

1 **Serological testing in addition to PCR screening for the re-opening of American**
2 **colleges and universities: potential for cost-savings without compromising**
3 **pandemic mitigation**

4
5 Youngji Jo^a, Ruby Singh^b, Gabriella Rao^c, Sandro Galea^b, Brooke Nichols^{*c,d}

6
7 a. Section of Infectious Disease, Department of Medicine, Boston Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA

8 b. School of Public Health, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

9 c. Department of Global Health, School of Public Health, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

10 d. Health Economics and Epidemiology Research Office, Department of Internal Medicine, School of
11 Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South
12 Africa

13
14 Address for correspondence: Brooke Nichols, Boston University School of Public Health, 801
15 Massachusetts Ave, Crosstown Center 3rd Floor, Boston, MA, USA; email: brooken@bu.edu;
16 phone: +1-617-358-2403

17

Key Points (96/100)

Question: Can the addition of a serological testing reduce the overall testing costs of a PCR-based SARS-CoV-2 testing reopening plan for universities in the United States?

Findings: This costing study suggested that inclusion of serological testing in addition to outsourced PCR testing as part of a university re-opening strategy could achieve cost savings of up to 20%. The amount of savings, or additional costs, is dependent on insourcing or outsourcing of testing, epidemic conditions and university size.

Meaning: The relative cost-savings depend strongly on whether PCR and/or serology are being insourced or outsourced, university sizes and cumulative incidence.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract** (303/350)

25 **Importance.** The addition of a serological testing could reduce the overall testing costs of a
26 PCR-based SARS-CoV-2 testing reopening plan for colleges/universities in the United States,
27 without compromising the efficacy of the testing plan.

28

29 **Objectives.** To determine whether a college/university reopening SARS-CoV-2 testing plan that
30 includes serological testing can be cost-saving compared to a PCR-only testing.

31

32 **Design, Setting, and Participants:** We assessed costs of serological testing in addition to PCR
33 testing under various scenarios of university sizes (2000, 10,000, and 40,000) and epidemic
34 conditions (initial antibody prevalence 2.5-15%; cumulative SARS-CoV-2 incidence during the
35 school year 5-30%) of SARS-CoV-2 in the United States. We estimated total testing costs and
36 relative percentage of cost-savings of different screening (i.e. targeted/ universal) and testing
37 (i.e. in-sourcing/out-sourcing) scenarios between September 2020-May 2021.

38

39 **Main Outcomes and Measures:** Testing costs of serological testing and PCR testing, Relative
40 percentage of cost saving by including serology testing in addition to PCR testing.

41

42 **Results:** Including baseline serology testing alongside routine regular PCR testing can reduce
43 total test volumes and related costs throughout the school year. While the total testing cost is
44 likely much lower if regular PCR testing is insourced compared to outsourced (\$5 million vs \$34

45 million for university size 10,000), including serologic testing could achieve the up to 20% cost-
46 savings relative to PCR testing alone. The insourcing of serological testing when PCR testing is
47 insourced can achieve greater cost-savings under high initial antibody prevalence (>5%) and
48 cumulative incidence throughout the school year (>10%) at medium and large sized
49 universities. If PCR testing is outsourced, however, the inclusion of serological testing becomes
50 always preferred in most university sizes and epidemic conditions.

51
52 **Conclusions and Relevance:** While regular PCR testing alone is the preferred strategy for
53 containing epidemics, including serology testing may help achieve cost-savings if outbreaks are
54 anticipated, or if baseline seropositivity is high.

56 Introduction

57
58 In the fall of 2020, colleges and universities throughout the United States started to open their
59 doors to in-person education amid the COVID-19 pandemic. Many adopted a testing-based
60 opening strategy as a piece of their mitigation strategies to contain outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2 on
61 college campuses, enabling the restart of in-person education. In order for this testing strategy
62 to be successful, reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction testing (RT-PCR, or PCR for
63 short) must be conducted at very frequent intervals, as many as once every two days for those
64 in high-contact with others on campus.¹ However, this frequent PCR testing may be cost-
65 prohibitive for the majority of American colleges and universities suggesting that ways to
66 reduce costs without compromising the testing strategy should be considered.

