

# Measuring Diagnostic Test Performance Using Imperfect Reference Tests: A Partial Identification Approach

Filip Obradović\*

March 31, 2022

## Abstract

*Diagnostic tests are almost never perfect. Studies quantifying their performance use knowledge of the true health status, measured with a reference diagnostic test. Researchers commonly assume that the reference test is perfect, which is not the case in practice. When the assumption fails, conventional studies identify only the “apparent” performance or performance with respect to the reference that is not of interest. This paper provides the smallest possible bounds on the measures of true performance - sensitivity and specificity, in standard settings. Existing methods for inference based on moment inequalities are used to construct uniformly consistent confidence sets in level over a relevant family of data distributions. Analysis of published studies for the ubiquitous Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Ag2 CARD antigen test demonstrates that the bound estimates can be very informative. Under plausible assumptions, estimates based on the Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) study data reveal that the false negative rates can be up to 3.89 times higher than the frequently cited “apparent” false negative rate. Independent study data show the estimated false negative rates in asymptomatic patients are up to 5.4 times higher than the cited “apparent” figure, warranting further attention.*

KEYWORDS: Sensitivity, specificity, gold standard bias, partial identification, moment inequalities.

---

\*Northwestern University, Department of Economics. Email: obradovicfilip@u.northwestern.edu

I am deeply grateful to Chuck Manski for his guidance and support, and to Amilcar Velez for extensive discussions that have helped shape the paper. I am also thankful to Ivan Canay, Federico Bugni, Joel Horowitz, and Eric Auerbach for valuable suggestions. I thank Kei Hirano, Francesca Molinari, Xiaoxia Shi, and participants at the Econometrics Seminar, Econometrics Reading Group, and 501 seminar at Northwestern for comments.

# 1 Introduction

Diagnostic tests are almost never perfect. Test performance studies seek to quantify their accuracy, predominantly in the form of sensitivity and specificity. They are often attributed to Yerushalmy (1947), but Binney, Hyde, and Bossuyt (2021) explain that their use dates back to early twentieth century. The two parameters are also referred to as performance measures or operating characteristics. Sensitivity is the probability that a test will return a positive result for an individual who truly has the underlying condition, while specificity is the probability that a test will produce a negative result for an individual who does not have the underlying condition. Equivalently, one can measure false positive and false negative rates. False negative rate and sensitivity sum to unity, as do specificity and the false positive rate.

Determining sensitivity and specificity for a diagnostic test of interest, referred to as an index test, requires knowledge of the true health status for all participants in the study. The true health status is unobservable, so a reference test is commonly used in lieu of it. However, such tests are rarely perfect themselves. When the reference is imperfect, conventional studies only identify “apparent” sensitivity and specificity, or the so-called rates of positive and negative agreement with the reference.<sup>1</sup> They measure performance with respect to the reference test and not true performance. Hence, they are not of interest. Furthermore, true performance measures are partially identified. In other words, there exists a set of parameter values that are observationally equivalent, i.e. that could generate the observed data. That set is called the identified set. This paper addresses the issue of finding, estimating and doing inference on the points in the identified set for sensitivity and specificity under standard assumptions used in the literature.

I provide the smallest possible joint identified set for the true performance measures without imposing any assumptions on the statistical dependence between the index and reference tests conditional on health status, assuming exact or approximate knowledge of the reference test characteristics. Sensitivity and specificity both lie in the interval  $[0, 1]$ . If the reference test performance is known exactly, this set is a line segment in the unit rectangle. Otherwise, it is a union of line segments.

I formalize an existing assumption regarding the dependence between the two tests conditional on health status. I call the assumption the “tendency to wrongly agree”. It maintains that if the reference test yields a false result for a particular health status, the index test is more likely than not to produce the same error. It is plausible in certain cases when the two tests share physical characteristics, such as sample types. Layering the assumption on the general identified set, I provide potentially smaller identified sets. The framework in this paper addresses the concerns raised in Boyko, Alderman, and Baron (1988): *“When two tests are strongly suspected of being conditionally dependent, then the performance of one of these tests should probably not be compared with that of the other, unless better methods are developed to sort out the degree of bias caused by reference test errors in the presence of conditional dependence.”*

I show how the derived identified sets may be estimated consistently. The FDA Statistical Guidance

---

1. “Apparent” false negative rate and “apparent” sensitivity sum to unity. Similarly, “apparent” false positive rate and “apparent” specificity sum to unity.

on Reporting Results Evaluating Diagnostic Tests<sup>2</sup> requires that all diagnostic performance studies must report confidence intervals for index test sensitivity and specificity to quantify the statistical uncertainty in the estimates. To conform to the practice, this paper shows that all derived identified sets may be represented using moment inequalities. I rely on the procedure from Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014) to construct confidence sets for points in the identified set that are uniformly consistent in level over a family of permissible distributions relevant in the application. Namely, the confidence sets asymptotically cover all points in the identified set uniformly over a relevant family of population distributions with probability of at least  $1 - \alpha$ , where  $\alpha$  is the chosen significance level.

The FDA Statistical Guidance defines a *reference standard* as: "*The best available method for establishing the presence or absence of the target condition. ... The "best available method" is established by opinion and practice within the medical, laboratory, and regulatory community.*" The guidance does not require a reference standard to be perfect, as it rarely is. When it is imperfect and used as a reference test, the estimates are reported as pertaining to the sensitivity and specificity, even though the estimands are "apparent" measures. This practice can be misleading. When a test other than a reference standard is used as a reference test, the estimates must be reported as "apparent". However, they are not of interest. The FDA does not require or suggest any corrections that would allow researchers to form adequate estimates of the true operating characteristics in either case. This paper offers a solution by forming the smallest possible bounds on the true performance measures, demonstrating estimation and inference procedures. The guidance also emphasizes that the index test can never be shown to be superior to the reference test in conventional studies, even if it is. This issue is also addressed, since the identified set can contain values for sensitivity and specificity that are larger than the corresponding measures of the reference test.

