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Methods

Estimating a conservative false positive rate (FPR)

We searched for external quality assessments (EQAs) of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assays that provided data that could be used to calculate FPRs. The South Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention conducted three EQAs since February 2020 involving 96 Korean laboratories that analyzed 96 negative samples yielding either 0 or 1 positive results (the published information is ambiguous),1 indicating a false positive rate around or under 1%. An EQA of German laboratories conducted in April 2020 reported results by the individual gene regions targeted rather than by samples tested, with a false positive rate of 3.8%.2 Many of the false positives were reportedly "due to incorrect assignment of results ("mix-ups")" between two samples; it's unclear whether these were due to a design flaw in the EQA and thus not referable to the rate of false positives in normal practice. If these incorrect positive results are treated instead as correct negative results, the FPR by gene region is 0.8%. Unfortunately, the information provided does not allow conversion of either of these gene region rates to a rate by samples tested. China's National Center for Clinical Laboratories apparently conducted an EQA, but we could find no record of the results. SARS-CoV-2 EQAs have also been announced in the U.S. (College of American Pathologists, and the American Proficiency Institute), U.K. (QCMD/EMQN, and LGC) and Canada (OneWorld Accuracy/Microbix Biosystems).

Lacking clear data on FPRs in SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assays, we estimated these through a review of EQAs of similar assays. We searched online for reports on EQAs of diagnostic laboratories conducting RT-PCR assays for other RNA viruses. We excluded EQAs prior to 2004, since many of the assays relied on older RT-PCR methods that may be less accurate. Where the included EQAs reported the type of assay used, 0.2% of the panels were analyzed with nucleic acid amplification methods other than PCR (loop-mediated isothermal amplification and reverse polymerase amplification). Where the type of PCR was specified, 17% were conventional assays and 83% were real-time.

In some EQAs, the test panel included 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, often related 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 or calculated the total number of negative samples assayed, the total number of positive results returned on negative samples, and the resulting FPR for the EQA. Where we could only determine a range, we conservatively took the FPR as the lower bound of the range. In EQAs where no negative samples were reported as positive, we reported the FPR in Tables 1 and S5 as below a detection limit equal to the reciprocal of the total number of negative samples, but for statistical analysis treated the FPR as zero.

We considered two data sets comprising all included EQAs (full data set), and the included EQAs that analyzed at least 100 negative samples (subset). There was no correlation between FPR 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 FPR over time (Figure S1). We calculated the median value and interquartile range for these FPR data and also for a subset restricted to EQAs with >100 negative samples. We used the lower of the 25th percentile values from these two data sets as a conservative estimate of the FPR in SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing programs in order to model the effect of FPR on the reliability of test results.

Estimating the false negative rate (FNR)

We searched on-line for studies that estimated FNRs in SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing. We used the midpoint of the rounded-off range of reported FNR estimates to model the effect of FPR on test results, and performed a sensitivity analysis across the rounded-off range.

Modeling

We obtained online test data for countries and US states and calculated the test positivity rate on a cumulative and 7-day-moving-average basis. Using these data and the formulae derived below, we constructed a spreadsheet model to calculate the negative predictive values and the positive predictive values. We graphed the results for the countries and states based on cumulative data and for selected, representative countries and states based on 7-day-moving-average data.

Derivation of formulae

To model the impact of the FPR on the reliability of test results, we derived formulae for calculating the relevant test statistics from the test positivity rate, FNR and FPR.

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

Sample-based and individual-based data

The meta-analysis of EQAs yields FPR estimates on a sample basis. In our modeling, we apply an FPR 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 FPR 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 FPR 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 FPR on a sample basis will tend to be less than or equal to the FPR on an individual basis, so that our application of a sample-based FPR 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:

Eq. 1

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. These false positives are thus "wasted" in the sense that they don't produce any additional false positive individuals, so:

So the FPR 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 from Equation1:

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 FPR.

At least one U.S. state (New York) reports its test data as data on individuals but defines an "individual" 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 FPR on an "individual" basis will then be either about equal to or greater than the FPR 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 FPR estimate to the test data. However, if the number of re-tests is small relative to total tests the error should be small.

Previous Reporting

We searched 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". 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. One published study, three unpublished studies and one retracted study assumed or roughly estimated false positive rates between 0% and 10% as inputs to models, including two pooled-sampling optimization models and three models exploring the effects of false positives on certain epidemiological statistics. One published and three unpublished studies (listed in Tables S3 and S4) mentioned false positives encountered while conducting sensitivity analyses or cross-reactivity assessments of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assays.

There have been several studies (Table S2) and considerable media coverage of false negative results in SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests and of false positive results in SARS-CoV-2 antibody tests, but we found only limited discussion by the major media outlets of false positive results in SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests. Most of this was in regard to four issues:

• Reports of initial false positives in the US CDC's RT-PCR test. caused by a contaminated reagent produced in a US CDC laboratory.10 11

• Statements by U.S. health officials that a study found that WHO's or China's SARS-CoV-2 test had a false positive rate of 47%12 13 (though the study did not find that14).

