

1 **Title**

2 A study to assess the impact of cobas Liat point-of-care PCR assays (SARS-CoV-2 and
3 Influenza A/B) on patient clinical management in the emergency department of the
4 University of California at Davis Medical Center

5 **Authors**

6 Larissa May,¹ Elissa M. Robbins,² Jesse A. Canchola,² Kamal Chugh,² Nam K. Tran³

7 **Affiliations**

8 ¹Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of California, Davis,
9 Sacramento, California, USA

10 ²Roche Molecular Systems, Pleasanton, California, USA

11 ³Department of Emergency Medicine, University of California, Davis, Sacramento, California,
12 USA

13 **Corresponding author**

14 Nam K. Tran

15 University of California, Davis,

16 CA 95616, USA

17 Tel: 530-752-7355

18 E-Mail: nktran@UCDAVIS.EDU

19 **Running head**

20 Use of cobas Liat SARS-CoV-2 and Influenza A/B assays

21 **Author contributions**

22 NKT, EMR, and LM were involved in the conception and design of the work, data collection,
23 and data interpretation. JAC and KC were involved in data analysis and interpretation. All

24 authors contributed to the drafting and critical revision of the article and gave their final

25 approval of the manuscript to be published.

26

27 **Abstract**

28 *Background*

29 Rapid detection of SARS-CoV-2 is crucial for reduction of transmission and clinical decision-
30 making. The cobas[®] SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B nucleic acid test for use on the cobas
31 Liat[®] System is a rapid (20 minutes) point-of-care (POC) polymerase chain reaction (PCR)
32 method.

33 *Methods*

34 This unblinded, pre-post study enrolled consecutive patients with symptoms/signs consistent
35 with SARS-CoV-2 infection presenting to the University of California, Davis emergency
36 department (ED). Outcomes following implementation of the cobas Liat SARS-CoV-2 &
37 Influenza A/B test (intervention period: December 2020–May 2021) were compared with
38 previous standard-of-care using centralized laboratory PCR methods (control period: April
39 2020–October 2020).

40 *Results*

41 Electronic health records of 8879 symptomatic patients were analyzed, comprising 4339 and
42 4540 patient visits and 538 and 638 positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test results in the control
43 and intervention periods, respectively. Compared with the control period, turnaround time
44 (TAT) was shorter in the intervention period (median 0.98 vs 12.3 hours; $p < 0.0001$). ED
45 length of stay (LOS) was generally longer in the intervention period compared with the
46 control period, but for those SARS-CoV-2-negative who were admitted, ED LOS was shorter
47 (median 12.53 vs 17.93 hours; $p < 0.0001$). Overall, the rate of anti-infective prescribing was
48 also lower in the intervention period than in the control period (antibiotics only: 38.11% vs
49 44.55%; $p < 0.0001$ and antivirals only: 3.13% vs 0.94%; $p < 0.0001$).

50 *Conclusion*

51 This real-world study confirms faster TAT with a POC PCR method in an emergency care
52 setting and highlights the importance of rapid SARS-CoV-2 detection to aid patient
53 management and inform treatment decisions.

54 **Clinical Relevance**

55 This study reports data collected from a quasi-experimental pre-post study using the
56 electronic health records of patients presenting to the emergency department (ED) of the
57 University of California at Davis Medical Center with symptoms or signs consistent with
58 SARS-CoV-2 infection during their ED visit. The primary objective of this study was to
59 determine if implementation of the point-of-care (POC) cobas[®] Liat[®] SARS-CoV-2 &
60 Influenza A/B test for use on the cobas Liat System reduced the diagnostic turnaround time
61 and/or length of stay for ED patients with suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection compared with
62 the previous standards of care (batch-wise diagnostic testing using the cobas 6800 System
63 and on-demand urgent testing on the GenMark Dx[®] ePlex[®] system in a centralized clinical
64 laboratory). Ultimately, these data help to inform how implementation of POC molecular
65 testing methods impact patient management.

66

67 **Keywords**

68 SARS-CoV-2; molecular testing; PCR; point-of-care; diagnosis

69 Introduction

70 As of May 26, 2022, the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic has resulted in an
71 estimated 83,408,645 cases of COVID-19 in the United States (US), and 1,000,254 deaths
72 (1). Even as vaccination levels increase in the general population, testing of symptomatic
73 individuals is vital for controlling the spread of SARS-CoV-2 (severe acute respiratory
74 syndrome coronavirus 2; the causative agent of COVID-19), as vaccination alone does not
75 prevent infection and transmission (2, 3). The choice of diagnostic test (e.g., nucleic acid
76 amplification test [NAAT] or antigen detection and point-of-care [POC] or centralized testing)
77 is setting dependent (4). Resources (e.g., availability of trained staff), turnaround time (TAT),
78 testing capacity, assay performance (sensitivity and specificity), and patient characteristics,
79 such as days since symptom onset, all need to be considered (4).

80 Vaccination has resulted in the relaxation of public health mitigation measures in many
81 geographical regions (5-7). The increase in respiratory viruses that had hitherto been
82 reduced due to physical distancing measures (8, 9) makes it important for a clinician to
83 determine whether COVID-19-associated symptoms are attributable to SARS-CoV-2
84 infection, another respiratory infection (4), or a non-infectious etiology. The SARS-CoV-2
85 Omicron (B.1.1.529) variant, which has a shorter incubation period than the Alpha (B.1.1.7)
86 variant (10) and potentially higher transmissibility than the ancestral viruses (11), increases
87 the need for rapid diagnosis. As the pandemic has evolved, monoclonal antibody therapies
88 have become available that are more effective if administered in the early stages of
89 symptomatic infection (12), meaning that rapid diagnosis also has important implications for
90 treatment.

91 In the emergency department (ED), test results are often not immediately available (13);
92 typical TATs for high-throughput NAATs can range from ~1.5 hours to 8 hours (14), with
93 approximately 97% of polymerase chain reaction (PCR) results available within 23 hours

94 from arrival in the ED (13). Symptomatic patients should be isolated in an examination room
95 or designated area, in the absence of a laboratory-confirmed diagnosis, with consequences
96 for allocations of hospital resources, including the need for isolation bays and personal
97 protective equipment (15, 16). Given the implications for infection prevention, and the
98 variability in isolation capacity (16), rapid results are helpful for the effective triage of ED
99 patients with suspected SARS-CoV-2, both to reduce transmission and to identify those that
100 may benefit from hospital admission or other therapeutic intervention (4). Further, performing
101 on-demand POC testing in the ED while using centralized high-throughput systems for less
102 urgent testing needs could increase overall testing capacity.

103 At the onset of this study, the University of California (UC) at Davis Medical Center
104 performed diagnostic testing in a centralized clinical laboratory. The cobas[®] Liat[®] SARS-
105 CoV-2 & Influenza A/B nucleic acid test for use on the cobas Liat System (cobas Liat SARS-
106 CoV-2 & Influenza A/B test) is intended for the simultaneous rapid *in vitro* detection and
107 differentiation of SARS-CoV-2 and influenza A and B virus nucleic acids in clinical
108 specimens from individuals suspected of respiratory viral infection (17). The assay provides
109 results from a single test to rule-in or rule-out influenza and COVID-19 simultaneously, within
110 approximately 20 minutes (17).

