

1 **FALSE-NEGATIVE RESULTS OF INITIAL RT-PCR ASSAYS FOR COVID-19: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW**

2

3 **AUTHORS**

4 Ingrid Arevalo-Rodriguez, MSc, PhD¹; Diana Buitrago-Garcia, MSc^{2,3}, Daniel Simancas-Racines, MD,
5 PhD⁴, Paula Zambrano-Achig, MSc⁵, Rosa Del Campo, MSc, PhD⁶, Agustín Ciapponi, MD, PhD⁷,
6 Omar Sued, MD⁸, Laura Martínez-García, MSc⁹, Anne Rutjes, PhD^{3,10}, Nicola Low, PhD^{3,11}, Patrick
7 M. Bossuyt¹², Jose A Perez-Molina, MD, PhD¹³, Javier Zamora, MSc, PhD^{14,15}

8

- 9 1. Clinical Biostatistics Unit, Hospital Universitario Ramón y Cajal, IRYCIS, CIBER of
10 Epidemiology and Public Health, Madrid, Spain.
- 11 2. Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine (ISPM), University of Bern, Switzerland.
- 12 3. Graduate School for Health Sciences, University of Bern, Switzerland
- 13 4. Centro de investigación en Salud Pública y Epidemiología Clínica (CISPEC). Facultad de
14 Ciencias de la Salud “Eugenio Espejo”, Universidad UTE, Ecuador.
- 15 5. Centro de investigación en Salud Pública y Epidemiología Clínica (CISPEC). Facultad de
16 Ciencias de la Salud “Eugenio Espejo”, Universidad UTE, Ecuador.
- 17 6. Department of Microbiology, Ramón y Cajal University Hospital, Ramón y Cajal Health
18 Research Institute (IRYCIS), Madrid, Spain.
- 19 7. Instituto de Efectividad Clínica y Sanitaria (IECS-CONICET), Buenos Aires, Argentina
- 20 8. Fundación Huésped, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- 21 9. Department of Microbiology, Ramón y Cajal University Hospital, Ramón y Cajal Health
22 Research Institute (IRYCIS), CIBER of Epidemiology and Public Health, Madrid, Spain.
- 23 10. Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine (ISPM), University of Bern, Switzerland.
- 24 11. Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine (ISPM), University of Bern, Switzerland.

- 25 12. Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Amsterdam
26 University Medical Centres, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- 27 13. National Referral Centre for Tropical Diseases, Infectious Diseases Department, Hospital
28 Universitario Ramón y Cajal, Instituto Ramón y Cajal de Investigación Sanitaria, Madrid,
29 Spain.
- 30 14. Clinical Biostatistics Unit, Hospital Universitario Ramón y Cajal, IRYCIS, CIBER of
31 Epidemiology and Public Health, Madrid, Spain.
- 32 15. Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary University London
33 (UK)

34

35 **Corresponding author:**

36 Ingrid Arevalo-Rodriguez

37 Clinical Biostatistics Unit, Hospital Universitario Ramón y Cajal, IRYCIS

38 CIBER of Epidemiology and Public Health

39 Madrid, Spain

40 Email: inarev7@yahoo.com; ingrid.arevalo@salud.madrid.org

41 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7326-4504

42 **ABSTRACT**

43 **Background:** A false-negative case of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-
44 2) infection is defined as a person with suspected infection and an initial negative result by reverse
45 transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) test, with a positive result on a subsequent test.
46 False-negative cases have important implications for isolation and risk of transmission of infected
47 people and for the management of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). We aimed to review and
48 critically appraise evidence about the rate of RT-PCR false-negatives at initial testing for COVID-19.

49 **Methods:** We searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, LILACS, as well as COVID-19 repositories including the
50 EPPI-Centre living systematic map of evidence about COVID-19 and the Coronavirus Open Access
51 Project living evidence database. Two authors independently screened and selected studies
52 according to the eligibility criteria and collected data from the included studies. The risk of bias
53 was assessed using the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (QUADAS-2) tool. We
54 calculated the proportion of false-negative test results with the corresponding 95% CI using a
55 multilevel mixed-effect logistic regression model. The certainty of the evidence about false-
56 negative cases was rated using the GRADE approach for tests and strategies. All information in this
57 article is current up to July 17, 2020.

58 **Results:** We included 34 studies enrolling 12,057 COVID-19 confirmed cases. All studies were
59 affected by several risks of bias and applicability concerns. The pooled estimate of false-negative
60 proportion was highly affected by unexplained heterogeneity ($\tau^2 = 1.39$; 90% prediction
61 interval from 0.02 to 0.54). The certainty of the evidence was judged as very low, due to the risk of
62 bias, indirectness, and inconsistency issues.

63 **Conclusions:** There is a substantial and largely unexplained heterogeneity in the proportion of
64 false-negative RT-PCR results. The collected evidence has several limitations, including risk of bias
65 issues, high heterogeneity, and concerns about its applicability. Nonetheless, our findings

66 reinforce the need for repeated testing in patients with suspicion of SARS-CoV-2 infection given
67 that up to 54% of COVID-19 patients may have an initial false-negative RT-PCR (certainty of
68 evidence: very low). An update of this review when additional studies become available is
69 warranted.

70

71 **Systematic review registration:** Protocol available on the OSF website: <https://osf.io/gp38w/>

72 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2 infection, reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction assays,
73 diagnostic testing, systematic review

DRAFT

74 INTRODUCTION

75 On December 31, 2019, the World Health Organization (WHO) was alerted about a cluster of
76 patients with pneumonia in Wuhan City, Hubei province, China (1). Chinese authorities confirmed,
77 a week later, an outbreak of a novel coronavirus. The virus has been named as severe acute
78 respiratory coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) (SARS-CoV-2) (2), and the clinical disease that it causes is
79 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), which has become a worldwide public health emergency
80 and reached pandemic status (3). By the time of this article's writing, the virus has spread to 215
81 countries and territories and has caused over 283,271 deaths worldwide (4).

82 Clinical suspicion of COVID-19 is based primarily on respiratory symptoms such as fever, cough,
83 and shortness of breath as primary manifestations (5, 6). The spectrum of symptoms and clinical
84 signs associated with COVID-19 has expanded with increasing knowledge about SARS-CoV-2.
85 Although most of the cases present mild symptoms, some cases have developed pneumonia,
86 severe respiratory diseases, kidney failure, and even death (7-9). SARS-CoV-2 mainly spreads
87 through person-to-person contact via respiratory droplets from coughing and sneezing, and
88 through surfaces that have been contaminated with these droplets (10). Recent evidence has
89 suggested the presence of asymptomatic cases in several different settings showing, that the
90 proportion could be up to 29% (11). Furthermore, recent studies have shown the presence of
91 asymptomatic cases in cluster families, possibly transmitting the virus before a virus-carrying
92 person displays any symptom (12-14).

93 Because the signs of infection mentioned above are non-specific, confirmation of cases is currently
94 based on the detection of nucleic acid amplification tests that detect viral ribonucleic acid (RNA)
95 sequences by reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR). Different RT-PCR assays
96 have been proposed, all of which include the N gene that codes for the viral nucleocapsid. Other
97 alternative targets are the E gene, for the viral envelope; the S gene for the spike protein; and the

98 Hel gene for the RNA polymerase gene (RdRp/Helicase) (15, 16). Molecular criteria for *in vitro*
99 diagnosis of COVID-19 disease are heterogeneous, and usually require the detection of two or
100 more SARS-CoV-2 genes (17).

