medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

A benchmark of online COVID-19 symptom checkers

Nicolas Munsch[1], Alistair Martin[1], Stefanie Gruarin[2], Jama Nateqi[2,3], Isselmou Abdarahmane[1], Rafael Weingartner-Ortner[1,2], Bernhard Knapp[1*]

[1] Symptoma, Data Science Department, Vienna, Austria
[2] Symptoma, Medical Department, Attersee, Austria
[3] Department of Internal Medicine, Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria

[*] science@symptoma.com

Abstract

Background

A large number of online COVID-19 symptom checkers and chatbots have been developed but anecdotal evidence suggests that their conclusions are highly variable. To our knowledge, no study has evaluated the accuracy of COVID-19 symptom checkers in a statistically rigorous manner.

Methods

In this paper, we evaluate 10 different COVID-19 symptom checkers screening 50 COVID-19 case reports alongside 410 non-COVID-19 control cases.

Results

We find that the number of correctly assessed cases varies considerably between different symptom checkers, with Symptoma (F_1=0.92, MCC=0.85) showing the overall best performance followed by Infermedica (F_1=0.80, MCC=0.61).

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

In the modern world, large numbers of patients initially turn to various online sources for self-diagnoses before seeking diagnoses from a trained medical professional. But web sources have inherent problems such as misinformation, misunderstandings, misleading advertisements and varying quality [1]. Interactive examples of web sources developed to meet the need of online diagnoses are sometimes referred to as symptom checkers or chatbots [2][3]. Based on a list of entered symptoms and other factors, symptom checkers return a list of potential diseases.

Online symptom checkers have become popular in the context of the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic as access to doctors is reduced, worry in the population is high, and lots of misinformation is circulating the web [1]. On COVID-19 symptom checker web pages users are asked a series of COVID-19 specific questions and, upon completion, an association between the answers and COVID-19 is given alongside behavioural recommendations, e.g., self-isolate.

COVID-19 symptom checkers are valuable tools for pre-assessment and screening during this pandemic, both taking pressure off from clinicians and reducing footfall within hospitals. A large number of symptom checkers specific to COVID-19 have been developed. Anecdotal evidence (e.g. a newspaper article [4]) suggests that their conclusions differ with possible implications on the quality of the symptom assessment. To our knowledge, there exist no studies comparing and evaluating COVID-19 symptom checkers.

In the following, we present a study evaluating 10 different COVID-19 online symptom checkers using 50 COVID-19 cases extracted from the literature and 410 non-COVID-19 control cases of patients with other diseases. We find that the COVID-19 symptom checkers' classification of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

many patient cases differ as well as their accuracies. Symptoma (F1=0.92, MCC=0.85) shows the overall best performance followed by Infermedica (F1=0.80, MCC=0.61).

Methods

COVID-19 symptom checkers

Ten COVID-19 symptom checkers that were freely available online between 3rd and 9th of April 2020 were selected for this study (Table 1). These symptom checkers were used in the versions available in this date range and updates after this date were not considered for analysis.

As a baseline for the performance evaluation of the 10 online COVID-19 symptom checkers, we developed two additional simplistic symptom checkers. These two checkers evaluate and weigh the presence of WHO [5] provided COVID-19 symptom frequencies (see S1 Table) based on vector distance (SF-DIST) and cosine similarity (SF-COS). These approaches can be implemented in a few lines of code (see S2 Text).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. List of online COVID-19 symptom checkers included in this study.

Name	URL
Ada	https://ada.com/covid-19-screener/
Apple	https://www.apple.com/covid19
Babylon	https://www.babylonhealth.com/ask-babylon-chat
CDC	https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html
Cleveland Clinic	http://covid19chat.clevelandclinic.org/
Docyet	https://corona.docyet.com/client/index.html
Infermedica	https://symptomate.com/covid19/checkup/en/
Providence	https://coronavirus.providence.org/
Symptoma	https://www.symptoma.com/covid-19
Your.MD	https://webapp.your.md/login

Clinical cases

We used a total of 460 clinical cases to evaluate the performance of the COVID-19 symptom checkers. Each case lists both symptoms and the correct diagnosis, alongside the age and sex of the patient when available. Details of the two case sets used are given below and in Table 2.

COVID-19 cases

A total of 50 COVID-19 cases were extracted by three trained medical doctors from the literature and are listed in S3 Table. Each case describes one patient's medical situation, i.e. symptoms experienced or COVID-19 contacts. Extreme edge cases of COVID-19 such as patients with several severe comorbidities were not included in this study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Control cases

COVID-19 cases allow us to evaluate the sensitivity of symptom checkers. To also evaluate the specificity, 410 control cases from the British Medical Journal (BMJ) were sourced [6,7]. To allow a fair assessment, we only used cases containing at least one of the COVID-19 symptoms (see S4 Table) reported by the WHO [5]. Classifying non-relevant cases (e.g., a fracture) would overestimate the symptom checkers' specificity. Furthermore, these patients would not consult an online COVID-19 symptom checker. None of these 410 BMJ cases has COVID-19 listed as the diagnosis as the cases where collected before the COVID-19 outbreak.

Table 2. Number of symptoms in case sets

case set	Number of cases	Number of symptoms	Age	Sex
COVID-19 cases	50	8.2 ± 4.1 (median 7)	45.6 ± 16.9 (median 45)	50% male 42% female 8% unknown
BMJ control cases	410	9.8 ± 4.4 (median 9)	38.6 ± 22.4 (median 38)	58% male 39% female 3% unknown

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Accuracy evaluation

For statistical analysis we used the following classification:

- True-positive (TP): COVID-19 case classified as COVID-19
- False-positive (FP): non-COVID-19 case classified as COVID-19
- True-negative (TN): non-COVID-19 case classified as non-COVID-19
- False-negative (FN): COVID-19 case classified as non-COVID-19

For each symptom checkers, we calculate the following metrics :

Sensitivity (= true positive rate) = $\frac{TP}{TP+FN}$

Specificity (= true negative rate) = $\frac{TN}{FP+TN}$

F1 score (= harmonic mean of the precision and recall) = $\frac{2.TP}{2.TP+FP+FN}$

Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC) = $\frac{TP.TN-FP.FN}{\sqrt{(TP+FP).(TP+FN).(TN+FP).(TN+FN)}}$

Classification of symptom checkers' outputs

Most COVID-19 symptom checkers return a human-readable text which contains an association between entered symptoms and COVID-19. We classified these associations into three different categories: high risk, medium risk and low risk. Examples of a high, medium and low risk classifications are "There is a high risk that COVID-19 is causing your symptoms", "Your symptoms are worrisome and may be related to COVID-19" and "There's nothing at present to suggest that you have coronavirus (COVID-19). Please practice physical/social distancing" respectively. Our full text-output to risk mapping for all symptom checkers and all text outputs is given in S5 Table.

Some symptom checkers only have two possible outputs: COVID-19 risk or no COVID-19 risk. In order to make symptom checkers with three and two risk levels comparable we performed

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

two analysis versions: (a) medium risk and high risk is treated as COVID-19 positive (and low risk as COVID-19 as negative) and (b) high risk is treated as COVID-19 positive (and low risk and medium risk as COVID-19 negative).

Bootstrapping

To evaluate the robustness of our statistical measures and account for the unbalanced dataset, we performed bootstrapping across our cases. A total of 3000 random samples consisting of 50 COVID-19 cases and 50 control cases were created by sampling with replacement from the original set of 50 COVID-19 cases and the 410 control cases.

