A multistage mixed-methods evaluation protocol for the UKHSA testing response during the COVID-19 pandemic in England

Reshania Naidoo[1,2*], Ben Lambert[3], Merryn Voysey[4], Rima Shretta[5], Claire Keene[6], Marta Wanat[7], Billie Andersen-Waine[8], Prabin Dahal[9], Kasia Stepniewska[9], Rachel Hounsell[2], Sassy Molyneux[6], Emily Rowe[1], Sarah Pinto-Duschinsky[1], Gulsen Yenidogan[1], Lisa J White[10], and the EY-Oxford Health Analytics Consortium**

[1]Ernst & Young(EY) UKI Health Sciences and Wellness, London, UK

[2] NDM Centre for Global Health Research, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford

[3]Department of Mathematics, University of Exeter, UK

[4]Oxford Vaccine Group, Department of Paediatrics, University of Oxford

[5]Self-employed consultant

[6]Health Systems Collaborative, NDM Centre for Global Health Research, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

[7]Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford

[8]Ernst & Young(EY) Seren, London, UK

[9] Infectious Diseases Data Observatory, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford

[10] Big Data Institute, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford

*Corresponding author: Reshania Naidoo, email: reshania.naidoo@uk.ey.com

**The EY-Oxford Health Analytics Consortium membership list is attached in appendix a

ABSTRACT

Introduction

In 2020, the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) established a large-scale testing programme to rapidly identify individuals in England who were infected with SARS-CoV-2 and had COVID-19. This comprised part of the UK government's COVID-19 response strategy, to protect those at risk of severe COVID-19 disease and death and to reduce the burden on the health system. To assess the success of this approach, UKHSA commissioned an independent evaluation of the activities delivered by the NHS testing programme in England. The primary purpose of this evaluation is to capture key learnings from the rollout of testing to different target populations via various testing services between October 2020 and March 2022 and to use these insights to formulate recommendations for future pandemic preparedness strategy.

Methods

The proposed study involves a stepwise mixed-methods approach, aligned with established methods for the evaluation of complex interventions in health. We will retrospectively assess the combined impact of the asymptomatic and symptomatic testing services nationally, including an evaluation of the universal testing service. This will be complemented by 'deep dive' evaluations of three testing services: Schools, Adult Social Care (staff and residents in care homes) and Healthcare workers. In the first instance we will develop a Theory of Change, formulated in collaboration with testing service stakeholders to understand the causal pathways and intended and unintended outcomes of each service, also exploring the effect of context on each individual service setting's intended outcomes.

Subsequently, the insights gained will be synthesised to identify indicators to evaluate how the combined aims of the testing programme were achieved.

Conclusion

This evaluation will be the first of its kind to produce a portfolio of evidence on testing effectiveness and public health impact for the national testing programme in England, encompassing behavioural, economic, equity and public health impact. These findings will strengthen the evidence base on the effectiveness of COVID-19 testing and identify which aspects are necessary to prioritise in mitigating future pandemic threats when deploying a complex public health intervention such as testing.

Disclaimer This is a protocol that represents research in progress. This research was commissioned and funded by UKHSA, to be performed between August 2022 and March 2023. The scope and depth of testing services and channels covered by this research were pre-agreed with UKHSA and were limited to the availability and provision of data available at the time this protocol was written. The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in BMJ editions and any other BMJPGL products and sublicences such use and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in the licence. No patients or public were involved in this research.

Ethics and dissemination The study protocol was granted ethics approval by the UKHSA Research Ethics and Governance Group, reference number NR0347. All relevant ethics

guidelines were followed throughout. Findings arising from this evaluation will be used to inform lessons learnt and recommendations for UKHSA on appropriate pandemic preparedness testing programme designs; findings will also be disseminated in peer-reviewed journals and at academic conferences.

