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**Reported high specificity of SARS-CoV-2 tests based on cross-reactivity assessments; and other causes of false positives**

It has often been suggested that the false positive rate for SARS-CoV-2 tests is zero or near zero, meaning that the specificity is nearly or actually 100%. For example, in a *New York Times* Op-Ed stated that "The tests appear to be highly specific: If your test comes back positive, it is almost certain you have the infection."1 An infectious disease expert at the Mayo Clinic told a reporter that "It’s unlikely there are false positives,"2 and another at the Cleveland Clinic said "false positives are extremely unlikely."3 "If your swab test comes back positive for COVID-19 then we can be very confident that you do have COVID-19" according to an article in a major medical journal providing advice to health professionals on the interpretation of COVID-19 test results.4 "False positive results are rare" according to the *COVID Reference* manual.5 The Massachusetts Institute of Technology says that the test "almost never gives a false positive."6 Across the United States, public health officials assured us that "basically, the false positive rate is zero" (Georgia),7 "we don't feel we have false positives with that test" (Kansas),8 "anyone who gets a positive test should assume that the results are correct" (Connecticut),9 "PCR tests for COVID-19 have very few false positives" (California),10 and "false positive test results are so rare that they approach a 0% rate" (New Hampshire).11

Statements that the false positive rate is zero or near zero are apparently based on the numbers reported in assessments of cross-reactivity. Test developers and manufacturers conduct these assessments to determine whether their tests react with non-SARS-CoV-2 genetic material, by testing samples that contain other human pathogens and clinical specimens known to be free of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. If there are no reactions, 100% specificity is reported, as shown in Table S1. However, these assessments focus on only one potential source of false positives—unwanted reaction of the reagents with material that is not SARS-CoV-2 RNA—and not with other sources of false positives, such as contamination of a sample with SARS-CoV-2 genetic material;33-36 contamination of reagents,37-40 of other supplies,41 42 or of equipment;43 equipment44 or software45 malfunction; sample mixups;46 47 data entry or data transcription errors;48-51 or miscommunication of the results.36 52 53 In fact, if false positives arise from any of these causes during cross-reactivity assessments they may be ignored or excluded from the results. For example, there were some weak reactions with clinical samples that contained no SARS-CoV-2 during the cross-reactivity assessment of the Charité test (the test distributed by the World Health Organization and generally known as the WHO test), but the researchers concluded that this was due to "handling issues" in the laboratory rather than a reaction with the wrong genetic material. As a result they excluded these reactions from the data being analyzed, and reported the test's specificity as 100%.18

Some media reports and studies have also reported RT-PCR detections of remnant SARS-CoV-2 RNA in individuals who no longer have an active infection as "false positives"54 but we believe that's the wrong term for the phenomenon. RT-PCR diagnostic tests have no mechanism and were never intended to determine whether a virus is currently replicating in a patient's body, but rather are designed to react with any target RNA present in a patient. A perfectly designed and implemented RT-PCR test will react with target RNA in the patient whether or not the virus is currently active. We believe that the term "false positive" should be reserved for situations where target RNA is not present in the patient and the positive results are due to some flaw in the test's design or implementation.

Table S1. Reported specificity of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assays based on *in vitro* cross-reactivity assessments. These include 20 of the 68 RT-PCR assays that received U.S. Food and Drug Administration Emergency Use Authorizations through 30 Apr 2020, and all four of the assays that had received World Health Organization Emergency Use Listings by that date.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Laboratory or manufacturer** | **Test** | **Authorizationa** | **Negative samples** | **Positive results** | **Speci-ficityb** | **Refer-ence** |
| Abbott Diagnostics Scarborough, Inc. | ID NOW COVID-19 | EUA/Commercial 3/27/20 | 30 | 0 | 100% | 12 |
| Abbott Molecular, Inc. | Abbott RealTime SARS-CoV-2 assay | EUA/Commercial 3/18/20, EUL 4/9/20 | 150 | 0 | 100% | 13 |
| Altona Diagnostics GmbH | RealStar SARS-CoV02 RT-PCR Kits U.S. | EUA/Commercial 4/22/20 | 63 | 0 | 100% | 14 |
| Altru Diagnostics, Inc. | Altru Dx SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay | EUA/Single Lab 4/30/20 | 66 | 0 | 100% | 15 |
| Biocerna | SARS-CoV-2 Test | EUA/Single Lab 4/28/20 | 30 | 0 | 100% | 16 |
| Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | CDC 2019-nCoV Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel | EUA/Commercial 2/4/20 | 181 | 0 | 100% | 17 |
| Charité–Universitätsmedizin Berlin/German Center for Infection Research | "WHO Test"c | - | 430 | 0 | 100% | 18 |
| Diagnostic Molecular Laboratory, Northwestern Medicine | SARS-Cov-2 Assay | EUA/Single Lab 4/2/20 | 58 | 0 | 100% | 19 |
| Hologic, Inc. | Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2 Assay | EUA/Commercial 3/16/20 | 243 | 0 | 100% | 20 |
| Infectious Disease Diagnostics Laboratory, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia | SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test | EUA/Single Lab 4/2/20 | 30 | 0 | 100% | 21 |
| LabGenomics Co., Ltd. | LabGun COVID-19 RT-PCR Kit | EUA/Commercial 4/29/20 | 229 | 0 | 100% | 22 |
| Nationwide Children’s Hospital | SARS-CoV-2 Assay | EUA/Single Lab 4/27/20 | 60 | 0 | 100% | 23 |
| PerkinElmer, Inc. | New Coronavirus Nucleic Acid Detection Kit | EUA/Commercial 3/24/20, EUL 4/24/20 | 319 | 0 | 100% | 24 |

