

1 **Asymptomatic Employee Screening for SARS-CoV-2: Implementation of and Reactions to**
2 **an Employer-Based Testing Program.**

3

4 Laura H. Goetz, M.D., M.P.H.^{1*} Tyler L. DeLaughder, D.O.¹ Kathleen L. Kennedy, M.P.H.¹
5 Nicholas J. Schork, Ph.D.^{1,2} Timothy K. McDaniel, Ph.D.¹ Jeffrey M. Trent, Ph.D.^{1,2} David M.
6 Engelthaler, Ph.D.¹

7

8 **Affiliations:**

- 9 1. Translational Genomics Research Institute, Phoenix, AZ
10 2. City of Hope National Medical Center, Duarte, CA

11

12 **Financial disclosures:** The authors have no financial disclosures or conflicts of interest.

13

14 **Keywords:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, asymptomatic screening, universal testing, healthcare
15 workforce, contact tracing, pandemic

16

17

18 **Word count:** 2996

19 **Pages:** 20

20 **Tables:** 4

21 **Figures:** none

22

23

24 ***Address correspondence to:**

25 Laura H. Goetz, MD, MPH

26 The Translational Genomics Research Institute (TGen)

27 445 North Fifth Street

28 Phoenix, AZ 85004

29 lgoetz@tgen.org

30 P: 1-602-343-8429

31 F: 1-602-343-8439

32 **ABSTRACT**

33 **Introduction:** Asymptomatic testing for SARS-CoV-2 among healthcare workers or other
34 essential personnel could remove infected carriers from the workforce, decreasing chances for
35 transmission and workplace outbreaks. Results from one-time testing programs have been reported
36 but data regarding longitudinal testing, including information about employee's reactions to such
37 programs, is not readily available.

38 **Methods:** To identify asymptomatic carriers of SARS-CoV-2, we implemented a longitudinal
39 screening program for critical on-site employees within our research institute in early April 2020.
40 We conducted a survey of both on-site employees and those working from home in order to
41 measure their reactions to the testing program. Statistical analysis of the survey was conducted
42 with general linear regression and Pearson's Chi-Square tests.

43 **Results:** Despite an ongoing high community prevalence rate of COVID-19, to date only two
44 asymptomatic employees tested positive out of 1050 tests run during 7 months of the program.
45 However, 12 symptomatic employees not participating in the program have tested positive. The
46 employee survey was completed by 132/306 (43%) employees, with 93% agreeing that
47 asymptomatic employee screening led to a better and safer working environment and 75% agreeing
48 with on-site public health measures to help contain the virus, but only 58% feeling COVID-19 was
49 a serious threat to their health.

50 **Conclusion:** Our results suggest that a longitudinal asymptomatic employee screening program
51 for SARS-CoV-2 can be accepted by employees and can be used to maintain the health of the
52 workforce, potentially keeping positivity rates below community levels in the face of the ongoing
53 COVID-19 pandemic.

54

55 INTRODUCTION

56 In January and February of 2020, the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic, reports from China
57 and subsequently Italy regarding the high mortality rate of infected healthcare workers prompted
58 consideration of stronger measures to keep healthcare workers from getting infected.^{1,2} Estimates
59 of viral shedding and transmissibility indicated that peak viral loads could occur in many
60 individuals prior to symptom onset, which was different from what was experienced in prior SARS
61 coronavirus epidemics.³⁻⁵ Up to 68% of cases in some areas were thought to be due to pre-
62 symptomatic transmission of SARS-CoV-2.⁶⁻¹⁰ Thus, with asymptomatic carriers identified as a
63 significant source of disease spread, routine testing of asymptomatic individuals, followed by
64 isolation of those testing positive and quarantining of their close contacts, emerged in many
65 countries as an effective first step in the containment of outbreaks and flattening of the
66 epidemiologic curve for COVID-19.¹¹⁻¹⁴

67

68 In early March of 2020, as the pandemic spread throughout the United States, the Translational
69 Genomics Research Institute's (TGen's) pathogen and microbiome facility was repurposed into a
70 CLIA-registered COVID-19 clinical diagnostic laboratory, employing a SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR
71 assay, which was allowed under an Emergency Use Authorization program from the Federal Drug
72 Administration (FDA). More than 45,000 suspect COVID-19 clinical samples were processed in
73 the facility, with >5000 known positive specimens identified. Additionally, all positive specimens
74 were genomically sequenced. The staff size in the facility increased from approximately 35
75 employees to over 70 at the height of the response, increasing chances for person-to-person spread
76 from an unidentified asymptomatic infected employee.

