“Like brushing teeth“ – Implementation experiences with opt-in, at-home screening for SARS-CoV-2 among schoolchildren in Germany

Jonas Wachinger^{1,2}, Maximilian Schirmer², Nicole Täuber³, Shannon A. McMahon^{1,4*}, Claudia M. Denking^{2,5*}

*Shared Senior Authors

¹ Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, Heidelberg University Hospital, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany

² Division of Clinical Tropical Medicine, Center of Infectious Diseases, 69120 Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany

³ Independent Researcher, Sinsheim, Germany

⁴ Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, 21205 Maryland, USA

⁵ German Centre for Infection Research (DZIF), partner site Heidelberg, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany.

Corresponding author: Jonas Wachinger, Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, Im Neuenheimer Feld 130.3, 69120 Heidelberg, Jonas.wachinger@uni-heidelberg.de

Word count: 2486

ABSTRACT

Background: Over the course of the pandemic, many countries have repeatedly closed schools and shifted students to remote learning. However, evidence for negative mental and physiological health consequences of such measures for students is increasing, highlighting the need for evidence-based recommendations on how to safely reopen schools. This study presents experiences when implementing opt-in, at-home SARS-CoV-2 screening using rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) to facilitate safe face-to-face-teaching during a pandemic.

Methods: We present data from a prospective study implementing an RDT-based screening program at a primary school in southwest Germany. We conducted qualitative in-depth interviews with participating children, parents, and school stakeholders to elicit implementation experiences and screening perception.

Results: The screening intervention was highly accepted and appreciated among participants; no positive RDT was reported over the duration of the study. Self-testing at home before coming to school was feasible, but more positive consequences of screening participation (e.g., easing of mask mandates) besides a personal feeling of safety would be appreciated. Participants preferred home-based RDTs over some other measures, particularly mask mandates. Despite the RDTs being licensed as self-tests in Germany, additional training can help avoid mistakes, and ensuring intervention ownership and improving pre-implementation communication can facilitate buy-in.

Conclusions: Ag-RDT-based SARS-CoV-2 screening programs relying on self-testing at home proved feasible and accepted among primary school students, parents, and school staff who participated in this study.

Trial Registration: DRKS00024845

Keywords: Rapid diagnostic tests, SARS-CoV-2, screening, school children, implementation research, qualitative research.

What is known about the subject

- Efforts to reduce COVID-19-associated school disruption are currently being debated globally as a means to reduce the impact of extended school closures on children's mental and physiological wellbeing.
- Rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) for SARS-CoV-2 are reliable and can be performed as self-tests at home.
- Although countries have already introduced RDT-based screening programs to facilitate safe face-to-face teaching, little is known about screening acceptance and experiences.

What this study adds

- Students, parents, and school staff perceive home-based RDT screening as feasible and less disrupting than other protective measures (e.g., mask mandates)
- Implementers should communicate early and clearly, and provide a support system for training, troubleshooting, and in case of positive results
- Concerns remain regarding the fidelity of home-based test performance in cases where students or parents are hesitant, even when testing is compulsory

INTRODUCTION

To curb infection rates in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic many countries closed primary and secondary schools, and children were shifted to remote learning to minimize risks of viral transmission.[1, 2] However, in light of growing evidence regarding the impact of prolonged school closure for children's education and mental health and children's limited impact on viral transmission dynamics, schools were reopened accompanied by the implementation of hygiene measures.[3] An addendum to the toolbox of measures entailed either antigen-based rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) or pooled Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing for SARS-CoV-2.

However, the idea of large-scale screening efforts at schools was criticized both from an epidemiological perspective (regarding imperfect test performance, especially of RDTs), but also as being an unnecessary burden for school children.[4–6] While a study from Great Britain suggests that SARS-CoV-2 protective measures in schools are highly accepted among students and parents,[7] to the best of our knowledge there is no evidence available on the perceptions of and experiences with the implementation of testing for entrance screening in school settings and the effects on compliance with other safety measures (e.g., masks).

