

Primary care and point-of-care testing during a pandemic: Clinician’s perspectives on integrating rapid testing for COVID-19 into the primary care pathway

Patrick Kierkegaard^{1,2}, Timothy Hicks^{3,4}, Yaling Yang⁵, Joseph Lee^{5,6}, Gail Hayward^{5,6}, Philip J. Turner^{5,6}, A. Joy Allen^{3,4}, Brian D. Nicholson^{5,6}

Affiliation 1: NIHR London In Vitro Diagnostics Co-operative, Department of Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College London, St Mary’s Hospital, Praed Street, London, W2 1NY, United Kingdom

Affiliation 2: CRUK Convergence Science Center, Institute for Cancer Research & Imperial College London, Roderic Hill Building, South Kensington Campus, Exhibition Road, London, SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

Affiliation 3: NIHR Newcastle In Vitro Diagnostics Co-Operative, Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE7 7DN, United Kingdom

Affiliation 4: Translational and Clinical Research Institute, The Medical School, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, United Kingdom

Affiliation 5: Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Radcliffe Primary Care Building, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6GG United Kingdom

Affiliation 6: NIHR Community Healthcare MedTech and In-Vitro Diagnostics Co-operative, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Radcliffe Primary Care Building, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6GG United Kingdom

Corresponding author: Patrick Kierkegaard, NIHR London In Vitro Diagnostics Co-operative, Department of Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College London, St Mary’s Hospital, Praed Street, London, W2 1NY, United Kingdom (P.Kierkegaard@imperial.ac.uk)

Abstract

Background: Real-world evidence to support the adoption of SARS-CoV-2 point-of-care (POC) tests in primary care is limited. As the first point of contact of the health system for most patients, POC testing can potentially support general practitioners (GPs) quickly identify infectious and non-infectious individuals to rapidly inform patient triaging, clinical management, and safely restore more in-person services.

Objectives: To explore the potential role of SARS-CoV-2 point-of-care testing in primary care services.

Design: A qualitative study using an inductive thematic analysis.

Setting: 21 general practices located across three regions in England.

Results: Three major themes were identified related to POC test implementation in primary care: (1) Insights into SARS-CoV-2 POC tests; (2) System and organisational factors; and (3) Practice-level service delivery strategies. Thematic subcategories included involvement in rapid testing, knowledge and perception of the current POC testing landscape, capacity for testing, economic concerns, resource necessities, perception of personal risk and safety, responsibility for administering the test, and targeted testing strategies.

Conclusion: GPs knowledge of POC tests influences their degree of trust, uncertainty, and their perception of risk of POC test use. Concerns around funding, occupational exposure, and workload play a crucial role in GPs hesitation to provide POC testing services. These concerns could potentially be addressed with government funding, the use of targeted testing, and improved triaging strategies to limit testing to essential patient cohorts.

Key words: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, point-of-care, diagnostics, rapid testing, implementation, pathway

BACKGROUND

Testing for SARS-CoV-2 is central to the global response to COVID-19. Laboratory-based reverse transcriptase or digital polymerase chain reaction (PCR) to detect SARS-CoV-2 has been criticised for results taking too long, and for requiring specialist operators at certified laboratories [1]. Point-of-care (POC) tests promise rapid results without the need for specialised facilities but the evidence for real-world SARS-CoV-2 POC tests accuracy, implementation, and adoption is limited.

General practices play an important role in the diagnosis, treatment, and control of infectious diseases [2-4]. As the first point of contact with the health system for most patients, general practice conducts over 95% of all health system activity in the UK [5, 6]. POC tests could support general practitioners (GPs) by rapidly informing patient triage, clinical management and by facilitating in-person consultations [7]. However, GPs have well documented reservations about POC tests accuracy, over-reliance on the tests, costs in the absence of reimbursement, integration into existing clinic workflows, and their overall clinical utility [8-12].

With so many concerns about POC tests use, it is critical to take account of GPs knowledge and attitudes about POC tests for SARS-CoV-2 to enable appropriate implementation strategies. We used semi-structure interviews to explore GPs views on the impact that SARS-CoV-2 POC tests might have on general practice, to assess the feasibility of introducing them into general practice, examine the potential impact on infection control in primary care, and to identify facilitators and barriers to adoption including attitudes toward SARS-CoV-2 POC tests.

METHODS

Study Design

This was a qualitative study, we used semi-structured interviews to capture GPs perceptions regarding the integration of SARS-COV-2 POC tests into routine primary care services during the pandemic [13]. Our methods and results are reported in accordance with the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ) [14].

Setting

We purposefully sampled GPs from a broad geographic distribution of general practices across three regions of England [15].

Recruitment

With support from three NIHR Local Clinical Research Networks (LCRN), GPs were invited by a standardised email outlining the purpose of the study. Eligible participants were English speaking, practicing GPs, providing care during the pandemic. GPs who worked at practices that were closed, or not providing care services throughout the pandemic, were not eligible. Reasons for nonparticipation were not elicited. A participant information sheet, visual pathway diagram triaging SARS-COV-2 testing, and consent form were sent to GPs who expressed an interest. We did not reimburse participants. The authors had no prior contact or relationships with the majority of research participants.

We obtained written, informed consent from all study participants. Interviewees were asked for permission to record interviews, and to publish excerpts from interviews. Apart from one participant, all interviewees granted the team permission to record the interview and to publish deidentified excerpts from the interview.

The project approved and registered as a service evaluation by the Newcastle Joint Research Office and recorded on the Newcastle upon Tyne Hospital Foundation Trust's Clinical Effectiveness Register (Project no. 10222). The Newcastle University Faculty of Medical Sciences Research Ethics Committee reviewed the protocol and deemed the work exempt from ethical approval.

Interview topic guide

We used an interview guide to prompt study participants to share their perspectives. The interview guide was informed by prior research conducted by members of the study team [16-18], informal discussions with primary and secondary care physicians, and prior studies on the role of primary care during past epidemics [19-21]. We iteratively refined it after review by a general practitioner (BDN) and two pilot interviews. A pathway diagram representing patient triage into national SARS-CoV-2 testing centres was also included to stimulate discussion, based on information extracted from NHS and NICE guidelines (Supplemental file 1).

