

1 **“Like brushing teeth“ – Implementation experiences with opt-in, at-home**
2 **screening for SARS-CoV-2 among schoolchildren in Germany**

3

4 Jonas Wachinger^{1,2}, Maximilian Schirmer², Nicole Täuber³, Shannon A. McMahon^{1,4*},
5 Claudia M. Denkinge^{2,5*}

6 *Shared Senior Authors

7 ¹ Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, Heidelberg University Hospital, 69120

8 Heidelberg, Germany

9 ² Division of Clinical Tropical Medicine, Center of Infectious Diseases, 69120

10 Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany

11 ³ Independent Researcher, Sinsheim, Germany

12 ⁴ Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public

13 Health, Baltimore, 21205 Maryland, USA

14 ⁵ German Centre for Infection Research (DZIF), partner site Heidelberg, 69120

15 Heidelberg, Germany.

16

17 **Corresponding author:** Jonas Wachinger, Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, Im

18 Neuenheimer Feld 130.3, 69120 Heidelberg, Jonas.wachinger@uni-heidelberg.de

19

20 **Word count:** 2486

21

22 **ABSTRACT**

23 **Background:** Over the course of the pandemic, many countries have repeatedly
24 closed schools and shifted students to remote learning. However, evidence for
25 negative mental and physiological health consequences of such measures for students
26 is increasing, highlighting the need for evidence-based recommendations on how to
27 safely reopen schools. This study presents experiences when implementing opt-in, at-
28 home SARS-CoV-2 screening using rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) to facilitate safe
29 face-to-face-teaching during a pandemic.

30 **Methods:** We present data from a prospective study implementing an RDT-based
31 screening program at a primary school in southwest Germany. We conducted
32 qualitative in-depth interviews with participating children, parents, and school
33 stakeholders to elicit implementation experiences and screening perception.

34 **Results:** The screening intervention was highly accepted and appreciated among
35 participants; no positive RDT was reported over the duration of the study. Self-testing
36 at home before coming to school was feasible, but more positive consequences of
37 screening participation (e.g., easing of mask mandates) besides a personal feeling of
38 safety would be appreciated. Participants preferred home-based RDTs over some
39 other measures, particularly mask mandates. Despite the RDTs being licensed as self-
40 tests in Germany, additional training can help avoid mistakes, and ensuring
41 intervention ownership and improving pre-implementation communication can facilitate
42 buy-in.

43 **Conclusions:** Ag-RDT-based SARS-CoV-2 screening programs relying on self-
44 testing at home proved feasible and accepted among primary school students, parents,
45 and school staff who participated in this study.

46 **Trial Registration:** DRKS00024845

47

48 **Keywords:** Rapid diagnostic tests, SARS-CoV-2, screening, school children,
49 implementation research, qualitative research.

What is known about the subject

- Efforts to reduce COVID-19-associated school disruption are currently being debated globally as a means to reduce the impact of extended school closures on children's mental and physiological wellbeing.
- Rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) for SARS-CoV-2 are reliable and can be performed as self-tests at home.
- Although countries have already introduced RDT-based screening programs to facilitate safe face-to-face teaching, little is known about screening acceptance and experiences.

What this study adds

- Students, parents, and school staff perceive home-based RDT screening as feasible and less disrupting than other protective measures (e.g., mask mandates)
- Implementers should communicate early and clearly, and provide a support system for training, troubleshooting, and in case of positive results
- Concerns remain regarding the fidelity of home-based test performance in cases where students or parents are hesitant, even when testing is compulsory

51 INTRODUCTION

52 To curb infection rates in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic many countries closed
53 primary and secondary schools, and children were shifted to remote learning to
54 minimize risks of viral transmission.[1, 2] However, in light of growing evidence
55 regarding the impact of prolonged school closure for children's education and mental
56 health and children's limited impact on viral transmission dynamics, schools were
57 reopened accompanied by the implementation of hygiene measures.[3] An addendum
58 to the toolbox of measures entailed either antigen-based rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs)
59 or pooled Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing for SARS-CoV-2.

