

1 Finding a Needle in the Haystack: Design and Implementation of a Digital Site-less Clinical
2 Study of Serial Rapid Antigen Testing to Identify Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection

3 Authors: Apurv Soni MD PhD^{1,2,3}, Carly Herbert BA¹, Caitlin Pretz MS¹, Pamela Stamegna MD¹,
4 Andreas Filippaios MD¹, Qiming Shi MS^{1,3,4}, Thejas Suvarna BBA BS⁵, Emma Harman MPH⁵,
5 Summer Schrader BA⁵, Chris Nowak BA⁵, Eric Schramm PharmD⁵, Vik Kheterpal MD⁵,
6 Stephanie Behar BA¹, Seanan Tarrant BA¹, Julia Ferranto BS¹, Nathaniel Hafer PhD⁴, Matthew
7 Robinson MD⁶, Chad Achenbach MD⁷, Rob Murphy MD⁷, Yuka Manabe MD⁶, Bruce Barton
8 PhD², Laurel O'Connor MD⁸, Nisha Fahey DO ScM⁹, Elizabeth Orvek MS², Peter Lazar BS²,
9 Didem Ayturk MS², Steven Wong BS², Adrian Zai MD PhD MPH², Lisa Cashman MPH¹⁰,
10 Lokinendi V Rao PhD¹⁰, Katherine Luzuriaga MD⁴, Stephenie Lemon PhD², Allison Blodgett
11 PhD⁴, William Heetderks PhD¹¹, John Broach MD MPH MBA⁸, David McManus MD ScM^{1,3,12}

12 AS and CH contributed equally to this work

13 Affiliations:

14 ¹Program in Digital Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Massachusetts Chan
15 Medical School, Worcester, MA, USA

16 ²Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences, University of Massachusetts Chan
17 Medical School, Worcester, MA, USA

18 ³Division of Clinical Informatics, Department of Medicine, University of Massachusetts Chan
19 Medical School, Worcester, MA, USA

20 ⁴University of Massachusetts Center for Clinical and Translational Science, University of
21 Massachusetts Chan Medical School, Worcester, MA, USA

22 ⁵CareEvolution, LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

23 ⁶Division of Infectious Disease, Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of
24 Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

25 ⁷Division of Infectious Disease, Department of Medicine, Havey Institute for Global Health,
26 Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, USA

27 ⁸Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School,
28 Worcester, MA, USA

29 ⁹Department of Pediatrics, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School, Worcester, MA,
30 USA

31 ¹⁰Quest Diagnostics, Marlborough, MA, USA

32 ¹¹National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering, NIH, via contract with Kelly
33 Services, Bethesda, MD, USA

34 ¹²Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical
35 School, Worcester, MA, USA

36 **Corresponding Author:**

37 Apurv Soni, M.D., Ph.D.

38 Program in Digital Medicine, Department of Medicine

39 S6-757, Medical School Building

40 55 Lake Avenue N

41 Worcester, MA, 01605

42 Apurv.soni@umassmed.edu

43

44 Abstract:

45 Background: Over-the-counter rapid antigen tests for SARS-CoV-2 with an Emergency Use
46 Authorization (EUA) in the United States generally include a condition of authorization to
47 evaluate the test's performance in asymptomatic individuals when used serially. A goal of this
48 study was to investigate the performance of SARS-CoV-2 antigen serial testing and generate
49 data to support regulatory decisions.

50 Objective: To describe a novel study design to evaluate serial use of rapid antigen tests in
51 detecting SARS-CoV-2 virus among asymptomatic individuals.

52 Design: Prospective cohort study using a decentralized approach. Eligible participants from
53 across the U.S. could enroll and complete this study from their home environment through a
54 study app. Participant enrollment was prioritized based on regional 7-day case rates,
55 participants' vaccination status, and sociodemographic characteristics prior to enrollment.
56 Prioritization criteria were adjusted on a daily or weekly basis. Enrolled participants were mailed
57 rapid antigen tests and molecular comparator collection kits and asked to test every 48 hours for
58 15 days. Three companies' rapid antigen tests were used in the study; assignment of participant
59 to a test was criteria-based and non-random, precluding head-to-head comparison between the
60 tests.

61 Participants: Mainland United States residents over 2 years old with no reported COVID-19
62 symptoms in the 14 days prior to study enrollment.

63 Main Measures: Participant demographics, COVID-19 vaccination status, and geographic
64 distribution were used to understand the impact of the site-less recruitment and enrollment
65 strategy.

66 Key Results: A total of 7,361 participants enrolled in the study between October 18, 2021 and
67 February 15, 2022. Throughout the study, 369 participants tested positive for SARS-CoV-2,

68 including 167 who were asymptomatic and tested negative on SARS-CoV-2 molecular assays
69 to start the study. This exceeded the initial enrollment goals of 60 positive participants. We
70 enrolled participants from 44 of the 48 mainland U.S. states, and geographic distribution of
71 participants shifted in accordance with the changing COVID-19 prevalence nationwide.

72

73 Conclusions: The novel, digital site-less approach employed in the ‘Test Us At Home’ study
74 enabled rapid, efficient, and rigorous evaluation of rapid diagnostics for COVID-19, and can be
75 adapted across research disciplines to optimize study enrollment and accessibility.