• A dispute involving the Malaysian and Cambodian governments and the US CDC over whether a cruise ship passenger's test result was a true positive or false positive.15

• Positive test results obtained after some individuals had recovered from COVID-19 and tested negative, apparently due to the tests' detection of inactive pieces of SARS-CoV-2 RNA that were remnant in the individuals' systems, were reported as false positives.16

We also found records of 67 incidents involving 528 apparent or possible false positives that occurred during regular SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing. This appears to be only a fraction of the records that exist online, which in turn must be a small fraction of what has occurred. These records are mainly from articles in small town newspapers and on local TV and radio news, and in notes in COVID-19 updates from local or regional health authorities when they corrected previous statements about numbers of cases (downward corrections are relatively common, explanations relatively rare). Many of the reported false positives derive from mass-testing in nursing homes or businesses, and most though not all involve asymptomatic individuals. These articles report numerous impacts such as individuals, including front-line health care workers, unnecessarily put into isolation; time and resources unnecessarily expended on contact tracing; uninfected individuals, including elderly individuals and individuals with compromising health conditions, transferred into coronavirus wards where they were exposed to elevated risks of infection; people stressed and angered; a lawsuit filed; workers striking; businesses closed; testing contracts terminated; and trust in public health officials eroded.



**Fig S1**  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).



**Fig S2** 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.



**Fig S3 Reliability of SARS-CoV-2 test results in different countries: sensitivity tests with a false negative rate of 0%.** As in Figure 1 but with a false negative rate of 0%. 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 82 countries based on cumulative test data through the most recent available date (between May 5 and May 24, 2020). Countries arranged left to right in order of decreasing test positivity. (B-D) Reliability trajectories based on the previous-7-day moving average, showing countries where the reliability of positive test results has declined significantly (United Kingdom), sharply (Italy), and precipitously (South Korea). Cumulative test data are from Our World in Data (https://github.com/owid/covid-19-data/tree/master/public/data/ accessed May 24, 2020). Daily test data are from Our World in Data, the 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 May 24, 2020) and the South Korean Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (https://www.cdc.go.kr/board/board.es?mid=&bid=0030 accessed May 24, 2020).



**Fig S4 Reliability of SARS-CoV-2 test results in different countries: sensitivity tests with a false negative rate of 50%.** As in Figure 1 but with a false negative rate of 50%. 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 82 countries based on cumulative test data through the most recent available date (between May 5 and May 24, 2020). Countries arranged left to right in order of decreasing test positivity. (B-D) Reliability trajectories based on the previous-7-day moving average, showing countries where the reliability of positive test results has declined significantly (United Kingdom), sharply (Italy), and precipitously (South Korea). Cumulative test data are from Our World in Data (https://github.com/owid/covid-19-data/tree/master/public/data/ accessed May 24, 2020). Daily test data are from Our World in Data, the 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 May 24, 2020) and the South Korean Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (https://www.cdc.go.kr/board/board.es?mid=&bid=0030 accessed May 24, 2020).



**Fig S5** Reliability of SARS-CoV-2 test results in the United States: sensitivity tests with a false negative rate of 0%. As in Figure 2 but with a false negative rate of 0%. 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 May 24, 2020. States arranged left to right in order of decreasing test positivity. (B-D) Reliability trajectories based on the previous-7-day moving average, showing states where the reliability of positive test results has declined significantly (New York), sharply (Oregon), and precipitously (Hawai'i). Test data are from The COVID Tracking Project (https://covidtracking.com/about-data accessed May 24, 2020).



**Fig S6** Reliability of SARS-CoV-2 test results in the United States: sensitivity tests with a false negative rate of 50%. As in Figure 2 but with a false negative rate of 50%. 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 May 24, 2020. States arranged left to right in order of decreasing test positivity. (B-D) Reliability trajectories based on the previous-7-day moving average, showing states where the reliability of positive test results has declined significantly (New York), sharply (Oregon), and precipitously (Hawai'i). Test data are from The COVID Tracking Project (https://covidtracking.com/about-data accessed May 24, 2020).