Data collection

Semi-structured interviews were conducted via videoconference between September and November 2020 by an experienced male qualitative researcher (PK) and three researchers (one male, two females) with training in qualitative methods (TH, YY, JA). All interviews lasted between 30-60 minutes. We documented observations about each interview (e.g., field notes) immediately after each interview. We continued to recruit and interview study participants until no new themes emerged from the interviews (saturation) [22].

Data Management and Analysis

Data management and analysis took place from October to December 2020. All interviews were transcribed verbatim using the Otter.ai software and both interview transcripts and notes were checked, anonymised, and corrected against the audio files. Transcripts were not returned to participants for review. Anonymized interview transcripts were securely stored on an encrypted server.

During data collection, the study team met regularly to review content and themes. We used NVivo 1.3 software (QSR International) for inductive thematic analysis [13]. Four researchers coded the transcripts: a health services researcher (PK), diagnostics evaluation methodologist (JA), biomedical engineer (TH), and health economist (YY). Transcripts were read and re-read to identify recurring themes [23]. PK coded transcripts and drafted the codebook using open coding followed by closed thematic coding to allow the iterative expansion and reduction of themes and subthemes [13]. The codebook was discussed amongst the research team in weekly meetings. Newly identified themes (intercoder agreement) relating to the original transcripts were aligned where necessary. Disagreements were resolved by consensus. Interviews continued until data saturation, determined when the study team judged that no new themes were identified [24-26]. All four researchers (PK, TH, YY, JA) then re-read the results to ensure they reflected the original interview data.

RESULTS

Participants

We recruited twenty-two GPs (10 women and 12 men) from twenty-one general practices across five regions in the UK (Table 1). All the participants were actively involved in providing remote and in-person care services to patients during the pandemic.

Table 1: Demographic features of participants and characteristics of study sites

Participant characteristics	Number
Total number of participants	22
Sex	
Male	12
Female	10
Medical training	
Average time post qualification (years), median	18
Range of qualification time (years), median	29
Study site characteristics	
Region of practice	
Thames Valley and South Midlands	9

London	4
North East and North Cumbria	8
Number of patients registered to practice, mean	14522 (3600 - 40,000)
Practice setting	
Urban	7
Suburban	1
Rural	5
Mixed	8

Table 2: Overview of themes and subthemes

Theme	Subthemes	Description	Illustrative quote
Awareness of SARS-CoV-2 testing	Involvement in rapid testing	The degree in which GPs are involved providing POC testing for SARS-CoV-2.	“We don't currently have a rapid test. I'd say there isn't current provision or not through our practice or NHS.” (GP 06)
	Knowledge and perception of the current POC test landscape	GPs understanding of POC tests currently in-development or approved for market use.	“I don't know anything about them. I knew that they're very early on this point of care testing for antibodies but that seems to have gone away.” (GP 01)
	Value to care management	The perceived value of POC testing to help in the clinical management of patients.	“Patients, especially with respiratory symptoms, would benefit from a rapid testing, because then we can actually see them, or the patients who have weak symptoms who we don't know if they have got COVID or not. So, I think it will fit in. It will be immensely helpful.” (GP 10)
System and organisational factors related to service implementation	Capacity for testing	The anticipated impact of implementing POC tests and fears of overwhelming primary care services.	“Because primary care doesn't have capacity to test as a general rule.” (GP 05)
	Economic concerns	Factors related to costs and incentives and their relationship to workload capacity.	“We've still got to carry on trying to earn our QOF points and so there's not been any leeway there at all.” (GP 19)
Practice-level implementation and service delivery strategies	Risk mitigation	Viewpoints concerning the affect POC tests would have on service delivery considering the potential for occupational exposure and assurance.	“As an individual practice, I think it's sort of the anxiety to have POC [tests] and be the contact. How would you practically administer those tests and what sort of PPE would we need to see these patients?” (GP 01)
	Responsibility for administering the test	Preferences in terms of which staff member should be assigned to perform the testing.	“That's not something that my surgery will be keen to provide a GP for, because you've spent all day taking a sample. And it is something that personally, I feel that an HCA or, you know, someone of a less extensive qualification would be able to be trained to deliver” (GP 14)
	Targeted testing strategies	Discussions where GPs preferred to use a selection criterion strategy to determine who should be tested.	“You would prioritise that resource to the symptomatic unwell patients The asymptomatic testing really would only be when you've got plenty of resource to do that because, you know, suddenly your tests are going to go through the roof.” (GP 09)
	Testing location	The locational set-up of where and how general practices would triage and test patients.	“I think if it's just a quick point of care test, I think more practices potentially might take it up and arrange a thing where they see the patient in the car park and do a very quick test.” (GP 07)

126 **Themes**

127 Our analysis revealed three major themes, and several subthemes (Table 2). Quotes are anonymized to
128 protect participant confidentiality. The following sections describe each of these themes and summarize
129 the key findings with illustrative quotes.

130 **Theme 1: Awareness of SARS-CoV-2 testing**

131 ***Involvement in rapid testing:***

132 GPs reported limited exposure, experience, and access to SARS-CoV-2 POC tests. All respondents said
133 they did not have access to POC tests.

134 “There was no direct testing available in the COVID Clinic because there was no testing within
135 primary care nationwide, as far as we're aware, and so anybody that needed a test would be
136 directed to the gov.uk website or 119 to get their test done.” (GP 08)

137 GPs said they often received inquiries from patients under the impression that they could access SARS-
138 CoV-2 tests.

139 “We have several people a day asking for tests and we have several people asking why we can't
140 do the tests, and we give them the same answer every time that we don't have access to the
141 tests.” (GP 16)

142 ***Knowledge of current POC testing landscape:***

143 GPs general level of understanding of POC tests varied across practices. In most cases, their knowledge
144 of SARS-CoV-2 POC tests was based on the news or social media leading several of them to express
145 concerns around the limited evidence-base.