77

78 Due to the potential high risk for workplace transmission through an increased employee
79 population and presence of live virus in diagnostic samples, a longitudinal asymptomatic employee
80 screening program was designed to conduct routine and repeated testing for SARS-CoV-2
81 infection, with subsequent isolation of individuals testing positive, in addition to contact tracing
82 and at-home quarantine of identified close contacts, following CDC recommendations. The goal
83 of this program was to decrease the risk for transmission of the virus in the workplace, primarily
84 in order to maintain continual CLIA laboratory operations during the COVID-19 response. Table
85 1 lists potential benefits and barriers to such an employee screening program. Here we review our
86 experience with development and implementation of this program, and present results to date, as
87 well as results of an employee survey we conducted seven months after the program began.

88

89 **METHODS**

90

91 **Program Description**

92

93 After the lockdown and work-from-home orders were put into place in Arizona in late March of
94 2020, a protocol for longitudinal asymptomatic employee screening was designed to test the subset
95 of employees working on-site as critical or essential workers in the SARS-CoV-2 testing facility
96 or in research laboratories working with SARS-CoV-2. Those employees working full-time from
97 home were not eligible to participate in the program. Symptomatic employees were offered testing
98 outside of the asymptomatic employee screening program. Out of 306 total employees, 40 were
99 initially eligible in April, increasing to 71 during July and August. The TGen Offices of
100 Compliance, Human Resources and Legal Counsel approved the protocol and assisted in careful
101 development of the consent forms to avoid any element of coercion, stressing that participation in

102 the protocol was confidential and entirely voluntarily, and emphasizing that there would be no
103 negative repercussions for not participating, such as loss of employment or reassignment of job
104 duties.

105
106 Public health precautions followed in the workplace during March and April included daily
107 symptom checking and temperature measurement upon arrival at work, social distancing, frequent
108 hand-washing, and frequent disinfection of shared surfaces. While masks were always part of the
109 required PPE in the laboratory, they became mandatory in all work areas starting in May when
110 mask-wearing became part of the Center for Disease Control and Prevention workplace
111 recommendations.¹⁵

112
113 An initial testing interval of two weeks was determined based on the community prevalence of
114 COVID-19, which in early April was less than 20 per 100,000, and also on estimates of viral
115 shedding and transmissibility in asymptomatic individuals.^{3,4} This interval was shortened to one
116 week during spikes in community to prevalence to over 1,000 per 100,000 individuals.

117
118 **Employee Survey**

119
120 Six months after implementation of the testing program, we developed a novel short IRB-exempt
121 and completely anonymized Likert Type (“strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”) survey
122 instrument to assess employee reactions to the program and the pandemic in general. No
123 identifying information, such as sex and age, was collected. Five categories were assessed: feelings
124 about the pandemic; beliefs about asymptomatic testing in general; feelings about an employee

125 testing program; feelings about public health measures in the workplace, and reactions to the
126 testing process itself.

127

128 The survey was developed as an online tool and an email invitation was sent to all employees
129 describing the instrument and the reasoning behind it. Consent for participation was obtained when
130 the individual agreed to begin the survey. Reminder emails were sent 1 and 2 weeks after the initial
131 email. Statistical analysis of results included frequency measurements for work-from-home status,
132 participation and motivation questions. Pearson's Chi-square and generalized linear regression
133 were used to assess associations between the items on the questionnaire and to ultimately test the
134 hypothesis that employees working on site or participating in the program would differ in their
135 responses compared with those working from home or not-participating. All analyses were carried
136 out using R software, version 4.0.3.

