

1 **A multistage mixed-methods evaluation protocol for the**
2 **national testing response during the COVID-19 pandemic in**
3 **England**
4

5 Reshania Naidoo^{1,2*}, Ben Lambert^{3,4}, Merryn Voysey⁵, Rima Shretta², Claire Keene², Marta Wanat⁶,
6 Billie Andersen-Waine⁷, Prabin Dahal⁷, Kasia Stepniowska⁷, Rachel Hounsell², Sassy Molyneux², Emily
7 Rowe¹, Sarah Pinto-Duschinsky¹, Gulsen Yenidogan¹, Tom Fowler⁸, Lisa J White⁹, and the EY-Oxford
8 Health Analytics Consortium **

9
10 ¹Ernst & Young (EY) UKI Health Sciences and Wellness, London, UK

11 ²NDM Centre for Global Health Research, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, UK

12 ³Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, UK

13 ⁴College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

14 ⁵Oxford Vaccine Group, Department of Paediatrics, University of Oxford, UK

15 ⁶Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

16 ⁷Infectious Diseases Data Observatory, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, UK

17 ⁸UK Health Security Agency

18 ⁹Big Data Institute, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, UK

19

20 *Corresponding author: Reshania Naidoo, email: Reshania.naidoo@ndm.ox.ac.uk

21 **The EY-Oxford Health Analytics Consortium membership list is attached in Appendix A

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 **Abstract**

32 **Introduction**

33 In 2020, the UK government established a large-scale testing programme to rapidly identify
34 individuals in England who were infected with SARS-CoV-2 and had COVID-19. This
35 comprised part of the UK government's COVID-19 response strategy, to protect those at risk
36 of severe COVID-19 disease and death and to reduce the burden on the health system. To
37 assess the success of this approach, the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) commissioned
38 an independent evaluation of the activities delivered by the National Health System (NHS)
39 testing programme in England. The primary purpose of this evaluation will be to capture key
40 learnings from the rollout of testing to different target populations via various testing
41 services between October 2020 and March 2022 and to use these insights to formulate
42 recommendations for future pandemic preparedness strategy. In this protocol, we detail the
43 rationale, approach and study design.

44 **Methods and analysis**

45 The proposed study involves a stepwise mixed-methods approach, aligned with established
46 methods for the evaluation of complex interventions in health, to retrospectively assess the
47 combined impact of key asymptomatic and symptomatic testing services nationally. The
48 research team will first develop a Theory of Change, formulated in collaboration with testing
49 service stakeholders, to understand the causal pathways and intended and unintended
50 outcomes of each testing service and explore contextual impacts on each testing service's
51 intended outcomes. Insights gained will help identify indicators to evaluate how the
52 combined aims of the testing programme were achieved, using a mixed methods approach.

53 **Ethics and dissemination** The study protocol was granted ethics approval by the UKHSA
54 Research Ethics and Governance Group (reference NR0347). All relevant ethics guidelines
55 will be followed throughout. Findings arising from this evaluation will be used to inform
56 lessons learnt and recommendations for UKHSA on appropriate pandemic preparedness
57 testing programme designs; findings will also be disseminated in peer-reviewed journals and
58 at academic conferences. This will be the first evaluation to produce a portfolio of evidence
59 in relation to the testing effectiveness and public health impact of the national testing
60 programme in England, encompassing behavioural, economic, equity and public health
61 impacts. These findings will strengthen the evidence base with regards to the effectiveness
62 of COVID-19 testing and identify which aspects are necessary to prioritise in mitigating
63 future pandemic threats when deploying a complex public health intervention such as
64 testing.

65 **Transparency declaration:** The lead author (the manuscript's guarantor) affirms that the
66 manuscript is an honest, accurate and transparent account of the study being reported; no
67 important aspects of the study have been omitted, and any discrepancies from the study as
68 planned have been explained.

69 **Strengths and limitations of this protocol**

- 70 • Strengths of this mixed methods evaluation protocol include the use of theory-
71 based, complex evaluation approaches and an iterative and participatory approach
72 with the stakeholder (UKHSA) to the evaluation process.
- 73 • Given the scale and complexity of the COVID-19 testing response in England, there is
74 a scarcity of previous relevant research, either in England or appropriate

75 international comparators, warranting the mixed methods evaluation approach we
76 will employ.

- 77 • To the best of the authors' knowledge, this is the first national-scale evaluation of
78 the COVID-19 testing programme in England to incorporate the broadest scope of
79 testing services, a programme that formed an integral part of the UK pandemic
80 response strategy. The approach proposed could be applied to the evaluation of
81 pandemic responses in other contexts or to other types of interventions.
- 82 • Whereas most complex interventions are ideally accompanied by a prospective
83 evaluation design initiated at the time of the intervention or earlier, this study will
84 predominantly comprise a retrospective evaluation and is therefore limited by the
85 quality of existing research and the data available to the research team at the time
86 of conducting the evaluation, within the specified eight-month period allocated by
87 UKHSA. As the UK government is in the process of consolidating data and policy
88 related to the COVID-19 pandemic and subject to an independent inquiry, certain
89 datasets may not be available to the researchers at the time of conducting the
90 evaluation.
- 91 • The scope of testing services to be evaluated and the selection of methods has been
92 guided by the study sponsor team within UKHSA and must be achievable within the
93 timeframe of the funding allocated to the study (eight months). Therefore, some
94 trade-offs had to be made in terms of selecting research methods that would be
95 feasible within this time constraint. For future evaluations, a mixed methods
96 approach could be complemented by qualitative interviews with members of the
97 public to gauge their experiences of testing and test-related behaviours, as well as an

98 evaluation of other testing services that were out of scope for this research,
99 including in prisons, the private sector and the events testing programme.