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96 **INTRODUCTION**

97 Over-the-counter (OTC) rapid antigen SARS-CoV-2 tests present unique opportunities
98 for widespread COVID-19 testing. However, the authorization of these tests under the Food and
99 Drug Administration's (FDA) Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) generally imposes a
100 requirement on companies to evaluate their rapid antigen test's performance for detecting
101 asymptomatic infections with serial screening. To accomplish this, it is necessary to conduct a
102 longitudinal study to observe the onset of SARS-CoV-2 infection and performance of rapid
103 antigen tests across the course of infection.⁵

104 The challenge of conducting this study is further compounded by fluctuations in the daily
105 incidence of SARS-CoV-2 across different geographical regions. For instance, on September 1,
106 2021, Massachusetts reported 24.2 cases of SARS-CoV-2 per 100k residents; however, on that
107 same date, the state of Georgia reported 85.9 cases per 100k residents.⁶ Further, asymptomatic
108 positivity rate from screening studies has been found to be between 1.9% and 3%.⁷ A study to
109 identify new-onset SARS-CoV-2 infection in this setting presents limited viable options,
110 especially when considering the financial resources needed to set up multiple in-person
111 recruitment centers to facilitate recruitment from different areas of the country where case-rate
112 may be high at any given time. However, recruitment and enrollment methodologies often fall
113 short, with 11% of sites in multi-center clinical trials failing to enroll any participants, 40% unable
114 to meet recruitment goals, and nearly half of enrolled participants dropping out of trials prior to
115 study completion.^{8,9} Additionally, despite efforts to increase diversity in clinical trials, clinical trial
116 participants are still predominantly white and English-speaking, posing ethical and scientific
117 issues.¹⁰⁻¹² Digital site-less studies pose great opportunities to enable community-based
118 recruitment and retention across geographic regions, and have been facilitated by increased
119 acceptance of digital medicine and mobile technologies in recent years.¹³

120 This manuscript describes the design, implementation, and completion of a novel, digital,
121 site-less study called ‘Test Us at Home’ funded by the NIH Rapid Acceleration Diagnostics
122 (RADx) Program. This study is a result of the collaboration between UMass Chan Medical
123 School, the FDA, and the National Institutes of Health (NIH). In this manuscript, we outline the
124 rationale for key decision-making and describe findings of the operational effort needed to
125 successfully collect data under this novel paradigm. We describe the challenges faced by our
126 study team and how we overcame those challenges to provide rapid, rigorous evaluation of
127 OTC diagnostics across diverse participants of all ages in community-based settings.

128 **METHODS**

129 *Study Design:*

130 This prospective cohort study recruited participants over two-years old who were asymptomatic
131 and self-reported absence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the three months prior to enrollment.
132 Participants were asked to test via rapid antigen test and molecular comparator every 48-hours
133 for 15 days. Primary analysis was restricted to participants that started the study with a negative
134 result on SARS-CoV-2 molecular assays.

135 *Study Objectives:*

136 The primary objective of this collaboration between the FDA, NIH, and the RADx Tech Clinical
137 Studies Core at UMass Chan was to generate right-of-reference data that can be used towards
138 FDA EUA. To accomplish this, we aimed to evaluate the performance of serial use of three
139 different rapid antigen test to detect a new-onset SARS-CoV-2 infection, as determined by a
140 laboratory-based molecular test. Secondary objectives of this study were to understand the
141 different factors associated with detection of asymptomatic positive patients using OTC devices,
142 including the optimal testing frequency and duration for individuals after exposure to COVID-19.
143 Lastly, this study aimed to identify whether there are certain subpopulations that are more likely
144 to test positive asymptotically.

145 *Study Population and Recruitment:* To approximate the performance of rapid antigen tests in the
146 general public, the FDA suggested against preferentially enrolling participants with a known
147 history of SARS-CoV-2 exposure (oral communication, August 3, 2021). Based on the FDA
148 guidance, the goal of the study was to recruit at least 60 participants who started the study
149 without any symptoms and with a negative SARS-CoV-2 molecular test and who subsequently
150 tested positive during the study period. Due to the fluctuating rates of COVID-19 positivity and
151 the importance of recruiting asymptomatic participants, we employed a decentralized study
152 design whereby eligible participants from anywhere in the mainland United States except for
153 Arizona could participate. Residents from the state of Arizona were excluded because Quest
154 Diagnostics, the laboratory performing molecular tests for this study, does not provide direct-to-
155 consumer tests in that state. Additional inclusion and exclusion criteria are listed in Table 1.
156 Recruitment relied on the engagement of community stakeholders, including local public health
157 officials and community organizers, to advertise the study and reach communities nationwide.
158 Periodic analyses were conducted to inform enrollment goals based on observed precision for
159 positive percent agreement.

160 *Enrollment:* Participants who expressed interest in the study received an email or flyer with
161 instructions for downloading the study app onto their phone or device and performing eligibility
162 screening. The study app was a custom interface designed through the MyDataHelps platform.
163 To enroll in the study, participants answered a series of questions to determine their eligibility
164 and whether they meet the study's criteria for enrollment at a given time. All eligible participants
165 underwent automated prioritization based on a-priori criteria that were adjusted on a daily or
166 weekly basis (Supplemental Figure 1, Supplemental Figure 2). We adjusted prioritization criteria
167 to preferentially enroll populations based on their region's SARS-CoV-2 transmission rates,
168 community-level vaccination, and participants sociodemographic characteristics. This step
169 occurred prior to consenting, and data collected was discarded if the participant did not enroll in
170 the study before the data collection period ended; these data were never accessible to the study

171 team unless the participant consented to take part in the study. Periodic analyses were
172 conducted to inform enrollment goals based on observed precision for positive percent
173 agreement. Eligible participants who did not match the preferred criteria for enrollment during
174 that time received a note saying that they cannot enroll in the study at this time but would
175 receive communication from the study team when/if they became eligible (Supplemental Figure
176 3). These participants were placed on a “waiting list”, which was reviewed with regard to
177 changing priority criteria throughout the study.

178 If eligible for enrollment, participants 18 years of age or older were asked to read the e-
179 consent form and provide their signature through the study app (Supplemental Figure 4).
180 Participants younger than 18 years were asked to review the e-assent and e-consent form with
181 the support of their parent(s) or guardian(s) and provide assent for participation, while the
182 parent/guardian provided consent for participation in the study. To acknowledge participants for
183 their time participating in study, participants were eligible to receive up to \$250 for timely
184 completion of all sample collections (Supplemental Figure 5). This study was approved by the
185 Institutional Review Board of the WIRB-Copernicus Group.