An in-depth investigation of school-based testing implementation would facilitate evidence-based recommendations for best practices of entrance screening in schools, not only in the context of this pandemic but also for future public health crises. This study fills a gap in the literature by providing implementation insights regarding RDTs for home-based screening of primary school children in Germany.

METHODS

We conducted a prospective implementation study to assess experiences with and perceptions of introducing in-home RDT-based screening at a primary school in a peri-urban area of southwestern Germany. Throughout the early pandemic, schools in the region were routinely fully or partly closed, and an increasing number of academics, policymakers, school representatives, and parents argued for schools to be reopened with comprehensive screening approaches complementing other hygiene measures.[8, 9]

Responding to calls for pilot projects testing the feasibility and acceptability of such screening efforts, our study-based screening was initiated in March 2021. Statewide compulsory screening was introduced for schools in April 2021. Figure 1 presents a timeline of study-related processes and the general context.

Figure 1. Study processes and the general context.

Intervention design

The design of the screening intervention was developed in partnership with school stakeholders (Figure 2). For each week of screening, school students and staff members who voluntarily decided to participate in the study received three STANDARD Q COVID-19 Ag Tests (SD Biosensor, Inc. Gyeonggi-do, Korea), an independently validated and WHO-approved SARS-CoV-2 RDT.[10, 11]

We trained members of the school staff and parents who volunteered on how to perform the test, and then trained others in a snowball system. We additionally set up telephone and email hotlines that could be contacted in case of screening-related questions. Additionally, the local health authority and local doctors were informed.

After four weeks of screening, compulsory testing was introduced for all schools in the German state of Baden-Württemberg.[12] The design of this state-wide screening was very similar to the study intervention, with the main difference being only two tests per week and parents having to confirm the test result to the school in writing. No training was offered in the context of the state-wide screening. Upon onset of the compulsory screening, all study participants were supplied with one test per week to supplement the two RDTs provided by the state to maintain the original screening frequency.

Figure 2. Implementation and theory of intervention of the RDT-based screening.

Data collection and analysis

Quantitative (number of participants, number of tests handed out, and number of tests reported to be positive) and qualitative (in-depth interviews with children, parents, and school stakeholders) data were collected over the entire duration of the study; data collection and analysis procedures are outlined in Figure 3. All participants provided written informed consent separately for their participation in the screening and, if applicable, when they participated in the qualitative interview. The ethical review board at the Medical Faculty, Heidelberg University, Germany approved this study (S-141/2021). Further information on recruitment and data collection processes are reported in supplemental file 1. We followed COREQ-guidelines [13] to report our findings (see supplemental files 1 and 2).

Patient and public involvement

Members of the school administrative staff and parents of school children initiated contact with the study staff to express interest for developing a pilot project to assess the feasibility and acceptability of RDT-based screening at schools and were actively involved in the conceptualization and implementation of the study. School staff were not involved in participant recruitment and data collection to maintain anonymity. One co-author (NT) is parent to two school pupils and was responsible for initiating the study, and also participated in an interview as a key informant.

Figure 3. Data Collection and Analysis.

RESULTS

Study participants

A majority of school staff decided to participate in the voluntary screening (n=21 out of 34, 62%), as well as a majority of pupils and their parents (n=109 out of 186; 59%). The study lasted nine weeks. During this time, SARS-CoV-2 incidence in the region initially increased from 106.7 infections per 100,000 inhabitants per week (March 22) to 154.1 (April 27) before it fell to 54.3 by the end of the study-based screening (May 21).[14]

Over the course of the study, no study-related positive RDT-result (neither false-positive nor true-positive) was communicated to the school or the study team. After the onset of state-wide compulsory testing in schools, while the study-based screening was still in place, the school was notified of one case of SARS-CoV-2 in a student whose parents had self-reported a negative Ag-RDT one day prior. No further cases were reported.

143 **Implementation experiences, home-based testing**

144 To highlight implementation processes and experiences, results are presented along
 145 the framework of McSween-Cadieux and colleagues (Table 1) [15] which combines
 146 the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research [16] and the Ecological
 147 Framework.[17] The framework investigates factors influencing intervention
 148 implementation across six domains: intervention, individuals, support system, inner
 149 setting, outer setting, and the implementation process.