100 **Introduction**

101 On 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a pandemic
102 and exhorted member states to ‘test, test, test’.(1) In response to the COVID-19 pandemic,
103 the UK government committed to mass testing, with initial testing commencing in March
104 2020.(2) NHS Test and Trace (NHSTT) was formally established in in May 2020, as a part of
105 the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC), to lead an ‘at scale’ national testing and
106 tracing service.(3) The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) was established, also as an
107 Executive Agency of DHSC, on 1 April 2021 and was operational on 1 October 2021.(4)
108 UKHSA combines the health protection, clinical and scientific functions formerly carried out
109 by Public Health England (PHE) with the functions of NHSTT and the Joint Biosecurity Centre
110 (JBC).(5)

111 During the initial phases of the pandemic, in the absence of pharmaceutical interventions or
112 a vaccine, testing was seen as a key means to reopen society. The UK government’s COVID-
113 19 response strategy was therefore deployed in the context of mitigating the impact of the
114 pandemic and the measures employed to control it on key areas of society, such as
115 education, protection of livelihoods and preventative and mental health.(6) NHSTT was
116 tasked with providing mass-scale testing and tracing systems to rapidly identify individuals
117 with COVID-19 and their close contacts, thereby minimising the spread of the disease.(7)
118 The NHSTT programme had four main stated objectives: 1) to increase the speed and
119 availability of testing, 2) to identify close contacts of positive cases and require them to
120 isolate, 3) to contain local outbreaks via a coordinated response, and 4) to enable the
121 government to learn more about the virus and explore ways to ease infection control
122 measures as the science developed.(3) The programme, at its scale, was the first of its kind

123 in the UK and was created and delivered at pace during a period of unprecedented
124 uncertainty.

125 The testing programme component of NHSTT played an integral role in the government's
126 COVID-19 response through the programme's various testing services. The testing
127 programme sought to work in partnership with national and local public health bodies, local
128 authorities, the NHS, and commercial and academic providers. The delivery of testing for
129 each of the target populations was multi-modal, through combinations of in-person testing,
130 e.g. public regional testing sites and mobile testing units, and via pharmacies and home
131 direct self-test kit deliveries; it was also driven in part by the technology available at the
132 time, e.g. accredited self-sample collection was originally not an option, so physical testing
133 sites were required. The delivery of testing was initially focused on regional and local PCR
134 testing sites, followed by service-specific testing sites, then PCR and LFD home testing was
135 rolled out as evidence accrued that this was a viable approach. These approaches to testing
136 were subject to ongoing revision by policymakers throughout the pandemic, dependent on
137 factors such as changing epidemiological prevalence, the emergence of new variants of
138 concern, e.g. the Delta and Omicron variants, updated scientific evidence and vaccination
139 rollout.(8)

140 Tests for COVID-19 include those that detect the presence of the SARS-CoV-2 virus and
141 those that detect the presence of antibodies to the virus.(9) Tests for the virus that detect
142 viral nucleic acid, such as polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and loop-mediated isothermal
143 amplification (LAMP), are usually performed in a laboratory. These tests can appear positive
144 beyond the period of infectiousness.(10) Lateral flow devices (LFDs) are test devices that can
145 detect SARS-CoV-2 viral protein (antigen) and represent a more rapid approach to testing.

146 They can also be used for self-testing, although they are less sensitive than nucleic acid-
147 based tests (11) and tend only to appear positive during the period of maximal viral
148 shedding.(12) At the start of the pandemic, only PCR tests were available for testing swabs
149 from suspected cases of COVID-19; however, LFDs for COVID-19 were rapidly developed and
150 being evaluated for use by mid-2020.(13) LFDs were initially rolled out for asymptomatic
151 testing, followed by a confirmatory PCR test in the case of a positive LFD result.

152 The overall success and effectiveness of any national COVID-19 testing service is dependent
153 on multiple contextual factors and the combined impacts of the various testing services.
154 From a public health perspective, increased testing has been shown to result in reduced
155 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and associated hospitalisations and mortality.(14-18)
156 Behavioural responses to testing strategies are dependent on public awareness and trust,
157 with adherence to testing policy shown to be driven by perceptions of disease risk and
158 socioeconomic factors.(19) From an equity perspective, COVID-19 testing has been found to
159 exacerbate existing health inequities, with disparities in access to testing for individuals
160 from ethnic minority backgrounds and those living in socially deprived areas.(20) The
161 economic impact of testing can be assessed via cost-effectiveness evaluations of testing
162 strategies, including testing unit costs, operational deployment costs and, on a macro-
163 economic level, quantifying the economic productivity gained from shortened isolation
164 periods and savings to the taxpayer.(21, 22)

165 UKHSA has appointed a consortium from Ernst & Young LLP in partnership with academics
166 from the University of Oxford, contracted through Oxford University Innovation Limited, to
167 carry out an evaluation of the testing programme; the evaluation will take eight months.
168 This consortium (hereafter referred to as 'the evaluation consortium') will undertake an

169 independent evaluation of the testing capabilities delivered by the national COVID-19
170 testing programme in England from October 2020 to March 2022 (hereafter referred to as
171 ‘the evaluation’), with a focus on public health outcomes. This evaluation will seek to
172 capture key learnings from the rollout of testing to the various target populations via the
173 different testing services during this period. The insights gained will inform the formulation
174 of key considerations and recommendations for future pandemic preparedness. Owing to
175 the complexity and rapidly evolving nature of the testing response, no evaluation of the
176 national testing service in England, utilising a mixed methods approach, has been conducted
177 to date.

178 **Testing services in scope**

179 The evaluation consortium and UKHSA has decided to conduct an overarching evaluation of
180 the national COVID-19 testing programme in England by assessing the combined impact of
181 the asymptomatic and symptomatic testing services. A major component of this will be an
182 evaluation of the universal testing service. This will be complemented by ‘deep-dive’
183 evaluations of three ‘priority’ testing services (see table 1 for further details):

- 184 • Schools (secondary school pupils aged 11 to 18 years)
- 185 • Adult social care (staff and residents in care homes)
- 186 • Healthcare workers

187 These four services have been included to ensure a broad spectrum of testing populations in
188 England will be evaluated within the given timeframe, i.e. high volumes (universal testing),
189 high-contact groups (schools) and high-risk groups (care homes and healthcare workers), to

190 best reflect the challenges faced during the pandemic and to balance the findings and
191 recommendations for future pandemics.