111 The primary objective of this study was to determine if implementation of the cobas Liat
112 SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B test reduced the diagnostic assay TAT and/or length of stay
113 (LOS) for ED patients with suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection compared with the previous
114 standards of care. The secondary objectives were to determine the impact of POC testing on
115 ED disposition and the use of anti-infectives in patient management.

116 **Materials and Methods**

117 *Study design*

118 This was a retrospective, unblinded, quasi-experimental pre-post study The study comprised
119 two periods: a control period (April 01, 2020 to October 31, 2020) and an intervention period
120 (December 01, 2020 to May 31, 2021).

121 *Participants*

122 Individuals presenting at the UC Davis ED were included in the study consecutively if they
123 had symptoms or signs consistent with COVID-19 at their ED visit (**Supplementary Table**
124 **S1**). A real-time reverse transcriptase PCR (RT-PCR) SARS-CoV-2 test must also have
125 been ordered by the ED physician during the patient's ED visit, in either study period. For
126 each patient included in the study, the information of a complete event, defined as all
127 diagnostics and prescriptions ordered within 30 days of the initial ED visit, was collected
128 using electronic health records.

129 *Sample collection, storage and testing*

130 Samples were collected according to manufacturer instructions and analyzed as soon as
131 possible, not exceeding maximum storage times and temperatures dictated by the
132 manufacturer's instructions for use (IFU) (17-19). In the control period, centralized diagnostic
133 testing was conducted using the cobas SARS-CoV-2 test on the cobas 6800 System (19) or
134 on-demand urgent testing using the GenMark Dx[®] ePlex[®] SARS-CoV-2 Test (18). The cobas
135 6800 System can perform more than 1000 tests per day, with first results reported in
136 approximately 3 hours of loading (20, 21). In contrast, the assay run time for the ePlex
137 SARS-CoV-2 Test is approximately 90 minutes (22) allowing for up to 288 samples per day
138 (23) depending on instrument configuration and lab staffing. In the intervention period, the
139 cobas Liat SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B test was used for detection of the target sequences
140 (17).

141 *Analysis*

142 For the purpose of this analysis, data from the two centralized testing methods were pooled
143 to allow the comparison between POC PCR and centralized PCR methods. Data collected
144 during November 2020 were excluded from the analysis as this was considered a transition
145 period, allowing a phasing in of the POC assay. Samples yielding indeterminate/invalid
146 results were handled per the assay IFUs (17-19).

147 More information on test methods and analysis is available in the **Supplementary**
148 **Materials.**

149 *Statistical analysis*

150 No formal sample size calculations were conducted for this study. All data analyses were
151 performed using SAS/STAT® v9.4 software (24). Comparisons were made at the patient
152 visit-level rather than continuously over the study duration. Patient data included in this study
153 were summarized using descriptive statistics and compared between the control and
154 intervention periods. The primary endpoints of TAT and LOS, and the secondary endpoints
155 of ED disposition and anti-infective prescription rates, were also analyzed by SARS-CoV-2
156 test result. A post hoc analysis of LOS and anti-infective use was conducted to stratify data
157 by ED disposition and by SARS-CoV-2 test result and ED disposition.

158 Statistical hypothesis testing was performed using the Chi-Square test for categorical data,
159 the non-parametric Wilcoxon rank-sum test for continuous-level non-normally distributed
160 data and the Student's t-test for normally distributed data. The rate of type I errors was
161 controlled for using the false discovery rate method when conducting multiple comparisons.
162 Indeterminate/invalid results were combined and included in the relevant tables but were not
163 included in statistical hypothesis testing due to small sample sizes.

164 *Ethics statement*

165 This study was conducted in compliance with the International Conference on Harmonisation
166 Good Clinical Practice Guidelines, and applicable US Food and Drug Administration
167 regulations. The study protocol and de-identification procedure for patient data were
168 approved by the UC Davis Institutional Review Board Administration.

169 *Data availability*

170 The data used to support the findings of this study are included within the article and
171 supplementary materials.

172 **Results**

173 *Patient demographics and characteristics*

174 A total of 8879 medical records were included in the study (**Supplementary Error!**
175 Reference source not found.). Patient demographics were similar (all comparisons, $p>0.05$)
176 in the control and intervention cohorts (**Table 1**) and were therefore not controlled for in
177 subsequent analyses. Across both periods, mean patient age was 47 years (median 51
178 years), the majority were White (42.03%), and 48.64% were female. Almost 40% of patients
179 had a body mass index below the cut-off for obesity ($<30.0 \text{ kg/m}^2$) (25).

180 The most commonly recorded SARS-CoV-2-related symptom was shortness of
181 breath/difficulty breathing (21.83% control period, 18.57% intervention period)
182 (**Supplementary Table S1**). Only one symptom was recorded for 54.51% of patients in
183 control period and 47.97% in the intervention period), with 2 or ≥ 3 symptoms reported by
184 $<3\%$ of patients each in either period (**Supplementary Table S2**).

185 More SARS-CoV-2 PCR tests were conducted in the intervention period than in the control
186 period ($n=4540$ vs $n=4339$), and of those, more tested positive in the intervention period
187 (14.05% vs 12.40%, respectively). Twelve (0.28%) tests were recorded as invalid/other in

188 the control period versus none in the intervention period (**Supplementary Table S3**; $p < 0.02$
189 overall for test outcome between periods).

190 *Impact of rapid POC testing on TAT*

191 The TAT (defined here as time from electronic SARS-CoV-2 test order to result reporting)
192 was shorter in the intervention period compared with the control period (median 0.98 vs 12.3
193 hours; $p < 0.0001$) (**Table 2**). The lower end of the range for TAT in the control period (range
194 1.92, 74.38 hours) likely reflects samples analyzed with the ePlex SARS-CoV-2 Test, which
195 has a shorter TAT than the cobas 6800. TAT was similarly reduced in the intervention period
196 when analyzed by SARS-CoV-2 test result (**Table 2**) and when TAT was calculated as the
197 time from sample collection to result reporting (**Supplementary Table S4**).

198 *Impact of rapid POC testing on ED LOS*

199 Median ED LOS was longer in the intervention period (7.56 vs 7.15 hours; $p = 0.02$) and for
200 patients positive for SARS-CoV-2 ($p < 0.0001$) (**Table 3**). ED LOS was similar in both periods
201 for patients negative for SARS-CoV-2. By ED disposition, median LOS was longer in the
202 intervention period for those who were discharged after ED care (5.10 hours vs 4.43 hours;
203 $p < 0.0001$) but shorter for those admitted (13.50 hours vs 18.48 hours; $p < 0.0001$). ED LOS
204 was similar in both periods for those who were admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU) or
205 who died (both $p > 0.05$) (**Table 3**).