Results

Sensitivity and specificity

In order to analyse the performance of the 10 online symptom checkers, we calculated the sensitivity and the specificity of each symptom checker based on the cases described in the method section. A scatterplot between sensitivity and specificity to COVID-19 of the different symptom checkers is given in Fig 1 and detailed numerics in S6 Table and S7 Table. These symptom checkers fall roughly into four groups: upper left corner, lower right corner, central region, upper right corner.

Further analysis of true and false case classifications of these groups shows that the group in the upper left corner is composed of symptom checkers that require one (or few) highly specific symptoms to be present in order to classify a case as COVID-19 positive (e.g. “intensive contact with a COVID-19 positive person”). By this way, these symptom checkers miss many COVID-19 positive patients that did not report exactly this highly specific symptom. Vice versa such highly

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

specific symptoms are hardly present in non-COVID-19 cases. This results in low sensitivity and high specificity.

The group in the lower right corner is composed of symptom checkers which predict a case as COVID-19 positive based on the presence of one or few COVID-19 associated symptoms, e.g. the presence of fever or cough is enough to predict a patient as COVID-19 positive. These checkers classify nearly every patient that has a respiratory disorder or viral infection as COVID-19 positive. As such, they do not miss many COVID-19 patients but wrongly predict many non-COVID-19 patients as COVID-19 positive. This results in low specificity and high sensitivity.

The group in the more central region is composed of symptom checkers which use a more balanced prediction but exhibit limited success correctly classifying COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 patients.

The group in the upper right corner is composed of symptom checkers which also use a more balanced “symptoms to COVID-19 association model” but in this case, the classification between COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 patients is more successful.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Fig 1. Sensitivity and specificity to COVID-19 *cases. The mean of the 3000 random samples and 90% bootstrap confidence interval are reported as dots and crosses respectively. (A) High risk: A COVID-19 positive prediction is defined only by a high risk returned by a symptom checker. (B) Medium-High risk: A COVID-19 positive prediction is defined by either a medium risk or high risk returned by a symptom checker.*

Constraining symptoms for Symptoma

As Symptoma exhibits the best combination of sensitivity and specificity, we focused our analysis on Symptoma's performance. Symptoma allows free-text input of one's symptoms and thereby a more precise representation of the clinical test cases. The other symptom checkers do not allow free text input which limits the number of possible symptoms considerably (Fig 2A). In order to investigate how Symptoma would perform if constrained, we performed pairwise

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

comparisons where Symptoma is only allowed to use the symptoms of another symptom checker. In this setup, Symptoma is massively disadvantaged as it can not use its full abilities. For example, in the pairwise comparison with “Your.MD”, Symptoma considers only “fever”, “dry cough”, “shortness of breath”, and “contact with a confirmed COVID-19 case” for the classification of cases. The results of this analysis are summarised in Fig 2B , the sensitivity and specificity scatter plots are provided in the S8 Fig and detailed numerics in S9 Table and S10 Table.

Under these constraints and when COVID-19 positive is defined by high risk only, Symptoma still significantly outperforms Apple and Cleveland Clinic, while performing statistically similar to six of the remaining symptom checkers (upper panel of Fig 2B). When COVID-19-positive is defined by high and medium risk (lower panel of Fig 2B), Symptoma’s constrained performance is similar to seven of the other checkers, while outperforming Ada and Docyet. For Apple, Babylon, CDC, Cleveland Clinic, Providence and “Your.MD” the performance is about the same. When Symptoma is allowed to use all symptoms of the case descriptions, it clearly outperforms all other checkers (dashed blue line in Fig 2B). This suggests that performance is directly related to the number of symptom’s any given checker considers as input, and as such, free-text input (non-constrained) will normally lead to a higher likelihood of correct diagnosis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Fig 2. (A) Percentage of symptoms used for case classifications by each symptom checker relative to the total number of symptoms contained in all cases. (B) Symptoma input-constrained evaluation: Pairwise comparison between all symptom checkers and Symptoma based on the F1 score if only the subset of symptoms used by one checker is also used for Symptoma. The same analysis based on the MCC is shown in the S11 Fig. Please note that using only Babylon's symptom inputs all cases are either classified medium or low risk by Symptoma and therefore there is no bar in the upper panel for Babylon's Symptoma.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

We classified 50 COVID-19 case descriptions from the recent literature as well as 410 non-COVID-19 control cases with ten different online COVID-19 symptom checkers. Only two out of ten symptom checkers showed a reasonably good balance between sensitivity and specificity: namely Infermedica (F_1=0.80) and Symptoma (F_1=0.92). Most other checkers are either too sensitive, classifying almost all patients as COVID-19 positive, or too specific, classifying many COVID-19 patients as COVID-19 negative (see Fig 1). For example, our BMJ control cases contain a patient suffering from a pulmonary disease who presents with various symptoms, including fever, cough and shortness of breath, the three most frequent symptoms associated with COVID-19. Symptoma uses the additional symptoms and risk factors not considered by the other checkers, namely loss of appetite, green sputum, and a history of smoking, to discern the correct diagnosis of COVID-19 negative. Five of the other checkers consider this case as high risk.

Furthermore, most of the symptom checkers are even out-performed by our simplistic symptom frequency vector approaches (SF-DIST (F_1=0.57) and SF-COS (F_1=0.79)). Notably, the cosine version shows surprisingly good results outperforming 8 out of 10 symptom checkers based on the F_1 score.

To our knowledge this is the first scientific evaluation of online COVID-19 symptom checkers, however, there are a number of related studies evaluating symptom checkers. These include a study that evaluated 23 general-purpose symptom checkers based on 45 clinical case descriptions across a wide range of medical conditions and found that the correct diagnosis was on average listed among the top 20 results of the checkers in 58% of all cases [2]. This study design was extended for five additional symptom checkers using ear, nose and throat (ENT)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

cases showing similar results [8]. Other evaluations include symptom checkers used for knee pain cases that found, based on 527 patients and 26 knee problems, that the physician's diagnosis was present within the prediction list in 89% of the cases while the specificity was only 27% [9]. In another study, an analysis of a university students' automated self-assessment triage system prior to an in-person consultation with a medical doctor found that the system's urgency rating agreed perfectly in only 39% of cases while for the remaining cases the system tended to be more risk averse than the doctor [10]. Also, the applicability of online symptom checkers for 79 persons aged ≥50 years based on "think-aloud" protocols [11], deep learning algorithms for medical imaging [12], and services for urgent care [3] were evaluated.

If the performance of any (COVID-19) online symptom checker is acceptable depends on the perspective and use of the results. In the case of COVID-19, an online assessment can not fully replace a PCR-test as some people are asymptomatic, while others presenting with very specific COVID-19 symptoms might, in fact, have a very similar but different disease. Regardless, online COVID-19 symptom checkers can act as a first triage shield to take pressure off from in-person physician visits or hospitals. Symptom checkers could even replace telephone triage lines in which non-medically trained personnel read a predefined sequence of questions. Even though this was not part of this study, the authors believe that COVID-19 symptom checkers (if appropriately maintained and tested) might also be more reliable than the direct use of search engines such as Google or information via social media.

The strength of this study lies in the fact that it is based on a large number (n=460) of real patients' case descriptions from the literature and a detailed evaluation on the best performing symptom checker (Fig 2). Vice versa, a potential weakness of this study lies in using real literature-based cases, which might have biased the test set to rather severe cases of COVID-19, as mild and uninteresting cases are usually not found in the literature. We countered

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

this bias by not including extreme edge cases from the literature into our 50 COVID-19 cases. Another bias might be that our control case descriptions do not report a "COVID-19 contact", even though a person with, for example a cold, might have had a COVID-19 contact (and did not get infected). Another limit of this study is the non-straight forward mapping of the symptom checker outputs to risk levels (S5 Table). The interpretation of the textual output is debatable in some cases. We countered this by allowing three different risk levels and merging them together in two different ways (see Fig 1A and Fig 1B). We also classified every symptom checker output by multiple persons until consensus was reached.