101 RT-PCR repeated testing might be required to confirm a clinical diagnosis, especially in the
102 presence of symptoms closely related to COVID-19, as numerous clinical practice guidelines and
103 consensus statements recommend (18-22). Cases with negative RT-PCR results at initial testing
104 and found to be positive in a subsequent test are commonly considered cases with an initial false-
105 negative diagnosis. Some researchers have suggested that these failures in SARS-CoV-2 detection
106 are related to multiple preanalytical and analytical factors, such as lack of standardisation for
107 specimen collection, delays or poor storage conditions before arrival in the laboratory, the use of
108 inadequately validated assays, contamination during the procedure, insufficient viral specimens
109 and load, the incubation period of the disease, and the presence of mutations that escape
110 detection or PCR inhibitors (17, 23).

111 The availability of accurate laboratory tools for COVID-19 is essential for case identification,
112 contact tracing, and optimisation of infection control measures, as it was shown by previous
113 epidemics caused by SARS-CoV and the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-
114 CoV) (24-26). Due to the significant burden on health systems around the globe caused by the
115 COVID-19 pandemic, and the potential consequences at several levels of missing a COVID-19 case,
116 we aimed to obtain through a systematic review of the literature, a summary estimate of the
117 proportion of false-negatives related to the detection of SARS-CoV-2 using RT-PCR assays at the
118 first healthcare encounter (initial testing).

119

120

121

122 MATERIALS AND METHODS

123 We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of
124 Diagnostic Test Accuracy studies (PRISMA-DTA) to prepare this report (27). A protocol for this
125 review, as well as previous reports of findings by date of search, are available in the Open Science
126 Framework repository for public consultation (<https://osf.io/jserd/>).

127 *Criteria for considering studies for this review*

128 We included observational studies (including accuracy studies) reporting the initial use of RT-PCR
129 in the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in patients under suspicion of infection by clinical or
130 epidemiological criteria. We primarily aimed to include studies enrolling consecutive patients who
131 were receiving RT-PCR at first healthcare encounter (initial testing), with further confirmation of
132 SARS-CoV-2 infection and/or COVID-19 diagnosis (positive/negative) by an additional RT-PCR
133 evaluation. We did not impose limits by age, gender, or study location.

134 We aimed to include all types of RT-PCR kits, regardless of the brand or manufacturer, the RNA
135 extraction method used, the number of target gene assays assessed, or the cycle threshold value
136 for positivity. We excluded studies focus on other populations or reporting samples/specimens
137 instead of patients (such as monitoring or discharge of COVID-19 confirmed cases, population
138 screening and patients with high-risk comorbidities), studies only providing the absolute number
139 of false-negatives or without clear information about numerical information, as well as studies
140 reporting validation of novel assays or comparing sample collection/sample specimens (i.e. focus
141 on agreement). Full eligibility criteria can be found in the S1 Appendix.

142

143 *Search methods for identification of studies*

144 We carried out a comprehensive and sensitive search strategy based on search terms developed
145 for the COVID-19 Open Access Project by researchers and librarians at the Institute of Social and

146 Preventive Medicine, University of Bern (<https://ispmbern.github.io/covid-19/living->
147 [review/collectingdata.html](https://ispmbern.github.io/covid-19/living-review/collectingdata.html)) in the following databases:

- 148 • MEDLINE (Ovid SP, 1946 to July 17, 2020)
- 149 • Embase (Ovid SP, 1982 to July 17, 2020)
- 150 • LILACS (iAH English) (BIREME, 1982 to July 17, 2020)

151 We did not apply any language restrictions to electronic searches (S2 Appendix). As additional
152 sources of potential studies, we searched in repositories of preprint articles, clinical trials registries
153 for ongoing or recently completed trials (clinicaltrials.gov; the World Health Organization's
154 International Trials Registry and Platform, and the ISRCTN Registry), and the reference lists of all
155 relevant papers. Finally, we also screened the following resources for additional information:

- 156 • The WHO Database of publications on coronavirus disease (COVID-19) (Available on
157 [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-research-on-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov)
158 [novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/global-research-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov)).
- 159 • The LOVE (Living Overview of Evidence) centralised repository developed by
160 Epistemonikos (available on <https://app.iloveevidence.com/topics>)
- 161 • The Living systematic map of the evidence about COVID-19 produced by EPPI-Centre (28).
- 162 • The COVID-19 Open Access Project Living Evidence on COVID-19, developed at the
163 Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern (available on
164 <https://ispmbern.github.io/covid-19/>)

165

166 *Data collection and analysis*

167 For the selection of eligible studies, two reviewers independently screened the search results
168 based on their titles and abstract. We retrieved the full-text copy of each study assessed as
169 potentially eligible, and pairs of reviewers confirmed eligibility according to the selection criteria.

170 In case of disagreements, we reached consensus by discussion. For data extraction, one reviewer
171 extracted qualitative and quantitative data from eligible studies, and an additional reviewer
172 checked all the extracted information for accuracy. We contacted study authors to supply missing
173 information about critical characteristics of included studies.

174

175 *Assessment of methodological quality*

176 Two authors independently assessed the risk of bias of included studies, and disagreements were
177 resolved through discussion. We evaluated the methodological quality using the Quality
178 Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (QUADAS-2) tool (29). We decided to also apply the
179 QUADAS-2 tool for case series studies due to the lack of tools to assess the risk of bias associated
180 with these studies. However, for a more comprehensive assessment of the limitations of the
181 included studies, we adapted the Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklist for Case Series
182 (30). This tool included items about inclusion criteria, measurement of asymptomatic status,
183 follow-up of the course of the disease, and availability of numerator and denominator. We added
184 questions about the representativeness of the source and target populations as well.

185

186 *Statistical analysis and data synthesis*

187 For all included studies, we extracted data about the number of false-negative cases as well as the
188 total of confirmed cases by additional RT-PCR investigations (i.e. repeated testing). We presented
189 the results of estimated proportions (with 95% CIs) in a forest plot to assess the between-study
190 variability. We aimed to calculate a summary estimate of the false-negative rate with the
191 corresponding 95% CI using a multilevel mixed-effect logistic regression model in Stata 16®.
192 This method allowed us to estimate the between-study heterogeneity from the variance of study-
193 specific random intercepts. We computed 90% prediction intervals to include the between-study

194 variation. The 90% prediction interval shows the range of true false-negative proportions that can
195 be expected in 90% of future settings, comparable to the ones included in the meta-analysis. We
196 expressed heterogeneity in primary study results using the Tau-square statistic.
197 We planned to investigate the potential sources of heterogeneity using a descriptive approach and
198 performing a random-effects meta-regression analysis, including covariates, one at each time, into
199 the logistic model. Anticipated sources of heterogeneity included the type of specimen collected,
200 the presence or not of clinical findings, the number of RNA targets genes under assessment, and
201 the time of symptom evolution.

202

203 *Summary of findings and certainty of the evidence*

204 We rated the certainty of the evidence about false-negative cases following the GRADE approach
205 for tests and strategies (31, 32). We assessed the quality of evidence as high, moderate, low, or
206 very low, depending on several factors, including risk of bias, imprecision, inconsistency,
207 indirectness, and publication bias. We illustrate the consequences of the numerical findings in a
208 population of 100 tested, according to three different prevalence estimates of the disease
209 provided by the stakeholders involved in this review.

210


211 **RESULTS**

212 Electronic searches yielded 2536 references from the selected databases. In addition, we obtained
213 186 additional references searching in other resources (Figure 1). Our initial screening of titles and
214 abstracts identified 171 references to assess in full text. We excluded 137 studies mostly due to: a)
215 ineligible setting (no initial COVID-19 testing); b) incomplete or no data about false-negative cases
216 and COVID-19 confirmed cases; c) ineligible population (i.e. pooling sample, analysis based on

217 samples instead of patients) (S3 Appendix). We included 34 studies in our synthesis (33-66) which
218 dealt with 12057 patients (Table 1).