146 “Not a great deal because we don't really have much information. I know that there's a swab
147 related [test], what we would call a pregnancy test, or a lateral flow test. But that's basically all
148 what we know.” (GP 14)

149 Although GPs familiarity with these tests varied, there was a broad consensus that the evidence-base for
150 POC tests and their accuracy needs to be improved to raise their confidence in using the tests.

151 “I know that the technology is out there, I don't know how accurate it is, and how easy it is to
152 use. By that I mean, it doesn't sound like very reliable sources. But that is the most, I think that's

153 the quickest way you can get information and you have to be very careful about how you assess
154 whether the data is credible or not.” (GP 01)

155 ***Value to care management***

156 GPs expressed that POC tests could potentially add value to the management of patient care, especially
157 in terms of supporting them in distinguishing between COVID-19 and other respiratory illnesses to
158 inform effective triaging, and treatment decisions.

159 “I think it will definitely help because if you get a result quite quickly, at least that way you can
160 reassure yourself and the patient quite quickly that they don't have COVID and don't need to
161 self-isolate. You can tell them “You've got a chest infection, here are your antibiotics”. I think
162 that's that would help a lot.” (GP 07)

163 Another anticipated that POC testing would enable them to restore in-person care management for
164 other patient cohorts, particularly those with other respiratory illnesses.

165 “Patients, especially with respiratory symptoms, would benefit from a rapid testing, because
166 then we can actually see them, or the patients who have weak symptoms who we don't know if
167 they have got COVID or not.” (GP 10)

168 Finally, some GPs said that that tests would be useful for cases of opportunistic testing in the event a
169 patient visits the practice for another condition but exhibits COVID-19 symptoms.

170 “They've come with a skin infection on their leg cellulitis and they come down to the practice
171 and it's quite clear when you're seeing them that their temperature may well be due to cellulitis.
172 But they've also got a cough. They've also lost their taste and smell, and they've just been
173 distracted by the cellulitis. You're sitting in front of a patient in a surgery who might have COVID.
174 Now, it makes no sense at all, for me to send that patient away to go to a regional test site, I
175 want to test that patient there.” (GP 21)

176 **Theme 2: System and organisational factors related to service implementation**

177 ***Capacity for testing***

178 GPs were concerned that offering POC tests would increase attendance and affect continuity of care by
179 drawing resources away from patients with chronic disease or urgent clinical needs.

180 “One of the problems is, in terms of all the other stuff, that primary care has to deal with all the
181 other normal cancer and heart disease and stuff. If primary care gets overwhelmed with testing,
182 it's struggling as it is coping with demand, so it adds an extra layer of demand.” (GP 12)

183 Most of the respondents emphasised that already busy general practices would struggle to handle the
184 potentially large influx of patients requesting SARS-CoV-2 testing.

185 “I don't think it would be able to work through our system because it would overload it... and we
186 know, we can't just manage doing that.” (GP 15)

187 A few GPs considered that testing should be offered based on regional disease prevalence. They were
188 reluctant to provide testing if local prevalence was high but prepared to if local prevalence was low.

189 “If we've got a high prevalence, it's not something we've got the capacity to deal with... But for
190 very low prevalence, speaking like any other standard test I need to complete, I'll be using it
191 with my trained healthcare assistant.” (GP 15)

192 ***Economic concerns***

193 The GPs interviewed indicated that POC tests could add pressure onto general practices who already
194 need to meet targets to generate income. GPs expressed that they would need additional resources to
195 hire extra staff in order to minimise the disruption of existing services to meet their reporting
196 requirements.

197 “I think because there's still an expectation for practices to meet all the targets for everything ...
198 is there a way to get another healthcare assistant? For example, a nurse or a GP running this
199 separately with which you know at least that way it wouldn't impact on current services that are
200 having to happen.” (GP 07)

201 One general practitioner mentioned that general practices would willingly adopt POC tests if financial
202 incentives were introduced to perform the testing.

203 “If you monetize the process, we will look at it.... I think if you monetize this and set up a
204 protocol, a lot of GPs will look at it.” (GP 01)

205 There were also concerns about the additional costs relation to procuring infection prevention easures.

206 “You've got extra cleaning fees for the room... glass screens at reception are thousands of
207 pounds.” (GP 15)

208 **Theme 3: Practice-level implementation and service delivery strategies**

209 ***Risk mitigation***

210 Some GPs felt that negative results from POC tests could reassure staff and patients that they are at a
211 reduced risk of exposure during face-to-face consultations.

212 “I think it definitely would make us feel safer again and I think more importantly it would make
213 other patients feel safe because we do still have patients who are very frightened about coming
214 to use our facilities.” (GP 19)

215 The use of POC tests in general practice could also give GPs more confidence to invite the patients into
216 the clinic, given they were presently reluctant to offer a face-to-face assessment.

217 “I think it will improve (and) it will make us more confident in face-to-face consultations. So,
218 we've got a huge population with respiratory illness, especially COPD. I think these are the
219 patients who kind of have been missed out on getting seen.” (GP 10)

220 However, GPs also explained that there was an increased risk of staff anxiety and absence if there was
221 increased risk of occupational exposure to potentially infectious individuals booking appointments to get
222 tested.

223 “Some people wouldn't come into work, because they would say it's not safe for them to come
224 into work.” (GP 17)

225 ***Responsibility for administering the test.***

226 Health care assistants (HCAs) or nurse practitioners were identified by most interview participants as the
227 most suitable and cost-effective GPs to administer POC tests.

228 “It's a skill that needs to be learned, but it's quite a simple one. You need someone who's
229 focused on just that one problem. But it's also time consuming. So, nurse practitioners but they
230 are a lot more expensive. So, you want someone who's not gonna be huge cost and resources.”
231 (GP 15)

232 Participants reported that this would also ensure that GPs could devote their limited face-to-face time
233 with patients to provide clinical care as opposed to performing POC tests.