Transparency declaration: The lead author (the manuscript's guarantor) affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

Strengths and limitations of the study

- Strengths of this mixed-methods evaluation protocol include the use of theory-based, complex evaluation approaches and an iterative and participatory approach with the stakeholder (UKHSA) to the evaluation process and prospective modelling.
- Given the scale and complexity of the COVID-19 testing response in England, there is a scarcity of previous relevant research into this, either in England or appropriate international comparators, warranting the mixed-methods evaluation approach we are adopting.
- To the authors knowledge, this is the first national-scale evaluation of the testing response to COVID-19 in England to incorporate most service settings, a programme which formed an integral part of the UK pandemic response strategy. The approach proposed could be applied to the evaluation of pandemic responses in other contexts or to other types of interventions.
- Whereas most complex interventions are accompanied by a prospective evaluation design initiated at the time of the intervention or earlier, this study predominantly

comprises a retrospective evaluation and is therefore limited by the quality of existing research and the data available to the research team at the time of conducting the evaluation within the specified period allocated by UKHSA.

INTRODUCTION

On 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a pandemic and exhorted member states to "test, test, test".(1) In response, the National Health Service (NHS) Test and Trace (T&T) Programme, England, part of the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), was established on 28 May 2020, with the purpose of enabling mass-scale testing and tracing systems to rapidly identify individuals with COVID-19 and their close contacts, thereby minimising the spread of the disease.(2, 3) During the initial phases of the pandemic, in the absence of pharmaceutical interventions or a vaccine, testing was seen as a key means to reopen society. The UK government's COVID-19 response strategy was therefore deployed in the context of mitigating the impact of the pandemic and the measures employed to control it on key areas of society, such as education, protection of livelihoods and preventative and mental health (4).

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the UK government committed to mass testing, with initial testing commencing in March 2020 (5). NHS Test and Trace (NHSTT) was then formally established in May 2020, as an Executive Agency of the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) to lead an 'at scale' national testing and tracing service (2). The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) was established, also as an Executive Agency of DHSC, on 1 April 2021 and was operational on 1 October 2021 (6). UKHSA combines the health protection, clinical and scientific functions formerly carried out by Public Health England (PHE) with the functions of NHSTT and the Joint Biosecurity Centre (JBC) (7).

NHSTT was tasked with providing mass-scale testing and tracing systems to rapidly identify individuals with COVID-19 and their close contacts, thereby minimising the spread of the

disease (3). The NHSTT programme had four main stated objectives: 1) to increase the speed and availability of testing, 2) to identify close contacts of positive cases and require them to isolate, 3) to contain local outbreaks via a coordinated response, and 4) to enable the government to learn more about the virus and explore ways to ease infection control measures as the science developed (2). The programme, at its scale, was the first of its kind in the UK and was created and delivered at pace during a period of unprecedented uncertainty, adapting as necessary in response to the evolving pandemic course.

The testing programme component of NHSTT played an integral role through its various testing services. The testing programme sought to work in partnership with national and local public health bodies, local authorities, the NHS, and commercial and academic providers. Testing was first rolled-out through a population-specific service delivery model followed by a population-wide universal testing service. The testing strategy and resultant policies were frequently adapted and revised in response to the changing epidemiological context of the pandemic, such as the emergence of new variants of concern (e.g. the Delta and Omicron variants), updated scientific evidence and the rollout of vaccines.

The delivery of testing for each of these target populations was multi-modal, through combinations of in-person testing (e.g. public regional testing sites, mobile testing units), pharmacies and home direct self-test kit deliveries, and driven in part by the technology available at the time (e.g. accredited self-sample collection was originally not an option, so physical sites were required). The delivery of testing was initially focused on regional testing sites, followed by service-specific testing sites, then home testing was rolled out as evidence

accrued that this was a viable approach. These approaches to testing were subject to ongoing revision by policymakers throughout the pandemic, dependent on factors such as changing epidemiological prevalence, emerging scientific evidence, and vaccination rollout(8).

Tests for COVID-19 include those that detect the presence of the SARS-CoV-2 virus and those that detect the presence of antibodies to the virus (9). Tests for the virus, such as polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP), detect viral nucleic acid and are usually performed in a laboratory. These tests can appear positive beyond the period of infectiousness(10). LFD tests, which detect SARS-CoV-2 viral protein (antigen), are a quicker approach to testing. They can also be used for self-testing, although they are less sensitive than nucleic acid-based tests (11) and tend only to appear positive during the period of maximal viral shedding (12). At the start of the pandemic, only PCR tests were available for testing swabs from suspected COVID-19 cases; however, LFD tests for COVID-19 were rapidly developed and being evaluated for use by the middle of 2020 (13). LFD tests were initially rolled out for asymptomatic testing, followed by a confirmatory PCR test in the case of a positive LFD result.