67

68 The addition of serological testing to the PCR testing algorithm may be one such way to reduce
69 overall costs to a college re-opening plan. While antibodies may only be detectable through
70 currently available tests for a limited duration² it is thought that immunity to the virus may
71 persist beyond the period of detectable antibodies through a T-cell mediated response.³
72 Therefore, someone who tests antibody positive with a serological test may be exempt from
73 repeat PCR testing during the school year, resulting in cost savings to the institution or payer,
74 and reduced burden on members of the university community.

75

76 Therefore, we assessed costs of including serological testing in addition to regular and repeated
77 PCR testing under various university sizes and epidemic conditions in the United States. We
78 explored different screening (i.e. targeted/ universal) and testing (i.e. in-sourcing/out-sourcing
79 of PCR testing) strategies to determine in what instances serological testing could be a cost-
80 saving addition to a PCR-only testing strategy.

81

82 **Methods**

83

84 We developed a model in Microsoft Excel to calculate the total number of PCR tests required,
85 by university community size, for an effective testing-based campus opening strategy over a 32-
86 week (two semesters) time horizon (September 2020-May 2021). For our PCR testing algorithm,
87 we followed the PCR testing protocol outlined by Boston University. We categorized the
88 students, faculty, and staff into the four groups (category 1-4) based on the severity of potential

89 exposure to COVID-19, apportioned to 40%, 20%, 20%, and 20% of the target population
90 respectively. The frequencies of testing were based on accepted COVID-19 transmission models
91 taking into account the specifics of spread within the university community⁴ The categories
92 included:

93

94 • Category 1 (PCR tests twice per week): Commuting students, staff, and faculty who interact
95 with residential students for significant periods of time either in classes or other activities or
96 who otherwise spend many hours on campus in close-contact activities like athletics,
97 performing arts, or in some research and off-campus educational environments

98 • Category 2 (PCR tests once per week): Commuting students residing off-campus attending
99 in-person classes, but with little contact with residential students

100 • Category 3 (PCR tests once per month): Commuting employees whose job duties require
101 very limited contact with students and who can control their contact with other employees
102 so as to limit interactions to small groups of individuals with appropriate work environment
103 protocols in place and minimal contact hours

104 • Category 4 (No PCR tests): Students, faculty, and staff who engage only in virtual learning,
105 working and other activities and events and who do not commute to campus

106

107 For the scenario that includes serological testing, we assume that individuals in categories 1-3
108 will receive an antibody test upon arrival on campus alongside their initial PCR test (Figure 1). If
109 the individual is antibody positive, we assume that they will not be tested again for the
110 remainder of the year. If they are PCR positive and antibody negative upon arrival to campus,

111 an antibody test will be re-done 30-days post symptom onset. If the antibody test remains
112 negative, then the individual will return to the PCR testing algorithm. At the beginning of the
113 second semester, everyone who has never tested antibody positive will again have a serological
114 test and a PCR test upon arrival. This is to enable the university to detect anyone who may have
115 been infected during the break.

116
117 We ranged the initial prevalence of antibodies at the beginning of the fall semester between
118 2.5%-15%, and ranged the cumulative proportion of the university community infected and
119 PCR-confirmed during the school year between 5-30%. We assumed that the immune response
120 remains throughout the school year (32 weeks).^{5,6} The total number of positive antibody tests is
121 a sum of the baseline prevalence plus the number of incident PCR-positive tests during the
122 school year. Based on the estimates, we calculated the total number of PCR and serological
123 tests required (assuming serological test sensitivity as 0.915) during the school year for each
124 testing category respectively, which are combined with relevant testing frequency and unit
125 costs per testing (\$100 if PCR outsourced and \$50 if serological testing outsourced⁷) for each
126 category respectively. Together with the serological testing costs (\$15 if PCR insourced and \$7.5
127 if serological testing insourced⁸), we evaluated total testing costs by multiple scenarios of in-
128 sourcing and out-sourcing both PCR and antibody testing. For insourcing strategies, we
129 additionally included capital and recurrent costs of setting up and running the in-house
130 laboratory infrastructure. (Table 1)

