVID-19 cases of between 159.54 and 127.26 per 100,000 population at the start and
128 the end of this period, respectively.

129 b. Recruitment of participants:

130 An information drive was established prior to the start of the pilot study, including information
131 videos, circulation of written information and a webinar to explain the principles of the test and the
132 reasons for doing the pilot. Veterinary hospital staff and students received an initial invitation and
133 follow-up reminders during the first three weeks of the study. Participation was voluntary, and all
134 participants were required to read and sign a consent form (supplementary file 1) before their first
135 test. The study was conducted with approval from the UCD Human Research Ethics Committee,
136 approval number LS-21-20-Barry.

137 c. The testing regime

138 The Panbio™ COVID-19 Ag rapid test device (Abbott, Ireland) was used for all tests. The nasal test
139 swab was self-administered under supervision from a trained tester. Training videos and were also
140 provided in advance of the first day of testing. Swabs were then tested using a lateral flow device by
141 a trained tester independent of the person that had been swabbed. All test swabs were labelled with
142 a code so testers did not know who they were testing.

143 Testing was carried out each Monday and Thursday. A person being tested entered a designated
144 room, they were directed to a swabbing station, and they were then instructed how to perform the
145 swab. The swabbing was then observed to ensure correct technique before the swab was placed in a
146 test tube for analysis by the testing team. The swabber being tested was allowed to leave after being
147 swabbed and their swab was analysed within 30 minutes of the swab taking place. If the person was
148 negative, they were not contacted, but if they were positive, they were informed verbally as soon as

149 the result came through. A rubric for how a positive person should act after testing positive was
150 generated and used to guide candidates that tested positive.

151 d. Participation

152 For staff, audit was conducted on Monday and Thursday of week four of the study to determine the
153 total number present in the hospital and eligible to participate in testing. Staff participation was
154 calculated for each of these two days. For students, rotation information was reviewed to determine
155 the number present at each of 8 days during weeks 2-5 of the study. Average student participation
156 over these 8 days was determined.

157 e. Follow-up questionnaire

158 At the end of the 6-week trial, a link to an electronic survey (supplementary file 2) was sent by email
159 to all staff and students that could have taken part in the study. Importantly, this included both
160 those that participated and those that did not but were eligible to do so.

161 3. Results

162 a. Participants

163 A total of 159 people attended at least once for testing during the pilot, including 112 staff and 47
164 students. The staff were working in a variety of roles within the veterinary hospital, whereas the
165 students were all final year veterinary medicine or veterinary nursing students.


166 b. Test results

167 A total of 798 tests were performed across a 6-week period with no positives recorded. No member
168 of staff or of the student cohort reported any symptoms associated with COVID-19 or tested positive
169 by PCR independent of the trial. Staff participation was 90% and 75% on the 2 audited days, whereas
170 the average student participation was 19%.

171 c. Survey results

172 A total of 128 people participated in the survey, including 88 staff and 38 students.

173 *Level of participation.* When asked about their level of participation, the 127 people who responded
174 to this question said they had participated as often as possible, however, 20% participated less than
175 3 times, and 15% said they had not participated at all (Figure 1).



176

177 Figure 1. Answers to the question: 'Which of the following best describes your level of participation
178 in the COVID-19 rapid antigen testing pilot?' 127 people responded.

179

180 *Reasons for limited or no participation.* Of the 19 people who said they didn't participate, 13
181 provided reasons for non-participation, and of the 26 people who participated between 1 and 3
182 times, 21 provided reasons why they did not participate more. Collectively, the reasons for limited or
183 no participation among these 34 respondents included the following: 1 said they were not
184 interested, 1 said they didn't want to risk a positive result, 8 said they did not have enough time, 2
185 people chose not to attend because they felt they were at low risk and didn't need to attend, and
186 others indicated that their time on campus was limited [11] or when on campus they did not have
187 time to participate [7 people]. The remainder [4 people] said that they simply forgot to attend, even
188 when on campus.

189 *Opportunities to increase participation.* There were a total of 81 respondents to this question, and
190 answers can be grouped into the following 4 themes:

- 191
- 192 • **Reminders:** Many people indicated that a reminder on the day of the test would have been
193 useful. This could have come as a text message or an email, but forgetting to attend was
clearly an issue for many.
 - 194 • **Convenience:** It was mentioned by a number of people that making the swabbing more
195 convenient would have allowed better participation. Allowing self-swabbing at home and

196 dropping the swab upon arrival at work was brought up on a few occasions. Having the
197 swabbing station at the front door of the hospital or within the hospital itself so people are
198 reminded to do it and not inconvenienced was also suggested.