**Table S1. continued**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Laboratory or manufacturer** | **Test** | **Authorizationa** | **Negative samples** | **Positive results** | **Speci-ficityb** | **Refer-ence** |
| Primerdesign Ltd. | COVID-19 genesig Real-Time PCR assay | EUA/Commercial 3/20/20, EUL 4/7/20 | 158 | 0 | 100% | 25 |
| Rheonix, Inc. | Rheonix COVID-19 MDx Assay | EUA/Commercial 4/29/20 | 60 | 0 | 100% | 26 |
| Roche Molecular Systems, Inc. | cobas SARS-CoV-2 | EUA/Commercial 3/12/20, EUL 4/3/20 | 283 | 0 | 100% | 27 |
| SD Biosensor, Inc. | Standard M nCoV Real-Time Detection Kit | EUA/Commercial 4/23/20 | 126 | 0 | 100% | 28 |
| SeaSun BioMaterials | U-TOP COVID-19 Detection Kit | EUA/Commercial 4/27/20 | 181 | 0 | 100% | 29 |
| Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc. | TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit | EUA/Commercial 3/13/20 | 96 | 0 | 100% | 30 |
| Wadsworth Center, New York State Department of Public Health | New York SARS-CoV-2 Real-time Reverse Transcriptase (RT)-PCR Diagnostic Panel | EUA/Commercial 2/29/20 | 165 | 0 | 100% | 31 |
| Yale New Haven Hospital, Clinical Virology Laboratory | SARS-CoV-2 PCR test | EUA/Single Lab 3/31/20 | 16 | 0 | 100% | 32 |

a EUA = Emergency Use Authorization by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, issued either for commercial products or for use by a single laboratory. EUL = Emergency Use Listing by the World Health Organization.

b The Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics (FIND), a World Health Organization Collaborating Centre, used clinical samples to assess sensitivity and specificity by gene target for 15 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assays, including a few in this table. FIND reported specificities under 100% (96%-99%) for 8 gene targets in 6 assays, but in a footnote stated that these might be due to incorrect classification of the samples rather than false positive results.

c Protocol for a test distributed by the World Health Organization (WHO), often referred to as the WHO test.

**Review of external quality assessments of RNA viruses**

Direct data on false positive rates in the real-world implementation of SARS-CoV-2 assays are scarce. We therefore undertook a review of external quality assessments (EQAs) of similar assays to gain insight into the expected false positive rates in SARS-CoV-2 assays. EQAs test the implementation of medical diagnostic assays by providing participating laboratories with blind panels of positive and negative samples. The laboratories assay these panels using their normal procedures and report the results to the EQA manager, who compiles and analyzes the results.

We searched online for reports on EQAs of laboratories conducting RT-PCR assays for RNA viruses. We excluded EQAs prior to 2004, since many of the assays relied on older RT-PCR methods that may be less accurate. We found reports on 43 EQAs conducted in 2004-2019 that included negative samples, and which reported the data needed to calculate a false positive rate: the total number of negative samples and the number of these reported positive by the participating laboratories (Table S2). Each EQA enrolled between three and 174 participating laboratories, which together provided results for 4,113 blind panels containing 10,538 negative samples. Where the EQAs reported the type of assay used, 99.8% of the panels were analyzed with RT-PCR and 0.2% with nucleic acid amplification methods other than PCR (loop-mediated isothermal amplification and reverse polymerase amplification). Where the type of RT-PCR was specified, 17% were conventional assays and 83% were real-time.

In these EQAs, the test panels included one or both of two types of samples that lacked the viral RNA that was the target of the assay: negative controls, containing no viral RNA; and specificity controls, containing RNA from other viruses but not the target virus, included in order to test for cross-reactivity. We counted both of these sample types as negative samples. For each EQA we extracted the total number of negative samples assayed and the total number of positive results returned on negative samples, and calculated the resulting false positive rate. Where we could only determine a range, for statistical analysis we conservatively took the false positive rate as the lower bound of the range. In EQAs where no negative samples were reported as positive, we listed the false positive rate in Table S2 as below a detection limit equal to the reciprocal of the total number of negative samples, but for statistical analysis treated the false positive rate as zero.

Of the 10,538 negative samples analyzed in the 43 EQAs, 336 (3.2%) were reported as positive. We considered two data sets, one comprising all 43 EQAs (full data set), and one comprising the 37 EQAs that analyzed at least 100 negative samples (subset). False positive rates in each EQA ranged from 0-16.7% for the full data set, and 0-8.1% for the subset. The median and interquartile range were lower for the full data set (median=2.3%, interquartile range=0.8-4.0%) than for the subset (median=2.5%, interquartile range=1.2-4.0%) (Figure S1). There was no correlation between false positive rate and Year for the full data set (n=43, r=0.147, p=0.346), but a weak downward correlation for the subset (n=35, r=0.327, p=0.056) suggesting a possible reduction in false positive rates over time (Figure S2).

The EQAs did not report any relationship between the occurrence of false positives and the type of assay used. This is unsurprising since the likely sources of these false positives (contamination, human error) are more directly connected to laboratory practices and layouts than to which particular assay is used. Thus there is probably no systematic difference between the false positive rates among the scores of different assays used to detect SARS-CoV-2 and the hundreds of different assays in the EQAs we reviewed.