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 April 30, 2020, and all four of the assays that 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% | 17 |
| Abbott Molecular, Inc. | Abbott RealTime SARS-CoV-2 assay | EUA/Commercial 3/18/20, EUL 4/9/20 | 150 | 0 | 100% | 18 |
| Altona Diagnostics GmbH | RealStar SARS-CoV02 RT-PCR Kits U.S. | EUA/Commercial 4/22/20 | 63 | 0 | 100% | 19 |
| Altru Diagnostics, Inc. | Altru Dx SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay | EUA/Single Lab 4/30/20 | 66 | 0 | 100% | 20 |
| Biocerna | SARS-CoV-2 Test | EUA/Single Lab 4/28/20 | 30 | 0 | 100% | 21 |
| Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | CDC 2019-nCoV Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel | EUA/Commercial 2/4/20 | 181 | 0 | 100% | 22 |
| Charité–Universitätsmedizin Berlin/German Center for Infection Research | "WHO Test"c | - | 430 | 0 | 100% | 23 |
| Diagnostic Molecular Laboratory, Northwestern Medicine | SARS-Cov-2 Assay | EUA/Single Lab 4/2/20 | 58 | 0 | 100% | 24 |
| Hologic, Inc. | Panther Fusion SARS-CoV-2 Assay | EUA/Commercial 3/16/20 | 243 | 0 | 100% | 25 |
| Infectious Disease Diagnostics Laboratory, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia | SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test | EUA/Single Lab 4/2/20 | 30 | 0 | 100% | 26 |
| LabGenomics Co., Ltd. | LabGun COVID-19 RT-PCR Kit | EUA/Commercial 4/29/20 | 229 | 0 | 100% | 27 |
| Nationwide Children’s Hospital | SARS-CoV-2 Assay | EUA/Single Lab 4/27/20 | 60 | 0 | 100% | 28 |

**Table S1. continued**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Laboratory or manufacturer** | **Test** | **Authorizationa** | **Negative samples** | **Positive results** | **Speci-ficityb** | **Refer-ence** |
| PerkinElmer, Inc. | New Coronavirus Nucleic Acid Detection Kit | EUA/Commercial 3/24/20, EUL 4/24/20 | 319 | 0 | 100% | 29 |
| Primerdesign Ltd. | COVID-19 genesig Real-Time PCR assay | EUA/Commercial 3/20/20, EUL 4/7/20 | 158 | 0 | 100% | 30 |
| Rheonix, Inc. | Rheonix COVID-19 MDx Assay | EUA/Commercial 4/29/20 | 60 | 0 | 100% | 31 |
| Roche Molecular Systems, Inc. | cobas SARS-CoV-2 | EUA/Commercial 3/12/20, EUL 4/3/20 | 283 | 0 | 100% | 32 |
| SD Biosensor, Inc. | Standard M nCoV Real-Time Detection Kit | EUA/Commercial 4/23/20 | 126 | 0 | 100% | 33 |
| SeaSun BioMaterials | U-TOP COVID-19 Detection Kit | EUA/Commercial 4/27/20 | 181 | 0 | 100% | 34 |
| Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc. | TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit | EUA/Commercial 3/13/20 | 96 | 0 | 100% | 35 |
| 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% | 36 |
| Yale New Haven Hospital, Clinical Virology Laboratory | SARS-CoV-2 PCR test | EUA/Single Lab 3/31/20 | 16 | 0 | 100% | 37 |

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.

Table S2. 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% | 38 |
| 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% | 39 |
| Of 167 infected patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 5 with positive chest CT had tested negative 2-8 days earlier. | 3.0% | 40 |
| 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% | 41 |
| Of 64 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 6 initially tested negative. | 9.4% | 42 |
| The pooled false negative rate in a meta-analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests was 11%. | 11% | 43 |
| 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% | 44 |
| Of 102 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 12 initially tested negative. | 11.8% | 45 |
| Of 36 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 6 initially tested negative. | 16.7% | 46 |
| Of 34 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 7 initially tested negative. | 20.6% | 47 |
| 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% | 48 |
| Of 87 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 19 initially tested negative. | 21.8% | 49 |
| 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% | 50 |
| Of 51 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 15 tested negative 0-6 days after symptom onset. | 29.4% | 51 |
| 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% | 52 |
| Estimated a 38% false negative rate in RT-PCR tests on the day of symptom onset. | 38% | 53 |
| Of 28 patients diagnosed as infected by the criteria of China's National Heath Commission, 11 tested negative by RT-PCR. | 39.3% | 54 |
| Of 80 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 39 initially tested negative. | 48.8% | 55 |
| 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% | 56 |
| Of 1,324 patients that tested positive by RT-PCR, 691 initially tested negative. | 52.2% | 57 |

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.

Table S3. False positives reported in four sensitivity or cross-reactivity assessments of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assays: results by target gene

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Test** | **Target genes** | **Negative samples** | **Positive results** | **Reference** |
| Charité | E and RdRp | 1198 | 4 | 23 |
| Charité | E | 24 | 0 | 58, 59 |
| Charité | RdRp | 24 | 0 | 58, 59 |
| HKU | N | 24 | 0 | 58, 59 |
| HKU | nsp14 | 24 | 0 | 58, 59 |
| China CDC | N | 24 | 15 | 58, 59 |
| China CDC | nsp10 | 24 | 6 | 58, 59 |
| US CDC | N1 | 24 | 0 | 58, 59 |
| US CDC | N2 | 24 | 6 | 58, 59 |
| US CDC | N3 | 24 | 18 | 58, 59 |
| Charité | E | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| Charité | RdRp S | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| Charité | RdRp NS | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| Charité | N | 7 | 7 | 60 |
| HKU | N | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| HKU | ORF | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| China CDC | N | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| China CDC | ORF | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| US CDC | N1 | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| US CDC | N2 | 7 | 7 | 60 |
| US CDC | N3 | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| Institut Pasteur | Ip2 Multiplex | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| Institut Pasteur | Ip2 Multiplex | 7 | 0 | 60 |
| Charité | E | 60 | 0 | 61 |
| Charité | RdRp | 60 | 0 | 61 |
| Charité | N | 60 | 60 | 61 |
| US CDC | N1 | 60 | 0 | 61 |
| US CDC | N2 | 60 | 60 | 61 |
| US CDC | N3 | 60 | 13 | 61 |