137

138

139 **RESULTS**

140

141 **Screening Program Results**

142

143 The first screening session was held on April, 3, 2020 and will continue throughout the length of
144 the pandemic. Thirty sessions were completed as of November 1, 2020. The average number of
145 participants per session was 48, with a range of 11 to 71. The average participation rate of those
146 eligible was 95% with a range of 85 to 100%. Of the 30 total sessions, 28 did not identify a single
147 positive asymptomatic employee. To date, 1082 samples have been processed with only two
148 asymptomatic positive employees identified. This equals a case rate of 184 per 100,000 individuals

149 tested, which is far below the current case rate for Arizona of 3,253 per 100,000.¹⁶ One employee
150 was retested due to concerns for a false positive and tested negative 4 days later. The other
151 employee remained home for seven days, did not develop symptoms, was retested on day 7 and
152 subsequently found to be negative.

153

154 **Symptomatic Testing Results**

155

156 During the period from April to November 1, 2020, a total of 12 symptomatic employees not
157 participating in asymptomatic screening tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. Nine of these employees
158 were working on-site and three were working from home. Isolation, contact tracing, and quarantine
159 of close contacts was conducted and no transmission to co-workers was identified. Employees
160 working on-site were retested after they had been symptom-free for 72 hours and a minimum of
161 seven days had passed since their last positive test. One individual remained positive for two weeks
162 and the other 8 tested negative after 10 days. Since not all symptomatic employees who receive
163 testing notify our Human Resources Department of their symptoms, the denominator for the total
164 number of symptomatic employees tested is unknown.

165

166

167 **Survey Results**

168

169 An initial email invitation was sent to a total of 306 employees, approximately half of whom
170 worked from home full time and half of whom worked on-site either full time or part time during
171 the COVID-19 pandemic response. Of those, 133 started and 132 completed the survey, for a
172 response rate of 132/306 or 43%. Eighty three of the 132 (63%) respondents were working on-
173 site and of these, 47 (57%) were participating in the asymptomatic screening program. Three of

174 the 49 (6%) respondents working from home were participating in the asymptomatic employee
175 testing program. Table 2 lists motivating factors for participation. Forty four of the 47 (94%)
176 participating respondents chose item 2, “I wanted to know my status for my own benefit”, while
177 35 (75%) chose more than one of items 2 through 5 and 28 (60%) chose all four items 2 through
178 5. Only one individual chose item 1. Table 3 gives results for the each of the five categories of
179 survey items. Regarding feelings about the pandemic, a small majority (57%) agreed or strongly
180 agreed with the statement ‘COVID-19 is a serious threat to my personal health’, but over 70% felt
181 more anxious since the pandemic. For items assessing beliefs about asymptomatic testing in
182 general, 96% of employees felt that asymptomatic screening could help contain the epidemic, 93%
183 felt that asymptomatic employee screening is necessary to keep the workforce healthy, and 89%
184 felt this type of testing should be freely available to the public through the health department.
185 Additionally, 86% did not feel asymptomatic screening should only be available for high-risk
186 individuals. Regarding feelings specifically about the employee program, four individuals (3%)
187 did not completely understand that the program was voluntary and 5 (4%) reported feeling
188 pressured into participating in the program. Other findings of note included responses to questions
189 concerning ‘feelings about public health measures in the workplace’, where the vast majority
190 replied favorably regarding their perceptions of how their employer and coworkers followed basic
191 guidelines to keep the workplace safe.

192

193 Four individuals had participated in the past but stopped participating. Two of these individuals
194 indicated the reason for stopping as “I did not feel my risk for getting COVID-19 was high enough
195 for me to continue to get tested”; one individual chose “Masks, handwashing, and social distancing

196 practices are enough to keep me safe from getting sick” and one individual chose “The testing
197 process was inconvenient due to timing with work schedule, location, etc.”

198

199 Generalized linear regression analysis focusing on those working from home and those not
200 working from home as a dependent variable did not suggest any significant differences in
201 responses, nor between those participating and those not participating. We also used generalized
202 linear regression with the question ‘COVID-19 is a serious threat to my personal health’ as the
203 dependent variable and found no significant difference between responses from those working on
204 site or not and those participating or not. Using Pearson’s Chi-square test on contingency tables
205 reflecting employee responses, we assessed each survey item listed in Table 3 individually and
206 found no significant difference in responses between non-participants and participants or those
207 working from home or on-site.