Table S2. External quality assessments of RT-PCR assays of RNA viruses

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Virus** | **Date** | **Labor-atories** | **Panels** | **Negative samples /panel** | **Negative samples** | **False positives** | **False positive ratea** | **Labor-atories with false positives** | **Refer-ence** |
| SARS | 2004? | 58 | 58 | 3 | 174 | 4-12 | 2.3-6.9% | 4 | 55 |
| MERS | spring 2014 | 99 | 189 | 6 | 1,134 | 11b | 1.0% | 8 | 56 |
| MERS | 2015? | 56 | 56 | 3 | 168 | 0 | <0.6% | 0 | 57 |
| MERS | 2017? | 49 | 49 | 1 | 49 | 0 | <2.0% | 0 | 58 |
| Influenza A viruses | Feb-Mar 2007 | 64 | 64 | 2 | 128 | 9 | 7.0% | 5-9 | 59 |
| Influenza A viruses | Aug-Oct 2007 | 83 | 83 | 4 | 332 | 9 | 2.7% | 3-9 | 59 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jan-Feb 2008 | 95 | 95 | 2 | 190 | 3 | 1.6% | 2-3 | 59 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jun-Jul 2008 | 109 | 109 | 2 | 218 | 7 | 3.2% | 4-7 | 59 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jan-Feb 2009 | 114 | 114 | 1 | 114 | 1 | 0.9% | 1 | 60 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jan-Mar 2010 | 138 | 138 | 1 | 138 | 1 | 0.7% | 1 | 61 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jun-Aug 2010 | 158 | 158 | 1 | 158 | 2 | 1.3% | 2 | 61 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jan-Mar 2011 | 158 | 316 | 2 | 316 | 11 | 3.5% | 3-11 | 62 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jun-Jul 2011 | 159 | 159 | 1 | 159 | 3 | 1.9% | 3 | 62 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2012 | 163 | 163 | 1 | 163 | 7 | 4.3% | 7 | 63 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2013 | 158 | 158 | 1 | 158 | 4 | 2.5% | 4 | 64 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2014 | 156 | 156 | 1 | 156 | 6 | 3.8% | 6 | 65 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2015 | 153 | 153 | 1 | 153 | 3 | 2.0% | 3 | 66 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2016 | 151 | 151 | 1 | 151 | 1 | 0.7% | 1 | 67 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2017 | 160 | 160 | 1 | 160 | 3 | 1.9% | 3 | 68 |
| Influenza A viruses | May-Jun 2018 | 174 | 174 | 1 | 174 | 0 | <0.6% | 0 | 69 |
| Influenza A viruses | May-Jul 2019 | 172 | 172 | 1 | 172 | 2 | 1.2% | 2 | 70 |
| HCV | Jan 2005 | 78 | 78 | 9 | 702 | 49 | 7.0% | 6-49 | 71 |
| HCV | Feb 2005 | 84 | 84 | 7 | 588 | 29 | 4.9% | 5-29 | 71 |
| HCV | 2005? | 5 | 119 | 1 | 119 | 4 | 3.4% | 3 | 72 |
| HCV | Jan 2006 | 96 | 96 | 7 | 672 | 47 | 7.0% | 7-47 | 71 |
| HCV | Feb 2006 | 89 | 89 | 6 | 534 | 11 | 2.1% | 2-11 | 71 |
| HCV | 2006? | 20 | 21 | 1 | 21 | 0 | <4.8% | 0 | 73 |
| HCV | Jan 2007 | 104 | 104 | 7 | 728 | 22 | 3.0% | 4-22 | 71 |
| HCV | Feb 2007 | 99 | 99 | 7 | 693 | 28 | 4.0% | 4-28 | 71 |
| Hepatitus Delta virus | 2015? | 28 | 56 | 4 | 112 | 6 | 5.4% | 5 | 74 |
| Chikungunya virus | 2007? | 31 | 36 | 3 | 108 | 2-6 | 1.9-5.6% | 2 | 75 |
| Chikungunya virus | Sep 2014 | 56 | 60 | 5 | 297 | 24 | 8.1% | 18 | 76 |

**Table S2. continued**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Virus** | **Date** | **Labor-atories** | **Panels** | **Negative samples /panel** | **Negative samples** | **False positives** | **False positive ratea** | **Labor-atories with false positives** | **Refer-ence** |
| Chikungunya, Dengue | Feb-May 2015 | 20 | 20 | 2 | 40 | 1 | 2.5% | 1 | 77 |
| Dengue virus | May-Jul 2013 | 16 | 16 | 1 | 16 | 1c | 6.3% | 1 | 78 |
| Zika virus | Oct-Nov 2016 | 50 | 85 | 6 | 504c | 14d | 2.8% | 12 | 79 |
| Rift Valley fever virus | 2012 | 30 | 39 | 3 | 117 | 4 | 3.4% | 3 | 80 |
| Measles virus | Aug 2014 | 41 | 41 | 3 | 123 | 1 | 0.8% | 1 | 81 |
| Ebola virus | Aug 2014 | 82 | 106e | 3 | 317e | 1 | 0.3% | 1 | 82 |
| Ebola virus | Dec 2014 | 19 | 20 | 3 | 60 | 0 | <1.7% | 0 | 83 |
| Ebola virus | Apr 2015 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | <33.3% | 0 | 46 |
| Ebola virus | Nov 2014 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 1 | 46 |
| Ebola virus | Mar 2016 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 0 | <11.1% | 0 | 46 |
| 4 arbovirusesf | Nov 2017 | 51 | 51 | 4 | 204 | 10 | 4.9% | 6 | 84 |

a "<" indicates a false positive rate below the detection limit (calculated as the reciprocal of the number of negative samples); treated as zero in the analyses.

b A majority of the laboratories in this study used a confirmatory second target in accordance with a World Health Organization recommendation; some used sequencing for confirmation.

c This was an equivocal result by a laboratory using real-time RT-PCR, scored as a positive result by the external quality assessment.

d Inconclusive results are not included in these figures.

e Not including two panels that were tested only for filovirus.

f Toscana virus, West Nile virus, Usutu virus and Tick-borne Encephalitis virus.