The overall success and effectiveness of any national COVID-19 testing service is dependent on multiple contextual factors and the combined impacts of the various testing service settings. From a public health perspective, increased testing has been shown to result in reduced transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and associated hospitalisations and mortality.(14, 15, 16, 17, 18) Behavioural responses to testing strategies are dependent on public awareness

and trust, with adherence to testing policy shown to be driven by perceptions of disease risk and socioeconomic factors.(19) From an equity perspective, COVID-19 testing has been found to exacerbate existing health inequalities, with disparities in access to testing for individuals from black and ethnic minority backgrounds and those living in socially deprived areas.(20) The economic impact of testing can be assessed via cost-effectiveness evaluations of testing strategies, including testing unit costs, operational deployment costs and, on a macro-economic level, quantifying the economic productivity gained from shortened isolation periods and savings to the taxpayer.(21, 22)

UKHSA has appointed a consortium from Ernst and Young LLP in partnership with academics from the University of Oxford, contracted through Oxford University Innovation Limited, to carry out an eight-month evaluation of the testing programme. This consortium (hereafter referred to as 'the evaluation consortium') will undertake an independent evaluation of the testing capabilities delivered by the national COVID-19 testing programme in England from October 2020 to March 2022 (hereafter referred to as 'the evaluation'), with a focus on public health outcomes. This evaluation will seek to capture key learnings from the rollout of testing to the various target populations via the different testing services during this period. The insights gained will inform the formulation of key considerations and recommendations for future pandemic preparedness. Owing to the complexity and rapidly evolving nature of the testing response, no evaluation of the national testing service in England, utilising a mixed methods approach, has been done to date.

Testing services in scope

A decision was made by the evaluation consortium together with UKHSA to conduct an overarching evaluation of the national COVID-19 testing programme in England by assessing the combined impact of the asymptomatic and symptomatic testing services, including an evaluation of the universal testing service which formed a large component of this. This was complemented by 'deep dive' evaluations of three testing services:

- Schools (secondary school pupils aged 11 to 18 years)
- Adult Social care (staff and residents in care homes)
- Healthcare workers

These three services were identified to ensure a broad spectrum of testing populations in England were being evaluated within the given timeframe, i.e., high volumes (universal testing), high-contact groups (schools) and high-risk groups (care homes and healthcare workers), to best reflect the challenges faced during the pandemic and to balance the findings and recommendations for future pandemics.

Table 1. Overview of the deep dive testing service target populations of the COVID-19 testing programme and the purpose of testing each population.

Testing service	Purpose of testing
Schools	Testing of staff and students to prevent transmission within schools and, as they are a high contact group, within the community and to allow schools to continue functioning as normally as possible
Adult Social care	Testing to prevent outbreaks in vulnerable populations (predominantly those in care homes and those receiving domiciliary care)
Healthcare	Testing of NHS staff and patients to reduce the risk of spread within hospital and other healthcare settings, which could then impact transmission in the community
Universal Testing	Rapid, asymptomatic, at-home LFD testing that was made available to the general public to enable faster detection of cases, thereby allowing more immediate isolation

Evaluation aims

The evaluation followed a hypothesis-led approach, where three key hypotheses were developed:

Hypothesis 1: testing services aimed at protecting high-risk groups (e.g. care homes and healthcare workers) led to a reduction in hospitalisations and deaths in these risk groups

Hypothesis 2: testing services aimed at high-contact groups (e.g. schools) led to a reduction in hospitalisations and deaths in the general population

Hypothesis 3: testing services aimed at increasing access to and eligibility for testing and targeting disproportionately impacted groups (e.g. universal testing service) led to increased testing uptake in these populations

Based on these hypotheses, the evaluation sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How was the national COVID-19 testing programme delivered and what factors affected this?
2. What were the barriers and facilitators to access, use and deliver the programme?
3. What were the costs and the cost-effectiveness of the programme?
4. For the universal testing service:
    a. Did the diversity of those reporting test results increase?
    b. Did the barriers and facilitators for testing, reporting and acting on a result change?
5. For each priority service:

a. Did the service achieve the UKHSA intended aims and purposes of the service?
b. Was the service cost-effective?
c. If testing were to be implemented again, what are the barriers and facilitators to increase access, use and delivery of tests?

