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**Abstract**

**Objectives:** The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) — also known as the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) — pandemic has led to the swift introduction of population testing programmes in many countries across the world, using testing modalities such as drive-through, walk-through, mobile and home visiting programmes. Here, we provide an overview of the literature describing the experience of implementing population testing for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).

**Study design:** Scoping review.

**Methods:** We conducted a scoping review using Embase, Medline and the Cochrane library in addition to a grey literature search. We identified indicators relevant to process, quality and resource outcomes related to each testing modality.

**Results:** In total, 2999 titles were identified from the academic literature and the grey literature search, of which 22 were relevant. Most studies were from the USA and the Republic of Korea. Drive-through testing centres were the most common testing modality evaluated and these provided a rapid method of testing whilst minimising resource use.

**Conclusions:** The evidence base for population testing lacks high quality studies, however, the literature provides evaluations of the advantages and limitations of different testing modalities. There is a need for robust evidence in this area to ensure that testing is deployed in a safe and effective manner in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

© 2021 The Royal Society for Public Health. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

**Introduction**

In response to the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic, many countries implemented population testing programmes as part of countermeasures to contain the spread of infection and mitigate its health and economic impacts. Population testing provides disease surveillance required to inform broader policy decisions, target resource utilisation and, when twinned with timely case isolation and contact tracing, more effective containment of the virus. Worldwide, population testing programmes are diverse, depending on the population eligible for testing, the technology used to sample and analyse specimens, as well as the timing and frequency of testing. In this article, we have defined population testing as any testing programme which uses an antigen or antibody test to identify coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in a group of symptomatic and/or asymptomatic individuals. In the UK, there are two distinct testing programmes. The UK National Health Service (NHS) Test and Trace system [NHSTT] tests self-reported, symptomatic individuals using quantitative polymerase chain reaction (Q-PCR) assays. More recently, mass testing of asymptomatic individuals using cheaper, faster lateral flow devices has also been introduced.

Population testing seeks to identify people infected with SARS-CoV-2 in a predefined group such as healthcare workers. By identifying cases of infection through testing, action can be taken to limit infection spread by isolating infected individuals and their contacts during their infectious period. As SARS-CoV-2 may be spread by asymptomatic individuals, including these individuals in testing programmes could help reduce viral transmission. Cumulatively, these actions help control the spread of infection and create conditions that would enable the relatively normal functioning of society.

Modalities used for COVID-19 population testing include drive-in, walk-in, mobile sites, postal testing and home visits. The UK, for example, adopted a testing strategy with five pillars, each pillar pertaining to a population subgroup and focussing on either
diagnosis, detecting past infection or for surveillance purposes to estimate population prevalence. Testing is co-ordinated centrally and delivered from satellite centres and via postal testing.2 South Korea adopted walk-in and drive-through testing,3,4 whilst some areas in Scotland have instituted home-testing to reach more vulnerable groups who cannot access test facilities easily.5,6 There is also increasing political and societal concern of the socioeconomic impact of blunt strategies such as national ‘lockdowns’ to combat COVID-19,7 and their effect on health inequalities. There may therefore be value in studying the different approaches used worldwide and to learn from successful programmes from other countries.

What is currently unclear is whether any modality of population testing is more robust and efficacious for containing the virus. There is a need to identify population testing programmes that are more accessible and effective at containing the spread of infection, together with the determinants of success. This can help inform national testing policies as part of the pandemic response efforts to minimise the health, social and economic harms. We conducted a scoping review to describe the volume and type of evidence reporting on the experience of implementing population testing for SARS-CoV-2 in high and upper-middle income countries during the pandemic.

Methods

Scoping review methodology

Scoping reviews aim to rapidly map the key concepts underpinning a research area, by comprehensively summarising evidence to inform practice and policy and provide direction for future research.8,9 Scoping reviews use rigorous and transparent literature searching methods but differ from systematic reviews as the quality of included studies are not routinely assessed, nor do they provide a synthesised answer to a particular research question.10

This scoping review followed the framework proposed by Arksey and O’Malley9 and refined by Levac et al.11 briefly comprising: identification of the research question, identification of studies, selection of studies, charting of data and collation of results. This review was commissioned by Public Health England who were consulted on the interim outputs of the study. The trial protocol was published on PROSPERO, number CRD42020186506.

