

1 Assessment of the effectiveness of required weekly COVID-19 2 surveillance antigen testing at a university

3 Christopher W. Ryan, MD, MS, MSPH*

4 Clinical Associate Professor of Family Medicine, SUNY Upstate Medical University Binghamton Clinical
5 Campus, PO Box 778, Johnson City, NY, 13790, US

6 Medical Director, Broome County Health Department, 225 Front Street, Binghamton, NY, 13905, US

8 2023-11-22 16:00:14

9 Word count: approximately 2991, excluding title page, abstract, required statements, and fig-
10 ure/table placement markers

11 Number of figures: 3

12 Number of tables: 3

13 1 Keywords

14 COVID-19, surveillance testing, pandemic control

15 2 Three-question summary box

16 **What is the current understanding of this subject?** Assessments of long-term operational effec-
17 tiveness of COVID-19 “surveillance testing” have not been published.

18 **What does this report add to the literature?** During the 2020-2021 academic year at one univer-
19 sity, people with COVID-19 detected via compulsory weekly surveillance antigen testing were
20 equally likely to be symptomatic at time of detection, and for just as long, as similar-aged
21 people detected via testing venues in the community.

22 **What are the implications for public health practice?** Surveillance testing programs during the pan-
23 demic consumed a large amount of time, money, and effort. In future respiratory pandemics,
24 resources might be better devoted to other mitigation measures.

*Corresponding author. Address: SUNY Upstate Medical University Binghamton Clinical Campus, PO Box 778, Johnson City, NY, 13790, US. Phone: 607-772-3526. Email: cryan@binghamton.edu

25 **Abstract**

26 **Objectives**

27 To mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic, many institutions implemented a regimen of periodic required
28 testing, irrespective of symptoms. The effectiveness of this “surveillance testing” requires assessment.

29 **Methods**

30 I fit a zero-inflated negative binomial model to COVID-19 testing and case investigation data be-
31 tween 1 November 2020 and 15 May 2021, from young adult subjects in one community. I compared
32 the duration of symptoms at time of specimen collection in those diagnosed via (1) surveillance test-
33 ing at a university, (2) the same university’s student health services, and (3) all other testing venues.

34 **Results**

35 The data comprised 2926 records: 393 from surveillance testing, 493 from student health service,
36 and 2040 from other venues. About 65% of people with COVID-19 detected via surveillance testing
37 were already symptomatic at time of specimen collection.

38 Predicted mean duration of pre-testing symptoms was 1.7 days (95% CI 1.59 to 1.84) for the
39 community, 1.81 days (95% CI 1.62 to 1.99) for surveillance, and 2 days (95% CI 1.83 to 2.16)
40 for student health service. The modelled “inflated” proportions of asymptomatic subjects from
41 the surveillance stream and the other/community stream were comparable (odds ratio 0.95, $p =$
42 0.7709). Comparing surveillance testing with the student health service, the proportion of “excess”
43 zero symptom durations was significantly higher in the former (Chi-square = 12.08, $p = 0.0005$)

44 **Conclusions**

45 Surveillance testing at a university detected 393 people with COVID-19, but no earlier in their
46 trajectory than similar-aged people detected in the broader community. This casts some doubt on
47 the public health value of such programs, which tend to be labor-intensive and expensive.

48 Introduction

49 Hoping to control the spread of COVID-19 attributable to asymptomatic and presymptomatic
50 infections, many institutions implemented a regimen of periodic required testing, irrespective of
51 symptoms, for people notionally under their jurisdiction—often called "surveillance testing." Among
52 them were many colleges and universities. After abruptly halting in-person, on-campus instruction
53 in March 2020, surveillance testing was widely considered important for a safe return to in-person
54 collegiate education in fall 2020 and was widely adopted.^{1–12}

55 Early mathematical modeling studies attempted to predict the effects of surveillance test-
56 ing,^{2,13–19} and several pilot or short-duration studies of implementation were also conducted.^{4,6,7}
57 As these programs are costly and labor-intensive, it is now important to assess their effects from
58 a longer-term perspective. The present study concerns a single university ("University") where,
59 serendipitously, surveillance test results could be confidently distinguished from those generated by
60 the student health service and by other testing venues in the wider community. The research ques-
61 tion is whether University's COVID-19 surveillance testing program detected COVID-19 infections
62 significantly earlier in their clinical evolution, compared to University's own student health service,
63 and to the broader community where the like-aged population was not generally subject to
64 surveillance testing.

