

1 Association of Mass Distribution of Rapid Antigen Tests and SARS-CoV-2 Prevalence: Results from  
2 NIH-CDC funded Say Yes! Covid Test program in Michigan

3 Apurv Soni\*<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Carly Herbert<sup>1</sup>, Jonggyu Baek<sup>2</sup>, Qiming Shi<sup>3,4</sup>, Juan Marquez<sup>5</sup>, Emma Harman<sup>6</sup>, Vik  
4 Kheterpal<sup>6</sup>, Chris Nowak<sup>6</sup>, Thejas Suvarna<sup>6</sup>, Honghuang Lin,<sup>1,2</sup> William Heetderks<sup>7</sup>, Adrian Zai<sup>3,4</sup>,  
5 Michael Cohen-Wolkowicz<sup>8</sup>, Giselle Corbie-Smith<sup>9</sup>, Warren Kibbe<sup>10</sup>, Ben S. Gerber<sup>3</sup>, Nathaniel Hafer<sup>3</sup>,  
6 Bruce Barton<sup>2</sup>, John Broach<sup>11</sup>, David McManus<sup>1,2,12</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup>Program in Digital Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical  
8 School, Worcester, MA, USA

9 <sup>2</sup>Division of Clinical Informatics, Department of Medicine, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical  
10 School, Worcester, MA, USA

11 <sup>3</sup>Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical  
12 School, Worcester, MA, USA

13 <sup>4</sup>University of Massachusetts Center for Clinical and Translational Science, University of Massachusetts  
14 Chan Medical School, Worcester, MA, USA

15 <sup>5</sup>Washtenaw County Health Department, Washtenaw, MI, USA

16 <sup>6</sup>CareEvolution LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

17 <sup>7</sup>National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering, NIH, via contract with Kelly Services,  
18 Bethesda, MD, USA

19 <sup>8</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA

20 <sup>9</sup>Center for Health Equity Research, Department of Social Medicine, Department of Medicine, University  
21 of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

22 <sup>10</sup>Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC,  
23 USA

24 <sup>11</sup>Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School, Worcester,  
25 MA, USA

26 <sup>12</sup>Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School,  
27 Worcester, MA, USA

28

29 **Corresponding Author:**

30 \*Apurv Soni

31 55 Lake Avenue North

32 Worcester, MA 01655

33 Phone: 774-455-6677

34 Email: [apurv.soni@umassmed.edu](mailto:apurv.soni@umassmed.edu)

35

36 **Abstract:**

37 **Importance:** Wide-spread distribution of diagnostics is an integral part of the United States' COVID-19  
38 strategy; however, few studies have assessed the effectiveness of this intervention at reducing  
39 transmission of community COVID-19.

40  
41 **Objective:** To assess the impact of the Say Yes! Covid Test (SYCT!) Michigan program, a population-  
42 based program that distributed 20,000 free rapid antigen tests within Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, Michigan  
43 in June-August 2021, on community prevalence of SARS-CoV-2.

44  
45 **Design:** This ecological study analyzed cases of SARS-CoV-2 from March to October 2021 reported to  
46 the Washtenaw County Health Department.

47  
48 **Setting:** Washtenaw County, Michigan

49  
50 **Participants:** All residents of Washtenaw County

51  
52 **Interventions:** Community-wide distribution of 500,000 rapid antigen tests for SARS-CoV-2 to residents  
53 of Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, Michigan. Each household was limited to one test kit containing 25 rapid  
54 antigen tests.

55  
56 **Main Outcome and Measures:** Community prevalence of SARS-CoV-2, as measured through 7-day  
57 average cases, in Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti was compared to the rest of Washtenaw County. A generalized  
58 additive model was fitted with non-parametric trends for control and relative differences of trends in the  
59 pre-intervention, intervention, and post-intervention periods to compare intervention municipalities of  
60 Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti to the rest of Washtenaw County. Model results were used to calculate average  
61 cases prevented in the post-intervention period.

62  
63 **Results:** In the post-intervention period, there were significantly lower standardized average cases in the  
64 intervention communities of Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti compared to the rest of Washtenaw County ( $p < 0.001$ ).  
65 The estimated standardized relative difference between Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti and the rest of Washtenaw  
66 County was -0.016 cases per day (95% CI: -0.020 to -0.013), implying that the intervention prevented 40  
67 average cases per day two months into the post-intervention period if trends were consistent.

