

## Evaluation of a novel community-based COVID-19 ‘Test-to-Care’ model for low-income populations

**Short title:** Evaluation of a COVID-19 enhanced support model

### Authors:

Andrew D. Kerkhoff<sup>1</sup>, Darpun Sachdev<sup>2</sup>, Sara Mizany<sup>3</sup>, Susy Rojas<sup>3</sup>, Monica Gandhi<sup>1</sup>, James Peng<sup>1</sup>, Douglas Black<sup>1</sup>, Diane Jones<sup>1</sup>, Susana Rojas<sup>3</sup>, Jon Jacobo<sup>3</sup>, Valerie Tulier-Laiwa<sup>3</sup>, Maya Petersen<sup>4</sup>, Jackie Martinez<sup>1</sup>, Gabriel Chamie<sup>1</sup>, Diane V. Havlir<sup>1</sup>, Carina Marquez<sup>1</sup>

### Affiliations:

<sup>1</sup>Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

<sup>2</sup>San Francisco Department of Public Health, San Francisco, CA, USA

<sup>3</sup>The San Francisco Latino Task Force on COVID-19

<sup>4</sup>Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, the School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

**Article type:** Original article

**Keywords:** COVID-19; community health workers; promotores; social support; community-based; vulnerable populations; Latinx; RE-AIM

1 **Abstract**

2  
3 **Background:** After a COVID-19 diagnosis, vulnerable populations face considerable logistical  
4 and financial challenges to isolate and quarantine. We developed and evaluated a novel,  
5 community-based approach ('Test-to-Care' Model) designed to address these barriers for  
6 socioeconomically vulnerable Latinx individuals with newly diagnosed COVID-19 and their  
7 households.

8  
9 **Methods:** This three-week demonstration project was nested within an epidemiologic  
10 surveillance study in a primarily Latinx neighborhood in the Mission district of San Francisco,  
11 California. The Test-to-Care model was developed with input from community members and  
12 public health leaders. Key components included: (1) provision of COVID-19-related education  
13 and information about available community resources, (2) home deliveries of material goods to  
14 facilitate safe isolation and quarantine (groceries, personal protective equipment and cleaning  
15 supplies), and (3) longitudinal clinical and social support. Newly SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive  
16 participants were eligible to participate. Components of the model were delivered by the Test-  
17 to-Care team which was comprised of healthcare providers and community health workers  
18 (CHWs) who provided longitudinal clinic- and community-based support for the duration of the  
19 isolation period to augment existing services from the Department of Public Health (DPH). We  
20 evaluated the Test-to-Care Model using the Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation,  
21 Maintenance (RE-AIM) Framework and drew upon multiple data sources including:  
22 programmatic data, informal interviews with participants and providers/CHWs and structured  
23 surveys among providers/CHWs.

24  
25 **Results:** Overall, 83 participants in the surveillance study were diagnosed with COVID-19, of  
26 whom 95% (79/83) were Latinx and 88% (65/74) had an annual household income <\$50,000.  
27 Ninety-six percent (80/83) of participants were reached for results disclosure, needs  
28 assessment and DPH linkage for contact tracing. Among those who underwent an initial needs  
29 assessment, 45% (36/80) were uninsured and 55% (44/80) were not connected to primary  
30 care. Sixty-seven percent (56/83) of participants requested community-based CHW support to  
31 safely isolate at their current address and 65% (54/83) of all COVID-19 participants received  
32 ongoing community support via CHWs for the entire self-isolation period. Participants reported

33 that the intervention was highly acceptable and that their trust increased over time – this  
34 resulted in 9 individuals who disclosed a larger number of household members than first  
35 reported, and 6 persons who requested temporary relocation to a hotel room for isolation  
36 despite initially declining this service; no unintended harms were identified. The Test-to-Care  
37 Model was found to be both acceptable and feasible to providers and CHWs. Challenges  
38 identified included a low proportion of participants linked to primary care despite support  
39 (approximately 10% after one month), and insufficient access to financial support for wage  
40 replacement.

41

42 **Conclusions:** The Test-to-Care Model is a feasible and acceptable intervention for supporting  
43 self-isolation and quarantine among newly diagnosed COVID-19 patients and their households  
44 by directly addressing key barriers faced by vulnerable populations.

45

46

47 **Introduction:**

48 COVID-19 disproportionately affects racial and ethnic minorities in the United States [1–4] In  
49 San Francisco, Latinx individuals comprise 50% of the COVID-19 cases, despite making up  
50 15% of the population [5]. Pre-existing structural inequities drive this excess number of cases  
51 in the Latinx community [4,6]. Following diagnosis with COVID-19, low-income Latinx and  
52 other socioeconomically vulnerable populations face considerable logistical and financial  
53 challenges to safely isolate and quarantine. Without the availability of a comprehensive model  
54 of care that can overcome barriers to the required isolation and quarantine, including: lack of  
55 access to culturally-tailored COVID-19 education, lack of access to food and personal  
56 protective equipment, and lack of social support, as well as the potentially catastrophic  
57 financial consequences, low-income persons are unlikely to undertake testing for COVID-19.  
58 Furthermore, due to fear and a lack of trust, individuals may be unwilling to name household  
59 and other close contacts, especially if they are undocumented. To address known health  
60 disparities and to ensure that test, isolate and trace strategies for COVID-19 are reaching the  
61 most vulnerable and affected persons, there is an urgent need to develop and evaluate tailored  
62 low-barrier testing strategies paired with social support interventions during the isolation period  
63 [7,8].

64  
65 Community health workers (CHWs), also known as promotores de salud, have been  
66 increasingly utilized in medical and public health interventions to engage marginalized and  
67 traditionally hard-to-reach individuals and reduce health disparities [9–12]. They often share  
68 the same language, ethnicity, community and/or life experiences as the individuals they serve;  
69 thus, their involvement in the design and implementation of health interventions can help to  
70 ensure cultural relevance through alignment with local concerns and priorities. CHWs can  
71 overcome individuals' barriers to engagement and retention in health services through several  
72 mechanisms including by serving as a trusted and credible source for healthcare information,  
73 increasing social support, reducing stigma, and through sharing of health-specific knowledge.  
74 Several studies have previously demonstrated that CHW interventions improved health  
75 behaviors and outcomes across a number of health domains, including diabetes [13,14],  
76 hypertension [15], asthma [16], cancer prevention [17] mental health [18] and HIV [19,20];  
77 CHWs have also shown to be both effective and cost-effective for improving health outcomes

78 specifically among underserved individuals and racial and ethnic minority communities [17,21].  
79 Despite urgent calls to scale-up CHWs to help respond to the COVID-19 pandemic [22–25], to  
80 date there have been no published evaluations of interventions that have incorporated  
81 community-based support provided by CHWs into a comprehensive care model to respond to  
82 and support the complex needs of low-income individuals affected by COVID-19.