206 By SARS-CoV-2 test result and ED disposition, median ED LOS was longer in the
207 intervention period for those who were discharged, regardless of test result (both $p < 0.0001$)
208 (**Supplementary Table S5**). For those admitted, median ED LOS was longer in the
209 intervention period for patients with a positive SARS-CoV-2 result ($p = 0.02$) and shorter with
210 a negative result ($p < 0.0001$).

211 Hospital LOS was similar between study periods overall and when analyzed by SARS-CoV-2
212 result (all comparisons, $p>0.05$; **Supplementary Table S6**). ICU LOS was shorter in the
213 intervention period compared with the control period overall (2.08 days vs 2.49 days;
214 $p=0.01$) and for those with a negative SARS-CoV-2 result ($p=0.01$) (**Supplementary Table**
215 **S7**). Patients with a positive SARS-CoV-2 result had a similar ICU LOS in both periods
216 ($p>0.05$).

217 *Impact of rapid POC testing on ED disposition*

218 Fewer patients were admitted to the ICU in the intervention period (11.78%) compared with
219 the control period (14.22%; $p=0.0026$) (**Table 4**). Patients with a positive SARS-CoV-2 result
220 in the intervention period were more likely to be admitted to the hospital ($p=0.0002$) and less
221 likely to be discharged ($p=0.0002$). Conversely, patients who tested negative were less likely
222 to be admitted to the ICU in the intervention period ($p=0.0006$).

223 *Impact of rapid POC testing on antibiotic/antiviral use*

224 Antibiotic-only use was 14.5% lower in the intervention period (38.11% vs 44.55%;
225 $p<0.0001$; **Table 5**), and the magnitude of the change was greater in patients with a positive
226 vs negative SARS-CoV-2 result (47.2% vs 10.6% reduction; $p<0.0001$ for both). Antiviral-
227 only use was higher in the intervention period compared with the control period (3.13% vs
228 0.94%; $p<0.0001$). Antivirals were prescribed more in the intervention period when patients
229 were SARS-CoV-2 positive (14.89%) than when negative (0.92%). Approximately half of
230 patients received no antibiotic or antiviral in both periods, though a higher proportion of
231 patients received neither in the intervention period (54.25% vs 49.97%; $p<0.0001$).

232 Patterns of anti-infective prescription were similar when analyzed by ED disposition (**Table**
233 **5**). However, as would be expected based on prescribing requirements, greater prescription
234 of antivirals in the intervention period compared with the control period was more evident in
235 those admitted to hospital or the ICU. By SARS-CoV-2 test result and ED disposition

236 **(Supplementary Table S8)**, antibiotic-only use in the intervention period compared with the
237 control period was considerably lower in positive patients who were discharged or admitted
238 (both $p < 0.0001$). For SARS-CoV-2-negative patients, antibiotic prescriptions were similar in
239 both periods for those who were discharged ($p > 0.05$) but lower in the intervention period for
240 those who were admitted to hospital ($p = 0.01$).

241 Summaries of antibiotic and antiviral prescription rates by month are available in
242 **Supplementary Tables S9 and S10**, respectively.

243 **Discussion**

244 In this large study, ED patients with signs or symptoms consistent with COVID-19 received
245 POC PCR test results in under an hour, compared with approximately 12 hours for
246 centralized tests, when averaged across the cobas SARS-CoV-2 test and ePlex Test. The
247 faster TAT did not reduce median ED LOS overall but did appear to reduce ED LOS for
248 patients with negative test results who were subsequently admitted, suggesting more
249 effective patient triage. The rate of antibiotic prescribing was also lower in the intervention
250 period than in the control period overall, and in the population of patients with a positive
251 SARS-CoV-2 result, which could support improved antibiotic stewardship with faster
252 diagnosis.

253 Previous studies have evaluated the clinical performance of the cobas Liat SARS-CoV-2 &
254 Influenza A/B test compared with other RT-PCR systems, such as the Cepheid[®] GeneXpert
255 system[®] (26) and the cobas SARS-CoV-2 test on the cobas 6800/8800 Systems (27), and
256 have demonstrated 100% positive percent agreement and 97–100% negative percent
257 agreement. One study, conducted in an ED in Germany, estimated that POC PCR results
258 using the cobas Liat System were available after 102 minutes from admission, which was
259 shorter than the 811 minutes with central laboratory PCR (28). Though the TAT observed in

260 the clinic is longer than the 20-minute assay run time, demonstrating some delay in the
261 testing strategy, time to result is still substantially shorter than for centralized PCR methods.

262 Fast TAT with a reliable POC PCR assay for respiratory pathogens can reduce ED LOS
263 (29). However, as in our study, some have reported increased ED LOS following the
264 introduction of rapid diagnostic tests (30, 31). It is likely that factors other than TAT, such as
265 availability of hospital resources (including number of isolation rooms), severity of symptoms,
266 and presence of comorbidities requiring further work-up, contribute to longer ED LOS (30,
267 31). In this study, the ED had a higher number of symptomatic patient visits and positive
268 SARS-CoV-2 test results in the intervention period than in the control period, likely related to
269 the emergence of several SARS-CoV-2 variants, most notably Delta, driving surges (32),
270 which may have contributed to increased LOS in the intervention period. Despite this, we
271 found that ED LOS for patients with negative test results who were admitted was shorter
272 following POC PCR implementation, indicating more effective patient triage.

273 Across both study periods, approximately 50% of ED patients were discharged and 37%
274 were admitted. Though ICU admissions were lower in the intervention period, this result
275 should be interpreted with care. Lower ICU admissions could indicate improved patient
276 triage and management, which would have cost-saving implications (33, 34), but it is
277 possible that patients in the control period had a variant associated with more severe
278 disease (35), or that the reduction was due to other changes in hospital practices. Admission
279 rates appeared higher than in other studies of symptomatic patients who were PCR tested
280 for SARS-CoV-2, where admission rates were approximately 27–28% (36, 37). Higher
281 admission rates could reflect the severity of symptoms encountered in this cohort,
282 differences in hospital practices, or factors such as comorbidities that have not been
283 controlled for. The UC Davis Medical Center is also a quaternary referral center, and the ED
284 serves as a safety net for vulnerable populations and those with comorbidities of concern.

285 Several studies have demonstrated that implementing rapid POC PCR tests can improve
286 clinical decision-making and management of patients with respiratory infections (27, 38, 39).
287 Shorter time to diagnosis can reduce inappropriate antibiotic prescribing and allow for
288 appropriate de-escalation (29, 38-41). Within the first 6 months of the pandemic, antibiotic
289 prescribing rates for patients with COVID-19 was high (almost 75%), even in the absence of
290 bacterial co-infection (42). In our study, though antibiotics were frequently prescribed, the
291 rate was lower in the intervention period than in the control period, particularly in those with a
292 positive SARS-CoV-2 result, supporting the notion that reduced time to result can improve
293 antibiotic stewardship and help slow the emergence of antibiotic resistance (43, 44). Antiviral
294 use was higher in the intervention period, though prescribing rates were low (<5%), likely
295 reflecting the availability of antivirals and the stringent prescribing requirements at the time of
296 the study.