Conclusion

Symptom checkers are being widely used in response to the COVID-19 global pandemic. As such, quality assessment of these tools is critical. We show that various online COVID-19 symptom checkers vary widely in their predictive capabilities, with some performing equivalently to randomly guessing, while others, namely Symptoma (F_1 = 0.92) and Infermedica (F_1 = 0.80), exhibiting high accuracy.

Contributors

Study design: BK, AM, JN, NM. Data compilation: SG, NM, RW, IA. Data analysis: NM, AM, BK, IA, RW. Writing the manuscript: BK, NM. Revising the manuscript critically: AM, BK, SG, JN.

Declaration of interests

All authors are employees of Symptoma GmbH. JN holds shares of Symptoma.

Acknowledgments

This study has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 830017.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Tasnim S, Hossain M, Mazumder H. Impact of rumors or misinformation on coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in social media. : 8.
2. Semigran HL, Linder JA, Gidengil C, Mehrotra A. Evaluation of symptom checkers for self diagnosis and triage: audit study. BMJ. 2015; h3480. doi:10.1136/bmj.h3480
3. Chambers D, Cantrell A, Johnson M, Preston L, Baxter SK, Booth A, et al. Digital and online symptom checkers and assessment services for urgent care to inform a new digital platform: a systematic review. Southampton (UK): NIHR Journals Library; 2019. Available: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK545124/
4. I asked eight chatbots whether I had Covid-19. The answers ranged from 'low' risk to 'start home isolation.' Available: https://www.statnews.com/2020/03/23/coronavirus-i-asked-eight-chatbots-whether-i-had-covid-19/
5. Report of the WHO-china joint mission on coronavirus disease 2019 (covid-19). 2020. Available: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-final-report.pdf
6. BMJ best practice. 2020. Available: https://bestpractice.bmj.com/info/
7. BMJ case reports. 2020. Available: https://casereports.bmj.com
8. Nateqi J, Lin S, Krobath H, Gruarin S, Lutz T, Dvorak T, et al. [From symptom to diagnosis-symptom checkers re-evaluated : Are symptom checkers finally sufficient and accurate to use? An update from the ENT perspective]. HNO. 2019;67: 334–342. doi:10.1007/s00106-019-0666-y
9. Bisson LJ, Komm JT, Bernas GA, Fineberg MS, Marzo JM, Rauh MA, et al. Accuracy of a Computer-Based Diagnostic Program for Ambulatory Patients With Knee Pain. Am J Sports Med. 2014;42: 2371–2376. doi:10.1177/0363546514541654
10. Poote AE, French DP, Dale J, Powell J. A study of automated self-assessment in a primary care student health centre setting. J Telemed Telecare. 2014;20: 123–127. doi:10.1177/1357633X14529246
11. Luger TM, Houston TK, Suls J. Older adult experience of online diagnosis: results from a scenario-based think-aloud protocol. J Med Internet Res. 2014;16: e16. doi:10.2196/jmir.2924
12. Nagendran M, Chen Y, Lovejoy CA, Gordon AC, Komorowski M, Harvey H, et al. Artificial intelligence versus clinicians: systematic review of design, reporting standards, and claims of deep learning studies. BMJ. 2020;368. doi:10.1136/bmj.m689

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Supporting information

S1 Table. Symptom frequencies used in S2 Text.

	COVID-19	Common cold	Influenza	Hay fever
Fever	87.9 [1]	15 [3]	68 [6]	NR
Fatigue	38.1 [2]	42 [4]	94 [6]	NR
Dry cough	67.7 [1]	80 [3]	93 [6]	22 [10]
Sneezing	NR	74 [4]	58 [7]	96 [11]
Malaise	14.8 [1]	30 [4]	94 [6]	NR
Rhinorrhea	4 [2]	95 [3]	91 [6]	62.1 [12]
Sore throat	13.9 [1]	70 [3]	84 [6]	30 [10]
Diarrhea	3.7 [1]	11 [4]	14.4 [8]	NR
Headache	13.6 [1]	80 [5]	91 [6]	50 [13]
Dyspnea	18.6 [1]	21 [4]	63 [9]	NR

[1] https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/who-china-joint-mission-on-covid-19-final-report.pdf&sa=D&ust=1585147724205000&usg=AFQjCNHMTMLZYuYavNS7iXN_D8AaJvOYiw

[2] https://www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S0140-6736%2820%2930211-7

[3] https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0095454305703559?via%3Dihub

[4] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3057962

[5] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4347877/pdf/nihms658637.pdf

[6] https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/fullarticle/485554

[7] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4915903/

[8] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4676820/

[9] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3650195/

[10] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10971479

[11] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5806744/

[12] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307953143_Inverse_correlation_of_soluble_programmed_cell_death-1_ligand-1_sPD-L1_with_eosinophil_count_and_clinical_severity_in_allergic_rhinitis_patients

[13] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17300360

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

S2 Text. Pseudo code of symptom frequencies based on vector distance (SF-DIST) and cosine similarity (SF-COS)

SF-COS :

```
Input : patient_symptoms (10x1), symptoms_frequencies (10x4)

if all patient_symptoms == 0:
       Return LOW RISK

For each column of symptoms_frequencies:
       similarity = cosine_similarity(patient_symptoms, symptoms_frequencies[column])

similarity = normalise(similarity)

similarity[COVID_19] = similarity[COVID_19]*(Area_Risk_Factor + Contact_Risk_Factor)

Output : return disease with maximum similarity
```

SF-DIST :

```
Input : patient_symptoms (10x1), symptoms_frequencies (10x4)

if all patient_symptoms == 0:
       Return LOW RISK

For each column of symptoms_frequencies:
       similarity = sum(abs((patient_symptoms - symptoms_frequencies[column]))

similarity = normalise(similarity)

similarity[COVID_19] = similarity[COVID_19]*(Area_Risk_Factor + Contact_Risk_Factor)

Output : return disease with maximum similarity
```