Table 1. Implementation experiences across domains		
Domains	Themes	Key quotes
Intervention: Home-based RDTs to screen primary school students	Framing of the intervention by school stakeholders as an option to minimize risks for staff and families, and to avoid school closures	"It was this balancing act between pedagogy, psychological needs of the children, and health protection. The risk assessment, what happens when we carry it into the school and get a wave of infections here" (school stakeholder)
	Usability and reliability of the RDTs and associated concerns pre-implementation	"A key experience why I wasn't against it was the practicability of this test. If this test would have meant offering children this other test [using nasopharyngeal swabs] on a regular basis, then I would have blocked it." (school stakeholder)
	Concerns regarding additional burden for children , but less burdensome as compared to other measures (e.g., mask mandates) or potential consequences	"That's the concern that this brings in unnecessary unrest, in addition to the unrest that is already there in any case. Now there are even tests being done that potentially are positive." (school stakeholder)
	Feasibility of home-based testing as compared to on-site screening, but risk of alternative use	"Otherwise you probably would have to do that somewhere in the school, that I think is difficult to implement. How do you do that with so many children, [...] I don't know how to imagine that." (mother)
	Hopes for positive consequences of screening implementation	"That also was a question of the parents: If we participate in this study, do we still have to wear these stupid masks?" (school stakeholder)
	Framing as a research study also resulting in concerns regarding ulterior motives	"It's not about testing the tests. It's about figuring out ... can we manage to create a good scenario to test ourself in our everyday lives? And does it really help to control the spread?" (school stakeholder)
Individuals: Students, parents, and school staff using the tests	Motivations for participation increased sense of safety, wanting to contribute to COVID-19 research	"We basically immediately decided to participate. Because if we don't do research on this virus, you can't analyze it. The more information you get about it, the better, and for us it wasn't a big sacrifice to participate. [...] And a higher sense of security of course is nice, too." (mother)
	Appreciation for tests and intervention Overall good testing experiences across respondent groups	"In general, I found it great that this was done. I talked with colleagues who also have children in primary schools that don't have tests. They were immediately jealous" (mother)
	Gradual integration of testing into daily routines From 'annoyed' and 'scared' to 'like brushing teeth'	"In the beginning I always was a bit scared, but my mother said that it's not that bad. Then I was really happy when the test was negative. [Now] I'm not afraid anymore. When I knew what was coming it wasn't bad at all anymore." (female student)
	No increased risk taking as a result , feeling of safety as the main consequence	"I still don't party or meet a lot of people [...] But in fact, this morning I tested myself. That is a good feeling, I'm happy then. You don't expect anything but a negative result, but you're just happy: This safety I have for today." (teacher)
	Surprise and incomprehension regarding concerns and criticism of those not participating	"I didn't at all expect that anyone could have a problem with this testing and the study. I had thought: Everyone must see how reasonable this idea is, how little invasive that is for the outcome that means we have security for our children and for the village here." (mother)