RESEARCH METHODS

Principles guiding the evaluation

The testing programme can be considered to be a complex public health intervention due to the complexity of the intervention design and the context within which it was implemented.(23) As such, this retrospective evaluation draws on a mixed-methods approach, utilising existing frameworks that have previously been applied to the evaluation of complex interventions, being broadly divided into process, outcome and impact evaluation components.(24, 25, 26, 27)

The evaluation will consist of a phased process:

- A scoping phase, to develop Theory of Change, evaluation aims, and research questions
- A design phase, to agree evaluation approaches, methods, process, outcome and impact indicators
- A conduct phase, to collect, review and synthesise data
- A recommend phase, during which findings and data will be triangulated to form conclusions and recommendations

The Medical Research Council (MRC) framework for process evaluation details three key interrelated components as part of any complex public health process evaluation: implementation, mechanisms of impact, and context.(27) The "Theory of Change" (ToC) approach(28, 29) – a theory of how and why an initiative works – will therefore be used to map the causal pathways for each of the three main service settings, as this approach lends itself to understanding complex interventions with multiple causal pathways.(30) The ToC

framework will be used to understand the causal pathways and intended and unintended outcomes of each service, also exploring the effect of context on each individual service setting's intended outcomes.

The ToCs will be formulated utilising existing evidence provided by UKHSA and will be subject to further refinement following interviews with UKHSA policy and operational stakeholders. Insights from existing UK government-commissioned evidence in the form of previous COVID-19 service-specific testing evaluations and pilot testing programme data will be utilised where possible to avoid duplication of work. Owing to the unpredictability of complex interventions such as this, sufficient flexibility will be allowed within the research design to allow emerging research questions to be addressed.(27)

A comprehensive ToC for each of the three service settings will subsequently inform process and outcome indicators that will be used to assess each service, address the research questions and determine how well each service met its objectives and intended purpose.(31) Based on data availability and granularity, these indicators will be further refined based on what was achievable within the evaluation timeframe.

The indicators will be categorised as follows:

- Process and output indicators: how did the delivery and uptake of the service compare with what was planned over time, and what factors affected this?
- Outcome indicators: what was the effectiveness of each service in terms of intended outcomes?
- Impact indicators: what were the broader economic and societal impacts? What were the overall impacts on minimising transmission while limiting harm?

A gap analysis will also be performed during the 'Conduct' stage to determine whether any crucial data, research, or information is unavailable within the existing literature or data sources provided by UKHSA and whether subsequent adjustment of the research questions or descoping is required. This will be decided through a participatory consultation approach with key UKHSA stakeholders.

Table 2: Example of potential evaluation indicators for the overall national testing programme

Indicator type	Indicator description
PROCESS/OUTPUT	Average percentage of LFD tests distributed that were reported over the entire 18-month time period Average percentage of PCR tests distributed that were reported over the entire 18-month time period
	Number of LFD tests distributed over 18-month time period Number of PCR tests distributed over 18-month time period (separated by pillar 1 and 2 and total) Cost per LFD test conducted over 18-month time period
	Cost per PCR test conducted over 18-month time period
	Total financial cost of TTI Service over 18-month time period
	Total number of tests reported per week
	Reported test positivity of LFD & PCR by IMD decile before and after rollout of universal testing
	Ratio of mean number of reported tests in upper income decile: lowest decile
OUTCOME	Number of hospitalizations averted at different assumptions of reductions in new cases (uncertainty analysis)
	Number of deaths averted at different assumptions of reductions in new cases (uncertainty analysis)
	Cost savings from hospitalisations averted at different assumptions of reductions in new cases (uncertainty analysis)
IMPACT	Cost per QALY gained at different assumptions of reductions in new cases (uncertainty analysis)

The ToCs will be populated in a collaborative manner, enabling the quantitative and qualitative research teams between them to define and align the process and outcome indicators for each service setting. Each team will conduct research concurrently for the various service settings and will communicate their findings at weekly meetings, allowing for emerging findings to be discussed and explored further if deemed necessary. Findings will

also be synthesised across the testing services to inform programme-level insights to meet the programme-level research aims and inform the overarching ToC.