60 However, the idea of large-scale screening efforts at schools was criticized both from
61 an epidemiological perspective (regarding imperfect test performance, especially of
62 RDTs), but also as being an unnecessary burden for school children.[4–6] While a
63 study from Great Britain suggests that SARS-CoV-2 protective measures in schools
64 are highly accepted among students and parents,[7] to the best of our knowledge there
65 is no evidence available on the perceptions of and experiences with the
66 implementation of testing for entrance screening in school settings and the effects on
67 compliance with other safety measures (e.g., masks).


68 An in-depth investigation of school-based testing implementation would facilitate
69 evidence-based recommendations for best practices of entrance screening in schools,
70 not only in the context of this pandemic but also for future public health crises. This
71 study fills a gap in the literature by providing implementation insights regarding RDTs
72 for home-based screening of primary school children in Germany.

73 METHODS

74 We conducted a prospective implementation study to assess experiences with and
75 perceptions of introducing in-home RDT-based screening at a primary school in a peri-
76 urban area of southwestern Germany. Throughout the early pandemic, schools in the
77 region were routinely fully or partly closed, and an increasing number of academics,
78 policymakers, school representatives, and parents argued for schools to be reopened
79 with comprehensive screening approaches complementing other hygiene
80 measures.[8, 9]

81 Responding to calls for pilot projects testing the feasibility and acceptability of such
82 screening efforts, our study-based screening was initiated in March 2021. Statewide
83 compulsory screening was introduced for schools in April 2021. Figure 1 presents a
84 timeline of study-related processes and the general context.

85 **Figure 1.** Study processes and the general context.



86

87 **Intervention design**


88 The design of the screening intervention was developed in partnership with school
89 stakeholders (Figure 2). For each week of screening, school students and staff
90 members who voluntarily decided to participate in the study received three
91 STANDARD Q COVID-19 Ag Tests (SD Biosensor, Inc. Gyeonggi-do, Korea), an
92 independently validated and WHO-approved SARS-CoV-2 RDT.[10, 11]

93 We trained members of the school staff and parents who volunteered on how to
94 perform the test, and then trained others in a snowball system. We additionally set up
95 telephone and email hotlines that could be contacted in case of screening-related
96 questions. Additionally, the local health authority and local doctors were informed.

97 After four weeks of screening, compulsory testing was introduced for all schools in the
98 German state of Baden-Württemberg.[12] The design of this state-wide screening was
99 very similar to the study intervention, with the main difference being only two tests per
100 week and parents having to confirm the test result to the school in writing. No training
101 was offered in the context of the state-wide screening. Upon onset of the compulsory
102 screening, all study participants were supplied with one test per week to supplement
103 the two RDTs provided by the state to maintain the original screening frequency.

104

105 **Figure 2.** Implementation and theory of intervention of the RDT-based screening.



106

107 **Data collection and analysis**


108 Quantitative (number of participants, number of tests handed out, and number of tests
109 reported to be positive) and qualitative (in-depth interviews with children, parents, and
110 school stakeholders) data were collected over the entire duration of the study; data
111 collection and analysis procedures are outlined in Figure 3. All participants provided
112 written informed consent separately for their participation in the screening and, if
113 applicable, when they participated in the qualitative interview. The ethical review board
114 at the Medical Faculty, Heidelberg University, Germany approved this study (S-
115 141/2021). Further information on recruitment and data collection processes are
116 reported in supplemental file 1. We followed COREQ-guidelines [13] to report our
117 findings (see supplemental files 1 and 2).

118 **Patient and public involvement**

119 Members of the school administrative staff and parents of school children initiated
120 contact with the study staff to express interest for developing a pilot project to assess
121 the feasibility and acceptability of RDT-based screening at schools and were actively
122 involved in the conceptualization and implementation of the study. School staff were
123 not involved in participant recruitment and data collection to maintain anonymity. One
124 co-author (NT) is parent to two school pupils and was responsible for initiating the
125 study, and also participated in an interview as a key informant.

126

127 **Figure 3.** Data Collection and Analysis.