208

209 **DISCUSSION**

210

211 Since the COVID-19 pandemic first became widespread (Spring 2020), reports from around the
212 world showed asymptomatic screening for SARS-CoV-2 to be an effective strategy for containing
213 COVID-19 outbreaks and as such, we began a screening program for our employees in early April,
214 2020. Since that time, several groups have published recommendations for asymptomatic
215 screening, either in a limited fashion for the healthcare workforce, such as Grassly et al¹⁷ and Black
216 et al,¹⁸ or more broadly via universal testing, as described by McClellan et al¹⁹. The rationale put
217 forth by these groups for such testing includes the early identification of small outbreaks to reduce

218 spread, protecting the health of the workforce, and minimizing workforce depletion by
219 unnecessary quarantine.

220

221 Several published reports have described either repeated or one-time screenings of asymptomatic
222 healthcare workers and are summarized in Table 4. Jameson et al²⁰ published their results of a
223 voluntary one-time screening of healthcare workers in an urban hospital in Michigan during a time
224 of high community burden of SARS-CoV-2, at 515 active cases per 100,000. They reported a
225 participation rate of 24.2% (121/499) of eligible employees, all of whom tested negative. This
226 study provided the hospital with critical data showing that the precautionary measures they were
227 using were effective. Nagler et al²¹ reported their results of on-demand testing of both
228 asymptomatic and symptomatic employees of New York University's Langone Health Center
229 from March through May, 2020. They found the asymptomatic positivity proportion was 12% in
230 March and decreased to 0% in May. They concluded that their program was effective in
231 maintaining and managing the health of their workforce. Rivett et al²² reported their results from
232 a one-time screening of asymptomatic healthcare workers over a 3 week period in April 2020 at
233 Cambridge University's National Health Service Hospital. They identified 30 positive individuals
234 out of 1032 who were tested. These individuals were able to be removed from the workforce when
235 they would have otherwise continued working. They concluded that their program showed the
236 utility of routine screening of asymptomatic employees. Lombardi et al²³ in Milan, Italy reported
237 their results from one-time screening of at-risk healthcare workers at the Foundation IRCCS Ca'
238 Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico who had contact with a known positive patient or co-
239 worker during the peak of the pandemic in late February and March, 2020. They identified 17
240 positive out of the 1070 asymptomatic individuals who were tested (1.6%). Finally, Mohanty et

241 al²⁴ reported the results from a program that is most similar in design to the one implemented at
242 our institute. They began asymptomatic screening of patients and staff in the electrophysiology
243 (EP) units and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) of several hospitals in the United States. From
244 April to June 2020, they tested 691 staff members, and identified 31 positive individuals
245 (4.5%). They did not identify any new transmissions between coworkers or between staff and
246 patients. They concluded the asymptomatic screening program led to a safe work environment
247 with no evidence of hospital-acquired infection.

248

249 Our testing results of an asymptomatic employee screening program in a COVID-19 diagnostic
250 and research facility revealed an extremely low proportion of asymptomatic carriers, with just 2
251 individuals testing positive out of 1082 tests performed across seven months. Despite significant
252 increases in the community case rate - the current case rate for Arizona is 3253 per 100,000¹⁶ - and
253 the risks associated with being employed in a COVID-19 diagnostics and research laboratory, the
254 infection rate amongst employees participating in asymptomatic screening has consistently been
255 below expectation based on general community rates of infection and below rates of infection
256 amongst employees not participating in the program. The low rate of infection in the screened
257 group could be a reflection of a higher degree of adherence to public health measures such as
258 handwashing and mask wearing. Whether or not participation in the screening program increased
259 one's likelihood of following public health measures is an interesting question, but not one we
260 were able to capture with our survey instrument.