Qualitative data analysis: Rapid scoping review on testing behaviours

A rapid scoping review will be conducted to evaluate the barriers and facilitators in England to engaging with COVID-19 testing, reporting results and self-isolating. This review will aim to 1) provide a summary of the research undertaken on this topic both in the UKHSA grey literature and in the wider academic literature; 2) identify gaps in research efforts; and 3) provide an overview of key barriers and facilitators for each testing and isolation service, as well for the overall testing programme. A scoping study approach has been selected as the method to synthesise the wide knowledge base on this topic, owing to the large volume of heterogenous literature available and to accommodate the time constraints of the commissioned evaluation. (32). The scoping review will be conducted adhering to the 2005 Arksey and O'Malley framework (33), incorporating the adaptations proposed by Levac and colleagues in 2010 (34), and also using the 2015 Joanna Briggs Institute guidance on conducting scoping reviews (35). The findings will be reported according to the standardised PRISMA-ScR checklist (36).

Behavioural findings will then be triangulated with the results of the statistical analyses and fed back into the developing ToCs, to refine and explain the assumptions and to help form the recommendations during the various evaluation phases. In addition, findings across each of the three priority testing services will be compared, with the aim of identifying universal as well as service-specific barriers and facilitators to testing, reporting and isolation following a test result.

More than 40 stakeholder interviews will also be conducted to identify additional sources of unpublished evidence, sense-check the findings, iterate the service-specific ToCs and test the emerging recommendations for feasibility. Additional sources identified through this route will be included in the scoping review (PRISMA-ScR) flow diagram as 'stakeholder-identified studies' (37). All insights from these discussions will be anonymised and incorporated throughout the evaluation report, with further thematic details included in the appendices for each priority testing service.

Quantitative data analysis: statistical methods

Data collection

Quantitative data will be obtained via the secretariat, existing UKHSA repositories, ONS, NHS Digital, and Public Health Scotland; by applying directly to various holders of non-public datasets; and from other public sources of data where available, such as ISARIC (International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging Infection Consortium). General datasets will include SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence surveys; COVID-19 vaccination data; testing coverage data; and COVID-19 cases, hospitalisations, and deaths.

Data analysis

The data will be analysed with the aim of 1) providing summaries of outcome indicators, identified in the ToC, in relation to the implementation of each testing service, to better understand the extent and reach of each service; and 2) providing estimates of the impact of each testing service, which will feed into the cost-effectiveness evaluations. Service-specific statistical approaches will be developed for each priority service and for the universal testing service.

Specified primary outcomes will be defined for each testing service, as defined in the ToC. Outcomes and appropriate counterfactual comparators will be defined, contingent on obtaining access to available data sources; these definitions may be refined using an iterative process based on concurrent analysis of qualitative data. For each testing service, a regression-based approach (24) will be undertaken together with analysis of data at the local authority level (or, if the data allow, at a finer spatial aggregation), accounting for potential confounding factors such as age, sex, and ethnicity profiles, as well as indicators of deprivation, population density, and relevant chronic illnesses. Where determined to be relevant, in collaboration with UKHSA stakeholders, predictors of engagement with health services, such as vaccination uptake or access to internet services will also be included.

Reported case and prevalence data at the Lower Tier Local Authority (LTLA) level will be combined where available to determine true case detection ratios, defined as the percentage of all true cases that were captured by the national testing programme, using a statistical debiasing methodology defined by Nicholson et al (38).

Quantitative data analysis: Cost-effectiveness evaluation

Data collection

The economic analyses will primarily comprise of cost-effectiveness analyses, adopting a provider perspective, incorporating costs to the NHS and to local authorities. For the Schools testing service analysis, a societal perspective will be adopted, to quantify potential productivity losses. A literature review of publicly available economic data will be conducted using keyword searches of scientific databases as well as a search of the grey literature, using Google Scholar. Data relating to the volumes of tests distributed to the various testing

services and the associated costs will be obtained from UKHSA. Data relating to payments made to individuals who were isolating, and other payments made, will be obtained from the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC). Costs will be apportioned to the three priority services according to the volumes of tests distributed. The costs of hospitalisations will be obtained from the National Schedule of NHS costs - Year 2020-21 (39).