Support System: Trainers, study staff, and external resources	Telephone hotline and general offer of the study team was appreciated (but not utilized by participants)	"In case of questions you also could have taken the initiative and reach you via e-mail or telephone, to follow up." (mother)
	Train-the-trainer system for building self-testing capacity as feasible but lacking supervision	"Something I would have wished for to be different was how information was passed on. In our class it wasn't really clear how you can get trained. The trainers in the end just said that whoever had questions could reach out." (mother)
	External support (e.g., local doctors) not utilized in light of lack of cases	"There were many options to reach out to in case of difficulties. Great." (mother)
Inner Setting: Periurban primary school in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic	RDT-based screening as the newest development after more than one year of pandemic state of emergency	"It was an exceptionally difficult year. We had imagined it to be completely different, for the small children who still have to get used to the school routines, have to learn the rules, the continuity you usually have in the school." (father)
	Screening not a dominant topic in intra-school interactions	"Almost none cares about that. Also not everyone participates. Sometimes someone says something like: Do you also participate in the study? Or whether the test is pleasant or not. But the study does not play a big role in the school." (male student)
	General perception of high screening acceptance within the school but debates outlining overarching disagreements regarding the pandemic	"We simply always have this dilemma: It's about the children! ... We also have colleagues who see more the psychological needs of the children [...] We also have colleagues who are more focused on the protection of health. [...] This general thing that develops in the entire society does not completely pass over our staff." (school stakeholder)
Outer Setting: Legal, ethical, and public discourses	Overarching dissatisfaction with policy decisions Screening in light of a year of constant and often rapid changes	"For a very long time I saw our workplace protection disregarded by the state government. Secondary schools received masks. Yes of course, there they introduced the mask mandate earlier ... and in our case they just assumed that small children are not infectious." (school stakeholder)
	Shift to compulsory screening appreciated by most but concerns regarding potential shortcomings	"I don't think that [that compulsory screening in the current form has a lot of benefits] because those who voluntarily participated in the study are the ones who want to actively help and see the danger. And those who didn't participate probably have a different attitude." (father)
Implementation Process: Introducing RDTs	Implementation ownership Initiated by and relying on local stakeholders	"[The school headmaster] also really stood up for this. That was also some educational work that was being done." (teacher)
	Implementation process as acceptable and successful Short time for decision-making and training as the new normal	"You can't improve it because it already was good. I liked it that there were additional tests for trying it out, [or] when one goes wrong. It was well communicated from the beginning. You were well informed via the information sheet. The pick-up of the tests was organized well, too. I liked the tests and the study, I don't have particular recommendations." (mother)
	Better communication might reduce barriers for participation	"Something I actually would have found helpful, from my perspective, would have been an online office hours to inform people about the tests [at the outset of the program when parents were deciding whether to engage...] where you say: you have questions, and I am here to answer them." (teacher)

Intervention. School stakeholders highlighted their key motivations for exploring RDT-based screening as minimizing risks of secondary infections and school closures, as well as a hope that screening may lead to other positive consequences (e.g., repeal of mask mandates). Some participants voiced concerns regarding screening because it placed an unnecessary burden on children, especially in light of increasing communication at the time that children were not a driver of the pandemic and the perception that children's physical and mental health was already strained enough by the pandemic. Consequently, a majority of stakeholders appreciated the newest generation of RDTs because they relied on antero-nasal swabs, which were viewed as less burdensome for those performing the tests in general and children in particular.

A major point of debate entailed whether to conduct screening at home or on-site. School stakeholders and staff predominantly highlighted organizational and infrastructural barriers to school-based screening, including the strain on already limited teaching time, concerns regarding the psychological consequences of a student testing positive in school (including potential stigmatization by peers), and questions regarding teacher accountability. While participants generally acknowledged these concerns, several parents also discussed concerns that not everyone would conscientiously perform the tests at home. This was voiced when testing became compulsory, especially addressing families who initially had decided against study participation.

Individuals. An increased sense of safety was reported as the key motivation and consequence of testing across respondent groups for participation in the study and testing in general. Participants also reported a desire to contribute to COVID-19 research, thereby increasing the chance for a timely return to "a more normal school routine" (mother). The screening itself was generally appreciated, and a majority of participants described how initial reservations or "fear" (female student) regarding the tests were alleviated after the first few times, and the screening quickly was integrated into the morning routine "like brushing teeth" (mother). Children themselves described RDTs as being much less disrupting or burdensome compared to other measures encountered over the course of the pandemic, in particular compared to mask mandates in schools.

Several participants voiced incomprehension or "disappointment" (school stakeholder) regarding the number of families deciding against participation, or recounted frustration

when interacting with screening hesitant parents or staff members. Several expressed disappointment regarding the limited consequences of participating in the screening and expected motivation and buy-in of others to increase once testing was seen as having consequences beyond a personal sense of security.

Support system. Participants appreciated offers made by the study team, including telephone and email hotlines, although neither was used during the course of the study. No participant reported interacting with complementary local resources (e.g., local health authority or local doctors). The experience of quick notification and confirmatory testing in light of a one positive results outside the study was seen as affirming that the support system in place would work.

