

Enhanced testing can substantially improve defence against several types of respiratory virus pandemic

James Petrie^{1,2,*}, James A. Hay^{1,2}, Oraya Srimokla³, Jasmina Panovska-Griffiths^{1,2,4,5}, Charles Whittaker⁶, and Joanna Masel⁷

¹Pandemic Sciences Institute, University of Oxford

²Big Data Institute, University of Oxford

³Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford

⁴UK Health Security Agency

⁵The Queen's College, University of Oxford

⁶Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Imperial College London

⁷Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of Arizona

*Corresponding author: jimpetrie@uwaterloo.ca

October 2, 2024

Abstract

Mass testing to identify and isolate infected individuals is a promising approach for reducing harm from the next acute respiratory virus pandemic. It offers the prospect of averting hospitalizations and deaths whilst avoiding the need for indiscriminate social distancing measures. To understand scenarios where mass testing might or might not be a viable intervention, here we modelled how effectiveness depends both on characteristics of the pathogen (R_0 , time to peak viral load) and on the testing strategy (limit of detection, testing frequency, test turnaround time, adherence). We base time-dependent test sensitivity and time-dependent infectiousness on an underlying viral load trajectory model. We show that given moderately high public adherence, frequent testing can prevent as many transmissions as more costly interventions such as school or business closures. With very high adherence and fast, frequent, and sensitive testing, we show that most respiratory virus pandemics could be controlled with mass testing alone.

1 Introduction

Respiratory virus pandemics pose a major threat to human health and well-being, as evidenced by the impacts of COVID-19 and 1918 influenza pandemics. The UK government estimates between 5-25% chance of a new pandemic the magnitude of COVID-19 occurring within the next 5 years, which could potentially lead to up to 800,000 deaths as well as extensive social distancing [1]. Given the massive potential harm of future pandemics, it is important to make disease control tools more reliable. Vaccines and therapeutics currently take months or years to design, test, and manufacture, and are not guaranteed to work. Social distancing imposes a huge burden on the population and is not sustainable for a long period. With low enough disease prevalence, contact tracing can prevent transmissions more efficiently than social distancing [2]. However, contact tracing is often not reliable enough, on its own, to control airborne pathogens, especially for the short latent periods combined with pre-symptomatic and/or asymptomatic transmission seen for SARS-CoV-2 [3, 4]. Before there is another major pandemic, there is time to prepare strategies,

39 technology, and infrastructure. It is important to understand which approaches would be most
40 useful to invest in.

41 Mass testing, defined as frequent testing of most of the population and isolation of positives,
42 was proposed as a promising approach to contain SARS-CoV-2 [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. On a
43 relatively small scale (tens of thousands of people), several universities, professional sports teams
44 and film studios succeeded in operating in-person with low disease burden during the COVID-19
45 pandemic by frequently testing people [13, 14, 15, 16]. Children in secondary school in the UK
46 were recommended to test twice weekly in March 2021 [17], and Slovakia performed two rounds
47 of mass antigen testing, which Pavelka et al [18] estimated caused a 70% reduction in prevalence.
48 However, prior to the availability of vaccines, and even with the pooling of samples, there was not
49 enough testing capacity outside of China [19] to consistently test more than 0.1% of the nation-wide
50 population per day [20].

51 Mass testing of an entire population would be logistically complicated, and expensive, raising
52 the question of whether scaling it up would be worth it, even in the light of the past success of
53 smaller scale implementations. While scaling up is difficult to do in real time during a pandemic,
54 sufficient preparation might mitigate current limitations to mass testing. Appendix A discusses how
55 the development of technology and infrastructure might optimize for scalability, cost effectiveness,
56 and speed.

57 Our primary aim is to provide a framework for understanding the potential effectiveness of
58 different mass testing strategies (similar to Fraser et al.’s 2004 work on contact tracing [4]). If mass
59 testing is likely to be effective, this, then this effectiveness should be weighed against expected costs
60 to inform investments into technology and infrastructure intended to increase capacity beyond that
61 available for SARS-CoV-2. We consider the effectiveness of mass testing given a range of likely
62 values for viral characteristics (R_0 and generation time), as well as for testing policy characteristics
63 (limit of detection, test delay, test frequency, and population adherence). Similar to previous
64 studies [21, 22, 23], we evaluate the potential impact of mass testing on reducing transmission,
65 by modeling different mass testing strategies with time-dependent test sensitivity conditional on
66 viral load trajectories. Like Middleton and Larremore [24], we treat infectiousness as a function of
67 the same underlying viral load trajectories. In contrast to previous work, our aim is to determine
68 which pandemic scenarios mass testing would be useful for, rather than whether it would work
69 specifically for SARS-CoV-2. Our model is available as an interactive application (<https://frequent-testing.shinyapps.io/shinyapp>), to enable easy exploration of different mass testing policies and
70 modelling assumptions.
71

72 **2 Methods**

73 We start by computing the expected number of transmissions from a person who tests regularly
74 and isolates perfectly when they learn they are positive. We later adjust this value to account
75 for imperfect adherence, and then estimate the population-level effect of mass testing under the
76 assumption that the population is well-mixed. Default parameter values are chosen based on SARS-
77 CoV-2, and then we explore different parameter values to represent other pathogens.

78 **2.1 Viral Load Trajectory**

79 Trajectories of log viral load for acute respiratory infections like influenza or SARS-CoV-2 are well
80 modelled by piece-wise linear curves [15, 25, 22] (Figure 1A). For simplicity, we neglect within-
81 population diversity in trajectories; in Appendix B we demonstrate that this assumption does not
82 substantially change the predicted effectiveness of PCR testing against most pathogens (due to
83 approximate linearity in relevant parts of the parameter space shown in Figure 6). This allows us
84 to characterize pathogens according to the mean time from infection to reach peak viral load τ_p ,
85 the mean time from peak viral load to recovery, τ_r , and the peak viral load, V_p . V_0 , the initial viral
86 load when infected, is set to $3 \cdot 10^{-3}$ based on initial infection with one viral particle and roughly
87 300ml of respiratory fluid [26]. Log viral load V is then:




Figure 1: **Infectiousness and test sensitivity over time are estimated based on simulated viral load trajectories.** (A) An example viral load trajectory, characterized by peak viral load and times from infection to peak, and from peak to recovery. (B) Test sensitivity vs. viral load for typical PCR and antigen tests. (C) Expected transmissions per day vs. viral load. (D) Test sensitivity vs. time since infection for this pathogen, computed by passing the time series in (A) through function (B). (E) Expected daily transmissions vs. time since infection, computed by passing the time series in (A) through function (C). The area under the curve in (E) is R_0 for this pathogen.

$$\log_{10}(V(t)) = \begin{cases} \log_{10}(V_0) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{t}{\tau_p}\right) + \log_{10}(V_p) \cdot \frac{t}{\tau_p}, & \text{for } 0 < t \leq \tau_p \\ \log_{10}(V_p) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{t - \tau_p}{\tau_r}\right) + \log_{10}(V_0) \cdot \frac{t - \tau_p}{\tau_r}, & \text{for } \tau_p \leq t < \tau_p + \tau_r \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

88 For most of this analysis, we assume viral load trajectories are symmetric, i.e. $\tau_p = \tau_r$; al-
 89 ternative trajectory shapes can be explored further in the interactive app at [https://frequent-](https://frequent-testing.shinyapps.io/shinyapp)
 90 testing.shinyapps.io/shinyapp. This assumption of symmetric trajectories slightly underestimates
 91 the effectiveness of mass testing compared to right skewed trajectories ($\tau_r > \tau_p$), where transmis-
 92 sions occur later in infection and are therefore easier to prevent.

93 Note that inactive virus material can persist for a long time following clearance of replication
 94 competent virions, which can prolong the time from peak viral load to a negative test result.
 95 This process might therefore be better modeled as the sum of exponential declines rather than a
 96 single exponential decline. In this context, our piecewise curves can be interpreted as replication-
 97 competent viral load peaking at V_p . Test sensitivity (probability that a sample from an infected
 98 person is classified as positive) depends strongly on the person's viral load at the time the sample is
 99 collected [27]. We neglect the contribution to test sensitivity from non-replication competent viral
 100 material, because its only effect is to catch infected individuals too late to prevent transmission, in

101 particular when testing is less frequent.

Model Component	Description
$V(t; V_0, V_p, \tau_p, \tau_r)$	Viral load at time t since infection. Dependence on other parameters is described in Equation 1 and shown in Figure 1A.
V_0	Viral load at the time of infection: $V_0 = 3 \cdot 10^{-3}$ based on one viral particle within ≈ 300 ml of respiratory fluid [26].
V_p	Peak viral load. Adjusted to attain a specified value of R_0 .
τ_p	Time from infection to peak viral load: 1.5 to 12 days.
τ_r	Time from V_p to V_0 . Symmetry assumption ($\tau_r = \tau_p$) can be relaxed in the app.
$S(v; S_{max}, k, LOD_{50})$	Test sensitivity (probability that a positive sample is detected as positive) as a function of viral load, v . Dependence on other parameters described in Equation 2 and shown in Figure 1B.
S_{max}	Maximum test sensitivity: 99.5% for PCR, 90% for antigen tests.
k	Controls width of intermediate test sensitivity region: $k = 6$ for PCR and $k = 1.3$ for antigen tests.
LOD_{50}	Viral load at which test sensitivity reaches $S_{max}/2$: 10^2 copies/ml for PCR and $10^{5.4}$ for antigen tests.
$T(v; N_C, h, K_m, \theta)$	Expected transmissions per day as a function of viral load, v . Dependence on other parameters described by Equation 3 and shown in Figure 1C.
N_C	Average number of close contacts per day: $N_C = 13$ based on [28]. Appendix C explores time-dependent reduction in contacts caused by symptoms.
h	Controls width of sigmoid for transmission risk vs. viral load: $h = 0.51$ based on [29].
K_m	Midpoint of infectiousness: $K_m = 8.9 \cdot 10^6$ copies/ml based on [29].
θ	Increased from 0.2 in Ke et al. [29] to 0.3, corresponding to a maximum per-contact transmission probability of 26%.
$\sigma(\delta, \rho)$	The fraction of transmissions that would be prevented (relative to R_0) if the entire population tested every ρ days and received test results after δ delay.
δ	Time delay before receiving a test result. 0 for antigen tests and 2+ hours for PCR.
ρ	Time between tests.
γ	Fraction of the population that adheres to regular testing.
β	Fraction reduction in transmissions after a person who tests regularly learns they are positive.
R_0	Expected transmissions per infected person with no population immunity or disease-control measures.
R_e	Expected transmissions per infected person given interventions, with no population immunity.

Table 1: Parameters and variables for modelling viral load, test sensitivity, and expected transmissions.