83

84 We have previously reported on the results of an epidemiologic surveillance study (Unidos en  
85 Salud) conducted from April 25-28, 2020 in the Mission Neighborhood of San Francisco  
86 California that found that the point prevalence of PCR-positive SARS-CoV-2 infection was 20-  
87 times higher among Latinx residents compared to non-Latinx residents (3.9% vs. 0.2%) [26].  
88 Notably, 96% of recent COVID-19 infections were among Latinx individuals who were  
89 predominantly low-income, lived in densely populated households and were frontline workers  
90 or unemployed persons who could not afford to shelter-in-place. To overcome the substantial  
91 barriers to self-isolation and quarantine faced by socioeconomically vulnerable individuals and  
92 their household members, we developed a model of enhanced clinic- and community-based  
93 support, including longitudinal support from CHWs (Test-to-Care Model [T2C]) for individuals  
94 who tested SARS-CoV-2 PCR-positive during the Unidos en Salud study. In this paper we  
95 describe the development of the T2C Model and evaluate its reach, feasibility and  
96 acceptability.

97

## 98 **Methods:**

99

### 100 **Setting**

101 The community-based COVID-19 testing campaigns and subsequent test-to-care  
102 demonstration project were undertaken in a single, densely populated, highly diverse, U.S.  
103 census tract (022901) within the Mission District of San Francisco, California. This represents  
104 a 16-square block area with approximately 5,174 residents of whom 58% are Latinx, 34%  
105 White/Caucasian, 5% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1% Black/African American [26]. Many  
106 residents live in high density, low-income households; the combined income of 34% of  
107 households in the district is less than \$50,000 per year. The Mission District is historically a  
108 predominantly Latinx district in San Francisco; however, over the last two decades it has

109 undergone substantial gentrification, resulting in rapidly escalating housing costs and  
110 displacement of Latinx residents [27].

111

112

### 113 **Ethics**

114 The UCSF Committee on Human Research determined that the study and subsequent  
115 program evaluation met criteria for public health surveillance, program evaluation and quality  
116 improvement activities, rendering it exempt from IRB oversight.

117

### 118 **Community-partnership approach**

119 A community-academic partnership between the Latino Task Force for COVID-19 (LTF) and  
120 UCSF underpinned the design of Unidos en Salud (UeS) Study and all subsequent study  
121 activities, including the T2C model [28]. The Latino Task Force for COVID-19 consists of  
122 leaders from several long-standing Latinx community-based organizations that was formed to  
123 support and address the specific needs of the Latinx community in San Francisco during the  
124 COVID-19 pandemic [29]. Members of the Latino Task Force and the UCSF study team met  
125 several times a week to discuss successes, ongoing challenges and to engage in shared-  
126 decision making.

127

### 128 **Overview of the Test-to-Care Model**

129 In conjunction with our community partners, we designed the T2C model to provide enhanced,  
130 longitudinal clinical and community-based support alongside the San Francisco Department of  
131 Public Health's (SFDPH) case and contact investigation services to any participant of the  
132 Unidos en Salud Study who tested PCR-positive for SARS-CoV-2 (**Fig 1**) [26]. In addition to  
133 using a community partnership approach, the T2C model also drew upon our prior experiences  
134 and lessons learned from designing and implementing large scale programs to facilitate low-  
135 barrier HIV testing and linkage-to-care [30–32]The objectives of the T2C model were to: (1)  
136 provide longitudinal medical, social and emotional support to low-income individuals who  
137 tested positive for COVID-19 in order to address potential barriers for them and their  
138 households to safely self-isolate and quarantine throughout the duration of the recommended  
139 period of 10 days or more (**Fig 1, Table 1**); (2) provide direct and ongoing support to COVID-

140 19 positive participants to enroll in health insurance and to establish or re-connect with a  
 141 primary care provider and access community resources in order to create a foundation to  
 142 support their positive physical and mental health beyond the demonstration project (**Fig 1,**  
 143 **Table 1**); and, (3) create an effective and sustainable community-based model utilizing CHWs  
 144 that could be implemented in other communities to support the needs of low-income persons  
 145 testing positive for COVID-19.

146 **Fig 1.** Overview of the Test-to-Care Model  
 147

148 **Table 1.** Hypothesized barriers faced by low-income, Latinx COVID-19 positive individuals and  
 149 description of intervention components to address potential barriers. Barriers are categorized  
 150 according to the Capability, Opportunity, and Motivation Model, which is a validated behavior  
 151 change framework [33,34].  
 152

<b>COM-B Domain</b>	<b>Barriers Targeted</b>	<b>Description of intervention components</b>
<b>Psychologic capability</b> <i>(Knowledge and decision processes)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of knowledge about:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COVID-19 symptoms and illness progression.</li> <li>• How COVID-19 spreads.</li> <li>• How to keep family/household members safe.</li> <li>• How/where household members can get tested</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T2C Providers and CHWs provide:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on COVID-19 specific symptoms and what to monitor for.</li> <li>• Information on how to prevent spread of COVID-19 including appropriate use of PPE, hygiene and cleaning procedures, and isolation procedures.</li> <li>• Linkage to care about where to go for evaluation if worsening of symptoms.</li> <li>• Instruction about where household members can go to get tested for COVID-19.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Physical opportunity</b> <i>(Environmental context and resources)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of health insurance and/or linkage to primary health care.</li> <li>• Lack of access to food, PPE and cleaning supplies during isolation and quarantine.</li> <li>• Lack of financial security</li> <li>• Lack of language concordant services and resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T2C Providers provide:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information and support to enroll in insurance and establish primary healthcare services.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• T2C CHWs provide:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Home-based deliveries of essential goods (food, masks, cleaning supplies).</li> <li>• Food vouchers at end of isolation period.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• T2C Providers and CHWs are bilingual and all information and materials are provided in Spanish in a culturally relevant manner.</li> </ul>
<b>Social opportunity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of social support and loneliness during isolation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T2C Providers and CHWs are bilingual and all information and materials are provided in</li> </ul>

<i>(Social influences)</i>	and quarantine.	Spanish in a culturally relevant manner.
<b>Automatic motivation</b> <i>(Emotion and reinforcement)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fear and/or anxiety of disclosing contacts and/or having household members undergo testing.</li> <li>• Fear and/or anxiety attending health facility for immediate or future healthcare.</li> <li>• Stigma associated with being COVID-19 positive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T2C Providers and CHWs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasize confidential, pleasant, and non-judgmental experience.</li> <li>• Provide support for health-related decisions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• T2C CHWs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Act as a credible source for information.</li> <li>• Make discrete home deliveries using unmarked cars.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

153

154 **Description of the Test-to-Care Model Demonstration Project**

155 We undertook a three-week demonstration project of the T2C Model from April 27<sup>th</sup> to May 14<sup>th</sup>  
156 that nested within the Unidos en Salud COVID-19 “Test and Respond” study [26]. The T2C  
157 model was carried out by a bilingual, multidisciplinary team comprised of CHWs and  
158 healthcare providers. There were three full-time, bilingual and bicultural community members  
159 who served as CHWs; these individuals had made extensive contributions as volunteers to  
160 prior Unidos en Salud study activities [26]. Healthcare providers included bilingual social  
161 workers, nurses and physicians who had extensive experience in providing care and support to  
162 highly vulnerable populations [31,32]. The T2C team had a community hub in the Mission  
163 neighborhood and a clinical hub at an outpatient clinic at San Francisco General Hospital.