Table S4. False positives rates in four sensitivity or cross-reactivity assessments of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assays: sum of results by target gene

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tests** | **Negative samples** | **Positive results** | **False positive rate** | **Reference** |
| Charité | 1198 | 4 | 0.3% | 43 |
| Charité, HKU, China CDC, US CDC | 216 | 45 | 20.8% | 58, 59 |
| Charité, HKU, China CDC, US CDC, Institut Pasteur | 91 | 14 | 15.4% | 60 |
| Charité, US CDC | 360 | 133 | 36.9% | 61 |

Table S5. External quality assessments of RNA virus assays

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | 2.3-6.8% | 4 | 62 |
| MERS | spring 2014 | 99 | 189 | 6 | 1,134 | 11b | 1.0% | 8 | 63 |
| MERS | 2015? | 56 | 56 | 3 | 168 | 0 | <0.6% | 0 | 64 |
| MERS | 2017? | 49 | 49 | 1 | 49 | 0 | <2.0% | 0 | 65 |
| Influenza A viruses | Feb-Mar 2007 | 64 | 64 | 2 | 128 | 9 | 7.0% | 5-9 | 66 |
| Influenza A viruses | Aug-Oct 2007 | 83 | 83 | 4 | 332 | 9 | 2.7% | 3-9 | 66 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jan-Feb 2008 | 95 | 95 | 2 | 190 | 3 | 1.6% | 2-3 | 66 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jun-Jul 2008 | 109 | 109 | 2 | 218 | 7 | 3.2% | 4-7 | 66 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jan-Feb 2009 | 114 | 114 | 1 | 114 | 1 | 0.9% | 1 | 67 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jan-Mar 2010 | 138 | 138 | 1 | 138 | 1 | 0.7% | 1 | 68 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jun-Aug 2010 | 158 | 158 | 1 | 158 | 2 | 1.3% | 2 | 68 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jan-Mar 2011 | 158 | 316 | 2 | 316 | 11 | 3.5% | 3-11 | 69 |
| Influenza A viruses | Jun-Jul 2011 | 159 | 159 | 1 | 159 | 3 | 1.9% | 3 | 69 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2012 | 163 | 163 | 1 | 163 | 7 | 4.3% | 7 | 70 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2013 | 158 | 158 | 1 | 158 | 4 | 2.5% | 4 | 71 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2014 | 156 | 156 | 1 | 156 | 6 | 3.8% | 6 | 72 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2015 | 153 | 153 | 1 | 153 | 3 | 2.0% | 3 | 73 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2016 | 151 | 151 | 1 | 151 | 1 | 0.7% | 1 | 74 |
| Influenza A viruses | Apr-Jun 2017 | 160 | 160 | 1 | 160 | 3 | 1.9% | 3 | 75 |
| Influenza A viruses | May-Jun 2018 | 174 | 174 | 1 | 174 | 0 | <0.6% | 0 | 76 |
| Influenza A viruses | May-Jul 2019 | 172 | 172 | 1 | 172 | 2 | 1.2% | 2 | 77 |
| HCV | Jan 2005 | 78 | 78 | 9 | 702 | 49 | 7.0% | 6-49 | 78 |
| HCV | Feb 2005 | 84 | 84 | 7 | 588 | 29 | 4.9% | 5-29 | 78 |
| HCV | 2005? | 5 | 119 | 1 | 119 | 4 | 3.4% | 3 | 79 |
| HCV | Jan 2006 | 96 | 96 | 7 | 672 | 47 | 7.0% | 7-47 | 78 |
| HCV | Feb 2006 | 89 | 89 | 6 | 534 | 11 | 2.1% | 2-11 | 78 |
| HCV | 2006? | 20 | 21 | 1 | 21 | 0 | <4.8% | 0 | 80 |
| HCV | Jan 2007 | 104 | 104 | 7 | 728 | 22 | 3.0% | 4-22 | 78 |
| HCV | Feb 2007 | 99 | 99 | 7 | 693 | 28 | 4.0% | 4-28 | 78 |
| Hepatitus Delta virus | 2015? | 28 | 56 | 4 | 112 | 6 | 5.4% | 5 | 81 |
| Chikungunya virus | 2007? | 31 | 36 | 3 | 108 | 2-6 | 1.9-5.6% | 2 | 82 |
| Chikungunya virus | Sep 2014 | 56 | 60 | 5 | 297 | 24 | 8.1% | 18 | 83 |