102 2.2 Test Sensitivity Depending on Viral Load

103 We model the dependence of test sensitivity on viral load, v , with the sigmoid function:

$$S(v; S_{max}, k, LOD_{50}) = S_{max} \frac{1}{1 + e^{-k(\log_{10}(v) - \log_{10}(LOD_{50}))}} \quad (2)$$

104 This equation is characterized by peak test sensitivity, S_{max} , the viral load LOD_{50} at which
105 $S_{max}/2$ of samples from infected people are classified as positive, and a parameter k that specifies
106 the width of the intermediate region. For PCR tests, we set $\text{LOD}_{50} = 10^2$ copies/ml and $k = 6$
107 so that the distance between 5% and 95% sensitivity is about a multiple of 10 as in [27]. We set
108 $S_{max} = 99.5\%$ to account for sample mishandling. Antigen tests are modeled as having a limit
109 of detection of $10^{5.4}$ copies/ml and $k = 1.3$ based on the average sensitivity that Wagenhauser et
110 al. measured for the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 variant [30] (although this varies considerably between
111 manufacturers, between variants of the same pathogen, and presumably between pathogens). The
112 maximum sensitivity, S_{max} , is reduced to 90% to account for errors in self-administered antigen
113 tests. Default PCR and antigen sensitivity curves are shown in Figure 1B.

114 2.3 Expected Transmission Rate Depending on Viral Load

115 While there is consensus that higher viral load increases the expected number of transmissions $T(v)$,
116 quantitative data on this relationship is very limited. Ke et al. [29] used the measured relationship
117 between SARS-CoV-2 viral load (as assessed by PCR) and cell culture positivity as a proxy for
118 the relationship between viral load and transmission. We use Ke et al.'s saturation model [29] in
119 Equation 3, with SARS-CoV-2-inspired default values of $N_C = 13$ contacts per day [28], shape
120 parameter $h = 0.51$, and an infectiousness midpoint of $K_m = 8.9 \cdot 10^6$ copies/ml (see Appendix
121 D for a sensitivity analysis of K_m). Ke et al. included a parameter θ to reduce the maximum
122 infectiousness below 100%; we increased this from 0.2 to 0.3, corresponding to an increase from
123 18% to 26% per contact.

$$T(v; N_C, h, K_m, \theta) = N_C \cdot (1 - e^{-\theta \frac{v^h}{v^h + K_m^h}}) \quad (3)$$

124 These values of K_m and θ are in broad agreement with Marc et al.'s [31] use of SARS-CoV-2
125 contact tracing data to connect estimated viral load at time of exposure with transmission probabil-
126 ity. Our assessment of agreement is focused on non-household contacts, because household contacts
127 typically are exposed over multiple days, corresponding to multiple opportunities for transmission,
128 with a correspondingly higher overall maximum probability of infection. Equation 3 for expected
129 daily transmissions as a function of viral load is shown in Figure 1C.

130 2.4 Test Sensitivity and Expected Transmissions over Time

131 Test sensitivity over time is computed as the composition of Equations 1 and 2, $S(V(t))$, shown
132 in Figure 1D. Similarly, the expected rate of transmissions as a function of time since infection is
133 computed as the composition of Equations 1 and 3, $T(V(t))$, shown in Figure 1E. For pathogens
134 where noticeable symptoms cause people to reduce interactions and therefore transmit to fewer
135 people, N_C can be made a function of time since infection, as explored in Appendix C (Figures 7
136 and 8).

137 2.5 Default Expected Transmissions per Infection (R_0)

138 The expected number of transmissions per infected person (in an immuno-naive population with
139 no behaviour modifications) is $R_0 = \int_0^\infty T(V(t)) \cdot dt$. I.e., total (expected) transmission is equal to
140 the integral of (expected) transmission over time. To achieve a given R_0 value, we modify the peak
141 viral load, V_p , according to the relationship of Equation 1.

142 2.6 Detection Probability over Time

143 Consider a testing policy with a set period, ρ , between sequential tests. An individual whose
144 first post-infection sample is collected κ days after infection (we denote this the offset) will have a

145 negative status on day t following infection (i.e. will have tested negative on all samples collected
146 on or before day t , if any) with probability

$$ProbAllNegative(t; \kappa, \rho) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t < \kappa \\ \prod_{i=0}^{\lfloor (t-\kappa)/\rho \rfloor} (1 - S(V(i * \rho + \kappa))), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

147 We compute the probability that a person knows they are positive at time t after infection
148 by averaging across offset times, $\kappa \sim Uniform(0, \rho)$ (because samples are collected every ρ days
149 and infection timing is independent of test timing). Allowing for a fixed delay time, δ , between
150 sample collection and receiving results, the probability that at least one sample taken before $t - \delta$
151 is detected as positive is

$$\begin{aligned} ProbAnyPositive(t; \delta, \rho) &= E_{\kappa}[1 - ProbAllNegative(t - \delta; \kappa, \rho)] \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho} \int_0^{\rho} [1 - ProbAllNegative(t - \delta; \kappa, \rho)] d\kappa \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

152 2.7 Transmissions Prevented by Isolation

153 When informing a person that they are infectious causes them to isolate effectively, the effective
154 transmission rate at time t is reduced by a factor $ProbAnyPositive(t)$. The expected number of
155 transmissions prevented by frequent testing followed by perfect isolation after testing positive is
156 then given by the integral of $ProbAnyPositive(t) \cdot T(V(t))$ over time. We define σ as the fraction
157 of transmissions that would be prevented by frequent testing given perfect adherence.

$$\sigma(\delta, \rho) = \frac{\int_0^{\infty} [ProbAnyPositive(t; \delta, \rho) \cdot T(V(t))] dt}{R_0} \quad (6)$$

158 2.8 Transmissions with Partially Adhered to Testing and Isolation (R_e)

159 Generalizing to imperfect adherence, let γ be the probability that a person adheres to regular testing,
160 and β capture the degree to which a positive test results causes a person to reduce their transmission,
161 with a fraction σ of their counterfactual expected transmissions having not yet occurred. Then
162 assuming a well mixed population, mass testing reduces the effective reproduction number according
163 to:

$$R_e(\gamma, \beta, \delta, \rho) = R_0 \cdot (1 - \gamma \cdot \beta \cdot \sigma(\delta, \rho)) \quad (7)$$

164 3 Results

165 Our results show that high adherence combined with frequent, rapid mass testing provide an ef-
166 fective strategy to prevent infections and hospitalizations. To better understand the effectiveness
167 of mass testing, we decompose transmissions over the course of a typical infection into two broad
168 failure modes: (1) non-adherence or (2) insufficiently sensitive, frequent, or rapid testing. Figure
169 2 shows expected transmissions over time when using two testing strategies against an example
170 pathogen. Individuals that do not adhere to testing or do not effectively isolate when detected as
171 positive, transmit on the same schedule as in the unmitigated scenario, as shown by the yellow
172 regions in Figure 2 (the yellow regions in A and B are identical because adherence is the same for
173 both strategies). If testing is sufficiently frequent and results are not substantially delayed, then
174 individuals adhering to the policy transmit at a much lower rate. In this case, transmissions from
175 adherent individuals are usually earlier in infection, as shown by the purple region in Figure 2B.
176 When testing is more delayed (in this example 24 hours instead of 12 hours) and less frequent (here
177 every 4 days instead of every 2 days), then adherent individuals transmit substantially more and
178 relatively later in infection, as shown by the larger purple region in Figure 2A.




Figure 2: **Expected transmissions under different testing strategies.** The upper black lines illustrate the baseline scenario (with $R_0 = 4.0$ expected transmissions). With mass testing, the purple areas show transmissions occurring before receiving a positive test result, while the non-overlapping yellow areas show transmissions occurring from people who don't adhere to either testing or isolation. Dashed lines show the fraction of infected people who have not yet tested positive. A) Testing every 4 days with a 24 hour test turnaround. B) Testing every 2 days with a 12 hour test turnaround. With less frequent and more delayed tests (A), transmission reduction is modest. With more frequent and less delayed tests (B), most transmissions are prevented, and the remaining transmissions are either early in infection or due to non-adherence to the testing and isolation policy. Both scenarios use tests with a limit of detection of 10^2 copies/ml (as described by Equation 2), 90% adherence to testing, 90% effective isolation (conditional on being a person who gets tested), 6 days from infection to peak viral load, and 6 days from peak viral load to recovery.




Figure 3: **Fraction of (ancestral variant) SARS-CoV-2 transmissions prevented** depends on adherence to testing and isolation (A) and test frequency (B). SARS-CoV-2 is parameterized as taking 5 days to reach peak viral load, symptoms occurring on the same day as peak viral load, a 50% reduction in transmissions after symptoms, and $R_0 = 2.75$ (including the behaviour modification from symptoms). In (A) we model daily testing with either a rapid antigen test (0 hour delay, $LOD_{50} = 10^{5.4}$, orange), or a fast PCR test (8 hour delay, $LOD_{50} = 10^2$, green), or a slow PCR test (72 hour delay, $LOD_{50} = 10^2$, blue). For (B) we model only the fast PCR test. For this pathogen, the benefit of frequent testing saturates when testing more often than every 2 days (B). Estimates by Brauner et al. [32] of the fraction reduction in transmissions from school and university closures (38%) and business closures (27%) are added for comparison (dashed lines).

179 Figure 3 compares mass testing to other commonly used strategies against the ancestral vari-
180 ant of SARS-CoV-2, expressing results as transmitted averted (reduction in R_e) as a function of
181 adherence to testing, effectiveness of isolation, the frequency of testing, and the type of test. The
182 proportion of transmissions prevented depends linearly on adherence to testing and isolation (Fig-
183 ure 3A), as described by the dependence on γ and β in Equation 7. The benefit from frequent
184 testing saturates when testing more than every 2 days for the ancestral variant of SARS-CoV-2
185 (Figure 3B), with 70% more infections averted when testing every 2 days compared to every 4 days.
186 Fast PCR testing every 3 days with 50% adherence to testing and 95% effective isolation (Figure
187 3B) achieves the same fraction reduction in transmissions as school and university closures (38%,
188 as assessed by Brauner et al. [32]). Higher adherence with more frequent testing is able to further
189 reduce transmissions (curves in figure 3B above upper dashed line).