192 Table 1. Overview of the testing services of the COVID-19 testing programme identified as
193 within scope for this evaluation

194

Testing service	Purpose of testing
Schools	Testing of staff and students to prevent transmission within schools and, as they are a high-contact group, within the community and to allow schools to continue functioning as normally as possible
Adult social care	Testing to prevent outbreaks in vulnerable populations (predominantly those in care homes and those receiving domiciliary care)
Healthcare	Testing of NHS staff and patients to reduce the risk of transmission within hospital and other healthcare settings, which could then impact transmission in the community
Universal testing	Rapid, asymptomatic, at-home testing with LFDs that were made available to the general public to enable faster detection of cases, thereby allowing more rapid self-isolation

195

196 The evaluation will follow a hypothesis-led approach, with three key hypotheses developed;
197 based on these hypotheses, the evaluation will seek to answer several research questions
198 (box 1).

199 Box 1. Hypotheses developed and research questions to be explored in the evaluation

Hypothesis 1: testing services aimed at protecting high-risk groups, e.g. people in care homes and healthcare workers, led to a reduction in hospitalisations and deaths in these risk groups

Hypothesis 2: testing services aimed at high-contact groups, e.g. children in schools, led to a reduction in hospitalisations and deaths in the general population

Hypothesis 3: testing services aimed at increasing access to and eligibility for testing and targeting disproportionately impacted groups, e.g. the universal testing service, led to increased testing uptake in these populations

Research questions:

1. How was the national COVID-19 testing programme delivered and what factors affected this?
2. What were the barriers and facilitators to access, use and deliver the programme?
3. What were the costs and the cost-effectiveness of the programme?
4. For the universal testing service:
 - a. Did the diversity of those reporting test results increase?
 - b. Did the barriers and facilitators for testing, reporting and acting on a result change?
5. For each testing service:
 - a. Did the service achieve UKHSA's intended aims and purposes of the service?
 - b. Was the service cost-effective?
 - c. If testing were to be implemented again, what are the barriers and facilitators to increase access, use and delivery of tests?

201 **Methodology**

202 **Principles guiding the evaluation**

203 The testing programme can be considered to be a complex public health intervention due to
204 the complexity of the intervention design, which evolved over time according to policy
205 changes and the evolving disease context within which it was implemented.(23) Therefore,
206 this retrospective evaluation will employ a mixed methods approach, utilising existing
207 frameworks that have previously been applied to the evaluation of complex interventions,
208 being broadly divided into process, outcome and impact evaluation components.(24-27)

209 The evaluation will consist of a phased process:

- 210 • A scoping phase, to develop a Theory of Change (ToC), evaluation aims and research
211 questions
- 212 • A design phase, to agree the mixed methods approach to the evaluation and confirm
213 process, outcome and impact indicators
- 214 • A conduct phase, to collect, review and synthesise data
- 215 • A recommend phase, during which findings and data will be triangulated to form
216 conclusions and recommendations

217 The Medical Research Council (MRC) framework for process evaluation details three key
218 interrelated components required as part of any evaluation of a complex public health
219 process: implementation, mechanisms of impact, and context.(27) The ToC approach(28, 29)
220 – a theory of how and why an initiative works – will therefore be used to map the causal
221 pathways for each of the testing services, as this approach lends itself to understanding
222 complex interventions with multiple causal pathways.(30) The ToC framework will be used

223 to understand the causal pathways and intended and unintended outcomes of each service,
224 as well as exploring the effect of context on each individual testing service's intended
225 outcomes.

226 The ToCs will be formulated utilising existing evidence provided by UKHSA and will be
227 subject to further refinement following interviews with UKHSA policy and operational
228 stakeholders. Insights from existing UK government-commissioned evidence in the form of
229 previous COVID-19 service-specific testing evaluations and pilot testing programme data will
230 be utilised where possible to avoid duplication of work. Owing to the unpredictability of
231 evaluating complex interventions such as this, sufficient flexibility will be allowed within the
232 research design to allow emerging research questions to be addressed.(27)

233 A comprehensive ToC for each of the testing services in scope will subsequently inform
234 process and outcome indicators (table 2) that will be used to assess each service, address
235 the research questions and determine how well each service met its objectives and
236 intended purpose.(31) Based on data availability and granularity, these indicators will be
237 further refined based on what is achievable within the evaluation timeframe.

238 The indicators will be categorised as follows:

- 239 • Process and output indicators: how did the delivery and uptake of the service
240 compare with what was planned over time, and what factors affected this?
- 241 • Outcome indicators: what was the effectiveness of each service in terms of its
242 intended outcomes?
- 243 • Impact indicators: what were the broader economic and societal impacts? What
244 were the overall impacts on minimising transmission while limiting harm?

245 A gap analysis will also be performed during the ‘conduct’ stage to determine whether any
 246 crucial data, research or information is unavailable within the existing literature or data
 247 sources provided by UKHSA and whether subsequent adjustment of the research questions
 248 or descopeing is required. This will be decided through a participatory consultation approach
 249 with key UKHSA stakeholders.

250 Table 2. Example of potential evaluation indicators for the overall national testing
 251 programme

Indicator type	Indicator description	Proposed method type to evaluate the indicator
PROCESS/OUTPUT	Average percentage of LFDs distributed that were reported over the 18-month time period	Statistical
	Average percentage of PCR tests registered that were reported over the 18-month time period	Statistical
	Number of LFDs distributed over the 18-month time period	Statistical
	Number of PCR tests registered over the 18-month time period (separated by Pillars 1 and 2* and total)	Statistical
	Cost per LFD conducted over the 18-month time period	Economic
	Cost per PCR test conducted over the 18-month time period	Economic
	Total financial cost of the testing service over the 18-month time period	Economic
	Total number of tests reported per week	Statistical
	Reported test positivity of LFD and PCR by indices of multiple deprivation (IMD) decile before and after rollout of universal testing	Statistical
Ratio of mean number of reported tests in the upper income decile: the lowest income decile	Statistical	
OUTCOME	Number of hospitalisations averted with different assumptions of reductions in new cases	Economic
	Number of deaths averted with different assumptions of reductions in new cases	Economic
	Cost savings from hospitalisations averted with different assumptions of reductions in new cases	Economic
	What were the barriers and facilitators to taking a test, reporting a test and acting on a positive test result?	Rapid scoping review
IMPACT	Cost per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) gained with different assumptions of reductions in new cases	Economic