261

262 Notably, the employee survey identified strong beliefs in universal testing, following public health
263 measures in the workplace and overwhelming support of asymptomatic employee screening,

264 regardless of whether employees were working on-site or from home, or participating or not. One
265 of the largest concerns when instituting the screening program was the potential perception among
266 employees of coercion to participate. We attempted to address this by carefully drafting the consent
267 forms for the testing program to clearly state that this program was entirely voluntary and
268 confidential, and that there would be no repercussions for not participating. As seen from the
269 survey results, less than 5% of people felt pressured into participating or felt that they did not
270 clearly understand that the program was entirely voluntary, indicating our consenting process and
271 communications about the program were effective at minimizing concerns of coercion.

272

273 Interestingly, only 58% of respondents felt that COVID-19 was a serious threat to their personal
274 health. We did not find an association between perceptions of COVID-19 as a serious threat based
275 on whether or not someone is working from home and/or participating in the program. Since
276 participation in the program is entirely voluntary, our hypothesis was that individuals who are
277 working from home and/or not participating do not necessarily feel COVID-19 is a threat, however
278 this was not supported by our analyses. This could be due to the relatively small sample size.

279

280 There are several limitations to discuss. The number of employees participating in the screening
281 program remains small, averaging less than 60 per week, and such a program may not be
282 generalizable to larger workplaces. Additionally, the survey instrument we used has not yet been
283 validated, although we plan on exploring this with future IRB-approved research. Our survey
284 response rate was 43%, which is above reported averages for organizational surveys,²⁵ but less
285 than desired. Thus, the overwhelming support shown by respondents to the program could be due
286 to volunteer bias, where those individuals who approve of such a program were more likely to

287 complete the survey. Also, because of the need for complete anonymity we could not collect any
288 demographic or identifying information, thus other important analyses of the survey results were
289 not possible, such as whether or not the responses differed by sex or age of the participant. These
290 variables are known to be important factors in understanding personal behaviors and beliefs about
291 the pandemic^{26,27} and by omitting them in our survey, generalizations to the broader population is
292 limited. Another limitation is that we did not conduct a baseline survey prior to implementation of
293 the program, so we are unable to assess whether the beliefs and attitudes about the testing program
294 we collected post hoc were in fact altered by being part of the program, and not reflective of *a*
295 *priori* beliefs and attitudes. In addition, the tested employee population was a group familiar with
296 laboratory testing and medical research, so the results might not be applicable to a lay workforce.

297

298 CONCLUSION

299 Despite the limitations listed above, we feel our results suggest that a longitudinal asymptomatic
300 employee screening program for SARS-CoV-2 can be well received by employees and can help
301 maintain the health of the workforce during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. We have learned
302 that it is important to communicate clearly to address issues surrounding perceptions of employee
303 coercion and to ensure that the voluntary nature of such a program is conveyed. We have also
304 learned that extending the program to all employees, even those working from home, can possibly
305 help decrease the spread of the pandemic in general. Finally, there is a role for expanding this type
306 of screening program for other active respiratory infectious diseases, such as the influenza and
307 respiratory syncytial viruses, since these can also be responsible for significant employee illness
308 and absenteeism. The success of this program provides evidence for establishing similar programs
309 even earlier in the face of future emergent public health threats.

310 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

311 Aspects of this work were funded in part by philanthropic gifts from the Northern Arizona
312 Regional Behavioral Health Authority (NARBHA) Institute and the Garcia Family Foundation.

313 Dr. Laura Goetz contributed to the design, implementation and management of the testing
314 program, created the employee survey, conducted the statistical analyses, and wrote the
315 manuscript.

316 Dr. Tyler DeLaughder contributed to the design, implementation and management of the testing
317 program and the employee survey and wrote parts of the manuscript.

318 Kathleen Kennedy is responsible for the employee health program, helped with conceptualization
319 and design of the employee survey and helped revise and edit the manuscript.

320 Dr. Nicholas Schork advised on design and implementation of the employee testing program and
321 all statistical analyses, and also revised and edited the manuscript.

322 Dr. Timothy McDaniel and Jeff Trent advised on the employee testing program and revised and
323 edited the manuscript.