**Figure S1.** **Distributions of false positive rates in external quality assessments of RT-PCR assays of RNA viruses.** (A) Full data set. (B) Subset comprising EQAs with >100 negative samples.



**Figure S2. False positive rates in external quality assessments of RT-PCR assays of RNA viruses over time.** (A) Full data set; linear regression shown as a dotted line (n=43, r=0.147, p=0.346). (B) Same as A, but for a subset comprising EQAs with >100 negative samples (n=35, r=0.327, p=0.056).

**Modeling the reliability of test results**

Positive predictive value (the proportion of positive results that are true) and negative predictive value (the proportion of negative result that are true) are common statistical measures of the reliability of test results. We derived formulae for calculating these statistics from the test positivity rate, the false negative rate and the false positive rate. We calculated test positivity rates from online SARS-CoV-2 test data for countries and US states, and estimated the false negative rate and false positive rate as described below. We used these data and estimates to model the positive predictive value and negative predictive value across countries and US states, and over time for selected countries and states.

Derivation of formulae

Let: *N* = the number of samples tested

*Prev* = the **Test Prevalence Rate** (the number of infected individuals that are tested divided by the number of individuals that are tested)

*Pos* = the **Test Positivity Rate** (the number of positive test results divided by the number of individuals that are tested);

*FPR* = the **False Positive Rate** (the number of uninfected individuals that test positive divided by the number of uninfected individuals that are tested); = 1–*Specificity* (*Specificity*=the fraction of uninfected individuals that test negative)

*FNR* = the **False Negative Rate** (the number of infected individuals that test negative divided by the number of infected individuals that are tested); = 1–*Sensitivity* (*Sensitivity*=the fraction of infected individuals that test positive)

*PPV* = the **Positive Predictive Value** (the number of true positive test results divided by the number of positive (true positive + false positive) test results)

*NPV* = the **Negative Predictive Value** (the number of true negative test results divided by the number of negative (true negative + false negative ) test results)

with all rate functions limited to values between 0 and 1.

The number of infected individuals among those tested is *Prev∙N*; the number of these that test negative (false negatives) is *FNR∙Prev∙N*, and the number that test positive (true positives) is (1-*FNR*)*∙Prev∙N*.

Also, the number of uninfected individuals is (1-*Prev*)*∙N* and the number of these that test positive (false positives) is *FPR∙*(1-*Prev*)*∙N*, and the number that test negative (true negatives) is (1-*FPR*)*∙*(1-*Prev*)*∙N*.

The total number of individuals that test positive is the sum of the true positives and the false positives = (1-*FNR*)*∙Prev∙N* + *FPR∙*(1-*Prev*)*∙N*. Dividing this sum by *N* gives the **Test Positivity Rate**:

Eq. 1

Rearranging Equation 1 yields the **Test Prevalence Rate**:

Eq. 2

Equation 2 yields negative values for *Prev* when *FPR*>*Pos*, and values >1 when *FNR* > 1-*Pos*. As such values are not allowed for rate functions, *Prev* should be constrained to 0 when *FPR*>*Pos* and to 1 when *FNR* > 1-*Pos*.

The **Positive Predictive Value** (the true positives divided by the total positives) is:

Substituting in *Pos* from equation 1,

Substituting for *Prev* from equation 2 and rearranging yields:

Eq. 3

The **Negative Predictive Value** (the true negatives divided by the total negatives) is:

Substituting in *Pos* from equation 1,

Substituting for *Prev* from equation 2 and rearranging yields:

Eq. 4

Estimating the false negative rate

We searched on-line for studies that estimated or provided data for estimating false negative rates in SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing, excluding studies with less than 20 infected patients. We found 20 relevant studies, yielding estimating of false negative rates that range for 0% to 52% based on a variety of methods (Table S3). We used the midpoint of the range (26%) as a primary input to model the effect on the reliability of test results (Figures S3 and S4), and performed a sensitivity analysis using inputs of 0% and 52% (Figures S5 to S8).

Estimating the false positive rate

We searched on-line for studies that provided data on positive rates in SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing. This included a systematic search on Google Scholar for studies published in any language from Jan 1, 2020 to April 25, 2020 using the terms "SARS-CoV-2", "COVID-19", "coronavirus" or "nCoV" AND "false positive" or "specificity" AND "PCR". In this search we found 34 papers that mentioned false positives or specificity in the context of SARS-CoV-2 testing, including unpublished preprints and one retracted study. Twenty-five of these studies made only brief or incidental mention of false positives or specificity. Five studies used assumed or roughly estimated false positive rates as inputs to models: one published study and two unpublished studies assumed rates of 0%, 0-5% and 0-10%, respectively; one unpublished study used an estimated rate of 0.12% without reporting what data the estimate is based on; and one retracted study used an estimate of 5% with a range of 1-10%, apparently based on information from various regions in China, including some re-testing of positive results. One published and three unpublished studies mentioned false positives encountered while conducting sensitivity analyses or cross-reactivity assessments of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests.