Given that sensitivity and specificity are frequently used to obtain other parameters of interest, I present two use cases for the derived identified sets: 1) Bounding prevalence in a screened population; 2) Bounding predictive values, i.e. probabilities that a patient is sick conditional on observing a test result. The specific shape of the identified set for test characteristics is critical for the sharpness of bounds on prevalence.

Finally, I use the developed framework to revisit the results of the original Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) performance study of the ubiquitous *Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Ag2 CARD* rapid antigen test, as well as an independent study by Shah et al. (2021).<sup>3</sup> All studies for rapid COVID-19 tests have a mandated RT-PCR reference test which is known to produce false negative results, and thus pertain to the setting analyzed in the paper. Using estimates for the reference test performance found in Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020) and Kanji et al. (2021), I construct the confidence sets and estimates of the identified sets for the true sensitivity, and specificity. The bound estimates can be very narrow. Since the false negative rate and sensitivity sum to unity, bounds on the false negative rates follow directly from the bounds on sensitivity.

Based on the EUA study interim and final results, the widely-cited estimated "apparent" false negative

---

2. <https://www.fda.gov/media/71147/download>

3. The test held 75% of the COVID-19 antigen test market share, according to Abbott Laboratories CEO Robert Ford on Q3 2021 Results - Earnings Call Transcript.

rates are 8.3% and 15.4%, respectively. Following the results found in the literature (Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020), Kucirka et al. (2020), Kanji et al. (2021)), and assuming that the reference has perfect specificity and 90% sensitivity, I find that that estimated bounds on the true false negative rate are [20%, 23.9%] in the same data set. Relaxing the assumption so that reference test sensitivity is known to be in [80%, 90%], the estimates are [20%, 32.3%]. These correspond to the bounds on sensitivity of [76.1%, 80%] and [67.7%, 80%]. Both estimated “apparent” false negative rates are understating even the estimated lower bound for the true false negative rate. The estimated average number of people who are infected and missed by the antigen test is up to 2.1 and 3.89 times higher than the test users may be led to believe by the final and interim study results, respectively. Data from Shah et al. (2021) show that the estimated true false negative rate can be up to 2.9 and 5.4 times higher for asymptomatic patients than the cited final and interim figures for symptomatic individuals, respectively. Depending on interpretation, the results suggest that the test may not satisfy the initial FDA requirement for EUA of at least 80% estimated sensitivity, despite fulfilling the criterion of high “apparent” sensitivity.

The medical profession refers to the difference between the “apparent” and true performance measures as gold standard bias, and it is well documented in the literature. There are various existing approaches to addressing the bias. Gart and Buck (1966), Staquet et al. (1981), and Zhou, McClish, and Obuchowski (2009) show that when the reference and index tests are statistically independent conditional on the true health status, index test sensitivity and specificity are point-identified. They offer an alternative maximum likelihood estimator under the assumption of exactly known reference test performance measures. This is an appealing result, however, Hui and Zhou (1998) elaborate that conditional independence is untenable when there are spectrum effects.<sup>4</sup> Briefly, more severe cases are easier to detect by any test, while the less severe ones are more prone to be falsely labeled as negative. This will induce positive correlation between the index and reference tests and invalidate conditional independence.

Several papers have analyzed the impact that conditional dependence may have on sensitivity and specificity measurement errors. Deneef (1987) shows that if the two tests are conditionally independent, “apparent” performance will be lower than true performance. The study also demonstrates that if the tests are positively correlated, “apparent” accuracy may be higher than true accuracy. Boyko, Alderman, and Baron (1988) use a case study to examine the difference between “apparent” and true operating characteristics when the tests are conditionally independent and disease prevalence is varied. Valenstein (1990) concludes that when classification errors committed by an index test and a reference test are highly correlated, the “apparent” sensitivity and specificity will be higher than the true parameters. Additionally, the author reports that when the correlation is slight, the “apparent” operating characteristics may either be over- or underestimating the true values. However, they do not demonstrate this analytically. More importantly, they do not precisely define highly correlated classification errors, leaving them open for interpretation. This

---

4. Spectrum effects imply varying sensitivity and specificity across different subpopulations of patients, for example grouped by severity of symptoms.

has prompted the formalization of the assumption in this paper.

A significant portion of the published work focuses on the direction of the effects of the conditional dependence, rather than on the magnitude. The purpose is to enable applied researchers to determine whether their estimates are biased upwards or downwards, but one could argue that the magnitude is perhaps even more important than the direction of the bias. Furthermore, correlation between the results of the two tests conditional on the health status cannot be observed, as it conditions on an unobservable random variable, so the assumption cannot be empirically verified. A formal approach to the issue of unknown bias magnitude is found in Thibodeau (1981), who poses explicit assumptions on the magnitude of the deviation from conditional independence when the reference test is at least as accurate as the index to bound the bias attributed to an imperfect reference test at the population level. More recently, Emerson et al. (2018) sketch an argument for separate bounds on sensitivity and specificity when the conditional independence assumption is not imposed. Both of these results are subsumed under the general analysis presented below. Ziegler (2021) uses a setting similar to the one in this paper to provide sufficient conditions for informativeness of the index test in terms of predictive values, but does not focus on measuring index test performance when the reference test is imperfect.