128

129 RESULTS

130 Study participants

131 A majority of school staff decided to participate in the voluntary screening (n=21 out of
132 34, 62%), as well as a majority of pupils and their parents (n=109 out of 186; 59%).
133 The study lasted nine weeks. During this time, SARS-CoV-2 incidence in the region
134 initially increased from 106.7 infections per 100,000 inhabitants per week (March 22)
135 to 154.1 (April 27) before it fell to 54.3 by the end of the study-based screening (May
136 21).[14]

137 Over the course of the study, no study-related positive RDT-result (neither false-
138 positive nor true-positive) was communicated to the school or the study team. After the
139 onset of state-wide compulsory testing in schools, while the study-based screening
140 was still in place, the school was notified of one case of SARS-CoV-2 in a student
141 whose parents had self-reported a negative Ag-RDT one day prior. No further cases
142 were reported.

143 **Implementation experiences, home-based testing**

144 To highlight implementation processes and experiences, results are presented along
145 the framework of McSween-Cadieux and colleagues (Table 1) [15] which combines
146 the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research [16] and the Ecological
147 Framework.[17] The framework investigates factors influencing intervention
148 implementation across six domains: intervention, individuals, support system, inner
149 setting, outer setting, and the implementation process.

Table 1. Implementation experiences across domains

Domains	Themes	Key quotes
Intervention: Home-based RDTs to screen primary school students	Framing of the intervention by school stakeholders as an option to minimize risks for staff and families, and to avoid school closures	“It was this balancing act between pedagogy, psychological needs of the children, and health protection. The risk assessment, what happens when we carry it into the school and get a wave of infections here” (school stakeholder)
	Usability and reliability of the RDTs and associated concerns pre-implementation	“A key experience why I wasn’t against it was the practicability of this test. If this test would have meant offering children this other test [using nasopharyngeal swabs] on a regular basis, then I would have blocked it.” (school stakeholder)
	Concerns regarding additional burden for children , but less burdensome as compared to other measures (e.g., mask mandates) or potential consequences	“That’s the concern that this brings in unnecessary unrest, in addition to the unrest that is already there in any case. Now there are even tests being done that potentially are positive.” (school stakeholder)
	Feasibility of home-based testing as compared to on-site screening, but risk of alternative use	“Otherwise you probably would have to do that somewhere in the school, that I think is difficult to implement. How do you do that with so many children, [...] I don’t know how to imagine that.” (mother)
	Hopes for positive consequences of screening implementation	“That also was a question of the parents: If we participate in this study, do we still have to wear these stupid masks?” (school stakeholder)
	Framing as a research study also resulting in concerns regarding ulterior motives	“It’s not about testing the tests. It’s about figuring out ... can we manage to create a good scenario to test ourself in our everyday lives? And does it really help to control the spread?” (school stakeholder)
Individuals: Students, parents, and school staff using the tests	Motivations for participation increased sense of safety, wanting to contribute to COVID-19 research	“We basically immediately decided to participate. Because if we don’t do research on this virus, you can’t analyze it. The more information you get about it, the better, and for us it wasn’t a big sacrifice to participate. [...] And a higher sense of security of course is nice, too.” (mother)
	Appreciation for tests and intervention Overall good testing experiences across respondent groups	“In general, I found it great that this was done. I talked with colleagues who also have children in primary schools that don’t have tests. They were immediately jealous” (mother)
	Gradual integration of testing into daily routines From ‘annoyed’ and ‘scared’ to ‘like brushing teeth’	“In the beginning I always was a bit scared, but my mother said that it’s not that bad. Then I was really happy when the test was negative. [Now] I’m not afraid anymore. When I knew what was coming it wasn’t bad at all anymore.” (female student)
	No increased risk taking as a result , feeling of safety as the main consequence	“I still don’t party or meet a lot of people [...] But in fact, this morning I tested myself. That is a good feeling, I’m happy then. You don’t expect anything but a negative result, but you’re just happy: This safety I have for today.” (teacher)
	Surprise and incomprehension regarding concerns and criticism of those not participating	“I didn’t at all expect that anyone could have a problem with this testing and the study. I had thought: Everyone must see how reasonable this idea is, how little invasive that is for the outcome that means we have security for our children and for the village here.” (mother)