252 *Pillar 1: swab testing for SARS-CoV-2 in UKHSA laboratories and NHS hospitals for those with a clinical need and for health
 253 and care workers; Pillar 2: swab testing for SARS-CoV-2 in the wider population, through commercial partnerships, either
 254 processed in a laboratory or more rapidly via LFDs

255 **Mixed methods approach to be used in the evaluation**

256 A convergent parallel mixed-methods approach will be taken to provide a more holistic
257 understanding of the testing programme, allowing the researchers to capture any
258 unanticipated aspects of testing that may be relevant to the research questions and to
259 explain the quantitative findings.(32)

260 Findings from the rapid scoping review will be triangulated with the results of the statistical
261 and economic analyses and fed back into the developing ToCs, to refine and explain the
262 indicators, address the hypotheses and help form the recommendations for each testing
263 service during the various evaluation phases. In addition, findings across each of the four
264 testing services will be compared, with the aim of identifying universal as well as service-
265 specific barriers and facilitators to testing, reporting and self-isolation following a positive
266 test result.

267 The ToCs will be populated in a collaborative manner, enabling the quantitative and
268 qualitative research teams between them to define and align the process and outcome
269 indicators for each testing service. Each team will conduct research concurrently for the
270 various testing services and will communicate their findings at weekly meetings, allowing for
271 emerging findings to be discussed and explored further if deemed necessary. Findings will
272 also be synthesised across the testing services to inform programme-level insights to meet
273 the programme-level research aims and inform the overarching ToC and indicators.

274 ***Qualitative data analysis: rapid scoping review of testing behaviours***

275 A rapid scoping review will be conducted to evaluate the barriers and facilitators to
276 engaging with COVID-19 testing, reporting results and self-isolating following a positive

277 result in the United Kingdom. This review will aim to 1) provide a summary of the research
278 undertaken on this topic available both in the UKHSA grey literature and in the wider
279 academic literature, 2) identify gaps in research efforts, and 3) provide an overview of key
280 barriers and facilitators for engagement with each testing service, as well for the overall
281 testing programme. A scoping study approach has been selected as the method to
282 synthesise the broad knowledge base on this topic, owing to the large volume of
283 heterogenous literature available and to accommodate the time constraints of the
284 commissioned evaluation.(33) The scoping review will be conducted adhering to the 2005
285 Arksey and O'Malley framework,(34) incorporating the adaptations proposed in 2010 by
286 Levac and colleagues on iterative study selection and stakeholder consultation (35) and also
287 using the 2015 Joanna Briggs Institute guidance on conducting scoping reviews.(36) The
288 findings will be reported according to the standardised PRISMA-ScR (Preferred Reporting
289 Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews)
290 checklist.(37)

291 **Search strategy and the selection of evidence**

292 A wide search strategy has been developed, using key phrases from relevant articles(34)
293 (see table 3 for categories and example terms). This will be used to identify literature that
294 describes behaviour around COVID-19 testing, reporting and self-isolation in the UK during
295 the COVID-19 pandemic. The search strategy will be adapted for each database and
296 information source that is searched and will be refined based on key words in sources
297 identified during the search.

298

299

300

301 Table 3. Search categories and examples of search terms

302

Category	Example search terms
COVID-19	COVID* OR corona OR coronavirus OR SARS-CoV-2 OR "SARS CoV 2" OR "SARS CoV-2" OR SARS-CoV2 OR SARSCoV2 OR "Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2" OR "Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Corona Virus 2" OR 2019-nCoV
AND	
Key activities	test* OR screen* OR RT-PCR OR PCR OR "polymerase chain reaction" OR "lateral flow" OR "lateral flow device*" OR "lateral flow assay*" OR LFD OR self-test* OR "test and trace" OR "contact trac*" OR surveillance OR POCT OR report* OR self-report* OR selfreport* OR "test positive" OR "testing positive" OR result* OR "self-isolation" OR "self isolation" OR isolat* OR containment OR reopening OR re-opening OR mitigat* OR flatten*
AND	
Behaviour, barriers and facilitators	knowledge OR understand* OR attitude* OR perception* OR perceive OR belief* OR believ* OR expectation* OR trust OR willing* OR intention* OR behaviour* OR behavior* OR practice* OR enact* OR engag* OR adher* OR complian* OR comply OR experience* OR view* OR motivation* OR barrier* OR block* OR challeng* OR difficult* OR facilitat* OR enabl* OR access* OR feasib* OR accept* OR uptake
AND	
Research methods	qualitative* OR interview* OR FGD OR "focus group*" OR survey* OR questionnaire* OR mixed-method* OR "mixed method*" OR ethnograph* OR theme OR thematic* OR "grounded theory" OR "content analysis" OR field-work OR "field work" OR selfreport* OR self-report* OR "self report*" OR view* OR experience* OR hermeneutic OR phenomenolog*
AND	
Geographic setting	"United Kingdom" OR UK OR England OR Ireland OR Irish OR Scot* OR Wales OR Britain OR British OR NHS OR "National Health Service*" OR UKHSA OR "United Kingdom Health Security Agency" OR "UK Health Security Agency" OR "Channel Island*" OR London OR Birmingham OR Liverpool OR Manchester OR Cardiff OR Belfast OR Edinburgh OR Glasgow

303

304 The databases to be searched include PubMed, Scopus and the WHO COVID-19 Research

305 Database. The search strategy aims to identify both published and unpublished studies

306 (including grey literature), as well as reports and guidance documentation. Research,

307 published from 1 January 2020 onwards and in English, will be included in the review if they

308 focus on one or more of the following three behaviours: undertaking a test, reporting a test

309 result and self-isolating following a positive result, symptoms or a positive contact (see table
 310 4 for search limits and eligibility criteria).