324 Dr. David Engelthaler oversaw the design and implementation of the employee testing program
325 and revised and edited the manuscript.

326 We acknowledge Carmel Plude for carrying out the testing itself and contributing to the efficient
327 running of the program.

328 **Financial disclosures:** The authors have no financial disclosures or conflicts of interest.

329

330

331

332

333

334 **REFERENCES**

- 335
- 336 1. Sadeghi N, Wen L. Novel Coronavirus Should Prompt Examination of Impact of Outbreaks
337 on Health Care Workers. *Health Affairs Blog*
338 <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hblog20200214587257/full/> Accessed March
339 24, 2020.
- 340 2. Stickings T, Dyer C. Five more Italian doctors die battling coronavirus: Thirteen medics
341 have now lost their lives, with 2,629 health workers infected - 8.3% of country's total.
342 [https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-8129499/More-2-600-medical-workers-](https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-8129499/More-2-600-medical-workers-infected-coronavirus-Italy.html)
343 [infected-coronavirus-Italy.html](https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-8129499/More-2-600-medical-workers-infected-coronavirus-Italy.html) Accessed March 20, 2020.
- 344 3. Ganyani T, Kremer C, Chen D, et al. Estimating the generation interval for coronavirus
345 disease (COVID-19) based on symptom onset data, March 2020. *Euro Surveill.*
346 2020;25(17).
- 347 4. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of
348 COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(5):672-675.
- 349 5. Peiris JS, Chu CM, Cheng VC, et al. Clinical progression and viral load in a community
350 outbreak of coronavirus-associated SARS pneumonia: a prospective study. *Lancet.*
351 2003;361(9371):1767-1772.
- 352 6. Mizumoto K, Kagaya K, Zarebski A, Chowell G. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of
353 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship,
354 Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020;25(10).
- 355 7. Qiu J. Covert coronavirus infections could be seeding new outbreaks. *Nature.* 2020.
- 356 8. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus
357 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases From
358 the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA.* 2020;323(13):1239-1242.
- 359 9. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, et al. Transmission of 2019-nCoV Infection from an
360 Asymptomatic Contact in Germany. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(10):970-971.
- 361 10. Day M. Covid-19: four fifths of cases are asymptomatic, China figures indicate. *BMJ.*
362 2020;369:m1375.
- 363 11. Day M. Covid-19: identifying and isolating asymptomatic people helped eliminate virus in
364 Italian village. *BMJ.* 2020;368:m1165.
- 365 12. McGregor G. South Korea amassed the world's most comprehensive coronavirus data.
366 What it's taught us so far. [https://fortune.com/2020/03/19/coronavirus-south-korea-](https://fortune.com/2020/03/19/coronavirus-south-korea-test-data/)
367 [test-data/](https://fortune.com/2020/03/19/coronavirus-south-korea-test-data/) Accessed March 19, 2020.
- 368 13. Kaplan EH. Containing 2019-nCoV (Wuhan) coronavirus. *Health Care Manag Sci.*
369 2020;23(3):311-314.
- 370 14. Cristani A, Cassone A. In one Italian town, we showed mass testing could eradicate the
371 coronavirus. [https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/mar/20/eradicated-](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/mar/20/eradicated-coronavirus-mass-testing-covid-19-italy-vo)
372 [coronavirus-mass-testing-covid-19-italy-vo](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/mar/20/eradicated-coronavirus-mass-testing-covid-19-italy-vo) Accessed March 24, 2020.
- 373 15. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim U.S. Guidance for Risk Assessment and
374 Work Restrictions for Healthcare Personnel with Potential Exposure to COVID-19
375 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/guidance-risk-asesment-hcp.html>
376 Accessed September 12, 2020.