186 *Test Distribution:* On enrollment, participants were asked to provide their shipping information
187 through the study app. Participants were assigned to one of three OTC tests (Quidel QuickVue
188 At-Home OTC COVID-19 Test, Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Antigen Self Test, or BD Veritor™
189 At-Home COVID-19 Test) using an automated algorithm that was informed by the investigators’
190 discretion based on enrollment numbers and geographic location of the participants to allow for
191 pragmatic distribution of the tests and fulfillment of the sample size (Supplemental Figure 6).
192 The three readily available rapid antigen tests used in the study are all authorized for
193 emergency use by the FDA and were selected for evaluation to provide multiple assessments
194 and facilitate generalizing results to non-participating companies. These tests will be hereby
195 referred to as test brands A, B, and C (randomly assigned), as the purpose of the study was not
196 to directly compare different test performances. Participants residing together and enrolling with

197 the same address or enrolled in a group, such as a cohort of classmates, were assigned the
198 same OTC test, to avoid mixing of test types between participants. Groups were given unique
199 codes to input on enrollment (i.e. group codes), to ensure members were easily identifiable. As
200 a result of this strategy, the assignment of tests to participants were non-random, and we
201 intentionally did not pursue a strategy to compare performance between different tests because
202 that was outside the scope of this project.

203 Because molecular assays require a prescription by a licensed physician, the study team
204 contracted with PWNHealth, a national clinician network, and developed an automated order
205 filing system working with Quest Diagnostics to place the requisite orders (Supplemental Figure
206 7). A total of 10 OTC tests and 7 home-collection kits supporting testing with the molecular
207 comparators were provided to each participant. Participants received OTC tests and PCR
208 home-collection kits by mail through separate shipments, unless participants enrolled at an
209 approved in-person location, in which case participants were handed both types of testing kits
210 directly. Once the test kits were received, participants were asked to confirm receipt through the
211 study app prior to starting the testing period. If a participant needed additional OTC tests or
212 PCR home-collection kits during the study period (e.g. tests were damaged upon delivery or lost
213 in the mail), the study team provided additional tests.

214 *Testing Schedule:* Participants were asked to perform the OTC test and collect the specimen for
215 molecular comparator testing on the same day roughly every 48 hours during the 15-day testing
216 period (Table 2, Supplemental Figure 8). Immediately prior to testing, participants were asked to
217 record any symptoms on the day of testing. The study app provided a push-notification testing
218 reminder at the 44-hour mark and additional notifications every two hours until the 52-hour mark
219 if the participant had not completed their tests. Participants were instructed via the app to have
220 at least a 15-minute break between the OTC test and the sample collection for molecular tests.
221 Participants were asked to only test with the OTC test on day 15 (Table 2). Participants were
222 asked to record the results of the OTC tests when available by selecting one of the following

223 options: “Negative”, “Positive”, “Invalid”, or “Don’t Know”, and upload a photo of the test strip
224 through the app (Supplemental Figure 9). Participants assigned to Test C were instead asked to
225 download the Test C company-specific app which contained a test reader. The company test
226 reader asked participants to upload a photo of the test strip and provided rapid antigen test
227 results in real time. Test C users were asked to report the test result given by the test reader,
228 rather than self-interpretation, to the study app. Test C participants were also asked to upload a
229 picture in the study app for validation. If the participant tested positive by OTC test, they were
230 referred to the OTC device’s instructions and told to contact their healthcare provider for any
231 medical questions. In the event of an invalid OTC test result, the participant was asked to
232 perform a second OTC test. If the second OTC result was also invalid, the participant was not
233 asked to perform additional OTC tests on that day and was instructed to continue to the PCR
234 sample collection (at least 15 minutes after OTC sample collection). Participants were
235 responsible for shipping the PCR collection kit containing the sample using the pre-paid FedEx
236 envelope based on the instructions provided by Quest Diagnostics, which were authorized by
237 the FDA for emergency use.

238 *Molecular Testing Procedures:* Due to concerns of potential false-positive molecular tests, the
239 FDA recommended the use of two types of molecular assays, and potentially, a third assay, if
240 the prior two assays were discordant (oral communication, August 3, 2021).^{23,4} Once participant
241 samples were received at Quest Diagnostics, the sample was divided into aliquots to perform
242 Roche Cobas 6800 SARS-CoV-2 PCR and Quest Laboratory Developed RT-PCR (LDT) for all
243 participants (Supplemental Figure 10). An additional aliquot was preserved by the Quest
244 laboratory to allow for testing of the sample on Hologic Aptima Transcription Mediated
245 Amplification (TMA) assay, and the UMass Chan team submitted an additional order for the
246 Hologic Aptima TMA assay when the results of the Roche Cobas and Quest LDT were
247 discordant or if at least one of the PCR assays resulted as inconclusive. All three molecular
248 assays used are highly sensitive, authorized by EUA, and run per instructions per use. Remnant

249 samples of sample fluid from home-collection kits were frozen at -80 Celsius and shipped to
250 UMass Chan Medical School for future testing. Results of the molecular PCR assays were
251 available to participants through the Quest results portal and through communication from the
252 study team. All participants that tested positive by molecular test received a phone call from a
253 study team member. For determining performance statistics, a molecular test was considered
254 as positive only if a majority of the three molecular assays were positive. In the event of
255 discordant results, the participant was contacted by the study staff to explain the results and the
256 results were made available through the study app.

257 *Communication with the study team:* Participants were provided a study hotline staffed with
258 research coordinators to provide support during extended hours during the weekdays from 8 AM
259 to 9 PM EST. Participants were also able to contact the study team via email outside of the
260 hotline hours. All calls between coordinators and participants were documented in a call log
261 containing the length of the call, the reason for the call, narrative about the call, and whether the
262 issue was resolved.