Data analysis

The data will be analysed with the aim of 1) providing an estimate of the costs for each testing service and 2) providing estimates of the value for money of each testing service. The outcome measure of quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) gained will be used for the economic analyses. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) defines a QALY as 'a measure of the state of health of a person or group in which the benefits, in terms of length of life, are adjusted to reflect the quality of life. One QALY is equal to 1 year of life in perfect health. QALYs are calculated by estimating the years of life remaining for a patient following a particular treatment or intervention and weighting each year with a quality-of-life score (on a 0 to 1 scale)' (40). The cost per QALY gained is a critical value that is used to determine whether an intervention is cost-effective and is used by NICE to determine whether a proposed new treatment can be covered by the NHS. We will use a value of GBP 70,000 as the willingness to pay threshold for interventions for COVID-19, based on HM Treasury's Green Book (2022) (41). This means that an intervention that costs less than GBP 70,000 per QALY gained can be considered cost-effective. In any graphs produced, we will also indicate the NICE willingness to pay threshold of GBP 30,000, for reference. QALY weights will be obtained from the relevant literature. Sensitivity analyses

will be conducted to test the outcomes against the assumptions, using ranges of estimates from the statistical analyses and the literature for each of the testing services.

Conclusion

The national testing programme in England was rapidly set up, scaled and adapted over time in response to emerging knowledge on COVID-19 transmission and severity and the availability of other public health interventions, such as vaccination. As such, ongoing monitoring and evaluation of testing as a public health intervention and its effectiveness was not uniformly implemented. This evaluation will therefore aim to retrospectively evaluate the national testing programme in England as a whole, with a deep dive of the Schools, Adult Social Care and Healthcare worker testing services through the adoption of a mixed methods approach. We believe that the combined strengths of quantitative and qualitative approaches are necessary for such a complex intervention and will allow for a broader spectrum of insights and triangulation to inform future learnings.

For the purpose of this evaluation, alongside a high-level evaluation of the national testing programme as a whole, we have chosen to narrow our scope to three deep-dive service settings to reflect the spectrum of testing impact on both high risk and high contact populations and in order to produce learnings that will be of most value within the constraints of the evaluation time period. Theories of change will be formulated through reviewing existing grey literature and in consultation with civil servants who set up the services in order to devise the outcome indicators that will guide the evaluation. This will also ensure that the results of the evaluation are firmly grounded in what the services were set up to achieve at the time of inception.

To the authors knowledge, this evaluation will be the first of its kind to produce a portfolio of evidence on testing effectiveness and public health impact for a nationally deployed testing service, focusing on the behavioural, economic, equity and public health impacts. These findings are expected to strengthen the evidence base on COVID-19 testing and identify which aspects when deploying a complex public health intervention, such as testing, are necessary to prioritise for decisionmakers in mitigating future pandemic threats.

Data management plan

All individuals on the research team will have Baseline Personnel Security Standard clearance. All "official-sensitive" data will be accessed through official, UKHSA-approved secure portals and UKHSA secure laptops. All data to be used in the proposed evaluation will be obtained from UKHSA, allied UK government bodies such as NHS Digital and ONS, and independent research organisations.

Funding statement:

This study was funded by Secretary of State for Health and Social Care
acting as part of the Crown through the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), reference number C80260/PRO5331.

Ethics statements

This study protocol has been granted ethical approval by the UKHSA Research Ethics and Governance Group Ref NR0347. All relevant ethics guidelines have been followed. Should the research approach or methods change following this version, the UKHSA Research Ethics and Governance Group will be notified and the appropriate ethical guidelines followed.

Acknowledgements

Scientific writing assistance and editorial support was provided by Adam Bodley and Richard Lewis, according to Good Publication Practice guidelines.