164  
165 The T2C huddled daily to discuss needs for initial and longitudinal support to COVID-19  
166 positive individuals and their household members throughout the recommended period of self-  
167 isolation and quarantine, respectively (**Fig 1**). Any participants testing COVID-19 PCR-positive  
168 were contacted by a bilingual clinician on the T2C team to provide same-day disclosure and to  
169 perform an initial screen to evaluate: (a) current symptoms and underlying medical  
170 comorbidities, (b) health insurance status, (c) primary care status, (d) ability to safely isolate at  
171 present address, (e) food security, (f) availability of and access to personal protective  
172 equipment (PPE) and cleaning supplies, and (g) other overt needs (**S1 Appendix**). Based  
173 upon this assessment, patients were categorized into one of three mutually exclusive  
174 categories according to the degree of support needed (low, medium and high), which



175 determined the frequency of follow-up wellness calls made by the clinic-based T2C team (low:  
176 every 4-7 days, medium: every 3-4 days, high: every 1-2 days) (**S1 Appendix**).

177

178 During the initial disclosure phone call, participants were provided with information and  
179 education related to COVID-19 and how to safely self-isolate, as well as a dedicated phone  
180 number they could call during business hours if they had any questions or concerns.  
181 Participants were informed about the CHW-led, community-based T2C team and asked if they  
182 would like to be contacted and supported by this team. Individuals who agreed and needed  
183 food, personal protective equipment (PPE), and/or cleaning supplies to safely isolate and/or  
184 who wanted social support were contacted the same day by a CHW and were provided urgent  
185 home-delivery of essential goods (**Table 2**). A COVID-19 positive result and disclosure note  
186 was documented in the electronic medical record system and primary care providers were  
187 alerted of the result (if or when established). Work excuse notes were provided to participants  
188 when requested. The SFPDH undertook contact investigation in accordance with local  
189 procedures and practices; any COVID-19 PCR-positive participants unable to safely self-  
190 isolate at their current address were referred to isolation and quarantine hotel rooms  
191 established by the SFPDH. Isolation and quarantine hotel rooms were provided free of charge  
192 for the duration of the isolation period and were located outside of the Mission District, but  
193 within San Francisco.

194

195 **Table 2.** Overview of goods and products provided through home delivery by CHWs

**Home delivery items:**

- Personal protective equipment (latex gloves, disposable masks)
- Cleaning Supplies (disinfecting surface cleaner, sponges, toilet brush)
- Hygiene products (hand sanitizer, toilet paper)
- Groceries for 2 weeks
- Supportive care medication (cough syrup, ibuprofen)

**Exit package:**

- Grocery vouchers
- Reusable cloth masks
- Bilingual educational and community resource materials (community food resources, San Francisco primary care linkage hotline, COVID-19 information to be shared with friends and family, including free community testing sites)

196 For the remaining period of isolation, COVID-19 positive participants were followed by T2C  
197 team members to assess for new or unresolved needs and to provide ongoing support.  
198 Participants with new or worsening symptoms were triaged by a T2C provider and directed to  
199 urgent care or the emergency department as appropriate. Those without health insurance,  
200 without established primary care, or with food or financial insecurity were contacted by a T2C  
201 social worker to assess eligibility and provided information and ongoing support to link to  
202 appropriate community resources, including scheduling new patient appointments at  
203 community health clinics. CHWs continued to assess for food insecurity and the need for  
204 additional PPE and cleaning supplies among participants, which were addressed through  
205 regular home-deliveries (**Table 2**). CHWs also spent substantial time regularly talking with  
206 participants and their family members during the isolation and quarantine period, providing  
207 them with social support that consisted of: (a) continued education, advice and guidance, (b)  
208 emotional support, and (c) companionship, all of which served to develop trust among  
209 participants. To optimally support the needs of all participants, there was regular and frequent  
210 communication between all T2C members as well as the SFPDH when applicable. At the end  
211 of the self-isolation period all participants, independent of initial needs classification, were  
212 called to ensure that they were asymptomatic, or clinically improving. Additionally, participants  
213 who had been supported by CHWs were provided an “exit package” (**Table 2**).

## 214 215 **Evaluation of the Test-to-Care Model Demonstration Project**

216 The Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation and Maintenance (RE-AIM) framework  
217 was utilized to guide the evaluation of the T2C model demonstration project [27]. Reach was  
218 defined according to the number of COVID-19 positive participants successfully contacted for  
219 disclosure and initial needs assessment as well as the number of participants who wanted and  
220 were provided social work support and community-based support from CHWs. Preliminary  
221 effectiveness was evaluated according to several indicators, including: (1) participant self-  
222 report that the T2C model made it easier for them to safely self-isolate for the duration of the  
223 recommended period; (2) the number of household contacts identified, which may reflect  
224 participant trust of CHW; (3) the proportion of participants initially without health insurance  
225 and/or a primary care provider who established health insurance and a primary care provider  
226 after 4 weeks follow-up; (4) the proportion of participants with worsening symptoms who were

227 triaged to appropriate evaluation/care; (5) the proportion of participants reached by CHWs who  
228 were followed and provided support for the entire period of self-isolation; and (6) any  
229 unintended consequences associated with the T2C model. Implementation measures included  
230 fidelity to the T2C model as intended, the perceived feasibility of the T2C model among T2C  
231 providers and CHWs, and acceptability of the T2C model among COVID-19 positive  
232 participants and the T2C team members.

233 A number of data sources informed the evaluation of the T2C model, including a brief  
234 structured survey among participants conducted on the initial date of COVID-19 testing [6],  
235 programmatic data from the T2C team, and data from the electronic medical record. The  
236 acceptability of the T2C model among participants was informed by informal interviews.  
237 Feasibility and acceptability of the T2C model among providers and CHWs was informed by  
238 both informal interviews as well as brief, structured surveys using five-point Likert scale  
239 questions (**S1 Table**) [35–37]. Participants were characterized using simple descriptive  
240 statistics. To further evaluate reach, participant characteristics of those wanting and receiving  
241 support from CHWs were compared to those who declined support from CHWs. The number  
242 of participants reached and supported by the T2C team was visually represented using a  
243 cascade-of-care analysis.

244

## 245 **Results:**

### 246 **Overview of COVID-19 positive participants**

247 Among 3,871 residents and workers tested for COVID-19 from April 25-28, 2020, 83 were  
248 PCR-positive (prevalence, 2.1% [95%CI, 1.7-2.7]). We have previously reported the  
249 demographics of PCR-positive participants [26], but in brief, positive participants had a median  
250 age of 39 years, were predominantly male (76%) and nearly all were Latinx (95%) (**Table 3**).  
251 Two-thirds were frontline workers and 91% reported that they were unable to shelter-in-place  
252 and maintain their income. 81 (98%) were housed, while 2 (2%) were unhoused. Housed  
253 participants lived in one of 47 unique households with a median of 6 (IQR, 3-7) reported  
254 members per household; 88% of participants lived in a household with an annual income  
255 <\$50,000 (**Table 3**).

256

257

258  
259

**Table 3.** Baseline demographics and socioeconomic characteristics and reach of the CHW support component of the T2C model.