68  
69 **Conclusions and Relevance:** Mass distribution of rapid antigen tests may be a useful mitigation strategy  
70 to combat community transmission of SARS-CoV-2, especially given the recent relaxation of social  
71 distancing and masking requirements.

72  
73

74 **Introduction:**

75 Large scale public health efforts, including non-pharmaceutical mitigation strategies of testing, social  
76 distancing, and masking, remain the focal point of the national strategy to address the SARS-CoV-2  
77 pandemic in the third year of this crisis.<sup>1</sup> Government-supported programs to distribute free rapid antigen  
78 tests, including the federal program to distribute up to 500 million tests, are an important step towards this  
79 goal.<sup>2</sup> While previous efforts of mass distribution of rapid antigen tests have been successful in  
80 demonstrating the feasibility of such programs, none have demonstrated the program's effectiveness at  
81 reducing transmission of COVID-19 in the community.<sup>3,4</sup> This manuscript describes an ecological  
82 assessment of the Say Yes! Covid Test (SYCT!) Michigan program, a population-based program that  
83 distributed 500,000 free rapid antigen tests within Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, Michigan in June-August  
84 2021, on SARS-CoV-2 community prevalence.

85 **Methods:**

86 The Say Yes! Covid Test Michigan program distributed 500,000 free rapid antigen tests between June 4  
87 and August 11, 2021 to the residents of Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, two municipalities in Washtenaw  
88 County, Michigan (Figure 1). Combined, Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti account for approximately 40% of  
89 total residents in Washtenaw County (Supplemental Table 1). The program was administered by the  
90 National Institutes of Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in partnership with the  
91 Washtenaw County Health Department. The tests were distributed via online ordering and direct shipment  
92 to resident's homes and by local distribution through pick-up sites at schools, churches, and community  
93 events. Each household was limited to one test kit containing 25 rapid antigen tests, and 20,000 kits were  
94 distributed in total. More information about the design and implementation of the SYCT! program can be  
95 found elsewhere.<sup>3,4</sup> We evaluated 7-day moving average cases of SARS-CoV-2 in Ann Arbor and  
96 Ypsilanti vs. the rest of Washtenaw County during the intervention (June 4-August 11, 2021) and post-  
97 intervention (August 11-October 15, 2021) periods. Municipality-level SARS-CoV-2 case numbers in  
98 Washtenaw County were obtained through the Washtenaw County Health Department. Case-rates in the

99 pre-intervention period (March 1-June 3, 2021) were standardized to adjust for pre-intervention  
100 differences of trends. To test the trends in the post-intervention period, a generalized additive model  
101 (GAM) with spline terms of pre-intervention, intervention, and post-intervention was fitted. Specifically,  
102 the fitted GAM for Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti compared to the rest of Washtenaw County was:

$$E[Y|t, AAYpsi] = \beta_0 + f(t) + \beta_1 AAYpsi * I(PreIntervention) + \beta_2 AAYpsi * I(Intervention) \\ + \beta_3 AAYpsi * I(PostIntervention) * (t - Aug\ 11th)_+$$

103 where  $I(PreIntervention)$ ,  $I(Intervention)$ , and  $I(PostIntervention)$  are indicators for time in the  
104 pre-intervention, intervention, post-intervention period, respectively,  $AAYpsi$  is an indicator for Ann  
105 Arbor and Ypsilanti, and  $(t - Aug\ 11th)_+$  is a linear spline slope term in the post intervention period. A  
106 model was also generated to compare the separate trends in the post-intervention period in Ypsilanti and  
107 Ann Arbor. For this model, functional terms of patterns were included: a quadratic trend difference for  
108 Ann Arbor and a linear trend difference for Ypsilanti. In the fitted GAM models, degree of smoothness  
109 was chosen by the automatic selection using generalized cross-validation in `gam()` function in `mgcv` R  
110 package.<sup>5</sup> Model estimates were used to calculate average cases prevented in the post-intervention period.  
111 All analyses were conducted in R 4.1.1.<sup>6</sup> The SYCT! Michigan intervention received non-research  
112 determination by the University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School Institutional Review Board.