65 Methods

66 The analysis involved all positive COVID-19 test results and the subsequent case investigation
67 reports among subjects aged 17.5 to 27 years, inclusive, in a county of approximately 198,000
68 population, between 1 November 2020 and 15 May 2021. For most of that interval, wild-type
69 SARS-CoV-2 was the predominant circulating strain; by the end of the study period, the alpha strain
70 accounted for about half of sequenced specimens worldwide.²⁰ The county encompasses University,
71 which enrolls approximately 18,000 students, undergraduate and graduate. Generally healthy people
72 of study age became eligible for COVID-19 vaccination toward the end of the study period.²¹
73 The Institutional Review Board of SUNY Upstate Medical University determined that this project
74 comprised public health surveillance and did not meet the definition of human subjects research
75 (determination 1933720-1).

76 During the study period, the local health department was obligated to investigate all occurrences
77 of COVID-19 via structured telephone interview, which included the presence and duration of
78 symptoms. All those with COVID-19 received official isolation orders and instructions. Exposed
79 contacts disclosed by the patients were also interviewed and quarantined. The health department
80 maintained continuous, close coordination with University.

81 Weekly, students at University were required to have a BINAXNow COVID-19 antigen test,²²
82 conducted at the student union ("surveillance testing"). This began in late August, but with a

83 different testing product; that period is excluded from this analysis. Students with symptoms
84 of COVID-19 were not to attend their next scheduled surveillance test but rather seek clinical
85 evaluation promptly. For many, this would be via University’s student health service. Nevertheless,
86 many students disclosed symptoms at the surveillance site, and if their test was positive, they
87 were automatically considered by the local health department to have COVID-19. Subjects with a
88 positive antigen test but who denied symptoms at the surveillance site were sent, immediately or
89 the next day, to the student health center for a point-of-care Cue Health isothermal nucleic acid
90 amplification test (NAAT).²³ If positive on NAAT, they too were considered to have COVID-19
91 and investigated as above; if negative (discordant results), they were not considered infected and
92 no further action was taken.

93 Employees of University were also subject to weekly required surveillance testing and are sub-
94 sumed here under the term “students.” There is no reliable, automated way to distinguish laboratory
95 results pertaining to students from those pertaining to employees.

96 Ill students presenting to the student health center were tested as clinically indicated, with one
97 or more of an antigen test, a point-of-care NAAT, or a specimen sent to a reference laboratory for a
98 NAAT (“shs testing”). Employees were not generally eligible for clinical care at the student health
99 center, except for the follow-up NAAT for those asymptomatic but with a positive surveillance test.

100 Students could also avail themselves of other testing venues: one state-operated and two hospital-
101 operated drive-through NAAT sites, and a mobile antigen testing service operated by the local health
102 department. These venues are here aggregated under the category “community/other testing.”

103 The results of all COVID-19 tests were reported into the state’s Electronic Clinical Laboratory
104 Reporting System (ECLRS) and thence to the local health department where the person resides.
105 College students attending University were considered residents of the study county, although in
106 practice some results were mis-routed to the health department of their family home; those were
107 not accessible for this study. I used all COVID-19 test results present in the study county’s ECLRS
108 database as of 14 February 2023.

109 Each result record contained a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act (CLIA) number that
110 uniquely identified the laboratory that analyzed the specimen. By convenient coincidence, Uni-
111 versity used different CLIA numbers for its surveillance testing and its student health service test-
112 ing, a decision for made for internal, operational reasons. All non-University CLIA numbers were
113 categorized here as “community/other.”

114 All positive COVID-19 laboratory reports were automatically transmitted into a commercial
115 database called CommCare (Dimagi, Inc.), which was provided by the state for this one purpose.
116 CommCare served as the data system for guiding the investigator’s interview and for recording the
117 findings. I used all records of investigations present in CommCare as of 27 December 2022.

118 The lab result and investigation datasets were each separately filtered to eliminate those with a
119 variety of anomalies, including:

- 120 • specimen collection date prior to February 2020 or as dates that had not yet occurred

- 121 • duplicate entries: results from the same specimen from the same person on the same day
- 122 • investigations marked as entered in error, duplicate, or outside the local health department’s
- 123 jurisdiction

124 Using the fastLink package²⁴ in R,²⁵ I then matched the two data sources on the basis of last
125 name, first name, day of the month of the birthdate (1-31), and age in fractional years on the
126 date the specimen was collected. Records were considered successfully matched if the posterior
127 probability of an accurate match was greater than 85%.