131

132 We considered three different size university settings with a target population of 2,000, 10,000,
133 and 40,000 community members⁹ and base case of the initial detectable antibody prevalence of
134 5% (varied from 2.5% to 15%) on September 2020 and the cumulative PCR-positive university
135 community members as 10% (varied from 5 to 30%) by May, 2021. As additional scenario
136 analyses, we also considered a targeted serological testing approach, where only category 1
137 university community members receive a serological test while category 1-3 members still
138 receive the regular PCR testing, given the greatest likelihood of cost-savings in this category due
139 to multiple PCR tests per week. Outputs were estimated as total costs and relative percentage
140 of cost saving of the complete testing strategy by arm including serological testing in addition to
141 PCR testing alone for the respective screening and testing strategies over the two semesters (32
142 weeks). To test the robustness of our cost-saving estimates, we performed a number of
143 sensitivity analyses (one-way and three-way sensitivity analyses) based on the uncertainty
144 estimates of each parameter value.

145

146 **Results**

147

148 Total testing cost and relative percentage of cost saving differ by university size, initial antibody
149 prevalence, cumulative PCR-confirmed incidence across the school-year, as well as by
150 screening/testing strategies (Table 2). For a medium sized university setting (10,000 students)
151 assuming a 5% initial prevalence of antibodies and 10% cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2
152 during September 2020-May 2021, universal screening (80% of the university community) of
153 PCR testing, without the addition of serological testing, costs approximately \$34.4 million when

154 outsourced and \$5.3 million when insourced. With the addition of serological testing in this
155 scenario, the total cost drops to \$32 million when PCR is outsourced. When PCR is insourced,
156 the total cost slightly drops to \$5.2 million with insourced serological testing but slightly
157 increases to \$5.8 million with outsourced serological testing. Targeted screening of Category 1
158 for serological testing (40% of target population) will decrease costs from \$800,000 to \$400,000
159 if serology testing is outsourced and \$244,000 to \$184,000, if serologic testing is insourced,
160 which results in a <8% decrease in total testing costs compared to universal screening across
161 categories. This is due to the fact that regular PCR testing costs are substantial (more than 90%
162 out of total testing costs) compared to serological testing costs.

163
164 Under a plausible range of epidemic conditions (initial antibody prevalence 2.5-15% and
165 cumulative PCR-confirmed incidence during the schoolyear of 5-30%), including serological
166 testing in addition to PCR outsourcing testing in most university settings could achieve cost
167 savings (1% to 20% depending on epidemic conditions) (Figure 2). On the other hand, including
168 outsourced serological testing in addition to PCR insourced testing may increase costs up to
169 12% under the same epidemic conditions. While PCR testing alone is the preferred strategy for
170 epidemic containment, including serological testing (particularly when insourced) may result in
171 cost-savings if an outbreak occurs, or if the baseline antibody prevalence is higher than
172 expected. Overall, targeted screening shows a similar pattern as compared to universal
173 screening but a slightly greater relative percentage of cost saving at medium and large sized
174 universities.

175

176 Our sensitivity analyses (Figure 3) reveal that when including serological testing in addition to
177 regular PCR testing, cost savings is strongly driven by university population size and cumulative
178 incidence. Not surprisingly, cost savings is likely greater for larger universities and when
179 cumulative incidence, as well as initial prevalence, are high. For example, as we varied
180 cumulative incidence between 5% to 30% from the baseline value of 10% under universal
181 screening at a medium sized university, cost savings of including serological testing varied
182 between \$1.3 million to \$5 million from the baseline value \$2 million if additional serological
183 testing is insourced under the condition of PCR outsourcing testing alone. On the other hand, if
184 additional serological testing is outsourced under PCR insourcing testing condition, reducing
185 serological testing cost is the key determinant to reduce total incremental costs relative to PCR
186 testing alone.