Outside of the systematic search, we found studies at two hospitals that reported false positive rates of 0.3% and 3% in SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests of presurgical patients,105 106 and two studies reporting no false positives in four external quality assessments with 119 South Korean laboratories testing 333 negative samples for SARS-CoV-2 using RT-PCR, for a false positive rate of <0.3%.107 108 Also, the US Food and Drug Administration has issued warnings of false positive rates of up to 3% with certain tests.46 111 As described above, we reviewed 43 external quality assessments of similar RT-PCR assays of RNA viruses and found a pooled average false positive rate of 3.2%, a median rate of 2.3%, and an interquartile range of 0.8-4.0%.

Based on the above data, we used a conservative estimate of 0.3% for the false positive rate in modeling the effect on the reliability of test results.

Modeling

We obtained cumulative test data for countries from Our World in Data (https://github.com/owid/covid-19-data/tree/master/public/data/ accessed 24 May 2020), and for US states from The COVID Tracking Project (https://covidtracking.com/about-data accessed 24 May 2020). For the 50 countries with the greatest reported number of tests and for the 50 US states we calculated the test positivity rate based on cumulative data through 24 May 2020.

We obtained daily test data for selected countries and states as follows:

• **Italy**: Italian Ministry of Health (http://www.salute.gov.it/portale/nuovocoronavirus/archivioNotizieNuovoCoronavirus.jsp?lingua=italiano&menu=notizie&p=dalministero&area=nuovocoronavirus&notizie.page=0 accessed 24 May 2020);

• **South Korea**: South Korean Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (https://www.cdc.go.kr/board/board.es?mid=&bid=0030 accessed 24 May 2020);

• **New York** and **Hawai'i**: The COVID Tracking Project (https://covidtracking.com/about-data accessed 24 May 2020).

From the daily test data we calculated the test positivity rate on a 7-day-moving-average basis.

For the cumulative and daily test data we calculated the positive predictive value and negative predictive value from the test positivity rates, false negative rate and false positive rate; and graphed the results (Figures S3 and S4). As noted in the derivation of the formulae, all rate functions were limited to values between 0 and 1. This truncates the reliability statistics (positive and negative predictive values) at zero if test positivity drops below the false positive rate input, effectively reducing the false positive rate to the test positivity rate.

We checked the sensitivity of the results to the estimated false negative rate by calculating and graphing the results for the lowest (0%) and highest (52%) published values that we found in a review of the literature (Figures S5 to S8).

Table S3. Estimates of false negative rates

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Basis for estimate of false negative ratea** | **Estimated ratea** | **Refer-ence** |
| RT-PCR detected 24 of 24 infected patients (apparently based on clinical observations). | 0% | 85 |
| Of 601 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 15 initially tested negative (2.5%); of 748 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR or were considered highly likely cases based on clinical symptoms and positive chest CT scans with dynamic changes on serial scans, 162 initially tested negative (21.7%). | 2.5-21.7% | 86 |
| Of 167 infected patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 5 with positive chest CT had tested negative 2-8 days earlier. | 3.0% | 87 |
| Throat swabs from 128 patients were tested by RT-PCR every 2 days until all were positive on the 6th test. 36 (28.1%) were negative on the first swab, and the average over the first five tests was 11 (8.6%) negative. | 8.6%-28.1% | 88 |
| Of 64 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 6 initially tested negative. | 9.4% | 89 |
| The pooled false negative rate in a meta-analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests was 11%. | 11% | 90 |
| Of 71 pharyngeal swabs that tested positive by digital RT-PCR, 8 (11.3%) tested negative by RT-PCR; of 104 samples (including stool, serum and 1 sputum sample) that tested positive by digital RT-PCR, 19 (18.3%) tested negative by RT-PCR. | 11.3-18.3% | 91 |
| Of 102 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 12 initially tested negative. | 11.8% | 92 |
| Of 36 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 6 initially tested negative. | 16.7% | 93 |
| Of 34 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 7 initially tested negative. | 20.6% | 94 |
| Of 35-37 paired samples that included a saliva sample, a nasopharyngeal swab or both that tested positive by RT-PCR, 8 nasopharyngeal swabs tested negative. | 21.6-22.9% | 95 |
| Of 87 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 19 initially tested negative. | 21.8% | 96 |
| Of 219 nasal swab samples taken 0-7 days after the onset of symptoms from 213 patients confirmed by the Guangdong CDC as infected, 51 tested negative by RT-PCR. | 23.3% | 97 |
| Of 51 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 15 tested negative 0-6 days after symptom onset. | 29.4% | 98 |
| Reported that the 5th edition of China's COVID-19 prevention and control guidelines states that the real-time RT-PCR test for SARS-CoV-2 has a false negative rate of at least 30%. | ≥30% | 99 |
| Estimated a 38% false negative rate in RT-PCR tests on the day of symptom onset. | 38% | 100 |
| Of 28 patients diagnosed as infected by the criteria of China's National Heath Commission, 11 tested negative by RT-PCR. | 39.3% | 101 |
| Of 80 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 39 initially tested negative. | 48.8% | 102 |
| Of 43 paired samples that included a sputum sample, a throat swab or both that tested positive by RT-PCR, 21 throat swabs tested negative. | 48.8% | 103 |
| Of 1,324 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 691 initially tested negative. | 52.2% | 104 |

a From an online search for studies reporting false negative rates in SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing, excluding studies with less than 20 infected patients.