**Table S5. 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 | 84 |
| Dengue virus | May-Jul 2013 | 16 | 16 | 1 | 16 | 1c | 6.3% | 1 | 85 |
| Zika virus | Oct-Nov 2016 | 50 | 85 | 6 | 504c | 14d | 2.8% | 12 | 86 |
| Rift Valley fever virus | 2012 | 30 | 39 | 3 | 117 | 4 | 3.4% | 3 | 87 |
| Measles virus | Aug 2014 | 41 | 41 | 3 | 123 | 1 | 0.8% | 1 | 88 |
| Ebola virus | Aug 2014 | 82 | 106e | 3 | 317e | 1 | 0.3% | 1 | 89 |
| Ebola virus | Dec 2014 | 19 | 20 | 3 | 60 | 0 | <1.7% | 0 | 90 |
| Ebola virus | Apr 2015 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | <33.3% | 0 | 91 |
| Ebola virus | Nov 2014 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 16.7% | 1 | 91 |
| Ebola virus | Mar 2016 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 0 | <11.1% | 0 | 91 |
| 4 arbovirusesf | Nov 2017 | 51 | 51 | 4 | 204 | 10 | 4.9% | 6 | 92 |

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.

**References**

1 Sung H. Yoo CK, Han MG, et al. Preparedness and rapid implementation of external quality assessment helped quickly increase COVID-19 testing capacity in the Republic of Korea. Clin Chem 2020; hvaa097. 10.1093/clinchem/hvaa097

2 Zeichhardt H, Kammel M. Report on extra external quality assessment scheme Group No. 340 virus genome detection – SARS-CoV-2. 2020. https://www.instand-ev.de/en/news/detail/news/extra-instand-ringversuch-340-virusgenom-nachweis-sars-cov-2-april-2020-teilnahmedokumente-sin/?tx\_news\_pi1%5Bcontroller%5D=News&tx\_news\_pi1%5Baction%5D=detail&cHash=58a2c9186c54a6cf9661fabde8dbf6c7

3 World Health Organization. Global surveillance for COVID-19 caused by human infection with COVID-19 virus. Interim guidance. 20 Mar 2020. https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/laboratory-guidance

4 US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Notifiable Diseases Surveillance System (NNDSS). Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) 2020 Interim Case Definition, Approved April 5, 2020. 5 Apr 2020. https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nndss/conditions/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/case-definition/2020/

5 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Case definition for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). 29 May 2020. https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/covid-19/surveillance/case-definition

6 National Health Service England. Guidance and standard operating procedure COVID-19 virus testing in NHS laboratories. 16 Mar 2020. https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/publication/guidance-and-standard-operating-procedure-covid-19-virus-testing-in-nhs-laboratories/

7 Government of Canada. Interim national case definition: Coronavirus disease (COVID-19). 2 Apr 2020. https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/health-professionals/national-case-definition.html

8 Pan American Health Organization. Laboratory guidelines for the detection and diagnosis of COVID-19 virus infection. 30 Mar 2020. https://www.paho.org/en/documents/laboratory-guidelines-detection-and-diagnosis-covid-19-virus-infection

9 General Office of the Chinese National Health Commission and the Office of the National Administration of Traditional Chinese Medicine. Diagnosis and Treatment Protocol for COVID-19 (Trial Version 7). 3 Mar 2020. http://en.nhc.gov.cn/2020-03/29/c\_78469.htm

10 Chen C, Allen M, Churchill L, Arnsdorf I. Key missteps at the CDC have set back its ability to detect the potential spread of coronavirus. ProPublica 28 Feb 2020. https://www.propublica.org/article/cdc-coronavirus-covid-19-test

11 Willman D. Contamination at CDC lab delayed rollout of coronavirus tests. Washington Post; Apr 18, 2020. https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/contamination-at-cdc-lab-delayed-rollout-of-coronavirus-tests/2020/04/18/fd7d3824-7139-11ea-aa80-c2470c6b2034\_story.html

12 McNeil DG Jr. Did federal officials really question W.H.O. tests for coronavirus? New York Times 17 Mar 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/17/health/coronavirus-tests-who.html

13 Harris R. In defense of coronavirus testing strategy, Administration cited retracted study. National Public Radio 26 Mar 2020. https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2020/03/26/822084429/in-defense-of-coronavirus-testing-strategy-administration-cited-retracted-study

14 Zhuang G, Shen M, Zeng L, et al. [Potential false-positive rate among the 'asymptomatic infected individuals' in close contacts of COVID-19 patients.] Chin J Epidemiol 2020;41:485-8 [retracted].