234 “I'd see it probably more being a nurse or a healthcare assistant if it's just the point-of-care test.
235 It's all about kind of using skills appropriately, isn't it? And obviously trying to free up the doctor
236 time for more doctory things really.” (GP 09)

237 ***Targeted testing strategies***

238 Several GPs suggested that testing resources should be reserved for use based on clinical need. They felt
239 that testing should be allocated to unwell patients.

240 “It should be at the discretion of GPs to test when they feel that it is clinically necessary for
241 patient care... For people who don't need any clinical input, I don't want to see 50 patients lined
242 up in the morning to have a COVID-19 test. This should not be an alternative to the drive thru
243 testing or the walking testing. It should be for safe patient care, where they actually need to be
244 seen.” (GP 10)

245 There was a consensus amongst participants that testing should only be reserved for patients who are
246 considered high-risk or vulnerable, require in-person consultation, and are unable to travel to a testing
247 centre.

248 “I'd choose the high-risk groups first, but the frail people who can't travel and a lot of anxious
249 people with lung conditions. Probably people who've got mobility problems, difficulties getting
250 to test centres.” (GP 15)

251 ***Testing location***

252 GPs said that testing should be conducted outside to reduce the risk of infection inside the practice.

253 “If it's a point-of-care test, maybe something even in a car park, where you've got someone
254 driving through and you do a test and they drive off with the result straightaway if possible, or
255 you phone them back if something's longer” (GP 07)

256 A few respondents said that if there was a high volume of testing, POC tests should be offered at a
257 separate mass testing site to reduce the risk of transmission.

258 “I think there should be a separate site rather than the general practice where they can get that
259 rapid test, just to reduce potential risk of cross infection.” (GP 09)

260 However, some GPs believed that testing patients in a hub nearby the clinic would be the most
261 appropriate option.

262 “We're talking about like a porta cabin or something separate somewhere from the building by
263 you, we can see our own patients, or we open up our red hub again, and we can see our own
264 patients, because we're the only ones that really know them.” (GP25)

265 **DISCUSSION**

266 We found multiple challenges to adoption of SARS-CoV-2 POC tests in primary care. GPs had significant
267 reservations based on the limited information available, an overwhelming workload, and the potential
268 for increased occupational exposure to SARS-CoV-2. GPs were more likely to adopt POC tests if
269 conducting testing added value to care management, if additional resources were made available to
270 offset the increased workload, and evidence was available to assure them that POC tests would reduce
271 occupational and patient exposure.

272 ***Comparison to the existing literature***

273 Occupational exposure was a concern amongst the GPs we interviewed as increased interaction with
274 patients would entail staff being exposed to more potentially infectious individuals. Increased
275 occupational exposure to patients has been linked with increased stress and anxiety amongst healthcare
276 workers related to being infected and infecting their families [27-32]. Without establishing and
277 communicating the risks associated with the introduction of POC tests, GPs may not feel reassured by
278 testing, which they fear could result in staff absenteeism during a pandemic [33-39]. Education and
279 pandemic response training may mitigate fear and absenteeism among clinicians [40, 41].

280 GPs had limited awareness of the SARS-CoV-2 POC tests. Although GPs were somewhat familiar with
281 some types of POC tests, most of their understanding was sourced from various mass media, and they
282 report concerned with the lack of robust ‘real-world’ evidence [42-45]. This suggests that GPs current
283 attitudes and expectations of SARS-CoV-2 POC tests are shaped by a combination of knowledge gaps,
284 perceived risks, and uncertainties. These factors are consequential as they are critical determinants that
285 inform decisions and behaviours [46-49].

286 There was a consensus amongst interview participants that HCAs should administer POC tests. Part of
287 this motivation was that HCAs are cost-effective, and are accustomed to taking on responsibilities that
288 remove burdens from GPs and nurses [50, 51]. This reasoning resonates with previous work exploring
289 team-based models in primary care focused on the redistribution of tasks among care team members.
290 Optimising workforce capacity by re-delegating tasks to non-medically qualified staff members can help

291 GPs and nurses can prioritise unwell patients requiring treatment [52-57]. However, we did not seek the
292 views of HCAs.

293 ***Implications for research and practice***

294 It may be necessary to incentivise POC tests in primary care [58-61]. GPs argued that increasing capacity
295 to deliver POC tests is dependent on securing additional funding to create the necessary infrastructure.
296 Alternative time-limited funding arrangements may be needed to increase capacity for POC tests use,
297 such as the Alternative Provider Medical Services (APMS) contract, to cover all associated costs until the
298 pandemic has passed [62]. Workforce optimisation strategies to share resources between general
299 practices across the 'primary care network' (PCN) could offset workload burden for individual practices
300 [63]. However, this may not be a sustainable approach across England given the high variability between
301 PCNs organisational structures and characteristics [64]. GPs suggested that outdoor testing stations
302 would facilitate infection control and reduce the need for patients to travel to distant community testing
303 sites [65], especially frail patients, and or those without vehicles [66]. GPs expressed a strong preference
304 for modular buildings, portable cabins or tents in practice car parks that could be used to triage and
305 dispatch patients and assess contamination risk. This approach is supported by evidence from secondary
306 care from both the COVID-19 and previous SARS pandemic [67-69].

307 GPs indicated that POC testing could add value to patient management if it served as a discriminator
308 between SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory viruses. For instance, reliably distinguishing between COVID-
309 19 and influenza clinically is impossible because of the overlap of clinical presentations [70-72].

310 This suggests that POC testing that can facilitate syndromic testing could provide value in guiding clinical
311 management. Thus, future developments for SARS-CoV-2 POC tests could help meet GPs clinical needs
312 of distinguishing between respiratory illnesses by focusing on multiplex testing. Related studies in
313 secondary care suggests that multiplex testing for influenza and RSV can a positive impact on patient
314 management and is associated with more appropriate clinical decisions, reduced antibiotic use, timelier
315 infection control measures, more appropriate antiviral management, and reduced costs in secondary
316 care settings [73-77].