Identification of the research question

The purpose of this review was to assess the volume of published literature describing the experience of implementing population testing for COVID-19 and to identify the nature and characteristics of the testing programmes. We sought to elucidate what data were available to assess the outcomes of these testing programmes in terms of processes, participants, quality and/or resource-use. We developed these broad aims in order to generate breadth of coverage and map the literature on this topic so that key concepts and gaps could be identified to inform further practice and policy.

Table 1 outlines the inclusion and exclusion criteria for this review. Studies were included if they described the process of providing or accessing a population testing point for symptomatic and/or asymptomatic individuals for COVID-19, using an antigen or antibody test in any setting, using any testing modality. In order to prioritise research relevant to high-income countries such as the UK, we included literature relating to comparable health services from high and upper-middle income countries only.

Studies of laboratory aspects of testing (including diagnostic accuracy), commentaries, opinion pieces and modelling studies were excluded. Studies that described screening where samples were not taken, or that described the testing of passengers at ports or borders, were also considered out of scope and excluded.

Table 1 inclusion and exclusion criteria.

| Inclusion criteria | Exclusion criteria |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| ● Any study evaluating or describing the process of providing or accessing a population testing point for COVID-19 | ● Commentaries, modelling studies or opinion pieces |
| ● Symptomatic and/or asymptomatic individuals | ● Studies describing only laboratory aspects of testing, including studies of diagnostic accuracy. |
| ● Any setting | ● Studies describing only testing at ports or borders |
| ● Antibody or antigen testing | ● Studies describing only screening in which samples were not taken |
| ● Any testing modality (for example drive through testing or home visiting testing) | ● Not written in English |
| ● High or upper-middle income countries according to World Bank criteria | |
categorised into one of five different types: drive-through testing, home visiting testing, indoor walk-through centre, outdoor walk-through centre and mobile testing. For outcome data, a thematic framework was used which categorised any quantitative outcomes indicators into one of four groups: process outcomes, participant outcomes, quality outcomes and resource use outcomes.

**Results**

The database search returned 2999 results (Fig. 1). After automated and manual deduplication, 2751 unique references were screened for relevance to the question. On first screening of titles, 250 references were identified as potentially relevant, and on further reading 22 were categorised as relevant.

**Study characteristics**

A summary of the studies' characteristics is presented in Table 2. Most of the published literature on this topic is difficult to assign to a study type. Studies were often referred to as brief reports or short communications. The articles typically comprise a description of the testing modality of interest, often with a diagram of the layout of the testing centre and useful operational details followed by an evaluation of its advantages and disadvantages. In some articles, a comparison group was described; however, there were no published randomised controlled trials (RCTs). One article was a qualitative interview study of early experiences of drive-through testing centres.13

All the eligible studies described population testing programmes where samples were taken from symptomatic and occasionally asymptomatic individuals. There were no eligibility studies of mass testing, defined as regular and/or large-scale testing of individuals from defined populations regardless of symptom status using lateral flow tests. Many articles describing testing programmes were from the USA (43% of studies) and the Republic of Korea (29% of studies).

Most articles described testing programmes in high income countries (95% of articles), with only one originating from an upper-middle income country (Malaysia).15

**Testing modalities**

Several different testing modalities were described, which were categorised into five main categories: drive-through, home visiting, mobile testing, indoor walk-through centres and outdoor walk-through centres.

Sometimes described as off-site COVID-19 testing centres (OSCTCs),13 drive-through testing centres were by far the most common testing modality evaluated (in 72% of articles), in Israel, Malaysia, Korea, Scotland and the USA. This testing modality enabled the use of a vehicle as a self-contained unit, which can reduce the spread of infection. Most were in car parks, stadiums and parks, and one was in an open-air area of a hospital.26 Some centres enabled individuals without a car to walk in for testing13 in order to increase accessibility. Six articles described drive-through testing in combination with either home visiting testing, mobile testing and/or walk-through testing, enabling a greater proportion of the population to access testing.