15 Rabin RC. Westerdam passengers at low risk of coronavirus infection, C.D.C. says. New York Times 24 Feb 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/24/health/coronavirus-westerdam-cdc.html

16 Cha S, Smith J. South Korean findings suggest 'reinfected' coronavirus cases are false positives. Reuters 6 May 2020. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-southkorea-explain/explainer-south-korean-findings-suggest-reinfected-coronavirus-cases-are-false-positives-idUSKBN22J0HR

17 ID NOW COVID-19; Instructions for Use. Abbott Diagnostics Scarborough, Inc. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

18 Abbott RealTime SARS-CoV-2; Instructions for Use. Abbott Molecular, Inc. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

19 RealStar® SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Kit U.S. Instructions for Use, Version 6.0. Altona Diagnostics GmbH 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

20 Accelerated Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) Summary: Thermo Fisher TaqMan 2019-nCoV Assay Kit v1 (singleplex). Altru Diagnostics, Inc. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

21 Accelerated Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) Summary:Modified Thermo Fisher TaqPath COVID-19 SARS-CoV-2 Test. Biocerna 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

22 CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel; Instructions for Use. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

23 Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill 2020;25:2000045. 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045

24 Northwestern Medicine SARS-CoV-2 Assay EUA Summary: Accelerated Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) Summary SARS-CoV-2 Assay. Diagnostic Molecular Laboratory, Northwestern Medicine 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

25 SARS-CoV-2 Assay (Panther Fusion® System). Hologic, Inc. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

26 CHOP SARS-CoV-2 test EUA Summary: Accelerated Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) Summary SARS-CoV- 2 RT-PCR Test. Infectious Disease Diagnostics Laboratory, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

27 Instructions for LabGunTM COVID-19 RT-PCR Kit; Instructions for Use. LabGenomics Co., Ltd. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

28 Nationwide Children’s Hospital SARS-CoV-2 Assay EUA Summary: Accelerated Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) Summary SARS-CoV-2 ASSAY. Nationwide Children’s Hospital 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

29 Instructions for PerkinElmer® New Coronavirus Nucleic Acid Detection Kit, v 3.0. PerkinElmer, Inc. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

30 Primerdesign Ltd COVID-19 genesig® Real-Time PCR assay; Instructions for Use (IFU) Issue 1.02. Primerdesign Ltd. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

31 Rheonix COVID-19TM MDx Assay: For use only with the Rheonix Encompass MDx® Workstation; Instructions for Use. Rheonix, Inc. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

32 cobas® SARS-CoV-2: Qualitative assay for use on the cobas® 6800/8800 Systems. Roche Molecular Systems, Inc. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

33 STANDARD M nCoV Real-Time Detection kit; Instructions for Use. SD Biosensor, Inc. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

34 U-TOPTM COVID-19 Detection Kit: A diagnostic kit for detection of SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) in clinical samples using Real-time PCR; Instructions for Use, V2.0. SeaSun BioMaterials 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

35 TaqPathTM COVID-19 Combo Kit: INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE: Multiplex real-time RT-PCR test intended for the qualitative detection of nucleic acid from SARS‐CoV‐2, Version C.0. Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc. 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

36 New York SARS-CoV-2 Real-time Reverse Transcriptase (RT)- PCR Diagnostic Panel; Instructions for Use. Wadsworth Center, New York State Department of Public Health 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

37 Yale New Haven Hospital SARS-CoV-2 assay EUA Summary: Accelerated Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) Summary SARS-CoV- 2 RT-PCR Assay. Yale New Haven Hospital, Clinical Virology Laboratory 2020. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/emergency-use-authorizations#covid19ivd

38 Liu L, Zhang D, Tang S, et al. The epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 2019 novel coronavirus infection in Changsha, China. SSRN 2020. [Preprint.] 10.2139/ssrn.3537093

39 Ai T, Yang Z, Hou H, et al. Correlation of chest CT and RT-PCR testing in coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: a report of 1014 cases. Radiol 2020. 10.1148/radiol.2020200642

40 Xie X, Zhong Z, Zhao W, Zheng C, Wang F, Liu J. Chest CT for typical 2019-nCoV pneumonia: relationship to negative RT-PCR testing. Radiol 2020. 10.1148/radiol.2020200343

41 Luo L, Liu D, Liao X-L, et al. Modes of contact and risk of transmission in COVID-19 among close contacts. medRxiv2020. [Preprint.] 10.1101/2020.03.24.20042606

42 Wong HY, Lam HY, Fong AH, et al. Frequency and distribution of chest radiographic findings in COVID-19 positive patients. Radiol 2020. 10.1148/radiol.2020201160

43 Kim H, Hong H, Yoon SH. Diagnostic performance of CT and reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction for coronavirus disease 2019: a meta-analysis. Radiol 2020. 10.1148/radiol.2020201343

44 Lu R, Wang J, Li M, Wang L, Dong J, Cai W. SARS-CoV-2 detection using digital PCR for COVID-19 diagnosis, treatment monitoring and criteria for discharge. medRxiv2020. [Preprint.] 10.1101/2020.03.24.20042689

45 Bernheim A, Mei X, Huang M, et al. Chest CT findings in coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19): relationship to duration of infection. Radiol 2020. 10.1148/radiol.2020200463

46 Long C, Xu H, Shen Q, Zhang X, Fan B, Wang C, Zeng B, Li Z, Li X, Li H. Diagnosis of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19): rRT-PCR or CT? Eur J Radiol 2020. 10.1016/j.ejrad.2020.108961.