Support System: Trainers, study staff, and external resources	Telephone hotline and general offer of the study team was appreciated (but not utilized by participants)	"In case of questions you also could have taken the initiative and reach you via e-mail or telephone, to follow up." (mother)
	Train-the-trainer system for building self-testing capacity as feasible but lacking supervision	"Something I would have wished for to be different was how information was passed on. In our class it wasn't really clear how you can get trained. The trainers in the end just said that whoever had questions could reach out." (mother)
	External support (e.g., local doctors) not utilized in light of lack of cases	"There were many options to reach out to in case of difficulties. Great." (mother)
Inner Setting: Periurban primary school in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic	RDT-based screening as the newest development after more than one year of pandemic state of emergency	"It was an exceptionally difficult year. We had imagined it to be completely different, for the small children who still have to get used to the school routines, have to learn the rules, the continuity you usually have in the school." (father)
	Screening not a dominant topic in intra-school interactions	"Almost none cares about that. Also not everyone participates. Sometimes someone says something like: Do you also participate in the study? Or whether the test is pleasant or not. But the study does not play a big role in the school." (male student)
	General perception of high screening acceptance within the school but debates outlining overarching disagreements regarding the pandemic	"We simply always have this dilemma: It's about the children! ... We also have colleagues who see more the psychological needs of the children [...] We also have colleagues who are more focused on the protection of health. [...] This general thing that develops in the entire society does not completely pass over our staff." (school stakeholder)
Outer Setting: Legal, ethical, and public discourses	Overarching dissatisfaction with policy decisions Screening in light of a year of constant and often rapid changes	"For a very long time I saw our workplace protection disregarded by the state government. Secondary schools received masks. Yes of course, there they introduced the mask mandate earlier ... and in our case they just assumed that small children are not infectious." (school stakeholder)
	Shift to compulsory screening appreciated by most but concerns regarding potential shortcomings	"I don't think that [that compulsory screening in the current form has a lot of benefits] because those who voluntarily participated in the study are the ones who want to actively help and see the danger. And those who didn't participate probably have a different attitude." (father)
Implementation Process: Introducing RDTs	Implementation ownership Initiated by and relying on local stakeholders	"[The school headmaster] also really stood up for this. That was also some educational work that was being done." (teacher)
	Implementation process as acceptable and successful Short time for decision-making and training as the new normal	"You can't improve it because it already was good. I liked it that there were additional tests for trying it out, [or] when one goes wrong. It was well communicated from the beginning. You were well informed via the information sheet. The pick-up of the tests was organized well, too. I liked the tests and the study, I don't have particular recommendations." (mother)
	Better communication might reduce barriers for participation	"Something I actually would have found helpful, from my perspective, would have been an online office hours to inform people about the tests [at the outset of the program when parents were deciding whether to engage...] where you say: you have questions, and I am here to answer them." (teacher)

150 *Intervention.* School stakeholders highlighted their key motivations for exploring RDT-
151 based screening as minimizing risks of secondary infections and school closures, as
152 well as a hope that screening may lead to other positive consequences (e.g., repeal of
153 mask mandates). Some participants voiced concerns regarding screening because it
154 placed an unnecessary burden on children, especially in light of increasing
155 communication at the time that children were not a driver of the pandemic and the
156 perception that children’s physical and mental health was already strained enough by
157 the pandemic. Consequently, a majority of stakeholders appreciated the newest
158 generation of RDTs because they relied on antero-nasal swabs, which were viewed
159 as less burdensome for those performing the tests in general and children in particular.

160 A major point of debate entailed whether to conduct screening at home or on-site.
161 School stakeholders and staff predominantly highlighted organizational and
162 infrastructural barriers to school-based screening, including the strain on already
163 limited teaching time, concerns regarding the psychological consequences of a student
164 testing positive in school (including potential stigmatization by peers), and questions
165 regarding teacher accountability. While participants generally acknowledged these
166 concerns, several parents also discussed concerns that not everyone would
167 conscientiously perform the tests at home. This was voiced when testing became
168 compulsory, especially addressing families who initially had decided against study
169 participation.