219

220 **Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram**



221

222

223 The sample sizes ranged from 18 to 5,700 COVID-19 confirmed cases (median 90; interquartile
224 range –IQR= 46.5 to 204). Twelve studies focused on the estimation of diagnostic test accuracy,
225 including populations with suspected COVID-19 at the beginning of the study (33, 36-38, 40, 43,

226 45, 46, 50, 56, 64). The remaining studies reported information from case series, most of which
227 included confirmed cases of COVID-19 at the beginning of the study (34, 35, 41, 42, 44, 47-49, 51-
228 55, 57-63, 65, 66). One study focused its data collection only on children (52) and other only on
229 healthcare workers (47). Only three studies included a small number of patients without
230 symptoms at the time of testing (from two to nine patients), but they did not provide subgroup
231 information of these cases (47, 52, 57).

232 Included studies collected information from January 1 (57) to April 15, 2020 (40, 47); two studies
233 did not provide complete information about the time of recruitment (34, 44). Ten studies were
234 carried out in institutions outside of China (34, 36, 40, 44, 45, 47, 48, 51, 53, 60). The age of
235 participants was reported heterogeneously in 21 studies providing information of COVID-19
236 confirmed cases (37-44, 46, 50, 52-54, 57, 58, 60-64, 66): for studies reporting a mean, the average
237 ranged from 2.5 (52) to 56 years (57), while for studies reporting medians, the corresponding
238 range was 45 (43) to 63 years (53). These 21 studies reported a total of 5331 men and 4067
239 women (Table 1).

240 In all cases, the presence of infection was confirmed after detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in any
241 real-time RT-PCR assay that was repeated after a negative result. The specimens collected for the
242 RT-PCR assessment were heterogeneous in most of the included studies; in 13 studies the authors
243 reported the use of nasopharyngeal swabs (34-37, 44-46, 48, 51, 53, 57, 60, 65), along with
244 oropharyngeal swabs in 7 out of these 13 studies (34-37, 44-46) (Table 1). The name/brand of the
245 SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid detection kit used was reported by 19 studies (33-36, 45-51, 54, 55, 57,
246 58, 60-62, 64), and 13 studies reported the target genes under assessment for positivity (34, 45,
247 48-51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 62, 64), with the ORF1ab being the most frequently used (8 studies). Ten
248 studies provided heterogeneous information about the time from the symptom onset to initial
249 testing (34, 35, 38, 39, 42, 43, 48, 50, 60, 64) (Table 1).

250 **Table 1.** Characteristics of included studies

251

ID	Data collection	Country	Setting	Age (years)	% Male: % Female	Type of specimen	RT-PCR Brand	Target genes	Days from symptoms onset (days)
Ai T 2020 (33)	January 6-February 6	China	Tongji Hospital of Tongji Medical College of Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, Hubei, China	Mean 51 ± 15 Range from 2 to 95 ^b	46:54 ^b	Throat swab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TaqMan One-Step RT-PCR Kits from Shanghai Huirui Biotechnology Co., Ltd Shanghai BioGerm Medical Biotechnology Co., Ltd 	Not reported	Not reported
Albert E 2020 (34)	Unclear-April 14	Spain	Hospital Clínico Universitario of Valencia	Median 65 years; range from 3 to 98 ^c	57:43 ^c	Nasopharyngeal or oropharyngeal swabs, upper RT samples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LightMix Modular SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) E-gene/LightMix Modular SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) RdRP gene from TIB MOLBIOL GmHD SARS-CoV-2 Real-time PCR Kit from Vircell Diagnostics SARS-CoV-2 (S gene)-BD Max System (Viasure Real-Time PCR Detection Kits; CerTest, Zaragoza, Spain). 	E, RdRp, S	Median 5 days; range: 1-14 days
Bernheim A 2020 (35)	January 18-February 2	China	Hospitals from four provinces in China: Nanchang (Jiangxi Province), Zhuhai (Guangdong Province), Chengdu (Sichuan province) and Guilin (Guangxi province)	Mean 45 ± 15,6 ^b	50:50 ^b	Bronchoalveolar lavage, endotracheal aspirate, nasopharyngeal swab, or oropharyngeal swab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sansure Biotech Inc. (Changsha, China), Shanghai Zhijiang Biotechnology Co. (Shanghai, China), Da An Gene Co. (Guangzhou, China). 	Not reported	Range from 0 to 12
Besutti G 2020 (36)	March 13-23	Italy	AUSL-IRCCS di Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy	Mean 59 ± 15.8 ^b	59:41 ^b	Nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs	GeneFinder™ COVID -19 PLUS Real Real Amp Kit	Not reported	Not reported
Chen D 2020 (37)	January 19-February 20	China	Five non-specialised infectious disease hospitals in Guangzhou	Mean 49.7 ± 15.7 ^a	43:57 ^a	Nasopharyngeal or oropharyngeal swabs	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Chen HJ 2020 (38)	January 26-February 4	China	Hainan General Hospital	Mean 54.5 ± 11.8 ^a	68:32 ^a	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Mean 6,3 ± 5,6 days
Chen ZH 2020 (39)	January 24-February 6	China	The Hangzhou Xixi Hospital Affiliated to Zhejiang Chinese Medical University	Mean 46.9 ± 11.1 ^a	55:45 ^a	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Mean 2; range 1 to 4,5 days
Çinkoğlu A 2020	March 15-April 15	Turkey	Ege University Faculty of Medicine	Means from 39.9 to 51 ^a	47:53 ^a	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

ID	Data collection	Country	Setting	Age (years)	% Male: % Female	Type of specimen	RT-PCR Brand	Target genes	Days from symptoms onset (days)
(40)									
Dai H 2020 (41)	January 10-February 7	China	13 hospitals in Jiangsu	Mean 44.6 ± 14.8 ^a	58:42 ^a	Respiratory samples	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Duan X 2020 (42)	January 10-February 8	China	The First Affiliated Hospital, College of Clinical Medicine, Medical College of Henan University of Science and Technology, Luoyang	Mean 52 ± 19.3 ^a	60:40 ^a	Nasal and pharyngeal swab specimens	Not reported	Not reported	Mean 6,64 ± 3,82 days
Fang Y 2020 (43)	January 19-February 4	China	Taizhou Enze Medical Center (Group) Enze Hospital, China	Median 45; IQR: 39-55 ^a	57:43 ^a	Throat swab, sputum	Not reported	Not reported	Mean 3±3
Fechner C 2020 (44)	Unclear	Switzerland	Cantonal Hospital Lucerne	Mean 63 ± 15.7 ^a	75:25 ^a	Nasopharyngeal or oropharyngeal swabs	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Gietema 2020 (45)	March 13-24	Netherlands	Maastricht University Medical Centre (MUMC+), the Netherlands	Median 66; IQR: 55-76 ^b	59:41 ^b	Nasopharyngeal and/or oropharyngeal swab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tib-Molbiol (Berlin, Germany) Biogelio (Netherlands) 	RdRp, E	Not reported
He JL 2020 (67)	January 10 – February 28	China	University of Hong Kong-Shenzhen Hospital, China	Median 52; range: 8 to 74 ^a	50:50 ^a	Nasopharyngeal swab, oropharyngeal swab, endotracheal aspirate, or bronchoalveolar lavage	BGI Genomics (Shenzhen, China)	Not reported	Not reported
Lan FY 2020 (47)	March 9- April 15	USA	Massachusetts community healthcare system	Mean 43.6 ± 12.9 ^b	21:79 ^b	Nasopharyngeal swabs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDC 2019-Novel RT-PCR Roche Cobas SARS-CoV-2 Abbott Real Time SARS-CoV-2 	Not reported	Not reported
Lee TH 2020 (48)	January-February 29	Singapore	National Centre for Infectious Diseases, Singapore	Not reported	Not reported	Nasopharyngeal swabs, sputum, and stool if diarrhoea is present	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory developed test A*STAR Fortitude Kit (Accelerate Technologies, Singapore) 	N +ORF1ab	Median 5 days; range from 1 to 24 days
Li Y 2020 (49)	February 2-17	China	Hankou Hospital of Wuhan, China	Median 57; range: 22 to 88 ^b	56:44 ^b	Pharyngeal swab specimens	Shengxiang Biotechnology Co (novel coronavirus 2019-nCoV nucleic acid detection kit (fluorescence PCR method) ^d	ORF1ab ^d	Not reported
Long C 2020 (50)	January 20-February 8	China	Yichang Yiling Hospital, China	Mean ±18,2 ^a 44,8	56:44 ^a	Not reported	DAAN GENE ^d	ORF1ab ^d	Only duration of fever reported: 2,6 ± 1,7 days
Long DR 2020 (51)	March 2-30	USA	University of Washington Virology clinical laboratory	Means from 56.7 to 61.6 ^c	57:43 ^c	Nasopharyngeal swabs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory-developed test (LDT) two-target/two-control assay modified from the CDC Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2 assay (Hologic, Marlborough, MA, target genes two conserved 	N1, N2, ORF1ab, E, S	Not reported