	<b>Overall (n=83)</b>	<b>Received CHW support (n=56)</b>	<b>Declined CHW support (n=24)</b>
<b>Median age, IQR</b>	39 (28-50)	38 (27-45)	40 (28-50)
<b>Age Category,</b>			
4-17	6 (7%)	4 (7%)	2 (8%)
18-50	60 (72%)	39 (70%)	18 (75%)
51-70	14 (17%)	10 (18%)	4 (17%)
>70	3 (4%)	3 (5%)	0
<b>Sex</b>			
Male	63 (76%)	44 (79%)	15 (67%)
Female	20 (24%)	12 (21%)	8 (33%)
<b>Ethnicity</b>			
Latinx	79 (95%)	54 (96%)	22 (92%)
Non-Latinx	4 (5%)	2 (4%)	2 (8%)
<b>Occupation<sup>a</sup></b>			
Frontline worker	47 (64%)	31 (63%)	15 (65%)
Non-frontline	18 (24%)	13 (27%)	5 (22%)
Unemployed	9 (11%)	5 (10%)	3 (13%)
<b>Able to shelter-in-place &amp; maintain income<sup>b</sup></b>			
Yes	5 (7%)	4 (9%)	1 (5%)
No	64 (93%)	41 (91%)	21 (95%)
<b>Has housing</b>			
Yes	81(98%)	56 (100%)	23 (96%)
No	2 (2%)	0	1 (4%)
<b>Median household size, IQR</b>	6 (3-7)	6 (4-7)*	5 (3-6)*
<b>Lives with additional confirmed COVID-19 case</b>			
Yes	51 (61%)	38 (68%)*	13 (54%)*
No	32 (39%)	18 (32%)*	11 (46%)*
<b>Annual household income<sup>a</sup></b>			
>\$100,000	2 (3%)	2 (4%)	0
\$50-100,000	7 (9%)	4 (8%)	3 (13%)
<\$50,000	65 (88%)	43 (88%)	20 (87%)

260  
261  
262

Note - 3 participants could not be reached for results disclosure or needs assessment. <sup>a</sup>9 observations missing, <sup>b</sup>14 observations missing, \*Difference between those who received CHW support compared to those who declined CHW support was significant at level of p<0.05.

263 **Reach**

264 **Result of disclosure and needs assessment**

265 Of 83 COVID-19 positive participants, 80 (96%) were reached by the T2C team for results  
266 disclosure, initial medical and social needs assessment and provision of education (**Fig 2**); 74  
267 (83%) reported Spanish as their preferred language. At the time of results disclosure and initial  
268 assessment, 27 (34%) had current symptoms compatible with COVID-19 (**Table 3**); 36 (45%)  
269 participants were without health insurance, including 4 participants who noted a recent lapse of  
270 health insurance coverage due to COVID-19-related job loss. Forty-four (55%) participants  
271 were without a primary care provider, while 36 (45%) had an established primary care clinic.  
272 There were 10 (12.5%) participants who said that they would be unable to safely isolate at  
273 their current address even with community support and home deliveries (either due to shared  
274 living spaces or because they were homeless) and they were provided a temporary room by  
275 the SFDPH at an isolation and quarantine hotel. The majority of participants (63%) stated that  
276 they would be able to isolate at home, but requested community-based support, including  
277 home deliveries; 20 (25%) participants said that they required no support to safely isolate at  
278 their current address (**Table 4**). Based upon initial assessment of the degree of support  
279 needed, 41 (51%), 34 (43%), 5 (6%) participants were classified as needing a low, medium  
280 and high amount of support, respectively.

281

282 **Fig 2. Cascade of enhanced community-based support among COVID-19 individuals**

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290 **Table 4.** Characteristics and needs of COVID-19 positive participants identified during initial  
 291 needs assessment.

	<b>Overall (n=80)</b>	<b>Received CHW support (n=56)</b>	<b>Declined CHW support (n=24)</b>
<b>Current symptom status</b>			
Asymptomatic	53 (66%)	36 (64%)	17 (71%)
Mild symptoms	15 (19%)	11 (20%)	4 (17%)
Moderate symptoms	10 (13%)	8 (14%)	2 (8%)
Severe symptoms	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	1 (4%)
<b>Health coverage</b>			
Insured	44 (55%)	32 (57%)	12 (50%)
Uninsured	36 (45%)	24 (43%)	12 (50%)
<b>Primary care status</b>			
Established care at primary care clinic	36 (45%)	21 (38%)	9 (38%)
No established primary care clinic	44 (55%)	30 (54%)	14 (58%)
<b>Ability to self-isolate</b>			
Unable to safely self-isolate at current address, despite home deliveries, required I&Q hotel room	10 (13%)	9 (16%)*	1 (4%)*
Requires delivery of food, PPE and/or cleaning supplies to safely isolate at current address	50 (63%)	47 (84%)*	3 (12.5%)*
Able to safely self-isolate at current address, no needs identified	20 (25%)	0*	20 (83%)*
<b>Classification of need and support</b>			
Low	41 (51%)	27 (48%)	14 (58%)
Medium	34 (43%)	26 (46%)	8 (33%)
High	5 (6%)	3 (5%)	2 (8%)

292 \*Difference between those who received CHW support compared to those who declined CHW support was  
 293 significant at level of  $p < 0.05$ .  
 294

295 **Household contacts and contact investigation**

296 All 80 COVID-19 positive patients reached for disclosure were asked details about additional  
 297 household members, including name, age and whether they had been tested for COVID-19;  
 298 COVID-19 positive individuals and their contacts were then connected with the SFDPH to  
 299 facilitate routine case investigation and contact tracing. Participants were provided information  
 300 on community sites where household members could go for free COVID-19 testing through the  
 301 T2C team and also through standard SFDPH case and contact investigation services.  
 302  
 303

## 304 **Longitudinal support provided by T2C team**

305 Each of the 80 participants who were reached for disclosure were regularly assessed by  
306 healthcare providers for new/progressive symptoms throughout the isolation period. Of 35  
307 uninsured participants and 44 participants without primary care, 27 (77%) and 31 (70%),  
308 respectively asked for social work support to help link to care; 28 participants were reached by  
309 a T2C social worker and provided further information on health insurance enrolment and/or  
310 primary care establishment; for those who were interested, primary care appointments were  
311 directly scheduled on their behalf.

312

313 Of the 80 participants reached for disclosure and needs assessment, 60 participants requested  
314 support from CHWs to help safely self-isolate (**Table 4**). CHWs were subsequently unable to  
315 reach three participants despite multiple attempts (median 6 attempts) and one participant no  
316 longer wished to be contacted by the T2C team. Therefore, 56 (67% of all COVID-19 positive  
317 participants) participants were reached by CHWs, provided social support and at least one  
318 home delivery (**Fig 2**). Participants who received community-based support from CHWs were  
319 more likely to reside in densely populated households and live with other confirmed COVID-19  
320 positive individuals compared to participants who declined community-based support (**Table**  
321 **3**); there was otherwise few differences observed among individuals supported by CHWs and  
322 those who were not (**Tables 3 and 4**).