128 I then filtered the matched records to those meeting the following criteria:

- 129 • specimen collection date (SCD) was within the study period
- 130 • the laboratory stream was recorded unambiguously
- 131 • the presence or absence of symptoms was recorded unambiguously
- 132 • if symptoms were present, the symptom onset date (SOD) was within seven days either side
- 133 of the SCD
- 134 • the SCD in ECLRS was within four days either side of the SCD in CommCare

135 This yielded the final, analytical dataset.

136 Using the countreg package^{26–28} in R, I fit a zero-inflated negative binomial model, with the
137 number of pre-test symptomatic days as the response and the testing stream by which the infection
138 was detected as the predictor of interest. The “other/community” stream served as the baseline
139 category. When symptoms began after specimen collection or were entirely absent, the response
140 variable was set to zero. All students with COVID-19 first detected via a positive surveillance antigen
141 test were attributed to that testing stream, irrespective of any immediate follow-up NAAT testing
142 at student health service. I controlled for overall community incidence with a kernel smoothed
143 estimate of the proportion of tests across the entire county (all three testing streams) that were
144 positive each week.

145 Briefly, a zero-inflated negative binomial model accomodates a mixture distribution where sub-
146 jects with zero counts (here, zero pre-collection symptomatic days) can arise in two different ways:
147 via a count process with overdispersion, or via a dichotomous process in which a count is either zero
148 or non-zero. A zero-inflated model can accomodate a larger number of subjects with zero counts
149 than can be well-fit by typical Poisson or negative binomial models—a so-called “excess” of zeros.

150 I assessed goodness of model fit with graphical methods in the countreg pacakge. I compared
151 coefficient estimates on the lab streams with Wald tests. Lastly, I conducted 5000 simulations from
152 the model, at a typical age of 22 years and at two different levels of overall community incidence,
153 generating point estimates and confidence intervals for stream-specific probability distributions of
154 the number of pre-test symptomatic days.

155 **Results**

156 The county-wide percent of tests each week that were positive ranged from 1.14% to 12%, with a
157 median of 5.52%.

158 The query of the state laboratory database yielded 2292320 records. Excluding those with
159 anomalous dates left 1384786. Limiting those to subjects aged 17.5 to 27 years left 340051, of which
160 12887 were positive.

161 The query of the Commcare case investigation database yielded 97543 records. Excluding records
162 marked as duplicate, erroneous, or out-of-jurisdiction left 76615. Of those, 8935 were between 17.5
163 and 27 years of age, inclusive. All non-erroneous records in Commcare by definition represent
164 patients with positive test results.

165 Record linkage yielded 7870 matched records. After the exclusions itemized above and summa-
166 rized in Table 1, 2926 matched records remained. These comprise the final, analytical dataset to
167 which models were fit.

168 [Table 1 about here.]

169 The testing streams from which the 2926 records in the analytical dataset emerged are summarized
170 in Table 2.

171 [Table 2 about here.]

172 The distribution of elapsed days between SOD (as determined from the case investigation interview)
173 and SCD (as determined from the state laboratory result database) is shown in Figure 1.

174 [Figure 1 about here.]

175 **Modeling results**

176 The fitted model is shown in Table 3. The coefficient estimates and standard errors in Table 3 are
177 on the scale of the linear predictor, so positive values imply an increase in the probability of an
178 “excess” zero (top half of Table 3) or in the number of pre-collection symptomatic days discounting
179 the excess zeros (bottom half of Table 3). Model fit seems adequate, as explored in more detail in
180 the Supplemental Materials.

181 [Table 3 about here.]

182 Part 3a of Table 3 models the “excess” portion of subjects asymptomatic at time of specimen col-
183 lection. These “excess zeros” are those poorly accounted for by the negative binomial count process
184 modeled in subtable 3b. Subtable 3a suggests that the “excess” proportion of asymptomatic subjects
185 presenting to the student health service (shs) is significantly lower than that in the other/community

186 setting (odds ratio 0.26, $p = 0.0002$.) This is perhaps not surprising. On the other hand, the “ex-
187 cess” proportions of asymptomatic subjects from the surveillance stream and the other/community
188 stream were comparable (odds ratio 0.95, $p = 0.7709$). Comparing surveillance testing with the
189 student health service, the proportion of “excess” zero symptom durations was significantly higher
190 in the former (Chi-square = 12.08, $p = 0.0005$)—also not surprising.