199 • **Time:** This was commonly raised as an issue. Solutions to this focussed on broader testing
200 windows – running testing earlier or perhaps later (after 5pm) so people did not have to take
201 time out of work. It was also suggested that a dedicated break could be introduced so that
202 people could go to the swabbing station without feeling like they were missing work. It was
203 also suggested by some students that they were reluctant to leave their post if no other staff
204 were going, so a dedicated testing time, or timings outside of work hours would have
205 worked better.

206 • **Incentives:** It was mentioned on a few occasions that students were reluctant to attend
207 because of the fear of missing 2 weeks if they tested positive. Despite emphasis on keeping
208 fellow workmates safer by getting tested, this was not incentive enough for many. With this
209 in mind, a number of respondents pointed out that incentives might encourage more
210 participation. Incentives such as the ability to use a testing certificate to be allowed to do
211 more things, partake in more activities. Other incentives such as sweets, a bottle of wine for
212 the most participation etc. were also mentioned.

213 *Further comments.* A total of 58 people responded to this question. Answers were provided as free-
214 text, but can be summarised as follows:

- 215 • Reduced anxiety among workers.
- 216 • Created a feeling of an extra layer of safety in the workplace and worked well alongside all
217 other mitigations such as mask wearing, hand sanitisation and increased ventilation.
- 218 • An understanding that it reduced but didn't remove the possibility of a superspreading event
219 in the workplace.
- 220 • Great initiative.
- 221 • Friendly and welcoming.
- 222 • Good information and training.

223 These comments are summarised in the word cloud generated from the answers (figure 3)

238 2 transmission. The testing programme was conducted on a regular basis over a 6-week pilot with a
239 relatively large group of workers and students.

240 b. Feasibility, including lessons learned

241 The pilot study was implemented successfully, and a relatively large group of staff and students were
242 tested on a regular basis in a safe and efficient manner over the 6-week period. Further, as a result
243 of the trial, the participants reported a decrease in anxiety in the workplace and increased
244 confidence among workers. The testing programme allowed participants to carry out their work
245 aware that an extra layer of risk reduction was in place alongside other risk mitigations such as high-
246 grade masks, physical distancing, hand cleanliness and increased ventilation. Importantly, the
247 introduction of the antigen testing was not associated with a noticeable decrease in people
248 following HSE guidelines around the other risk mitigations, so risk of a COVID-19 outbreak in the
249 workplace was decreased overall.

250 There was excellent feedback from staff and students in relation to the information they received
251 beforehand as well as the training videos. Nonetheless, the initial swabbing technique among
252 participants varied greatly, highlighting the importance of on-hand assistance for first-time
253 participants. Correct nasal swabbing technique will likely improve test sensitivity and it is vital that
254 this aspect is performed correctly every time. The current study found that after some initial one-to-
255 one direction, technique became relatively uniform and efficient.

256 The strengths and weaknesses of rapid antigen tests were clearly highlighted to participants,
257 including prudent interpretation of test results. In particular, an understanding that while a positive
258 means that the individual is very likely to be infected and shedding virus, a negative test means that
259 virus was not detected at this point but it did not mean you aren't infected, and therefore one
260 should continue to follow all other public health guidelines. The major benefit of an antigen test is
261 that it will pick up highly infectious people efficiently and conveniently, but with the possibility of
262 missing infected people. This was clearly explained to participants in the information leaflet. These
263 messages have been informed by earlier experience of rapid antigen testing in Ireland, during
264 ongoing screening of asymptomatic people in meat processing plants in January 2021¹³. Over 5000
265 people were tested by both PCR and antigen test, with no evidence of false positive results (a
266 specificity of 100%). In the meat processing plant study, the sensitivity was found to be
267 approximately 80% in people with a PCR Ct below 25 %, falling below 60% in people with Ct values
268 above 30.

269 In the current study, there were no changes to existing mitigation practices within the veterinary
270 hospital. The overwhelming sentiment from staff and students was that antigen testing provided
271 extra reassurance, and greater confidence that the working environment was a safer place to be.
272 From a mental health and team morale point of view, this was reported as being a successful and
273 important consequence of the study.

274 c. Limitations, including lessons learned

275 High levels of participation are vital to make any testing regime effective. Reliance on people staying
276 away from the University campus when symptoms appear is not sufficient to prevent COVID-19
277 outbreaks, given that asymptomatic and mildly symptomatic people can also shed virus. Serial
278 testing by either rapid antigen test or PCR is conducted independent of symptoms, focusing instead
279 on the detection of highly infectious people. In order to carry out a test on a serial basis, however, it
280 should ideally be easy to perform, convenient and cheap. It should be cost-effective, and people
281 must be willing to submit to testing regularly.