317 POC tests are less efficient and more error-prone when handled by non-laboratory trained individuals
318 [78, 79]. For instance, the accuracy of a lateral flow immune assay for SARS-CoV-2 dropped significantly
319 when used by non-laboratory trained professionals [80]. As GPs identified HCAs as the ideal candidates
320 to administer the POC tests this raises questions about the training required to ensure they are

321 administered correctly. We suggest studies developing training protocols and standard operating
322 procedures for individuals without medical or laboratory backgrounds to minimize inaccurate results
323 and test failures [81]. The role of POC tests in home visiting and out-of-hour services warrants further
324 investigation [82] [83].

325 ***Strengths and Limitations***

326 A strength was the qualitative methods we used. They allowed us to explore the views and experiences
327 of general practice staff in an in-depth and descriptive manner. The topic guide was piloted with two
328 GPs who were not participants in the study, with minimal changes recommended. Although the sample
329 size was small, we achieved information saturation appropriate to a qualitative study design when no
330 new themes were discovered during the interviews [22]. Concurrent thematic analysis ensured that data
331 saturation occurred before data collection was complete.

332 A limitation is that we included general practices from only three regions of England, which may not
333 have captured the variation in clinical practice and might therefore limit the generalisability of findings.
334 The interview participants did not include any nurses and HCAs, who are likely to have play a central
335 part of POC use in primary care. Lastly, the interviews occurred between the 25th of September 2020
336 and the 27th of October when the COVID-19 situation in the UK was changing rapidly, immediately prior
337 to the second national lockdown in November 2020. It is possible participants priorities may have
338 changed subsequently.

339 **CONCLUSION**

340 We explored the perspectives of general practice staff on adopting SARS-CoV-2 POC tests into clinical
341 routine practice. Our findings highlight that GPs awareness of the POC testing landscape varies, as do
342 their perception of risk, and uncertainty regarding the adoption of these tests. Our interviews revealed
343 concerns around the support general practices would need to manage the additional workload, staffing,
344 and risks of occupational exposure. General practices would be willing to provide point-of-care testing
345 services if these concerns could be mitigated through increased government funding, and targeted
346 testing and triaging strategies to limit testing services to essential patient cohorts. Our findings provide
347 important information that can inform policy development concerning planning and implementation of
348 mass testing programmes for COVID-19 and future pandemics.

349 **Abbreviations:** British Medical Association (BMA), Clinical commissioning group (CCG), Coronavirus
350 Disease 2019 (COVID-19), General Practitioner (GP), Health care assistant (HCA), Local Clinical Research
351 Network (LCRN), Local Medical Committees (LMC), National Institute of Health Research (NIHR), Point of
352 care (POC), Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF), Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
353 (SARS-CoV-2)

354 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank the general practices who participated in the
355 study. The study team is also grateful to the NIHR Clinical Research Networks for assisting in the
356 recruitment of the study sites. The authors thank Prof. Peter Buckle for helping review the first draft of
357 the paper and providing valuable feedback and to Dr Sara Graziadio for helpful advice on the initial draft
358 of the interview topic guide. We are grateful to Drs Kile Green, Sam G. Urwin, Jana Suklan, Clare
359 Lendrem and Amanda Winter for double checking the accuracy of the transcripts. We are also thankful
360 for the advice and feedback provided by the NIHR Newcastle MIC Insight Panel.

361 **Author contributions:** PK drafted the manuscript. AJA, TH, YY, BN, PJT, GH, JL contributed to the editing
362 and provided critical feedback. PK, TH, YY, AJA, BN designed the study. PK, TH, YY, AJA collected and
363 analysed the data. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

364 **Role of the Funder/Sponsor:** The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection,
365 management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the
366 manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

367 **Data availability statement:** All relevant data are within the manuscript and its supporting information
368 files.

369 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** None reported.

370 **Funding/Support:** This work is supported by the COVID-19 National Diagnostic Research and Evaluation
371 Platform (CONDOR), which is funded by UK Research and Innovation, the Department of Health and
372 Social Care through the National Institute for Health Research, Asthma UK and the British Lung
373 Foundation. PK is supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) London In Vitro
374 Diagnostics Co-operative at Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust. TH and AJA are supported by the
375 NIHR Newcastle In Vitro Diagnostics Co-operative at Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation
376 Trust. YY, BN, PJT, GH, and JL are supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)
377 Community Healthcare MedTech and In Vitro Diagnostics Co-operative at Oxford Health NHS

378 Foundation Trust. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS,
379 the NIHR, Imperial College London, University of Oxford, or Newcastle University.

380 **Role of the Funder/Sponsor:** The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection,
381 management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the
382 manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