191 Part 3b of Table 3 models the negative binomial count process for the number of symptomatic
192 days prior to specimen collection (which can itself also yield zeros). Subtable 3b suggests that,
193 discounting the “excess” asymptomatic infections (that were accounted for by the “excess zero” com-
194 ponent in 3a), the mean duration of pre-collection symptoms was not significantly different in either
195 the surveillance stream or the student health stream, compared to the baseline other/community
196 stream (odds ratios 0.96, $p = 0.4265$ and 1.06, $p = 0.3374$, respectively.)

197 Combining the two components of the model, we can predict two informative things:

- 198 1. The probability that a person detected as having COVID-19 would have any particular number
199 of pre-test symptomatic days. This is shown in Figure 2, for each lab stream, at each of two
200 illustrative overall community incidence levels: “low” (the observed lower quartile of 3.9%)
201 and “high” (the observed upper quartile of 8.75%). At either incidence level, the probability
202 profiles of University’s surveillance testing stream and that from the wider community are
203 nearly identical. On the other hand, people identified via the student health service stream
204 were less likely to have been asymptomatic.
- 205 2. The mean duration of symptoms prior to specimen collection. This is shown in Figure 3 for
206 each lab stream, again at “low” and “high” community incidence. Within each graph, there
207 is much overlap between predicted mean pre-collection symptom durations from each of the
208 three testing streams. The scale of the horizontal axis should also be noted: what differences
209 there may be in the predicted means are on the order of a few tenths of a day, i.e. 6-12 hours.

210 [Figure 2 about here.]

211 [Figure 3 about here.]

212 Discussion

213 At a three-year remove from the onset of the pandemic, the effects of surveillance testing programs
214 can now be assessed with some perspective. The serendipitous use of a separate CLIA number
215 for surveillance testing at University enabled the present analysis to compare surveillance testing
216 with (1) University’s student health service and (2) testing venues in the wider community used by
217 college-aged people.

218 The interpretation of the present findings is nuanced. About 35% of students with COVID-19
219 detected via University’s surveillance regimen had no symptoms at the time of specimen collection.

220 This compares with about 20% of those detected via the student health service. This could be
221 considered a success for disease control, in that it enabled early isolation of those asymptomatic but
222 infected students, and identification and quarantine of their contacts.

223 Nevertheless, that leaves about 65% of surveillance-detected students already symptomatic at
224 the time of detection, despite instructions that symptomatic students should not wait for their
225 scheduled surveillance test. The concern is that those students could potentially transmit infection
226 while waiting. On the other hand, a more encouraging interpretation is that those infections might
227 have gone entirely undetected but for University’s surveillance regimen.

228 The fundamental question in the present analysis is whether infections with COVID-19 were
229 detected earlier in their trajectory among a population subject to surveillance testing compared
230 to a like-aged population that generally was not. This analysis provided no evidence that they
231 were. Those identified via University’s surveillance testing were as likely to be symptomatic at
232 the time of specimen collection as similar-aged subjects arising from various testing venues in the
233 community, and model-predicted mean duration of pre-collection symptoms differed only trivially
234 between the three different testing streams. These findings raise important questions about the
235 utility of resource-intensive surveillance testing programs in mitigating respiratory pandemics.

236 Public health interventions take place in a larger behavioral, social, ecological, economic, occupa-
237 tional, and academic context. These contextual factors may influence the effects of such programs,
238 perhaps by influencing care-seeking (or care-avoiding) behavior—in potentially paradoxical ways.

239 In any one-month period, approximately 75% of adults will develop some sort of symptom, yet
240 only one-third of those will seek medical care.^{29–31} Symptoms are by definition subjective and not
241 verifiable externally. They also have meaning for the person experiencing them, and that meaning
242 can change with time and events. Minor symptoms initially self-interpreted as unworthy of mention
243 or action may later be reinterpreted, especially after being presented with a test result.³²

244 People with COVID-19 could not attend class, work, or other group activities. Neither could the
245 people who were identified as having been close around them. So besides the medical ramifications,
246 the decision to seek prompt clinical testing, as opposed to awaiting a scheduled surveillance test,
247 entailed opportunity costs, and not just for the person infected.

248 “Risk homeostasis,” still a controversial concept, posits that people might become less careful
249 when they perceive their individual risk to be reduced by external mitigation measures.^{33,34} This
250 could manifest as a delay in seeking care if one felt reassured by the results of a recent (negative)
251 surveillance test or by the sure knowledge of another test coming up soon. Several early mixed-
252 methods studies in university settings suggested that some subjects receiving a negative result on
253 a recent test indeed felt reassured and thus willing to liberalize their social interactions.^{35–39}

254 **Limitations**

255 This analysis was based on data from weekly antigen-based surveillance testing at a single university
256 and may not be generalizable. Replication in other settings, where other procedures were used,
257 would be valuable.