- 377 16. Arizona Department of Health Services COVID-19 Data Dashboard
378 [https://azdhs.gov/preparedness/epidemiology-disease-control/infectious-disease-](https://azdhs.gov/preparedness/epidemiology-disease-control/infectious-disease-epidemiology/covid-19/dashboards/index.php)
379 [epidemiology/covid-19/dashboards/index.php](https://azdhs.gov/preparedness/epidemiology-disease-control/infectious-disease-epidemiology/covid-19/dashboards/index.php) Accessed November 1, 2020.
- 380 17. Grassly N, Pons-Salort M, Parker E, White P, al e. Report 16: Role of testing in COVID-19
381 control. [https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/mrc-gida/2020-](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/mrc-gida/2020-04-23-COVID19-Report-16.pdf)
382 [04-23-COVID19-Report-16.pdf](https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/medicine/mrc-gida/2020-04-23-COVID19-Report-16.pdf) Accessed September 12, 2020.
- 383 18. Black JRM, Bailey C, Przewrocka J, Dijkstra KK, Swanton C. COVID-19: the case for health-
384 care worker screening to prevent hospital transmission. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10234):1418-
385 1420.
- 386 19. McClellan M, Gottlieb S, Mostashari F, Rivers C, Silvis L. A National COVID-19 Surveillance
387 System: Achieving Containment [https://healthpolicy.duke.edu/sites/default/files/2020-](https://healthpolicy.duke.edu/sites/default/files/2020-06/a_national_covid_surveillance_system.pdf)
388 [06/a_national_covid_surveillance_system.pdf](https://healthpolicy.duke.edu/sites/default/files/2020-06/a_national_covid_surveillance_system.pdf) Accessed August 24th, 2020.
- 389 20. Jameson AP, Biersack MP, Sebastian TM, Jacques LR. SARS-CoV-2 screening of
390 asymptomatic healthcare workers. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2020:1-2.
- 391 21. Nagler AR, Goldberg ER, Aguero-Rosenfeld ME, et al. Early Results from SARS-CoV-2 PCR
392 testing of Healthcare Workers at an Academic Medical Center in New York City. *Clin Infect*
393 *Dis*. 2020.
- 394 22. Rivett L, Sridhar S, Sparkes D, et al. Screening of healthcare workers for SARS-CoV-2
395 highlights the role of asymptomatic carriage in COVID-19 transmission. *Elife*. 2020;9.
- 396 23. Lombardi A, Consonni D, Carugno M, et al. Characteristics of 1573 healthcare workers
397 who underwent nasopharyngeal swab testing for SARS-CoV-2 in Milan, Lombardy, Italy.
398 *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2020;26(10):1413 e1419-1413 e1413.
- 399 24. Mohanty S, Lakkireddy D, Trivedi C, et al. Creating a safe workplace by universal testing
400 of SARS-CoV-2 infection in asymptomatic patients and healthcare workers in the
401 electrophysiology units: a multi-center experience. *J Interv Card Electrophysiol*. 2020.
- 402 25. Baruch Y, Holtom B. Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research.
403 *Human Relations*. 2008;61(8):1139–1160.
- 404 26. Clements JM. Knowledge and Behaviors Toward COVID-19 Among US Residents During
405 the Early Days of the Pandemic: Cross-Sectional Online Questionnaire. *JMIR Public Health*
406 *Surveill*. 2020;6(2):e19161.
- 407 27. Fan Y, Orhun AYi, Turjeman D. Heterogeneous Actions, Beliefs, Constraints And Risk
408 Tolerance During The Covid-19 Pandemic *National Bureau Of Economic Research Working*
409 *Paper Series Working Paper No 27211 May 2020 DOI: 103386/w27211*. 2020.

410

411

412

413

414

415

Table 1. Possible benefits and barriers to implementation of an asymptomatic employee screening program for SARS-CoV-2.

Benefits	Barriers
1. Protecting health of the workforce by early identification of small outbreaks to reduce spread of SARS-CoV-2. 2. Minimizing workforce depletion due to unnecessary quarantine periods. 3. Building employer-employee trust and appreciation on both sides. 4. Psychological benefits of knowing public health practices are working to decrease spread of COVID-19.	1. Element of coercion or fear of retribution for not participating. 2. Lack of interest in participation in the program. 3. Lack of trust that information will be kept confidential. 4. Fear of stigmatization if a positive result is leaked to co-workers. 5. Discomfort with the specimen collection process. 6. Fear of missing work if employee learned they were positive.