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

S3 Table. List of the COVID-19 cases

case	assessor	age	sex	symptoms	Source
1	1	50	FEMALE	Fever, Diarrhea, Anorexia, Asthenia, Dry Cough, Myalgia, China	1
1	2	50	FEMALE	Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, Wuhan, fever, diarrhea, asthenia, anorexia, dry cough, myalgia, C-reactive protein increased, ground glass opacity (CT)	1
1	3	50	FEMALE	fever, diarrhea , anorexia, asthenia, Covid-19 risk area, dry cough, muscle ache, increased CRP , ground glass opacities, consolidation	1
2	1	10	FEMALE	Contact COVID-19 Case, Fever, Sputum Production, consolidations, Ground Glass Opacities (CT)	2
2	2	10	FEMALE	contact Covid-19 patient , fever, sputum production , consolidations, ground glass opacities	2
2	3	10	FEMALE	Contact COVID-19 Case, fever, sputum production, patchy consolidation, ground glass opacity	2
3	1	33	FEMALE	Wuhan, Fever, Cough, coarse breath sounds , Leukopenia, C-Reactive Protein Increased, Elevated Sedimentation Rate, D-Dimer Abnormal, Ground Glass Opacities (CT)	3
3	2	33	FEMALE	fever, cough, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, Wuhan, leukopenia, coarse breath sounds, elevated C-reactive protein, Elevated Sedimentation Rate, D-Dimer Abnormal, peripheral ground-glass opacitiy on CT	3
3	3	33	FEMALE	fever, cough, Wuhan, coarse breath sounds, leucopenia, increased CRP, increased erythrocyte sedimentation rate, increased D-dimer, ground glass opacities	3
4	1	41	FEMALE	Wuhan, Fever, Ground Glass Opacities (CT)	4
4	2	41	FEMALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, fever, ground-glass opacity on CT	4
4	3	41	FEMALE	Wuhan, fever, ground glass opacities	4
5	1	32	MALE	Wuhan, Fever, coarse breath sounds, Interleukin-6 Increased, right lower lobe consolidation, Bronchiectasis	5
5	2	32	MALE	Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, Wuhan, cough, fever, IL-6 Increased, subpleural right lower lobe consolidation	5
5	3	32	MALE	Wuhan, cough, fever, coarse breath sounds, increased interleukin 6 , bronchiectasis, subpleural right lower lobe consolidation	5
6	1	45	FEMALE	Wuhan, Fever, Cough, coarse breath sounds, Neutrophil Count Increased, Lymphocytopenia, Elevated Sedimentation Rate, Interleukin-6 Increased, peripheral consolidation, Pneumonia, crazy-paving pattern	5
6	2	45	FEMALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, cough, fever, Neutrophil Count Increased, lymphopenia, Elevated Sedimentation Rate, IL-6 increased, bilateral peripheral consolidation	5

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

6	3	45	FEMALE	Wuhan, cough, fever, coarse breath sounds, increased neutrophil ratio , decreased lymphocyte , increased erythrocyte sedimentation rate, increased interleukin 6 , consolidation, interlobular septal thickening, crazy paving appearance, bronchiectasis	5
7	1	42	MALE	High Fever, Cough, Fatigue, Bilateral coarse breath sounds, Wet Rales, Leukopenia, Lymphocytes Increased, C-Reactive Protein Increased, Elevated Sedimentation Rate, Amyloid A Protein Increased, Aspartate Transaminase Increased, Alanine Aminotransferase Increased, Ground Glass Appearance, Ground Glass Opacities (CT), consolidation	6
7	2	42	MALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, high fever, cough, fatigue, bilateral coarse breath sounds, wet rales, leukopenia, lymphocytosis, Elevated Sedimentation Rate, C-Reactive Protein Increased, Aspartate Aminotransferase Increased, Alanine Aminotransferase Increased	6
7	3	42	MALE	Wuhan, fever, cough, fatigue , coarse breath sounds, wet rales , leukopenia, lymphocytosis, increased CRP, increased erythrocyte sedimentation rate, increased serum amyloid A protein, increased aspartate aminotransferase, increased alanine aminotransferase , ground glass opacities, ground glass consolidation	6
8	1	63	FEMALE	Wuhan, Fever, Cough, Dizziness, Constipation, Tachypnea, Rhonchi, Bilateral pneumonia	7
8	2	63	FEMALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, fever, cough, dizziness, constipation, Hyperpnea	7
8	3	63	FEMALE	Wuhan, fever , cough, dizziness, constipation, tachypnea , Rhonchi, pneumonia	7
9	1	63	MALE	Contact COVID-19 Case, Fever, Cough, Tachypnea, Rhonchi , Unilateral pneumonia	7
9	2	63	MALE	Contact COVID-19 Case, fever, cough, hyperpnea, Abnormal Chest CT Scan	7
9	3	63	MALE	contact Covid-19 patient , fever, cough, tachypnea, Rhonchi, pneumonia	7
10	1	19	MALE	Wuhan, Fever, Cough, Fatigue, Nasal Congestion, Rhinorrhea, Unilateral pneumonia	7
10	2	19	MALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, fever, cough, fatigue, nasal congestion, rhinorrhea, Abnormal CT scan	7
10	3	19	MALE	fever , cough, fatigue , Nasal congestion, Rhinorrhea, pneumonia , COVID-19 Risk Area	7
11	1	30	FEMALE	Fever, Chills, Fatigue, Cough, China	8
11	2	30	FEMALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, Contact COVID-19 Case, fever, chills, fatigue, cough	8
11	3	30	FEMALE	Covid-19 risk area, contact Covid-19 patient , fever, chills , fatigue, cough	8
12	1	31	MALE	Wuhan, Fever, Chills, Fatigue, Conjunctivitis, Cough	8
12	2	31	MALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, fever, chills, fatigue, conjunctivitis	8

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

12	3	31	MALE	fever, chills , fatigue, conjunctivitis, cough, Covid-19 risk area	8
13	1	48	MALE	Wuhan , Fever, Headache, Cough	9
13	2	48	MALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, fever, headache, cough	9
13	3	48	MALE	Covid-19 risk area, fever, headache , cough	9
14	1	55	MALE	Wuhan, Sore Throat, Myalgia, prominent bronchovascular bundle, Fever, Lymphocytopenia, C-Reactive Protein Increased, consolidation of both lower lobes, Ground Glass Opacities (CT)	10
14	2	55	MALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, Contact COVID-19 Case, Fever, sore throat, bilateral patchy consolidation, myalgia	10
14	3	55	MALE	Covid-19 risk area , sore throat, myalgia, prominent bronchovascular bundle, fever, lymphopenia, increased CRP, bilateral patch consolidation, ground glass opacities, interlobular septal thickening	10
15	1	50	MALE	Fever, Chills, Cough, Fatigue, Dyspnea, Wuhan, Leukopenia, Lymphocytopenia, multiple patchy shadows in both lungs, C-Reactive Protein Increased	11
15	2	50	MALE	fever, chills, cough, fatigue, dyspnea, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, patchy shadow on X-ray	11
15	3	50	MALE	fever, chills, cough, fatigue, shortness of breath, Covid-19 risk area , diffuse gridding shadow lung	11
16	1	46	FEMALE	Fever, Sore Throat, Cough, Chest Discomfort, Wuhan, Ground Glass Opacities (CT)	12
16	2	46	FEMALE	fever, sore throat, cough, chest distress, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, Wuhan, ground-glass opacity on CT	12
16	3	46	FEMALE	fever, sore throat , cough , chest distress, Covid-19 risk area , contact Covid-19 patient , ground glass opacities	12
17	1	34	FEMALE	Fever, history of hypothyroidism, Vaginal Bleeding, Abdominal Pain, Wuhan, Ground Glass Opacities (CT), Lymphocytopenia, Neutrophil Count Increased, C-Reactive Protein Increased	13
17	2	34	FEMALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, fever, ground-glass opacity on CT, lymphopenia, neutrophilia, C-reactive protein increased	13
17	3	34	FEMALE	Covid-19 risk area, vaginal bleeding, abdominal pain, fever, ground glass opacities, lymphopenia, neutrophilia, increased CRP	13
18	1	52	MALE	history of kidney transplantation, Immunosuppressive Therapy, Wuhan, Fatigue, Dyspnea, Dull Chest Pain, Chest Pain, Nausea, Loss of Appetite, Abdominal Pain, Dry Cough, Fever, Headache, Lymphocytopenia, Neutrophil Count Increased, Monocyte Count Increased, C-Reactive Protein Increased, Ground Glass Opacities (CT)	14
18	2	52	MALE	immunosuppression, Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, fatigue, dyspnea, chest tightness, nausea, loss of appetite, abdominal pain, dry cough, fever, headache, lymphopenia, neutrophil count increased, C-reactive protein increased, multiple ground-glass opacity	14
18	3	52	MALE	chronic glomerulonephritis, immunosuppressive therapy, Covid-19 risk area , fatigue, dyspnea, tightness chest, chest pain, nausea, loss of appetite,	14