311 Table 4. Summary of the search parameters and limits as well as the inclusion and exclusion
 312 criteria, categorised according to the ‘population, context, concept’ search framework. (34,
 313 36)

314 *Click or tap here to enter text.*

	Inclusion	Exclusion
SEARCH LIMITS		
Language	Published in English	Published in languages other than English
Dates	Published between 1 January 2020 and the search date (the database search was conducted on 7 November 2022 and the UKHSA documents were received throughout September to December 2022)	Published before 2020
Methods	Qualitative or mixed-methods studies; quantitative surveys	Quantitative studies only reporting associations between demographic variables and behavioural outcomes
ELIGIBILITY		
Literature	Journal articles, peer-reviewed material, articles under review, published books and book chapters, other academic research, research commissioned by governments, unpublished reports	Opinion or statement pieces, magazine articles, blog posts
Population	England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales and the islands making up the British Isles; multi-country studies were included if they included one of these settings	Countries outside the UK, including the Republic of Ireland
Concept (key activities)	Descriptions of individuals’ behaviour and/or barriers to testing and/or facilitators to testing with regards to the following key activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Antigen testing for COVID-19 (with a focus on LFDs, but including LAMP and PCR testing) - Reporting test results - Isolating (with a focus on isolating due to a positive COVID-19 test result, but including isolating after being identified as a close contact of a COVID-19-positive case) The description of behaviours included associations of survey responses with behaviour or intention to test, report or isolate	Descriptions of testing, reporting or self-isolation but not the behaviour associated with them, e.g. describes the sensitivity of a specific test Descriptions of testing for antibodies Descriptions of the barriers or facilitators to self-isolation in the context of social distancing, self-isolation if symptomatic or traveller isolation (hotel quarantine) Descriptions of associations of demographic factors with behaviour or intention to test, report or isolate Testing, reporting results or self-isolation after a positive result in the context of other diseases Descriptions of facilitators or

		barriers to other COVID-19-related behaviours, such as vaccination or social distancing Descriptions of the impact of testing/reporting/self-isolation on behaviour Knowledge, attitudes or perceptions in relation to COVID-19 itself
--	--	--

315

316

317 **Stakeholder-identified supplementary data**

318 UKHSA has identified a repository of data and documentation, comprising more than 5000
319 reports and internal documents, that may be of potential relevance to the evaluation. Upon
320 commencement of the evaluation, and if a review of the documents highlights further
321 potentially relevant sources, additional documentation will be requested by the evaluation
322 consortium. This documentation will be searched for evidence that supports the
323 consortium's efforts to understand how the testing services were intended to work, how
324 they were experienced and any prior measurement of their effectiveness. Supplementary
325 documents to be provided by UKHSA could include:

- 326 • Testing guidance published by UKHSA
- 327 • Testing process documentation
- 328 • Business cases
- 329 • Primary qualitative or quantitative research (including behavioural studies)
- 330 • Documentation involving reporting, managing or measuring the testing programme
- 331 • Previous evaluations of testing services

332 Once all of the publicly available data have been screened, these stakeholder-identified
333 sources will also be reviewed for inclusion.

334 **Stakeholder consultation**

335 Stakeholder engagement is considered useful for adding methodological rigour to scoping
336 studies.(35) Therefore, stakeholders from the evaluation sponsor team within UKHSA will be
337 consulted to help identify additional sources of published and unpublished evidence
338 (described above in ‘Supplementary Data’) and offer perspective and validate the findings.
339 Additional sources identified in this way will be included in the scoping review as
340 ‘stakeholder-identified studies’,(38) and insights from these conversations with stakeholders
341 will be anonymised and incorporated into the discussion of the scoping review results. Due
342 to the rapid turnover of testing programme staff members, the availability of stakeholders
343 that the research team will be able to interview is limited. However, the research team has
344 been provided with the names of at least ten policy staff per testing service to interview as
345 part of the stakeholder consultation. This list of names was provided by the funder.

346 Ethics Committee approval for this research has been granted on the basis that informed
347 consent be sought prior to engaging with any UKHSA stakeholders and that anonymity will
348 be preserved in our write-up of the findings. To preserve anonymity, robust measures will
349 be implemented, including the development of pseudonyms or codes for participants,
350 secure storage of data on UKHSA laptops and careful handling of information during data
351 analysis and reporting. The anonymity preservation strategy has been discussed and refined
352 in collaboration with the study sponsor (UKHSA) and their stakeholders, prior to ethics
353 approval being granted.

354 **Data extraction, charting and synthesis**

355 Data extracted from each evidence source will include study metadata (authors, title, year
356 of publication/dissemination, publication stage, country, participant characteristics and
357 methods), the setting (testing service and key activity), and information about the
358 perceptions, experiences and the barriers and facilitators to each of the key activities
359 (testing, reporting and isolating).

360 All sources will be collated, uploaded into Rayyan, and duplicates removed.(39) Following
361 an initial screening pilot to refine the eligibility criteria, titles and abstracts will then be
362 screened by two reviewers for assessment against the refined inclusion criteria. A sample of
363 $\geq 20\%$ will be reviewed by a third reviewer to ensure consistency of inclusion.(35) The inter-
364 rater agreement will then be calculated for the final list using Gwet's first-order agreement
365 coefficient (AC1). (40) Potentially relevant sources will be extracted fully and then assessed
366 against the inclusion criteria. Any disagreements will be resolved through discussion, and
367 with an additional reviewer if no consensus is reached. The same process will be undertaken
368 for the supplementary data.

369 Once all the data have been extracted and assessed against the inclusion criteria, we will
370 synthesise the data thematically. This process will be repeated for each testing service.

371 Given the rapid timelines, the aim of the work and the scoping study methodology guidance,
372 the included publications will not be assessed for quality.

373 ***Quantitative data analysis: statistical methods***

374 **Data collection**

375 Quantitative data will be obtained via the secretariat of the study sponsor within UKHSA,
376 existing UKHSA repositories, the UK Office for National Statistics (ONS), NHS Digital and
377 Public Health Scotland; by applying directly to various holders of non-public datasets; and
378 from other public sources of data where available, such as ISARIC (International Severe
379 Acute Respiratory and Emerging Infection Consortium). General datasets will include SARS-
380 CoV-2 seroprevalence surveys; COVID-19 vaccination data; testing coverage data; and
381 COVID-19 cases, hospitalisations and deaths.