### 113 **Results:**

114 Unadjusted cases in Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti compared to the rest of Washtenaw County are  
115 shown in Supplemental Figure 1. After standardizing for variance in the pre-intervention period, we found  
116 no significant difference in SARS-CoV-2 cases in the intervention period between Ann Arbor and  
117 Ypsilanti compared to the rest of Washtenaw County. However, in the post-intervention period, as cases  
118 increased across all communities, there were significantly lower standardized average cases in Ann Arbor  
119 and Ypsilanti compared to the rest of Washtenaw County ( $p < 0.001$ ) (Figure 2a; Supplemental Figure 2).  
120 The estimated standardized relative difference between Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti and the rest of Washtenaw

121 County was -0.016 cases per day (95% CI: -0.020 to -0.013). We estimate that the intervention prevented  
122 40 average cases per day two months into the post-intervention period if trends of the average cases  
123 between Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti and the rest of Washtenaw were consistent (Supplementary Table 1,  
124 Supplementary Table 2). Separate evaluation of Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti average cases revealed a similar  
125 pattern, though the intervention had a delayed effect in Ann Arbor compared to Ypsilanti (Figure 2b),  
126 attributable to a spike in cases in Ann Arbor during late August/early September.

## 127 **Discussion:**

128 In this evaluation of the large-scale distribution of rapid antigen tests in two Michigan municipalities, we  
129 observed a significantly lower average case-rate in intervention municipalities two months after test  
130 distribution. This finding was observed in the context of the Delta-variant related SARS-CoV-2 surge in  
131 the state of Michigan. With the relaxation of indoor mask guidelines by the Centers for Disease Control  
132 and Prevention, timely testing will be a centerpiece of non-pharmaceutical mitigation strategy.<sup>7</sup> In that  
133 context, these findings suggest that mass distribution of rapid antigen tests is a viable strategy for  
134 reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2, especially during a surge.

135 These findings must be interpreted in the context of the ecological design, which limits our ability to draw  
136 causal inferences. Consistent effects were observed in both municipalities that received the tests, despite  
137 marked differences between municipalities in vaccination rates before and after the intervention period,  
138 suggesting the observed reduction in cases is not entirely attributable to differences in vaccination rates  
139 (Supplemental Table 1). It is important to note that the Washtenaw County Health Department COVID-  
140 19 data is predominantly comprised of molecular (PCR) test results, and rapid antigen tests are often  
141 unreported to health departments. Therefore, observed differences may be attributable to a reporting bias  
142 such that residents in intervention towns, where rapid antigen tests were more widely available due to the  
143 SYCT! Michigan intervention, performed molecular tests less frequently. Unfortunately, data for total  
144 number of tests performed is not available from Washtenaw County Health Department at the sub-county  
145 level, precluding our ability to test this assumption. However, we present robust findings using rigorous

146 non-parametric methods from the best data available. Finally, this program distributed 25 tests to each  
147 household, which is 6-fold higher than the number of tests being distributed by the US government  
148 throughout the country. Therefore, caution must be applied for generalizing findings from this study to  
149 possible effectiveness of the federal program.

150 **Public Health Implications and Conclusions:**

151 Rapid antigen tests offer unique advantages over more sensitive real-time reverse transcriptase  
152 polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) tests as a public health strategy including relatively low cost, ease of  
153 use, and availability of results in 15 minutes.<sup>8</sup> These benefits need to be weighed against the limitations of  
154 rapid antigen tests, including lower sensitivity among asymptomatic individuals and those with low viral  
155 load.<sup>8,9</sup> Our finding indicating that distribution of tests several months prior to a surge in SARS-CoV-2  
156 cases was still associated with a reduction in community transmission suggests that recipients of this  
157 intervention were responsible owners of a personal supply of rapid antigen tests. These findings, taken  
158 together with recent reports that rapid antigen tests' performance remain consistent across variants,  
159 underscore the continued utility of rapid antigen tests.<sup>9</sup> With emerging reports of the BA.2 variant causing  
160 a surge in cases across the globe and in the United States, these findings hold particular importance for  
161 the public health of the country.

162

163 **Competing Interest Statement**

164 DDM reports consulting and research grants from Bristol-Myers Squibb and Pfizer, consulting and  
165 research support from Fitbit, consulting, and research support from Flexcon, research grant from  
166 Boehringer Ingelheim, consulting from Avania, non-financial research support from Apple Computer,  
167 consulting/other support from Heart Rhythm Society.

168 **Funding Statement**

169 This study was funded by the NIH RADx-Tech program under 3U54HL143541-02S2 and NIH CTSA  
170 grant UL1TR001453. The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not  
171 necessarily represent the views of the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering; the  
172 National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; the National Institutes of Health, or the U.S. Department of  
173 Health and Human Services. Salary support from the National Institutes of Health U54HL143541,  
174 R01HL141434, R01HL137794, R61HL158541, R01HL137734, U01HL146382 (AS, DDM).