Results



**Figure S3. Reliability of SARS-CoV-2 test results in different countries.** Positive predictive value (the probability that a positive result is true) and negative predictive value (the probability that a negative result is true) calculated with a false negative rate of 26% (midpoint of published estimates of 0-52%)4 and a false positive rate of 0.3%. (A) Results for 50countries based on cumulative test data through 24 May 2020. Countries arranged left to right in order of decreasing test positivity. (B, C) Reliability trajectories based on the previous-7-day moving average, showing a country with (Italy) and without (South Korea) a major outbreak.



**Figure S4. Reliability of SARS-CoV-2 test results in the US states.** Positive predictive value (the probability that a positive result is true) and negative predictive value (the probability that a negative result is true) calculated with a false negative rate of 26% (midpoint of published estimates of 0-52%)4 and a false positive rate of 0.3%. (A) Results for the 50 U.S. states based on cumulative test data through 24 May 2020. States arranged left to right in order of decreasing test positivity. (B-C) Reliability trajectories based on the previous-7-day moving average, showing a state with (New York) and without (Hawai'i) a major outbreak. The relatively high test positivity in the Hawai'i data through 23 Mar is probably due to uneven reporting of test results in the early days of testing (positive result reported first, negative results later).

Sensitivity Analysis



**Figure S5. Reliability of SARS-CoV-2 test results in different countries, analyzed with a false negative rate of 0%.** Sensitivity analysis for Figure S3. Positive predictive value (the probability that a positive result is true) and negative predictive value (the probability that a negative result is true) calculated with a false positive rate of 0.8%. (A) Results for 50 countries based on cumulative test data through 24 May 2020. Countries arranged left to right in order of decreasing test positivity. (B, C) Reliability trajectories based on the previous-7-day moving average, showing a country with (Italy) and without (South Korea) a major outbreak.



**Figure S6. Reliability of SARS-CoV-2 test results in different countries, analyzed with a false negative rate of 52%.** Sensitivity analysis for Figure S3. Positive predictive value (the probability that a positive result is true) and negative predictive value (the probability that a negative result is true) calculated with a false positive rate of 0.8%. (A) Results for 50 countries based on cumulative test data through 24 May 2020. Countries arranged left to right in order of decreasing test positivity. (B, C) Reliability trajectories based on the previous-7-day moving average, showing a country with (Italy) and without (South Korea) a major outbreak.



**Figure S7. Reliability of SARS-CoV-2 test results in the United States, analyzed with a false negative rate of 0%**. Sensitivity analysis for Figure S4. Positive predictive value (the probability that a positive result is true) and negative predictive value (the probability that a negative result is true) calculated with a false positive rate of 0.3%. (A) Results for the 50 U.S. states based on cumulative test data through 24 May 2020. States arranged left to right in order of decreasing test positivity. (B-C) Reliability trajectories based on the previous-7-day moving average, showing a state with (New York) and without (Hawai'i) a major outbreak. The relatively high test positivity in the Hawai'i data through 23 Mar is probably due to uneven reporting of test results in the early days of testing (positive result reported first, negative results later).



**Figure S8. Reliability of SARS-CoV-2 test results in the United States, analyzed with a false negative rate of 52%.** Sensitivity analysis for Figure S4. Positive predictive value (the probability that a positive result is true) and negative predictive value (the probability that a negative result is true) calculated with a false positive rate of 0.8%. (A) Results for the 50 U.S. states based on cumulative test data through 24 May 2020. States arranged left to right in order of decreasing test positivity. (B-C) Reliability trajectories based on the previous-7-day moving average, showing a state with (New York) and without (Hawai'i) a major outbreak. The relatively high test positivity in the Hawai'i data through 23 Mar is probably due to uneven reporting of test results in the early days of testing (positive result reported first, negative results later).

**Limitations**

We determined that a false positive rate of 0.3%, which we used in modeling the reliability of results in SARS-CoV-2 testing, is a conservative estimate partly on the basis of our review of false positive rates in external quality assessments (EQAs) of similar RT-PCR tests of RNA viruses, in which the median false positive rate was 2.3% and the interquartile range was 0.8-4.0%. There are several factors, however, that could affect the applicability of false positive rate data from the EQA review to estimating false positive rates in the real-world implementation of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests. These include two factors that would tend to make the rates derived from EQAs high relative to real-world SARS-CoV-2 rates and three that would tend to make them low, as discussed below. Another issue—variations in how country and state test data are compiled—can affect the accuracy of the modeled reliability of test results.

Possible trend in false positive rates

Although there is no correlation between the false positive rate in an EQA and the year the EQA was conducted for the full data set, there is a weak correlation for the data subset consisting of the 35 EQAs with more than 100 negative samples, indicating a possible downward trend. The median false positive rate for the data subset is 2.5% but the intersection of the trend line with the year 2020 is 1.5%, which might be a better estimate for the expected false positive rate for tests implemented in 2020, if the trend is real.

Percent positive samples

EQAs of medical diagnostic tests tend to focus more on assessing test sensitivity rather than specificity, and thus typically have more positive than negative samples. The panels in the 43 EQAs that we reviewed each consisted of 25% to 93% positive samples, with a median of 75% and an interquartile range of 54%-90%. This is probably higher than the typical percentage of positive samples among the clinical specimens processed by these laboratories, and higher than the percentage in most laboratories at most times during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic: corresponding statistics on the cumulative test positivity in the data that we used for modeling are, for countries, a median of 4.3% and an interquartile range of 2.1% to 9.0%, and for US states, a median of 7.6% and an interquartile range of 5.3% to 13.5%.

