Figure s9a. Direct comparative test accuracy studies evaluating rapid RT-PCR test and standard non-rapid laboratory-based NAAT vs. composite reference standard

Study	Index	Index Sample	Reference	Ref Sample	TP	FN		Sensitivity	95%-CI
Test: Non-Rapid PCR									
Lieberman	Cobas	NPS-VTM	Cobas/CXX/DS/HPF/LDT	NPS-VTM	11	0		1.00	[0.72; 1]
Smith	HPF	NPS-VTM	Aptima/BioFire/HPF	NPS-VTM	74	1		0.99	[0.93; 1]
Smithgall	Cobas	NPS-VTM	Cobas/CXX/ID Now	NPS-VTM	87	0		1.00	[0.96; 1]
Zhen	HPF	NPS-VTM; MTS/NS-Dry	CXX/ePlex/HPF/ID Now	NPS-VTM; MTS/NS-Dry	57	0		1.00	[0.94; 1]
Random effects model								**1.00**	**[0.97; 1]**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 1.00$									
Test: Rapid PCR									
Lieberman	CXX	NPS-VTM	Cobas/CXX/UW-LDT	NPS-VTM	11	0		1.00	[0.72; 1]
Smith	BioFire	NPS-VTM	Aptima/BioFire/HPF	NPS-VTM	74	1		0.99	[0.93; 1]
Smithgall	CXX	NPS-VTM	Cobas/CXX/ID Now	NPS-VTM	87	0		1.00	[0.96; 1]
Zhen	CXX	NPS-VTM; MTS/NS-Dry	CXX/ePlex/HPF/ID Now	NPS-VTM; MTS/NS-Dry	57	0		1.00	[0.94; 1]
Random effects model								**1.00**	**[0.97; 1]**
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 1.00$									

Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $p = 1.00$
Test for subgroup differences: $\chi^2_1 = 0.00$, df = 1 ($p = 1.00$)

0.75 0.8 0.85 0.9 0.95 1

4 studies, 460 patients; sensitivity based on bivariate model: non-rapid 0.98 (0.95-0.99) vs. rapid 0.98 (0.95-1)