This paper primarily contributes to the literature on gold standard bias in diagnostic test performance studies (Hui and Walter (1980), Thibodeau (1981), Staquet et al. (1981), Vacek (1985), Deneef (1987), Boyko, Alderman, and Baron (1988), Valenstein (1990), Hui and Zhou (1998), Feinstein (2002), Emerson et al. (2018)), and to a growing body of literature concerning partial identification in medical and epidemiologic research such as, Bhattacharya, Shaikh, and Vytlacil (2012), Manski (2020), Toulis (2021), Manski and Molinari (2021), Ziegler (2021), and Stoye (2022). In doing so, it merges ideas from two branches of econometric research, partial identification (Manski (2003), Manski (2007)) and inference in moment inequality models (Andrews and Soares (2010), Andrews and Barwick (2012), Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014), Canay and Shaikh (2017), Bugni, Canay, and Shi (2017), Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2019), Bai, Santos, and Shaikh (2021)). Finally, to the extent of my knowledge, these are the first empirical results aiming to recover the true sensitivity and specificity for COVID-19 antigen tests despite reference test imperfections. This is an addition to the corpus of COVID-19 test performance studies (Shah et al. (2021), Pollock et al. (2021), Siddiqui et al. (2021)).

I view the outlined approach as an attractive alternative to posing untenable convenient assumptions, such as perfect performance of the reference test or conditional independence of the reference and index tests in addition to exactly known reference test characteristics, at the expense of credibility. Therefore, I provide replication files that researchers may directly utilize to obtain estimates and confidence sets in their own work.<sup>5</sup> Since the method requires no changes to the assumptions and data-collection process of most current applied work, it can also be used to easily interpret existing published studies, as demonstrated by the application section of the paper.

---

5. Available from: [https://github.com/obradovicflip/bounding\\_test\\_performance](https://github.com/obradovicflip/bounding_test_performance)

Section 2 provides the identification argument. Section 3 demonstrates identification of prevalence and predictive values. Section 4 explains estimation and inference. Section 5 presents confidence and estimated identified sets for the operating characteristics of the COVID-19 antigen test. Section 6 concludes.

## 2 Identification

In this section, I present the setting and assumptions, and derive the joint identified sets for the index test sensitivity and specificity.

Let  $t = 1$  and  $r = 1$  if the index and reference tests, respectively, yield positive results and  $t = 0$ ,  $r = 0$  otherwise. Let  $y = 1$  denote the existence of the underlying condition we are testing for and  $y = 0$  the absence of it.<sup>6</sup> We are interested in learning the sensitivity  $\theta_1 = P(t = 1|y = 1)$  and specificity  $\theta_0 = P(t = 0|y = 0)$  of the index test. Finally, define the reference test sensitivity  $s_1 = P(r = 1|y = 1)$  and specificity  $s_0 = P(r = 0|y = 0)$ . Data collection in test performance studies is commonly done by testing all study participants with both the reference and index tests. The observed outcome for each participant is  $(t, r) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ . The data identify the joint probability distribution  $P(t, r)$ .

Focusing the analysis on binary tests and binary health statuses is standard procedure. Sensitivity and specificity are defined only in such settings. Many tests that yield discrete or continuous test results, such as RT-PCR tests, are reduced to binary tests by thresholding in practice. FDA Statistical Guidance recognizes only binary reference tests and health statuses, explicitly stating: *"A reference standard ... divides the intended use population into only two groups (condition present or absent)."*

The section begins by outlining the formal assumptions used. I then provide the sharp identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  without imposing any assumptions on the statistical dependence between  $t$  and  $r$ . For simplicity of exposition, this is first done when  $(s_1, s_0)$  are known. I show how an additional assumption on the dependence structure between the two tests can be used to reduced the size of the identified set. Finally, I allow  $(s_1, s_0)$  to be approximately known by assuming  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is some known compact set.

### 2.1 Assumptions

The joint probability distribution of  $P(t, r)$  is used to determine  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  under further assumptions. "Apparent" sensitivity and specificity,  $\tilde{\theta}_1 = P(t = 1|r = 1)$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_0 = P(t = 0|r = 0)$ , are defined whenever  $P(r = 1) \in (0, 1)$ . "Apparent" measures are equal to the parameters of interest  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  if the reference test is perfect, so that  $r = y$ . This is rarely the case in practice. Generally,  $\tilde{\theta}_j \neq \theta_j$  for  $j = 0, 1$  which referred to as *gold standard bias*. Gart and Buck (1966), Staquet et al. (1981), and Zhou, McClish, and Obuchowski (2009) show that one can point-identify  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  using  $P(t, r)$  and knowledge of  $(s_1, s_0)$ , if  $t$  and  $r$  are independent conditional on  $y$ . Thibodeau (1981), Hui and Zhou (1998) and Emerson et al. (2018) elaborate that

---

6. I interchangeably say that the person is ill when  $y = 1$  and when  $y = 0$ , that they are healthy. This can be extended to encompass antibody tests with minor semantic changes, since they can also measure if a person has been ill.

conditional independence is frequently implausible. When it is not assumed,  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  are partially identified. I present the sharp joint identified sets for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  in standard study settings.

**Assumption 1.** (*Random Sampling*) *The study sample is a sequence of i.i.d random vectors  $W_i = (t_i, r_i)$ , where each  $W_i$  follows a categorical distribution  $P(t, r)$  for  $(t, r) \in \{0, 1\}^2$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .*

The distribution  $P(t, r)$  is a marginal of the joint distribution  $P(t, r, y)$ . Since  $y$  is not observable,  $P(t, r, y)$  is not identified.