190 Fast reporting of test results is more important for diseases that reach peak viral load quickly
191 (e.g. influenza). In Figure 4A, the fraction reduction in transmissions for a perfectly adhering
192 individual is shown as a function of LOD_{50} and test delay for three example pathogens that take
193 3, 6, and 9 days to reach peak viral load, with peak viral load modified so that $R_0 = 3$ for all
194 pathogens. The contours are much steeper for the pathogen that takes 3 days to reach peak viral
195 load than for the other pathogens, which means that the relative importance of fast reporting is
196 greater. When using PCR tests, the number of transmissions with a 20-hour delay compared to a
197 10-hour delay is 3.2x larger with 3 days to peak viral load, 2.0x larger with 6 days to peak viral load,
198 and 1.6x larger with 9 days to peak viral load. With a low limit of detection (10^2 copies/ml) and
199 fast reporting (10 hours), adhered-to daily testing is able to prevent more than 92% of transmissions
200 for a pathogen with 3 days to peak viral load, and almost 99% of transmissions for a pathogen with
201 9 days to peak viral load.

202 Because of antigen tests' higher detection limit, with LOD_{50} close to the viral load where
203 someone is substantially infectious (K_m), the predicted number of transmissions prevented is lower
204 than for PCR. LOD_{50} being close to K_m also makes model results for antigen tests more sensitive
205 to uncertainty in parameters, as demonstrated in Appendix D. Figure 4B shows that daily antigen
206 testing prevents fewer transmissions than daily PCR testing unless the PCR reporting delay is
207 more than a few days (e.g. 1 day for a pathogen with 3 days to peak viral load, and 2 days for a
208 pathogen with 6 days to peak viral load). If antigen testing is done twice daily, Figure 4C shows
209 that it could prevent almost 80% of transmissions; however this result should be interpreted with
210 caution because this model assumes that subsequent test results are uncorrelated when viral load
211 is controlled for (while in reality tests might have shared dependence on factors that might not
212 change for a person in a day). The effectiveness of tests with different parameters can be explored
213 using the app at <https://frequent-testing.shinyapps.io/shinyapp>.

214 To estimate the effectiveness of potential mass testing strategies against a broader range of
215 pathogens, we compute R_e while varying both R_0 and time to peak viral load. We find that some
216 strategies might be able to independently control a pathogen. Using the same approach as Figure
217 4, we find that daily PCR testing with an 8 hour delay could avert 0.96*adherence of transmissions
218 for a pathogen like 1918 influenza (3.5 days to peak viral load, $R_0 = 2.5$) and 0.98*adherence for a
219 pathogen like wild-type SARS-CoV-2 (5 days to peak viral load, $R_0 = 2.5$). Here, adherence is de-
220 fined as the product $\gamma \cdot \beta$ from Equation 7, or equivalently $E[\text{Isolation Effectiveness} | \text{Tests Regularly}] * P(\text{Tests Regularly})$.

221
222 Mass PCR testing with overall adherence of 90% and an 8 hour reporting delay is sufficient,
223 on its own, to control all of the example pathogens in Figure 5A except for measles (which has a
224 very high R_0). Lines in Figure 5, each representing a different testing policy, indicate the highest
225 controllable value of R_0 for each testing policy, found by increasing the peak viral load, V_p , until
226 R_e in Equation 7 is equal to 1. Figure 5A shows very high adherence (95% adherence to testing,
227 and 95% effective isolation), while 5B shows moderately high adherence (70% adherence to testing
228 followed by 80% isolation adherence if positive). While antigen testing in Figure 5 is insufficient on
229 its own to control most pathogens, it can still substantially reduce the number of transmissions that
230 are most difficult to control otherwise: transmissions from cases that have high viral load and are
231 therefore highly contagious even during brief exposures. Using antigen tests with a lower LOD_{50}




Figure 4: The fraction of transmissions prevented by mass testing depends on test frequency, LOD_{50} , and test delay for three hypothetical pathogens that take 3, 6, and 9 days to reach peak viral load. The extent of transmission reduction from an infected person who tests daily and isolates effectively if positive depends on test turnaround time (x-axis of (A)), test limit of detection (y-axis of (A)), and time to peak viral load, with peak load varying accordingly to maintain $R_0 = 3$ (3 panels in (A)). For shorter latent periods (left of (A)) delays are more important (closer contour lines along horizontal transect). Test sensitivity is similarly important for all latent periods; (similarly spaced contour lines along vertical transect). Shaded areas indicate likely LOD_{50} and delay time values for PCR vs. antigen tests. We use $k = 6$ and $S_{max} = 99.5\%$ from Equation 2 for all tests in (A) and for PCR tests in (B) and (C). This is overoptimistic about the maximum sensitivity (S_{max}) of antigen tests, and invokes a sharper transition region than typical, so the shaded region in the upper left corner of each subplot in (A) corresponds with the LOD_{50} of antigen tests but not the shape of their test sensitivity curve. For (B) and (C), antigen tests are computed more accurately with $LOD_{50} = 10^{5.4}$, $k = 1.3$, and $S_{max} = 0.9$. Rapid PCR tests (e.g. 8 hour turnaround) achieve dramatic transmission reduction under all conditions considered. Calculations assume perfect adherence to daily testing and to isolation following a positive test result. The fractional reduction in transmissions is proportional to adherence, so results can be modified for other scenarios by multiplication (e.g. if the fraction reduction is 0.8 with perfect adherence, it would be 0.4 if 50% of people tested frequently and isolated effectively if positive). Pooled PCR tests will be shifted upwards by the appropriate pooling factor, and are likely to also have increased delay. (B) shows cross-sections that hold the limit of detection constant while varying the test delay and (C) shows intervals other than daily testing.




Figure 5: **The maximum transmissibility (R_0) that can be controlled by different mass testing strategies depends on the time to reach peak viral load.** Viruses in the area under each line can be controlled by that testing strategy alone, in the absence of other measures. High adherence (A not B) and high test frequency (cyan) are required to control a wide variety of challenging viruses. The highest value of R_0 that can be controlled with a testing strategy (computed by increasing peak viral load until R_e in Equation 7 is equal to 1) is shown as a function of time to peak viral load (x-axis), test type (solid vs dashed), and testing interval (orange vs cyan). Shaded ovals indicate the approximate values of R_0 and time to peak viral load for a variety of viruses. Panel A) shows high adherence: 95% adherence to testing and 95% adherence to isolation if positive. The maximum R_0 depends on the product of these two numbers. Panel B shows more moderate 70% adherence to testing followed by 80% isolation adherence if positive. Moderate adherence (B) might be inadequate on its own to control an outbreak of the original wild-type SARS-CoV-2 variant, but makes an important contribution when combined with other measures. As the speed of viral exponential rise and fall (x-axis) is varied, the same R_0 is achieved by adjusting peak viral load. For simplicity, symptom onset does not trigger behaviour modification; in Appendix C we show similar results when symptoms are detected 24 hours before peak viral load and cause a 75% reduction in contacts (while holding R_0 constant and increasing the peak viral load to compensate for fewer contacts).

232 value can also dramatically change the results; this can be explored further at [https://frequent-](https://frequent-testing.shinyapps.io/shinyapp)
233 [testing.shinyapps.io/shinyapp](https://frequent-testing.shinyapps.io/shinyapp).

234 While it is impossible to anticipate parameters for novel pathogens (and indeed, parameters
235 are only partially understood for existing pathogens), the predicted effectiveness of frequent PCR
236 testing is quite robust to changes in parameters. Different pathogens might transmit with a different
237 proportionality factor with respect to viral load, due e.g. to how well the virus binds human cells;
238 this will be reflected in different values of K_m . The minimum infectious dose for SARS-CoV-2 is
239 thought to be around 100 particles [33] and the minimum infectious dose for any pathogen has
240 to be ≥ 1 . Therefore if transmission occurs via similar mechanistic routes to SARS-CoV-2, it is
241 unlikely that K_m will be more than a factor of 100 lower. In Appendix D, we explore the effect of a
242 100-fold lower K_m and show that antigen tests fail, on their own, to control any of the pathogens,
243 while frequent PCR testing does only slightly worse (Figure 9). Similarly, the effectiveness of PCR
244 testing is robust to behaviour modifications due to symptoms (Appendix C) and to changes in viral
245 load trajectory shape (Viral Load tab of app: <https://frequent-testing.shinyapps.io/shinyapp>).

246 Sustained mass testing was infeasible during much of the COVID-19 pandemic, but there is
247 now time to develop testing technology and infrastructure, so that less socially costly disease control
248 measures are available for future pandemics. Promising newer technologies like multiplexed
249 sequencing are becoming faster and more affordable [34]. Alternatively, more mature technology
250 like saliva-based PCR testing can be scaled up with less technical risk, as discussed in Appendix
251 A. In Appendix A we also discuss feasibility of potential implementations in terms of cost, public
252 acceptability, infrastructure, and timing in a pandemic. We find that there are feasible solutions
253 to deploy a relatively inexpensive mass testing program early in a pandemic, but that the primary
254 logistical barrier is building and maintaining enough testing infrastructure in advance. Once built,
255 uses will likely be found; e.g. at the time of writing, there is an acute need for more H5N1 testing
256 of cows and farm workers in the United States[35].

257 4 Discussion

258 Our findings illustrate that large-scale, rapid testing can effectively control a respiratory virus
259 pandemic, but that adherence to frequent testing and to isolation is crucial to achieve this impact. A
260 partially adhered-to mass testing strategy could also be used to replace more restrictive interventions
261 such as school or business closures. For the wild-type SARS-CoV-2 variant, assuming 5 days to
262 peak viral load and $R_0 = 2.5$, overall adherence of 61% would be needed to bring $R_e < 1$ in the
263 absence of other measures. If work from home, masking, voluntary outdoor socializing etc. succeed
264 in achieving $R_e = 1.5$, then adherence of 34% would be sufficient in a homogeneous population to
265 further reduce $R_e < 1$ and achieve control. This modest level of adherence seems achievable, and
266 could avoid the need for more draconian lockdowns. However, in scenarios where the test result
267 delay time is long (e.g. 72 hour) compared to the time to peak viral load, mass testing becomes
268 substantially less useful, bringing down from $R_0 = 2.5$ to $R_e = 2.3$ and 2.4 in these two examples of
269 61% and 34% adherence. Contact tracing will magnify the benefits of mass testing [36], and with
270 long test delays, the indirect benefits of testing on contact quarantine become more important than
271 the direct effects on case isolation.

272 Our model assumes a well-mixed population, but we note that if there is a connected group of
273 people that are unable or unwilling to adhere to testing or isolation, then the epidemic could escape
274 control within that sub-network. Conversely, as seen for SARS-CoV-2 in some universities and film
275 studios, smaller groups of people might adopt frequent testing to control transmission within their
276 sub-network, in scenarios where there isn't broader public support for disease elimination. The
277 smallest, simplest example of this is testing the caregiver for someone at elevated risk of severe
278 disease, reducing the caregiver's transmission probability by the amount shown in Figure 4.