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

				abdominal pain, dry cough, fever, headache, decreased lymphocytes , increased CRP , ground glass shadow , increased neutrophil count	
19	1	40	FEMALE	Fever, Dull Chest Pain, Fatigue, peripheral consolidations, ground-glass opacities in both lungs	15
19	2	40	FEMALE	fever, chest tightness, fatigue, ground glass opacity (CT), cough, leukopenia	15
19	3	40	FEMALE	fever, chest tightness, fatigue, glucose increased , ground glass opacities, peripheral consolidations, cough, decreased leukocytes, increased CRP	15
20	1	35	MALE	Wuhan, Fever, Cough, Neutrophil Count Increased, Lymphocytopenia, Glucose Increased, Ground Glass Appearance, C-Reactive Protein Increased	16
20	2	35	MALE	Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, fever, cough, Wuhan, neutrophil count increased, lymphopenia, C-reactive protein increased, multiple patchy consolidations, ground-glass opacity (CT)	16
20	3	35	MALE	fever, cough, Covid-19 risk area, increased neutrophils, decreased lymphocytes , elevated glucose, increased CRP , consolidation, ground glass opacities	16
21	1	81	FEMALE	Abdominal Pain, Diarrhea, Sore Throat, Diamond Princess cruise ship	17
21	2	81	FEMALE	abdominal pain, sore throat , cruise ship, diarrhea , Japan	17
21	3	81	FEMALE	abdominal pain, watery diarrhea, sore throat, Diamond Princess	17
22	1	35	FEMALE	Fever, Chills, Myalgia, Wuhan, Nasal Congestion, Cough, Sputum Production	18
22	2	35	FEMALE	fever, chills, myalgia, Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, cough, nasal congestion, sputum production	18
22	3	35	FEMALE	Covid-19 risk area , fever, chill, myalgia, nasal congestion, cough, sputum production	18
23	1	54	MALE	Fever, Dry Cough, ground-glass opacities in both lower lobes, China	19
23	2	54	MALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, hypertension, fever, dry cough, ground glass opacity (CT)	19
23	3	54	MALE	Covid-19 risk area, chills, muscle pain , hypertension, dry cough, consolidation, ground glass opacities	19
24	1	39	MALE	Fever, Sore Throat, Glucose Increased, Ground Glass Opacities (CT)	16
24	2	39	MALE	Contact COVID-19 Case, fever, ground-glass opacity (CT)	16
24	3	39	MALE	fever, soar throat , contact Covid-19 patient, , decreased aspartate aminotransferase, elevated glucose, ground glass opacities	16
25	1	39	MALE	Cough, frothy white sputum, Bilateral Pulmonary Opacities, Dyspnea, Decreased Oxygen Saturation, Altered Mental Status, Wuhan	20
25	2	39	MALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, fever, cough, sputum production, dyspnea, alteration of consciousness, patchy opacities (CT)	20

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

25	3	39	MALE	Covid-19 risk area, fever, cough , frothy white sputum, shortness of breath, patchy opacities, decreased mental state, decreased SpO2, ground glass opacities, increased albumin , increased Aspartate aminotransferase, increased Lactate dehydrogenase, Wuhan	20
26	1	21	FEMALE	Cough, Chills, Fever, frothy white sputum, Bilateral Pulmonary Opacities, Wuhan	21
26	2	21	FEMALE	Contact COVID-19 Case, fever, cough, chills, sputum production, leukopenia, thrombocytopenia	21
26	3	21	FEMALE	Covid-19 risk area, fever, cough, chills, frothy white sputum, patchy opacities, decreased lymphocytes , decreased platelet count	21
27	1	50	MALE	Diabetes Mellitus, Pneumonia, Respiratory Distress, Decreased Oxygen Saturation	22
27	2	50	MALE	diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidemia, respiratory distress	22
27	3	50	MALE	diabetes mellitus, penumonia, respiratory distress	22
28	1	47	FEMALE	Wuhan, Lethargy, Sore Throat, Dry Cough, Pleuritic Pain, Dyspnea, Fever, Bilateral Pulmonary Infiltrate, C-Reactive Protein Increased	23
28	2	47	FEMALE	Wuhan, lethargy, sore throat, dry cough, pleuritic chest pain, dyspnea, fever, tachycardia, C-reactive protein increased, bilateraly patchy infiltration	23
28	3	47	FEMALE	Covid-19 risk area, lethargy, sore throat, dry cough, pleuritic chest pain , dyspnea, fever, rhonchi, increased CRP, pulmonary infiltrate	23
29	1	32	MALE	Fever, Fatigue, Dizziness, Constipation, Rhonchi , Tachypnea, Bilateral pneumonia	7
29	2	32	MALE	fever, fatigue, dizziness, constipation, rhonchi on auscultation, hyperpnea, CT scan abnormal	7
29	3	32	MALE	Covid-19 risk area, fever, fatigue , dizziness , Constipation, Rhonchi, tachypnea , pneumonia	7
30	1	64	MALE	Fever, Dizziness, Headache, Malaise, Wuhan, bilateral multiple ground-glass opacities	24
30	2	64	MALE	fever, dizziness, headache, myalgia, Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, ground-glass opacity	24
30	3	64	MALE	ground glass opacities, fever, dizziness, headache, aching limbs , Covid-19 risk area	24
31	1	79	FEMALE	history of coronary artery disease , Hypertension, Congestive Heart Failure, Syncope, Myalgia, Fever, Cough, Lymphocytopenia, Chills, Ground Glass Opacities (CT)	25
31	2	79	FEMALE	coronary artery disease, hypertension, myalgia, cough, fever, altered consciousness, lymphopenia, chills, ground-glass opacity (CT)	25
31	3	79	FEMALE	coronary artery disease , hypertension, myalgia, cough , fever, lymphopenia, chills, ground glass opacities	25
32	1	75	MALE	End Stage Renal Disease, Wuhan, Cough, Dull Chest Pain, Hypertension, Heart Failure, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, pitting edema bilaterally, Ground Glass Opacities (CT), Decreased Oxygen Saturation	26