263 *Data Management:* There were three primary sources of data (Supplemental Figure 11). All
264 participant-reported data were collected through the MyDataHelps smartphone app and
265 downloaded incrementally through secure file transfer protocol to UMass Chan servers. The
266 molecular testing data were shared by Quest Diagnostics through an established datafeed
267 between Quest and UMass Chan servers, which populated output of molecular assays.
268 However, the PCR cycle threshold (CT) values and results of the tiebreaker assays were not
269 part of routinely abstracted data and required manual abstraction. Finally, tracking reports were
270 used to document all communications between participants and the study staff. All three
271 sources of data were combined using a participant's unique identifier assigned by the
272 MyDataHelps app. Paired OTC and PCR data were merged by matching on participant identifier
273 and date of testing. When test dates were not aligned or there were unmatched results, a
274 member of the study team reviewed all testing data from the participants to adjudicate paired

275 findings. The most common reason for mismatched dates was due to missing dates of collection
276 or transcription errors, as date of collection for PCR sample is handwritten by the participant on
277 the Quest requisition form. Study staff reconciled possible mismatched test results by reviewing
278 data for requisition numbers entered in the app, shipment tracking data, and contact reports
279 from the study. If mismatched data could not be adequately aligned, those data were
280 considered as ineligible due to failed quality-checks. Additional adjudication undertaken by the
281 study team prior to data lock included a manual review of all rapid antigen test images for
282 participants who either had a self-reported positive, don't know, or invalid OTC result or if they
283 tested positive on molecular test at any point during the study. All data were de-identified and
284 shared with the FDA throughout the study. At the end of the study, the final and cleaned dataset
285 was shared with the FDA and company-specific data were shared with the companies. All data
286 will be made available on the NIH Data Hub once the main findings from this study are
287 published.

288 **RESULTS**

289 *Enrollment:* In total, 7,361 participants enrolled in the study between October 18, 2021 and
290 February 15, 2022 (Figure 1a). Due to complications with the Test C company app, Test C
291 enrollment began on November 4, 2021, three weeks after Test A and B enrollment started
292 (Figure 1b). Following initial surges in recruitment, the enrollment waitlist was implemented on
293 November 24, 2021 to allow for refinement of enrollment from geographic hotspots (Figure 2). In
294 total, 369 participants tested positive on molecular assays during the study and 167 of those
295 were eligible for analyses (Figure 3).

296 *Geographic and Sociodemographic Participant Characteristics:* The geographic and
297 sociodemographic characteristics of study participants changed over the course of the study,
298 reflecting the shifts in the enrollment approach. In total, participants from 44 of the 48 mainland
299 U.S. states enrolled in the study (Figure 2). In October, the majority of initial study recruitment
300 occurred on a college campus in Wisconsin, resulting in a young, predominantly white, student

301 population (Figure 2; Table 3). Additionally, only 3.1% of enrolled participants in October were
302 unvaccinated for SARS-CoV-2. In November, study recruitment was expanded throughout the
303 United States, with enrollment from more than 20 different states. Participants from rural
304 populations comprised 14% of the participants recruited in November. In December and
305 January, study enrollment shifted to prioritize unvaccinated participants, preferentially pulling
306 these participants from the study waitlist, resulting in 24.6% and 21.4% of monthly enrollment
307 being unvaccinated (Table 3). In January, recruitment efforts also focused on increasing racial
308 and ethnic diversity in the study population, and the minority of participants enrolled during
309 January identified as White (42.6%). Additionally, 10.5% of participants enrolled in January were
310 of Hispanic origin.

311 *Operational Support and Logistics:* Throughout the study, there were 11,646 contacts between
312 coordinators and 4,389 distinct participants (Table 4). This accounted for 33,356 minutes of
313 coordination time. Coordinators and participants communicated by phone call (39.7%), email
314 (30.6%), voicemail (29.7%), and push notification within the study app (4.2%). The most
315 common reason for contact was to share COVID-19 test results from molecular tests, which
316 accounted for 24.3% of all calls. Other common reasons for contact included testing reminders
317 (19.1%), shipping and receipt of test kits (16.7%), compensation (16.3%), and clarifying the
318 testing schedule (10.4%). The company-generated app for Test C was initially only compatible
319 with certain smartphones, and many participants were unable to use the company app
320 effectively. Due to these challenges, we delayed enrollment for Test C by two weeks and
321 troubleshooted the app with the company, to ensure participants were able to use the app
322 appropriately (Figure 1a). With participants assigned to Tests A and B, there was not a
323 company app, so similar issues did not arise. Further, the decentralized design necessitated an
324 increased reliance on shipping vendors, allowing us to reach participants across the mainland
325 US states. However, this also required a variety of tracking methods to keep track of the 58,888
326 kits shipped. This study spanned the holiday season, which resulted in additional shipping

327 delays; 1.2% (n =728) of packages were affected by logistical or participant errors that led to an
328 unviable or missing RT-PCR test result.

329

330 **DISCUSSION**

331 Using an innovative digital, site-less study approach, we developed recruitment and
332 enrollment strategies to capture new onset COVID-19 infections most effectively throughout the
333 country, resulting in the detection of nearly three times as many new-onset COVID-19 cases as
334 originally specified. The digital site-less approach allowed us to seamlessly and dynamically
335 change enrollment patterns and sample different populations based on the evolving nature of
336 the pandemic, to assess rapid diagnostics with agility, efficiency, and rigor among asymptomatic
337 individuals.