282 In the staff cohort, participation levels were high (75-90 %) and commentary about the test was
283 generally very positive with regular use of words such as peace of mind, confidence and safe in the
284 survey. No concerns were raised about the test itself. In contrast, the participation in the student
285 group was very low (19%), which appears to be due to a number of contributing factors. Among
286 students, a common reason given in the survey and also verbally during the study, when queried,
287 was the fear of testing positive and the consequent impact on their studies. The timing of the pilot
288 study may have played a role in this anxiety, as it was the final few weeks of term before graduation,
289 with exams approaching and rotations in the hospital pending that needed completion. Nonetheless,
290 it is worrying that some people would place these concerns ahead of the benefit that would accrue
291 from a positive test result, including the reduction in infection risk, which could potentially be
292 devastating, for fellow staff and students. It would be informative to conduct a similar pilot study at
293 a different time of year, when similar pressures are not present (the start of the academic term for
294 example), to see if this issue dissipates. Another common reported issue was time. Although this was
295 a factor for both staff and students, students may have felt extra pressure, either consciously or
296 otherwise, to avoid missing time in hospital for the sake of a test. It is apparent, based on feedback
297 from both staff and students, that convenience is a priority and would help participants to
298 participate more regularly, particularly when time is at a premium.

299 Throughout the pilot study, messaging in support of participation had a strong public good element,
300 seeking to reduce infection risk both to the individual and their fellow classmates / workmates /
301 hospital as a whole. While this apparently worked well with staff, it did not appear to resonate with

302 the vast majority of students at our institution. The interplay between public good and private
303 benefit has been considered in several recent papers, with differing results. In a recent study from
304 the US, Thunström et al. (2021) found that healthy younger people were more likely to take a no-
305 cost COVID-19 test than health older people, with people generally selfless in their decision to test
306 for COVID-19¹⁴. In contrast, Fallucchi et al. (2021) found that willingness-to-test was increased in
307 association with altruism, conformism and risk-aversion and decreased with decreasing age and
308 increased willingness to take risks¹⁵. Messaging tailored to our students with an emphasis on
309 personal benefits or rewards may have been more successful. Indeed, a bottle of wine was
310 suggested by one survey respondent or sweets for every swab by another. Incentives may be a way
311 to encourage participation in the student cohort and this is something that needs to be considered
312 going forward, although this would then have to be made available for staff too.

313 d. Conclusions

314 In conclusion, the trial showed that antigen testing could be carried out effectively and efficiently in
315 a university setting with a relatively large cohort, on a regular basis. The study also identified
316 differences in participation in the staff and student cohort, suggesting different approaches are
317 needed to incentivise different cohorts. Future studies will focus on promoting how a testing regime
318 can bring personal benefits to students, rather than emphasising the benefit of increasing safety to
319 others. Future work will also focus on convenience and the potential, for example, of running at
320 home testing and self-reporting rather than attending a testing centre.

321 Because of the concern around participation, it could also be considered to deploy rapid testing
322 during times of case number surges only, rather than on a serial basis during times when case
323 numbers were stable or low. One could initially train large cohorts to carry out self-testing during
324 times when cases were low and if the need arose, because of a surge of cases in a concentrated
325 geographical area, test sites could be rapidly set up to test large numbers of people in a short space
326 of time. While not ideal theoretically, because regular testing would be better as a risk mitigation
327 strategy, practically, surge testing might be more feasible and cost effective.

328

329 Acknowledgements:

330 We would like to thank University College Dublin for supporting this study. We thank all participants,
331 both students and staff of University College Dublin for taking part.