258 Release from isolation depended mainly on the presence and duration of symptoms, which were
259 measured by telephone interview after diagnosis. It is possible that some subjects fabricated symp-
260 toms, or provided spuriously early symptom onset dates, to expedite their release. This caveat would
261 apply to both students (subject to surveillance testing) and non-students (not generally subject to
262 surveillance testing), so any bias may not have been differential.

263 A small number of county residents unaffiliated with University were subject to surveillance
264 testing, mainly the employees of skilled nursing facilities. Test results from these settings were
265 included here in the “other/community” stream, since they could not easily be otherwise distin-
266 guished. Compared to University, these surveillance testing programs were relatively low-volume,
267 with a still smaller fraction of participants expected to be of study age.

268 No subjects were interviewed specifically for the purposes of this study. The case investigation
269 records did not record any subject’s thoughts, feelings, or intentions around getting or not getting
270 tested through any particular stream. That would be fertile ground for further study.

271 **Conclusions**

272 People with COVID-19 detected via a compulsory weekly COVID-19 surveillance antigen testing
273 program at a university were equally likely to be symptomatic at time of detection, and for just
274 as long, as similar-aged people whose COVID-19 was detected via testing venues in the broader
275 community. This casts some doubt on the public health value of such programs, which are gener-
276 ally expensive and labor-intensive. Given the mean duration of symptoms found here, a twice- or
277 thrice-weekly testing frequency may have been necessary to achieve earlier detection, with a concomi-
278 tant increase in the effort and resources required. Alternatively, in future respiratory pandemics,
279 resources might be better devoted to other mitigation measures.

280 **3 Funding sources**

281 The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this
282 article.

283 **4 Conflicts of interest**

284 The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship,
285 and/or publication of this article.

286 References


- 287 [1] N. J. Matheson et al. “Mass testing of university students for covid-19.” In: *BMJ (Clinical*
288 *research ed.)* 375 (Oct. 2021), n2388. ISSN: 1756-1833. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.n2388. epublish.
- 289 [2] C. E. Brook et al. “Optimizing COVID-19 control with asymptomatic surveillance testing in
290 a university environment.” In: *Epidemics* 37 (Dec. 2021), p. 100527. ISSN: 1878-0067. DOI:
291 10.1016/j.epidem.2021.100527. ppublish.
- 292 [3] “COVID-19 Stats: College and University COVID-19 Student Testing Protocols, by Mode of
293 Instruction–United States, Spring 2021”. In: *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report*
294 70 (14 Apr. 2021), p. 535. ISSN: 1545-861X. DOI: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7014a5. epublish.
- 295 [4] D. H. Hamer et al. “Assessment of a COVID-19 Control Plan on an Urban University Campus
296 During a Second Wave of the Pandemic.” In: *JAMA network open* 4 (6 June 2021), e2116425.
297 ISSN: 2574-3805. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.16425. URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233704/>. epublish.
- 298 [5] C. Peacock. *Stanford leaders and health experts detail university’s COVID-19 surveillance test-*
299 *ing program*. Stanford University. Sept. 20, 2020. URL: [https://news.stanford.edu/2020/](https://news.stanford.edu/2020/09/02/university-med-school-leaders-discuss-campus-covid-testing/)
300 [09/02/university-med-school-leaders-discuss-campus-covid-testing/](https://news.stanford.edu/2020/09/02/university-med-school-leaders-discuss-campus-covid-testing/) (visited on
301 04/24/2023).
- 302 [6] T. N. Denny et al. “Implementation of a Pooled Surveillance Testing Program for Asymp-
303 tomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections on a College Campus - Duke University, Durham, North
304 Carolina, August 2-October 11, 2020.” In: *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 69
305 (46 Nov. 2020), pp. 1743–1747. ISSN: 1545-861X. DOI: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6946e1. epublish.
- 306 [7] J. P. Bigouette et al. “Application of a Serial Antigen-Based Testing Strategy for Severe
307 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 and Student Adherence in a University Setting:
308 Wisconsin, October–November 2020.” In: *Open forum infectious diseases* 8 (10 Oct. 2021),
309 ofab472. ISSN: 2328-8957. DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofab472. epublish.
- 310 [8] K. Drenkard et al. “University COVID -19 Surveillance Testing Center: Challenges and Op-
311 portunities for Schools of Nursing.” In: *Journal of professional nursing : official journal of the*
312 *American Association of Colleges of Nursing* 37 (5 2021), pp. 948–953. ISSN: 1532-8481. DOI:
313 10.1016/j.profnurs.2021.07.004. ppublish.
- 314 [9] Reopening Guidelines Committee. *Considerations for Reopening Institutions of Higher Educa-*
315 *tion for the Spring Semester 2021*. American College Health Association, Dec. 29, 2020. URL:
316 [https://www.acha.org/documents/resources/guidelines/ACHA_Considerations_for_](https://www.acha.org/documents/resources/guidelines/ACHA_Considerations_for_Reopening_IHEs_for_Spring_2021.pdf)
317 [Reopening_IHEs_for_Spring_2021.pdf](https://www.acha.org/documents/resources/guidelines/ACHA_Considerations_for_Reopening_IHEs_for_Spring_2021.pdf).