ID	Data collection	Country	Setting	Age (years)	% Male: % Female	Type of specimen	RT-PCR Brand	Target genes	Days from symptoms onset (days)
							regions of ORF1ab); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roche RT-PCR (Basel, Switzerland, target E gene) DiaSorin (Saluggia, Italy, target ORF1ab and S genes). 		
Ma H (52)	January 21-February 14	China	Wuhan Children's Hospital	Mean 2.5; range: 0.9 to 7 ^a	56:44 ^a	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Richards on 2020 (53)	March 1-April 4	USA	12 hospitals in New York City, Long Island, and Westchester County, New York (Northwell Health system), USA	Median 63; IQR: 52-75 ^a	60:40 ^a	Nasopharyngeal swabs	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Shen N (54)	January 22-February 18	China	Tongji Hospital in Wuhan	Median 56; IQR: 42-66	49:51	Throat swabs	SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid detection kit (Shanghai Huirui Biotechnology Co. Ltd)	N+ORF1ab	Not reported
Wang P (55)	January 25-March 16	China	First People's Hospital of Jingmen, Hubei Province	Median 58; range: 21-95	46:54	Throat swabs	RT-PCR reagent BioGerm (Shanghai BioGerm Medical Technology Co., Ltd.)	N+ORF1ab	Not reported
Wen Z (56)	January 21-February 14	China	Two areas in Henan Province, China	Median 16; range: 12 to 98 ^b	47:53 ^b	throat-swab, sputum, or alveolar lavage fluid specimens	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Wong HYF (57)	January 1-March 5	China	Four tertiary and regional hospitals in Hong Kong (Queen Mary Hospital, Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and Ruttonjee Hospital), China	Mean 56; range: 16 to 96 ^a	41:59 ^a	nasopharyngeal swabs and throat swabs	QuantiNova Probe RT-PCR Kit (QIAGEN, Hilden, Germany)	RdRp	Not reported
Wu J (58)	January 22-February 14	China	First People's Hospital of Yancheng City, the Second People's Hospital of Yancheng City, and the Fifth People's Hospital of Wuxi, China	Median 46.1; IQR: 30.7 to 61.5	49:51	nose swab and/or throat swab	Bio-germ, Shanghai, China	N+ORF1ab	Not reported
Xie X (59)	January 16-February 2	China	Database of Radiology Quality Control Centre, Hunan/ 3 cities in Hunan Province, China	Not reported	Not reported	swab test; no further details provided	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Young BE (60)	January 23-February 3	Singapore	Four hospitals in Singapore	Median 47; range: 31-73 ^a	50:50 ^a	Nasopharyngeal swabs	QuantiTect Probe RT-PCR kit (Qiagen)	N, S, ORF1ab	Median 13; range 5-24 days
Zhang H (61)	January 22-February 28	China	Huanggang Central Hospital and The Second Affiliated Hospital of Shandong First Medical University	Median 48.3; IQR: 33-56 ^a	56:44 ^a	Not reported	The Beijing Genomics Institute (BGI, Beijing, China)	Not reported	Not reported
Zhang JJ (62)	December 29-February 16	China	Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University and No.7 hospital of Wuhan, China	Median 57; range: 22 to 88 ^a	53:47 ^a	Pharyngeal swab	Shanghai bio-germ Medical Technology Co Ltd	N+ORF1ab	Not reported
Zhao JJ (63)	January 11-February 9	China	Shenzhen Third People's Hospital	Median 48; IQR: 35-61 ^a	49:51 ^a	Throat swabs, Nasal swabs	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

ID	Data collection	Country	Setting	Age (years)	% Male: % Female	Type of specimen	RT-PCR Brand	Target genes	Days from symptoms onset (days)
Zhifeng 2020 (64)	January 25-February 6	China	Xiaogan Central Hospital, China	Range: 23 to 82 ^a	59:41 ^a	Throat swabs	Multiple brands ^d	N +ORF1ab	Mean 6,5 days ^d
Zhou H 2020 (65)	January 19-February 15	China	First Affiliated Hospital, Zhejiang University School of Medicine	Mean 53.3; range: 14-96 ^c	59:41 ^c	Bronchoalveolar lavage, endotracheal aspirate, or nasopharyngeal swab	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
Zhou S 2020 (66)	January 16-February 12	China	Tongji Hospital of Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology	Mean 52.3 ± 13.1 ^a	54:46 ^a	Pharyngeal swab	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported

252

253 **Notes:** a) Information from COVID-19 confirmed cases only; b) Information from COVID-19 suspected (positive and negative); c) information from
 254 other groups reported by the authors; d) data provided by the corresponding author (personal communication).

255 **Quality of included studies**

256 We applied the QUADAS-2 tool to all included studies to reflect critical limitations in the validity of
257 the findings (Figure 2). In addition, given that to some of the studies were cohorts/case series, we
258 also applied the JBI tool for case series to all included studies for a comprehensive assessment of
259 their limitations (S4 Appendix).

260 According to the QUADAS-2 tool, the domain most affected by a high risk of bias was the flow and
261 timing domain, as some studies had not repeated the RT-PCR testing to all patients with negative
262 results at initial testing (36, 44, 45, 51, 53, 54); besides, some studies did not provide information
263 about the interval of time for the administration of a new RT-PCR assay. Regarding the patient
264 selection domain, the risk of bias and applicability concerns were judged as high or unclear for
265 several studies selecting patients assessed by RT-PCR plus Chest CT findings or serology tests. In
266 most of the studies was unclear whether the administration of these tests was the standard
267 protocol of management, or if the authors only enrolled patients undergoing all tests (33-35, 37-
268 40, 46, 47, 50, 52, 56, 57, 59, 63, 66).