297 One of the major limitations of this study is that due to the real-world, pre-post study design,
298 several epidemiological factors could not be controlled for. The control and intervention
299 periods were very different in terms of the stage of the COVID-19 pandemic. The control
300 period coincided largely with the first wave, which peaked at approximately 10,000 new
301 cases/day in mid-July (45). The intervention period was initiated in November, which was the
302 start of a surge in cases in California, with approximately 47,000 new cases/day at the end
303 of December and >100,000 cases/day in January (45). The study may also have been
304 impacted by seasonality, with higher rates of respiratory infections generally encountered in
305 winter (the intervention period) (46). In addition to environmental factors, COVID-19
306 treatment guidelines or practices were rapidly evolving (47, 48), and the availability of
307 effective treatments changed over time (49), making clinical comparisons challenging.
308 Though the demographics of our patient population were not statistically different between
309 periods, other non-collected characteristics of patients presenting to the ED may have
310 differed (50), particularly as ED volumes were low during the beginning of the pandemic.

311 Nevertheless, this study provides an important insight into the outcomes observed following
312 the implementation of a rapid POC SARS-CoV-2 test at a time when new cases of COVID-
313 19 were high. It is also important to note that while our study supports the use of POC PCR
314 tests in an emergency care setting, high-throughput centralized testing for SARS-CoV-2
315 remains an important diagnostic tool for patients not in need of immediate results. In this
316 study, system identifiers were missing from the dataset, so it was not possible to analyze
317 TAT for the cobas 6800 or ePlex systems separately; however, it is recognized that TAT
318 using the ePlex SARS-CoV-2 Test is shorter than the cobas SARS-CoV-2 test. The ability to
319 perform tests on the cobas Liat System, or other POC platforms, may increase capacity for
320 testing to be conducted on centralized systems with broader respiratory pathogen testing
321 panels, potentially improving testing efficiency and antibiotic prescribing practices.

322 **Conclusion**

323 In conclusion, this study confirms that the cobas Liat SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B test
324 provides a considerably shorter TAT compared with centralized laboratory PCR methods,
325 particularly those using sample batching, in a real-world emergency care setting. Decreased
326 TAT also has the potential to reduce ED LOS in some patient populations and allows for
327 better patient management and informed treatment decisions, in-line with improved antibiotic
328 stewardship.

329 **Funding**

330 This study was funded by Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.

331

332 **Disclosures**

333 EMR, JAC, and KC are employees of Roche Molecular Systems Inc., and EMR holds
334 company stock. LM and NKT have received payment or honoraria for lectures,

335 presentations, or advisory boards from Roche Molecular Systems, Inc., and LM has received
336 honoraria from Roche Diagnostics Solutions.

337 **Acknowledgements**

338 The authors would like to thank Christopher Dodoo of Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.,
339 Pleasanton, California, USA, who contributed statistical support; Jeffrey Flack of University
340 of California, Davis, California, USA for support with dataset creation; and Babar Javed of
341 Roche Molecular Systems, Inc., Pleasanton, California, USA, who was the study manager.
342 Medical writing support was provided by Samantha Forster of Elements Communications Ltd
343 (Westerham, UK) and was funded by Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.

344 In the US, the cobas SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B test (17) is only for use under the Food
345 and Drug Administration's Emergency Use Authorization. COBAS, LIAT, EPLEX and
346 GENMARK DX are trademarks of Roche. All other product names and trademarks are the
347 property of their respective owners.

348

349 References

- 350 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2022. COVID data tracker.
351 <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#datatracker-home>. Accessed 09 May 2022.
- 352 2. Singanayagam A, Hakki S, Dunning J, Madon KJ, Crone MA, Koycheva A, Derqui-
353 Fernandez N, Barnett JL, Whitfield MG, Varro R, Charlett A, Kundu R, Fenn J, Cutajar
354 J, Quinn V, Conibear E, Barclay W, Freemont PS, Taylor GP, Ahmad S, Zambon M,
355 Ferguson NM, Lalvani A. 2022. Community transmission and viral load kinetics of the
356 SARS-CoV-2 delta (B.1.617.2) variant in vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals in
357 the UK: a prospective, longitudinal, cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 22:183–195.
- 358 3. Elliott P, Haw D, Wang H, Eales O, Walters CE, Ainslie KEC, Atchison C, Fronterre C,
359 Diggle PJ, Page AJ, Trotter AJ, Prosolek SJ, Ashby D, Donnelly CA, Barclay W, Taylor
360 G, Cooke G, Ward H, Darzi A, Riley S. 2021. Exponential growth, high prevalence of
361 SARS-CoV-2, and vaccine effectiveness associated with the Delta variant. *Science*
362 374:eabl9551.
- 363 4. Baldanti F, Ganguly NK, Wang G, Möckel M, O'Neill LA, Renz H, Dos Santos Ferreira
364 CE, Tateda K, Van Der Pol B. 2022. Choice of SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic test: challenges
365 and key considerations for the future. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci*
366 doi:10.1080/10408363.2022.2045250:1–15.
- 367 5. Cabinet Office. 2022. Guidance: COVID-19 response: living with COVID-19, *on*
368 Gov.uk. [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-response-living-with-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-response-living-with-covid-19/covid-19-response-living-with-covid-19)
369 [covid-19/covid-19-response-living-with-covid-19](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-response-living-with-covid-19/covid-19-response-living-with-covid-19). Accessed 26 May 2022.
- 370 6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2021. Public health recommendations
371 for fully vaccinated people. [https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2021/p0308-](https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2021/p0308-vaccinated-guidelines.html)
372 [vaccinated-guidelines.html](https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2021/p0308-vaccinated-guidelines.html). Accessed 26 May 2022.
- 373 7. Israel Ministry of Health. 2021. Israel to life all Coronavirus restrictions, *on* Gov.il.
374 <https://www.gov.il/en/departments/news/23052021-02>. Accessed 26 May 2022.
- 375 8. Olsen SJ, Azziz-Baumgartner E, Budd AP, Brammer L, Sullivan S, Pineda RF, Cohen
376 C, Fry AM. 2020. Decreased influenza activity during the COVID-19 pandemic -
377 United States, Australia, Chile, and South Africa, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*
378 69:1305-1309.
- 379 9. Foley DA, Yeoh DK, Minney-Smith CA, Martin AC, Mace AO, Sikazwe CT, Le H, Levy
380 A, Moore HC, Blyth CC. 2021. The interseasonal resurgence of respiratory syncytial
381 virus in Australian children following the reduction of coronavirus disease 2019–
382 related public health measures. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 73:e2829-e2830.
- 383 10. Tanaka H, Ogata T, Shibata T, Nagai H, Takahashi Y, Kinoshita M, Matsubayashi K,
384 Hattori S, Taniguchi C. 2022. Shorter incubation period among COVID-19 cases with
385 the BA.1 Omicron variant. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 19:6330.