279 A scenario where massive but non-universal testing capacity could be useful is to avoid school
280 closures by frequently testing students and staff. School closures in the US were estimated to have
281 cost \$6 trillion USD during COVID-19 pandemic, but some schools avoided closures by testing
282 frequently. If testing were done frequently enough and a negative test were a prerequisite for

283 attendance, then the probability of an infected contact at school transmitting the disease would be
284 10-20 times lower than otherwise (see Figure 4 for the 90-95% fraction reduction in transmissions,
285 depending on the virus). Unless closing schools reduces childrens' contacts by a factor of at least
286 10-20, effective testing at school could actually be safer than closing schools and not testing. This
287 might be a good use of testing capacity that, while massive, is nevertheless insufficient on its own
288 to control a pandemic - potentially not avoiding all social distancing measures, but avoiding school
289 closures. While the school setting might have above the usual R_0 , it is also conducive to the
290 enforcement of testing and isolation policies.

291 In a scenario where a pathogen causes sufficiently severe disease such that most people adopt
292 social distancing, essential workers might choose not to work because of fear of infection. Frequent
293 testing of essential workers and the people they interact with could dramatically improve their safety
294 (in addition to other important safety measures like effective PPE [37]), and reduce the probability
295 of infecting workers' family, which could increase the number willing to continue working [38].

296 Frequent mass testing of asymptomatic individuals inevitably risks large numbers of false posi-
297 tive tests leading to isolation both of individuals who are not infected, and of individuals who
298 were infected but are no longer infectious. However, even with wide-scale testing, the total num-
299 ber incorrectly isolated is manageable and fairly small, despite an expected reduction in positive
300 predictive value as true positive individuals are removed from the population and thus prevalence
301 in the remaining tested population goes down [39]. The duration of unnecessary isolation could
302 be shortened by ending isolation earlier given a series of negative results, and/or by using a Ct
303 threshold during the downward trajectory, rather than isolating until completely negative.

304 This work focuses on population-wide asymptomatic testing, but given limited testing capacity,
305 it is most efficient to prioritize symptomatic testing before asymptomatic testing [40]. For simplicity,
306 we did not model people seeking additional testing because of symptoms, although we did model
307 behavior modification due to symptoms even in the absence of a positive test. In a related work, we
308 use a branching model to estimate the benefit of adding symptomatic testing and contact tracing
309 to a mass testing policy, finding that in some scenarios adding contact tracing could allow the mass
310 testing frequency to be halved with the same reduction in transmissions [36].

311 We made the simplifying assumption of transmission risk being independent of location and time,
312 but testing policies could be made more efficient by focusing on higher risk settings. For example,
313 collecting samples from people so that their test results are returned right before attending an
314 event would prevent even more transmissions. A location-based strategy could target more frequent
315 testing to regions with an active outbreak, and less frequent surveillance testing for new outbreaks
316 in previously clear regions, requiring fewer tests in total as a country approaches elimination.

317 The COVID-19 pandemic caused an estimated \$16 trillion USD in harm in the USA [41], and
318 efforts to contain it were also very costly (e.g. \$2.5 trillion USD in lost future productivity from
319 four months of school closure in the USA [42]). Another pandemic at least as severe as COVID-
320 19 is likely in the next few decades, and many countries are not prepared. We show that with
321 sufficient testing capacity and good adherence, mass testing could be effectively used to mitigate
322 transmission and avoid the much more costly interventions and harms of future pandemics or
323 reactions to future pandemics. This motivates substantial effort to design a testing system with
324 high enough throughput, and to build it before the next pandemic.

325 Acknowledgements

326 We would like to thank Nirav Merchant and Greg Gibson for sharing their experience with real-world
327 testing programs, Kayla Zochowski for advice on PCR technology, Christophe Fraser for suggestions
328 on figures, and Luca Ferretti and Chris Wymant for advice on framing. JP's work is supported
329 by Open Philanthropy and the Wellcome Trust (Collaboration Award 206298/Z/17/Z, ARTIC-
330 Network). JAH is supported by a Wellcome Trust Early Career Award (grant 225001/Z/22/Z).
331 CW is supported by Sir Henry Wellcome Postdoctoral Fellowship (reference 224190/Z/21/Z). JPG's
332 work is supported by the UK Health Security Agency and the UK Department of Health and Social
333 Care. These funders had no role in the study design, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing

334 of the report. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and not necessarily those
335 of the UK Health Security Agency or the UK Department of Health and Social Care.

336 References

- 337 1. Cabinet Office. National Risk Register 2023. Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/
338 publications/national-risk-register-2023](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-risk-register-2023) [Accessed on: 2023 Aug 10]
- 339 2. Petrie J and Masel J. Optimal targeting of interventions uses estimated risk of infectiousness
340 to control a pandemic with minimal collateral damage. 2023 Oct. DOI: 10.1101/2023.10.
341 06.23296661. Available from: [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.10.06.
342 23296661v1](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.10.06.23296661v1) [Accessed on: 2023 Nov 20]
- 343 3. Davis EL, Lucas TCD, Borlase A, Pollington TM, Abbott S, Ayabina D, Crellen T, Hellewell
344 J, Pi L, Medley GF, Hollingsworth TD, and Klepac P. Contact tracing is an imperfect tool
345 for controlling COVID-19 transmission and relies on population adherence. *Nature Commu-
346 nications* 2021 Sep; 12. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group:5412. DOI: 10.1038/
347 s41467-021-25531-5. Available from: [https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-021-
348 25531-5](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-021-25531-5)
- 349 4. Fraser C, Riley S, Anderson RM, and Ferguson NM. Factors that make an infectious disease
350 outbreak controllable. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2004 Apr; 101.
351 Publisher: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences:6146–51. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.
352 0307506101. Available from: [https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.
353 0307506101](https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.0307506101)
- 354 5. Colbourn T, Waites W, Panovska-Griffiths J, Manheim D, Sturniolo S, Colbourn G, Bowie
355 C, Godfrey KM, Peto J, and Burgess RA. Modelling the health and economic impacts of
356 population-wide testing, contact tracing and isolation (PTTI) strategies for COVID-19 in the
357 UK. 2020. Available from: [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=
358 3627273](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3627273)
- 359 6. Taipale J, Romer P, and Linnarsson S. Population-scale testing can suppress the spread of
360 COVID-19. 2020 May. DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.27.20078329. Available from: [https:
361 //www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.27.20078329v2](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.27.20078329v2) [Accessed on: 2023 Nov
362 2]
- 363 7. Libin PJK, Willem L, Verstraeten T, Torneri A, Vanderlocht J, and Hens N. Assessing the fea-
364 sibility and effectiveness of household-pooled universal testing to control COVID-19 epidemics.
365 *PLOS Computational Biology* 2021 Mar; 17. Publisher: Public Library of Science:e1008688.
366 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008688. Available from: [https://journals.plos.org/
367 ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008688](https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008688)
- 368 8. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, Shehata S, Burke JM, Hay JA, Tambe M, Mina MJ,
369 and Parker R. Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-
370 19 screening. *Science Advances* 2021 Jan; 7. Publisher: American Association for the Ad-
371 vancement of Science:eabd5393. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.abd5393. Available from: [https:
372 //www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abd5393](https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abd5393)
- 373 9. Neilan AM, Losina E, Bangs AC, Flanagan C, Panella C, Eskibozkurt GE, Mohareb A, Hyle
374 EP, Scott JA, Weinstein MC, Siedner MJ, Reddy KP, Harling G, Freedberg KA, Shebl FM,
375 Kazemian P, and Ciaranello AL. Clinical Impact, Costs, and Cost-effectiveness of Expanded
376 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Testing in Massachusetts. *Clinical Infec-
377 tious Diseases: An Official Publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 2020
378 Sep; 73:e2908–e2917. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1418. Available from: [https://www.ncbi.nlm.
379 nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7543346/](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7543346/)

- 379 10. Poole SF, Gronsbell J, Winter D, Nickels S, Levy R, Fu B, Burq M, Saeb S, Edwards MD,
380 Behr MK, Kumaresan V, Macalalad AR, Shah S, Prevost M, Snoad N, Brenner MP, Myers
381 LJ, Varghese P, Califf RM, Washington V, Lee VS, and Fromer M. A holistic approach for
382 suppression of COVID-19 spread in workplaces and universities. *PLOS ONE* 2021 Aug;
383 16. Publisher: Public Library of Science:e0254798. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0254798.
384 Available from: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0254798>
385
- 386 11. Lehrach H, Curtis J, Lange B, Ogilvie LA, Gauss R, Steininger C, Scholz E, and Kreck M.
387 Proposal of a population wide genome-based testing for Covid-19. *Scientific Reports* 2022
388 Apr; 12. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group:5618. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-022-
389 08934-2. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-022-08934-2>
- 390 12. Cherif R and Hasanov F. Testing our way out of pandemics. *Health Policy and Technology*
391 2023 Mar; 12:100714. DOI: 10.1016/j.hlpt.2022.100714. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2211883722001216>
392
- 393 13. Ranoa DRE et al. Mitigation of SARS-CoV-2 transmission at a large public university. *Nature*
394 *Communications* 2022 Jun; 13. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group:3207. DOI:
395 10.1038/s41467-022-30833-3. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-022-30833-3>
396
- 397 14. Gibson G, Weitz JS, Shannon MP, Holton B, Bryksin A, Liu B, Sieglinger M, Coenen AR,
398 Zhao C, Beckett SJ, Bramblett S, Williamson J, Farrell M, Ortiz A, Abdallah CT, and García
399 AJ. Surveillance-to-Diagnostic Testing Program for Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections on
400 a Large, Urban Campus in Fall 2020. *Epidemiology* 2021 Nov; 33:209–16. DOI: 10.1097/
401 EDE.0000000000001448
- 402 15. Kissler SM, Fauver JR, Mack C, Olesen SW, Tai C, Shiue KY, Kalinich CC, Jednak S, Ott
403 IM, Vogels CBF, Wohlgemuth J, Weisberger J, DiFiori J, Anderson DJ, Mancell J, Ho DD,
404 Grubaugh ND, and Grad YH. Viral dynamics of acute SARS-CoV-2 infection and applications
405 to diagnostic and public health strategies. *PLOS Biology* 2021 Jul; 19. Publisher: Public
406 Library of Science:e3001333. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3001333. Available from: <https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.3001333>
407
- 408 16. Rossol M. Comparison of Two Entertainment Industry COVID-19 Programs. *NEW SOLU-*
409 *TIONS: A Journal of Environmental and Occupational Health Policy* 2022 Nov; 32. Pub-
410 lisher: SAGE Publications Inc:171–81. DOI: 10.1177/10482911221134515. Available from:
411 <https://doi.org/10.1177/10482911221134515>
- 412 17. Hughes DM, Bird SM, Cheyne CP, Ashton M, Campbell MC, García-Fiñana M, and Buchan
413 I. Rapid antigen testing in COVID-19 management for school-aged children: an observational
414 study in Cheshire and Merseyside, UK. *Journal of Public Health* 2023 Mar; 45:e38–e47. DOI:
415 10.1093/pubmed/fdac003. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdac003>
- 416 18. Pavelka M, Van-Zandvoort K, Abbott S, Sherratt K, Majdan M, CMMID COVID-19 WORK-
417 ING GROUP, INŠTITÚT ZDRAVOTNÝCH ANALÝZ, Jarčuška P, Krajčí M, Flasche S, and
418 Funk S. The impact of population-wide rapid antigen testing on SARS-CoV-2 prevalence in
419 Slovakia. *Science* 2021 May; 372. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of
420 Science:635–41. DOI: 10.1126/science.abf9648. Available from: <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abf9648>
421
- 422 19. Zhou Y, Jiang H, Wang Q, Yang M, Chen Y, and Jiang Q. Use of contact tracing, isolation,
423 and mass testing to control transmission of covid-19 in China. *BMJ* 2021 Dec; 375. Publisher:
424 British Medical Journal Publishing Group Section: Analysis:n2330. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.n2330.
425 Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/375/bmj.n2330>
- 426 20. Daily COVID-19 tests per 1,000 people. Available from: <https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/daily-tests-per-thousand-people-smoothed-7-day> [Accessed on: 2023 Aug
427 12]
428