269 In regards to the index test domain, details about the criteria for positive results, such as the
270 target genes under assessment of the SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid detection kit used, were not
271 provided by several studies. Their risk of bias and applicability were judged as unclear in both
272 cases (33, 35-44, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 56, 59, 63, 65, 66). Finally, two studies were judged as
273 unclear in the reference standard domain, since the authors did not report in detail the
274 characteristics of the repeated RT-PCR and their administration (38, 51). Six studies were
275 considered as at low risk of bias in all QUADAS-II domains assessed (48, 55, 58, 60, 61, 64), while
276 20 were considered as at unclear risk due to at least one domain was judged with unclear risk of
277 bias. The remaining eight studies were considered at high risk of bias (at least one domain judged
278 with high risk) (36, 37, 45, 50, 51, 53, 54, 62).

279 The analysis of limitations carried out with the adapted JBI case-series tool provided a similar
280 assessment of the quality of included studies due to the uncertainty regarding the consecutive
281 inclusion of patients and follow-up time after the first RT-PCR result. Additionally, due to the
282 selection of patients, the majority of included studies were not an adequate sample of the target
283 population (S4 Appendix).

284

285 **Findings**

286 We analysed information from 34 studies collecting information from 12,057 patients confirmed
287 to have SARS-CoV-2 infection and 1060 cases with RT-PCR negative findings in their initial
288 assessment. False-negative rates ranged from 0.018 (44) to 0.58 (56) (Figure 2).

289 The summary estimate of the false-negative rate was 0.13 (95% CI 0.09 to 0.19). The data were
290 characterised by a considerable between-study heterogeneity (τ -squared = 1.39). The 90%
291 prediction interval ranged from 0.02 to 0.54.

292 Assessment of the effect of potential sources of heterogeneity was limited due to the lack of
293 separate information of relevant subgroups (Table 2). There were no differences related to the
294 duration of symptoms at the time of the first RT-PCR test based on information derived from nine
295 studies provided means and medians of symptoms onset (Table 2). Comparison of false-negative
296 rates of studies using different RT-PCR kits targetting (nucleocapside N-gene and/or ORF1ab gene)
297 makes no significant differences (Table 2). In addition, most of the studies (28 out of 34) reported
298 a mixture of specimens collected for RT-PCR assessment; those reporting the use of
299 nasopharyngeal swabs provided a range of false-negative from 0.018 to 0.33, while those
300 reporting the additional use of oropharyngeal swabs reported a range of false-negative from 0.02
301 to 0.33. Only the analysis by country (China versus other countries) showed a potential effect in
302 the summary estimations; studies developed in other countries provide a false-negative pooled

303 estimation of 0.06 (CI 95%= 0.04 to 0.09; 90% prediction interval 0.02 to 0.17; tau-squared= 0.36).

304 Using meta-regression, we found a positive association of country with the false-negative rate
305 (Table 2).

306

307 Additional post-hoc analysis by type of study did not provide a reduction of the observed
308 heterogeneity (accuracy studies = 0.16, 95% CI 0.08 to 0.28, tau-squared= 1.52; cohorts/case-
309 series=0.12, 95% CI 0.08 to 0.18, tau-square = 1.28). An analysis by the global risk of bias (based on
310 the QUADAS-II domains) showed a difference between high risk versus low risk studies (high-risk
311 studies = 0.08, 95% CI 0.04 to 0.14, tau-square = 0.79; low-risk studies=0.33, 95% CI 0.20 to 0.49,
312 Tau-square =0.60), although the heterogeneity remains similar to those reported for the total
313 group (Table 2).

314 Since we are not able to warrant that the summary estimate provided by the meta-analysis is a
315 valid representation of the false-negative rate that can be expected in current practice, because of
316 the very large heterogeneity, we instead used the estimated prediction interval in the analysis of
317 the certainty of the evidence using the GRADE approach.


318

319

320 **Figure 2. Forest plot included studies**

321

322



323

324

325 **Table 2.** Assessment of sources of heterogeneity

Variable		Number of studies (patients)	Heterogeneity (Tau-squared)	P-value
Days of symptoms (average/median)	Less than 5 days	3 (120)	0.01	0.145
	Five days or more	6 (817)	0.87	
PCR target	N gene	8 (2911)	1.09	0.448
	No N gene	5 (615)	0.30	
	ORF1ab gene	10 (3188)	0.91	0.144
	No ORF1ab gene	3 (338)	0.00	
Country	China	24 (4798)	1.31	0.002
	Other countries	10 (7259)	0.36	
Type of design	Accuracy	12 (1798)	1.52	0.407
	Cohorts/case series	22 (10259)	1.28	
Risk of bias	High risk	8 (8947)	0.79	Reference
	Unclear risk	20 (2549)	1.31	0.357
	Low risk	6 (561)	0.60	0.004

326

327 **Certainty of the evidence**

328 We used the estimated prediction interval of the main meta-analysis to develop a summary of
 329 findings following the GRADE approach. We illustrated the consequences of the range of false-
 330 negative rates in a population of 100 tested, according to three different prevalence estimates
 331 seen in the current clinical practice for participant stakeholders and similar to those estimated by
 332 the included studies (10%, 30%, and 50%) (Figure 3). Using a prevalence of 50%, we found that 1
 333 to 27 cases would be misdiagnosed and then they would not receive adequate clinical
 334 management; in addition, they could require repeated testing at some point in their
 335 hospitalisation or require another testing for competing diagnoses. The quality of the evidence
 336 was judged to be very low due to issues related to the risk of bias, indirectness, and inconsistency
 337 (Figure 3). This numerical approach should be interpreted with caution due to the multiple
 338 limitations of the evidence described above (Figure 3).

339

340

341

342 **Figure 3. Certainty of the evidence (GRADE assessment)**

90% Predictive interval: ranged from 0.02 to 0.30	Effect per 100 patient tested			Number of participants (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)
	Prevalence 10% Typically seen in	Prevalence 30% Typically seen in	Prevalence 50% Typically seen in		
False-negatives (patients incorrectly classified as not having COVID-19)	0 to 5	1 to 16	1 to 27	12057 (34 studies)	⊕○○○ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3}

Notes= 1) Evidence downgraded one level due to risk of bias issues: multiple unclear risk related to patient selection and index test, several studies at high risk of bias in flow and timing Domain; 2) Evidence downgraded one level due to indirectness: unclear or high concerns about applicability of selected populations enrolled in studies; 3) Evidence downgraded one level due to inconsistency: tau-square =1.39.

343

344

345 **DISCUSSION**

346 Our systematic review identified 34 studies and 12,507 participants providing information about
 347 the proportion of false-negative (FN) cases in the detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR assays at first
 348 use. Individual studies estimates of false-negative rate ranged from 0.018 to 0.58. Included
 349 studies were affected by several sources of potential bias, especially related to the administration
 350 of an additional RT-PCR to rule in/rule out the presence of SARS-CoV-2 infection, the analysis of a
 351 selected sample of COVID-19 patients, as well as the unclear report of key index test
 352 characteristics.

353 The meta-analysis of the FN rates showed a considerable variability of data not explained by any of
 354 the foreseen potential sources of heterogeneity. This variability is a limitation for the
 355 interpretation of the mean proportion of the FN results as a summary estimate. Kucirka et al. also
 356 detected similar uncertainties in their Bayesian modelling of false-negative rates of RT-PCR by time
 357 since exposure, based on information from seven studies and 1330 respiratory samples (68). As an
 358 alternative, we chose to illustrate the impact of this heterogeneity by showing the number of
 359 false-negative cases expected in a cohort of 100 patients tested under three different prevalence
 360 of the disease scenarios. We based our calculations on the limits of the false-negative prediction

361 interval. Using a prevalence of 50%, we found that up to 27 cases would be misdiagnosed and then
362 they would not receive adequate clinical management. We emphasised that these numerical
363 approaches should be interpreted with caution due to very low quality of evidence.