Competing interests statement:

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: all authors had financial support from the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) for the submitted work; EY LLP London has previously received payment for consultancy work and advisory on the NHS Test & Trace response from the UK Department of Health and Social Care, now known as the UK Health Security Agency. There are no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

References

1. World Health Organization. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 16 March 2020: World Health Organization; 2020 [Available from: https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---16-march-2020.
2. Department of Health and Social Care. Government launches NHS Test and Trace service London: HM Government; 2020 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-launches-nhs-test-and-trace-service.
3. SAGE. Thirty-second SAGE meeting on Covid-19, 1 May 2020. 2020.
4. UK Cabinet Office. Our plan to rebuild: The UK Government's COVID-19 recovery strategy 2020 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy.
5. Department of Health and Social Care. Coronavirus (COVID-19): scaling up our testing programmes 2020 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-scaling-up-testing-programmes/coronavirus-covid-19-scaling-up-our-testing-programmes.
6. UK Health Security Agency. UKHSA Annual Report and Accounts 2021-2022. London: HMSO; 2023. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1131855/UKHSA_Annual_Report_21_22_FINAL.pdf.
7. UK Health Security Agency. Test and Trace: overarching privacy notice 2021 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-test-and-trace-privacy-information/test-and-trace-overarching-privacy-notice.
8. Agency UHS. NHS Test and Trace statistics (England): methodology 2022 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-test-and-trace-statistics-england-methodology/nhs-test-and-trace-statistics-england-methodology.

9. Jarrom D, Elston L, Washington J, Prettyjohns M, Cann K, Myles S, et al. Effectiveness of tests to detect the presence of SARS-CoV-2 virus, and antibodies to SARS-CoV-2, to inform COVID-19 diagnosis: a rapid systematic review. BMJ Evid Based Med. 2022;27(1):33-45.
10. Teymouri M, Mollazadeh S, Mortazavi H, Naderi Ghale-Noie Z, Keyvani V, Aghababaei F, et al. Recent advances and challenges of RT-PCR tests for the diagnosis of COVID-19. Pathol Res Pract. 2021;221:153443.
11. Leber W, Lammel O, Siebenhofer A, Redlberger-Fritz M, Panovska-Griffiths J, Czypionka T. Comparing the diagnostic accuracy of point-of-care lateral flow antigen testing for SARS-CoV-2 with RT-PCR in primary care (REAP-2). EClinicalMedicine. 2021;38:101011.
12. Geddes L. Vaccines Work [Internet]: Gavi, The Vaccine Alliance. 2022. [13 March 2023]. Available from: https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/infectious-period-are-cuts-covid-19-isolation-times-good-idea.
13. Peto T. COVID-19: Rapid antigen detection for SARS-CoV-2 by lateral flow assay: A national systematic evaluation of sensitivity and specificity for mass-testing. EClinicalMedicine. 2021;36:100924.
14. Mercer TR, Salit M. Testing at scale during the COVID-19 pandemic. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2021;22(7):415-26.
15. Di Bari M, Balzi D, Carreras G, Onder G. Extensive Testing May Reduce COVID-19 Mortality: A Lesson From Northern Italy. Front Med (Lausanne). 2020;7:402.
16. Rannan-Eliya RP, Wijemunige N, Gunawardana J, Amarasinghe SN, Sivagnanam I, Fonseka S, et al. Increased Intensity Of PCR Testing Reduced COVID-19 Transmission Within Countries During The First Pandemic Wave. Health Aff (Millwood). 2021;40(1):70-81.
17. Liang LL, Tseng CH, Ho HJ, Wu CY. Covid-19 mortality is negatively associated with test number and government effectiveness. Sci Rep. 2020;10(1):12567.
18. Liverpool University. Liverpool Covid-SMART Community Testing Pilot. Liverpool: Liverpool University; 2021.
19. Thorneloe RJ, Clarke EN, Arden MA. Adherence to behaviours associated with the test, trace, and isolate system: an analysis using the theoretical domains framework. BMC Public Health. 2022;22(1):567.
20. Public Health England. Disparities in the risk and outcomes of COVID-19. London: Public Health England; 2020.
21. Du Z, Pandey A, Bai Y, Fitzpatrick MC, Chinazzi M, Pastore y Piontti A, et al. Comparative cost-effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 testing strategies in the USA: a modelling study. The Lancet Public Health. 2021;6(3):e184-e91.
22. Iacobucci G, Coombes R. Covid-19: Government plans to spend £100bn on expanding testing to 10 million a day. BMJ. 2020;370:m3520.
23. Petticrew M. When are complex interventions 'complex'? When are simple interventions 'simple'? European Journal of Public Health. 2011;21(4):397-8.
24. HM Treasury. Magenta Book - Central Government guidance on evaluation. London: HM Treasury; 2020.
25. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, et al. Framework for the development and evaluation of complex interventions: gap analysis, workshop and consultation-informed update. Health Technol Assess. 2021;25(57):1-132.
26. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, et al. A new framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions: update of Medical Research Council guidance. BMJ. 2021;374:n2061.
27. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, et al. Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. BMJ. 2015;350:h1258.
28. Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change. Community Change: Theories, Practice, and Evidence. Auspos EbKF-AaP, editor. Washington D.C.: Aspen Institute; 2006.