**Assumption 2.** (*Reference Performance*) *Sensitivity and specificity of the reference test  $s_1 = P(r = 1|y = 1)$  and  $s_0 = P(r = 0|y = 0)$  are known, and  $s_1 > 1 - s_0$ .*

Knowledge of  $(s_1, s_0)$  is assumed in papers dealing with gold standard bias correction, such as Gart and Buck (1966), Thibodeau (1981), Staquet et al. (1981), and Emerson et al. (2018). The current norm of relying on the assumption that the reference test is perfect means that researchers regularly maintain  $(s_1, s_0) = (1, 1)$ . For the sake of clarity, the analysis here is first done for the simple case when  $(s_1, s_0)$  are known exactly. To lend more credibility to the procedure, the approach is generalized in Section 2.4 by assuming  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is some compact set. Hence, reference test performance needs to only be known approximately.

I further maintain that  $s_1 > 1 - s_0$ , or that the reference test is reasonable.<sup>7</sup> DiCiccio et al. (2021) refer to such  $r$  as a test that has diagnostic value. If  $s_1 = 1 - s_0$ , the test is completely uninformative and will not provide any information on the health status. This can be seen from:

$$\begin{aligned} P(r = 1) &= P(r = 1|y = 1)P(y = 1) + P(r = 1|y = 0)(1 - P(y = 1)) \\ &= s_1P(y = 1) + (1 - s_0)(1 - P(y = 1)). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

When  $s_1 = 1 - s_0$ ,  $P(r = 1) = P(r = 1|y = 1) = P(r = 1|y = 0)$ . Similarly,  $P(r = 0) = P(r = 0|y = 0) = P(r = 0|y = 1)$ . Therefore  $r \perp\!\!\!\perp y$ , so the test provides no information on  $y$ . Tests are costly, and any use of such test is not rational. If  $s_1 < 1 - s_0$ , then the probability of a true positive is less than a probability of a false positive. It would be possible to redefine  $r^* = 1 - r$ , so that  $s_1^* = 1 - s_1$  and  $s_0^* = 1 - s_0$ . Now  $s_1^* > 1 - s_0^*$ , since  $1 - s_1 > s_0$ .

**Assumption 3.** (*Bounded Prevalence*) *The population prevalence  $P(y = 1)$  is  $0 < P(y = 1) < 1$ .*

In a study population in which all participants are either healthy or diseased, one of the measures  $\theta_1$  or  $\theta_0$  is undefined. The assumption is implicitly found in diagnostic test performance studies measuring sensitivity and specificity.

---

<sup>7</sup> The assumption does not require that both  $s_1$  and  $s_0$  are high. Indeed, it is possible that either  $s_1$  or  $s_0$  are close to 0, but that their sum is higher than 1.

**Remark 1.** *The assumed value  $(s_1, s_0)$  and Assumption 3 are refutable. Since  $P(y = 1) \in (0, 1)$ , from (1) it follows that  $P(r = 1) \in (1 - s_0, s_1)$ . If  $P(r = 1) \leq 1 - s_0$  or  $P(r = 1) \geq s_1$ , then  $P(y = 1) \notin (0, 1)$  or the assumed  $(s_1, s_0)$  cannot be true.*

## 2.2 General Identified Set for $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ Given $(s_1, s_0)$

We would first like to learn  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  without imposing any assumptions on the statistical dependence structure between  $t$  and  $r$  conditional on  $y$ . This will yield the general identification region or identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  when  $(s_1, s_0)$  is known.

The data reveal  $P(t, r)$ , while probability distributions involving  $y$  are not directly observable. Still,  $P(r, y)$  can be determined using  $(s_1, s_0)$  and  $P(t, r)$ . I henceforth use  $P_{s_1, s_0}$  to denote probability distributions that are derived from observable distributions given  $(s_1, s_0)$ . All directly observable distributions, such as  $P(t, r)$ , do not have the subscript. From (1),  $P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) = \frac{P(r=1)+s_0-1}{s_1+s_0-1}$ . By Assumption 2,  $s_1 \neq 1 - s_0$ . Finally,  $P_{s_1, s_0}(r, y) = P_{s_1, s_0}(r|y)P_{s_1, s_0}(y)$ , so  $P_{s_1, s_0}(r, y)$  is known given  $(s_1, s_0)$ . To outline the idea of finding the identified set, first note that  $\theta_j = P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j|y = j)$  for  $j = 0, 1$ :

$$\theta_j = \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 0, y = j) + P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1, y = j)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}. \quad (2)$$

Probabilities  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j)$  for  $k = 0, 1$  are unobservable. However, they can be bounded using the knowledge of  $P(t, r)$  and  $P_{s_1, s_0}(r, y)$ . By the properties of probability measures, an upper bound on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j)$  is  $\min(P(t = j, r = k), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = j))$ . To form a lower bound, one can similarly find that  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - j) \leq \min(P(t = j, r = k), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j))$  and use:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j) &= P(t = j, r = k) - P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - j) \\ &\geq \max\left(0, P(t = j, r = k) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Such bounds are shown to be the smallest possible. By summing the upper and lower bounds on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j)$  for  $k = 0, 1$ , one can bound  $\theta_j$ . A joint identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  then follows from (1). Proposition 1 expands on this intuition to provide sharp individual bounds on  $\theta_j$  and the sharp joint identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ .

**Proposition 1.** *The sharp identified set  $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0)$  for parameter  $\theta_j$  and  $j = 0, 1$ , given reference test*



sensitivity  $s_1$  and specificity  $s_0$  is an interval  $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\theta_j^L, \theta_j^U]$ , where:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_j^L &= \left[ \max\left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ \theta_j^U &= \left[ \min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The sharp identified set  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  given reference test sensitivity  $s_1$  and specificity  $s_0$  is:

$$\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) = \left\{ (t_1, t_0) : t_0 = t_1 \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)} + 1 - \frac{P(t = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)}, t_1 \in \mathcal{H}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

See proof on page 36.