364

365 Our systematic review faced other challenges in its development. First, our study was initially
366 planned as a rapid review aiming to provide a quick response to our local clinicians at the
367 beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the permanent involvement of clinicians managing
368 COVID-19 patients at this point, we were able to define a review question that responds to a
369 clinical inquiry relevant to current clinical practice (69-71). However, due to the increasing number
370 of publications potentially eligible to answer the review question, our approach evolved into a
371 living-systematic review with regular updates of the evidence. This manuscript reflects the third
372 update of our literature searches with information current up to July 2020. To promote
373 transparency in the development of this review, we have uploaded our previous results in the
374 Open Science Framework repository for public consultation (<https://osf.io/jserd/>). We plan to
375 perform additional searches after the publication of this manuscript to keep the conclusions as
376 update as possible.

377 A second challenge is related to the type of studies providing information about the false-negative
378 rate associated with RT-PCR at initial testing. We expected to find studies specifically aimed to
379 estimate the number of initial negative results of RT-PCR assays, with further confirmation of
380 SARS-CoV-2 infection with an additional RT-PCR within the following days to the first result. On the
381 contrary, we found that the reporting of false-negative rate was not the primary aim of any of the
382 include studies. In some cases, these figures were reported as descriptive statistics of the collected
383 sample. Although we carried out a comprehensive and sensitive search strategy including major
384 databases and repositories of preprint publications, we cannot discard that some eligible studies

385 have not been identified yet due to the limitation of the reporting in key study sections, such as
386 the abstract and methods.

387 Finally, as we have remarked in the findings section of this review, we found a considerable
388 heterogeneity of data not explained by the statistical analysis performed. Suggested sources of
389 heterogeneity such as the type of specimen collected, the time to onset of symptoms (as an
390 approach to viral load), as well as the name of the RT-PCR kit used (to know essential
391 characteristics as their analytical properties), were insufficiently reported or not reported at all for
392 collected studies. This variability on COVID-19 testing data and the challenge to provide a pooled
393 estimation with a useful clinical meaning have been previously remarked as the main constraint in
394 the development of systematic reviews on this field (72). Despite our efforts in the analysis of
395 data, we only were able to find some reduction of this variability comparing those studies
396 performed in China versus those carried out in other countries (i.e. USA, Singapore, and the
397 Netherlands). We believe that information provided by Chinese studies reflects early experiences
398 with the diagnosis of COVID-19; their findings are probably affected by several unreported issues,
399 such as the RT-PCR kits in use (likely the first kits developed for SARS-CoV-2 detection), the lack of
400 standardised methods for COVID-19 testing and, in general, the limited knowledge about this new
401 infection at the beginning of 2020.

402
403 Despite the heterogeneous information answering the review question, our study carried out a
404 rigorous assessment of potential sources of bias, a formal statistical analysis of results and a final
405 evaluation of the certainty of the evidence under a well-known system (GRADE). Although not all
406 studies included in this review were accuracy studies, we decided to apply the QUADAS-II tool
407 regardless of the type of design. However, even though QUADAS-II was not developed to evaluate
408 case series, we preferred to standardise the quality assessment to report on a common pool of

409 issues. We added as an appendix the assessment of all studies using an adapted checklist tool for
410 case-series to provide complementary information to this assessment. Due to the multiple
411 difficulties associated with the lack of reporting of included studies, and due to the high
412 probability of new studies being published in the short-term, we provided some recommendations
413 for future studies candidates to be included in an update of this review:

- 414 • Inclusion of a series of consecutive patients instead of selected groups, to avoid spectrum bias.
- 415 • Description of RT-PCR scheme in use, including target genes under assessment and positivity
416 criteria.
- 417 • Description of preanalytical steps (conservation of samples, time until being sent to the
418 laboratory, training of personal).
- 419 • Clear reporting of the time since the onset of symptoms, especially for those patients with
420 clinical findings at admission
- 421 • Reporting of the number of additional RT-PCR assays performed
- 422 • Details about the application of the reference standard, including the time of administration
423 after the index test (initial RT-PCR)
- 424 • If possible, database sharing could allow re-analyses by independent researchers, including
425 individual-patient data (IPD)-meta-analysis and increasing thus the confidence on the new
426 evidence
- 427 • Adding serological samples to a cohort of individuals with compatible symptoms and negative
428 PCR to warrant an independent verification of infection.

429

430 **CONCLUSIONS**

431 Our findings reinforce the need for repeated testing in patients with suspicion of being infected,
432 due to either clinical or epidemiological reasons, given that up to 54% of COVID-19 patients may

433 have an initial negative RT-PCR result (certainty of evidence: very low). The collected evidence has
434 several limitations in terms of risk of bias and applicability; besides, lack of reporting of several key
435 factors remains a significant constraint for a comprehensive analysis of collected data. A new
436 update of this review when additional studies become available is warranted.

437

438

DRAFT

439 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

440	Chest CT	Chest Computed tomography
441	COVID-19	coronavirus disease 2019
442	GRADE	Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation
443	PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
444	QUADAS-II	Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies-II tool
445	RT-PCR	reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction
446	SARS-CoV-2	Severe Acute Respiratory Coronavirus 2
447	WHO	World Health Organization

DRAFT

448 **DECLARATIONS**

449 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:** Not applicable

450 **Consent for publication:** Not applicable

451 **Availability of data and material:** The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are
452 available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. The study protocol is available
453 online at <https://tinyurl.com/vvbggqya>.

454 **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests

455 **Funding:** No specific funding was received for the development of this research

456 **Authors' contribution:** IAR, DBG, DS and JZ conceived the study. IAR, DBG, DSR, RDC, JAPM and JZ
457 designed the study. IAR, DBG, DSR, PZA screened titles and abstracts for inclusion. IAR, DBG, DSR,
458 PZA, AR and JZ extracted and analysed data. RDC, JAPM, AC, OS and NL assisted in the
459 interpretation from a clinical viewpoint. IAR, DBG, DSR and JZ wrote the first draft, which all
460 authors revised for critical content. All authors approved the final manuscript. IAR and JZ are the
461 guarantors. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and
462 that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

463 **Acknowledgements:** Ingrid Arevalo-Rodriguez is funded by the Instituto de Salud Carlos III
464 through the "Acción Estrategica en Salud 2013-2016 / Contratos Sara Borrell convocatoria
465 2017/CD17/00219" (Co-funded by European Social Fund 2014-2020, "Investing in your future").