187

188 **Discussion**

189

190 This analysis explores whether and to what extent PCR and serology screening and testing
191 strategies might be considered cost saving depending on university sizes, epidemic conditions,
192 and screening and testing strategies in the United States. We found that serology testing in
193 addition to regular PCR screening can reduce total test volume and related costs through
194 community members with positive serological test results compared to PCR testing alone. The
195 total testing cost is likely much lower if the regular PCR testing is insourced compared to
196 outsourced (\$5 million vs \$34 million). While regular and repeated PCR testing is the current
197 preferred strategy for epidemic containment, the inclusion of serological testing may help

198 achieve cost savings if outbreaks occur, or if baseline antibody prevalence is higher than
199 expected, especially in larger sized university communities. In smaller sized universities,
200 however, including serology testing may not be cost-effective if regular PCR testing is highly
201 effective at containing outbreaks.

202

203 Rapid and frequent PCR testing is a central pillar of a mitigation strategy to ensure that
204 individuals quickly isolate themselves if positive and hence control outbreaks in the community.

205 Serological testing is important to estimate the prevalence of infections, including those that
206 are asymptomatic. We show that the inclusion of serological testing to a university testing
207 regiment can reduce the required total number and cost of PCR testing. Importantly we found
208 that this was the case only when serological testing was insourced. The outsourcing of
209 serological testing when PCR tests are insourced was rarely cost saving in any scenario
210 compared to a scenario without serological testing. This is because the additional cost required
211 for serological outsourcing testing is greater than the benefit of test volume reduction. The
212 insourcing of serological testing when PCR testing is insourced can achieve greater cost-savings
213 (1%- 15%) under high initial antibody prevalence (>5%) and cumulative incidence throughout
214 the school year (>10%) at medium and large sized universities. Despite the high up-front cost of
215 setting up in-house laboratory infrastructure for insourcing of serologic testing, the final
216 resulting cost per test can be much lower if insourced (\$7) than outsourced (\$50), resulting
217 much lower total serological insourcing testing costs and thus cost saving relative to PCR testing
218 alone. If, however, PCR testing is outsourced, the inclusion of serological testing becomes
219 always preferred in most university sizes and epidemic conditions.

220

221 Our study shows that cumulative incidence may be the most important intervenable
222 determinant of cost-savings when including serology testing to PCR testing condition. Several
223 previous studies^{1,10,11} assessed PCR-based SARS-CoV-2 screening strategies – with varying test
224 frequency and sensitivity (and offered interactive tools to project cumulative incidence^{12,13}) –
225 for university settings in the United States. They suggested testing frequency was more strongly
226 associated with cumulative infection than test sensitivity. Studies also found that the spread of
227 COVID-19 is mostly happening during a short period of infectivity (3-5 days) from a subset of
228 people (i.e. an estimated eighty per cent of transmissions are caused by just ten per cent of
229 cases).¹⁴ Studies to date have not, however, assessed how antibody testing can be incorporated
230 within a university re-opening strategy.

231

232 A university-funded testing program may not be feasible for the majority of American colleges
233 and universities. If the individual is responsible for the cost of their own testing, the potential in
234 reduced medical co-payment costs (if insured) through a once or twice-off antibody test may be
235 cost-saving at the individual level.¹⁵ Additionally, if university community members are
236 responsible for getting themselves tested, they may be less adherent, and as such outbreaks
237 may occur (increasing the cost-savings of serological testing). As the optimal testing frequency
238 likely depends on the baseline prevalence of infection in the group¹, frequency of regular PCR
239 testing may be reduced (e.g. from two to once a week for category 1) as the percent positive
240 gets lower over time (i.e. below 5% for at least two weeks according to World Health
241 Organization).¹⁶ Further, additional cost reduction strategies, such as pooled PCR testing, or

242 partnering with state or local governments for reduced-priced PCR or serological testing should
243 be considered.¹⁷