The set  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  is a line segment on  $[0, 1]^2$  for a given value of reference test operating characteristics  $s_1$  and  $s_0$ . Emerson et al. (2018) sketch an argument for individual bounds on  $\theta_j$  as in (4) and do not discuss the joint identified set. Proposition 1 goes further by proving that both individual bounds and the joint identified sets are the smallest possible. Section 3.1 shows that the linear structure of the set  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  is crucial for sharpness of bounds on certain derived parameters of interest, such as disease prevalence in screened populations. Resulting bounds on prevalence are unnecessarily wide if one supposes that any value of  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  within  $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0) \times \mathcal{H}_{\theta_0}(s_1, s_0)$  is feasible.

**Remark 2.** *It is possible that  $\theta_j > s_j$  in the identified set. The bounds overcome an important limitation of conventional studies in which the index can never be shown to outperform the reference test. Since such studies assume  $(s_1, s_0) = (1, 1)$ , then by definition  $\theta_j \leq s_j$ . Intuitively, if one maintains that a reference test is perfect so  $r = y$ , all discordant results  $t \neq r$  will always be treated as errors of the index test, even though they need not be. The researcher can never observe a strictly lower error rate of the index test if the reference is assumed to be infallible.<sup>8</sup> That is not the case when using the method in this paper.*

*A sufficient condition for  $\theta_j > s_j$  to be possible is that  $P(t = j, r = j) > P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, t = j) = s_j P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)$  and  $\min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)\right) > 0$ . Then  $\theta_j^U = \min\left(\frac{P(t=j, r=1-j)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y=j)} \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r=1-j, y=j)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y=j)}\right) + s_j > s_j$ .*

**Remark 3.** *“Apparent” measures  $(\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_0)$  need not be contained in the identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ . In that sense,  $(\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_0)$  may be over- or understating  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ .*

<sup>8</sup> For an extreme example, assume a perfect index test  $(\theta_1, \theta_0) = (1, 1)$ . Let the reference be imperfect so  $s_1 < 1$  or  $s_0 < 1$ , but the researcher maintains that it is perfect. The index test will have “apparent” sensitivity and specificity equal to  $(s_1, s_0)$ . “Apparent” operating characteristics will be treated as true operating characteristics under the assumption.

The identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  is sharp. Encountering wide bounds on sensitivity and specificity implies that is not possible to learn the operating characteristics more precisely without additional assumptions that may be untenable, or without changing the reference test. Since the reference test is supposed to be the best available test, researchers and practitioners may have to embrace the ambiguity regarding the index test performance.

### 2.3 Misclassification Assumptions

Points in the identified set  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  derived in the previous section correspond to different non-observable probability distributions  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t, r, y)$  that are consistent with the identified distribution  $P(t, r)$  and  $(s_1, s_0)$ . Until this point, no additional restrictions on the statistical dependence structure between  $t$ ,  $r$  and  $y$  were imposed. Literature on gold standard bias suggests that  $t$  and  $r$  may frequently be statistically dependent conditional on  $y$  in ways that would further restrict the set of distributions  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t, r, y)$  consistent with the data, resulting in more informative identified sets for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ . It is thus important to incorporate assumptions on the dependence structure into the framework.

A particular kind of restrictions that researchers may be willing to consider concern the error probabilities of  $t$  conditional on  $r$  making a misclassification error for a specific value of  $y$ . The appeal of such assumptions stems from the ability to scrutinize their credibility based on shared physical properties of the two tests. Valenstein (1990) informally discusses one such restriction. The author analyzes the magnitude of the difference  $\theta_j - \tilde{\theta}_j$  for  $j = 0, 1$  by means of a numerical example when the two tests have classification errors that are referred to as “highly correlated”. The meaning of highly correlated errors is not formally defined, and in the numerical example the assumption is imposed as  $P(t = 1 - y | r = 1 - y, y) = 1$  for all  $y$ . I formalize this assumption and derive the resulting sharp identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ . Given that its plausibility may vary across health statuses, I also allow it to hold only for a particular value of  $y$ .

Thibodeau (1981), Vacek (1985), and Deneef (1987) formally analyze the difference between the corresponding true and “apparent” operating characteristics under a different type of dependence. They consider an assumption that restricts the conditional covariance so that  $Cov(t, r | y) \geq 0$ . The condition  $Cov(t, r | y) \geq 0$  is equivalent to:

$$P(t = 1, r = 1 | y) \geq \left( P(t = 1, r = 1 | y) + P(t = 1, r = 0 | y) \right) \left( P(t = 1, r = 1 | y) + P(t = 0, r = 1 | y) \right). \quad (6)$$

However, expression (6) does not have a clear interpretation in terms of individual error probabilities  $P(t, r | y)$  where  $t \neq y$  or  $r \neq y$ . Determining its plausibility based on the physical characteristics of the tests may thus be more difficult in practice than for assumptions that clearly restrict particular error probabilities.

**Definition 1.** (*Tendency to wrongly agree*) An index test has a tendency to wrongly agree with the reference test for disease status  $\bar{y}$  given  $(s_1, s_0)$  if  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - \bar{y} | r = 1 - \bar{y}, y = \bar{y}) \geq P_{s_1, s_0}(t = \bar{y} | r = 1 - \bar{y}, y = \bar{y})$ . An index test has a tendency to correctly disagree with the reference test for disease status  $\bar{y}$  given  $(s_1, s_0)$  if

$$P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - \bar{y} | r = 1 - \bar{y}, y = \bar{y}) \leq P_{s_1, s_0}(t = \bar{y} | r = 1 - \bar{y}, y = \bar{y}).$$

If an index test exhibits a tendency to wrongly agree with the reference test for  $\bar{y}$ , conditional on the reference test making a classification error, the index test is more likely to misdiagnose the patient than to diagnose them correctly.<sup>9</sup> Valenstein (1990) explains that the tendency may arise if the two tests have common properties, such as the type of sample used, e.g. the same swab type.