Thus, in the EQAs that we reviewed the number of positive samples on the same reaction plate as the negative samples from the EQA panel, and in wells on the plate near the negative samples from the panel, would have been higher than the typical number of positive samples analyzed with or near negative samples in the real-world use of SARS-CoV-2 tests. This would create a greater opportunity for cross-contamination in the laboratory—contamination of a negative sample by a positive sample being processed at the same time—and thus tend to raise the false positive rate in the EQAs compared to the real-world use of SARS-CoV-2 tests.

How much difference this would make in the overall false positive rate is unclear. There are other potential sources of contamination within the laboratory—contaminated reagents, carry-over contamination from positive samples processed earlier, contamination from positive controls, and infected workers—that are not affected by the percentage of positive samples in an EQA panel; and as discussed in the next section there are also factors outside of the laboratory that can cause false positives. The overall false positive rate is the sum of all of the contributing causes, and the distortion caused by the generally high percentage of positive samples in EQA panels affects only one of these.

Factors outside of the laboratory

EQAs can detect false positives generated by problems within the participating laboratories, but in the real-world implementation of diagnostic assays false positives can also result from problems outside of the laboratory, including contamination that occurs during the collection of the patient specimen,110-113 sample mix-ups that occur during specimen collection,111 and miscommunication of results from the laboratory to the physician, the patient or the health agency compiling test statistics.36 52 53 Such factors would tend to increase the false positive rate in the real-world use of a test compared to the false positive rate determined in an EQA.

Rapid implementation and over-extended resources

The emergency implementation of SARS-CoV-2 testing in response to the pandemic included a rapid expansion of sampling capacity. This utilized some novel specimen collection procedures (such as drive-through testing) and relied to a substantial extent on newly-trained sampling staff; resulted in scarcities of personal protective equipment; utilized novel diagnostic assays and controls; relied on a rapid expansion in production of the necessary reagents; and regularly resulted in laboratories being pressed to operate beyond their normal capacities, including the expansion of facilities, the rapid hiring and training of new laboratory staff, and analyses being conducted in work shifts that covered 24 hours a day and seven days a week, sometimes operating under the pressure of large backlogs of unanalyzed tests and delays in providing results. These circumstances suggest a greater potential for error, including the production of false positives, than during the normal operating circumstances tested by EQAs.110-112

Awareness of the assessment

Although laboratories participating in EQAs are usually instructed to conduct the testing of EQA panels in the same manner as routine samples, it appears that laboratories and staff may generally be aware of which samples are from EQA panels. If so, there are some inherent incentives to do the best job possible on those particular samples. For example, staff may know or believe that their superiors will see the results of the EQA, including how well the laboratory performed compared to other laboratories, which creates an obvious incentive to perform as well as possible. In EQAs where the results affect certifications that are required to conduct the test commercially, the laboratory may have a large financial incentive to do better than usual work. The differences between the usual quality of work and somewhat better quality work may be subtle, and may not even be consciously chosen. For example, laboratory staff being a little more rigorous than usual in following protocols, using the equipment or machines that are in the best condition, or assigning the analysis to the most experienced workers, could improve performance and reduce the false positive rate below normal rates.

Sample-based and individual-based data

The EQA review yielded estimates of the false positive rate on a sample basis. In our modeling, we applied a false positive rate estimate derived from the EQA data to available state and national test data. These test data are usually reported on an individual basis, with an individual classified as positive if testing positive in a single RT-PCR test.3-9

If some individuals are tested more than once, then the false positive rate on a sample basis (that is, the number of samples from uninfected individuals that test positive divided by the number of samples from uninfected individuals that are tested) can differ from the false positive rate on an individual basis (the number of uninfected individuals that test positive at least once divided by the number of uninfected individuals that are tested). We show here that the false positive rate on a sample basis will usually be less than or equal to the false positive rate on an individual basis, so that our application of a sample-based false positive rate estimate to individual-based data will tend to understate the impact of false positives.

We define an infected individual as an individual who is shedding virus at the time of at least one test, and an uninfected individual as an individual who is not shedding virus at the time of any of the tests.

Let: *NUninf* = the number of uninfected individuals tested

*FP* = the number of uninfected individuals who test positive at least once, i.e. the number of false positive individuals

*FP1* = the number of uninfected individuals who test positive on their first test

*FPRS* = the false positive rate on a sample basis

*FPRI* = the false positive rate on an individual basis.

Consider the set of samples from the first tests of the tested individuals. There are *NUninf* samples taken from uninfected individuals in this set, and the expected number of false positive samples is:

Now if some individuals are tested more than once, these re-tests will be distributed in some fashion over the individuals tested: some may be tested twice, some three times, etc. First consider the case where any false positives that occur in a re-test happen either to an infected individual (that is, an individual who was shedding virus during at least one test but not at the time of the false positive test) or to an uninfected individual who tested positive on the first test. Then all false positives that occur in a re-test are "wasted" in the sense that they don't produce any additional false positive individuals, so:

So the false positive rate on an individual basis is:

Now consider the other case, where one or more of the false positives that occur in a re-test happen to an uninfected individual who did not test positive on the first test. Then these false positives produce additional false positive individuals, so:

And combining with Equation 1:

So *FPRI* is always either about equal to or greater than *FPRS*, and applying an estimate of *FPRS* to data aggregated on an individual basis will tend to underestimate the effect of a given false positive rate.