- 429 21. Brault V, Mallein B, and Rupprecht JF. Group testing as a strategy for COVID-19 epidemiological monitoring and community surveillance. *PLOS Computational Biology* 2021 Mar; 17. Publisher: Public Library of Science:e1008726. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008726. Available from: <https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008726>
- 430
431
432
433
- 434 22. Cleary B, Hay JA, Blumenstiel B, Harden M, Cipicchio M, Bezney J, Simonton B, Hong D, Senghore M, Sesay AK, Gabriel S, Regev A, and Mina MJ. Using viral load and epidemic dynamics to optimize pooled testing in resource-constrained settings. *Science Translational Medicine* 2021 Apr; 13. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science:eabf1568. DOI: 10.1126/scitranslmed.abf1568. Available from: <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/scitranslmed.abf1568>
- 435
436
437
438
439
- 440 23. Yu J, Huang Y, and Shen ZJ. Optimizing and evaluating PCR-based pooled screening during COVID-19 pandemics. *Scientific Reports* 2021 Nov; 11. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group:21460. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-021-01065-0. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-021-01065-0>
- 441
442
443
- 444 24. Middleton C and Larremore DB. Modeling the Transmission Mitigation Impact of Testing for Infectious Diseases. 2023 Sep. DOI: 10.1101/2023.09.22.23295983. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.09.22.23295983v1> [Accessed on: 2023 Oct 24]
- 445
446
447
- 448 25. Carrat F, Vergu E, Ferguson NM, Lemaître M, Cauchemez S, Leach S, and Valleron AJ. Time Lines of Infection and Disease in Human Influenza: A Review of Volunteer Challenge Studies. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2008 Apr; 167:775–85. DOI: 10.1093/aje/kwm375. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwm375>
- 449
450
451
- 452 26. Lewis FR, Elings VB, and Sturm JA. Bedside measurement of lung water. *Journal of Surgical Research* 1979 Oct; 27:250–61. DOI: 10.1016/0022-4804(79)90138-0. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022480479901380>
- 453
454
- 455 27. Yang J, Han Y, Zhang R, Zhang R, and Li J. Comparison of analytical sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 molecular detection kits. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2021 Oct; 111:233–41. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2021.08.043. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2021.08.043>
- 456
457
458
- 459 28. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, Massari M, Salmaso S, Tomba GS, Wallinga J, Heijne J, Sadkowska-Todys M, Rosinska M, and Edmunds WJ. Social Contacts and Mixing Patterns Relevant to the Spread of Infectious Diseases. *PLOS Medicine* 2008 Mar; 5. Publisher: Public Library of Science:e74. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074. Available from: <https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074>
- 460
461
462
463
464
- 465 29. Ke R, Zitzmann C, Ho DD, Ribeiro RM, and Perelson AS. In vivo kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 infection and its relationship with a person's infectiousness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2021 Dec; 118. Publisher: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences:e2111477118. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2111477118. Available from: <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2111477118>
- 466
467
468
469
- 470 30. Wagenhäuser I, Knies K, Hofmann D, Rauschenberger V, Eisenmann M, Reusch J, Gabel A, Flemming S, Andres O, Petri N, Topp MS, Papsdorf M, McDonogh M, Verma-Führung R, Scherzad A, Zeller D, Böhm H, Gesierich A, Seitz AK, Kiderlen M, Gawlik M, Taurines R, Wurmb T, Ernestus RI, Forster J, Weismann D, Weißbrich B, Dölken L, Liese J, Kaderali L, Kurzai O, Vogel U, and Krone M. Virus variant-specific clinical performance of SARS coronavirus two rapid antigen tests in point-of-care use, from November 2020 to January 2022. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* 2023 Feb; 29:225–32. DOI: 10.1016/j.cmi.2022.08.006. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1198743X22004220>
- 471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478

- 479 31. Marc A, Kerioui M, Blanquart F, Bertrand J, Mitjà O, Corbacho-Monné M, Marks M, and
480 Guedj J. Quantifying the relationship between SARS-CoV-2 viral load and infectiousness. *eLife*
481 2021 Sep; 10. Ed. by Cobey SE and Van der Meer JW. Publisher: eLife Sciences Publications,
482 Ltd:e69302. DOI: 10.7554/eLife.69302. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.](https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.69302)
483 69302
- 484 32. Brauner JM, Mindermann S, Sharma M, Johnston D, Salvatier J, Gavenčiak T, Stephenson
485 AB, Leech G, Altman G, Mikulik V, Norman AJ, Monrad JT, Besiroglu T, Ge H, Hartwick
486 MA, Teh YW, Chindelevitch L, Gal Y, and Kulveit J. Inferring the effectiveness of government
487 interventions against COVID-19. *Science* 2021 Feb; 371. Publisher: American Association for
488 the Advancement of Science:eabd9338. DOI: 10.1126/science.abd9338. Available from:
489 <https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.abd9338>
- 490 33. Karimzadeh S, Bhopal R, and Nguyen Tien H. Review of infective dose, routes of transmission
491 and outcome of COVID-19 caused by the SARS-COV-2: comparison with other respiratory
492 viruses. *Epidemiology and Infection* 2021 Apr; 149:e96. DOI: 10.1017/S0950268821000790.
493 Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8082124/>
- 494 34. Aynaud MM, Hernandez JJ, Barutcu S, Braunschweig U, Chan K, Pearson JD, Trcka D,
495 Prosser SL, Kim J, Barrios-Rodiles M, Jen M, Song S, Shen J, Bruce C, Hazlett B, Poutanen
496 S, Attisano L, Bremner R, Blencowe BJ, Mazzulli T, Han H, Pelletier L, and Wrana JL.
497 A multiplexed, next generation sequencing platform for high-throughput detection of SARS-
498 CoV-2. *Nature Communications* 2021 Mar; 12. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing
499 Group:1405. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-021-21653-y. Available from: [https://www.nature.](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-021-21653-y)
500 [com/articles/s41467-021-21653-y](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-021-21653-y)
- 501 35. Schreiber M. ‘We are not testing enough’: new US bird flu cases stoke fears over poor response.
502 *The Guardian* 2024 Sep. Available from: [https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2024/](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2024/sep/23/bird-flu-spreading-testing)
503 [sep/23/bird-flu-spreading-testing](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2024/sep/23/bird-flu-spreading-testing)
- 504 36. Srimokla O and Petrie J. Effective contact tracing can halve mass testing frequency needed
505 to control respiratory virus pandemics. 2023 Oct. DOI: 10.1101/2023.10.12.23296969.
506 Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.10.12.23296969v1>
507 [Accessed on: 2023 Nov 16]
- 508 37. Montazeri NX and Sandbrink JB. Innovate and Stockpile: Respiratory Protection for Essential
509 Workers in a Catastrophic Pandemic. *Health Security* 2023 Aug; 21. Publisher: Mary Ann
510 Liebert, Inc., publishers:266–71. DOI: 10.1089/hs.2022.0126. Available from: [https://www.](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/hs.2022.0126)
511 [liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/hs.2022.0126](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/hs.2022.0126)
- 512 38. Gottberg C von, Krumm S, Porzolt F, and Kilian R. The analysis of factors affecting mu-
513 nicipal employees’ willingness to report to work during an influenza pandemic by means of
514 the extended parallel process model (EPPM). *BMC Public Health* 2016 Jan; 16:26. DOI:
515 10.1186/s12889-015-2663-8. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2663-8)
516 [2663-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2663-8)
- 517 39. Hay JA, Hellewell J, and Qiu X. When intuition falters: repeated testing accuracy during an
518 epidemic. *European Journal of Epidemiology* 2021 Jul; 36:749–52. DOI: 10.1007/s10654-
519 021-00786-w. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-021-00786-w>
- 520 40. Han AX, Girdwood SJ, Khan S, Sacks JA, Toporowski A, Huq N, Hannay E, Russell CA, and
521 Nichols BE. Strategies for Using Antigen Rapid Diagnostic Tests to Reduce Transmission of
522 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A
523 Mathematical Modelling Study Applied to Zambia. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2023 Feb;
524 76:620–30. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciac814. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciac814)
525 [ciac814](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciac814)
- 526 41. Cutler DM and Summers LH. The COVID-19 Pandemic and the \$16 Trillion Virus. *JAMA*
527 2020 Oct; 324:1495–6. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2020.19759. Available from: [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.19759)
528 [10.1001/jama.2020.19759](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.19759)