338 The digital site-less approach offered great agility to alter the recruitment strategy to fit
339 our needs throughout the evolution of the study. Initially, to iron out the study logistics, including
340 shipping rapid antigen tests and molecular comparator collection kits directly to participants, we
341 opened study recruitment in October 2021 to members of a Midwestern university marching
342 band who were traveling together, where we anticipated a high amount of unmasked, close
343 contact interactions. This group enrollment is reflected in the demographics of participants in
344 October, who were younger and had a higher proportion of white participants than participants
345 recruited in November through January. Later, we were able to geographically alter the
346 sampling to enroll participants from throughout the United States and use a waitlist to selectively
347 sample certain populations by zip-code, determined by community prevalence of COVID-19,
348 and demographics to ensure we were curating a representative sample. For example, after
349 seeing low enrollment of participants over age 65 years in October through December, in
350 January, we selectively pulled those over 65 years of age off the waitlist, increasing the
351 proportion of participants in this group from 1.5% in October to 13.4% in January. Additionally,

352 the recruitment strategy resulted in 16.6% of all enrolled participants being unvaccinated,
353 matching nationwide estimates for those over 5 years of age (CDC data tracker). The waitlist
354 approach also allows us to ensure that enrollment was not solely clustered among those who
355 have greatest access to recruitment strategies, including news articles and social media, but
356 rather gave the time for information to disseminate to and within various communities.

357 The remote design also resulted in gains in study efficiency, in terms of both coordinator
358 time and cost. Instead of requiring coordinators to schedule and supervise serial sample
359 collections for each participant, the virtual, site-less design allowed participants to test in their
360 homes and on their time, increasing accessibility to individuals with various employment and
361 school schedules, as well as living situations. According to the study coordination logs, direct
362 participant-coordinator phone calls averaged to just over 1-hour per day (82.3 minutes over 161
363 days of the study) and consisted primarily of testing reminders and returning molecular test
364 results to participants, as well as notifying positive participants of their infection. As clinical
365 research coordinators on average support upwards of seven studies concurrently and
366 approximately two-thirds of coordinators report being expected to work more time on studies
367 than allotted, it is important to understand methods to optimize study coordination time, while
368 maintaining quality and consistency.¹⁴ Here, we showed the ability for site-less digital trials to
369 run with minimal participant-coordinator interaction, while maintaining high enrollment and
370 adherence to the study protocol (data not shown).

371 Site-less cohort studies have become increasingly common, as advances in technology
372 have made virtual recruitment and engagement more feasible.¹⁵ However, digital products and
373 solutions in clinical research remain underutilized.¹⁶ Site-less studies can not only facilitate
374 recruitment and participant engagement, but they can also enhance scientific rigor and design.
375 Through coordination with shipping services, home-test distributors, and clinical labs, we
376 organized shipments of study supplies to participants on enrollment, to allow participants to start
377 testing at home within 24 to 48 hours of enrollment with minimal participant burden. Further, we

378 coordinated the pick-up and shipment of repeated biological samples to the central laboratory
379 throughout the study period for comparator testing, which has seldom been done within the
380 framework of a digital study. The success of these workflows opens the door for the adaptation
381 of site-less studies to answer many complex research questions, by integrating survey
382 responses, biological samples, and home health monitoring.

383 There are a few potential limitations to the study. We did not require participants to be
384 under video observation while performing the rapid antigen tests or collecting samples for the
385 molecular tests, which could have resulted in improper technique and sample collection.
386 However, our study facilitated use of these tests ‘as intended’ and ‘as authorized’ by the FDA
387 and therefore may represent better approximation of real-world performance of the tests than
388 traditional clinical studies, which simulate a home environment in controlled research sites.
389 Additionally, the smartphone app required participants to take images of the rapid antigen tests;
390 therefore, we could verify the rapid antigen test results for all participants. Due to the scale and
391 nature of this study, we relied on commercial vendors for assembly and distribution of the
392 testing kits, which precluded our ability to provide study-specific written instructions enclosed
393 within the kit; we instead relied on providing all study-specific instructions through the
394 smartphone app. This resulted in confusion for some participants who did not start testing right
395 away after receiving the test kits or did not start with performing both rapid antigen and PCR
396 tests concurrently. However, our study team were able to detect these instances and intervene
397 by contacting the participants who did not begin testing for an extended period of time after
398 receiving the tests or were not performing paired testing. Because of the logistical constraints,
399 we could not facilitate a cold-chain transportation of the collected specimen, which preclude our
400 ability to perform viral culture studies, which would have provided additional insights into the
401 performance of rapid antigen tests. The workflow for sample collection for molecular tests
402 required participants to handwrite the date and time of sample collection on a form, and the data
403 generated from the laboratory had to be linked with rapid antigen testing data based on

404 Participant ID and day of testing, which resulted in mismatches and required substantial manual
405 effort for reconciling differences by reviewing tracking history of sample collection. Finally, the
406 requirement of smartphone ownership to participate in the study disadvantages people without
407 smartphones. However, smartphone use is ubiquitous and has been accelerated by the SARS-
408 CoV-2 pandemic.¹⁷ Additionally, we submit that the barrier to participation created by requiring a
409 smartphone is lesser than that created by requiring participants to take time off from their day
410 during business hours to travel to a clinical study site, multiple times during the study.

411 These limitations notwithstanding, this study represents the most robust attempt at
412 understanding the performance of serial use of rapid antigen tests for SARS-CoV-2 detection
413 among asymptomatic participants. We summarize the advantages of our digital siteless
414 approach in Table 5 and outline recommendations for future digital studies. The collaboration
415 behind this study between the NIH, FDA, and the RADx Clinical Studies Core allowed for
416 development of a protocol that was innovative and a clinical study that will provide tremendous
417 value to federal agencies, academic researchers and companies for elucidating key questions
418 related to rapid antigen tests' performance. Future collaborative efforts to develop best practice
419 guidelines and infrastructure for performing digital clinical studies are needed to advance
420 scientific community's ability to perform rigorous clinical research and answer vexing questions.