47 He J-L, Luo L, Luo Z-D, et al. Diagnostic performance between CT and initial real-time RT-PCR for clinically suspected 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) patients outside Wuhan, China. Respiratory Med (2020). 10.1016/ j.rmed.2020.105980

48 Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P, Geng B, Muenker MC, Moore AJ, Vogels CB, Petrone ME. Saliva is more sensitive for SARS-CoV-2 detection in COVID-19 patients than nasopharyngeal swabs. medRxiv 2020. [Preprint.] 10.1101/2020.04.16.20067835

49 Ren X, Liu Y, Chen H, et al. Application and Optimization of RT-PCR in Diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. medRxiv 2020. [Preprint.] 10.1101/2020.02.25.20027755

50 Yang Y, Yang M, Shen C, et al. Evaluating the accuracy of different respiratory specimens in the laboratory diagnosis and monitoring the viral shedding of 2019-nCoV infections. medRxiv 2020. [Preprint.] 10.1101/2020.02.11.20021493

51 Fang Y, Zhang H, Xie J, et al. Sensitivity of Chest CT for COVID-19: Comparison to RT-PCR. Radiol 2020. 10.1148/radiol.2020200432

52 Yang H, Wang C, Poon LC. Novel coronavirus infection and pregnancy. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2020;55:435.

53 Kucirka L, Lauer S, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction–based SARS-CoV-2 tests by time since exposure. Ann Intern Med 2020. 10.7326/M20-1495

54 Yu H, Li D, Deng Z, et al. Total protein as a biomarker for predicting coronavirus disease-2019 pneumonia. SSRN 2020. [Preprint.] 10.2139/ssrn.3551289

55 Wu J, Liu J, Zhao X, et al. Clinical characteristics of imported cases of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Jiangsu Province: a multicenter descriptive study. Clin Infect Dis 2020. 10.1093/cid/ciaa199

56 Lin C, Xiang J, Yan M, Li H, Huang S, Shen C. Comparison of throat swabs and sputum specimens for viral nucleic acid detection in 52 cases of novel coronavirus (SARS-Cov-2)-infected pneumonia (COVID-19). Clin Chem Lab Med 2020. 10.1515/cclm-2020-0187

57 Xu H, Yan L, Qiu CM, et al. Analysis and prediction of false negative results for SARS-CoV-2 detection with pharyngeal swab specimen in COVID-19 patients: a retrospective study. medRxiv 2020. [Preprint.] 10.1101/2020.03.26.20043042

58 Vogels CB, Brito AF, Wyllie AL, et al. Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of SARS-COV-2 qRT-PCR assays. medRxiv 1 Apr 2020. [Preprint.] https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.30.20048108v1?versioned=true

59 Vogels CB, Brito AF, Wyllie AL, et al. Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of SARS-COV-2 qRT-PCR assays. medRxiv 26 Apr 2020. [Preprint.] https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.30.20048108v3

60 Etievant S, Bal A, Escurret V, et al. Sensitivity assessment of SARS-CoV-2 PCR assays developed by WHO referral laboratories. medRxiv 2020. [Preprint.] 10.1101/2020.05.03.20072207

61 Barra GB, Santa Rita TH, Mesquita PG, Jacomo RH, Nery LF. Analytical sensibility and specificity of two RT-qPCR protocols for SARS-CoV-2 detection performed in an automated workflow. medRxiv 2020. [Preprint.] 10.1101/2020.03.07.20032326

62 Drosten C, Doerr HW, Lim W, Stöhr K, Niedrig M. SARS molecular detection external quality assurance. Emerg Infect Dis 2004;10:2200-3. 10.3201/eid1012.040416

63 Pas SD, Patel P, Reusken C, et al. First international external quality assessment of molecular diagnostics for MERS-CoV. J Clin Virol 2015;69:81-5. 10.1016/j.jcv.2015.05.022

64 Zhang L, Hao M, Zhang K, et al. External quality assessment for the molecular detection of MERS-CoV in China. J Clin Virol 2016;75:5-9. 10.1016/j.jcv.2015.12.001

65 Zhou D, Luo J. Construction of Lentivirus-based reference material for RT-PCR detection of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome coronavirus and its application in external quality assessment. Adv Microbiol 2018;8:506-18. 10.4236/aim.2018.87035

66 World Health Organization. WHO external quality assessment project for the detection of subtype influenza A viruses by polymerase chain reaction—summary analysis, 2007 and 2008. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2008;83:401-12.

67 World Health Organization. WHO external quality assessment project for detecting influenza virus subtype A by polymerase chain reaction—summary analysis, 2009. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2009;84:493-504.

68 World Health Organization. WHO external quality assessment for detecting influenza A virus using polymerase chain reaction—summary, 2010. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2011;86:17-24.

69 World Health Organization. Detection of influenza virus subtype A by polymerase chain reaction: WHO external quality assessment project summary analysis, 2011. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2012;87:29-36.