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose that the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for  $y = j$ . The sharp identified set  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0)$  for parameter  $\theta_j$   $j = 0, 1$ , given reference test sensitivity  $s_1$  and specificity  $s_0$  is an interval  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\bar{\theta}_j^L, \bar{\theta}_j^U]$ , where:*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}_j^L &= \left[ \max\left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ \bar{\theta}_j^U &= \left[ \min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The corresponding sharp joint identification region  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  is:

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) = \left\{ (t_1, t_0) : t_0 = t_1 \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)} + 1 - \frac{P(t = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)}, t_j \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) \right\}. \quad (8)$$

If the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for  $y = 0$  and  $y = 1$ , the sharp joint identification region  $\bar{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  for parameters  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ , given reference test sensitivity  $s_1$  and specificity  $s_0$  is:

$$\bar{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) = \left\{ (t_1, t_0) : t_0 = t_1 \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)} + 1 - \frac{P(t = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)}, t_1 \in \bar{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}_{(\theta_1)}(s_1, s_0) \right\}, \quad (9)$$

---

9. Condition (6) is neither sufficient nor necessary for the assumption. To see this consider counterexamples where for  $y = 1$ ,  $(P(t = 1, r = 1|y), P(t = 1, r = 0|y), P(t = 0, r = 1|y), P(t = 0, r = 0|y))$  is  $(0.1, 0.25, 0.25, 0.4)$  and  $(0.5, 0.3, 0.1, 0.1)$ .

where  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1)}(s_1, s_0) = [\bar{\theta}_1^L, \bar{\theta}_1^U]$ , for:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\theta}_j^L &= \left[ \max\left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ \bar{\theta}_j^U &= \left[ \min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)}{2}, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}.\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

See proof on page 40.

Proposition 2 provides sharp identification regions for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  when the researcher maintains that the tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for only one or both health statuses. The identified set given  $(s_1, s_0)$  is again a line segment in  $[0, 1]^2$ . The bounds  $[\bar{\theta}_j^L, \bar{\theta}_j^U]$ , and  $[\bar{\theta}_j^L, \bar{\theta}_j^U]$  imply that the sets are reduced in size only from above compared to  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  in Proposition 1, in the sense that  $\bar{\theta}_j^U \leq \theta_j^U$  and  $\bar{\theta}_j^L \leq \theta_j^L$ , but  $\bar{\theta}_j^L = \theta_j^L$  and  $\bar{\theta}_j^U = \theta_j^U$  for  $j = 0, 1$ .

The identified set  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  was derived by finding all distributions  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t, r, y)$  that are consistent with the data given  $(s_1, s_0)$ . It thus represents a domain of consensus for the value of  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  under additional assumptions restricting the set of  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t, r, y)$  that are considered to be feasible. In other words, any identified set obtained under further assumptions on the statistical dependence of  $t$ ,  $r$ , and  $y$  will be a subset of  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ . Thus, the bounds in Thibodeau (1981) obtained for tests satisfying condition (6) are also subsumed under the general analysis in this paper.

One case where it might be plausible to maintain the assumption that an index test has a tendency to wrongly agree with the reference for  $y = 1$  is when using SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR tests to evaluate performance of rapid antigen swab tests. Weissleder et al. (2020) note that RT-PCR tests typically have exceptionally high analytical sensitivities and specificities. These measure performance in contrived samples produced by the researchers, rather than clinical samples. Thus, we know that if any viral specimens are present in a test-sample, the test will return a positive result with very high probability. Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020) explain that false negatives are still an issue in clinical settings due to the absence of viral specimens at the swab location. That is, it is possible that the virus simply is not present at the swabbed site of a diseased individual at the time of sampling, inducing a false negative result. Conversely, since the test is almost perfectly analytically sensitive, if it does produce a false negative result, it is highly likely that the sample did not contain any viral particles.

All participants are tested with both tests by taking a swab sample typically from the same location, e.g. nasopharynx, nares or oropharynx. Suppose that the RT-PCR produces produced a false negative result, i.e. that the swab did not contain any viral particles. Then the antigen test is more likely than not to make

the same error using a swab from the same location.<sup>10</sup> This would be equivalent to a claim that the two tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for  $y = 1$ .

More examples can be found in the literature. Hadgu (1999) observes that the same assumption is credible for the ligase chain reaction (LCR) and culture tests for *Chlamydia trachomatis* by the same reasoning. Valenstein (1990) indicates that when determining the performance of direct immunoassay swab tests for *Group A streptococci* using a culture as a reference, the tendency to wrongly agree may hold for  $y = 1$  due to inadequately obtained samples leading to false negatives. Furthermore, the same is suggested for  $y = 0$ . Patients who are ill with viral pharyngitis, but incidentally carry the bacteria elsewhere, may appear falsely positive on both tests. Vacek (1985) argues that Tine and Mantoux tuberculin tests may have a tendency to wrongly agree for any  $y$  as both rely on the antibody reaction to tuberculin.

Identification regions when the tests tend to correctly disagree can be derived symmetrically. Intuitively, in those cases, the regions may be further reduced in size from below compared to  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  in Proposition 1. Thibodeau (1981) emphasizes that tests are generally not expected to exhibit such dependence in practice, and these regions are hence not analyzed formally in this paper.