466

467

REFERENCES

468

- 469 1. Perrella A, Carannante N, Berretta M, Rinaldi M, Maturo N, Rinaldi L. Novel Coronavirus
470 2019 (Sars-CoV2): a global emergency that needs new approaches? European review for medical
471 and pharmacological sciences. 2020;24(4):2162-4.
- 472 2. Pang J, Wang MX, Ang IYH, Tan SHX, Lewis RF, Chen JI, et al. Potential Rapid Diagnostics,
473 Vaccine and Therapeutics for 2019 Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV): A Systematic Review. J Clin
474 Med. 2020;9(3).
- 475 3. Meo SA, Alhowikan AM, Al-Khlaiwi T, Meo IM, Halepoto DM, Iqbal M, et al. Novel
476 coronavirus 2019-nCoV: prevalence, biological and clinical characteristics comparison with SARS-
477 CoV and MERS-CoV. European review for medical and pharmacological sciences. 2020;24(4):2012-
478 9.
- 479 4. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): Situation Report – 113.
480 Geneve, Switzerland; 2020. Report No.: May 12 2020.
- 481 5. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with
482 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet. 2020;395(10223):497-506.
- 483 6. Chen Q, Quan B, Li X, Gao G, Zheng W, Zhang J, et al. A report of clinical diagnosis and
484 treatment of nine cases of coronavirus disease 2019. J Med Virol. 2020.
- 485 7. Paules CI, Marston HD, Fauci AS. Coronavirus Infections—More Than Just the Common
486 Cold. JAMA. 2020;323(8):707-8.
- 487 8. Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, Low JG, Tan SY, Loh J, et al. Epidemiologic Features and
488 Clinical Course of Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. JAMA. 2020.
- 489 9. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, et al. Estimates of the
490 severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. The Lancet Infectious Diseases.
- 491 10. Azman AS, Luquero FJ. From China: hope and lessons for COVID-19 control. The Lancet
492 Infectious Diseases.
- 493 11. Buitrago-Garcia DC, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, Hossmann S, Imeri H, Salanti G, et al. The
494 role of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: rapid living systematic review and meta-analysis.
495 medRxiv. 2020:2020.04.25.20079103.
- 496 12. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper
497 Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(12):1177-9.
- 498 13. Al-Sadeq DW, Nasrallah GK. The incidence of the novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 among
499 asymptomatic patients: a systematic review. International journal of infectious diseases : IJID :
500 official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases. 2020.
- 501 14. Walsh KA, Jordan K, Clyne B, Rohde D, Drummond L, Byrne P, et al. SARS-CoV-2 detection,
502 viral load and infectivity over the course of an infection. J Infect. 2020;81(3):357-71.
- 503 15. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW, et al. Detection of 2019
504 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro surveillance : bulletin Europeen sur les
505 maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin. 2020;25(3).
- 506 16. Chu DKW, Pan Y, Cheng SMS, Hui KPY, Krishnan P, Liu Y, et al. Molecular Diagnosis of a
507 Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Causing an Outbreak of Pneumonia. Clinical chemistry.
508 2020;66(4):549-55.
- 509 17. Lippi G, Simundic AM, Plebani M. Potential preanalytical and analytical vulnerabilities in
510 the laboratory diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Clinical chemistry and laboratory
511 medicine. 2020.
- 512 18. World Health Organization. Laboratory testing for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in
513 suspected human cases. Interim guidance. Geneve, Switzerland: World Health Organization,; 2020.

- 514 19. Asociación Colombiana de Infectología. Consenso Colombiano de Atención, Diagnóstico y
515 Manejo de la Infección por SARS-CoV-2/ COVID-19 en establecimientos de atención de la salud.
516 Infectio. 2020;24(3 (S1)):1-163.
- 517 20. KE Hanson, AM Caliendo, CA Arias, JA Englund, MJ Lee, M Loeb, et al. Infectious Diseases
518 Society of America Guidelines on the Diagnosis of COVID-19. Arlington, VA: Infectious Diseases
519 Society of America; 2020.
- 520 21. National Institute for Communicable Diseases Department. Clinical Management of
521 Suspected or confirmed COVID-19 Disease. In: Department of Health, editor. V2 ed. South Africa:
522 Republic of South Africa; 2020.
- 523 22. Pakistan Chest Society (PCS) Guidelines Working Group. Guidelines on Management of
524 Patients with COVID-19. Pakistan: Pakistan Chest Society; 2020.
- 525 23. Li D, Wang D, Dong J, Wang N, Huang H, Xu H, et al. False-Negative Results of Real-Time
526 Reverse-Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
527 Coronavirus 2: Role of Deep-Learning-Based CT Diagnosis and Insights from Two Cases. Korean
528 journal of radiology. 2020;21(4):505-8.
- 529 24. Gostin LO. Public Health Emergency Preparedness: Globalizing Risk, Localizing Threats.
530 JAMA. 2018;320(17):1743-4.
- 531 25. Lin C, Ye R, Xia YL. A meta-analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of real-time PCR for
532 diagnosing novel coronavirus infections. Genetics and molecular research : GMR.
533 2015;14(4):15634-41.
- 534 26. Sharfstein JM, Becker SJ, Mello MM. Diagnostic Testing for the Novel Coronavirus. JAMA.
535 2020.
- 536 27. McInnes MDF, Moher D, Thombs BD, McGrath TA, Bossuyt PM, Clifford T, et al. Preferred
537 reporting items for a systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies: The
538 PRISMA-DTA statement. JAMA. 2018;319(4):338-96.
- 539 28. Digital Solution Foundry, EPPI-Centre. EPPI-Mapper. Version 125: EPPI-Centre, UCL Social
540 Research Institute, University College London; 2020.
- 541 29. Whiting PF, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, et al. QUADAS-2: a
542 revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. Annals of internal medicine.
543 2011;155(8):529-36.
- 544 30. The Joanna Briggs Institute. Checklist for Case Series Adelaide, Australia: The Joanna Briggs
545 Institute,; 2017.
- 546 31. Schünemann HJ, Mustafa RA, Brozek J, Steingart KR, Leeflang M, Murad MH, et al. GRADE
547 guidelines: 21 part 1. Study design, risk of bias and indirectness in rating the certainty across a
548 body of evidence for test accuracy. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology.
- 549 32. Schünemann HJ, Mustafa RA, Brozek J, Steingart KR, Leeflang M, Murad MH, et al. GRADE
550 guidelines: 21 part 2. Inconsistency, Imprecision, publication bias and other domains for rating the
551 certainty of evidence for test accuracy and presenting it in evidence profiles and summary of
552 findings tables. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology.
- 553 33. Ai T, Yang Z, Hou H, Zhan C, Chen C, Lv W, et al. Correlation of Chest CT and RT-PCR Testing
554 in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A Report of 1014 Cases. Radiology. 2020:200642.
- 555 34. Albert E, Ferrer B, Torres I, Serrano A, Alcaraz MJ, Buesa J, et al. Amplification of human β -
556 glucuronidase gene for appraising the accuracy of negative SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR results in upper
557 respiratory tract specimens. J Med Virol. 2020.
- 558 35. Bernheim A, Mei X, Huang M, Yang Y, Fayad ZA, Zhang N, et al. Chest CT Findings in
559 Coronavirus Disease-19 (COVID-19): Relationship to Duration of Infection. Radiology.
560 2020:200463.