323

## 324 **Implementation**

325

### 326 **Acceptability**

327 We found that the T2C model was highly acceptable to participants. Participants, especially  
328 those who received community-based, CHW support, expressed gratitude and a high level of  
329 satisfaction associated with the continued support offered beyond COVID-19 results  
330 disclosure. Participants reported that having Spanish speaking members of their community  
331 provide them support was very important to them and that they greatly appreciated the  
332 ongoing ability to ask questions and indicate new needs as they arose. Some participants  
333 directly commented on how reassuring it was to regularly communicate with and have access  
334 to healthcare providers, including social workers.

335

336 Participants came to know CHWs on a first name basis and over subsequent calls increasingly  
337 trusted them and shared information related to additional needs as well as household  
338 members not initially volunteered. This included 9 individuals who disclosed a larger number of  
339 household members than initially reported, 8 individuals who accepted supplies after initial  
340 reluctance and multiple refusals of material support (median 4 calls, range 3-5), and 6 persons  
341 who requested temporary relocation to a hotel room for isolation despite initially declining this  
342 service. The acceptability of the T2C model was high among both providers and CHWs.

343

344 The T2C Model was acceptable to providers and CHWs (**S1 Table**). Specifically, they reported  
345 that the T2C Model was an acceptable and appropriate way to address the many needs of low-  
346 income Latinx individuals with COVID-19, that it would be an appropriate model to address the  
347 needs of other low-income populations impacted by COVID-19 and that they would  
348 recommend the T2C Model to other providers and policy makers. Providers and CHWs also  
349 stated that they liked the approach and procedures used in the T2C model and that they  
350 greatly enjoyed working as a member of the T2C team (**S1 Table**).

351

### 352 **Feasibility**

353 In general, the providers and CHWs felt that the T2C Model feasible to carry out as intended.  
354 Providers and CHWs became invested in the outcomes of the participants over the short time  
355 period of clinical follow-up. While significant time for initial and follow-up calls were sometimes  
356 required (at times up to 45 minutes), T2C providers and CHWs noted that the time investment  
357 became a strength of the model and allowed for the building of trust among T2C members and  
358 participants, allowing for a dynamic response to needs that might develop. They emphasized  
359 the importance of daily huddles and noted that when this did not occur, it created inefficiencies.

360

361 They reported that the T2C Model could likely be implemented in other settings – while not  
362 always easy to carry out, they felt strongly that it would be both possible and doable for other  
363 providers and CHWs to undertake (**S1 Table**) Providers and CHWs felt that providers and  
364 policy makers in other settings would be excited to implement a similar model in support of



365 low-income individuals with COVID-19 and if implemented, it was a model that could be  
366 sustained over time (**S1 Table**).

367

### 368 **Fidelity**

369 The majority of participants were called and reached either the same day (60/83, 72%) or  
370 within 24 hours (74/83, 89%) of COVID-19 positive result receipt to undertake disclosure, an  
371 initial needs assessment, and linkage to the SFDPH for contact investigation. T2C providers  
372 and CHWs provided longitudinal support to participants for the duration of the self-isolation  
373 period including ongoing education, symptom assessment, home deliveries as needed, and  
374 social support. During the demonstration project T2C CHWs made 250 daily phone calls  
375 (median 4 per participant, range 2-7) and 105 home-based deliveries (median 2 per  
376 participant, range 1-4) that included 300 bags of groceries.

377

### 378 **Effectiveness**

379 Overall, participants communicated that regular check-ins and home deliveries of essential  
380 goods provided valued support during a very difficult period. Participants also noted that CHW  
381 support helped overcome feelings of loneliness and social isolation and provided them with  
382 increased confidence through ongoing education and reassurance.

383

384 Of the 36 (45%) participants without insurance at the time results were disclosed, 4 (11%) had  
385 documented health insurance one month later. Only 3 (7%) of 44 participants previously  
386 without a primary care provider established care at a clinic in the San Francisco Health  
387 Network within a month of follow-up. We identified three participants who developed severe  
388 symptoms of COVID-19 and were referred for urgent care or emergency room evaluation; one  
389 participant was hospitalized and none died. Notably, 54 (96%) of the 56 participants reached  
390 by CHWs were supported for the entire isolation period and received an exit package (**Table 2,**  
391 **Fig 2**). No participants articulated any stigma or discrimination experienced as a result of  
392 participation in the T2C model and providers and CHWs did not identify any unintended harms.

393

394 Initially, among 47 households, 246 total household members were reported. While few  
395 participants noted specific concerns about sharing information about all household members,

396 through longitudinal CHW support, 9 of 47 households (19%) were found to have a higher  
397 number of household members than first reported. The total number of household members  
398 was found to be 284 - in one instance 20 additional household members were elicited than  
399 originally volunteered (30 total). Of 284 total household members, 118 (41.5%) were tested  
400 through the Unidos en Salud testing campaign. All remaining household contacts were referred  
401 by both the T2C team and SFDPH to free community COVID-19 testing.

402

### 403 **Discussion:**

404 We found that a novel, short-term care model designed to provide enhanced clinical and  
405 community-based support to socioeconomically vulnerable, COVID-19-positive Latinx persons  
406 following diagnosis and during isolation was feasible, acceptable, and reached a majority of  
407 individuals after a mass testing campaign. To our knowledge, the T2C model is the first model  
408 of its kind developed in partnership with community members and designed to address the  
409 specific needs during isolation and quarantine in a community disproportionately impacted by  
410 COVID-19. The care model augmented routine services provided by the SFDPH with  
411 additional provider-led and CHW-led components in order to holistically support the needs of  
412 low-income individuals during the required isolation period.

413

414 The majority of highly socioeconomically vulnerable COVID-19 participants requested direct  
415 support to safely self-isolate at their current address. This study suggests that the T2C model  
416 is both feasible and acceptable; if implemented, it could improve the ability of low-income  
417 COVID-19 positive persons to isolate and quarantine by directly addressing many of the  
418 barriers that they face. In order to halt COVID-19 community transmission and reduce its  
419 disproportionate impact among racial and ethnic minorities, “test, isolate and trace” strategies,  
420 must be coupled with a robust support component to facilitate early and effective isolation and  
421 quarantine among COVID-19 cases and their close contacts [7,8]. Without this promise of  
422 support to address the many barriers low-income, Latinx and other socioeconomically  
423 vulnerable persons face to safely self-isolate and quarantine, they are unlikely to undertake  
424 testing, even if provided low-barrier testing options, especially since COVID-19 can manifest  
425 with mild or no symptoms and the financial impact of isolation and quarantine is large. While  
426 most participants requested ongoing, community-based support, it is important to highlight that

427 more than one quarter of low-income, Latinx COVID-19 positive participants declined  
428 enhanced CHW support. Participants who declined did not differ in any substantial way with  
429 regard to demographics, socioeconomic status, current symptomology or connectedness to  
430 primary health care than those who accepted. Further work is required to determine how to  
431 improve the uptake of the T2C Model in order to maximize its reach among all  
432 socioeconomically vulnerable persons who are likely to benefit from its support.