383 REFERENCES

- 384 1. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Adriano A, Berhane S, Davenport C, Dittrich S, et al. Rapid, point-of-care
385 antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cochrane Database of*
386 *Systematic Reviews*. 2020;(8). doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD013705. PubMed PMID: CD013705.
- 387 2. Lee A, Chuh AA. Facing the threat of influenza pandemic-roles of and implications to general
388 practitioners. *BMC Public Health*. 2010;10(1):661.
- 389 3. Rust G, Melbourne M, Truman BI, Daniels E, Fry-Johnson Y, Curtin T. Role of the primary care
390 safety net in pandemic influenza. *American journal of public health*. 2009;99(S2):S316-S23.
- 391 4. Opstelten W, van Steenberghe JE, van Essen GA, van der Sande MA. Threat of an influenza
392 pandemic: family physicians in the front line. *BMC Family Practice*. 2009;10(1):11.
- 393 5. Dunlop C, Howe A, Li D, Allen LN. The coronavirus outbreak: the central role of primary care in
394 emergency preparedness and response. *BJGP Open*. 2020;4(1):bjgpopen20X101041. doi:
395 10.3399/bjgpopen20X101041.
- 396 6. World Health Organization. Regional Office for the Western P. Role of primary care in the
397 COVID-19 response. Manila : WHO Regional Office for the Western Pacific; 2020.
- 398 7. Cals J, van Weert H. Point-of-care tests in general practice: Hope or hype? *European Journal of*
399 *General Practice*. 2013;19(4):251-6. doi: 10.3109/13814788.2013.800041.
- 400 8. Hardy V, Thompson M, Keppel GA, Alto W, Dirac MA, Neher J, et al. Qualitative study of primary
401 care clinicians' views on point-of-care testing for C-reactive protein for acute respiratory tract infections
402 in family medicine. *BMJ open*. 2017;7(1).
- 403 9. Jones CH, Howick J, Roberts NW, Price CP, Heneghan C, Plüddemann A, et al. Primary care
404 clinicians' attitudes towards point-of-care blood testing: a systematic review of qualitative studies. *BMC*
405 *family practice*. 2013;14(1):117.
- 406 10. Huddy JR, Ni MZ, Barlow J, Majeed A, Hanna GB. Point-of-care C reactive protein for the
407 diagnosis of lower respiratory tract infection in NHS primary care: a qualitative study of barriers and
408 facilitators to adoption. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(3):e009959. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009959.
- 409 11. Schols AM, Dinant G-J, Cals JW. Point-of-care testing in general practice: just what the doctor
410 ordered? *British Journal of General Practice*. 2018;68(673):362-3. doi: 10.3399/bjgp18X698033.
- 411 12. Verbakel JY, Turner PJ, Thompson MJ, Plüddemann A, Price CP, Shinkins B, et al. Common
412 evidence gaps in point-of-care diagnostic test evaluation: a review of horizon scan reports. *BMJ Open*.
413 2017;7(9):e015760. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-015760.
- 414 13. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*.
415 2006;3(2):77-101.
- 416 14. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a
417 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International journal for quality in health care*.
418 2007;19(6):349-57.
- 419 15. Bryman A. *Social research methods*: Oxford university press; 2016.
- 420 16. Graziadio S, Urwin SG, Cocco P, Micocci M, Winter A, Yang Y, et al. Unmet clinical needs for
421 COVID-19 tests in UK health and social care settings. *PloS one*. 2020;15(11):e0242125.

- 422 17. Urwin SG, Lendrem BC, Suklan J, Green K, Graziadio S, Buckle P, et al. FebriDx point-of-care test
423 in patients with suspected COVID-19: a pooled diagnostic accuracy study. medRxiv.
424 2020:2020.10.15.20213108. doi: 10.1101/2020.10.15.20213108.
- 425 18. Micocci M, Gordon AL, Allen AJ, Hicks T, Kierkegaard P, McLister A, et al. Understanding COVID-
426 19 testing pathways in English care homes to identify the role of point-of-care testing: an interview-
427 based process mapping study. medRxiv. 2020:2020.11.02.20224550. doi:
428 10.1101/2020.11.02.20224550.
- 429 19. Sauro A, Barone F, Blasio G, Russo L, Santillo L. Do influenza and acute respiratory infective
430 diseases weigh heavily on general practitioners' daily practice? *The European journal of general practice*.
431 2006;12(1):34-6.
- 432 20. Simonsen KA, Hunskaar S, Sandvik H, Rortveit G. Capacity and Adaptations of General Practice
433 during an Influenza Pandemic. *PLOS ONE*. 2013;8(7):e69408. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0069408.
- 434 21. de Lusignan S, Hoang U, Liyanage H, Tripathy M, Yonova I, Byford R, et al. Integrating molecular
435 point-of-care testing for influenza into primary care: a mixed-methods feasibility study. *British Journal of*
436 *General Practice*. 2020;70(697):e555-e62. doi: 10.3399/bjgp20X710897.
- 437 22. Guest G, Bunce A, Johnson L. How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data
438 saturation and variability. *Field methods*. 2006;18(1):59-82.
- 439 23. Vaismoradi M, Turunen H, Bondas T. Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for
440 conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing & health sciences*. 2013;15(3):398-405.
- 441 24. Saunders B, Sim J, Kingstone T, Baker S, Waterfield J, Bartlam B, et al. Saturation in qualitative
442 research: exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Quality & quantity*. 2018;52(4):1893-
443 907.
- 444 25. Varpio L, Ajjawi R, Monrouxe LV, O'Brien BC, Rees CE. Shedding the cobra effect: problematising
445 thematic emergence, triangulation, saturation and member checking. *Medical education*. 2017;51(1):40-
446 50.
- 447 26. Marshall MN. Sampling for qualitative research. *Family practice*. 1996;13(6):522-6.
- 448 27. Wang J, Zhou M, Liu F. Reasons for healthcare workers becoming infected with novel
449 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2020;105(1):100-1.
- 450 28. Heinzerling A, Stuckey PMJ, Scheuer T, Xu K, Perkins KM, Resseger H, et al. Transmission of
451 COVID-19 to health care personnel during exposures to a hospitalized patient—Solano County,
452 California, February 2020. 2020.
- 453 29. Simione L, Gnagnarella C. Differences between health workers and general population in risk
454 perception, behaviors, and psychological distress related to COVID-19 spread in Italy. 2020.
- 455 30. Wu Y, Wang J, Luo C, Hu S, Lin X, Anderson AE, et al. A comparison of burnout frequency among
456 oncology physicians and nurses working on the front lines and usual wards during the COVID-19
457 epidemic in Wuhan, China. *Journal of pain and symptom management*. 2020.
- 458 31. Cai H, Tu B, Ma J, Chen L, Fu L, Jiang Y, et al. Psychological Impact and Coping Strategies of
459 Frontline Medical Staff in Hunan Between January and March 2020 During the Outbreak of Coronavirus
460 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Hubei, China. *Med Sci Monit*. 2020;26:e924171-e. doi:
461 10.12659/MSM.924171. PubMed PMID: 32291383.
- 462 32. Wong TW, Yau JK, Chan CL, Kwong RS, Ho SM, Lau CC, et al. The psychological impact of severe
463 acute respiratory syndrome outbreak on healthcare workers in emergency departments and how they
464 cope. *European Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2005;12(1):13-8.
- 465 33. Damery S, Draper H, Wilson S, Greenfield S, Ives J, Parry J, et al. Healthcare workers' perceptions
466 of the duty to work during an influenza pandemic. *Journal of Medical Ethics*. 2010;36(1):12-8. doi:
467 10.1136/jme.2009.032821.