Home visiting testing (18% of articles) typically involved a small number of healthcare workers visiting the home of an individual to perform a test. This enabled individuals who are home-bound, frail or have no means of private transportation to access testing without having to use an ambulance, visit a hospital or rely on the assistance of others to access a drive-through site. These schemes were often used as an alternative to local drive-through testing facilities. Home visiting testing took place in Israel, Scotland and the USA.

Two articles described mobile testing, in which testing staff visited populations rather than expecting the participants to travel to a testing centre. In Korea, testing staff visited workers onsite at their workplaces28 and in Florida, mobile polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing laboratories were used to provide point-of-care testing in different cities.27

![Fig. 1. PRISMA flow diagram.](image-url)
Indoor walk-through centres based in healthcare facilities were used in Singapore and Korea. There were several different designs for walk-through centres, which were located inside hospitals or other healthcare facilities: screening centres,22,26 negative pressure booths16 and negative pressure tents.16 Screening centres permit individuals to access testing inside a building. The Singapore Screening Centre was designed to minimise the movement of patients around the building.26 Patients were assigned a seat number and tagged with a tracker to facilitate contact tracing; staff visited patients in their seats to further reduce contact amongst patients.

Negative pressure booths and tents have been designed to minimise the opportunity for viral spread in an indoor setting. Negative pressure booths22 were used for sample collection and minimising the movement of patients.25 Staff working in the tent wore full personal protective equipment (PPE) and most of the tent required sterilisation between people tested that took at least 30 min.

The final testing modality described was outdoor walk-through centres. These were located outside the hospitals in Korea and Taiwan.23,24 The Korean clinic23 screened all patients and visitors to the hospital with the aim of minimising ward closures due to COVID-19 outbreaks. In Taiwan, a ‘multifunctional sampling station’ was built outside an emergency department, using a 2-cm thick clear acrylic board to separate emergency department patients and medical personnel, with inbuilt gloves used to conduct sampling.24

### Types of testing used

The most common method for sampling was through nasal or throat swabs. 45% of articles described the use of nasal swabbing, involving either nasal, nasopharyngeal or mid-turbinate sampling. 27% described the use of throat/oropharyngeal swabbing. 27% stated that swabbing was used but did not specify whether these were nasal and/or throat swabs. Less commonly described testing procedures included sputum sampling (14% of articles) and blood sampling for antibody testing (14% of articles) and one included the use of temperature measurements. 9% of publications described the use of prescreening questionnaires before sampling took place. 18% of articles did not specify the method of testing and 41% of articles described the use of a combination of the above methods.

### Outcomes of interest

Outcomes of interest were divided into three categories: process outcomes, quality outcomes and resource use outcomes. No participant outcomes were measured quantitatively in any of the included studies; however, the discussion section of many articles contained rich qualitative data describing participant outcomes such as staff and participant safety and well-being and service equity.

### Process outcomes

The process outcomes described comprise throughput, duration of test, decontamination time, time to don/doff PPE and waiting time.

Seventy-seven percent of the articles reported the number of people tested in a specified time period (Table 4). These figures were used to calculate the mean number of people tested each day.a Although the different studies are not directly comparable due to

---

### Table 2

| First Author          | Country                  | Mode of Testing                                         |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Appa                  | USA                      | Drive-through                                           |
| Brammer               | USA                      | Drive-through                                           |
| Chang                 | Republic of Korea        | Drive-through and walk-through                          |
| Drees                 | USA                      | Drive-through and walk-through                          |
| Flynn                 | USA                      | Home visiting testing                                   |
| Goldberg              | USA                      | Drive-through                                           |
| Halalau               | USA                      | Drive-through and home visiting testing                 |
| Hill                  | Scotland                 | Drive-through and home visiting testing                 |
| Kim                   | Israel                   | Drive-through and home visiting testing                 |
| Kim                   | Republic of Korea        | Indoor walk-through centre                              |
| Kwon                  | Republic of Korea        | Drive-through                                           |
| Kwon                  | Republic of Korea        | Outdoor walk-through centre                             |
| Lee                   | Malaysia                 | Drive-through                                           |
| Lin                   | Taiwan                   | Drive-through and mobile testing                       |
| Lindholm              | USA                      | Drive-through and home visiting testing                 |
| Ministry of Foreign Affairs | Republic of Korea   | Drive-through                                           |
| Mark                  | Scotland                 | Drive-through and home visiting testing                 |
| Rivkees               | USA                      | Drive-through, walk-through and mobile testing          |
| Seo                   | Republic of Korea        | Mobile testing                                          |
| Shah                  | USA                      | Drive-through                                           |
| Ton                   | USA                      | Drive-through                                           |