433  
434 There are a number of lessons that we learned during the course of the demonstration project,  
435 several of which could potentially be applied to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the  
436 T2C model. First and foremost, the longitudinal follow-up provided by Spanish-speaking CHWs  
437 and care providers to participants was a key feature of the T2C model's design that allowed us  
438 to develop trust with participants over the course of two weeks through repeated phone calls  
439 and/or texts. Many participants were initially reluctant to accept help and services; additionally,  
440 some participants did not initially anticipate the challenge of isolating for 10 days and declined  
441 services, including isolation hotel rooms, on that basis. Due to relationships formed with CHWs  
442 combined with ongoing assessments, many participants ultimately accepted social and  
443 material support and two-thirds of all COVID-19 positive participants were provided ongoing  
444 support from CHW, including home deliveries, for the entire duration of self-isolation. We  
445 therefore would expect that vulnerable persons in other settings might initially decline help and  
446 services, but would strongly benefit from and may eventually accept support after multiple  
447 offerings. Trust of CHWs also allowed greater information about the household to be elicited  
448 and CHWs often learned that there were more household members than initially volunteered.  
449 This allowed us to more optimally support the true needs of the entire household.

450  
451 Team members and participants strongly highlighted the need for improved communication  
452 and integration of T2C teams within the DPH. Due to the initial T2C model design, participants  
453 sometimes received calls from both the T2C team and SFDPH (for contact tracing) in the same  
454 day, which at times caused confusion and frustration among participants as they were not  
455 always clear who was calling, how one caller was from a different organization from the prior  
456 caller, and the purpose of each call. Full integration of community-based organizations and  
457 CHWs into the DPHs' case investigation and contact tracing services, with the addition of the

458 longitudinal services of the T2C model over the duration of isolation, would enhance  
459 communication and optimize trust and support for community members [25,38].

460

461 Nearly half of COVID-19 positive participants were without health insurance and almost two-  
462 thirds did not have an established primary care provider. While we sought to provide dedicated  
463 support to facilitate establishment of health insurance and linkage to primary care, we found  
464 that after one month only 11% previously uninsured participants were now insured and 7% of  
465 those previously without a primary care provider were newly established in care. Notably, 23%  
466 of uninsured participants and 30% of those without primary care declined social work support  
467 to link to care. While care linkage estimates may be underestimated due to our inability to  
468 ascertain

469 who established care outside of the main public health network, possible delays in scheduling  
470 related to COVID-19 and the relatively short follow-up period (one months), this still suggests  
471 that an important proportion of participants did not establish primary care. Among COVID-19  
472 positive participants who tended to be younger (72% 18-50 years old), and were likely to be  
473 asymptomatic (66%), competing priorities may have made them less likely to invest the time  
474 required to establish care due to a lack of perception of ongoing health needs. Language  
475 concordance and immigration concerns may have also been important barriers. At the time of  
476 the study, the new patient hotline for the main public health network's recorded greeting was  
477 only in English, but is now also in Spanish and Cantonese. Additionally, we conveyed to  
478 participants that seeking care does not count as a public charge, but this may still have been a  
479 barrier to establishing care; under current U.S. law, individuals who have received certain  
480 public benefits are deemed likely to become primarily dependent on the government for their  
481 basic needs are known as a "public charge" and are not eligible to become a legal permanent  
482 resident or receive a temporary visa [39]. Interventions to improve linkage to primary care after  
483 a COVID-19 diagnosis warrant further assessment. Possible interventions for further study  
484 include: enrollment into primary care at the time of testing, enhanced patient navigation such  
485 as having CHWs join participants' calls to the new-patient enrollment phone number, direct  
486 outreach from the local clinic or health network, or reserving new appointment slots in local  
487 clinics to facilitate rapid intake and care engagement.

488

489 We identified challenges to reaching household members and other close contacts of Latinx  
490 individuals to undertake contact investigation and COVID-19 testing due to fear and distrust,  
491 but found that some of these barriers can potentially be overcome by longitudinal support and  
492 relationship building. Due to the high transmissibility of SARS-COV-2 and the close and  
493 prolonged contact among household members, such individuals are at extremely high risk of  
494 COVID-19 and should be prioritized for contact investigation – as evidenced by our finding that  
495 61% of positive participants shared a household with at least one other confirmed case.  
496 Through the establishment of trust, the CHW-led T2C team found that nearly 20% of  
497 households had more household members than first reported. This suggests fear and/or  
498 reluctance among some Latinx individuals to report all close contacts to public health  
499 authorities, possibly due to immigration concerns (documentation status, Public Charge Rule)  
500 and concerns about impact on employment status, concerns which may undermine case  
501 investigation and contact investigation efforts. Furthermore, although all participants and their  
502 close contacts were provided information regarding free COVID-19 testing sites, further data is  
503 needed to assess the uptake of testing among household contacts. Moreover, interventions to  
504 expand low-barrier, community-based COVID-19 testing including self-test kits, mobile testing,  
505 or providing direct support to access existing services [6,40] coupled with surveillance systems  
506 to monitor and ensure support testing uptake among all household and other close non-  
507 household contacts, are needed.

508  
509 Our results have several important implications for future COVID-19 response efforts. As  
510 demonstrated here, the multicomponent T2C model may offer an effective approach that can  
511 be implemented in other settings to support socioeconomically vulnerable individuals during  
512 isolation who are disproportionately impacted by COVID-19. While the T2C model can and  
513 should be adapted to the needs of a local community including other vulnerable populations,  
514 we believe that the CHW-led, community-based component - offering social support, ongoing  
515 assessments and home-deliveries - are major strengths of the T2C model and therefore  
516 represent core components. This concurs with several prior studies that have shown CHW to  
517 be associated with positive health outcomes for a number of health conditions [9,11,12,17].  
518

519 Despite multiple levels of support, many individuals still expressed an extremely strong need  
520 for financial support to assist with rent and cellphone bill payments as well as other expenses  
521 during isolation. Our study directly contributed to policy change in the city, with the  
522 establishment of the 'Right to Recover Program', which provides eligible individuals in San  
523 Francisco with COVID-19 with two weeks of wage replacement to allow them and their families  
524 to safely isolate and quarantine [41]; notably, the program does not require a formal application  
525 and does not ask about one's citizenship or immigration status. We believe that low-barrier  
526 financial assistance, along with this comprehensive care model, should be an essential  
527 commitment made to support all vulnerable COVID-19 positive community members during the  
528 isolation period through the pandemic. Such programs are likely to increase the willingness of  
529 communities to undergo testing if they know they have access to funds to offset their lost  
530 wages.

531

532 Our study has some limitations. First, assessment of implementation outcomes among COVID-  
533 19-positive participants was limited to informal interviews; nonetheless, these still provided  
534 important information related to the acceptability of the T2C and will inform formal qualitative  
535 research as part of future evaluations of the T2C Model. Additionally, we were unable to  
536 directly assess adherence to isolation and quarantine among participants and their  
537 households; therefore, we could not directly assess whether the T2C Model was effective in  
538 enabling individuals to more closely adhere to recommended public health guidance. Reliable  
539 and validated approaches for monitoring adherence to (and appropriate support for) isolation  
540 and quarantine among vulnerable populations for whom mobile device tracking may not be  
541 acceptable are currently lacking and represent an important public health priority to optimize  
542 the effectiveness of COVID-19 test, isolate and trace strategies [8]. Finally, the T2C model was  
543 designed to address the specific needs of low-income Latinx persons with COVID-19 in the  
544 Mission District of San Francisco, California and thus our findings may not be generalizable;  
545 however, all T2C providers and CHWs felt that the T2C Model could be implemented in other  
546 settings and could be adapted to better support the needs of other low-income individuals.