Most participants appreciated the implemented train-the-trainer system and reported their interactions during the training as reassuring and empowering for when they performed the first RDT with their children, particularly when mistakes emerged during training. Participants saw themselves as being better prepared and able to assist others when statewide compulsory screening was implemented without prior training.

Inner setting. In light of prior experiences like school closures, challenges associated with remote learning, and quarantines, the intervention was perceived as less disruptive compared to other measures and associated with the hope for some continuity “at least until the summer break” (school stakeholder).

Both children and teachers reported the study-based screening to be only a side topic, if at all, in their interactions at school, although participating teachers recounted how sometimes children talked about their experiences in class or the reasons why their parents were against testing. In general, participants perceived screenings (both as part of the study and following the introduction of compulsory screening) as being highly accepted.

Outer setting. Participants stated that their support of the study-based screening represented an attempt to increase their own safety, which they felt had been neglected by elected authorities.

The subsequent introduction of compulsory screening therefore was appreciated by most participants, although concerns were voiced that a stricter control of testing fidelity than currently in place might be required, as not everyone was eager to comply.

Implementation process. The study was advocated by school stakeholders, and also relied on those stakeholders for successful implementation. This resulted in high level of stakeholder ownership, which was seen as particularly relevant for study buy-in across respondent groups. The broad buy-in was particularly important given a context marked by a highly emotionalized debate around COVID-19 control measures in schools.

Respondents generally appreciated the chosen implementation process. Although the information sheets, particularly the information sheet for children, and the communication by school stakeholders was appreciated, respondents expected study participation to further increase with additional events and opportunities for potential respondents to ask questions directly of the study team prior to making a decision about participation (which was only offered to the parents' association and staff, though not all parents). Although the implemented training was highly appreciated, in a few instances, the snowball system did not work as envisioned, with information only being relayed verbally.

DISCUSSION

This study outlined experiences implementing home-based RDTs for universal screening in a primary school setting. The screening was highly accepted among participants and viewed as feasible. Negative consequences were not observed (e.g., more risk-taking behavior). However, concerns surfaced regarding broad utility of screening when many individuals within a social setting may decline participation or not perform tests as advised. Participants expected screening acceptance and motivation to increase if the test was perceived to have consequences beyond a heightened sense of personal security. No case of SARS-CoV-2 was detected via the screening in the context of this study, and no clusters of infections indicated undetected cases.

To the best of our knowledge, this study is among the first to explore perceptions of test-based screening in a school setting. Our findings regarding the screening's feasibility mirror outcomes of projects that implemented self-sampling for SARS-CoV-2 testing in school settings.[18, 19] However, this evidence stems from secondary schools [19] or from oral self-sampling.[18] The high acceptance of screening expressed by our participants mirrors qualitative evidence regarding the acceptance of

broader COVID-19 prevention measures in schools in the UK.[7] We expand on this evidence by highlighting the acceptability and feasibility of home-based nasal sampling among primary school pupils.

The topic of large-scale RDT-based screening efforts in schools is emotionally highly charged in Germany, including lawsuits and homeschooling by parents who are fundamentally against SARS-CoV-2 testing for their children.[6] Our findings highlight that an emotionally charged intervention can be easily implemented if stakeholder buy-in and ownership is achieved through repeated explanations and demonstrations of the intervention. Also, our study demonstrated that testing was perceived as less burdensome to participants, including children, than more established measures, such as facial masks. Considering the exceptional burden faced by students, teachers, and parents in the pandemic,[20] and in light of increasing evidence regarding the impact of school closures on health and education [21, 22] and that children are unlikely to play a key role as drivers of the pandemic,[23] our results provide evidence that RDT-based screening is an acceptable and feasible way to facilitate in person teaching.

Beyond COVID-19, one other public health measure relying on self-testing in school settings in high-income countries entails screening for head lice. A study in primary schools in Australia aimed to assess the reliability of home-based screening for head lice, and only found a sensitivity of parental reports of 16%.[24] This suggests challenges of shifting testing from schools into the private realms, particularly in cases where a positive test result could be perceived as stigmatizing or as having consequences for short-term school access. While this concern was also voiced by participating parents and educators in our study, the participation of over 50% of staff and parents, probably reflects important distinctions between routine lice screening and self-testing amidst a viral pandemic.