170 *Individuals.* An increased sense of safety was reported as the key motivation and
171 consequence of testing across respondent groups for participation in the study and
172 testing in general. Participants also reported a desire to contribute to COVID-19
173 research, thereby increasing the chance for a timely return to “a more normal school
174 routine” (mother). The screening itself was generally appreciated, and a majority of
175 participants described how initial reservations or “fear” (female student) regarding the
176 tests were alleviated after the first few times, and the screening quickly was integrated
177 into the morning routine “like brushing teeth” (mother). Children themselves described
178 RDTs as being much less disrupting or burdensome compared to other measures
179 encountered over the course of the pandemic, in particular compared to mask
180 mandates in schools.

181 Several participants voiced incomprehension or “disappointment” (school stakeholder)
182 regarding the number of families deciding against participation, or recounted frustration

183 when interacting with screening hesitant parents or staff members. Several expressed
184 disappointment regarding the limited consequences of participating in the screening
185 and expected motivation and buy-in of others to increase once testing was seen as
186 having consequences beyond a personal sense of security.

187 *Support system.* Participants appreciated offers made by the study team, including
188 telephone and email hotlines, although neither was used during the course of the study.
189 No participant reported interacting with complementary local resources (e.g., local
190 health authority or local doctors). The experience of quick notification and confirmatory
191 testing in light of a one positive results outside the study was seen as affirming that the
192 support system in place would work.

193 Most participants appreciated the implemented train-the-trainer system and reported
194 their interactions during the training as reassuring and empowering for when they
195 performed the first RDT with their children, particularly when mistakes emerged during
196 training. Participants saw themselves as being better prepared and able to assist
197 others when statewide compulsory screening was implemented without prior training.

198 *Inner setting.* In light of prior experiences like school closures, challenges associated
199 with remote learning, and quarantines, the intervention was perceived as less
200 disruptive compared to other measures and associated with the hope for some
201 continuity “at least until the summer break” (school stakeholder).

202 Both children and teachers reported the study-based screening to be only a side topic,
203 if at all, in their interactions at school, although participating teachers recounted how
204 sometimes children talked about their experiences in class or the reasons why their
205 parents were against testing. In general, participants perceived screenings (both as
206 part of the study and following the introduction of compulsory screening) as being
207 highly accepted.

208 *Outer setting.* Participants stated that their support of the study-based screening
209 represented an attempt to increase their own safety, which they felt had been
210 neglected by elected authorities.

211 The subsequent introduction of compulsory screening therefore was appreciated by
212 most participants, although concerns were voiced that a stricter control of testing
213 fidelity than currently in place might be required, as not everyone was eager to comply.

214 *Implementation process.* The study was advocated by school stakeholders, and also
215 relied on those stakeholders for successful implementation. This resulted in high level
216 of stakeholder ownership, which was seen as particularly relevant for study buy-in
217 across respondent groups. The broad buy-in was particularly important given a context
218 marked by a highly emotionalized debate around COVID-19 control measures in
219 schools.

220 Respondents generally appreciated the chosen implementation process. Although the
221 information sheets, particularly the information sheet for children, and the
222 communication by school stakeholders was appreciated, respondents expected study
223 participation to further increase with additional events and opportunities for potential
224 respondents to ask questions directly of the study team prior to making a decision
225 about participation (which was only offered to the parents' association and staff, though
226 not all parents). Although the implemented training was highly appreciated, in a few
227 instances, the snowball system did not work as envisioned, with information only being
228 relayed verbally.

229 **DISCUSSION**

230 This study outlined experiences implementing home-based RDTs for universal
231 screening in a primary school setting. The screening was highly accepted among
232 participants and viewed as feasible. Negative consequences were not observed (e.g.,
233 more risk-taking behavior). However, concerns surfaced regarding broad utility of
234 screening when many individuals within a social setting may decline participation or
235 not perform tests as advised. Participants expected screening acceptance and
236 motivation to increase if the test was perceived to have consequences beyond a
237 heightened sense of personal security. No case of SARS-CoV-2 was detected via the
238 screening in the context of this study, and no clusters of infections indicated undetected
239 cases.