- 386 11. Saxena SK, Kumar S, Ansari S, Paweska JT, Maurya VK, Tripathi AK, Abdel-Moneim
387 AS. 2022. Characterization of the novel SARS-CoV-2 Omicron (B.1.1.529) variant of
388 concern and its global perspective. *J Med Virol* 94:1738-1744.
- 389 12. Stadler E, Chai KL, Schlub TE, Cromer D, Polizzotto MN, Kent SJ, Skoetz N, Estcourt
390 L, McQuilten ZK, Wood EM, Houry DS, Davenport MP. 2022. Determinants of
391 passive antibody effectiveness in SARS-CoV-2 infection. medRxiv
392 doi:10.1101/2022.03.21.22272672:2022.03.21.22272672.
- 393 13. Soltan AAS, Yang J, Pattanshetty R, Novak A, Yang Y, Rohanian O, Beer S, Soltan
394 MA, Thickett DR, Fairhead R, Zhu T, Eyre DW, Clifton DA, Collaborative CT. 2022.
395 Real-world evaluation of rapid and laboratory-free COVID-19 triage for emergency
396 care: external validation and pilot deployment of artificial intelligence driven
397 screening. *Lancet Digit Health* 4:e266-e278.
- 398 14. Mostafa HH, Hardick J, Morehead E, Miller JA, Gaydos CA, Manabe YC. 2020.
399 Comparison of the analytical sensitivity of seven commonly used commercial SARS-
400 CoV-2 automated molecular assays. *J Clin Virol* 130:104578.
- 401 15. Dancer SJ. 2021. Reducing the risk of COVID-19 transmission in hospitals: focus on
402 additional infection control strategies. *Surgery (Oxford, Oxfordshire)* 39:752-758.
- 403 16. El Tawil C, El Hussein M, Souaiby N, Helou M. 2022. Emergency department
404 management of COVID-19 suspected patients. An international perspective. *Int J*
405 *Public Health* 67:1604534.
- 406 17. Roche Molecular Systems Inc. 2022. Instructions for use: cobas® SARS-CoV-2 &
407 Influenza A/B Nucleic acid test for use on the cobas® Liat® System. v3.0.
- 408 18. GenMark Diagnostics I. 2020. ePlex®SARS-CoV-2 Test assay manual.
409 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136282/download>. Accessed 31 May 2022.
- 410 19. Roche Molecular Systems. 2022. Instructions for use: cobas® SARS-CoV-2:
411 qualitative assay for use on the cobas® 6800/8800 Systems v8.0.
- 412 20. Roche molecular Systems I. 2015. cobas® 6800/8800 Systems: systems
413 specifications.
- 414 21. UC Davis Health News. 2020. UC Davis Health speeds up COVID-19 testing.
415 [https://health.ucdavis.edu/news/headlines/uc-davis-health-speeds-up-covid-19-](https://health.ucdavis.edu/news/headlines/uc-davis-health-speeds-up-covid-19-testing/2020/04)
416 [testing/2020/04](https://health.ucdavis.edu/news/headlines/uc-davis-health-speeds-up-covid-19-testing/2020/04). Accessed 23 Jun 2022.
- 417 22. Zhen W, Smith E, Manji R, Schron D, Berry GJ. 2020. Clinical evaluation of three
418 sample-to-answer platforms for detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Microbiol* 58:e00783-
419 20.
- 420 23. Roche Diagnostics Limited. 2022. Product information: ePlex® System.
421 <https://diagnostics.roche.com/global/en/products/systems/eplix-system.html>.
422 Accessed 4 August 2022.

- 423 24. SAS Institute Inc. 2013. The SAS®System for Linux, v9.4. Cary, NC, USA.
- 424 25. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2022. Defining adult overweight and
425 obesity <https://www.cdc.gov/obesity/basics/adult-defining.html>. Accessed 7 June
426 2022.
- 427 26. Tsang HF, Leung WMS, Chan LWC, Cho WCS, Wong SCC. 2021. Performance
428 comparison of the Cobas® Liat® and Cepheid® GeneXpert® systems on SARS-CoV-
429 2 detection in nasopharyngeal swab and posterior oropharyngeal saliva. *Expert Rev*
430 *Mol Diagn* 21:515–518.
- 431 27. Hansen G, Marino J, Wang ZX, Beavis KG, Rodrigo J, Labog K, Westblade LF, Jin R,
432 Love N, Ding K, Garg S, Huang A, Sickler J, Tran NK. 2021. Clinical performance of
433 the point-of-care cobas Liat for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in 20 minutes: a multicenter
434 study. *J Clin Microbiol* 59:e02811-20.
- 435 28. Möckel M, Bolanaki M, Hofmann J, Stein A, Hitzek J, Holert F, Fischer-Rosinský A,
436 Slagman A. 2022. SARS-CoV-2 screening in patients in need of urgent inpatient
437 treatment in the Emergency Department (ED) by digitally integrated point-of-care
438 PCR: a clinical cohort study. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* 102:115637.
- 439 29. Egilmez E, Walker GJ, Bakthavathsalam P, Peterson JR, Gooding JJ, Rawlinson W,
440 Stelzer-Braid S. 2018. Systematic review of the impact of point-of-care testing for
441 influenza on the outcomes of patients with acute respiratory tract infection. *Rev Med*
442 *Virol* 28:e1995.
- 443 30. Jeong HW, Heo JY, Park JS, Kim WJ. 2014. Effect of the influenza virus rapid antigen
444 test on a physician's decision to prescribe antibiotics and on patient length of stay in
445 the emergency department. *PLoS One* 9:e110978-e110978.
- 446 31. Jun S-H, Kim J-Y, Yoon Y-H, Lim C-S, Ch H-J, Choi S-H. 2016. The effect of the rapid
447 antigen test for influenza on clinical practice in the emergency department: a
448 comparison of periods before and after the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic. *Signa*
449 *Vitae* 11:74-89.
- 450 32. Our World in Data. 2022. Share of SARS-CoV-2 sequences that are the delta variant.
451 <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus#coronavirus-country-profiles>. Accessed 4 July
452 2022.
- 453 33. Ohsfeldt RL, Choong CK, Mc Collam PL, Abedtash H, Kelton KA, Burge R. 2021.
454 Inpatient hospital costs for COVID-19 patients in the United States. *Adv Ther*
455 38:5557-5595.
- 456 34. Di Fusco M, Shea KM, Lin J, Nguyen JL, Angulo FJ, Benigno M, Malhotra D, Emir B,
457 Sung AH, Hammond JL, Stoychev S, Charos A. 2021. Health outcomes and economic
458 burden of hospitalized COVID-19 patients in the United States. *J Med Econ* 24:308-
459 317.
- 460 35. Boehm E, Kronig I, Neher RA, Eckerle I, Vetter P, Kaiser L. 2021. Novel SARS-CoV-2
461 variants: the pandemics within the pandemic. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 27:1109-1117.