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

32	2	75	MALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, end-stage kidney disease, cough, chest tightness, hypertension, Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, hyperpnea	26
32	3	75	MALE	Covid-19 risk area, cough , chest tightness, hypertension, chronic heart failure, COPD, End Stage Kidney Disease, tachypnea , pitting edema, ground glass opacity, decreased oxygen saturation, CRP increased, Wuhan	26
33	1	53	FEMALE	Fatigue, Fever, Cough, Hypotension, Alkalosis, Hypoxemia, Hypocapnia, Low-Voltage Electrocardiogram, ST-segment depression with T-wave inversion in lead V1 and aVR, Creatine Phosphokinase Increased, C-Reactive Protein Increased, Chloride Decreased, Potassium Increased, Hyponatremia, Lymphocytopenia, Hemoglobin Increased, Hematocrit Increased, Erythrocytes Increased, ST Elevation, Cardiac Enzymes Increased	27
33	2	53	FEMALE	fatigue, fever, cough, hypotension, tachycardia, C-reactive protein increased	27
33	3	53	FEMALE	fatigue, fever, dry cough, hypotension , alkalosis, increased creatine kinase, increased CRP, hyperkalemia, heart dysfunction	27
34	1	73	FEMALE	Diabetes Mellitus, Obesity, Chronic Kidney Insufficiency, Hypertension, Congestive Heart Failure, Cough, Fever, Dyspnea, Hypoxemia, Tachycardia, Respiratory Failure, Bilateral Pulmonary Infiltrate	28
34	2	73	FEMALE	cough, fever, dyspnea, hypoxemia, tachycardia, bilateral infiltrates CT	28
34	3	73	FEMALE	coronary artery disease, hypertension, congestive heart failure, cough, fever, shortness of breath, tachycardia , respiratory failure, bilateral infiltrates, diabetes mellitus, hypoxemia, chronic kidney disease	28
35	1	38	MALE	Fever, Lymphocytopenia, Cough, Decreased Oxygen Saturation, Dull Chest Pain, Palpitations, Dyspnea, Hypoxemia, Ground Glass Opacities (CT), consolidation, Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome, Pulmonary Emphysema	29
35	2	38	MALE	Wuhan, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, fever, lymphopenia, cough, hypoxemia, chest tightness, dyspnea, Ground Glass Opacities (CT)	29
35	3	38	MALE	Covid-19 risk area , hearing loss, tinnitus, fever, decreased lymphocytes , cough, decreased oxygen saturation , chest tightness , dyspnea, hypoxemia, ground glass opacities, pulmonary lesion , consolidation	29
36	1	51	MALE	Italy, Fever, Cough, Myalgia, Malaise, Sinusitis, Sputum Production, bilateral scleral injection, Hypertension, Lymphocytopenia	30
36	2	51	MALE	fever, cough, Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, myalgia, malaise, sputum production	30
36	3	51	MALE	fever , cough, myalgia, malaise, sinusitis, sputum production , Covid-19 risk area, hypertension	30
37	1	39	MALE	history of non-Hodgkin lymphoma, history of chronic lymphocytic leukaemia, China, Fever, Sore Throat, Productive Cough, Dyspnea, Leukocytes Increased, Lymphocytes Increased, Hemoglobin Decreased, Decreased Platelet Count, C-Reactive Protein Increased, β2-microglobulin increased, Lactate Dehydrogenase Increased, Immunoglobulins Decreased or Undetectable, Ground Glass Opacities (CT), Pleural Effusion	31
37	2	39	MALE	Stay in COVID-19 Risk Area, non-Hodgkin Lymphoma, fever, sore throat, productive cough, dyspnea, immunosupression, lymphocytosis, thrombocytopenia, C-reactive protein increased, Ground Glass Opacities (CT)	31

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

37	3	39	MALE	non-Hodgkin lymphoma, chronic lymphocytic leukaemia, fever, sore throat , productive cough, dyspnoea, increased CRP, lymphocytosis, thrombocytopenia, increased leukocytes , increased lactate dehydrogenase, decreased platelet count, ground glass opacities , Covid-19 risk area, China	31
38	1		MALE	Fever, Lethargy, cutaneous mottling, Respiratory Distress, Contact COVID-19 Case	32
38	2		MALE	fever, lethargy, respiratory distress	32
38	3		MALE	fever, lethargy, cutaneous mottling, respiratory distress, tachycardia, tachypnoea, contact Covid-19 patient, Iran	32
39	1	27	FEMALE	Contact COVID-19 Case, Fever, Myalgia, Cough, Lymphocytopenia, C-Reactive Protein Increased, Pneumonia	33
39	2	27	FEMALE	Contact COVID-19 Case, fever, myalgia, cough, C-reactive protein increased, CT scan abnormal	33
39	3	27	FEMALE	contact Covid-19 patient , fever, myalgia, cough, lymphocytopenia, increased CRP, pneumonia	33
40	1	26	FEMALE	Contact COVID-19 Case, Fever, Myalgia, Malaise, Cough, Sore Throat, Lymphocytopenia, C-Reactive Protein Increased, Pneumonia	33
40	2	26	FEMALE	Contact COVID-19 Case, fever, myalgia, malaise, cough, sore throat, lymphopenia, C-reactive protein increased, CT scan abnormal	33
40	3	26	FEMALE	contact Covid-19 patient, fever, myalgia, malaise, cough, sore throat, Lymphopenia, increased CRP, pneumonia	33
41	1	61	MALE	Fever, Dry Cough, Dyspnea, feeling very tired, Malaise, Hypertension, Tachycardia, Chest x-ray shows bilateral lung infiltrates, Ground Glass Opacities (CT), Respiratory Distress	34
41	2	61	MALE	fever, dry cough, dyspnea, fatigue, malaise, hypertension, tachycardia, ground-glass opacity on CT, respiratory distress	34
41	3	61	MALE	fever, dry cough, difficulty breathing, fatigue, malaise, bilateral lung infiltrates, ground glass opacity, respiratory distress, hypertension	34
42	1	26	FEMALE	Sore Throat, Dry Cough	34
42	2	26	FEMALE	sore throat, dry cough	34
42	3	26	FEMALE	sore throat, dry cough	34
43	1		UNKNOWN	Fever, Sore Throat, Myalgia, ground glass opacity of inferior lobe of left lung	35
43	2		UNKNOWN	fever, sore throat, myalgia, ground-glass opacity on CT	35
43	3		UNKNOWN	fever, sore throat, muscle pain, ground glass opacity	35
44	1		UNKNOWN	multiple patchy ground glass opacity in both lungs, effusion on both lungs, Fever, Dry Cough, Productive Cough, Headache, Fatigue	35
44	2		UNKNOWN	Fever, dry cough, productive cough, headache, fatigue, ground-glass opacity on CT	35

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

44	3		UNKNOWN	fever, dry cough, productive cough, headache, fatigue , ground glass opacity, effusion on both lungs	35
45	1		UNKNOWN	Fever, multiple patchy ground glass opacity on both lungs	35
45	2		UNKNOWN	ground-glass opacity on CT, Fever	35
45	3		UNKNOWN	fever, CT ground glass opacity	35
46	1		UNKNOWN	multiple patchy ground glass opacity on both lungs, Fever, Sore Throat, Dry Cough, Headache, Fatigue	35
46	2		UNKNOWN	Fever, Sore throat, dry cough, headache, fatigue, ground-glass opacity on CT	35
46	3		UNKNOWN	fever, sore throat, dry cough, headache, fatigue, ground glass opacity	35
47	1	32	MALE	Diarrhea, Fatigue, Cough, Dyspnea, Wuhan, foamy sputum, Tachypnea, Leukocytes Increased, Neutrophil Count Increased, Lymphocytopenia, C-Reactive Protein Increased, Elevated Sedimentation Rate, Glucose Increased, Alanine Aminotransferase Increased, Aspartate Aminotransferase Increased, Blood Urea Nitrogen Increased, procalcitonin increased, diffuse multiple patchy exudates, Ground Glass Opacities (CT), Hypercapnia, Hypoxemia, Base Deficit, HCO3- decreased, Lactate Increased, Acidosis, Thrombocytosis	36
47	2	32	MALE	diarrhea, fatigue, dyspnea, Wuhan, hyperpnea, leukocytosis, neutrophil count increased, lymphocyte count increased, C-reactive protein increased, Erythrocyte sedimentation rate increased, alanine aminotransferase increased, aspartate aminotransferase increased, ground-glass opacities on CT	36
47	3	32	MALE	diarrhea, fatigue, cough, dyspnea , Wuhan, sputum production , tachypnea , increased leucocytes , increased neutrophil count , increased lymphocyte count, increased CRP, increased erythrocyte sedimentation rate , increased glucose , increased alanine aminotransferase, increased aspartate aminotransferase, increased blood urea nitrogen, increased procalcitonin, multiple patchy exudates, acidosis, decreased PO2, increased PCO2, ground glass opacities	36
48	1	48	MALE	Smoking, Diabetes Mellitus, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, Fever, Cough, foamy sputum, Leukocytes Increased, Lymphocytopenia, Neutrophil Count Increased, Lactate Increased, Alanine Aminotransferase Increased, Bilirubin Increased, Plasma Fibrinogen Increased, Fibrin Degradation Products Increased, C-Reactive Protein Increased, Immunoglobulin G Increased, diffuse multiple patchy exudates with partial interlobar septation, Hypoxemia, Hypercapnia	36
48	2	48	MALE	smoking, Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, fever, productive cough, chills, diabetes mellitus, patchy exudates on CT, leukocytosis, neutrophil count increased, lactate dehydrogenase increased, alanine aminotransferase increased, fibrinogen increased, C-reactive protein increased	36
48	3	48	MALE	fever, cough, shivering, sputum production , leukocytes increased , lymphocytes decreased , neutrophil count increased , lactate increased , increased Alanine aminotransferase, bilirubin increased , LDH increased, fibrinogen increased, CRP increased, Immunoglobulin G decreased , smoker, Diabetes mellitus , COPD	36