- 529 42. Psacharopoulos G, Patrinos H, Collis V, and Vegas E. The COVID-19 cost of school closures.
530 2020 Apr. Available from: [https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-covid-19-cost-](https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-covid-19-cost-of-school-closures/)
531 [of-school-closures/](https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-covid-19-cost-of-school-closures/) [Accessed on: 2023 Aug 15]
- 532 43. Guglielmi G. Rapid coronavirus tests: a guide for the perplexed. *Nature* 2021 Feb; 590.
533 Bandiera_abtest: a Cg_type: News Feature Number: 7845 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group
534 Subject_term: SARS-CoV-2, Virology, Immunology:202-5. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-021-00332-
535 4. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-00332-4>
- 536 44. Gu W, Deng X, Lee M, Sucu YD, Arevalo S, Stryke D, Federman S, Gopez A, Reyes K,
537 Zorn K, Sample H, Yu G, Ishpuniani G, Briggs B, Chow ED, Berger A, Wilson MR, Wang C,
538 Hsu E, Miller S, DeRisi JL, and Chiu CY. Rapid pathogen detection by metagenomic next-
539 generation sequencing of infected body fluids. *Nature Medicine* 2021 Jan; 27. Number: 1
540 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group:115-24. DOI: 10.1038/s41591-020-1105-z. Available
541 from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-020-1105-z>
- 542 45. Lu R, Wu X, Wan Z, Li Y, Jin X, and Zhang C. A Novel Reverse Transcription Loop-Mediated
543 Isothermal Amplification Method for Rapid Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *International Journal of*
544 *Molecular Sciences* 2020 Apr; 21:2826. DOI: 10.3390/ijms21082826
- 545 46. Broughton JP, Deng X, Yu G, Fasching CL, Servellita V, Singh J, Miao X, Streithorst JA,
546 Granados A, Sotomayor-Gonzalez A, Zorn K, Gopez A, Hsu E, Gu W, Miller S, Pan CY, Gue-
547 varra H, Wadford DA, Chen JS, and Chiu CY. CRISPR-Cas12-based detection of SARS-CoV-2.
548 *Nature Biotechnology* 2020 Jul; 38. Number: 7 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group:870-4.
549 DOI: 10.1038/s41587-020-0513-4. Available from: [https://www.nature.com/articles/](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41587-020-0513-4)
550 [s41587-020-0513-4](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41587-020-0513-4)
- 551 47. Shiaelis N, Tometzki A, Peto L, McMahon A, Hepp C, Bickerton E, Favard C, Muriaux D,
552 Andersson M, Oakley S, Vaughan A, Matthews PC, Stoesser N, Crook DW, Kapanidis AN,
553 and Robb NC. Virus Detection and Identification in Minutes Using Single-Particle Imaging and
554 Deep Learning. *ACS Nano* 2023 Jan; 17. Publisher: American Chemical Society:697-710. DOI:
555 10.1021/acsnano.2c10159. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsnano.2c10159>
- 556 48. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, Bleicker T, Brünink S,
557 Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DG, Haagmans BL, Veer B van der, Brink S van den,
558 Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette JL, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C,
559 Koopmans MP, and Drosten C. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time
560 RT-PCR. *Eurosurveillance* 2020 Jan; 25:2000045. DOI: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.
561 3.2000045. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6988269/>
- 562 49. Li D, Zhang J, and Li J. Primer design for quantitative real-time PCR for the emerging
563 Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2. *Theranostics* 2020 Jun; 10:7150-62. DOI: 10.7150/thno.47649.
564 Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7330846/>
- 565 50. Jarvis B, Pavone T, and Cedillo I. Designing Commercial-Scale Oligonucleotide Synthesis.
566 *Pharmaceutical Technology*. *Pharmaceutical Technology-02-02-2020* 2020 Feb; 44. Publisher:
567 MJH Life Sciences:30-4. Available from: [https://www.pharmtech.com/view/designing-](https://www.pharmtech.com/view/designing-commercial-scale-oligonucleotide-synthesis)
568 [commercial-scale-oligonucleotide-synthesis](https://www.pharmtech.com/view/designing-commercial-scale-oligonucleotide-synthesis)
- 569 51. Why the CDC botched its coronavirus testing. Available from: [https://www.technologyreview.](https://www.technologyreview.com/2020/03/05/905484/why-the-cdc-botched-its-coronavirus-testing/)
570 [com/2020/03/05/905484/why-the-cdc-botched-its-coronavirus-testing/](https://www.technologyreview.com/2020/03/05/905484/why-the-cdc-botched-its-coronavirus-testing/) [Accessed
571 on: 2023 Aug 10]
- 572 52. Tobik ER, Kitfield-Vernon LB, Thomas RJ, Steel SA, Tan SH, Allicock OM, Choate BL, Ak-
573 barzada S, and Wyllie AL. Saliva as a sample type for SARS-CoV-2 detection: implementation
574 successes and opportunities around the globe. *Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics* 2022
575 May; 22. Publisher: Taylor & Francis _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14737159.2022.2094250>:519-
576 35. DOI: 10.1080/14737159.2022.2094250. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1080/](https://doi.org/10.1080/14737159.2022.2094250)
577 [14737159.2022.2094250](https://doi.org/10.1080/14737159.2022.2094250)

- 578 53. Bastos ML, Perlman-Arrow S, Menzies D, and Campbell JR. The Sensitivity and Costs of Test-
579 ing for SARS-CoV-2 Infection With Saliva Versus Nasopharyngeal Swabs. *Annals of Internal*
580 *Medicine* 2021 Apr; 174. Publisher: American College of Physicians:501–10. DOI: 10.7326/
581 M20-6569. Available from: <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/full/10.7326/M20-6569>
- 582 54. Vogels CBF, Watkins AE, Harden CA, Brackney DE, Shafer J, Wang J, Caraballo C, Kalinich
583 CC, Ott IM, Fauver JR, Kudo E, Lu P, Venkataraman A, Tokuyama M, Moore AJ, Muenker
584 MC, Casanovas-Massana A, Fournier J, Bermejo S, Campbell M, Datta R, Nelson A, Anastasio
585 K, Askenase MH, Batsu M, Bickerton S, Brower K, Bucklin ML, Cahill S, Cao Y, Courchaine
586 E, DeIuliis G, Earnest R, Geng B, Goldman-Israelow B, Handoko R, Khoury-Hanold W, Kim
587 D, Knaggs L, Kuang M, Lapidus S, Lim J, Linehan M, Lu-Culligan A, Martin A, Matos I,
588 McDonald D, Minasyan M, Nakahata M, Naushad N, Nouws J, Obaid A, Odio C, Oh JE,
589 Omer S, Park A, Park HJ, Peng X, Petrone M, Prophet S, Rice T, Rose KA, Sewanan L,
590 Sharma L, Shaw AC, Shepard D, Smolgovsky M, Sonnert N, Strong Y, Todeasa C, Valdez J,
591 Velazquez S, Vijayakumar P, White EB, Yang Y, Dela Cruz CS, Ko AI, Iwasaki A, Krumholz
592 HM, Matheus JD, Hui P, Liu C, Farhadian SF, Sikka R, Wyllie AL, and Grubaugh ND.
593 SalivaDirect: A simplified and flexible platform to enhance SARS-CoV-2 testing capacity.
594 *Med* 2021 Mar; 2:263–280.e6. DOI: 10.1016/j.medj.2020.12.010. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666634020300763>
- 596 55. Cardwell K, O’Neill SM, Tyner B, Broderick N, O’Brien K, Smith SM, Harrington P, Ryan
597 M, and O’Neill M. A rapid review of measures to support people in isolation or quarantine
598 during the Covid-19 pandemic and the effectiveness of such measures. *Reviews in Medical*
599 *Virology* 2022; 32. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/rmv.2244>.
600 DOI: 10.1002/rmv.2244. Available from: [https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/rmv.2244)
601 [1002/rmv.2244](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/rmv.2244)
- 602 56. Grout L, Katar A, Ait Ouakrim D, Summers JA, Kvalsvig A, Baker MG, Blakely T, and
603 Wilson N. Failures of quarantine systems for preventing COVID-19 outbreaks in Australia
604 and New Zealand. *Medical Journal of Australia* 2021; 215:320–4. DOI: 10.5694/mja2.51240.
605 Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.5694/mja2.51240>
- 606 57. DiGiovanni C, Conley J, Chiu D, and Zaborski J. Factors Influencing Compliance with Quar-
607 antine in Toronto During the 2003 SARS Outbreak. *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism: Biodefense*
608 *Strategy, Practice, and Science* 2004 Dec; 2. Publisher: Mary Ann Liebert, Inc., publish-
609 ers:265–72. DOI: 10.1089/bsp.2004.2.265. Available from: [https://www.liebertpub.com/
610 doi/10.1089/bsp.2004.2.265](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/10.1089/bsp.2004.2.265)
- 611 58. Li Z, Liu F, Cui J, Peng Z, Chang Z, Lai S, Chen Q, Wang L, Gao GF, and Feng Z. Com-
612 prehensive large-scale nucleic acid-testing strategies support China’s sustained containment
613 of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine* 2021 May; 27. Number: 5 Publisher: Nature Publishing
614 Group:740–2. DOI: 10.1038/s41591-021-01308-7. Available from: [https://www.nature.](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-021-01308-7)
615 [com/articles/s41591-021-01308-7](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-021-01308-7)
- 616 59. Minhas N, Gurav YK, Sambhare S, Potdar V, Choudhary ML, Bhardwaj SD, and Abraham P.
617 Cost-analysis of real time RT-PCR test performed for COVID-19 diagnosis at India’s national
618 reference laboratory during the early stages of pandemic mitigation. *PLOS ONE* 2023 Jan;
619 18. Publisher: Public Library of Science:e0277867. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0277867.
620 Available from: [https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0277867)
621 [pone.0277867](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0277867)
- 622 60. Home Office. Fire and rescue workforce and pensions statistics: England, April 2021 to March
623 2022. Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/fire-and-rescue-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/fire-and-rescue-workforce-and-pensions-statistics-england-april-2021-to-march-2022/fire-and-rescue-workforce-and-pensions-statistics-england-april-2021-to-march-2022)
624 [workforce-and-pensions-statistics-england-april-2021-to-march-2022/fire-and-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/fire-and-rescue-workforce-and-pensions-statistics-england-april-2021-to-march-2022/fire-and-rescue-workforce-and-pensions-statistics-england-april-2021-to-march-2022)
625 [rescue-workforce-and-pensions-statistics-england-april-2021-to-march-2022](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/fire-and-rescue-workforce-and-pensions-statistics-england-april-2021-to-march-2022/fire-and-rescue-workforce-and-pensions-statistics-england-april-2021-to-march-2022)
626 [Accessed on: 2023 Aug 12]