- 462 36. McPadden J, Warner F, Young HP, Hurley NC, Pulk RA, Singh A, Durant TJS, Gong G,
463 Desai N, Haimovich A, Taylor RA, Gunel M, Dela Cruz CS, Farhadian SF, Siner J,
464 Villanueva M, Churchwell K, Hsiao A, Torre CJ, Jr., Velazquez EJ, Herbst RS, Iwasaki
465 A, Ko AI, Mortazavi BJ, Krumholz HM, Schulz WL. 2021. Clinical characteristics and
466 outcomes for 7,995 patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection. *PLoS One* 16:e0243291-
467 e0243291.
- 468 37. Russell FM, Wang A, Ehrman RR, Jacobs J, Croft A, Larsen C. 2021. Risk factors
469 associated with hospital admission in COVID-19 patients initially admitted to an
470 observation unit. *Am J Emerg Med* 46:339-343.
- 471 38. Hansen GT, Moore J, Herding E, Gooch T, Hirigoyen D, Hanson K, Deike M. 2018.
472 Clinical decision making in the emergency department setting using rapid PCR:
473 results of the CLADE study group. *J Clin Virol* 102:42-49.
- 474 39. van Rijn AL, Nijhuis RHT, Bekker V, Groeneveld GH, Wessels E, Feltkamp MCW, Claas
475 ECJ. 2018. Clinical implications of rapid ePlex® Respiratory Pathogen Panel testing
476 compared to laboratory-developed real-time PCR. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*
477 37:571–577.
- 478 40. Benirschke RC, McElvania E, Thomson RB, Jr., Kaul KL, Das S. 2019. Clinical impact
479 of rapid point-of-care PCR influenza testing in an urgent care setting: a single-center
480 study. *J Clin Microbiol* 57:e01281-18.
- 481 41. Pedersen CJ, Rogan DT, Yang S, Quinn JV. 2018. Using a novel rapid viral test to
482 improve triage of emergency department patients with acute respiratory illness
483 during flu season. *J Clin Virol* 108:72-76.
- 484 42. Langford BJ, So M, Raybardhan S, Leung V, Soucy JR, Westwood D, Daneman N,
485 MacFadden DR. 2021. Antibiotic prescribing in patients with COVID-19: rapid review
486 and meta-analysis. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 27:520-531.
- 487 43. World Health Organization. 2012. The evolving threat of antimicrobial resistance:
488 options for action, *on* World Health Organization.
489 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/44812> Accessed 30 June 2022.
- 490 44. File TM, Jr., Srinivasan A, Bartlett JG. 2014. Antimicrobial stewardship: importance
491 for patient and public health. *Clin Infect Dis* 59 Suppl 3:S93-S96.
- 492 45. USAFacts. 2022. California coronavirus cases and deaths.
493 <https://usafacts.org/visualizations/coronavirus-covid-19-spread-map/state/california>.
494 Accessed 9 June 2022.
- 495 46. Price RHM, Graham C, Ramalingam S. 2019. Association between viral seasonality
496 and meteorological factors. *Sci Rep* 9:929-929.
- 497 47. National Institutes of Health. April 29, 2022 2022. COVID-19 treatment guidelines.
498 [https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/about-the-guidelines/guidelines-
499 development/](https://www.covid19treatmentguidelines.nih.gov/about-the-guidelines/guidelines-development/). Accessed 13 June 2022.

- 500 48. Lee CK, Merriam LT, Pearson JC, Lipnick MS, McKleroy W, Kim EY. 2022. Treating
501 COVID-19: Evolving approaches to evidence in a pandemic. *Cell Rep Med* 3:100533.
- 502 49. Cascella M, Rajnik M, Aleem A, Dulebohn SC, R DN. May 4, 2022 2022. Features,
503 evaluation, and treatment of coronavirus (COVID-19), *on* StatPearls Publishing.
504 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK554776/>. Accessed 15 June 2022.
- 505 50. Matsunaga N, Hayakawa K, Asai Y, Tsuzuki S, Terada M, Suzuki S, Ohtsu H, Kitajima
506 K, Toyoda A, Suzuki K, Suzuki M, Saito S, Uemura Y, Shibata T, Kondo M, Nakamura-
507 Uchiyama F, Yokota K, Saito F, Izumi K, Sugiura W, Ohmagari N. 2022. Clinical
508 characteristics of the first three waves of hospitalised patients with COVID-19 in
509 Japan prior to the widespread use of vaccination: a nationwide observational study.
510 *Lancet Reg Health West Pac* 22:100421.
- 511

512 Table 1: Patient demographics

	Control period	Intervention period	p-value
	(Centralized PCR)	(POC PCR)	
Total patient visits, n	4339	4540	
Age (years), n (%)			0.63 ^a
≤30	1152 (26.55%)	1259 (27.73%)	
31–40	492 (11.34%)	505 (11.12%)	
41–50	481 (11.09%)	485 (10.68%)	
51–60	691 (15.93%)	685 (15.09%)	
61–70	723 (16.66%)	727 (16.01%)	
71–80	488 (11.25%)	526 (11.59%)	
≥81	312 (7.19%)	353 (7.78%)	
Age (years)			0.18 ^b
Mean (SD)	47.47 (24.17)	46.76 (25.34)	
Median (IQR)	51 (29, 66)	51 (28, 67)	
Range	(0, 90)	(0, 90)	
BMI^c (kg/m²), n (%)			0.11 ^a
Below 18.5 (underweight)	236 (5.44%)	270 (5.95%)	
18.5–24.9 (healthy)	767 (17.68%)	711 (15.66%)	
25.0–29.9 (pre-obesity)	756 (17.42%)	680 (14.98%)	
30–39.9 (obesity class I)	726 (16.73%)	736 (16.21%)	
≥40 (obesity class II)	251 (5.78%)	259 (5.70%)	
Unknown ^e	1579 (36.39%)	1850 (40.75%)	
BMI^c (kg/m²)			0.56 ^b
Mean (SD)	28.47 (8.22)	28.60 (8.59)	
Median (IQR)	27.4 (22.7, 32.8)	27.4 (22.4, 33.5)	
Range	(14.0, 65.1)	(14.0, 65.5)	
Sex, n (%)			0.30 ^{a,d}
Female	2086 (48.08%)	2233 (49.19%)	
Male	2251 (51.88%)	2305 (50.77%)	
Other	2 (0.05%)	2 (0.04%)	
Ethnicity, n (%)			0.24 ^{a,d}
Hispanic/Latino	969 (22.33%)	972 (21.41%)	

Not Hispanic/not Latino	3318 (76.47%)	3534 (77.84%)	
Unknown ^e	50 (1.15%)	34 (0.75%)	
Not reported	2 (0.05%)	0 (0.00%)	
Race, n (%)			0.12 ^{a, d}
American Indian/Alaskan Native	46 (1.06%)	47 (1.04%)	
Asian	342 (7.88%)	408 (8.99%)	
Black/African-American	836 (19.27%)	936 (20.62%)	
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	103 (2.37%)	84 (1.85%)	
White	1843 (42.48%)	1889 (41.61%)	
Multiple/other	1104 (25.44%)	1133 (24.96%)	
Not reported	65 (1.50%)	43 (0.95%)	

513 This table may include multiple visits per patient. All individuals with symptoms of a possible SARS-
 514 CoV-2 infection, and a PCR SARS-CoV-2 test ordered by a clinician during the control period (April
 515 2020–October 2020) or the intervention period (December 2020– May 2021), were considered eligible
 516 for this study and are included in this summary table.