This study provides timely and in-depth qualitative data, producing insights into the real-life discourse amidst rapidly changing regulations. The study site is representative for schools in peri-urban settings; research to date on health interventions at schools has predominantly focused on the urban context. However, our study also has limitations. First, only parents and students who had decided to voluntarily participate in the overarching screening program could be recruited for interviews; critical voices therefore might be underrepresented in the data on parents and their children. Additionally, as RDTs for SARS-CoV-2 have been introduced in Germany on a large

scale in recent months, generalizability of our results to other countries where RDTs were less present in the public discourse might be limited.

RDT-based screening is an acceptable and easily scalable intervention to decrease risk of transmissions at schools and facilitate face-to-face teaching amidst a pandemic. Policymakers should ensure comprehensive capacity building for testing, fit-for-purpose training materials for all age levels and train-the-trainer programs to enable scale up of universal screening. Furthermore, consistent communication on regulations and readily available support networks (hotlines via phone or email) can reduce burden for school staff and families.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to all participants for their time and contribution.

FUNDING STATEMENT

This study was supported by a grant of the Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts of Baden-Württemberg, Germany, as well as hospital-internal funds (Grant numbers: Not applicable). RDTs were provided free of cost by the manufacturer (Roche diagnostics). Funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf. CMD reports grants from Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts of Baden-Württemberg, Germany, grants from University Hospital Heidelberg Internal funds, non-financial support from Roche Diagnostics (Grant numbers: Not applicable) during the conduct of the study; NT reports her children receiving RDTs as part of their participation in the screening program; JW, MS, and SAM report no competing interests.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

NT and CMD conceived of the study. JW, NT, SAM, and CMD conceptualized the study and data collection processes. JW, MS, and NT implemented the study with support from SAM and CMD. JW collected and analyzed the data, supported by all co-

authors. JW drafted the manuscript. All co-authors contributed to data interpretation, edited the manuscript, and approved of the final manuscript.

DATA SHARING STATEMENT

Considering the high public interest in research on COVID-19, qualitative data of participants who have indicated their agreement to this as part of the informed consent procedure can be shared with other researchers. However, to preserve the anonymity of respondents and considering the personal nature of qualitative data, requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Please contact the corresponding author.

REFERENCES

- 1 UNESCO. Education: From disruption to recovery 2021. Available at: <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse> Accessed July 08, 2021.
- 2 Buonsenso D, Roland D, Rose C de, et al. Schools Closures During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Catastrophic Global Situation. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2021;40(4):e146-e150.
- 3 van Lancker W, Parolin Z. COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: A social crisis in the making. *The Lancet Public Health* 2020;5(5):e243-e244.
- 4 CNN. Debate emerges around Covid-19 testing strategies in schools as districts plan to reopen 2021. Available at: <https://edition.cnn.com/2021/07/26/health/covid-19-testing-in-schools-debate-wellness/index.html> Accessed August 11, 2021.
- 5 Die ZEIT. Kritik von Lehrer-Verbänden an Selbsttests in Schulen 2021. Available at: https://www.zeit.de/news/2021-03/17/kritik-von-lehrer-verbaenden-an-selbsttests-in-schulen?utm_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ecosia.org%2F Accessed August 11, 2021.
- 6 Die ZEIT. Testpflicht an Schulen: "Die Eltern fürchten eine Stigmatisierung ihres Kindes" 2021. Available at: <https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/schule/2021-04/corona-testpflicht-schulen-selbsttest-umsetzung-massnahmen-schuloeffnungen> Accessed July 08, 2021.
- 7 Lorenc A, Kesten JM, Kidger J, et al. Reducing COVID-19 risk in schools: A qualitative examination of secondary school staff and family views and concerns in the South West of England. *BMJ Paediatr Open* 2021;5(1):e000987. doi:10.1136/bmjpo-2020-000987 [published Online First: 10 March 2021].