---

*a* 2 studies reported the time period per ‘week’ but did not state which days of the week were available for testing; a 7-day week was assumed for calculations.
factors such as the different sizes of populations served and staff employed, this section gives a broad overview of the types of throughput that may be experienced for different testing modalities.

Drive-through testing centres tested between 22 and 539 individuals per day. Indoor walk-through centres tested 9–500 people per day. One outdoor walk-through centre tested 300 people per day. Home visiting testing teams tested 6–15 people per day.

Some studies compared the throughput of different testing modalities (Table 5). Three studies compared drive-through testing with walk-through or home visiting testing.\textsuperscript{55,56,58} For similar settings, a higher throughput of individuals could be achieved in a drive-through setting compared to walk-through testing\textsuperscript{4} or home visiting testing.\textsuperscript{16} For the same time period, one indoor walk-through screening centre using negative pressure booths tested more patients than a walk-through centre with no negative pressure booths (>70 people per day compared to 9–10 people per day).\textsuperscript{55} Multiple booths could be installed and decontamination time between individuals could be reduced to 3–5 min from over 30 min. It is difficult to compare different studies, as several variables other than the testing modality can affect the number of people tested per day, such as the number of staff present, the procedures used and the number of individuals who could be tested concurrently.

The mean duration of a drive-through test was between 3 and 15 min. One study reported a median time per test of 28 min (interquartile range [IQR] 17–44 min).\textsuperscript{20} Some centres allowed multiple people to be tested per vehicle, whereas others allowed only one person per vehicle. The layout of drive-through testing sites can allow several individuals to be tested at one time, for example one drive- and walk-through centre could test two patients every 5 min.\textsuperscript{18}

Twenty-seven percent of articles compared testing modalities, calculating a range of indicators for process outcomes (Table 5). Drive-through testing was found to be faster than walk-through testing using a negative pressure tent\textsuperscript{4} or a screening centre.\textsuperscript{4} Testing using an outdoor walk-through centre (2 min per test) was faster than using traditional sample collection in a single negative-pressure isolation room (5 min per test).\textsuperscript{24} Home visiting testing (30 min per test) was also quicker than transporting patients to hospital for tests with a specialist ambulance (~1 h).\textsuperscript{6} However, waiting times, defined as the time between arrival at the drive-through centre and testing, was reported to be as high as 7 h at peak volume.\textsuperscript{29}

Testing in an outdoor walk-through centre dramatically reduced time to don/doff PPE compared to traditional sample collection in a single negative-pressure isolation room (1 min per patient compared to 21 min per patient).\textsuperscript{24}

Several studies measured the time to disinfect equipment between individuals (decontamination time). The use of drive-through testing eliminated the need for a 30 min decontamination time between patients in a walk-through centre using a negative pressure tent.\textsuperscript{18} Drive-through and home visiting testing also required no decontamination time, compared to up to 6 h of decontamination time needed if a patient was tested in the emergency department.\textsuperscript{19} Decontamination time was much shorter when using an outdoor walk-through centre (10 min per patient) compared to a single negative-pressure isolation room (35 min per patient). The use of negative pressure booths reduced decontamination time from >30 min with no negative pressure booths to 3–5 min between patients.\textsuperscript{31}

**Quality outcomes**

Two different indicators were used to describe quality outcomes: the median time from referral to test and the test
turnaround time. Only one study of home visiting testing calculated the median time from referral to test, which was 1 day with a maximum of 3 days.6 One drive-through testing study calculated the test turnaround time, defined as the time between testing and communication of results. This was found to be 25 h (IQR 21–29) in-house and 221 h (IQR 161–269) if outsourced.25

Resource use outcomes

Resource use outcomes were measured using cost per patient, use of PPE and impact on hospital closure. Home visiting testing reportedly costed much less (£55 per patient) than the use of a specialist ambulance and hospital sampling (£768 per patient)6 (Table 6).