- 468 34. Damery S, Wilson S, Draper H, Gratus C, Greenfield S, Ives J, et al. Will the NHS continue to
469 function in an influenza pandemic? A survey of healthcare workers in the West Midlands, UK. BMC
470 Public Health. 2009;9(1):142.
- 471 35. Ives J, Greenfield S, Parry JM, Draper H, Gratus C, Petts JI, et al. Healthcare workers' attitudes to
472 working during pandemic influenza: a qualitative study. BMC Public Health. 2009;9(1):56. doi:
473 10.1186/1471-2458-9-56.
- 474 36. Qureshi K, Gershon RRM, Sherman MF, Straub T, Gebbie E, McCollum M, et al. Health care
475 workers' ability and willingness to report to duty during catastrophic disasters. Journal of Urban Health.
476 2005;82(3):378-88. doi: 10.1093/jurban/jti086.
- 477 37. Ehrenstein BP, Hanses F, Salzberger B. Influenza pandemic and professional duty: family or
478 patients first? A survey of hospital employees. BMC Public Health. 2006;6(1):311.
- 479 38. Balicer RD, Omer SB, Barnett DJ, Everly GS. Local public health workers' perceptions toward
480 responding to an influenza pandemic. BMC Public Health. 2006;6(1):99.
- 481 39. Wong TY, Koh GC, Cheong SK, Sundram M, Koh K, Chia SE, et al. A cross-sectional study of
482 primary-care physicians in Singapore on their concerns and preparedness for an avian influenza
483 outbreak. Annals Academy of Medicine Singapore. 2008;37(6):458.
- 484 40. Devnani M. Factors Associated with the Willingness of Health Care Personnel to Work During an
485 Influenza Public Health Emergency: An Integrative Review. Prehospital and Disaster Medicine.
486 2012;27(6):551-66. Epub 2012/10/02. doi: 10.1017/S1049023X12001331.
- 487 41. Aoyagi Y, Beck CR, Dingwall R, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS. Healthcare workers' willingness to work
488 during an influenza pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Influenza and Other Respiratory
489 Viruses. 2015;9(3):120-30. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.12310>.
- 490 42. Armstrong S. Covid-19: Government buried negative data on its favoured antibody test. BMJ.
491 2020;371:m4353. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m4353.
- 492 43. Mahase E. Covid-19: Innova lateral flow test is not fit for "test and release" strategy, say experts.
493 BMJ. 2020;371:m4469. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m4469.
- 494 44. Wise J. Covid-19: Safety of lateral flow tests questioned after they are found to miss half of
495 cases. BMJ. 2020;371:m4744. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m4744.
- 496 45. Armstrong S. Covid-19: Tests on students are highly inaccurate, early findings show. BMJ.
497 2020;371:m4941. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m4941.
- 498 46. Giddens A. The consequences of modernity: John Wiley & Sons; 2013.
- 499 47. Luhmann N. Trust and power: John Wiley & Sons; 2018.
- 500 48. Zinn JO. Social theories of risk and uncertainty: An introduction: John Wiley & Sons; 2009.
- 501 49. Frederiksen M. Trust in the face of uncertainty: a qualitative study of intersubjective trust and
502 risk. International Review of Sociology. 2014;24(1):130-44. doi: 10.1080/03906701.2014.894335.
- 503 50. Vail L, Bosley S, Petrova M, Dale J. Healthcare assistants in general practice: a qualitative study
504 of their experiences. Primary Health Care Research & Development. 2011;12(1):29-41. Epub
505 2010/07/07. doi: 10.1017/S1463423610000204.
- 506 51. Petrova M, Vail L, Bosley S, Dale J. Benefits and challenges of employing health care assistants in
507 general practice: a qualitative study of GPs' and practice nurses' perspectives. Family Practice.
508 2010;27(3):303-11. doi: 10.1093/fampra/cm011.
- 509 52. Brandenburg L, Gabow P, Steele G, Toussaint J, Tyson BJ. Innovation and best practices in health
510 care scheduling. NAM Perspectives. 2015.
- 511 53. Doherty RB, Crowley RA. Principles supporting dynamic clinical care teams: an American College
512 of Physicians position paper. Annals of internal medicine. 2013;159(9):620-6.
- 513 54. Bodenheimer T. Building Powerful Primary Care Teams. Mayo Clinic Proceedings.
514 2019;94(7):1135-7. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2019.05.017.