382 **Data analysis**

383 The data will be analysed with the aim of 1) providing summaries of indicators identified in
384 the ToCs, in relation to the implementation of each testing service, to better understand the
385 extent and reach of each service and validate findings from the rapid scoping review in
386 relation to behaviours; and 2) providing estimates of the impact of each testing service,
387 which will feed into the cost-effectiveness evaluations. Service-specific statistical
388 approaches will be developed for each of the four testing services.

389 Specified primary outcome indicators will be defined for each testing service, as defined in
390 the ToCs. Outcomes and appropriate counterfactual comparators will be defined,
391 contingent on obtaining access to relevant data sources; these definitions may be refined
392 using an iterative process based on concurrent analysis of qualitative data from the rapid
393 scoping review. For each testing service, a regression-based approach(24) will be
394 undertaken together with analysis of data at the local authority level (or, if the data allow, at
395 a finer spatial aggregation), accounting for potential confounding factors such as age, sex
396 and ethnicity profiles, as well as indicators of deprivation, population density and relevant
397 chronic illnesses. If determined to be relevant, in collaboration with UKHSA stakeholders,

398 predictors of engagement with health services, such as vaccination uptake or access to
399 internet services, will also be included.

400 Where available, reported case and prevalence data at the lower tier local authority (LTLA)
401 level will be combined to determine true case-detection ratios, defined as the percentage of
402 all true cases that were captured by the national testing programme, using the statistical
403 debiasing methodology described by Nicholson et al.(41)

404 ***Quantitative data analysis: economic evaluation methods***

405 **Data collection**

406 The economic analyses will primarily comprise cost-effectiveness analyses, adopting a
407 provider perspective, incorporating costs to the NHS and to local authorities. For the schools
408 testing service analysis, a societal perspective will be adopted to quantify potential
409 productivity losses. A rapid literature review of publicly available economic data will be
410 conducted using keyword searches of scientific databases, as well as a search of the grey
411 literature using Google Scholar. Data relating to the volumes of tests distributed to the
412 various testing services and the associated costs will be obtained from UKHSA. Data relating
413 to payments made to individuals who were isolating, and other payments made, will be
414 obtained from DHSC. Costs will be apportioned to the four testing services according to the
415 volumes of tests distributed. The costs of hospitalisations will be obtained from the National
416 Schedule of NHS Costs 2020/21.(42)

417 **Data analysis**

418 The data will be analysed with the aim of 1) providing an estimate of the costs for each
419 testing service and 2) providing estimates of the value for money of each testing service.

420 The outcome measure of quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) gained will be used for the
421 economic analyses. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) defines a
422 QALY as ‘a measure of the state of health of a person or group in which the benefits, in
423 terms of length of life, are adjusted to reflect the quality of life. One QALY is equal to 1 year
424 of life in perfect health. QALYs are calculated by estimating the years of life remaining for a
425 patient following a particular treatment or intervention and weighting each year with a
426 quality-of-life score (on a 0 to 1 scale)’.⁽⁴³⁾ The cost per QALY gained is a critical value that
427 can be used to determine whether an intervention is cost-effective and is used by NICE to
428 determine whether a proposed new treatment can be covered by the NHS. We will use a
429 value of GBP 70,000 as the willingness to pay threshold for interventions for COVID-19,
430 based on HM Treasury’s Green Book (2022).⁽⁴⁴⁾ This means that an intervention that costs
431 less than GBP 70,000 per QALY gained can be considered cost-effective. In any graphs
432 produced, we will also indicate the NICE willingness to pay threshold of GBP 30,000, for
433 reference. QALY weights will be obtained from the relevant literature. Sensitivity analyses
434 will be conducted to test the outcomes against the assumptions, using ranges of estimates
435 from the statistical analyses and the literature, for each of the testing services.

436 **Data management plan**

437 All individuals on the research team will have UK government Baseline Personnel Security
438 Standard clearance.⁽⁴⁵⁾ All ‘official-sensitive’ data will be accessed via official, UKHSA-
439 approved secure portals and secure UKHSA laptops. All data to be used in the proposed
440 evaluation will be obtained from UKHSA, allied UK government bodies, such as NHS Digital
441 and the Office for National Statistics (ONS), and independent research organisations.

442

443 **Discussion**

444 The national COVID-19 testing programme in England was rapidly set up, scaled, and
445 adapted over time in response to emerging knowledge about COVID-19 transmission,
446 severity and the availability of other public health interventions, such as vaccination. As a
447 result, ongoing monitoring and evaluation of testing as a public health intervention and its
448 effectiveness was not uniformly implemented. This evaluation will therefore aim to
449 retrospectively evaluate the national testing programme in England as a whole, with a deep
450 dive into the schools, adult social care, healthcare worker and universal testing services,
451 using a mixed-methods approach. We believe that the combined strengths of quantitative
452 and qualitative approaches are necessary to evaluate such a complex intervention and will
453 allow for a broader spectrum of insights and triangulation to inform future learnings.

454 For the purpose of this evaluation, alongside a high-level evaluation of the national testing
455 programme as a whole, we have chosen to narrow our scope to conduct deep dives into
456 four testing services to reflect the spectrum of the impact of testing on both high-risk and
457 high-contact populations and to generate learnings that will be of most value, within the
458 constraints of the evaluation time period.

459 To the best of the authors' knowledge, this evaluation will be the first of its kind to produce
460 a portfolio of evidence on testing effectiveness and public health impact for a nationally
461 deployed testing service, focusing on the behavioural, economic, equity and public health
462 impacts. The findings of the evaluation are expected to strengthen the evidence base in
463 relation to COVID-19 testing and identify which aspects when deploying a complex public

464 health intervention, such as testing, will be necessary for decision-makers to prioritise when
465 mitigating future pandemic threats.

466 **Funding statement**

467 This study will be funded by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care acting as part
468 of the Crown through the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), reference number
469 C80260/PRO5331.

470 **Ethics statement**

471 This study protocol has been granted ethics approval by the UKHSA Research Ethics and
472 Governance Group (reference NR0347). All relevant ethics guidelines have been followed.
473 Should the research approach or methods change following this version of the protocol, the
474 UKHSA Research Ethics and Governance Group will be notified and the appropriate ethics
475 guidelines followed.