240 To the best of our knowledge, this study is among the first to explore perceptions of
241 test-based screening in a school setting. Our findings regarding the screening's
242 feasibility mirror outcomes of projects that implemented self-sampling for SARS-CoV-
243 2 testing in school settings.[18, 19] However, this evidence stems from secondary
244 schools [19] or from oral self-sampling.[18] The high acceptance of screening
245 expressed by our participants mirrors qualitative evidence regarding the acceptance of

246 broader COVID-19 prevention measures in schools in the UK.[7] We expand on this
247 evidence by highlighting the acceptability and feasibility of home-based nasal sampling
248 among primary school pupils.

249 The topic of large-scale RDT-based screening efforts in schools is emotionally highly
250 charged in Germany, including lawsuits and homeschooling by parents who are
251 fundamentally against SARS-CoV-2 testing for their children.[6] Our findings highlight
252 that an emotionally charged intervention can be easily implemented if stakeholder buy-
253 in and ownership is achieved through repeated explanations and demonstrations of
254 the intervention. Also, our study demonstrated that testing was perceived as less
255 burdensome to participants, including children, than more established measures, such
256 as facial masks. Considering the exceptional burden faced by students, teachers, and
257 parents in the pandemic,[20] and in light of increasing evidence regarding the impact
258 of school closures on health and education [21, 22] and that children are unlikely to
259 play a key role as drivers of the pandemic,[23] our results provide evidence that RDT-
260 based screening is an acceptable and feasible way to facilitate in person teaching.

261 Beyond COVID-19, one other public health measure relying on self-testing in school
262 settings in high-income countries entails screening for head lice. A study in primary
263 schools in Australia aimed to assess the reliability of home-based screening for head
264 lice, and only found a sensitivity of parental reports of 16%.[24] This suggests
265 challenges of shifting testing from schools into the private realms, particularly in cases
266 where a positive test result could be perceived as stigmatizing or as having
267 consequences for short-term school access. While this concern was also voiced by
268 participating parents and educators in our study, the participation of over 50% of staff
269 and parents, probably reflects important distinctions between routine lice screening
270 and self-testing amidst a viral pandemic.

271 This study provides timely and in-depth qualitative data, producing insights into the
272 real-life discourse amidst rapidly changing regulations. The study site is representative
273 for schools in peri-urban settings; research to date on health interventions at schools
274 has predominantly focused on the urban context. However, our study also has
275 limitations. First, only parents and students who had decided to voluntarily participate
276 in the overarching screening program could be recruited for interviews; critical voices
277 therefore might be underrepresented in the data on parents and their children.
278 Additionally, as RDTs for SARS-CoV-2 have been introduced in Germany on a large

279 scale in recent months, generalizability of our results to other countries where RDTs
280 were less present in the public discourse might be limited.

281 RDT-based screening is an acceptable and easily scalable intervention to decrease
282 risk of transmissions at schools and facilitate face-to-face teaching amidst a pandemic.
283 Policymakers should ensure comprehensive capacity building for testing, fit-for-
284 purpose training materials for all age levels and train-the-trainer programs to enable
285 scale up of universal screening. Furthermore, consistent communication on regulations
286 and readily available support networks (hotlines via phone or email) can reduce burden
287 for school staff and families.

288 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

289 We are grateful to all participants for their time and contribution.

290 **FUNDING STATEMENT**

291 This study was supported by a grant of the Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts
292 of Baden-Württemberg, Germany, as well as hospital-internal funds (Grant numbers:
293 Not applicable). RDTs were provided free of cost by the manufacturer (Roche
294 diagnostics). Funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis,
295 decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

296 **COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT**

297 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at
298 www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf. CMD reports grants from Ministry of Science,
299 Research and the Arts of Baden-Württemberg, Germany, grants from University
300 Hospital Heidelberg Internal funds, non-financial support from Roche Diagnostics
301 (Grant numbers: Not applicable) during the conduct of the study; NT reports her
302 children receiving RDTs as part of their participation in the screening program; JW,
303 MS, and SAM report no competing interests.