332 Competing interests:

333 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

334

- 335 1. Casey-Bryars M, Griffin J, McAloon C, Byrne A, Madden J, Evoy DM, et al. Presymptomatic
336 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infection: a secondary analysis using published data. *BMJ Open*
337 [Internet]. 2021 Jun 1 [cited 2021 Jul 12];11(6):e041240. Available from:
338 <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/11/6/e041240>
- 339 2. Johansson MA, Quandelacy TM, Kada S, Prasad PV, Steele M, Brooks JT, et al. SARS-CoV-2
340 Transmission from People without COVID-19 Symptoms. *JAMA Network Open* [Internet].
341 2021 Jan 1 [cited 2021 Apr 28];4(1). Available from:
342 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33410879/>
- 343 3. McEvoy D, McAloon C, Collins A, Hunt K, Butler F, Byrne A, et al. Relative infectiousness of
344 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infected persons compared with symptomatic individuals: A rapid
345 scoping review [Internet]. Vol. 11, *BMJ Open*. BMJ Publishing Group; 2021 [cited 2021 May
346 27]. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33947725/>
- 347 4. Yang Q, Saldi TK, Gonzales PK, Lasda E, Decker CJ, Tat KL, et al. Just 2% of SARS-CoV-
348 2-positive individuals carry 90% of the virus circulating in communities. *Proceedings of the*
349 *National Academy of Sciences* [Internet]. 2021 May 25 [cited 2021 May
350 11];118(21):e2104547118. Available from:
351 <http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.2104547118>
- 352 5. Kawasuji H, Takegoshi Y, Kaneda M, Ueno A, Miyajima Y, Kawago K, et al. Transmissibility of
353 COVID-19 depends on the viral load around onset in adult and symptomatic patients. Pan X,
354 editor. *PLOS ONE* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 9 [cited 2021 Apr 13];15(12):e0243597. Available from:
355 <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0243597>
- 356 6. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Berhane S, Taylor M, Adriano A, Davenport C, et al. Rapid, point-of-care
357 antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection [Internet]. Vol. 2021,
358 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd; 2021 [cited 2021 May
359 27]. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33760236/>
- 360 7. Pollock NR, Lee F, Ginocchio CC, Yao JD, Humphries RM. Considerations for Assessment and
361 Deployment of Rapid Antigen Tests for Diagnosis of COVID-19. *Open Forum Infectious*
362 *Diseases* [Internet]. 2021 Mar 7 [cited 2021 May 27]; Available from:
363 <https://academic.oup.com/ofid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/ofid/ofab110/6161332>
- 364 8. Crozier A, Rajan S, Buchan I, McKee M. Put to the test: Use of rapid testing technologies for
365 Covid-19. *The BMJ* [Internet]. 2021 Feb 3 [cited 2021 May 11];372. Available from:
366 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n208>
- 367 9. WHO. Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection using rapid immunoassays
368 Interim guidance. 2020.
- 369 10. Bohn MK, Lippi G, Horvath AR, Erasmus R, Grimm M, Gramegna M, et al. IFCC interim
370 guidelines on rapid point-of-care antigen testing for SARS-CoV-2 detection in asymptomatic
371 and symptomatic individuals. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine* [Internet]. 2021
372 [cited 2021 May 27]; Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33908222/>

- 373 11. Wise J. Covid-19: Lateral flow tests miss over half of cases, Liverpool pilot data show. *BMJ*
374 (Clinical research ed) [Internet]. 2020 Dec 15 [cited 2021 May 27];371:m4848. Available from:
375 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33323368/>
- 376 12. Public Health England. Weekly statistics for rapid asymptomatic testing in England: 22 April to
377 28 April 2021 - GOV.UK [Internet]. [cited 2021 May 27]. Available from:
378 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/weekly-statistics-for-nhs-test-and-trace-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/weekly-statistics-for-nhs-test-and-trace-england-22-april-to-28-april-2021/weekly-statistics-for-rapid-asymptomatic-testing-in-england-22-april-to-28-april-2021)
379 [england-22-april-to-28-april-2021/weekly-statistics-for-rapid-asymptomatic-testing-in-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/weekly-statistics-for-nhs-test-and-trace-england-22-april-to-28-april-2021/weekly-statistics-for-rapid-asymptomatic-testing-in-england-22-april-to-28-april-2021)
380 [england-22-april-to-28-april-2021](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/weekly-statistics-for-nhs-test-and-trace-england-22-april-to-28-april-2021/weekly-statistics-for-rapid-asymptomatic-testing-in-england-22-april-to-28-april-2021)
- 381 13. Potential impact of different serial testing scenarios using RADTs to detect SARS-CoV-2 in
382 meat processing plant workers Health Information and Quality Authority Potential impact of
383 different serial testing scenarios using rapid antigen detection tests (RADTs) to detect SARS-
384 CoV-2 in meat processing plant workers.
- 385 14. Thunström L, Ashworth M, Shogren JF, Newbold S, Finnoff D. Testing for COVID-19: willful
386 ignorance or selfless behavior? *Behavioural Public Policy* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 May
387 31];5(2):135–52. Available from: [https://ideas.repec.org/a/cup/bpubpo/v5y2021i2p135-](https://ideas.repec.org/a/cup/bpubpo/v5y2021i2p135-152_1.html)
388 [152_1.html](https://ideas.repec.org/a/cup/bpubpo/v5y2021i2p135-152_1.html)
- 389 15. Fallucchi F, Görges L, Machado J, Pieters A, Suhrcke M. How to make universal, voluntary
390 testing for COVID-19 work? A behavioural economics perspective. *Health Policy* [Internet].
391 2021 May 16 [cited 2021 May 31]; Available from:
392 [https://liser.elsevierpure.com/en/publications/how-to-make-universal-voluntary-testing-for-](https://liser.elsevierpure.com/en/publications/how-to-make-universal-voluntary-testing-for-covid-19-work-a-behav)
393 [covid-19-work-a-behav](https://liser.elsevierpure.com/en/publications/how-to-make-universal-voluntary-testing-for-covid-19-work-a-behav)
- 394
- 395
- 396