- 627 61. Diagnostic & Medical Laboratories in the US - Market Size, Industry Analysis, Trends and
628 Forecasts (2023-2028)— IBISWorld. Available from: <https://www.ibisworld.com/default.aspx> [Accessed on: 2023 Nov 2]
629
- 630 62. Landaverde L, McIntyre D, Robson J, Fu D, Ortiz L, Chen R, Oliveira SMD, Fan A, Barrett A,
631 Burgay SP, Choate S, Corbett D, Doucette-Stamm L, Gonzales K, Hamer DH, Huang L, Huval
632 S, Knight C, Landa C, Lindquist D, Lockard K, Macdowell TL, Mauro E, McGinty C, Miller
633 C, Monahan M, Moore R, Platt J, Rolles L, Roy J, Schroeder T, Tolan DR, Zaia A, Brown
634 RA, Waters G, Densmore D, and Klapperich CM. Buildout and integration of an automated
635 high-throughput CLIA laboratory for SARS-CoV-2 testing on a large urban campus. *SLAS*
636 *Technology* 2022 Oct; 27. Publisher: Elsevier:302–11. DOI: 10.1016/j.slast.2022.06.003.
637 Available from: [https://slas-technology.org/article/S2472-6303\(22\)05163-9/
638 fulltext](https://slas-technology.org/article/S2472-6303(22)05163-9/fulltext)
- 639 63. Douthwaite JA, Brown CA, Ferdinand JR, Sharma R, Elliott J, Taylor MA, Malintan NT,
640 Duvoisin H, Hill T, Delpuech O, Orton AL, Pitt H, Kuenzi F, Fish S, Nicholls DJ, Cuthbert
641 A, Richards I, Ratcliffe G, Upadhyay A, Marklew A, Hewitt C, Ross-Thriepland D, Brankin
642 C, Chodorge M, Browne G, Mander PK, DeWildt RM, Weaver S, Smee PA, Kempen J van,
643 Bartlett JG, Allen PM, Koppe EL, Ashby CA, Phipps JD, Mehta N, Brierley DJ, Tew DG,
644 Leveridge MV, Baddeley SM, Goodfellow IG, Green C, Abell C, Neely A, Waddell I, Rees S,
645 Maxwell PH, Pangalos MN, Howes R, and Clark R. Improving the efficiency and effectiveness
646 of an industrial SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic facility. *Scientific Reports* 2022 Feb; 12. Number:
647 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group:3114. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-022-06873-6. Available
648 from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-022-06873-6>
- 649 64. Krijger PHL, Hoek TA, Boersma S, Donders LIPM, Broeders MMC, Pieterse M, Toonen PW,
650 Logister I, Verhagen BMP, Verstegen MJAM, Ravesteyn TW van, Roymans RJTM, Mattioli
651 F, Vandesompele J, Nijhuis M, Meijer S, Weert A van, Dekker E, Dom FJ, Ruijtenbeek R,
652 Velden LBJ van der, Bovenkamp JHB van de, Bosch M, Laat W de, and Tanenbaum ME.
653 A public–private partnership model for COVID-19 diagnostics. *Nature Biotechnology* 2021
654 Oct; 39. Number: 10 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group:1182–4. DOI: 10.1038/s41587-021-
655 01080-6. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41587-021-01080-6>
- 656 65. Moses S, Warren C, Robinson P, Curtis J, Asquith S, Holme J, Jain N, Brookes KJ, and
657 Hanley QS. Endpoint PCR Detection of Sars-CoV-2 RNA. 2020 Jul. DOI: 10.1101/2020.
658 07.21.20158337. Available from: [https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.
659 21.20158337v1](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.21.20158337v1) [Accessed on: 2023 Aug 12]
- 660 66. Ultra-high-throughput PCR testing system for SARS-CoV-2 detection. Available from: [https://www.biosearchtech.com/ultra-high-throughput-pcr-testing-system-for-sars-
661 cov-2-detection](https://www.biosearchtech.com/ultra-high-throughput-pcr-testing-system-for-sars-cov-2-detection) [Accessed on: 2023 Aug 12]
662
- 663 67. SUMMARY NOTE: VISIT TO THE ROSALIND FRANKLIN LABORATORY, LEAMING-
664 TON SPA (DECEMBER 2021). Available from: [https://committees.parliament.uk/
665 writtenevidence/107131/html/](https://committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/107131/html/) [Accessed on: 2023 Aug 12]
- 666 68. Lovett S. Inside Britain’s flagship Covid lab that no one knows what to do with. 2022 Apr.
667 Available from: [https://www.independent.co.uk/news/health/covid-test-rosalind-
668 franklin-laboratory-b2067802.html](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/health/covid-test-rosalind-franklin-laboratory-b2067802.html) [Accessed on: 2023 Aug 12]
- 669 69. Cost of processing a PCR test for Covid-19: FOI release. Available from: [http://www.gov.
670 scot/publications/foi-202100215784/](http://www.gov.scot/publications/foi-202100215784/) [Accessed on: 2023 Aug 12]
- 671 70. Mendoza RP, Bi C, Cheng HT, Gabutan E, Pagaspas GJ, Khan N, Hoxie H, Hanna S, Holmes
672 K, Gao N, Lewis R, Wang H, Neumann D, Chan A, Takizawa M, Lowe J, Chen X, Kelly B,
673 Asif A, Barnes K, Khan N, May B, Chowdhury T, Pollonini G, Gouda N, Guy C, Gordon C,
674 Ayoluwa N, Colon E, Miller-Medzon N, Jones S, Hossain R, Dodson A, Weng M, McGaskey M,
675 Vasileva A, Lincoln AE, Sikka R, Wyllie AL, Berke EM, Libien J, Pincus M, and Premrirut
676 PK. Implementation of a pooled surveillance testing program for asymptomatic SARS-CoV-
677 2 infections in K-12 schools and universities. *eClinicalMedicine* 2021 Aug; 38. Publisher:

- 678 Elsevier. DOI: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101028. Available from: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/eclinm/article/PIIS2589-5370\(21\)00308-4/fulltext#%20](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/eclinm/article/PIIS2589-5370(21)00308-4/fulltext#%20)
- 679
- 680 71. Taylor A, Fram A, Kellman L, and Superville D. Trump signs \$2.2T stimulus after swift con-
- 681 gressional votes. 2020 Mar. Available from: [https://apnews.com/article/donald-trump-](https://apnews.com/article/donald-trump-financial-markets-ap-top-news-bills-virus-outbreak-2099a53bb8adf2def7ee7329ea322f9d)
- 682 [financial-markets-ap-top-news-bills-virus-outbreak-2099a53bb8adf2def7ee7329ea322f9d](https://apnews.com/article/donald-trump-financial-markets-ap-top-news-bills-virus-outbreak-2099a53bb8adf2def7ee7329ea322f9d)
- 683 [Accessed on: 2023 Aug 12]

684 Appendices

685 A Implementation Feasibility

686 For a mass testing strategy to be effective, there are several things that must go right: (1) tests
687 must be available early in a pandemic; (2) there must be scalable logistics for fast transportation of
688 tests/samples; (3) there must be sufficient public support for the strategy; (4) this support must be
689 translated into sufficient adherence to testing and effective isolation; (5) there must be enough test
690 equipment and skilled technicians; (6) the variable cost per test must be affordable. While these
691 challenges are significant, the massive costs of either social distancing or unchecked disease, and
692 the difficulties of effective contact tracing, motivate a thorough investigation of mass testing as a
693 potential solution, either as an alternative to distancing and contact tracing, or as an adjunct.

694 In this Appendix we focus on PCR testing of saliva samples because it is a mature technology
695 that has been proven at scale and can be functional within weeks of detecting a pandemic. Rapid
696 antigen testing is another option that has been proven at scale, but for it to be useful in future pan-
697 demics, development, manufacturing, and deployment would have to be much faster than they were
698 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, rapid antigen tests became available almost a year
699 after detecting the COVID-19 pandemic [43]. There are also several other promising technologies,
700 e.g. based on multiplexed next-generation sequencing [34, 44], LAMP [45], CRISPR [46], or even
701 particle imaging [47]. The aim of this Appendix is to demonstrate one relatively low-risk strategy
702 for scaling up, but not to argue that it is the best or only possible solution for mass testing. In
703 the ideal case, redundant technological approaches and infrastructure could improve robustness to
704 unanticipated challenges.

705 A.1 Time to Deploy

706 PCR can be ready within weeks of detecting a pathogen; e.g., Corman et al. published a protocol for
707 SARS-CoV-2 on January 23, 2020, 13 days after the pathogen sequence was first published [48]. The
708 main decision that needs to be made is which amplicon targets to use to selectively amplify RNA
709 or DNA from the pathogen of interest (e.g. distinguishing SARS-CoV-2 from other coronaviruses)
710 [49]. After a protocol is chosen, oligonucleotides for the target amplicons can be synthesized with
711 a high-throughput solid phase process [50] and distributed to testing labs. Redundancy in protocol
712 design and test kit manufacturing would be prudent to avoid delays like the ones experienced by
713 the USA in early 2020 [51].

714 A.2 Logistics: Sample Collection and Transportation

715 Cost-effective deployment at scale could be achieved by borrowing approaches from home delivery
716 services, a market that has recently expanded and successfully overcome many logistical challenges.
717 As an example, both unused sample collection kits and self-collected saliva samples could be left at
718 unstaffed booths (potentially with security cameras to deter misuse). This could be done cheaply
719 by providing a tray of empty tubes from which users detach a QR code, collect and seal a saliva
720 sample, and place the tube in a box. Rideshare or delivery companies could be hired on demand
721 to frequently (i.e. ideally with less than 4 hours wait time to achieve a total turnaround less than
722 8 hours) pick up the boxes of samples at a low average cost per sample (e.g. if 50 samples were
723 transported by a \$30 USD Uber ride). In low or middle income countries (LMICs) the available
724 budget would likely be lower, but the cost of labour would also be lower. The right choices for
725 logistics depend on the setting, but using self-collected samples with batched delivery through
726 existing consumer delivery services or similar could likely keep the cost of logistics below \$1 per
727 sample in high income countries and considerably lower in LMICs.

728 **A.3 Public Support**

729 Mass testing depends on public support, which could potentially be improved by making the overall
730 approach simple and non-invasive. For example, several schools used saliva or gargle based testing
731 because it avoids the discomfort of nasopharyngeal swabs [52] and samples are easily self-collected
732 without specialized supplies. Saliva tests sometimes had higher sensitivity early in infection [53],
733 although the cheap, low-volume SalivaDirect test had slightly worse sensitivity [54]. Using easily
734 accessible locations where tests can be completed within a few minutes could also improve the overall
735 experience. Because public support is so important for mass testing to be successful, it is likely
736 worthwhile to make significant trade-offs in test sensitivity, delay time, or cost if necessary. However,
737 if there remains insufficient public support for mass testing of the entire population, testing could
738 be focused on schools and senior living facilities.

739 **A.4 Testing and Isolation Adherence**

740 The achievable level of testing and isolation adherence depends on public sentiment, which likely
741 depends strongly on the severity of the pandemic. In milder pandemics, adherence might depend
742 on voluntary participation, as enforcement might be too extreme an infringement on civil liberties.
743 However, in a very deadly pandemic without viable alternative control strategies, there might be
744 support for more strictly enforcing adherence. This might be easier if the verification process is
745 smooth, and if those who do not wish to adhere have some viable (albeit restrictive) alternative
746 option to partially quarantine rather than test. E.g., proof of a recent negative test could be
747 required for entry into public spaces where there is substantial risk of transmission (similar to
748 testing requirements for flights or some schools or workplaces for SARS-CoV-2).