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

Table 2. Motivations for participating in asymptomatic employee screening for SARS-CoV-2
Options for responses to the question: “If you have participated in the past or are currently participating, why did you choose to participate? Please select any of the following that may apply.”
1. I was told it was mandatory for my job.
2. I wanted to know my status for my own benefit.
3. I wanted to know my status for my family's benefit.
4. I wanted to know my status for my co-worker’s benefit.
5. I think it is the right thing to do.
Other write-in responses: “To help with control of transmission within the work place.” “It would seem hypocritical to encourage others to be tested if I hadn't been, myself.” “I wanted to know my status for my patients.” “It’s great to have confirmation that health promotion and COVID prevention measures are successful in keeping me and my loved ones healthy.”

Table 3. Selected survey results. Cells contain the number (percent) responding in each column.						
Category	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
Feelings about the pandemic						
COVID-19 is a serious threat to my personal health.	2 (1)	18 (14)	35 (27)	40 (31)	36 (27)	131
I have felt more anxious in general because of the pandemic.	8 (6)	10 (8)	19 (14)	59 (45)	35 (27)	131
Beliefs about asymptomatic testing in general						
Universal testing should be free and available to the general public through the health department.	1 (1)	3 (2)	10 (8)	36 (27)	81 (62)	131
Asymptomatic screening can help contain the spread of COVID-19.	2 (1.5)	1 (1)	1 (1)	35 (26.5)	93 (70)	132
Asymptomatic screening is necessary to keep our workforce healthy.	2 (1.5)	0 (0)	7 (5)	39 (29.5)	84 (63)	132
Only people at high-risk for COVID-19 complications should get asymptomatic testing.	72 (55)	41 (31)	10 (8)	4 (3)	4 (3)	131
Feelings about the employee program						
I clearly understood that the testing program was voluntary with no negative repercussions for not participating.	2 (1.5)	2 (1.5)	15 (12)	27 (21)	81 (64)	127
I feel fortunate that my employer is offering asymptomatic employee screening.	1 (1)	2 (1.5)	3 (2)	38 (29.5)	85 (66)	129
I feel or felt pressured to participate in this program.	86 (67)	124 (19)	14 (10)	1 (1)	4 (3)	129
It is the responsibility of my employer to offer free testing for SARS-CoV-2.	4 (3)	13 (10)	37 (29)	47 (36)	29 (22)	130
Asymptomatic screening should be offered to all employees, even those working from home.	4 (3)	10 (7)	22 (17)	28 (37)	47 (36)	131
Reactions to the testing process itself						
The nasopharyngeal swabs are uncomfortable.	11 (9)	20 (17)	49 (40)	33 (27)	9 (7)	122
I will prefer the saliva collection method for testing over the nasopharyngeal swabbing.	5 (4)	11 (9)	61 (47)	26 (20)	26 (20)	129
Feelings about public health measures in the workplace						
Masks, handwashing, and social distancing practices are being closely followed by my co-workers	0 (0)	1 (1)	29 (24)	56 (45)	37 (30)	123
I am more concerned than my coworkers about keeping the workplace safe.	16 (13)	29 (24)	64 (51)	8 (6)	8 (6)	125
My employer is doing an adequate job of keeping the workplace safe.	4 (3)	3 (2)	8 (6)	49 (39)	63 (50)	127
If I have concerns about the safety of the workplace relating to the pandemic, I am comfortable discussing them with my supervisor.	5 (4)	6 (5)	8 (6)	50 (39)	60 (46)	129

Source	Employee Group	Screening Frequency	Number Screened	Asymptomatic Carrier Rate
Jameson ²⁰	Michigan urban hospital workers	One time	121	0.0%
Nagler ²¹	New York City hospital workers	On-Demand over three months	1596	12% in March and 0% in May
Rivett ²²	Cambridge, England hospital workers	One-time	1302	2.3%
Lombardi ²³	Milan, Italy hospital workers	One-time	1070	1.6%
Mohanty ²⁴	Electrophysiology Unit workers from multiple locations across the United States.	Repeat testing over 3 months	691	4.5%