- 319 [10] G. Yamey and R. P. Walensky. “Covid-19: re-opening universities is high risk.” In: *BMJ*
320 (*Clinical research ed.*) 370 (Sept. 2020), p. m3365. ISSN: 1756-1833. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.m3365.
321 epublish.
- 322 [11] E. Whitford. *COVID-19 Mitigation Costs Still Add Up After Students Sent Home*. Inside
323 Higher Ed. Oct. 8, 2020. URL: [https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/10/09/](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/10/09/trying-curb-covid-19-campus-expensive-whether-colleges-plans-work-or-not)
324 [trying-curb-covid-19-campus-expensive-whether-colleges-plans-work-or-not](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/10/09/trying-curb-covid-19-campus-expensive-whether-colleges-plans-work-or-not)
325 (visited on 06/28/2023).
- 326 [12] M. Peplow. *How one university built a COVID-19 screening system*. Chemical and Engineering
327 News. Nov. 1, 2020. URL: [https://cen.acs.org/biological-chemistry/infectious-](https://cen.acs.org/biological-chemistry/infectious-disease/one-university-built-COVID-19/98/i42?PageSpeed=noscript)
328 [disease/one-university-built-COVID-19/98/i42?PageSpeed=noscript](https://cen.acs.org/biological-chemistry/infectious-disease/one-university-built-COVID-19/98/i42?PageSpeed=noscript) (visited on
329 06/28/2023).
- 330 [13] A. D. Paltiel, A. Zheng, and R. P. Walensky. “Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies
331 to Permit the Safe Reopening of College Campuses in the United States.” In: *JAMA network*
332 *open* 3 (7 July 2020), e2016818. ISSN: 2574-3805. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.
333 16818. epublish.
- 334 [14] E. Losina et al. “College Campuses and COVID-19 Mitigation: Clinical and Economic Value.”
335 In: *Annals of internal medicine* 174 (4 Apr. 2021), pp. 472–483. ISSN: 1539-3704. DOI: 10.
336 7326/M20-6558. ppublish.
- 337 [15] E. H. Bradley, M.-W. An, and E. Fox. “Reopening Colleges During the Coronavirus Disease
338 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic—One Size Does Not Fit All.” In: *JAMA network open* 3 (7 July
339 2020), e2017838. ISSN: 2574-3805. DOI: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.17838. epublish.
- 340 [16] E. Brooks-Pollock et al. *High COVID-19 transmission potential associated with re-opening*
341 *universities can be mitigated with layered interventions*. 2021. DOI: 10.1101/2020.09.10.
342 20189696.
- 343 [17] F. C. Motta et al. “Assessment of Simulated Surveillance Testing and Quarantine in a SARS-
344 CoV-2-Vaccinated Population of Students on a University Campus.” In: *JAMA health forum*
345 2 (10 Oct. 2021), e213035. ISSN: 2689-0186. DOI: 10.1001/jamahealthforum.2021.3035.
346 epublish.
- 347 [18] G. D. Lyng et al. “Identifying optimal COVID-19 testing strategies for schools and businesses:
348 Balancing testing frequency, individual test technology, and cost.” In: *PloS one* 16 (3 2021),
349 e0248783. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0248783. epublish.
- 350 [19] P. I. Frazier et al. “Modeling for COVID-19 college reopening decisions: Cornell, a case study.”
351 In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 119 (2
352 Jan. 2022). ISSN: 1091-6490. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2112532119. ppublish.
- 353 [20] P. V. Markov et al. “The evolution of SARS-CoV-2.” In: *Nature reviews. Microbiology* (Apr.
354 2023). ISSN: 1740-1534. DOI: 10.1038/s41579-023-00878-2. aheadofprint.