244

245 Our study has several limitations. First, we did not include the additional costs (including tests
246 and personnel) related to contact tracing. While this may affect the point estimates of annual
247 testing costs, it is unlikely to vary by testing strategy. Second, we assumed low PCR and
248 serological test result misclassification, and did not consider potential cost or epidemic
249 implications of PCR false negatives¹⁸ (owing either to sampling collection, specimen handling,
250 storage condition problems or low viral load) or antibody false positive¹⁹ (such that people
251 think they are immune when they are not) especially for larger size universities under the
252 condition of high SARS-CoV-2 prevalence/incidence²⁰, which may incorrectly inflate the
253 estimated prevalence and cumulative incidence. On the other hand, as we consider frequent
254 screening for PCR (e.g at least once a week for majority students in campus regardless of
255 symptoms), this may result in a number of false positive cases (and associated costs for contact
256 tracing) for larger universities under the condition of low SARS-CoV-2 prevalence/incidence²¹.
257 The overall utility of screening strategies may differ, however, by prevalence of disease among
258 the population and the potential associated costs of false positives and negatives.²² Third, we
259 assumed that the immune response remains throughout the entire school year (32 weeks). If
260 duration of immune response is shorter than the whole school year (e.g. 16-20 weeks)²³ and
261 antibodies cannot be reliably detected after several weeks, the initial prevalence of seropositive
262 university community members and associated cost saving may be lower than the range we
263 have assumed here. We also assumed no regular PCR testing if the antibody test is positive, but

264 there is on-going research for serology test validation which may influence the accurate
265 assessment of true immunity and prevalence for individual and population.²⁴ While some
266 degree of immunity to COVID-19 after recovery is assumed, it remains an open question
267 whether the presence of antibodies correlates with protection from disease and whether there
268 is a specific antibody level that correlates with immunity.²⁵ Fourth, we did not quantify the
269 savings to the individual, in terms of their time and opportunity cost, and potentially bearing
270 the cost of the testing depending on the payer of the testing strategy. At the individual level,
271 particularly when seropositive, cost-savings could be substantial. Finally, we did not consider
272 the addition of antigen testing yet as part of a testing strategy given the relatively low
273 sensitivity compared to the PCR test. Future work should incorporate the use of rapid antigen
274 testing as a component of an on-campus testing strategy.

275

276 **Conclusion**

277

278 To conclude, while the total testing cost is likely much lower if regular PCR testing is insourced
279 compared to outsourced (\$5 million vs \$34 million), the inclusion of serological testing
280 alongside regular PCR testing can reduce total test volume and achieve cost savings up to 20%
281 compared to PCR testing alone. As we discuss when and how to phase in re-opening, these
282 results may be useful to decision-makers in planning SARS-CoV-2 testing and considering an
283 investment for mass screening of PCR and serological testing strategies under various capacities
284 of academic institutions and epidemic conditions in the United States. Given the substantial
285 financial investment required for regular PCR testing on university campuses, serological testing

286 may be one tool to reduce total costs without compromising the epidemic containment
 287 strategy.

288
 289 **Table 1. Key input parameters**
 290

University size	Base case	Low	High	Source
Total population size	10,000	2,000	40,000	9
Track 1 (PCR 2 per week)	40%	NA	NA	4
Track 2 (PCR 1 per week)	20%	NA	NA	
Track 3 (PCR 1 per month)	20%	NA	NA	
Track 4 (No testing)	20%	NA	NA	
Number of weeks	32	NA	NA	
Epidemic condition				
Prevalence of antibodies on arrival	5%	2.5%	15%	1,10,12,13
Proportion of people expected to test PCR pos	10%	5%	30%	
Abbott Architect IgG	0.915	0.8	0.98	24
Cost				
Capital cost for lab setting for PCR test	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$200,000	7
Recurrent cost for PCR lab operation per year	\$20,000	\$15,000	\$25,000	
Cost per Rt-PCR test (In-sourcing)	\$15	\$10	\$20	
Cost per Rt-PCR test (Out-sourcing)	\$100	\$80	\$200	
Capital cost for serological testing (Abbott architect i2000SR instrument)	\$107,500	\$86,000	\$129,000	8
Re-training option per year	\$2,955	\$2,364	\$3,546	
Recurrent cost for Architect i2000SR per year	\$13,200	\$10,560	\$15,840	
Cost per Abbott serological test (In-sourcing)	\$7.5	\$5	\$10	
Cost per Abbott serological test (Out-sourcing)	\$50	\$40	\$150	