29. De Silva MJ, Breuer E, Lee L, Asher L, Chowdhary N, Lund C, et al. Theory of Change: a theory-driven approach to enhance the Medical Research Council's framework for complex interventions. Trials. 2014;15:267.
30. Blamey A, Mackenzie M. Theories of Change and Realistic Evaluation:Peas in a Pod or Apples and Oranges? Evaluation. 2007;13(4):439-55.
31. Funnell SC, Rogers PJ. Purposeful Program Theory: Effective Use of Theories of Change and Logic Models: Wiley; 2011.
32. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien K, Colquhoun H, Kastner M, et al. A scoping review on the conduct and reporting of scoping reviews. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2016;16:15.
33. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. International Journal of Social Research Methodology. 2005;8(1):19-32.
34. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. Implement Sci. 2010;5:69.
35. Peters MD, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, McInerney P, Parker D, Soares CB. Guidance for conducting systematic scoping reviews. Int J Evid Based Healthc. 2015;13(3):141-6.
36. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2018;169(7):467-73.
37. Hanneke R, Asada Y, Lieberman L, Neubauer LC. The Scoping Review Method: Mapping the Literature in "Structural Change" Public Health Interventions. London2017. Available from: https://methods.sagepub.com/case/scoping-review-mapping-literature-structural-change-public-interventions.
38. Nicholson G, Lehmann B, Padellini T, Pouwels KB, Jersakova R, Lomax J, et al. Improving local prevalence estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infections using a causal debiasing framework. Nature Microbiology. 2022;7(1):97-107.
39. NHS England. 2020/21 National Cost Collection Data Publication 2022 [Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/2020-21-national-cost-collection-data-publication/.
40. NICE. Glossary 2023 [Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/glossary.
41. HM Treasury. The Green Book (2022) 2022 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-governent/the-green-book-2020.

Appendix A: EY-Oxford Health Analytics Consortium Membership

Name	Affiliation
Ainura Moldokmatova	Big Data Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Anastasiia Polner	Ernst & Young LLP London
Bo Gao	Center for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Caroline Franco	Nuffield Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Oxford | Institute of Theoretical Physics - São Paulo State University (UNESP)
Jared Norman	Modelling and Simulation Hub, Africa (MASHA), University of Cape Town
Katie Douglass	Ernst & Young LLP London
Liberty Cantrell	Department of Paediatrics, University of Oxford
Lok (Joseph) Tsui	Department of Biology, University of Oxford
Ma'ayan Amswych	Ernst & Young LLP London
Muhammad Kasim	Department of Physics, University of Oxford
Randolph Ngwafor Anye	Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford
Ricardo Aguas	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Richard Creswell	Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford
Sabine Dittrich	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Sheetal Silal	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Siyu Chen	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford

Sompob Saralamba	Center for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Sophie Dickenson	Ernst & Young LLP London
Sumali Bajaj	Biodiversity, Ecology & Evolutionary Processes Stream, Department of Biology, University of Oxford
Sunil Pokharel	Center for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Tracy Evans	Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford
Umar Mahmood	Ernst & Young LLP London
Wirichada Pan-ngum	Center for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Zoe Echanah	Ernst & Young LLP London