Another study reported that staff in an outdoor walk-through centre used fewer items of PPE than staff working in negative-pressure isolation rooms.24 Similarly, drive-through testing can reduce PPE use (96% reduction in mask use, 97% reduction in gown use and 47% reduction in glove use) compared to emergency department based testing.30

One study reported the effect of a screening and testing clinic on maintaining the functioning of a tertiary hospital.23 Before the clinic was opened, an average of 36 beds per day were closed due to COVID-19 patients entering the hospital, whereas after the clinic was open and operating well, there was only one closure event (25 beds).

Discussion

This scoping review provides an overview of the literature describing the experience of implementing population testing for SARS-CoV-2 in high and upper-middle income countries. Whilst a range of modalities were reported, the most commonly evaluated were drive-through services using naso- and/oropharyngeal swabbing. Drive-through testing provided a rapid and scalable method of testing for COVID-19, reducing the risk of exposure to staff and patients within healthcare settings and minimising PPE use. However, this approach raises questions regarding equity of access for those
who do not have access to a private vehicle or are not well enough to drive. The addition of other testing options such as home visiting, mobile testing or walk-through services may help address this issue. Recently, home-based diagnostic and screening tests for SARS-CoV-2 have become much more widely available, which may reduce the need for large scale testing facilities in the future.

However, the evidence base for population testing lacks robust studies and the heterogeneous nature of the testing programmes described in the literature makes it difficult to compare between studies. Many were simply an evaluation of a testing programme with a discussion of its advantages and limitations rather than robust research studies with control groups. Prospective randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of testing centres would give higher quality data, however the researchers would need to overcome challenges such as adversely impacting the expediency and evolution of site practices in real time, and keeping pace with the rapid development of testing methods in response to the pandemic. Conversely, the studies described in this review are rich in qualitative data which could be synthesised to produce valuable insights into the lessons that have been learned in a variety of different settings. Such a review may be a better use of public health resources to identify translatable and implementable best practices.

There is a paucity of published literature on the implementation of mass testing for SARS-CoV-2, defined as regular and/or large-scale testing of individuals from defined populations regardless of symptom status, using lateral flow tests. There were no studies on mass testing that fit the inclusion criteria of this review, although a few articles have described mass testing of residents in facilities such as care homes and prisons. A recent review by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) highlights the need for further studies on the assessment and impact of mass testing. Indeed, some countries have rushed to adopt mass testing before the benefits, risks and costs of this approach is fully understood. It is therefore pertinent to draw on the international literature on population testing to inform decision making in order to ensure that testing is deployed in a safe and effective way as part of the overall COVID response. It is imperative that future studies assess the cost-effectiveness, specificity and sensitivity of home-based testing, in conjunction with assessing possible scenarios for ending or reducing access to home-testing in the future.

A distinction needs to be made between population testing and screening for COVID-19. As COVID-19 is a new disease, it is unsurprising that definitions for screening and testing in this context have not yet been standardised and often appear to be arbitrary. We found the term ‘screening’ is loosely used in different ways in the literature, including the testing of symptomatic and/or asymptomatic individuals, assessment of risk factors via a questionnaire, and temperature measurement of individuals travelling past a screening post.

Our literature search aimed to be comprehensive but timely and expedient. Whilst we used rigorous and transparent search methods, we had to limit our search to articles published in English. Therefore it is possible that some relevant studies have not been included. Although we did not formally assess the quality of included articles, much of the literature was not robust as stated earlier. Any preference for one testing modality over another cannot be extrapolated from the data collected in this review, as there is considerable heterogeneity between studies and outcomes will reflect factors such as the local population, geography and site protocols.

Further exploration is needed of population testing using different SARS-CoV-2 tests as the strengths and limitations of the various SARS-CoV-2 tests could influence the yield, cost-effectiveness and viability of the population testing programmes. Additionally, research into the wider consequences of testing programmes is needed especially on population behaviours as a result of testing. Finally, further study of the cost-effectiveness of population testing compared to other pandemic control measures is also required. As with most public health interventions, there is no ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach, and whatever population testing approach is adopted it will need to be tailored to the local context and target population.
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