70 World Health Organization. Detection of influenza virus subtype A by polymerase chain reaction: WHO external quality assessment programme summary analysis, 2012. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2013;88:37-48.

71 World Health Organization. Detection of influenza virus subtype A by polymerase chain reaction: WHO external quality assessment programme summary analysis, 2013. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2014;89:37-44.

72 World Health Organization. Detection of influenza virus subtype A by polymerase chain reaction: WHO external quality assessment programme summary analysis, 2014. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2015;90:9-16.

73 World Health Organization. Detection of influenza virus subtype A by polymerase chain reaction: WHO external quality assessment programme summary analysis, 2015. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2016;90:3-11.

74 World Health Organization. Detection of influenza virus subtype A by polymerase chain reaction: WHO external quality assessment programme summary analysis, 2016. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2017;92:37-44.

75 World Health Organization. Detection of influenza viruses by reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction: WHO external quality assessment programme summary analysis, 2017. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2018;93:9-16.

76 World Health Organization. Detection of influenza viruses by reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction: WHO external quality assessment programme summary analysis, 2017. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2019;94:53-64.

77 World Health Organization. Detection of influenza viruses by reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction: WHO external quality assessment programme summary analysis, 2019. Wkly Epidemiol Rec 2010;95:49-60.

78 Tvorogova MG, Chulanov VP, Volkova RA, et al. [Quality assessment of HCV RNA detection by PCR method in federal system of external quality assessment in 2005-2007.] J Microbiol Epidemiol Immunobiol 2009;2009:59-62.

79 Caliendo AM, Valsamakis A, Zhou Y, et al. Multilaboratory comparison of Hepatitis C Virus viral load assays. J Clin Microbiol 2006;44:1726-32. 10.1128/JCM.44.5.1726-1732.2006

80 Laperche S, Bouchardeau F, Thibault V, et al. Multicenter trials need to use the same assay for Hepatitis C Virus viral load determination. J Clin Microbiol 2007;45:3788-90. 10.1128/JCM.00825-07

81 Le Gal F, Brichler S, Sahli R, Chevret S, Gordien E. First international external quality assessment for Hepatitis Delta Virus RNA quantification in plasma. Hepatol 2016;64:1483-94. 10.1002/hep.28772

82 Panning M, Charrel RN, Mantke OD, Landt O, Niedrig M, Drosten C. Coordinated implementation of Chikungunya Virus reverse transcription-PCR. Emerg Infect Dis 2009;15:469-71. 10.3201/eid1503.081104

83 Jacobsen S, Patel P, Schmidt-Chanasit J, et al. External quality assessment studies for laboratory performance of molecular and serological diagnosis of Chikungunya Virus infection. J Clin Virol 2016;76:55-65. 10.1016/j.jcv.2016.01.008

84 Soh LT, Squires RC, Tan LK, et al. External quality assessment of dengue and chikungunya diagnostics in the Asia Pacific region, 2015. Western Pac Surveill Response J 2016;7:26-34. 10.5365/WPSAR.2016.7.1.002

85 Pok KY, Squires RC, Tan LK, et al. First round of external quality assessment of dengue diagnostics in the WHO Western Pacific Region, 2013. Western Pac Surveill Response J 2015;6:73-81. 10.5365/WPSAR.2015.6.1.017

86 Charrel R, Mögling R, Pas S, et al. Variable sensitivity in molecular detection of Zika Virus in European expert laboratories: external quality assessment, November 2016. J Clin Microbiol 2017;55:3219-26. 10.1128/JCM.00987-17

87 Escadafal C, Paweska JT, Grobbelaar A, et al. International external quality assessment of molecular detection of Rift Valley Fever Virus. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 2013;7:e2244. 10.1371/journal.pntd.0002244

88 Zhang D, Sun Y, Jia T, et al. External quality assessment for the detection of measles virus by reverse transcription-PCR using armored RNA. Plos One 2015;10:e0134681. 10.1371/journal.pone.0134681

89 Ellerbrok H, Jacobsen S, Patel P, et al. External quality assessment study for ebolavirus PCR-diagnostic promotes international preparedness during the 2014-2016 Ebola outbreak in West Africa. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 2017;11:e0005570. 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005570

90 Wang G, Sun Y, Zhang K, et al. External quality assessment of molecular detection of Ebola Virus in China. PloS One 2015;10:e0132659. 10.1371/journal.pone.0132659

91 Lau KA, Theis T, Gray J, Rawlinson WD. Ebola preparedness: diagnosis improvement using rapid approaches for proficiency testing. J Clin Microbiol 2017;55:783-90. 10.1128/JCM.02173-16

92 Reusken C, Baronti C, Mögling R, Papa A, Leitmeyer K, Charrel RN. Toscana, West Nile, Usutu and tick-borne encephalitis viruses: external quality assessment for molecular detection of emerging neurotropic viruses in Europe, 2017. Euro Surveill 2019;24:pii=1900051. 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2019.24.50.1900051