517 ^aChi-square test

518 ^bStudent’s t-test

519 ^cN=58 observations were excluded from the BMI analysis due to data quality issues. BMI cut-off
 520 based on Centers for Disease Control and Prevention definitions (25)

521 ^dChi-square test excludes ‘Other’, ‘Unknown’, or ‘Not reported’ categories

522 ^eUnknown category indicates subjects for whom the corresponding information is not available or
 523 reported as unknown

524 BMI, body mass index; IQR, interquartile range; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; POC, point-of-care;
 525 SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SD, standard deviation

526

527 Table 2: Summary of SARS-CoV-2 test turnaround time (TAT), order to result

	Control period	Intervention period	p-value^a
	(Centralized PCR)	(POC PCR)	
Total patient visits, n	4339	4540	
TAT^b (hours)			<0.0001 ^c
Mean (SD)	13.32 (6.77)	1.29 (1.79)	
Median (IQR)	12.3 (7.93, 18.7)	0.98 (0.7, 1.43)	
Range	1.92, 74.38	0.42, 79.92	
TAT^b (hours) by PCR SARS-CoV-2 result^d			
Positive, n (%)	538 (12.40%)	638 (14.05%)	<0.0001
Mean (SD)	13.5 (7.45)	1.18 (1.04)	
Median (IQR)	12.26 (7.87, 18.73)	0.93 (0.72, 1.33)	
Range	2.08, 74.38	0.43, 17.07	
Negative, n (%)	3789 (87.32%)	3902 (85.95%)	<0.0001
Mean (SD)	13.27 (6.66)	1.31 (1.88)	
Median (IQR)	12.27 (7.95, 18.65)	0.98 (0.7, 1.45)	
Range	1.92, 61.7	0.42, 79.92	
Missing	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Invalid/other, n (%)	12 (0.28%)	0 (0.00%)	N/A
Mean (SD)	21.01 (5.82)	N/A	
Median (IQR)	19.73 (15.83, 26.575)	N/A	
Range	14.2, 28.73	N/A	

528 This table may include multiple visits per patient. All individuals with symptoms of a possible SARS-
 529 CoV-2 infection, and a PCR SARS-CoV-2 test ordered by a clinician during the control period (April
 530 2020–October 2020) or the intervention period (December 2020– May 2021), were considered eligible
 531 for this study and are included in this summary table.

532 ^aWilcoxon rank-sum test

533 ^bTAT was calculated as the difference between test order date–time and result date–time

534

535 ^cTest excludes 'Invalid/other' category

536 ^dPCR SARS-CoV-2 test was the cobas SARS-CoV-2 test on the 6800 System or ePlex SARS-CoV-2

537 Test during the control period, and was the Liat SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B test during the

538 intervention period

539 IQR, interquartile range; N/A, not applicable; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; POC, point-of-care;

540 SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SD, standard deviation

541 Table 3: Summary of patient's emergency department (ED) length of stay (LOS)

	Control period	Intervention period	p-value^a
	(Centralized PCR)	(POC PCR)	
Total patient visits, n	4339	4540	
Patient's ED LOS (hours)			0.02 ^b
Mean (SD)	13.50 (16.49)	13.30 (23.01)	
Median (IQR)	7.15 (4.08, 17.78)	7.56 (4.62, 14.62)	
Range	0.32, 202.47	0.70, 776.88	
Missing	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
ED LOS (hours) by PCR SARS-CoV-2 test result^c			
Positive, n (%)	538 (12.40%)	638 (14.05%)	<0.0001
Mean (SD)	12.20 (14.79)	21.57 (37.83)	
Median (IQR)	6.04 (3.10, 15.40)	9.28 (4.60, 25.97)	
Range	0.53, 106.88	0.98, 383.27	
Missing	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Negative, n (%)	3789 (87.32%)	3902 (85.95%)	0.76
Mean (SD)	13.67 (16.69)	11.95 (19.22)	
Median (IQR)	7.32 (4.20, 18.10)	7.38 (4.63, 13.57)	
Range	0.32, 202.47	0.70, 776.88	
Missing	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Invalid/other, n (%)	12 (0.28%)	0 (0.00%)	N/A
Mean (SD)	17.37 (22.17)	N/A	
Median (IQR)	7.25 (2.85, 29.58)	N/A	
Range	1.15, 75.72	N/A	
Missing	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
ED LOS (hours) by ED patient visit disposition^{c,d}			
Discharge, n (%)	2139 (49.30%)	2258 (49.74%)	<0.0001
Mean (SD)	7.36 (11.69)	8.20 (21.30)	
Median (IQR)	4.43 (2.67, 7.12)	5.10 (3.35, 7.62)	
Range	0.32, 196.22	0.70, 776.88	
Hospital admission, n (%)	1576 (36.32%)	1740 (38.33%)	<0.0001

Mean (SD)	22.80 (19.07)	20.10 (24.03)	
Median (IQR)	18.48 (8.74, 30.49)	13.50 (8.43, 25.37)	
Range	1.53, 202.47	1.23, 383.27	
ICU admission, n (%)	617 (14.22%)	535 (11.78%)	0.19
Mean (SD)	11.09 (12.30)	12.83 (21.00)	
Median (IQR)	7.45 (5.02, 12.33)	7.87 (5.50, 13.38)	
Range	1.23, 178.15	1.38, 346.48	
Death, n (%)	7 (0.16%)	6 (0.13%)	1
Mean (SD)	8.65 (6.15)	7.11 (2.88)	
Median (IQR)	7.80 (3.92, 10.83)	6.51 (4.62, 9.27)	
Range	3.57, 21.32	4.12, 11.65	

542 This table may include multiple visits per patient. All individuals with symptoms of a possible SARS-
543 CoV-2 infection, and a PCR SARS-CoV-2 test ordered by a clinician during the control period (April
544 2020–October 2020) or the intervention period (December 2020– May 2021), were considered eligible
545 for this study and are included in this summary table.