547

548 In conclusion, the T2C model to support low-income individuals after a COVID-19 diagnosis  
549 was found to be highly acceptable to participants, feasible to undertake and, through direct and

550 ongoing multilevel support, effective in supporting low-income Latinx individuals and their  
551 households through the period of self-isolation and quarantine. To further improve the  
552 effectiveness of this model, improved integration with public health services coupled with  
553 expansion of tailored, low-barrier COVID-19 testing options for close contacts is  
554 recommended.

555 **Acknowledgements**

556 We thank the community members from the census tract studied for their generous  
557 participation in our study during San Francisco's shelter-in-place ordinance. We thank all  
558 members of the San Francisco Latino Task Force for COVID-19 who led who helped design  
559 the Test-to-Care Model and supported community outreach and education. We thank Gaynor  
560 Siataga for helping with home deliveries of essential goods. We gratefully acknowledge the  
561 contributions of Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital Ward 86 providers and staff who  
562 provided support for the Test-to-Care Model, including Jon Oskarrson, Mary Shiels, Erin  
563 Pederson, Myriam Beltran, Sandra Torres, Fatima Ticas, Tamareh Abualhsan, Helen Lin, John  
564 Szumowski, and Francesco Sergi. We also thank Stacie Powers for her generous donation of  
565 the Brava Theater space to operate as headquarters for the community-based Test-to-Care  
566 Team. We also thank Grocery Outlet for their generous donation of groceries to support this  
567 demonstration project.

568

569 **Funding Statement**

570 The study was supported by the Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, UCSF, and a Program for  
571 Breakthrough Biomedical Research award. The funders had no role in study design, data  
572 collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

573

574 **Ethics Statement**

575 The UCSF Committee on Human Research determined that the study met criteria for public  
576 health surveillance, program evaluation and quality improvement activities and was exempt  
577 from IRB oversight.

578

579 **Data Availability**

580 The data will be held in a public repository and will be made available after acceptance of the  
581 manuscript.



582 **References**

583

584 1. Hooper M, Nápoles A, Pérez-Stable E. COVID-19 and Racial/Ethnic Disparities. *JAMA*.  
585 2020;323: 2466–2467. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.8598

586 2. Azar KMJ, Shen Z, Romanelli RJ, Lockhart SH, Smits K, Robinson S, et al. Disparities in  
587 Outcomes Among COVID-19 Patients in a Large Health Care System in California. *Health*  
588 *Affair*. 2020; 10.1377/hlthaff. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00598

589 3. Stokes EK, Zambrano LD, Anderson KN, Marder EP, Raz KM, Felix SEB, et al. Coronavirus  
590 Disease 2019 Case Surveillance — United States, January 22–May 30, 2020. *Morb Mortal*  
591 *Wkly Rep*. 2020;69: 759–765. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6924e2

592 4. Gil Macias R, Marcelin JR, Zuniga-Blanco B, Marquez C, Mathew T, Piggott DA. COVID-19  
593 Pandemic: Disparate Health Impact on the Hispanic/Latinx Population in the United States. *J*  
594 *Infect Dis*. 2020; In press.

595 5. San Francisco Department of Public Health. Population Characteristics of COVID-19 Cases  
596 and Deaths. 2 Jul 2020. Available: <https://data.sfgov.org/stories/s/w6za-6st8>

597 6. Calo WA, Murray A, Francis E, Bermudez M, Kraschnewski J. Reaching the Hispanic  
598 Community About COVID-19 Through Existing Chronic Disease Prevention Programs. *Prev*  
599 *Chronic Dis*. 2020;17. doi:10.5888/pcd17.200165

600 7. Rajan S, Cylus JD, Mckee M. What do countries need to do to implement effective ‘find,  
601 test, trace, isolate and support’ systems? *J Roy Soc Med*. 2020;113: 245–250.  
602 doi:10.1177/0141076820939395

603 8. Kucharski AJ, Klepac P, Conlan AJK, Kissler SM, Tang ML, Fry H, et al. Effectiveness of  
604 isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-  
605 CoV-2 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.  
606 doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(20)30457-6

607 9. Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. Community Health Workers: Evidence of  
608 Their Effectiveness. 1 Mar 2020 [cited 21 Jul 2020]. Available:  
609 [https://www.astho.org/Programs/Clinical-to-Community-Connections/Documents/CHW-](https://www.astho.org/Programs/Clinical-to-Community-Connections/Documents/CHW-Evidence-of-Effectiveness/)  
610 [Evidence-of-Effectiveness/](https://www.astho.org/Programs/Clinical-to-Community-Connections/Documents/CHW-Evidence-of-Effectiveness/)

611 10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Policy Evidence Assessment Report:  
612 Community Health Worker Policy Components. 2014. Available:  
613 [https://www.cdc.gov/dhdsp/pubs/docs/chw\\_evidence\\_assessment\\_report.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/dhdsp/pubs/docs/chw_evidence_assessment_report.pdf)

614 11. Landers S, Levinson M. Mounting Evidence of the Effectiveness and Versatility of  
615 Community Health Workers. *Am J Public Health*. 2016;106: 591–592.  
616 doi:10.2105/ajph.2016.303099

- 617 12. Perry HB, Zulliger R, Rogers MM. Community Health Workers in Low-, Middle-, and High-  
618 Income Countries: An Overview of Their History, Recent Evolution, and Current Effectiveness.  
619 *Annu Rev Publ Health*. 2014;35: 399–421. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-032013-182354
- 620 13. Palmas W, March D, Darakjy S, Findley SE, Teresi J, Carrasquillo O, et al. Community  
621 Health Worker Interventions to Improve Glycemic Control in People with Diabetes: A  
622 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2015;30: 1004–1012.  
623 doi:10.1007/s11606-015-3247-0
- 624 14. Trump LJ, Mendenhall TJ. Community Health Workers in Diabetes Care: A Systematic  
625 Review of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Fam Syst Heal*. 2017;35: 320–340.  
626 doi:10.1037/fsh0000283
- 627 15. Brownstein JN, Chowdhury FM, Norris SL, Horsley T, Jack L, Zhang X, et al. Effectiveness  
628 of Community Health Workers in the Care of People with Hypertension. *Am J Prev Med*.  
629 2007;32: 435–447. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2007.01.011
- 630 16. Parekh TM, Copeland CR, Dransfield MT, Cherrington A. Application of the community  
631 health worker model in adult asthma and COPD in the U.S.: a systematic review. *Bmc Pulm*  
632 *Med*. 2019;19: 116. doi:10.1186/s12890-019-0878-7
- 633 17. Kim K, Choi JS, Choi E, Nieman CL, Joo JH, Lin FR, et al. Effects of Community-Based  
634 Health Worker Interventions to Improve Chronic Disease Management and Care Among  
635 Vulnerable Populations: A Systematic Review. *Am J Public Health*. 2016;106: e3–e28.  
636 doi:10.2105/ajph.2015.302987
- 637• 18. Weaver A, Lapidus A. Mental Health Interventions with Community Health Workers in the  
638 United States: A Systematic Review. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2018;29(1):159-180.  
639 doi: 10.1353/hpu.2018.0011
- 640 19. Han H-R, Kim K, Murphy J, Cudjoe J, Wilson P, Sharps P, et al. Community health worker  
641 interventions to promote psychosocial outcomes among people living with HIV—A systematic  
642 review. *Plos One*. 2018;13: e0194928. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0194928
- 643 20. Kenya S, Chida N, Symes S, Shor-Posner G. Can community health workers improve  
644 adherence to highly active antiretroviral therapy in the USA? A review of the literature. *Hiv*  
645 *Med*. 2011;12: 525–534. doi:10.1111/j.1468-1293.2011.00921.x
- 646 21. Kangovi S, Mitra N, Grande D, Huo H, Smith RA, Long JA. Community Health Worker  
647 Support for Disadvantaged Patients With Multiple Chronic Diseases: A Randomized Clinical  
648 Trial. *Am J Public Health*. 2017;107: 1660–1667. doi:10.2105/ajph.2017.303985
- 649 22. Kangovi S. Want to help battle COVID-19? Bring in more community health workers.  
650 *American Association of Medical Colleges*. 9 Jun 2020 [cited 20 Jul 2020]. Available:  
651 [https://www.aamc.org/news-insights/want-help-battle-covid-19-bring-more-community-health-](https://www.aamc.org/news-insights/want-help-battle-covid-19-bring-more-community-health-workers)  
652 [workers](https://www.aamc.org/news-insights/want-help-battle-covid-19-bring-more-community-health-workers)