476 **Disclaimer**

477 This protocol represents research in progress, commissioned and funded by UKHSA, to be
478 performed between August 2022 and March 2023. The scope and depth of testing services
479 covered by this research were pre-agreed with UKHSA and were limited to the availability
480 and provision of data available at the time this protocol was written. The corresponding
481 author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors, and does grant on behalf of all
482 authors, an exclusive licence (or non-exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide
483 basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in
484 BMJ editions and any other BMJ Publishing Group Ltd products and sublicences such use

485 and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in the licence. No patients or members of the
486 public were involved in this research.

487 **Acknowledgements**

488 Scientific writing assistance and editorial support was provided by Adam Bodley, according
489 to Good Publication Practice guidelines. The authors would like to acknowledge the efforts
490 of the UKHSA Scientific Advisory Group, who provided peer review and approval of the
491 study protocol on behalf of the funder.

492 **Competing interests statement**

493 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at
494 www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare that all authors had financial support from
495 the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) for the submitted work; Ernst & Young LLP London
496 has previously received payment for consultancy and advisory work on the NHS Test and
497 Trace response from the UK Department of Health and Social Care, prior to the
498 establishment of the UK Health Security Agency. There are no other relationships or
499 activities that have or could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509 References

- 510 1. World Health Organization. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing
511 on COVID-19 - 16 March 2020: World Health Organization; 2020 [Available from:
512 [https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-](https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---16-march-2020)
513 [the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---16-march-2020](https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---16-march-2020).
- 514 2. Department of Health and Social Care. Coronavirus (COVID-19): scaling up our testing
515 programmes 2020 [Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-scaling-up-testing-programmes/coronavirus-covid-19-scaling-up-our-testing-programmes)
516 [covid-19-scaling-up-testing-programmes/coronavirus-covid-19-scaling-up-our-testing-programmes](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-scaling-up-testing-programmes/coronavirus-covid-19-scaling-up-our-testing-programmes).
- 517 3. Department of Health and Social Care. Government launches NHS Test and Trace service
518 London: HM Government; 2020 [Available from:
519 <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-launches-nhs-test-and-trace-service>.
- 520 4. UK Health Security Agency. UKHSA Annual Report and Accounts 2021-2022. London: HMSO;
521 2023. Available from:
522 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1131855/UKHSA_Annual_Report_21_22_FINAL.pdf)
523 [/1131855/UKHSA_Annual_Report_21_22_FINAL.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1131855/UKHSA_Annual_Report_21_22_FINAL.pdf).
- 524 5. UK Health Security Agency. Test and Trace: overarching privacy notice 2021 [Available from:
525 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-test-and-trace-privacy-information/test-and-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-test-and-trace-privacy-information/test-and-trace-overarching-privacy-notice)
526 [trace-overarching-privacy-notice](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-test-and-trace-privacy-information/test-and-trace-overarching-privacy-notice).
- 527 6. UK Cabinet Office. Our plan to rebuild: The UK Government's COVID-19 recovery strategy
528 2020 [Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy)
529 [governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/our-plan-to-rebuild-the-uk-governments-covid-19-recovery-strategy).
- 530 7. SAGE. Thirty-second SAGE meeting on Covid-19, 1 May 2020. 2020.
- 531 8. UK Health Security Agency. NHS Test and Trace statistics (England): methodology 2022
532 [Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-test-and-trace-statistics-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-test-and-trace-statistics-england-methodology/nhs-test-and-trace-statistics-england-methodology)
533 [england-methodology/nhs-test-and-trace-statistics-england-methodology](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nhs-test-and-trace-statistics-england-methodology/nhs-test-and-trace-statistics-england-methodology).
- 534 9. Jarrom D, Elston L, Washington J, Prettyjohns M, Cann K, Myles S, Groves P. Effectiveness of
535 tests to detect the presence of SARS-CoV-2 virus, and antibodies to SARS-CoV-2, to inform COVID-19
536 diagnosis: a rapid systematic review. *BMJ Evid Based Med*. 2022;27(1):33-45.
- 537 10. Teymouri M, Mollazadeh S, Mortazavi H, Naderi Ghale-Noie Z, Keyvani V, Aghababaei F, et
538 al. Recent advances and challenges of RT-PCR tests for the diagnosis of COVID-19. *Pathol Res Pract*.
539 2021;221:153443.
- 540 11. Leber W, Lammel O, Siebenhofer A, Redlberger-Fritz M, Panovska-Griffiths J, Cypionka T.
541 Comparing the diagnostic accuracy of point-of-care lateral flow antigen testing for SARS-CoV-2 with
542 RT-PCR in primary care (REAP-2). *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021;38:101011.
- 543 12. Geddes L. Vaccines Work [Internet]: Gavi, The Vaccine Alliance. 2022. [13 March 2023].
544 Available from: [https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/infectious-period-are-cuts-covid-19-isolation-](https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/infectious-period-are-cuts-covid-19-isolation-times-good-idea)
545 [times-good-idea](https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/infectious-period-are-cuts-covid-19-isolation-times-good-idea).
- 546 13. Peto T. COVID-19: Rapid antigen detection for SARS-CoV-2 by lateral flow assay: A national
547 systematic evaluation of sensitivity and specificity for mass-testing. *EClinicalMedicine*.
548 2021;36:100924.
- 549 14. Mercer TR, Salit M. Testing at scale during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Reviews*
550 *Genetics*. 2021;22(7):415-26.
- 551 15. Di Bari M, Balzi D, Carreras G, Onder G. Extensive Testing May Reduce COVID-19 Mortality: A
552 Lesson From Northern Italy. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2020;7:402.
- 553 16. Rannan-Eliya RP, Wijemunige N, Gunawardana J, Amarasinghe SN, Sivagnanam I, Fonseka S,
554 et al. Increased Intensity Of PCR Testing Reduced COVID-19 Transmission Within Countries During
555 The First Pandemic Wave. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2021;40(1):70-81.
- 556 17. Liang LL, Tseng CH, Ho HJ, Wu CY. Covid-19 mortality is negatively associated with test
557 number and government effectiveness. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10(1):12567.
- 558 18. Liverpool University. Liverpool Covid-SMART Community Testing Pilot. Liverpool: Liverpool
559 University; 2021.