- 561 36. Besutti G, Giorgi Rossi P, Iotti V, Spaggiari L, Bonacini R, Nitrosi A, et al. Accuracy of CT in a
562 cohort of symptomatic patients with suspected COVID-19 pneumonia during the outbreak peak in
563 Italy. *European radiology*. 2020.
- 564 37. Chen D, Jiang X, Hong Y, Wen Z, Wei S, Peng G, et al. Can Chest CT Features Distinguish
565 Patients With Negative From Those With Positive Initial RT-PCR Results for Coronavirus Disease
566 (COVID-19)? *AJR American journal of roentgenology*. 2020:01-May.
- 567 38. Chen HJ QJ, Wu B, Huang T, Gao Y, Wang ZP, Chen Y, Cheng F. Early Chest CT Features of
568 Patients with 2019 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pneumonia: Relationship to Diagnosis and
569 Prognosis. In: College) HGHAHHoHM, editor.: Research Square; 2020. p. 21.
- 570 39. Chen ZH, Li YJ, Wang XJ, Ye YF, Wu BL, Zhang Y, et al. Chest CT of COVID-19 in patients with
571 a negative first RT-PCR test: Comparison with patients with a positive first RT-PCR test. *Medicine*
572 (Baltimore). 2020;99(26):e20837.
- 573 40. Çinkooğlu A, Hepdurgun C, Bayraktaroğlu S, Ceylan N, Savaş R. CT imaging features of
574 COVID-19 pneumonia: initial experience from Turkey. *Diagn Interv Radiol*. 2020.
- 575 41. Dai H, Zhang X, Xia J, Zhang T, Shang Y, Huang R, et al. High-resolution Chest CT Features
576 and Clinical Characteristics of Patients Infected with COVID-19 in Jiangsu, China. *International*
577 *journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious*
578 *Diseases*. 2020;95:106-12.
- 579 42. Duan X, Guo X, Qiang J. A retrospective study of the initial 25 COVID-19 patients in
580 Luoyang, China. *Jpn J Radiol*. 2020;38(7):683-90.
- 581 43. Fang Y, Zhang H, Xie J, Lin M, Ying L, Pang P, et al. Sensitivity of Chest CT for COVID-19:
582 Comparison to RT-PCR. *Radiology*. 2020:200432.
- 583 44. Fechner C, Strobel K, Treumann T, Sonderegger B, Azzola A, Fornaro J, et al. COVID-19 and
584 the role of imaging: early experiences in Central Switzerland. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2020;150:w20304.
- 585 45. Gietema HA, Zelis N, Nobel JM, Lambriks LJG, van Alphen LB, Oude Lashof AML, et al. CT in
586 relation to RT-PCR in diagnosing COVID-19 in the Netherlands: a prospective study. *medRxiv*.
587 2020:2020.04.22.20070441.
- 588 46. He JL, Luo L, Luo ZD, Lyu JX, Ng MY, Shen XP, et al. Diagnostic performance between CT
589 and initial real-time RT-PCR for clinically suspected 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) patients
590 outside Wuhan, China. *Respir Med*. 2020;168:105980.
- 591 47. Lan FY, Filler R, Mathew S, Buley J, Iliaki E, Bruno-Murtha LA, et al. COVID-19 symptoms
592 predictive of healthcare workers' SARS-CoV-2 PCR results. *PLoS ONE*. 2020;15(6):e0235460.
- 593 48. Lee TH, Lin RJ, Lin RTP, Barkham T, Rao P, Leo YS, et al. Testing for SARS-CoV-2: Can We
594 Stop at Two? *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society*
595 *of America*. 2020.
- 596 49. Li Y, Yao L, Li J, Chen L, Song Y, Cai Z, et al. Stability issues of RT-PCR testing of SARS-CoV-2
597 for hospitalized patients clinically diagnosed with COVID-19. *J Med Virol*. 2020.
- 598 50. Long C, Xu H, Shen Q, Zhang X, Fan B, Wang C, et al. Diagnosis of the Coronavirus disease
599 (COVID-19): rRT-PCR or CT? *European journal of radiology*. 2020;126:108961.
- 600 51. Long DR, Gombor S, Hogan CA, Greninger AL, Shah VO, Bryson-Cahn C, et al. Occurrence
601 and Timing of Subsequent SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Positivity Among Initially Negative Patients. *Clin*
602 *Infect Dis*. 2020.
- 603 52. Ma H, Hu J, Tian J, Zhou X, Li H, Laws MT, et al. A single-center, retrospective study of
604 COVID-19 features in children: a descriptive investigation. *BMC Med*. 2020;18(1):123.
- 605 53. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, Crawford JM, McGinn T, Davidson KW, et al.
606 Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities, and Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With
607 COVID-19 in the New York City Area. *JAMA*. 2020.

- 608 54. Shen N, Zhu Y, Wang X, Peng J, Liu W, Wang F, et al. Characteristics and diagnosis rate of
609 5630 subjects receiving SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid tests from Wuhan, China. *JCI Insight*. 2020;5(10).
- 610 55. Wang P. Combination of Serological Total Antibody and RT-PCR Test for Detection of SARS-
611 CoV-2 Infections. *J Virol Methods*. 2020:113919.
- 612 56. Wen Z, Chi Y, Zhang L, Liu H, Du K, Li Z, et al. Coronavirus Disease 2019: Initial Detection on
613 Chest CT in a Retrospective Multicenter Study of 103 Chinese Subjects. *Radiology: Cardiothoracic*
614 *Imaging*. 2020;2(2):e200092.
- 615 57. Wong HYF, Lam HYS, Fong AH, Leung ST, Chin TW, Lo CSY, et al. Frequency and Distribution
616 of Chest Radiographic Findings in COVID-19 Positive Patients. *Radiology*. 2019:201160.
- 617 58. Wu J, Liu J, Zhao X, Liu C, Wang W, Wang D, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Imported Cases
618 of COVID-19 in Jiangsu Province: A Multicenter Descriptive Study. *Clinical infectious diseases* : an
619 official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2020.
- 620 59. Xie X, Zhong Z, Zhao W, Zheng C, Wang F, Liu J. Chest CT for Typical 2019-nCoV
621 Pneumonia: Relationship to Negative RT-PCR Testing. *Radiology*. 2020:200343.
- 622 60. Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, Low JG, Tan SY, Loh J, et al. Epidemiologic Features and
623 Clinical Course of Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *Jama*. 2020;323(15):1488-94.
- 624 61. Zhang H, Shang W, Liu Q, Zhang X, Zheng M, Yue M. Clinical characteristics of 194 cases of
625 COVID-19 in Huanggang and Taian, China. *Infection*. 2020.
- 626 62. Zhang JJ, Cao YY, Dong X, Wang BC, Liao MY, Lin J, et al. Distinct characteristics of COVID-
627 19 patients with initial rRT-PCR-positive and rRT-PCR-negative results for SARS-CoV-2. *Allergy*.
628 2020.
- 629 63. Zhao J YQ, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, Wang X, Yuan J. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2
630 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. In: *Hospital STPs*, editor. *MedRxiv2020*. p. 28.
- 631 64. Zhifeng J, Feng A, Li T. Consistency analysis of COVID-19 nucleic acid tests and the changes
632 of lung CT. *Journal of clinical virology* : the official publication of the Pan American Society for
633 *Clinical Virology*. 2020;127:104359.
- 634 65. Zhou H, Xu K, Shen Y, Fang Q, Chen F, Sheng J, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19):
635 chest CT characteristics benefit to early disease recognition and patient classification-a single
636 center experience. *Ann Transl Med*. 2020;8(11):679.
- 637 66. Zhou S, Zhu T, Wang Y, Xia L. Imaging features and evolution on CT in 100 COVID-19
638 pneumonia patients in Wuhan, China. *European radiology*. 2020.
- 639 67. He J-L, Luo L, Luo Z-D, Lyu J-X, Ng M-Y, Shen X-P, et al. Diagnostic performance between CT
640 and initial real-time RT-PCR for clinically suspected 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) patients
641 outside Wuhan, China. *Respiratory Medicine*.
- 642 68. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative Rate
643 of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction-Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since
644 Exposure. *LID - 10.7326/M20-1495 [doi] LID - M20-1495. (1539-3704 (Electronic))*.
- 645 69. Wilson MG, Lavis JN, Gauvin FP. Developing a rapid-response program for health system
646 decision-makers in Canada: findings from an issue brief and stakeholder dialogue. *Systematic*
647 *reviews*. 2015;4:25.
- 648 70. Moore G, Redman S, Rudge S, Haynes A. Do policy-makers find commissioned rapid
649 reviews useful? *Health Res Policy Syst*. 2018;16(1):17.
- 650 71. Hartling L, Guise JM, Hempel S, Featherstone R, Mitchell MD, Motu'apuaka ML, et al. Fit
651 for purpose: perspectives on rapid reviews from end-user interviews. *Systematic reviews*.
652 2017;6(1):32.
- 653 72. Bossuyt PM. Testing COVID-19 tests faces methodological challenges. *Journal of clinical*
654 *epidemiology*.

DRAFT