- 653 23. Smith DO, Barbero C. What you need to know about COVID 19 and the role of community  
654 health workers in the Latino community. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Available  
655 at: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/downloads/COVID-19-role-community-health-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/downloads/COVID-19-role-community-health-workers.pdf)  
656 [workers.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/downloads/COVID-19-role-community-health-workers.pdf).
- 657 24. Smith DO, Wennerstrom A. To Strengthen the Public Health Response to COVID-19, We  
658 Need Community Health Workers. Health Affairs Blog. 6 May 2020 [cited 20 Jul 2020].  
659 Available: <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hblog20200504.336184/full/>
- 660 25. Haines A, Barros EF de, Berlin A, Heymann DL, Harris MJ. National UK programme of  
661 community health workers for COVID-19 response. Lancet. 2020;395: 1173–1175.  
662 doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30735-2
- 663 26. Chamie G, Marquez C, Crawford E, Peng J, Petersen M, Schwab D, et al. SARS-CoV-2  
664 Community Transmission During Shelter-in-Place in San Francisco. Medrxiv. 2020;  
665 2020.06.15.20132233. doi:10.1101/2020.06.15.20132233
- 666 27. Urban Displacement Project. Rising Housing Costs and Re-Segregation in San Francisco.  
667 2018 Sep. Available: [https://www.urbandisplacement.org/sites/default/files/images/sf\\_final.pdf](https://www.urbandisplacement.org/sites/default/files/images/sf_final.pdf)
- 668 28. Drahota A, Meza RD, Brikho B, Naaf M, Estabillo JA, Gomez ED, et al. Community-  
669 Academic Partnerships: A Systematic Review of the State of the Literature and  
670 Recommendations for Future Research. Milbank Q. 2016;94: 163–214. doi:10.1111/1468-  
671 0009.12184
- 672 29. The San Francisco Latino Task Force on COVID-19. 2 Jul 2020 [cited 2 Jul 2020].  
673 Available: <https://www.ltfrespuestalatina.com/>
- 674 30. Havlir DV, Balzer LB, Charlebois ED, Clark TD, Kwarisiima D, Ayieko J, et al. HIV Testing  
675 and Treatment with the Use of a Community Health Approach in Rural Africa. New Engl J Med.  
676 2019;381: 219–229. doi:10.1056/nejmoa1809866
- 677 31. Christopoulos KA, Kaplan B, Dowdy D, Haller B, Nassos P, Roemer M, et al. Testing and  
678 Linkage to Care Outcomes for a Clinician-Initiated Rapid HIV Testing Program in an Urban  
679 Emergency Department. Aids Patient Care St. 2011;25: 439–444. doi:10.1089/apc.2011.0041
- 680 32. Coffey S, Bacchetti P, Sachdev D, Bacon O, Jones D, Ospina-Norvell C, et al. RAPID  
681 antiretroviral therapy: high virologic suppression rates with immediate antiretroviral therapy  
682 initiation in a vulnerable urban clinic population. AIDS. 2019;33: 825–832.  
683 doi:10.1097/qad.0000000000002124
- 684 33. Michie S, Atkins L, West R. The Behaviour Change Wheel: A Guide to Designing  
685 Interventions. Silverback Publishing.; 2014.

- 686 34. Atkins L, Francis J, Islam R, O'Connor D, Patey A, Ivers N, et al. A guide to using the  
687 Theoretical Domains Framework of behaviour change to investigate implementation problems.  
688 Implement Sci. 2017;12: 77. doi:10.1186/s13012-017-0605-9
- 689 35. Weiner BJ, Lewis CC, Stanick C, Powell BJ, Dorsey CN, Clary AS, et al. Psychometric  
690 assessment of three newly developed implementation outcome measures. Implement Sci.  
691 2017;12: 108. doi:10.1186/s13012-017-0635-3
- 692 36. Bowen DJ, Kreuter M, Spring B, Cofta-Woerpel L, Linnan L, Weiner D, et al. How We  
693 Design Feasibility Studies. Am J Prev Med. 2009;36: 452–457.  
694 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.02.002
- 695 37. Power TJ, Hess LE, Bennett DS. The Acceptability of Interventions for Attention-Deficit  
696 Hyperactivity Disorder Among Elementary and Middle School Teachers. J Dev Behav  
697 Pediatrics. 1995;16: 238–243. doi:10.1097/00004703-199508000-00005
- 698 38. Penn Center for Community Health Workers. Call to Action. 11 May 2020 [cited 2 Jul  
699 2020]. Available: <https://chw.upenn.edu/2020/04/17/callstoaction/>
- 700 39. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Public Charge. 24 Feb 2020 [cited 21 Jul  
701 2020]. Available: [https://www.uscis.gov/green-card/green-card-processes-and-](https://www.uscis.gov/green-card/green-card-processes-and-procedures/public-charge)  
702 [procedures/public-charge](https://www.uscis.gov/green-card/green-card-processes-and-procedures/public-charge)
- 703 40. Siegler AJ, Hall E, Luisi N, Zlotorzynska M, Wilde G, Sanchez T, et al. Willingness to seek  
704 laboratory testing for SARS-CoV-2 with home, drive-through, and clinic-based specimen  
705 collection locations. Medrxiv. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.06.20093005
- 706 41. San Francisco Chronicle. SF to pay low-wage workers who get COVID-19 to stay home  
707 and isolate. 2020. Available: [https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/SF-rolls-out-new-](https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/SF-rolls-out-new-program-to-help-low-income-15299045.php)  
708 [program-to-help-low-income-15299045.php](https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/SF-rolls-out-new-program-to-help-low-income-15299045.php)
- 709