- 355 [21] State University of New York. *Chancellor Malatras Announces Program to Begin More Easily*
356 *Vaccinating SUNY Residential Students Prior to Spring Semester Departure Using One Dose*
357 *Vaccine*. Apr. 6, 2021. URL: [https://www.suny.edu/suny-news/press-releases/4-21/4-](https://www.suny.edu/suny-news/press-releases/4-21/4-6-21/jj-vaccine-students.html)
358 [6-21/jj-vaccine-students.html](https://www.suny.edu/suny-news/press-releases/4-21/4-6-21/jj-vaccine-students.html) (visited on 05/18/2023).
- 359 [22] Abbott. *BinaxNOW: With a swab and a card, reliable coronavirus test results in 15 minutes*.
360 Aug. 26, 2020. URL: [https://www.abbott.com/corpnewsroom/diagnostics-testing/](https://www.abbott.com/corpnewsroom/diagnostics-testing/upping-the-ante-on-COVID-19-antigen-testing.html)
361 [upping-the-ante-on-COVID-19-antigen-testing.html](https://www.abbott.com/corpnewsroom/diagnostics-testing/upping-the-ante-on-COVID-19-antigen-testing.html) (visited on 05/18/2023).
- 362 [23] Cue Health. *Cue COVID-19 Test Instructions For Use-For Professional Use*. Tech. rep.
363 Mar. 26, 2021. URL: <https://www.fda.gov/media/138826/download> (visited on 05/18/2023).
- 364 [24] T. Enamorado, B. Fifield, and K. Imai. *fastLink: Fast Probabilistic Record Linkage with Miss-*
365 *ing Data*. R package version 0.6.0. 2020. URL: [https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=fastLink)
366 [fastLink](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=fastLink).
- 367 [25] R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for
368 Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria, 2015. URL: <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- 369 [26] A. Zeileis and C. Kleiber. *countreg: Count Data Regression*. R package version 0.2-1. 2022.
370 URL: <https://R-Forge.R-project.org/projects/countreg/>.
- 371 [27] A. Zeileis, C. Kleiber, and S. Jackman. “Regression Models for Count Data in R”. In: *Journal*
372 *of Statistical Software* 27.8 (2008), 1–25. DOI: 10.18637/jss.v027.i08. URL: [https://www.](https://www.jstatsoft.org/index.php/jss/article/view/v027i08)
373 [jstatsoft.org/index.php/jss/article/view/v027i08](https://www.jstatsoft.org/index.php/jss/article/view/v027i08).
- 374 [28] C. Kleiber and A. Zeileis. “Visualizing Count Data Regressions Using Rootograms”. In: *The*
375 *American Statistician* 70.3 (2016), pp. 296–303. DOI: 10.1080/00031305.2016.1173590.
- 376 [29] K. Whittle, W. TF, and G. BG. “The ecology of medical care.” In: *The New England journal of*
377 *medicine* 265 (Nov. 1961), pp. 885–892. ISSN: 0028-4793. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM196111022651805.
378 ppublish.
- 379 [30] K. J. Roghmann and R. J. Haggerty. “The diary as a research instrument in the study of
380 health and illness behavior: experiences with a random sample of young families.” In: *Medical*
381 *care* 10 (2 1972), pp. 143–163. ISSN: 0025-7079. DOI: 10.1097/00005650-197203000-00004.
382 ppublish.
- 383 [31] L. A. Green et al. “The ecology of medical care revisited.” eng. In: *N Engl J Med* 344.26
384 (2001), pp. 2021–2025. DOI: 10.1056/NEJM200106283442611. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJM200106283442611)
385 [1056/NEJM200106283442611](http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJM200106283442611).
- 386 [32] B.-M. Bernhardson et al. “Sensations, symptoms, and then what? Early bodily experiences
387 prior to diagnosis of lung cancer.” In: *PloS one* 16 (3 2021), e0249114. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI:
388 [10.1371/journal.pone.0249114](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249114). epublish.