175 **Acknowledgment:**

176 We are deeply grateful first to the local community of Washtenaw County Michigan, including the local  
177 health officials and second to our collaborators from the National Institute of Health (NIBIB and NHLBI)  
178 who provided scientific input into the design of this study and interpretation of our results, but could not  
179 formally join as co-authors due to institutional policies. We received meaningful contributions from Drs.  
180 Bruce Tromberg, Jill Heemskerk, Rachael Fleurence, Andrew Weitz, Krishna Juluru, Felicia Qashu,  
181 Dennis Buxton, Jue Chen and Erin Itturriaga.

182

183 **References:**

- 184 1. National COVID-19 Preparedness Plan | The White House. Accessed March 15, 2022.  
185 <https://www.whitehouse.gov/covidplan/>
- 186 2. Fact Sheet: The Biden Administration to Begin Distributing At-Home, Rapid COVID-19 Tests to  
187 Americans for Free | The White House. Accessed March 15, 2022.  
188 [https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/01/14/fact-sheet-the-biden-  
189 administration-to-begin-distributing-at-home-rapid-covid-19-tests-to-americans-for-free/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/01/14/fact-sheet-the-biden-administration-to-begin-distributing-at-home-rapid-covid-19-tests-to-americans-for-free/)
- 190 3. CDC–NIH Initiative Provides Free COVID-19 Rapid Home Tests In North Carolina, Tennessee |  
191 Health Affairs. Accessed February 28, 2022.  
192 <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/forefront.20211025.437195/full/>
- 193 4. Ciccone EJ, Conserve DF, Dave G, et al. At-home testing to mitigate community transmission of  
194 SARS-CoV-2: protocol for a public health intervention with a nested prospective cohort study.  
195 *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21(1):1-15. doi:10.1186/S12889-021-12007-W/TABLES/3
- 196 5. Wood S. Mixed GAM Computation Vehicle with Automatic Smoothness Estimation. Published  
197 online February 24, 2022.
- 198 6. R Development Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Published  
199 online 2022.
- 200 7. COVID-19 Community Levels | CDC. Accessed March 15, 2022.  
201 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/community-levels.html>
- 202 8. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Berhane S, et al. Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for  
203 diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2021;2021(4).  
204 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013705.pub2
- 205 9. Soni A, Herbert C, Filippaios A, et al. Comparison of Rapid Antigen Tests' Performance between  
206 Delta (B.1.61.7; AY.X) and Omicron (B.1.1.529; BA1) Variants of SARS-CoV-2: Secondary  
207 Analysis from a Serial Home Self-Testing Study. *medRxiv*. Published online March 2,  
208 2022:2022.02.27.22271090. doi:10.1101/2022.02.27.22271090

209

210

211 **Figures and Tables:**

**Table 1: Population, SARS-CoV-2 Cases, and Vaccination Rate in Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti, June-October 2021**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Population (2019):</b>	<b>Mean SARS-CoV-2 Cases in the Pre-Period</b> n (SD)	<b>Vaccination Rate<sup>b</sup>: Start of Intervention</b> (June 7 <sup>th</sup> )	<b>Vaccination Rate: End of Intervention</b> (August 11 <sup>th</sup> )	<b>Vaccination Rate: Post-Intervention</b> (October 15 <sup>th</sup> )
<b>Ann Arbor</b>	120,735	25.2 (20.2)	72.4	75.3	78.3
<b>Ypsilanti</b>	20,828	27.6 (21.0)	54.3	59.1	62.8
<b>Washtenaw County<sup>a</sup></b>	226,038	23.1 (39.8)	62.0	65.2	67.7


<sup>a</sup>Excluding Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti

212 <sup>b</sup>Percent of individuals who have received 1+ doses of a SARS-CoV-2 vaccine


213

214

**Figure 1: Distribution of Direct-to-Consumer Say Yes Covid Test Kits in Washtenaw County**



**Figure 2: Standardized Comparison of 7-day Moving Average Cases of SARS-CoV-2 infections and predicted cases in Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti compared to the rest of Washtenaw County, March-September 2021.**



Footnote: Predicted cases according to fitted generalized additive model. The smoothness of the fitted generalized additive model was chosen automatically based on generalized cross-validation.