## 2.4 Imperfect Knowledge of Reference Test Characteristics

For simplicity of exposition, previously derived identified sets for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  were presented under the premise that  $(s_1, s_0)$  are known exactly. That assumption might be implausible depending on the setting. Researchers may instead prefer to maintain that they do not possess exact, but rather approximate knowledge of  $(s_1, s_0)$ . I thus relax Assumption 2 by supposing that we only have knowledge of a set  $\mathcal{S}$  that contains true sensitivity and specificity of the reference test.

**Assumption 2A.** *Sensitivity and specificity of the reference test are contained in a known compact set  $\mathcal{S} \subset [0, 1]^2$ . All values  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$  satisfy  $s_1 > 1 - s_0$ .*

Assumption 2A is a weakening of the previously used Assumption 2. Compactness of  $\mathcal{S}$  is not relevant for identification, but it is important in the inference procedure defined in Section 4.2. For a fixed arbitrary element  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ , the identified set  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  can be found using expressions from Proposition 1, or Proposition 2, depending on which of the previously discussed assumptions the researcher is willing to maintain. Denote by  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$  the corresponding identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  when  $(s_1, s_0)$  is known to be in  $\mathcal{S}$ . All values  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  that are found in at least one set  $G$  within a collection of sets  $G \in \{\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) : (s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}\}$  then constitute  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$ . In other words, the set  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$  contains all values of  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  that are consistent with the observed data and at least one  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ . We can formally define:

$$\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0). \quad (11)$$

---

10. We cannot maintain this with certainty, since the antigen test can still potentially falsely produce a positive result, even though there is no virus in the sample. That is, one cannot credibly claim that  $(r, y) = (0, 1) \Rightarrow (t, y) = (0, 1)$ .

**Corollary 1.** *Suppose that Assumption 2A holds. Let  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  be a sharp identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  given a value  $(s_1, s_0)$  as defined in Proposition 1, or Proposition 2. Then  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$  in (11) is a sharp identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  if  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ .*

Any set  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  contains only the values of  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  that are consistent with the observed data and  $(s_1, s_0)$ . The union of sets  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  over all possible  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$  then only contains the values of  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  that are consistent with the observed data and at least one  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ . Hence, the identified set  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$  is the smallest possible under the maintained assumptions.

The set  $\mathcal{S}$  may take different forms. Expected ones would include sets of finitely many values, line segments or rectangles. In general, within  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$  test performance measures  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$  will no longer necessarily be linearly dependent. The set  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$  may not be a line segment in  $[0, 1]^2$ , but rather a union of line segments.

**Remark 4.** *Values  $(s_1, s_0)$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  and Assumption 3 are refutable. Since  $P(y = 1) \in (0, 1)$ , from (1) it follows that  $\forall_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} : P(r = 1) \in (1 - s_0, s_1)$ . If  $\exists_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} : P(r = 1) \notin (1 - s_0, s_1)$ , then such values  $(s_1, s_0)$  cannot be the true reference test performance measures or  $P(y = 1) \notin (0, 1)$ .*

#### 2.4.1 Credibility of Assuming Knowledge of Reference Test Performance

One might rightfully ask how it is possible to credibly come up with  $(s_1, s_0)$  or  $\mathcal{S}$  for a reference test  $r$ . To identify the performance of  $r$  by means of conventional test performance studies, one would require a different reference test whose performance would have to be known, which again would have to be determined using yet another reference test, and so on. It may seem that researchers would be entering a vicious cycle. Hence Assumption 2 or even Assumption 2A might appear untenable. Yet, knowledge of  $(s_1, s_0)$  is routinely maintained by researchers in practice.

Performance of certain tests used as references can be learned via alternative methods such as those in Hui and Walter (1980), and Kanji et al. (2021) that do not require a reference test with known  $(s_1, s_0)$ . The latter is used to choose  $(s_1, s_0)$  in Section 5 of this paper. Such methods rely on stronger assumptions than standard performance studies and are applicable only in specific settings. Still, they may allow us to find  $(s_1, s_0)$  for certain reference tests. Furthermore, tests are generally expected to have precisely measured analytical performance. Woloshin, Patel, and Kesselheim (2020) explain that analytical performance may not always accurately represent clinical performance denoted by  $(s_1, s_0)$ . Nonetheless, it may provide some information on how the tests will perform in clinical settings. For example, Kucirka et al. (2020) consider COVID-19 RT-PCR tests to be perfectly specific due to their perfect analytical specificity.<sup>11</sup> Finally, it is sensible to assume that practitioners will accumulate at least some knowledge of test performance through use. Information on patient health statuses needed to do so can be obtained through means other than reference tests. Examples are autopsy reports, positive reactions to illness-specific treatment regimes, or

<sup>11</sup>. Specificity on contrived laboratory samples containing other pathogens, but not SARS-CoV-2.

invasive tests that are not well suited to be used as references, such as biopsies or pathology reports following prophylactic surgeries.

The arguments above suggest that it is plausible that researchers may be able to come up with a value of  $(s_1, s_0)$  or a set  $\mathcal{S}$  for their test  $r$ . If no knowledge on the performance of  $r$  can be acquired or credibly assumed, Emerson et al. (2018) explain that one cannot reasonably expect to use such a test as a reference in conventional studies. A standardized procedure for choosing the appropriate  $(s_1, s_0)$  or  $\mathcal{S}$  is outside of the scope of this paper, but is an important question for future applications.