- 8 Spitzer M. Öffnet die Schulen! *Nervenheilkunde* 2021;40(05):296–311.
- 9 Seifried J, Böttcher S, Kleist M von, et al. Antigen tests als ergänzendes
Instrument in der Pandemiebekämpfung. *Epidemiologisches Bulletin*
2021(17):3-14.
- 10 Krüger LJ, Gaedert M, Brümmer LE, et al. Evaluation of the accuracy, ease of
use and limit of detection of novel, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care
diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.10.01.20203836.
<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.01.20203836v1.full.pdf>.
- 11 World Health Organization. WHO Emergency Use Assessment Coronavirus
disease (COVID-19) IVDs: Public Report 2020. Available at:
https://www.who.int/diagnostics_laboratory/eual/201019_final_pqpr_eul_0563_17_00_standard_q_covid19_ag_test.pdf?ua=1 Accessed July 08, 2021.
- 12 Ministerium für Kultus, Jugend und Sport Baden-Württemberg. Corona-
Pandemie: Umsetzung der Teststrategie an den Schulen in Baden-Württemberg
2021. Available at: https://km-bw.de/site/pbs-bw-km-root/get/documents_E-1649554719/KULTUS.Dachmandant/KULTUS/KM-Homepage/Artikelseiten%20KP-KM/1_FAQ_Corona/Handreichung_Teststrategie_Stand%2023.04.2021.pdf
Accessed July 08, 2021.
- 13 Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative
research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J
Qual Health Care* 2007;19(6):349–57. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzm042 [published
Online First: 14 September 2007].
- 14 Robert Koch Institut. 7-Tage-Inzidenzen nach Bundesländern und Kreisen sowie
Gesamtübersicht der pro Tag ans RKI übermittelten Fälle und Todesfälle, Stand:
8.7.2021 2021. Available at:
https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/Daten/Fallzahlen_Kum_Tab.html Accessed July 08, 2021.
- 15 Mc Sween-Cadieux E, Dagenais C, Somé DT, et al. A health knowledge
brokering intervention in a district of Burkina Faso: A qualitative retrospective
implementation analysis. *PLoS ONE* 2019;14(7):e0220105.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0220105 [published Online First: 26 July 2019].
- 16 Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, et al. Fostering implementation of health
services research findings into practice: A consolidated framework for advancing

- implementation science. *Implement Sci* 2009;4:50. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-50
[published Online First: 7 August 2009].
- 17 Durlak JA, DuPre EP. Implementation matters: A review of research on the
influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting
implementation. *Am J Community Psychol* 2008;41(3-4):327–50.
- 18 Bordi L, Parisi G, Sberna G, et al. Effective screening strategy against SARS-
CoV-2 on self-collected saliva samples in primary school setting: A pilot project.
J Infect 2021;83(1):e8-e10. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2021.05.013 [published Online
First: 21 May 2021].
- 19 Volpp KG, Kraut BH, Ghosh S, et al. Minimal SARS-CoV-2 Transmission After
Implementation of a Comprehensive Mitigation Strategy at a School - New
Jersey, August 20-November 27, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*
2021;70(11):377–81. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7011a2 [published Online First: 19
March 2021].
- 20 Garbe A, ogurlu U, Logan N, et al. Parents' Experiences with Remote Education
during COVID-19 School Closures. *AM J QUALITATIVE RES* 2020;4(3).
- 21 Rajmil L, Hjern A, Boran P, et al. Impact of lockdown and school closure on
children's health and well-being during the first wave of COVID-19: A narrative
review. *BMJ Paediatr Open* 2021;5(1):e001043. doi:10.1136/bmjpo-2021-
001043 [published Online First: 25 May 2021].
- 22 Christakis DA, van Cleve W, Zimmerman FJ. Estimation of US Children's
Educational Attainment and Years of Life Lost Associated With Primary School
Closures During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*
2020;3(11):e2028786. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.28786 [published
Online First: 2 November 2020].
- 23 Tönshoff B, Müller B, Elling R, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in
Children and Their Parents in Southwest Germany. *JAMA Pediatr*
2021;175(6):586–93.
- 24 Counahan ML, Andrews RM, Speare R. Reliability of parental reports of head
lice in their children. *Med J Aust* 2005;182(3):137–38.