- 389 [33] G. J. Wilde. *Target risk: Dealing with the danger of death, disease and damage in everyday*
390 *decisions*. en. 1994. ISBN: 0969912404.
- 391 [34] G. J. S. Wilde. “Risk homeostasis theory: an overview”. In: 4 (1998), pp. 89–91. ISSN: 1353-
392 8047. DOI: 10.1136/ip.4.2.89.
- 393 [35] M. Wanat et al. “Perceptions on undertaking regular asymptomatic self-testing for COVID-19
394 using lateral flow tests: a qualitative study of university students and staff.” In: *BMJ open* 11
395 (9 Sept. 2021), e053850. ISSN: 2044-6055. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-053850. epublish.
- 396 [36] J. A. Hirst et al. “Feasibility and Acceptability of Community Coronavirus Disease 2019
397 Testing Strategies (FACTS) in a University Setting.” In: *Open forum infectious diseases* 8 (12
398 Dec. 2021), ofab495. ISSN: 2328-8957. DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofab495. epublish.
- 399 [37] L. Bauld et al. “Students’ and staffs’ views and experiences of asymptomatic testing on a
400 university campus during the COVID-19 pandemic in Scotland: a mixed methods study.” In:
401 *BMJ open* 13 (3 Mar. 2023), e065021. ISSN: 2044-6055. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-065021.
402 epublish.
- 403 [38] H. Blake et al. “Students’ Views towards Sars-Cov-2 Mass Asymptomatic Testing, Social
404 Distancing and Self-Isolation in a University Setting during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A
405 Qualitative Study.” In: *International journal of environmental research and public health* 18
406 (8 Apr. 2021). ISSN: 1660-4601. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph18084182. epublish.
- 407 [39] C. E. French et al. “Low uptake of COVID-19 lateral flow testing among university students:
408 a mixed methods evaluation.” In: *Public health* 204 (Mar. 2022), pp. 54–62. ISSN: 1476-5616.
409 DOI: 10.1016/j.puhe.2022.01.002. ppublish.

Symptom onset date compared with specimen collection date



**Red line at zero indicates specimen collection.
Negative values mean symptoms preceded collection**

Figure 1: Distribution of times between onset of symptoms (from the case investigation interview) and the specimen collection date (from the state laboratory result database) in the three different testing streams, as a proportion of all results from the respective streams. Negative values mean onset of symptoms preceded specimen collection; conversely, positive values mean onset of symptoms followed specimen collection.

Estimated probabilities of symptomatic days before specimen collection, by lab stream and overall community incidence




Figure 2: The model-estimated proportion of subjects with any given number of symptomatic days (from 0 to 7) prior to specimen collection, at each of two levels of community incidence, for each of three laboratory streams. The probability of symptom duration beyond 7 days was very low and is not shown. “shs” = student health service.




Figure 3: 5000 values of mean duration of symptoms simulated from the model, at each of two levels of community incidence, for each of three laboratory streams. Envelopes represent the density of the mean duration values obtained, while the dark bars show the means and their 95% two-sided confidence intervals. “shs” = student health service.

Table 1: Reasons matched records were excluded from further analysis and modeling. SOD = symptom onset date. SCD = specimen collection date. Reasons are not mutually exclusive, i.e. some records may have qualified for exclusion on more than one account. Total number excluded was 4944

exclusion criterion	number excluded
more then 4 days discordance on SCD	670
missing indicator of symptoms	175
ambiguous lab indicator	88
more than 7 days between SCD and SOD	662
missing duration between SCD and SOD	1986
prior to study period	628
after study period	3950

Table 2: Sources of positive COVID-19 test results in the final analytical dataset: other = non-university-affiliated settings; shs = university student health service; surveillance = university surveillance testing.

testing stream	number	percent
other	2040	70%
shs	493	17%
surveillance	393	13%

Table 3: Zero-inflated negative binomial model. The coefficient estimates and standard errors are on the scale of the linear predictor. The “other” lab stream, i.e. the broader community outside University, serves as the baseline category.

Coefficient	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
intercept	-1.18611	0.5927	-2.001	0.045
shs lab	-1.34612	0.3617	-3.721	<0.001
surveillance lab	-0.05549	0.1905	-0.291	0.771
smoothed daily incidence	2.63214	2.1972	1.198	0.231
age	-0.00407	0.0261	-0.156	0.876

(a) The zero component.

Coefficient	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
intercept	0.9865	0.18755	5.260	<0.001
shs lab	-0.0428	0.05383	-0.795	0.427
surveillance lab	0.0564	0.05881	0.959	0.337
smoothed daily incidence	-1.0210	0.70775	-1.443	0.149
age	-0.0031	0.00826	-0.375	0.708

(b) The count component