304 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION**

305 NT and CMD conceived of the study. JW, NT, SAM, and CMD conceptualized the
306 study and data collection processes. JW, MS, and NT implemented the study with
307 support from SAM and CMD. JW collected and analyzed the data, supported by all co-

308 authors. JW drafted the manuscript. All co-authors contributed to data interpretation,
309 edited the manuscript, and approved of the final manuscript.

310 DATA SHARING STATEMENT

311 Considering the high public interest in research on COVID-19, qualitative data of
312 participants who have indicated their agreement to this as part of the informed consent
313 procedure can be shared with other researchers. However, to preserve the anonymity
314 of respondents and considering the personal nature of qualitative data, requests will
315 be considered on a case-by-case basis. Please contact the corresponding author.

316 REFERENCES

- 317 1 UNESCO. Education: From disruption to recovery 2021. Available at:
318 <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse> Accessed July 08, 2021.
- 319 2 Buonsenso D, Roland D, Rose C de, et al. Schools Closures During the COVID-
320 19 Pandemic: A Catastrophic Global Situation. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*
321 2021;40(4):e146-e150.
- 322 3 van Lancker W, Parolin Z. COVID-19, school closures, and child poverty: A
323 social crisis in the making. *The Lancet Public Health* 2020;5(5):e243-e244.
- 324 4 CNN. Debate emerges around Covid-19 testing strategies in schools as districts
325 plan to reopen 2021. Available at:
326 [https://edition.cnn.com/2021/07/26/health/covid-19-testing-in-schools-debate-](https://edition.cnn.com/2021/07/26/health/covid-19-testing-in-schools-debate-wellness/index.html)
327 [wellness/index.html](https://edition.cnn.com/2021/07/26/health/covid-19-testing-in-schools-debate-wellness/index.html) Accessed August 11, 2021.
- 328 5 Die ZEIT. Kritik von Lehrer-Verbänden an Selbsttests in Schulen 2021. Available
329 at: [https://www.zeit.de/news/2021-03/17/kritik-von-lehrer-verbaenden-an-](https://www.zeit.de/news/2021-03/17/kritik-von-lehrer-verbaenden-an-selbsttests-in-schulen?utm_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ecosia.org%2F)
330 [selbsttests-in-schulen?utm_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ecosia.org%2F](https://www.zeit.de/news/2021-03/17/kritik-von-lehrer-verbaenden-an-selbsttests-in-schulen?utm_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ecosia.org%2F)
331 Accessed August 11, 2021.
- 332 6 Die ZEIT. Testpflicht an Schulen: "Die Eltern fürchten eine Stigmatisierung ihres
333 Kindes" 2021. Available at: [https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/schule/2021-](https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/schule/2021-04/corona-testpflicht-schulen-selbsttest-umsetzung-massnahmen-schuloeffnungen)
334 [04/corona-testpflicht-schulen-selbsttest-umsetzung-massnahmen-](https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/schule/2021-04/corona-testpflicht-schulen-selbsttest-umsetzung-massnahmen-schuloeffnungen)
335 [schuloeffnungen](https://www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/schule/2021-04/corona-testpflicht-schulen-selbsttest-umsetzung-massnahmen-schuloeffnungen) Accessed July 08, 2021.
- 336 7 Lorenc A, Kesten JM, Kidger J, et al. Reducing COVID-19 risk in schools: A
337 qualitative examination of secondary school staff and family views and concerns
338 in the South West of England. *BMJ Paediatr Open* 2021;5(1):e000987.
339 doi:10.1136/bmjpo-2020-000987 [published Online First: 10 March 2021].