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

49	1	82	FEMALE	Tachypnea, Diarrhea, Contact COVID-19 Case, Loss of Appetite, Abdominal Distension, Decreased Oxygen Saturation, Coarse Rales, Alkalosis, Leukocytes Decreased, Lymphocytopenia, Neutrophil Count Decreased, Decreased Platelet Count, C-Reactive Protein Increased, Immunoglobulin G Increased, Hypoxemia, decreased HCO3-, bilateral ground glass opacities, peripheral exudative changes	36
49	2	82	FEMALE	Contact covid-19 case, abdominal pain, tachypnea, leukopenia, lymphopenia, neutropenia, ground-glass opacities on CT, thrombocytopenia	36
49	3	82	FEMALE	contact Covid-19 patient, Diarrhea, Nausea, decreased leukocytes , decreased lymphocytes , decreased Neutrophil count, Platelet count decreased, CRP increased , ground glass opacity, loss of appetite , abdominal distension, decreased oxygen saturation , tachypnea , alkalosis , decreased PaO2, HCO3- decreased	36
50	1	60	MALE	Hypertension, Nausea, Vomiting, Diarrhea, Fever, Dyspnea, Thrombocytopenia, bilateral parenchymal opacities, basal pleural effusions, Tachypnea, Hypoxemia	37
50	2	60	MALE	Italy, hypertension, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, fever, dyspnea, thrombocytopenia, bilateral parenchymal opacities on X-ray	37
50	3	60	MALE	Italy , hypertension, Nausea, vomiting, diarrhoea, fever, dyspnoea , thrombocytopenia, bilateral parenchymal opacities, pleural effusions	37

Source	URL
1	http://balkanmedicaljournal.org/uploads/pdf/pdf_BMJ_2192.pdf
2	https://jkms.org/DOIx.php?id=10.3346/jkms.2020.35.e124
3	https://pubs.rsna.org/doi/10.1148/radiol.2020200236?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%3dpubmed
4	https://pubs.rsna.org/doi/10.1148/radiol.2020200257?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%3dpubmed
5	https://pubs.rsna.org/doi/10.1148/radiol.2020200280?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%3dpubmed
6	https://pubs.rsna.org/doi/10.1148/radiol.2020200269?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%3dpubmed
7	https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/bst/14/1/14_2020.01030/_pdf/-char/en
8	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7029452/#!po=32.1429
9	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7029452/#!po=17.8571
10	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7036338/
11	https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanres/article/PIIS2213-2600(20)30076-X/fulltext
12	https://www.ijidonline.com/article/S1201-9712(20)30122-3/pdf
13	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32161941
14	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/ajt.15869
15	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32100486

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

16	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7039714/
17	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32188528
18	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7036342/
19	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7025910/
20	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7033720/
21	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7033720/#!po=31.8182
22	https://annals.org/aim/fullarticle/2763329/covid-19-risk-health-care-workers-case-report
23	https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-020-0819-2
24	https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11604-020-00945-1
25	http://rimed.org/rimedicaljournal/2020/04/2020-04-50-case-tape.pdf
26	https://www.karger.com/Article/FullText/507261
27	https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamacardiology/fullarticle/2763843
28	https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6912e1.htm?s_cid=mm6912e1_w
29	https://www.kjronline.org/DOIx.php?id=10.3348/kjr.2020.0180
30	https://www.journalofinfection.com/article/S0163-4453(20)30148-1/fulltext
31	https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanhae/article/PIIS2352-3026(20)30074-0/fulltext
32	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32233816
33	https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(20)30360-3/fulltext
34	https://bestpractice.bmj.com/topics/en-gb/3000168/case-history
35	https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/BBE978EC4E1C2664DE599BA639088BF7/S193578932000066Xa.pdf/case_report_on_early_diagnosis_of_covid19.pdf
36	https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0929664620301443?via%3Dihub
37	https://smw.ch/article/doi/smw.2020.20246

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

S4 Table. List of COVID-19 symptoms according to the WHO

Fever	Fatigue	Cough	Sneezing	Malaise
Rhinorrhea	Sore throat	Diarrhea	Headache	Dyspnea

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

S5 Table. Mapping between symptom checkers output texts and risk levels. All mappings were independently done by two different persons and conflicts resolved by a third person's opinion.

Ada	Your symptoms **are probably caused by other diseases** that are more common than COVID-19	Low
	It's **unlikely** that you're experiencing symptoms of COVID-19	Low
	Based on what you've reported, you should take steps to monitor your health and practice social distancing. You have **none of the typical symptoms of COVID-19.** However, in the last 14 days, you've been in contact with a confirmed or probable COVID-19 case. Also, you're in one of the groups at risk of developing a more serious form of the disease.	Medium
	The symptoms you have reported are **present in some cases** of COVID-19. You haven't reported exposure to cases of COVID-19. However, you are in one of the groups at risk of developing a more serious form of the disease.	Medium
	You have **symptoms typical of COVID-19**, and you're in one of the groups at risk of having a more serious form of the disease.	Medium
	It's **possible that COVID-19** is causing your symptoms	Medium
	There is a **high risk** that COVID-19 is causing your symptoms	High
Apple	You Should Practice Social Distancing	Low
	You Should Self-Isolate	Medium
	Contact Your Healthcare Provider	High
Babylon	It's **unlikely** that you are experiencing symptoms of coronavirus (COVID-19). But if you develop a new or continuous cough, fever or difficulty breathing, start a new symptom check.	Low
	The symptoms you mentioned sound worrying and **could be caused** by coronavirus (COVID-19). Call 999 for an ambulance immediately and let them know you may have symptoms of coronavirus.	Medium
CDC	Sorry you're feeling ill. Stay at home and monitor your symptoms. Call your provider if you get worse (No COVID-19 risk)	Low
	Stay home and take care of yourself. Call your provider if you get worse. You have one or more symptom that **may be related** to COVID-19	Medium
Cleveland Clinic	You're at **low risk** for COVID-19.	Low
	You're at **medium risk** for COVID-19.	Medium
	You're at **high risk** for COVID-19.	High
Docyet	"Es besteht kein Grund zur Sorge! Basierend auf Ihren Angaben ist es **ziemlich unwahrscheinlich**, dass Sie sich mit dem Coronavirus infiziert haben. Sie zeigen keine Symptome von COVID-19.	Low
	Aktuell besteht kein wesentlicher Grund zur Sorge. Basierend auf Ihren Angaben ist es **ziemlich unwahrscheinlich**, dass Sie sich mit dem Coronavirus infiziert haben.	Low
	Aktuell besteht kein wesentlicher Grund zur Sorge. Basierend auf Ihren Angaben ist es **relativ**	Low