749 Data on the effectiveness of home isolation is limited [55], but isolation in dedicated facilities
750 is likely to be highly effective. Even quarantine in poorly chosen facilities that mixed air between
751 the infected and uninfected was shown to be at least 99.4% effective at preventing transmissions of
752 SARS-CoV-2 from infected cases in Australia [56]. Isolation could be incentivized by fully replacing
753 lost wages (the COVID-19 pandemic typically saw partial wage replacement at best [57]), and
754 providing generous support (e.g. accommodation, food, childcare, medical care) [55]. Successful
755 local control of a pandemic corresponds to fewer than 1/1000 people infected at any time (and
756 hopefully far fewer), meaning that spending double each person's salary to support their isolation
757 would cost less than 2/1000 of GDP.

758 **A.5 Testing Capacity: Equipment and Skilled Labour**

759 Test capacity depends on equipment and skilled labour. Capacity was a significant barrier to
760 performing mass testing during the COVID-19 response when there was little time to manufacture,
761 let alone design, new equipment. Sample pooling was sometimes used to test more people using a
762 fixed amount of available equipment, at the expense of decreased sensitivity, increased complexity,
763 and many re-tests when prevalence is high [58].

764 A simple way to build PCR capacity in preparation for future pandemics is to manufacture more
765 conventional PCR equipment, to be combined with sample pooling. Minhas et al's description of a
766 national lab in Pune, India [59] can be used as a basis to estimate the upfront investment and number
767 of trained staff needed for this strategy, although we note that locations with high labour costs would
768 probably employ fewer people while using more expensive equipment. Their peak capacity was 1800
769 samples per day, they employed around 100 people, and the cost of their diagnostic equipment was
770 15,592,420 INR, which is roughly equivalent to \$188,000 USD. The same lab could process samples
771 that were pooled 10x at time of collection (having all 10 individuals home isolate until individually
772 retested), thus processing roughly 18,000 samples per day. 100 people employed in a lab per 20,000
773 sampled is 1/200 of the total population; this would be highly costly to staff in preparation. As a
774 comparison, 1/2000 people are on 'standby' as firefighters in the UK [60]. Rapidly recruiting skilled
775 technicians when a pandemic is detected is another option, but this would be difficult to do in 1-2

776 months and only about 1/1000 people are currently employed in the medical diagnostics industry
777 in the US [61].

778 Alternatively, there has been recent progress on highly automated workflows for PCR diagnostics
779 [62, 63, 64] that require fewer lab technicians. One example is endpoint PCR [65], which uses a
780 waterbath instead of the more common piezoelectric system, for higher-throughput thermal cycling
781 at lower cost. A large British diagnostics company, LGC Group, claims to be able to test 150,000
782 samples per day [66] with two technicians per shift and an upfront cost of \$902,000 USD for
783 the equipment [personal communication]. We note however that a real-world deployment of this
784 technology only reached 65,000 samples/day with an infrastructure cost of \$186M USD [67]. The
785 reasons for such a high cost include construction of a 220,000 square foot facility, while the low
786 output likely reflects reliability issues with early-stage technology [68].

787 One strategy for building and maintaining high-throughput PCR for the purpose of pandemic
788 readiness, within a developed country, is to make research institutions eligible for targeted grants.
789 These grants would provide standardized ultra-high-throughput PCR equipment, which the grantee
790 would be free to put to innovative research use between emergencies. In exchange, grantees would
791 guarantee a mobilizable workforce able to use the equipment for mass testing, as assessed through a
792 system of occasional drills. Once established, it might be found that mass testing is useful more often
793 than anticipated, e.g. at the time of writing, there is an acute need for more H5N1 testing of cows
794 and farm workers in the United States [35]. Such a scheme would have the benefit of standardizing
795 the equipment, once an appropriate prototype is available. The current LGC technology would first
796 need clearer proof of concept before being chosen, and it is possible that more R&D is first required
797 to build an adequate system.

798 A.6 Variable Cost per Test

799 Even when there is sufficient equipment and trained personnel, there is a per-test cost that de-
800 termines how much countries can afford to test in a pandemic. This cost depends on the price
801 of consumables and the price of logistics (discussed in Section A.2), and was fairly high in most
802 countries during the COVID-19 pandemic (e.g. \$24 - \$55 USD per test in the UK [69]). Pooled
803 testing substantially reduced the cost of PCR testing during the COVID-19 pandemic by using less
804 consumables per sample (e.g. Mirimus Inc. tested students in New York for \$10/sample [70], and
805 China tested millions of people for \$1.50/sample [58]). SalivaDirect demonstrated that low prices
806 could be achieved by using a small volume of the cheapest available reagents, reducing the cost of
807 consumables to \$1.21/sample with an extraction free protocol [54]. In Section A.5 we argued that
808 the cost of logistics in high income countries could be less than \$1 per sample, so with consumables
809 included the cost per test could be around \$2. For wealthier countries, a cost of \$2/person/day
810 is very affordable if it averts most of the harm of the pandemic, and for LMICs, the cost could
811 potentially be further reduced with sample pooling and when considering the lower cost of delivery.
812 For the USA, the cost of testing every person daily for a year would be about \$240 billion, which
813 is almost 10 times smaller than the \$2.2 trillion spent on the CARES Act [71] in response to the
814 COVID-19 pandemic.

815 B Impact of Heterogeneity in Transmissibility and Time to 816 Peak Viral Load

817 We modeled each pathogen as having a fixed expected number of transmissions (R_0) and time
818 to reach peak viral load (τ_p) for every infected person. In reality, viral load trajectories will be
819 different for every person who is infected, which could be more accurately modelled as drawing
820 R_0 and τ_p from a distribution. By only computing R_e at the average parameter values instead of
821 integrating over the entire parameter distribution we might introduce some error. I.e., we made the
822 approximation that $E[R_e(\tau_p, R_0)] \approx R_e(E[\tau_p], E[R_0])$, where $[\tau_p, R_0]$ is a random vector.




Figure 6: R_e vs. R_0 and τ_p for daily antigen testing (with immediate results) and PCR testing (with an 8 hour result delay).

823 If $R_e(\tau_p, R_0)$ is a linear function, then this approximation is exact. If $R_e(\tau_p, R_0)$ is well ap-
 824 proximated by a linear function in the neighborhood occupied by the parameter distribution for
 825 a pathogen, then the error introduced by this approximation is therefore small. Figure 6 shows
 826 how R_e depends on R_0 and τ_p for PCR tests and antigen tests (assuming perfect adherence - lower
 827 adherence can be computed with a linear transformation of the displayed function). Approximately
 828 linear regions in the function are shown as either not having any contour lines (flat) or having
 829 consistent spacing between straight contour lines (increasing linearly in the direction of a constant
 830 vector). For both types of tests the function is nonlinear when $\tau_p < 3$ days, and for antigen tests
 831 the function becomes nonlinear with lower values of R_0 . If the $[\tau_p, R_0]$ distribution for a pathogen
 832 does not have much mass in these non-linear regions, then the point approximation does not cause
 833 significant error.

834 C Sensitivity to Symptom-Based Behaviour Modification

835 Modified assumptions regarding timing of symptoms and behaviour change due to symptoms do
 836 not substantially change the estimated effectiveness of mass testing. Figure 7 is generated using
 837 the same parameters as Figure 3, except symptoms occur 24 hours before peak viral load instead
 838 of at the time of peak viral load, and contacts are reduced 75% instead of 50% after symptoms.
 839 Because R_0 is held at the same value of 2.75, the peak viral load for the scenario with earlier
 840 symptoms is higher. The predicted impact of testing in these two scenarios is almost identical,
 841 except with earlier symptoms, slightly more frequent testing is needed. This is mainly because the
 842 increase in peak viral load shifts more transmissions earlier in the infection, which requires more
 843 frequent testing to detect in time. Similarly, Figure 8 shows a modified version of Figure 5 in the
 844 scenario where symptoms are detected 24 hours before peak viral load, and cause a 75% reduction
 845 in transmissions. For a fixed R_0 , the addition of symptoms changes the shape of the infectiousness
 846 profile. Daily testing performs slightly worse in this scenario because more transmissions occur
 847 earlier in infection. With testing every 3 days for fast viruses, the increase in test sensitivity from
 848 a greater viral load is a more important effect, causing the testing effectiveness to increase slightly.




Figure 7: **Fraction of (ancestral variant) SARS-CoV-2 transmissions prevented when symptoms occur 1 day before peak viral load, and contacts are reduced by 75% after symptoms.** Compare to symptoms 0 days before peak viral load and a 50% reduction in contacts in Figure 3). Because R_0 is kept at 2.75, the additional behaviour modification from symptoms causes the computed peak viral load to increase slightly, causing transmissions to shift earlier in infection. Except for a slight reduction in the effectiveness of slow PCR tests, the modified symptom parameters do not substantially change Figure 3.




Figure 8: **Effectiveness of mass testing with and without behaviour modification due to symptoms.** As in Figure 5, the solid lines do not include symptoms. The dashed lines are computed with symptoms 24 hours before peak viral load and a 75% reduction in contacts after symptoms. For a fixed value of R_0 , the addition of symptoms causes the computed viral load to increase and transmissions to shift earlier in infection. Earlier transmissions are generally more difficult to control, so the effectiveness of mass testing decreases slightly because of this.

849 **D Sensitivity to Infectiousness Midpoint**

850 To test the sensitivity of our results to the infectiousness function in Equation 3, we reduce the viral
851 load at which half of peak infectiousness has been reached from $K_m = 8.9 \cdot 10^6$ to $K_m = 8.9 \cdot 10^4$.
852 With a 100 times smaller value of K_m , the viral load needed to transmit is substantially lower,
853 while the viral load needed to detect infection stays the same. In Figure 9 we see that with the
854 reduced value of K_m , frequent PCR testing does slightly worse than in Figure 5, while antigen
855 testing fails to control any of the pathogens. This is because in this extreme scenario, PCR tests
856 are still able to detect infections before people become substantially infectious, while the antigen
857 tests fail to detect infected people even at their highest viral load.




Figure 9: Figures 4 and 5, are recomputed with the viral load midpoint for infectiousness reduced from $K_m = 8.9 \cdot 10^6$ to $K_m = 8.9 \cdot 10^4$. In the upper 3 panels we see that for PCR tests, the number of transmissions prevented is slightly lower than in Figure 4, and for antigen tests less than 30% of the transmissions are prevented. In the bottom two panels, PCR tests are able to control a similar range of epidemics as in Figure 5 (with slightly reduced effectiveness) and antigen tests are unable to substantially control any outbreaks.