- 340 8 Spitzer M. Öffnet die Schulen! *Nervenheilkunde* 2021;40(05):296–311.
- 341 9 Seifried J, Böttcher S, Kleist M von, et al. Antigen tests as an additional
342 instrument in the pandemic fight. *Epidemiologisches Bulletin*
343 2021(17):3-14.
- 344 10 Krüger LJ, Gaeddert M, Brümmer LE, et al. Evaluation of the accuracy, ease of
345 use and limit of detection of novel, rapid, antigen-detecting point-of-care
346 diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.10.01.20203836.
347 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.10.01.20203836v1.full.pdf>.
- 348 11 World Health Organization. WHO Emergency Use Assessment Coronavirus
349 disease (COVID-19) IVDs: Public Report 2020. Available at:
350 https://www.who.int/diagnostics_laboratory/eual/201019_final_pqpr_eul_0563_17_00_standard_q_covid19_ag_test.pdf?ua=1 Accessed July 08, 2021.
- 351 12 Ministerium für Kultus, Jugend und Sport Baden-Württemberg. Corona-
352 Pandemie: Umsetzung der Teststrategie an den Schulen in Baden-Württemberg
353 2021. Available at: https://km-bw.de/site/pbs-bw-km-root/get/documents_E-1649554719/KULTUS.Dachmandant/KULTUS/KM-Homepage/Artikelseiten%20KP-KM/1_FAQ_Corona/Handreichung_Teststrategie_Stand%2023.04.2021.pdf
354 Accessed July 08, 2021.
- 355 13 Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative
356 research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J
357 Qual Health Care* 2007;19(6):349–57. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzm042 [published
358 Online First: 14 September 2007].
- 359 14 Robert Koch Institut. 7-Tage-Inzidenzen nach Bundesländern und Kreisen sowie
360 Gesamtübersicht der pro Tag ans RKI übermittelten Fälle und Todesfälle, Stand:
361 8.7.2021 2021. Available at:
362 https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/InfAZ/N/Neuartiges_Coronavirus/Daten/Fallzahlen_Kum_Tab.html Accessed July 08, 2021.
- 363 15 Mc Sween-Cadieux E, Dagenais C, Somé DT, et al. A health knowledge
364 brokering intervention in a district of Burkina Faso: A qualitative retrospective
365 implementation analysis. *PLoS ONE* 2019;14(7):e0220105.
366 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0220105 [published Online First: 26 July 2019].
- 367 16 Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, et al. Fostering implementation of health
368 services research findings into practice: A consolidated framework for advancing
369
370
371
372
373

- 374 implementation science. *Implement Sci* 2009;4:50. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-50
375 [published Online First: 7 August 2009].
- 376 17 Durlak JA, DuPre EP. Implementation matters: A review of research on the
377 influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting
378 implementation. *Am J Community Psychol* 2008;41(3-4):327–50.
- 379 18 Bordi L, Parisi G, Sberna G, et al. Effective screening strategy against SARS-
380 CoV-2 on self-collected saliva samples in primary school setting: A pilot project.
381 *J Infect* 2021;83(1):e8-e10. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2021.05.013 [published Online
382 First: 21 May 2021].
- 383 19 Volpp KG, Kraut BH, Ghosh S, et al. Minimal SARS-CoV-2 Transmission After
384 Implementation of a Comprehensive Mitigation Strategy at a School - New
385 Jersey, August 20-November 27, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*
386 2021;70(11):377–81. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7011a2 [published Online First: 19
387 March 2021].
- 388 20 Garbe A, ogurlu U, Logan N, et al. Parents' Experiences with Remote Education
389 during COVID-19 School Closures. *AM J QUALITATIVE RES* 2020;4(3).
- 390 21 Rajmil L, Hjern A, Boran P, et al. Impact of lockdown and school closure on
391 children's health and well-being during the first wave of COVID-19: A narrative
392 review. *BMJ Paediatr Open* 2021;5(1):e001043. doi:10.1136/bmjpo-2021-
393 001043 [published Online First: 25 May 2021].
- 394 22 Christakis DA, van Cleve W, Zimmerman FJ. Estimation of US Children's
395 Educational Attainment and Years of Life Lost Associated With Primary School
396 Closures During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*
397 2020;3(11):e2028786. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.28786 [published
398 Online First: 2 November 2020].
- 399 23 Tönshoff B, Müller B, Elling R, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in
400 Children and Their Parents in Southwest Germany. *JAMA Pediatr*
401 2021;175(6):586–93.
- 402 24 Counahan ML, Andrews RM, Speare R. Reliability of parental reports of head
403 lice in their children. *Med J Aust* 2005;182(3):137–38.
404