- 515 55. Sinsky CA, Willard-Grace R, Schutzbank AM, Sinsky TA, Margolius D, Bodenheimer T. In search of
516 joy in practice: a report of 23 high-functioning primary care practices. *The Annals of Family Medicine*.
517 2013;11(3):272-8.
- 518 56. Bodenheimer TS, Smith MD. Primary care: proposed solutions to the physician shortage without
519 training more physicians. *Health Affairs*. 2013;32(11):1881-6.
- 520 57. West CP, Dyrbye LN, Erwin PJ, Shanafelt TD. Interventions to prevent and reduce physician
521 burnout: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. 2016;388(10057):2272-81.
- 522 58. Kramer G. Payment for Performance and the QOF: are we doing the right thing? *British Journal*
523 *of General Practice*. 2012;62(596):e217-e9.
- 524 59. Hamel MB, Roland M, Campbell S. Successes and failures of pay for performance in the United
525 Kingdom. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2014;370(20):1944.
- 526 60. Torchiana DF, Colton DG, Rao SK, Lenz SK, Meyer GS, Ferris TG. Massachusetts General
527 Physicians Organization's quality incentive program produces encouraging results. *Health Affairs*.
528 2013;32(10):1748-56.
- 529 61. Khullar D, Chokshi DA, Kocher R, Reddy A, Basu K, Conway PH, et al. Behavioral economics and
530 physician compensation—promise and challenges. *New England Journal of Medicine*.
531 2015;372(24):2281-3.
- 532 62. Burch P. Funding in primary care. *InnovAiT*. 2019;12(2):100-4.
- 533 63. Pettigrew LM, Kumpunen S, Mays N. Primary care networks: the impact of covid-19 and the
534 challenges ahead. *BMJ*. 2020;370:m3353. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m3353.
- 535 64. Morciano M, Checkland K, Hammond J, Lau Y-S, Sutton M. Variability in size and characteristics
536 of primary care networks in England: observational study. *British Journal of General Practice*.
537 2020;70(701):e899-e905. doi: 10.3399/bjgp20X713441.
- 538 65. Rimmer A. Covid-19: Doctors call for action after patients are left unable to get tests. *BMJ*.
539 2020;370:m3508. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m3508.
- 540 66. Bandeen-Roche K, Seplaki CL, Huang J, Buta B, Kalyani RR, Varadhan R, et al. Frailty in older
541 adults: a nationally representative profile in the United States. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A*.
542 2015;70(11):1427-34.
- 543 67. Croke L. Preparing for the next infectious disease pandemic. *AORN Journal*. 2020;112(3):P12-P4.
544 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/aorn.13188>.
- 545 68. Yen M-Y, Lin Y-E, Lee C-H, Ho M-S, Huang F-Y, Chang S-C, et al. Taiwan's traffic control bundle
546 and the elimination of nosocomial severe acute respiratory syndrome among healthcare workers.
547 *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2011;77(4):332-7.
- 548 69. Schwartz J, King C-C, Yen M-Y. Protecting healthcare workers during the coronavirus disease
549 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak: lessons from Taiwan's severe acute respiratory syndrome response. *Clinical*
550 *Infectious Diseases*. 2020.
- 551 70. Khorramdelazad H, Kazemi MH, Najafi A, Keykhaee M, Zolfaghari Emameh R, Falak R.
552 Immunopathological similarities between COVID-19 and influenza: Investigating the consequences of
553 Co-infection. *Microb Pathog*. 2020:104554-. doi: 10.1016/j.micpath.2020.104554. PubMed PMID:
554 33157216.
- 555 71. Kakodkar P, Kaka N, Baig MN. A Comprehensive Literature Review on the Clinical Presentation,
556 and Management of the Pandemic Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Cureus*. 2020;12(4):e7560-e.
557 doi: 10.7759/cureus.7560. PubMed PMID: 32269893.
- 558 72. Petrozzino JJ, Smith C, Atkinson MJ. Rapid diagnostic testing for seasonal influenza: an evidence-
559 based review and comparison with unaided clinical diagnosis. *J Emerg Med*. 2010;39(4):476-90.e1. Epub
560 2010/03/17. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2009.11.031. PubMed PMID: 20227846.

- 561 73. Subramony A, Zachariah P, Krones A, Whittier S, Saiman L. Impact of multiplex polymerase chain
562 reaction testing for respiratory pathogens on healthcare resource utilization for pediatric inpatients. *The*
563 *Journal of pediatrics*. 2016;173:196-201. e2.
- 564 74. Brendish NJ, Malachira AK, Armstrong L, Houghton R, Aitken S, Nyimbili E, et al. Routine
565 molecular point-of-care testing for respiratory viruses in adults presenting to hospital with acute
566 respiratory illness (ResPOC): a pragmatic, open-label, randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet*
567 *Respiratory Medicine*. 2017;5(5):401-11.
- 568 75. Rahamat-Langendoen J, Groenewoud H, Kuijpers J, Melchers WJG, van der Wilt GJ. Impact of
569 molecular point-of-care testing on clinical management and in-hospital costs of patients suspected of
570 influenza or RSV infection: a modeling study. *Journal of Medical Virology*. 2019;91(8):1408-14. doi:
571 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25479>.
- 572 76. Rogan DT, Kochar MS, Yang S, Quinn JV. Impact of rapid molecular respiratory virus testing on
573 real-time decision making in a pediatric emergency department. *The Journal of Molecular Diagnostics*.
574 2017;19(3):460-7.
- 575 77. Hansen GT, Moore J, Herding E, Gooch T, Hirigoyen D, Hanson K, et al. Clinical decision making in
576 the emergency department setting using rapid PCR: Results of the CLADE study group. *Journal of Clinical*
577 *Virology*. 2018;102:42-9.
- 578 78. Meier FA, Jones BA. Point-of-care testing error: sources and amplifiers, taxonomy, prevention
579 strategies, and detection monitors. *Archives of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine*. 2005;129(10):1262-
580 7.
- 581 79. Shaw JLV. Practical challenges related to point of care testing. *Practical Laboratory Medicine*.
582 2016;4:22-9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plabm.2015.12.002>.
- 583 80. Preliminary report from the Joint PHE Porton Down and University of Oxford SARS-CoV-2 test
584 development and validation cell: rapid evaluation of lateral flow viral antigen detection devices (LFDs)
585 for mass community testing. 8 November 2020. [cited 2021 2 December]. Available from:
586 [www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/media_wysiwyg/UK%20evaluation_PHE%20Porton%20Down%20%20U](http://www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/media_wysiwyg/UK%20evaluation_PHE%20Porton%20Down%20%20University%20of%20Oxford_final.pdf)
587 [niversity%20of%20Oxford_final.pdf](http://www.ox.ac.uk/sites/files/oxford/media_wysiwyg/UK%20evaluation_PHE%20Porton%20Down%20%20University%20of%20Oxford_final.pdf).
- 588 81. Borsci S, Buckle P, Hanna GB. Why you need to include human factors in clinical and empirical
589 studies of in vitro point of care devices? Review and future perspectives. *Expert Review of Medical*
590 *Devices*. 2016;13(4):405-16. doi: 10.1586/17434440.2016.1154277.
- 591 82. Mitchell S, Hillman S, Rapley D, Gray SDP, Dale J. GP home visits: essential patient care or
592 disposable relic? *British Journal of General Practice*. 2020;70(695):306-7. doi: 10.3399/bjgp20X710345.
- 593 83. Macdonald G, Vernon G, McNab D, Murdoch J. Home visits for vulnerable older people: journeys
594 to the 'Far End'. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2020;70(699):479-80. doi: 10.3399/bjgp20X712685.

595