At least one U.S. state (New York) reports its test data as data on "individuals" defined as follows: if multiple samples are taken from an individual on a single day and tested this counts as one individual tested, but if the individual is sampled and tested on multiple days these are counted as multiple individuals tested. By a proof similar to the one given above, the false positive rate on an "individual" basis as defined by New York will be either about equal to or greater than the false positive rate on a sample basis.

Italy initially reported "mixed" test data, that is, the number of tests were reported on a sample basis (*tamponi*) while the results were reported on an individual basis (*casi totali*). Beginning on April 23 Italy also reported the number of tests on an individual basis (*casi testati*). For modeling, we estimated the number of tests on an individual basis for dates prior to April 23 by multiplying the reported number of *tamponi* by the ratio between cumulative number of *casi testati* and *tamponi* on April 23.

It is not always clear how test data are reported by a state or country, and in some cases the reporting method may confound the application of a sample-based false positive rate estimate to the test data, particularly if the rate is applied to mixed test data. However, if the number of re-tests is small relative to total tests the error should be small. Where country or state data are available on both the number of samples tested and the number of individuals tested, we've found the ratio of samples to individuals tested to be between 1 and 1.5.

**Claims that positive results are more reliable than negative results**

Many public health authorities have stated or implied that positive results from SARS-CoV-2 tests are more trustworthy than negative results:

US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: "Positive results are indicative of active infection with 2019-nCoV...Negative results do not preclude 2019-nCoV infection."17 "A positive test result for COVID-19 indicates that...the patient is presumptively infected with the virus...a negative result does not rule out COVID-19...When diagnostic testing is negative, the possibility of a false negative result should be considered."114 "If you have a positive test result, it is very likely that you have COVID-19...There is a very small chance that this test can give a positive result that is wrong (a false positive result)...it is possible for this test to give a negative result that is incorrect (false negative)...This means that you could possibly still have COVID-19 even though the test is negative."115

Pan American Health Organization: "[A] positive result confirms the detection of the virus. On the contrary, a negative result might not always mean the absence of COVID-19 virus infection."116

Dr. Anthony Fauci, Director of the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Disease, in an interview with the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA): “If it’s positive … you absolutely can make a [clinical] decision. If it’s negative, you may be early on in the infection and the viral load may be so low you don’t get it.”117

Dr. Harlan Krumholz, Yale Professor of Medicine and Director of the Yale New Haven Hospital Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation, writing in an Op-Ed in the *New York Times*: "The tests appear to be highly specific: If your test comes back positive, it is almost certain you have the infection...[but] false-negative test results...seem to be uncomfortably common."1

Dr. Priya Sampathkumar, an infectious diseases specialist at Mayo Clinic: “It’s unlikely there are false positives. But when it’s negative, you can’t be sure a person doesn’t have coronavirus.”2

Dr. Gary Procop, Chair of the American Society for Clinical Pathology’s Commission on Science, Technology and Policy, and Vice-chair and Director of Virology at Cleveland Clinic: "Procop says [that] a patient could get a false positive or a false negative result. However, he says, false positives are extremely unlikely."3

Dr. Benjamin Chan, the New Hampshire State Epidemiologist: "[F]alse positive test results...are so rare that they approach a 0% rate, said state epidemiologist Dr. Benjamin Chan...Negative test results, on the other hand, can be false about 3% of the time..., Chan said."11

Georgia Department of Public Health: "A positive diagnostic test means that the virus is present. So, positive = positive. Unfortunately, false negative results sometimes happen."118

San Francisco Department of Public Health: "PCR tests for COVID-19 have very few false positives...There may be false negatives depending on timing of the test related to when symptoms began, the type of specimen, and the technique of collection...the specificity of most of the PCR tests is 100%...The sensitivity of the PCR tests appears to be between 56% and 83%."10

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: "The PCR test for COVID-19...almost never gives a false positive. If you are tested for COVID-19, and the test comes back positive, you can be very sure that you are infected with this virus...Unfortunately [the test isn't] equally sensitive...There are many stories about patients who tested negative soon after their symptoms began, only to test positive on a test done later."6

Dwayne Breining, Executive Director of Northwell Labs: "False positives are highly unlikely, [Breining] said, though false negatives may result from poor-quality swabs or if the instrument is blocked by mucus."119

From the 3rd Edition of the *COVID-19 Reference* manual: "False positive results are rare. The main problem of any qualitative PCR is above all the false negative results."5 (Note: This was amended in the 4th Edition, in response to our preprint posted on *medRxiv*.)

Drs. Watson, Whiting and Brush, in *Interpreting a COVID-19 Test Result*, an article in a major medical journal providing guidance for health professionals: "A positive RT-PCR test for COVID-19...has more weight than a negative test because of the test’s high specificity but moderate sensitivity... While positive tests for COVID-19 are clinically useful, negative tests need to be interpreted with caution...If your swab test comes back positive for COVID-19 then we can be very confident that you do have COVID-19...However, people with COVID-19 can be missed by these swab tests."4

Drs. Carpenter, Mudd, West and Wilber in a journal article on diagnosing COVID-19: "[F]alse negatives are frequent...false positives appear rare...False-negative tests commonly occur with rRT-PCR...False-positive tests associated with rRT-PCR for SARS- CoV-2 are believed to be rare."120
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