546 ^aWilcoxon rank-sum test

547 ^bTest excludes 'Invalid/other' category

548 ^cPCR SARS-CoV-2 test was the cobas SARS-CoV-2 test on the 6800 System or the ePlex SARS-
549 CoV-2 Test during the control period, and was the Liat SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B test during the
550 intervention period

551 ^dThere were no data in the control period and only one record in the intervention period for 'Other'
552 disposition category. ED LOS summary statistics for 'Other' disposition category were therefore not
553 calculated

554 ICU, intensive care unit; IQR, interquartile range; N/A, not applicable; PCR, polymerase chain
555 reaction; POC, point-of-care; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SD,
556 standard deviation

557 Table 4: Summary of emergency department (ED) disposition

	Control period	Intervention period	p-value^a
	(Centralized PCR)	(POC PCR)	
Total patient visits, n	4339	4540	
ED disposition, n (%)			0.01 ^b
Discharge	2139 (49.30%)	2258 (49.74%)	0.72
Hospital admission	1576 (36.32%)	1741 (38.35%)	0.1
ICU admission	617 (14.22%)	535 (11.78%)	0.0026
Death	7 (0.16%)	6 (0.13%)	0.72
Other	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.02%)	N/A
ED disposition by PCR SARS-CoV-2 test result^c, n, (%)			
Positive	538 (12.40%)	638 (14.05%)	0.0005
Discharge	302 (56.13%)	285 (44.67%)	0.0002
Hospital admission	236 (43.87%)	352 (55.17%)	0.0002
ICU admission	69 (12.83%)	85 (13.32%)	0.8
Death	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.16%)	N/A
Other	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	-
Negative	3789 (87.32%)	3902 (85.95%)	0.0029
Discharge	1830 (48.30%)	1973 (50.56%)	0.09
Hospital admission	1952 (51.52%)	1923 (49.28%)	0.54
ICU admission	547 (14.44%)	450 (11.53%)	0.0006
Death	7 (0.18%)	5 (0.13%)	0.54
Other	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.03%)	N/A
Inconclusive	12 (0.28%)	0 (0.00%)	N/A
Discharge	7 (58.33%)	0 (0.00%)	N/A
Hospital admission	5 (41.67%)	0 (0.00%)	N/A
ICU admission	1 (8.33%)	0 (0.00%)	N/A
Death	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	-
Other	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	-

558 This table may include multiple visits per patient. All individuals with symptoms of a possible SARS-
559 CoV-2 infection, and a PCR SARS-CoV-2 test ordered by a clinician during the control period (April

560 2020–October 2020) or the intervention period (December 2020– May 2021), were considered eligible
561 for this study and are included in this summary table.

562 ^aChi-square test. Subgroup p-values were adjusted for multiplicity using the false discovery rate
563 method

564 ^bTest excludes ‘Other’ disposition category

565 ^cPCR SARS-CoV-2 test was the cobas SARS-CoV-2 test on the 6800 System or the ePlex SARS-
566 CoV-2 Test during the control period, and was the Liat SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B test during the
567 intervention period

568 ICU, intensive care unit; N/A, not applicable; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; POC, point-of-care;
569 SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

570

571 Table 5: Summary of anti-infective prescriptions

	Control period	Intervention period	p-value^a
	(Centralized PCR)	(POC PCR)	
Total patient visits, n	4339	4540	
Anti-infective prescription n, (%)			<0.0001
Antibiotic only	1933 (44.55%)	1730 (38.11%)	<0.0001
Antiviral only	38 (0.94%)	131 (3.13%)	<0.0001
Antibiotic and antiviral	200 (4.61%)	216 (4.76%)	0.74
No antibiotic or antiviral	2168 (49.97%)	2463 (54.25%)	<0.0001
Anti-infective prescription by test result^b, n, (%)			
Positive	538 (12.40%)	638 (14.05%)	<0.0001
Antibiotic only	158 (29.37%)	99 (15.52%)	<0.0001
Antiviral only	20 (3.72%)	95 (14.89%)	<0.0001
Antibiotic and antiviral	83 (15.43%)	129 (20.22%)	0.04
No antibiotic or antiviral	277 (51.49%)	315 (49.37%)	0.47
Negative	3789 (87.32%)	3902 (85.95%)	<0.0001
Antibiotic only	1771 (46.74%)	1631 (41.80%)	<0.0001
Antiviral only	18 (0.48%)	36 (0.92%)	0.02
Antibiotic and antiviral	117 (3.09%)	87 (2.23%)	0.02
No antibiotic or antiviral	1883 (49.70%)	2148 (55.05%)	<0.0001
Invalid/other	12 (0.28%)	0 (0.00%)	N/A
Antibiotic only	4 (33.33%)	0 (0.00%)	N/A
Antiviral only	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	-
Antibiotic and antiviral	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	-
No antibiotic or antiviral	8 (66.67%)	0 (%)	N/A
Anti-infective prescription by ED disposition^{c,d}, n, (%)			
Discharge	2139 (49.30%)	2258 (49.74%)	0.0004
Antibiotic only	437 (20.43%)	388 (17.18%)	0.02
Antiviral only	6 (0.28%)	19 (0.84%)	0.02
Antibiotic and antiviral	7 (0.33%)	1 (0.04%)	0.03
No antibiotic or antiviral	1689 (78.96%)	1850 (81.93%)	0.02

Hospital admission	1576 (36.32%)	1740 (38.33%)	<0.0001
Antibiotic only	1025 (65.04%)	970 (55.75%)	<0.0001
Antiviral only	27 (1.71%)	101 (5.80%)	<0.0001
Antibiotic and antiviral	126 (7.99%)	155 (8.91%)	0.35
No antibiotic or antiviral	398 (25.25%)	514 (29.54%)	0.01
ICU admission	617 (14.22%)	535 (11.78%)	0.02
Antibiotic only	467 (75.69%)	369 (68.97%)	0.03
Antiviral only	5 (0.81%)	11 (2.06%)	0.1
Antibiotic and antiviral	67 (10.86%)	60 (11.21%)	0.85
No antibiotic or antiviral	78 (12.64%)	95 (17.76%)	0.03
Death	7 (0.16%)	6 (0.13%)	0.8
Antibiotic only	4 (57.14%)	3 (50.00%)	0.8
Antiviral only	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	-
Antibiotic and antiviral	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	-
No antibiotic or antiviral	3 (42.86%)	3 (50.00%)	0.8

572 One patient may receive multiple anti-infective prescriptions per visit. Antibiotic or antiviral
 573 prescriptions are counted as one instance per visit. All individuals with symptoms of a possible SARS-
 574 CoV-2 infection, and a PCR SARS-CoV-2 test ordered by a clinician during the control period (April
 575 2020–October 2020) or the intervention period (December 2020– May 2021), were considered eligible
 576 for this study and are included in this summary table.

577 ^aChi-square test. Subgroup p-values were adjusted for multiplicity using the false discovery rate
 578 method

579 ^bPCR SARS-CoV-2 test was the cobas SARS-CoV-2 test on the 6800 System or the ePlex SARS-
 580 CoV-2 Test during the control period, and was the Liat SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B test during the
 581 intervention period

582 ^cThere were no data in the control period and only one record in the intervention period for 'Other'
 583 disposition category. ED LOS summary statistics for 'Other' disposition category were therefore not
 584 calculated

585 ED, emergency department; ICU, intensive care unit; N/A, not applicable; PCR, polymerase chain
586 reaction; POC, point-of-care; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