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	unwahrscheinlich, dass Sie sich mit dem Coronavirus infiziert haben. Sie schildern jedoch einige typische Symptome eines Atemwegsinfekts (z.B. Grippe, Bronchitis) oder einer Erkältung.	
	Sie sollten dringend ärztliche Hilfe aufsuchen. Sie haben typische Symptome einer schweren Grippe oder Lungenentzündung geschildert. Auf Basis Ihrer Angaben ist es jedoch **nicht sehr wahrscheinlich**, dass Sie sich mit dem Coronavirus infiziert haben.	Low
	Sie zeigen deutliche grippeähnliche Symptome und waren potentiell in Kontakt mit am Coronavirus infizierten Personen. Es ist **daher möglich,** dass auch Sie sich angesteckt haben.	Medium
	Sie zeigen erste grippeähnliche Symptome und waren potentiell in Kontakt mit am Coronavirus infizierten Personen. Es ist **daher möglich**, dass auch Sie sich angesteckt haben.	Medium
	"Bisher zeigen Sie keine auffälligen Symptome. Sie sind jedoch in Kontakt mit am Coronavirus infizierten Personen gekommen. Es ist **daher möglich**, dass auch Sie sich angesteckt haben, auf Grund der zweiwöchigen Ausbruchszeit jedoch noch keine Symptome zeigen.	Medium
	Ihre Symptome deuten auf eine schwere Grippe bzw. Lungenentzündung hin. Außerdem waren Sie potentiell in Kontakt mit am Coronavirus infizierten Personen. Es ist **möglich**, dass auch Sie sich angesteckt haben.	Medium
	"Sie zeigen deutliche grippeähnliche Symptome sowie erste Anzeichen einer Lungenentzündung. Außerdem waren Sie potentiell in Kontakt mit am Coronavirus infizierten Personen. Es ist **daher möglich**, dass auch Sie sich angesteckt haben.	Medium
Providence	You do not report exposure to coronavirus (COVID-19) and do not have symptoms. You don't report any symptoms of coronavirus infection, so your risk is **low**. You can use this tool again or call your provider if anything changes, but in the meantime:	Low
	You **might be** infected with coronavirus (COVID-19). Please do one of the following: Call 911 for a life-threatening emergency. Schedule an evaluation with your primary care physician. Speak with a provider at Express Care Virtual.	Medium
	Please do one of the following: Call 911 for a life-threatening emergency. Schedule an evaluation with your primary care physician. Speak with a provider at Express Care Virtual.	High
Symptoma	**High risk** for COVID-19	High
	Medium risk for COVID-19	Medium
	Low risk for COVID-19	Low
Infermedica	Your symptoms **do not suggest** that you have COVID-19. Continue following the common measures and government directives to avoid contracting COVID-19. Remember that your symptoms may also result from other diseases and may require medical consultation - this interview targets the COVID-19 infection. If your symptoms seem severe and you are worried, contact your doctor or local health authorities.	Low
	Your symptoms are worrisome and **may be relate**d to COVID-19. Call your local COVID-19-related healthcare number. Depending on the country, this may be a telephone line issued by the Ministry of Health or Health Department.	Medium
Your.MD	**There's nothing at present to suggest** that you have coronavirus (COVID-19). Please practice physical/social distancing.	Low
	You **may** have coronavirus (COVID-19).	Medium
	You **may** still be at risk of coronavirus (COVID-19).	Medium
	You're **highly likely** to have coronavirus (COVID-19).	High

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	Call an ambulance immediately. Please tell them you have symptoms that may be caused by coronavirus (COVID-19).	High

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

S6 Table. Full table of sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, F1 score and MCC for all symptom checkers (COVID-19 positive defined by "high risk" for non binary symptom checkers)

Symptom checker	sensitivity	specificity	accuracy	F1 score	MCC
Ada	0.14	1.00	0.57	0.24	0.27
Apple	0.22	0.69	0.46	0.29	-0.10
Babylon	0.90	0.33	0.62	0.70	0.29
CDC	0.94	0.29	0.61	0.71	0.30
Cleveland Clinic	0.32	0.74	0.53	0.40	0.07
Docyet	0.16	1.00	0.58	0.27	0.29
Infermedica	0.78	0.83	0.80	0.80	0.61
Providence	0.32	0.72	0.52	0.40	0.05
SF-COS	0.90	0.66	0.78	0.80	0.58
SF-DIST	0.52	0.70	0.61	0.57	0.22
Symptoma	0.88	0.97	0.93	0.92	0.85
Your.MD	0.14	1.00	0.57	0.24	0.27

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

S7 Table. Full table of sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, F1 score and MCC for all symptom checkers (COVID-19 positive defined by “medium risk or “high risk” for non binary symptom checkers)

Symptom checker	sensitivity	specificity	accuracy	F1 score	MCC
Ada	0.36	0.67	0.51	0.42	0.03
Apple	0.98	0.17	0.57	0.70	0.25
Babylon	0.90	0.33	0.62	0.70	0.29
CDC	0.94	0.29	0.61	0.71	0.30
Cleveland Clinic	0.98	0.41	0.69	0.76	0.47
Docyet	0.16	1.00	0.58	0.27	0.29
Infermedica	0.78	0.83	0.80	0.80	0.61
Providence	0.98	0.38	0.68	0.75	0.45
SF-COS	0.90	0.66	0.78	0.80	0.58
SF-DIST	0.52	0.70	0.61	0.57	0.22
Symptoma	0.94	0.88	0.91	0.91	0.83
Your.MD	0.94	0.32	0.63	0.72	0.33

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



S8 Fig. Sensitivity vs specificity for all symptom checkers and Symptoma input constraint respectively by each symptom checker

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

S9 Table. Full table of sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, F1 score and MCC for Symptoma constrained by each symptom checker (COVID-19 positive defined by "high risk" for non binary symptom checkers)

Symptoma constrained by	sensitivity	specificity	accuracy	F1 score	MCC
Ada	0.28	0.94	0.61	0.42	0.30
Apple	0.76	0.92	0.84	0.82	0.69
Babylon	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	n/a
CDC	0.78	0.89	0.83	0.82	0.68
Cleveland Clinic	0.72	0.99	0.85	0.83	0.73
Docyet	0.20	0.98	0.59	0.33	0.29
Infermedica	0.32	0.92	0.62	0.45	0.30
Providence	0.22	0.99	0.60	0.35	0.32
Your.MD	0.22	0.98	0.60	0.35	0.31

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

S10 Table. Full table of sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, F1 score and MCC for Symptoma constrained by each symptom checker (COVID-19 positive defined by "medium risk" or "high risk" for non binary symptom checkers)

Symptoma constrained by	sensitivity	specificity	accuracy	F1 score	MCC
Ada	0.98	0.36	0.67	0.75	0.44
Apple	0.98	0.20	0.59	0.70	0.28
Babylon	0.84	0.43	0.63	0.70	0.30
CDC	0.98	0.21	0.59	0.71	0.29
Cleveland Clinic	0.98	0.30	0.64	0.73	0.38
Docyet	0.96	0.27	0.62	0.71	0.32
Infermedica	0.94	0.28	0.61	0.71	0.29
Providence	0.96	0.26	0.61	0.71	0.31
Your.MD	0.94	0.32	0.63	0.72	0.33

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109777; this version posted May 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



S11 Fig. Pairwise comparison between all symptom checkers and Symptoma based on the MCC if only the subset of symptoms used by one checker is also used for Symptoma.