- 560 19. Thorneloe RJ, Clarke EN, Arden MA. Adherence to behaviours associated with the test, trace,
561 and isolate system: an analysis using the theoretical domains framework. *BMC Public Health*.
562 2022;22(1):567.
- 563 20. Public Health England. Disparities in the risk and outcomes of COVID-19. London: Public
564 Health England; 2020.
- 565 21. Du Z, Pandey A, Bai Y, Fitzpatrick MC, Chinazzi M, Pastore y Piontti A, et al. Comparative
566 cost-effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 testing strategies in the USA: a modelling study. *The Lancet Public*
567 *Health*. 2021;6(3):e184-e91.
- 568 22. Iacobucci G, Coombes R. Covid-19: Government plans to spend £100bn on expanding testing
569 to 10 million a day. *BMJ*. 2020;370:m3520.
- 570 23. Petticrew M. When are complex interventions ‘complex’? When are simple interventions
571 ‘simple’? *European Journal of Public Health*. 2011;21(4):397-8.
- 572 24. HM Treasury. Magenta Book - Central Government guidance on evaluation. London: HM
573 Treasury; 2020.
- 574 25. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, et al. Framework for the
575 development and evaluation of complex interventions: gap analysis, workshop and consultation-
576 informed update. *Health Technol Assess*. 2021;25(57):1-132.
- 577 26. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, et al. A new framework
578 for developing and evaluating complex interventions: update of Medical Research Council guidance.
579 *BMJ*. 2021;374:n2061.
- 580 27. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, et al. Process evaluation of
581 complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. 2015;350:h1258.
- 582 28. Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change. *Community Change: Theories, Practice,*
583 *and Evidence*. Edited by Karen Fulbright-Anderson and Patricia Auspos, editor. Washington D.C.:
584 Aspen Institute; 2006.
- 585 29. De Silva MJ, Breuer E, Lee L, Asher L, Chowdhary N, Lund C, Patel V. Theory of Change: a
586 theory-driven approach to enhance the Medical Research Council's framework for complex
587 interventions. *Trials*. 2014;15:267.
- 588 30. Blamey A, Mackenzie M. Theories of Change and Realistic Evaluation: Peas in a Pod or Apples
589 and Oranges? *Evaluation*. 2007;13(4):439-55.
- 590 31. Funnell SC, Rogers PJ. *Purposeful Program Theory: Effective Use of Theories of Change and*
591 *Logic Models*: Wiley; 2011.
- 592 32. Creswell JW. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*:
593 SAGE Publications; 2014.
- 594 33. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien K, Colquhoun H, Kastner M, et al. A scoping review on the
595 conduct and reporting of scoping reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2016;16:15.
- 596 34. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International*
597 *Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32.
- 598 35. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implement*
599 *Sci*. 2010;5:69.
- 600 36. Peters MD, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, McInerney P, Parker D, Soares CB. Guidance for conducting
601 systematic scoping reviews. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2015;13(3):141-6.
- 602 37. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for
603 Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;169(7):467-73.
- 604 38. Hanneke R, Asada Y, Lieberman L, Neubauer LC. The Scoping Review Method: Mapping the
605 Literature in “Structural Change” Public Health Interventions. London 2017. Available from:
606 [https://methods.sagepub.com/case/scoping-review-mapping-literature-structural-change-public-](https://methods.sagepub.com/case/scoping-review-mapping-literature-structural-change-public-interventions)
607 [interventions](https://methods.sagepub.com/case/scoping-review-mapping-literature-structural-change-public-interventions).
- 608 39. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan-a web and mobile app for
609 systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2016;5(1):210.

- 610 40. Gwet KL. Computing inter-rater reliability and its variance in the presence of high
611 agreement. *Br J Math Stat Psychol*. 2008;61(Pt 1):29-48.
- 612 41. Nicholson G, Lehmann B, Padellini T, Pouwels KB, Jersakova R, Lomax J, et al. Improving local
613 prevalence estimates of SARS-CoV-2 infections using a causal debiasing framework. *Nature*
614 *Microbiology*. 2022;7(1):97-107.
- 615 42. NHS England. 2020/21 National Cost Collection Data Publication 2022 [Available from:
616 <https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/2020-21-national-cost-collection-data-publication/>].
- 617 43. NICE. Glossary 2023 [Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/glossary>].
- 618 44. HM Treasury. The Green Book (2022) 2022 [Available from:
619 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-government/the-green-book-2020)
620 [government/the-green-book-2020](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-government/the-green-book-2020)].
- 621 45. Office C. HMG Baseline Personnel Security Standard. 2018.

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640 **Appendix A: EY-Oxford Health Analytics Consortium Membership (in addition to headline authors)**

Name	Affiliation
Adam Bodley	Impact Factor Editing, Oxford
Ainura Moldokmatova	Big Data Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Anastasiia Polner	Ernst & Young LLP London
Bo Gao	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Caroline Franco	Nuffield Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Oxford Institute of Theoretical Physics - São Paulo State University (UNESP)
Jared Norman	Modelling and Simulation Hub, Africa (MASHA), University of Cape Town
Katie Douglass	Ernst & Young LLP London
Liberty Cantrell	Department of Paediatrics, University of Oxford
Lok (Joseph) Tsui	Department of Biology, University of Oxford
Ma'ayan Amswych	Ernst & Young LLP London
Muhammad Kasim	Department of Physics, University of Oxford
Randolph Ngwafor Anye	Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford
Ricardo Aguas	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Richard Creswell	Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford
Sabine Dittrich	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Sheetal Silal	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Siyu Chen	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Sompob Saralamba	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Sophie Dickenson	Ernst & Young LLP London
Sumali Bajaj	Biodiversity, Ecology & Evolutionary Processes Stream, Department of Biology, University of Oxford
Sunil Pokharel	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Tracy Evans	Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health

	Sciences, University of Oxford
Umar Mahmood	Ernst & Young LLP London
Wirichada Pan-ngum	Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford
Zoe Echanah	Ernst & Young LLP London

641