291
 292

Figure 1. Proposed testing algorithm that includes serological testing (Antibody, Ab) in addition to regular PCR testing





Table 2. Total costs and cost saving by including serological testing in addition to PCR testing under initial antibody prevalence of 5%, cumulative SARS-CoV-2 incidence during the school year of 10% (uncertainty ranges are based on varying initial prevalence 2.5-15%; and cumulative prevalence 5-30%) with universal antibody screening at the beginning of each semester at a medium sized university size (10,000)

Testing strategies		Cost (\$USD, thousands)			
PCR	Serology	PCR testing	Serological testing	Total testing	Cost savings
PCR insourcing	No testing	\$5,330	NA	\$5,330	ref
	Insourcing	\$4,814 (\$4,122 - \$4,987)	\$244	\$5,228 (\$4,536 - \$5,401)	\$102 (-\$71, \$794)
	Outsourcing	\$4,814 (\$4,122 - \$4,987)	\$800	\$5,784 (\$5,092 - \$5,957)	-\$454 (-\$627, \$238)
PCR outsourcing	No testing	\$34,400	NA	\$34,400	ref
	Insourcing	\$32,094 (\$27,483 - \$33,247)	\$244	\$32,338 (\$27,726 - \$33,491)	\$2,062 (\$909, \$6,674)
	Outsourcing	\$32,094 (\$27,483 - \$33,247)	\$800	\$32,894 (\$28,283 - \$34,047)	\$1,506 (\$353, \$6,117)

Figure 2. Relative percentage of cost saving by including serology testing in addition to the PCR testing under epidemic condition by university size and screening and testing strategies.

In panel A, the base case is (circular point) set as 5% for initial prevalence and 10% for cumulative incidence. The bar represents the extent of relative percentage of cost saving based on the variation of epidemic condition (initial prevalence 2.5-15%; and cumulative incidence 5-30%). Negative estimates indicate cost increase, while positive estimates indicate cost saving, by including serological testing in addition to the PCR testing. For example, for a targetted screening at University size 10000, insourcing serological testing (Blue bar) in addition to PCR outsourcing ("PCRout.T") will result in 6% (uncertainty range: from 3% under the initial prevalence and cumulative incidence as 2.5% and 5% to 19% under 15% and 30%) cost saving at basecase epidemic condition. On the other hand, for a universal screening at University size 10000, outsourcing serological testing (Red bar) in addition to PCR insourcing ("PCRin.U") will result 9% cost increase (uncertainty range: from 12% cost increase under 2.5% and 5% to 4% cost saving under 15% and 30%) at basecase epidemic condition. Panel B illustrates heat maps of the relative percentage of cost saving for universal screening at university size 10,000 across a range of the epidemic conditions (initial prevalence 2.5-15%; and cumulative incidence 5-30%). Dark red (cost increase) represents cost saving thresholds (black dashed lines) under the set of epidemic conditions in the given scenario. Targetted screening shows similar pattern for the most scenarios but greater cost saving estimates for the scenario with outsourcing serological testing to PCR insourcing compared to the universal screening.

A. Relative percentage of cost saving by including serology testing in addition to the PCR testing



B. Relative percentage of cost saving for universal screening at university size 10,000






Figure 3. One way sensitivity analyses by including serology testing in addition to the PCR testing for a medium university size (10,000) under 5% initial prevalence and 10% cumulative incidence with universal screening