421

422

423 **Acknowledgment:** We are grateful to our study participants and to our collaborators from the
424 National Institute of Health (NIBIB and NHLBI) who provided scientific input into the design of
425 this study and interpretation of our results, but could not formally join as co-authors due to
426 institutional policies and to the Food and Drug Administration (Office of In Vitro Diagnostics and
427 Radiological Health) for their involvement in the primary TUAH study. We received meaningful
428 contributions from Drs. Bruce Tromberg, Jill Heemskerk, Dennis Buxton, Erin Iturriaga, Jue
429 Chen, Andrew Weitz, and Krishna Juluru. We are thankful to the developers of the rapid antigen
430 tests, who donated their tests for research use in this study. We are thankful to county health
431 departments across the country who helped with recruitment for this siteless study by spreading
432 the word in their networks.

433

434 **Competing Interest Statement**

435 VK is principal, and TS, SS, CN, ES, and EH are employees of the health care technology
436 company CareEvolution, which was contracted to configure the smartphone study app, provide
437 operational and logistical support, and collaborate on overall research approach. LS and LR are
438 employees of Quest Diagnostics LLC, which was contracted to provide direct-to-consumer kits,
439 logistical support for nationwide RT-PCR testing, and operational support for producing
440 molecular testing results. DDM reports consulting and research grants from Bristol-Myers
441 Squibb and Pfizer, consulting and research support from Fitbit, consulting, and research support
442 from Flexcon, research grant from Boehringer Ingelheim, consulting from Avania, non-financial
443 research support from Apple Computer, consulting/other support from Heart Rhythm Society.
444 YCM has received tests from Quanterix, Becton-Dickinson, Ceres, and Hologic for research-
445 related purposes, consults for Abbott on subjects unrelated to SARS-CoV-2, and receives
446 funding support to Johns Hopkins University from miDiagnostics. AS receives non-financial
447 support from CareEvolution for collaborative research activities.

448

449 **Funding Statement**

450 This study was funded by the NIH RADx Tech program under 3U54HL143541-02S2 and NIH
451 CTSA grant UL1TR001453. The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors
452 and do not necessarily represent the views of the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and
453 Bioengineering; the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; the National Institutes of Health,
454 or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Salary support from the National
455 Institutes of Health U54HL143541, R01HL141434, R01HL137794, R61HL158541,
456 R01HL137734, U01HL146382 (AS, DDM), U54EB007958-13 (YCM, MLR), AI272201400007C,
457 UM1AI068613 (YCM).

458

459 **References:**

- 460 1. Policy for Coronavirus Disease-2019 Tests During the Public Health Emergency (Revised) | FDA.
461 Accessed July 4, 2022. [https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/policy-coronavirus-disease-2019-tests-during-public-health-emergency-revised)
462 [documents/policy-coronavirus-disease-2019-tests-during-public-health-emergency-revised](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/policy-coronavirus-disease-2019-tests-during-public-health-emergency-revised)
- 463 2. Kanji JN, Zelyas N, MacDonald C, et al. False negative rate of COVID-19 PCR testing: a discordant
464 testing analysis. *Virology Journal*. 2021;18(1):13. doi:10.1186/s12985-021-01489-0
- 465 3. Wei Z, Ryhana M, Elizabeth S, J BG, J MA. Comparison of Four Molecular In Vitro Diagnostic
466 Assays for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Nasopharyngeal Specimens. *Journal of Clinical*
467 *Microbiology*. 2022;58(8):e00743-20. doi:10.1128/JCM.00743-20
- 468 4. Lowe CF, Matic N, Ritchie G, et al. Detection of low levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from
469 nasopharyngeal swabs using three commercial molecular assays. *Journal of Clinical Virology*.
470 2020;128:104387. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104387>
- 471 5. Smith RL, Gibson LL, Martinez PP, et al. Longitudinal Assessment of Diagnostic Test Performance
472 Over the Course of Acute SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*.
473 2021;224(6):976-982. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiab337
- 474 6. CDC COVID Data Tracker. Accessed May 12, 2021. [https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#variant-proportions)
475 [tracker/#variant-proportions](https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#variant-proportions)
- 476 7. Herbert C, Kheterpal V, Suvarna T, et al. Design and Preliminary Findings of Adherence to the
477 Self-Testing for Our Protection From COVID-19 (STOP COVID-19) Risk-Based Testing Protocol:
478 Prospective Digital Study. *JMIR Form Res*. 2022;6(6):e38113. doi:10.2196/38113
- 479 8. Lamberti MJ, Getz K. Profiles of New Approaches to Improving the Efficiency and Performance of
480 Pharmaceutical Drug Development. *Tufts White Paper*. Published online 2015.
- 481 9. Hirsch IB, Martinez J, Dorsey ER, et al. Incorporating Site-less Clinical Trials Into Drug
482 Development: A Framework for Action. *Clinical Therapeutics*. 2017;39(5).
483 doi:10.1016/j.clinthera.2017.03.018
- 484 10. Gray DM, Nolan TS, Gregory J, Joseph JJ. Diversity in clinical trials: an opportunity and imperative
485 for community engagement. *The Lancet Gastroenterology and Hepatology*. 2021;6(8).
486 doi:10.1016/S2468-1253(21)00228-4
- 487 11. Clark LT, Watkins L, Piña IL, et al. Increasing Diversity in Clinical Trials: Overcoming Critical
488 Barriers. *Current Problems in Cardiology*. 2019;44(5). doi:10.1016/j.cpcardiol.2018.11.002
- 489 12. National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine. *Improving Representation in Clinical*
490 *Trials and Research: Building Research Equity for Women and Underrepresented Groups*. The
491 National Academies Press; 2022. doi:<https://doi.org/10.17226/26479>.
- 492 13. Inan OT, Tenaerts P, Prindiville SA, et al. Digitizing clinical trials. *npj Digital Medicine*.
493 2020;3(1):101. doi:10.1038/s41746-020-0302-y
- 494 14. Speicher LA, Fromell G, Avery S, et al. The critical need for academic health centers to assess the
495 training, support, and career development requirements of clinical research coordinators:

- 496 recommendations from the Clinical and Translational Science Award Research Coordinator
497 Taskforce. *Clin Transl Sci*. 2012;5(6):470-475. doi:10.1111/j.1752-8062.2012.00423.x
- 498 15. Banks MA. Core Concept: In the wake of COVID-19, decentralized clinical trials move to center
499 stage. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2021;118(47):e2119097118. doi:10.1073/pnas.2119097118
- 500 16. Marra C, Gordon WJ, Stern AD. Use of connected digital products in clinical research following
501 the COVID-19 pandemic: a comprehensive analysis of clinical trials. *BMJ Open*.
502 2021;11(6):e047341. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-047341
- 503 17. Demographics of Mobile Device Ownership and Adoption in the United States | Pew Research
504 Center. Accessed July 31, 2022. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/fact-sheet/mobile/>
- 505
- 506

507 **Tables and Figures:**

508 **Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

Inclusion Criteria	
➤	At least 2 years old
➤	Access or parental access to a smartphone or device to download and use study app
➤	Reside in mainland United States
➤	Able to receive mail at home
➤	Willing to drop off comparator samples at FedEx drop-off site or allow for pick-up service to retrieve samples
➤	Report no COVID-19 symptoms within 14 days prior to study enrollment
Exclusion Criteria	
➤	Self-reported positive test for SARS-CoV-2 infection in the previous 3 months
➤	Facial trauma interfering with nasal swabs
➤	Lack capacity to consent
➤	Do not understand English or Spanish
➤	Currently in the correctional justice system
➤	No internet access on smartphone while at home

509

510 **Table 2: Test Us At Home Testing Schedule**

Study Day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
OTC Device	X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
Molecular Comparator	X		X		X		X		X		X		X		

511 X=Test completed on this day

512

513 **Table 3: Test Us at Home Participant Demographics by Month of Enrollment**

	October N=415	November N=3701	December N=1592	January N=1653	Total N=7361
Test Assigned: n (%)					
Test A	80 (19.3)	1,474 (39.8)	375 (23.6)	530 (32.1)	2,459 (33.4)
Test B	335 (80.7)	1,231 (33.3)	375 (23.6)	565 (34.2)	2,506 (34.0)
Test C	0 (0.0)	996 (26.9)	842 (52.9)	558 (33.8)	2,396 (32.6)
Vaccination Doses: n (%)					
1	51 (12.3)	1,176 (31.8)	418 (26.3)	32 (1.9)	1,677 (22.8)
2	350 (84.3)	2,062 (55.7)	513 (32.2)	352 (21.3)	3,277 (44.5)
3+	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	269 (16.9)	915 (55.4)	1,184 (16.1)
Unvaccinated	13 (3.1)	462 (12.5)	392 (24.6)	354 (21.4)	1,221 (16.6)
Don't know	1 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.1)
Age Category: n (%)					
Less than 18 years	0 (0.0)	417 (11.3)	199 (12.5)	164 (9.9)	780 (10.6)
18-45 years	384 (92.5)	2,156 (58.3)	851 (53.5)	878 (53.1)	4,269 (58.0)
45-65 years	25 (6.0)	871 (23.5)	392 (24.6)	390 (23.6)	1,678 (22.8)
Over 65 years	6 (1.5)	257 (6.9)	150 (9.4)	221 (13.4)	634 (8.6)
Gender: n (%)					
Female	232 (55.9)	2,340 (63.2)	1,045 (65.6)	1,025 (62.1)	4,642 (63.1)
Male	131 (31.6)	1,208 (32.6)	458 (28.8)	523 (31.7)	2,320 (31.5)
Nonbinary	28 (6.8)	49 (1.3)	20 (1.3)	19 (1.2)	116 (1.6)
Transgender	14 (3.4)	20 (0.5)	11 (0.7)	2 (0.1)	47 (0.6)
No answer	10 (2.4)	84 (2.3)	58 (3.6)	84 (5.1)	236 (3.2)
Race/Ethnicity: n (%)					
White	358 (86.3)	3,167 (85.6)	1,249 (78.4)	703 (42.6)	5,477 (74.4)
African American/Black	15 (3.6)	95 (2.6)	94 (5.9)	159 (9.6)	363 (4.9)
Asian	5 (1.2)	98 (2.7)	50 (3.1)	302 (18.3)	455 (6.2)
Pacific Islander	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	25 (1.5)	27 (0.4)
Native American/Alaskan Native	3 (0.7)	19 (0.5)	9 (0.6)	10 (0.6)	41 (0.6)
Other	9 (2.2)	83 (2.2)	49 (3.1)	192 (11.6)	333 (4.5)
Multiracial	13 (3.1)	137 (3.7)	66 (4.1)	129 (7.8)	345 (4.7)

No answer	12 (2.9)	101 (2.7)	74 (4.7)	133 (8.1)	320 (4.4)
Hispanic: n (%)	24 (5.8)	243 (6.6)	88 (5.5)	174 (10.5)	529 (7.2)
Geographic Setting					
Rural	25 (6.0)	521 (14.1)	188 (11.8)	137 (8.3)	871 (11.8)
Suburban	238 (57.4)	1,997 (54.0)	900 (56.5)	797 (48.2)	3,932 (53.4)
Urban	144 (34.7)	1,126 (30.4)	456 (28.6)	643 (38.9)	2,369 (32.2)
No answer	8 (1.9)	57 (1.5)	48 (3.0)	76 (4.6)	189 (2.6)
Highest Level of Education: n (%)					
Did not finish high school	0 (0.0)	331 (8.9)	160 (10.1)	131 (7.9)	622 (8.5)
High school graduate	173 (41.7)	328 (8.9)	145 (9.1)	179 (10.8)	825 (11.2)
Some college	155 (37.4)	830 (22.4)	336 (21.1)	378 (22.9)	1,699 (23.1)
Bachelor's Degree or higher	78 (18.8)	2,027 (54.8)	833 (52.3)	830 (50.2)	3,768 (51.2)
Don't know	1 (0.2)	45 (1.2)	18 (1.1)	19 (1.2)	83 (1.1)
No answer	8 (1.9)	140 (3.8)	100 (6.3)	116 (7.0)	364 (4.9)
Employment Status: n (%)					
Unemployed	22 (5.3)	414 (11.2)	134 (8.4)	169 (10.2)	739 (10.0)
Retired	8 (1.9)	253 (6.8)	121 (7.6)	170 (10.3)	552 (7.5)
Student	265 (63.9)	656 (17.7)	273 (17.2)	239 (14.5)	1,433 (19.5)
Working now	106 (25.5)	2,230 (60.3)	967 (60.7)	934 (56.5)	4,237 (57.6)
Other	3 (0.7)	55 (1.5)	27 (1.7)	30 (1.8)	115 (1.6)
No answer	11 (2.7)	93 (2.5)	70 (4.4)	111 (6.7)	285 (3.9)

514

515

516 **Table 4. Type of Contact and Reasons for Participant-Coordinator Contact**

	Number of Participant-Coordinator Contacts
Total	11,646
Type of Contact, n (%)	
Phone Call	4,627 (39.7)
Voice mail	3,455 (29.7)
Email	3,564 (30.6)
Unscheduled Push notification	483 (4.2)
Who Initiated Contact?, n (%)	
Participant	5,371 (46.1)
Coordinator	5,261 (45.2)
Both	825 (7.1)
Missing	189 (1.6)
Reason, n^a	
App issues	1,123 (9.6)
Interpretation of Test Results	16 (0.1)
Symptom reporting	63 (0.5)
Issues with Rapid Antigen Tests	251 (2.2)
Testing Reminder	2,228 (19.1)
Compensation	1,903 (16.3)
Shipping of Tests	1,950 (16.7)
Study testing schedule	1,215 (10.4)
Giving Test Results	2,833 (24.3)
Other	1,794 (15.4)

517 ^aReasons for contact were not mutually exclusive

Table 5. Summary of features of this study and opportunity for improvement

Challenges	Innovation	Opportunity for improvement
Widespread outreach to asymptomatic individuals	Democratized participation such that anyone, anywhere, anytime can choose to participate through a smartphone without needing to travel to a clinical study site or recruitment centers	Requirement of smartphone to enroll can prevent some people from participating. Approaches that loan study smartphones or leverage community-health workers as digital studies' liaisons can help overcome this limitation
Engagement of diverse communities	A dedicated team met with county health workers and community stakeholders from across the country to promote awareness of the study and participation among people of color, indigenous heritage, and rural locations	A network of community partners and stakeholders for digital clinical studies that inform, plan, and conduct outreach efforts can help further enhance participation of historically underrepresented populations
Recruitment from SARS-CoV-2 "hotspot"	Use of CDC daily case reports and projects to identify geographical regions where community outreach efforts were enhanced and which were identified as 'preferred regions for enrollment'	Promoting peer-to-peer recruitment from hotspots through the use of the smartphone apps
Refinement of enrollment	Adding a layer of prioritization to allow cohort composition such that participants from "hotspots" and those that improve diverse representation of the enrolled cohort	Automatically adaptive priority criteria that does not require manual input or decision-making but can allow manual override
Consenting participants including children > 2 years old	Self-contained description of consent, including brief description of key parts of the study displayed through the smartphone app	Use of participatory videos that explain the study objectives and activities embedded within the smartphone app
Assigning rapid antigen tests	Pre-specified criteria that assigned tests to participants automatically	Adaptive algorithm that refines criteria to create balanced cohorts based on multiple variables
Distributing testing kits	Asynchronous assembly and shipment of kits from commercial vendors	Synchronous assemble and shipment of kits such that all materials arrive in box instead of different boxes
Collecting samples for molecular tests	Direct-to-consumer kits for nasal swabs that were returned using FedEx overnight prepaid envelopes	Courier pickup options that can be invoked from within the study app

Performing up to three separate molecular assays in CLIA laboratories	Automated ordering of two tests and manual ordering of additional tests when discordance was observed	Automated ordering of discordant testing with streamlined data collection
Serial testing within a specific window (44-52 hours apart)	Automated app notification and text messages every two hours during the testing window	Providing the option of defining notification frequency during the testing window to the participants
Verification of rapid antigen testing results	In-app widget to allow participants to take an image of rapid antigen tests that were later verified by the participants	Automated readers that confirms that an image of rapid antigen test was collected and interprets the test result ^a
Data collection and quality	Data fidelity and timestamp for each element collected within the study app and collation of disparate datafeed from the molecular testing laboratory	Minimizing user entry of free-text or handwritten data
Participant reimbursement	Batch processing of prepaid Bank of America cards that are mailed to participants' home	Automated delivery of reimbursement through smartphone app once the requirements are met
a: future automated readers that help with interpretation of test result will need FDA authorization		

Figure 1: Test Us At Home Study Enrollment

Figure 1a:






Figure 1b:



a: Test A and B enrollment opens to individuals with specific group codes on October 18, 2021; b: Enrollment opens nationwide on October 26, 2021; c: Test C enrollment starts on November 4, 2021; d: Enrollment waitlist approach implemented on November 24, 2021

Figure 2: Test Us at Home Enrollment by State and Month, October 2021-January 2022


medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.04.22278274>; this version posted August 5, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Note: COVID-19 monthly incidence calculated from CDC COVID Data Tracker⁶

Figure 3: CONSORT diagram of the Test Us At Home Study

CONSORT diagram for data included in the final dataset shared with the FDA (all data)



a= participants replaced their assigned rapid antigen tests with commercially obtained rapid antigen tests; b= dates of RT-PCR testing could not be verified based on triangulation of self-reported, shipping, and resulting data; A, B, and C refer to rapid antigen test assignment. c = at-least two positive molecular assays from a single sample per participant (Roche Cobas 6800, Quest LDT, Hologic Aptima)