A. Insourcing serological testing alongside outsourcing PCR testing vs outsourcing PCR testing only




B. Outsourcing serological testing alongside outsourcing PCR testing vs outsourcing PCR testing only



C. Insourcing serological testing alongside insourcing PCR testing vs insourcing PCR testing only



D. Outsourcing serological testing alongside insourcing PCR testing vs insourcing PCR testing only



References

1. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to Permit the Safe Reopening of College Campuses in the United States. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(7):e2016818.
2. Grandjean L et al. Humoral Response Dynamics Following Infection with SARS-CoV-2 . <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.16.20155663v2.full.pdf>. Accessed September 20, 2020.
3. Le Bert N, Tan AT, Kunasegaran K, et al. SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell immunity in cases of COVID-19 and SARS, and uninfected controls. *Nature*. 2020;584(7821):457-462.
4. Boston University. COVID-19 Screening, Testing & Contact Tracing. <https://www.bu.edu/back2bu/student-health-safety/covid-19-screening-testing-contact-tracing/> Accessed September 20, 2020.
5. Seow J, Graham C, Merric B et al. Longitudinal evaluation and decline of antibody responses in SARS-CoV-2 infection. medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.09.20148429>. Accessed September 20, 2020.
6. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*. 2020;581(7809):465-469.
7. The Global Fund. HIV Viral Load and Early Infant Diagnosis Selection and Procurement Information Tool. Version 2 April 2017. https://www.theglobalfund.org/media/5765/psm_viralloadearlyinfantdiagnosis_content_en.pdf Accessed September 20, 2020.
8. Abbott Laboratories, Inc Federal Supply Schedule FSC Group 66, Part III Cost-per-Test: Clinical Laboratory Analyzers.
9. NICHE. The 100 Largest Colleges in America. <https://www.niche.com/blog/the-100-largest-colleges-in-america/> Accessed September 20, 2020.
10. Gressman PT, Peck JR. Simulating COVID-19 in a university environment. *Math Biosci*. 2020;328:108436.
11. Zhao X, Tatapudi H, Corey G, Gopalappa C. Threshold analyses on rates of testing, transmission, and contact for COVID-19 control in a university setting. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.21.20158303v1.full.pdf> Accessed September 20, 2020.
12. Bewick S, Ludden E, Robertson S, Demers J. The COVID-19 Consequences of College Class Continuity Calculator: A Tool to Provide Students and Administrators with Estimated Risks of Returning to Campus. <https://bewicklab.shinyapps.io/covid-1/>
13. Lopman B, Liu C, Guillou LA et al. A model of COVID-19 transmission and control on university campuses. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.23.20138677>. Model: <https://epimodel.shinyapps.io/covid-university/>
14. Endo A, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases C-WG, Abbott S, Kucharski AJ, Funk S. Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-19 transmission using outbreak sizes outside China. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2020;5:67.
15. Liu M, Jin J. Coverage Of COVID-19 Serology Testing Must Include The Uninsured. Health Affairs Blog. April 26, 2020. <https://www.healthaffairs.org/do/10.1377/hblog20200424.409047/full/>
16. Dowdy D and D'Souza G. COVID-19 Testing: Understanding the “Percent Positive”. <https://www.jhsph.edu/covid-19/articles/covid-19-testing-understanding-the-percent-positive.html>. Accessed September 20, 2020.
17. Ben-Ami R, Klochendler A, Seidel M, et al. Large-scale implementation of pooled RNA extraction and RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 detection. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2020.

18. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction-Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020;173(4):262-267.
19. Taylor NP. FDA warns of false positives with BD coronavirus diagnostic.MEDTECHDIVE. July 7, 2020. <https://www.medtechdive.com/news/fda-warns-of-false-positives-with-bd-coronavirus-diagnostic/581115/>. Accessed September 20, 2020.
20. CDC. Use the FDA Calculator to Select a COVID-19 Antibody Test for Your Community. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/downloads/lab/fda-calculator.pdf>
21. Watson J, Whiting PF, Brush JE. Interpreting a covid-19 test result. *BMJ.* 2020;369:m1808.
22. Maxim LD, Niebo R, Utell MJ. Screening tests: a review with examples. *Inhal Toxicol.* 2014;26(13):811-828.
23. Kirkcaldy RD, King BA, Brooks JT. COVID-19 and Postinfection Immunity: Limited Evidence, Many Remaining Questions. *JAMA.* 2020;323(22):2245-2246.
24. Lisboa Bastos M, Tavaziva G, Abidi SK, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of serological tests for covid-19: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2020;370:m2516.
25. Gronvall G, Connell N, Kobokovich A et al. Developing a National Strategy for Serology (Antibody Testing) in the United States. The Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security. April 22, 2020.