### 3 Identification of Derived Parameters

Sensitivity and specificity are often used to derive other parameters of interest. Two notable examples are: 1) prevalence in a population being screened; 2) test predictive values. Both will be defined in detail in the following subsections. If the operating characteristics of the test are partially identified, the derived parameters will be too. I demonstrate how to find their corresponding identified sets and show how the particular structure of the identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  affects the sharpness of bounds on prevalence.

All mentioned applications are sensible only if the identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  is externally valid. The researcher must find it credible that the test will perform similarly in the population of interest as it did in the study population used to measure performance. This is an often maintained assumption both in the literature and in practice, albeit implicitly. Mulherin and Miller (2002) emphasize that clinicians should consider study samples carefully to determine whether the results are generalizable to their specific patient population. For example, if the test performance has been measured on a population of patients with severe respiratory symptoms it may not be plausible to claim that the results will extrapolate readily to asymptomatic screening of some other population. However, if the operating characteristics were bounded using an asymptomatic population with similar traits, then the conclusions may be more plausible. External validity will be assumed throughout this section.

#### 3.1 Bounding Prevalence in Screened Populations

Suppose that a researcher is interested in learning the true prevalence  $P(y = 1)$  in a population that is undergoing screening using a test  $t$ . Assume that the whole population is tested exactly once. This is a standard problem in epidemiology where the prevalence can be found for known identified operating characteristics  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$ , as explained by Gart and Buck (1966), Greenland (1996) and Diggle (2011). It follows directly from the law of total probability:

$$P(y = 1) = \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0 - 1}{\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1}. \tag{12}$$

Proposition 3 extends the identity above to the case when  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  are partially identified.

**Proposition 3.** Let  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  be an identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  obtained from an externally valid study for a known  $(s_1, s_0)$ . Let  $\theta_j^L$  and  $\theta_j^H$  be the smallest and largest values of  $\theta_j$  in the identified set. Then:

$$P(y = 1) \in \left[ \min \left\{ \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^L - 1}{\theta_1^L + \theta_0^L - 1}, \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^H - 1}{\theta_1^H + \theta_0^H - 1} \right\}, \max \left\{ \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^L - 1}{\theta_1^L + \theta_0^L - 1}, \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^H - 1}{\theta_1^H + \theta_0^H - 1} \right\} \right] = \Pi_{s_1, s_0} \quad (13)$$

when  $\forall (\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) : \theta_1 \neq 1 - \theta_0$ , and  $P(y = 1) \in [0, 1]$  otherwise.

See proof on page 42.

Let  $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = \{\theta_j : (\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)\}$  denote the individual bounds on  $\theta_j$  for  $j = 0, 1$ . The sets  $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0)$  and  $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_0}(s_1, s_0)$  are also referred to as projection bounds on  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$ .

**Remark 5.** If we were to disregard the linear structure of the identified set  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  by supposing that it is a rectangle  $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0) \times \mathcal{G}_{\theta_0}(s_1, s_0)$ , then the bounds on the prevalence would be:

$$P(y = 1) \in \left[ \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^L - 1}{\theta_1^H + \theta_0^L - 1}, \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^H - 1}{\theta_1^L + \theta_0^H - 1} \right] = \bar{\Pi}_{s_1, s_0}. \quad (14)$$

It is direct that  $\Pi_{s_1, s_0} \subset \bar{\Pi}_{s_1, s_0}$  whenever  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  is not a singleton, so that  $\theta_j^H > \theta_j^L$  for  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ . Disregarding the linear structure of the identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  will yield strictly wider bounds on prevalence.

**Corollary 2.** Let  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$  be an identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  obtained from an externally valid study where  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ . Then:

$$P(y = 1) \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \Pi_{s_1, s_0} = \Pi_{\mathcal{S}} \quad (15)$$

when  $\forall (\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S}) : \theta_1 \neq 1 - \theta_0$ , and  $P(y = 1) \in [0, 1]$  otherwise.

If the shape of  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$  was disregarded by assuming that the identified set was a rectangle, bounds  $\bar{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}}$  analogous to the ones in (14) can still be formed, and it would hold that  $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} \subset \bar{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}}$ .

As a result of high communicability of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, identification of population prevalence through testing has become an important goal for various institutions, states and countries. Daily positivity rates are used to decide upon further mitigation measures that will be implemented. The rates are treated as a measure of prevalence, though they are not the same when the tests are imperfect. The use of such a heuristic to make quick decisions is not surprising, given the failure of the random testing assumption makes it difficult to precisely measure the true prevalence, as Manski and Molinari (2021) explain. In this setting, the bounds in (13) and (15) do not hold without correction. Stoye (2022) provides the appropriate bounds on prevalence relying on known bounds on sensitivity and specificity. The identified sets for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  can be inputs in the bounds on  $P(y = 1)$  such as those derived by the author.



Some institutions do mandate regular population-level or random screening, in which case the (13) and (15) may hold. Many universities have mandatory COVID-19 antigen test screening that is conducted on all students. If each student is tested exactly once, bounds on the prevalence given above are valid. If such testing is mandated with regular frequency, then formulating a time series of prevalence bounds is also possible. Adaptation of the method when there are multiple tests is left for future research.

### 3.2 Bounding Predictive Values

Positive predictive value (PPV) is the probability that a patient is diseased conditional on receiving a positive test result. Negative predictive value (NPV) is the probability that a patient who has tested negative is truly healthy. Clinicians are usually more concerned with knowing predictive values of a test  $t$  than its sensitivity and specificity.

As Watson, Whiting, and Brush (2020) explain, the probability of the patient being diseased prior to observing a test result is referred to as a pre-test probability. For a known pre-test probability, sensitivity and specificity, the predictive values are easily found using Bayes' theorem. Clinicians settle on a pre-test probability using the knowledge of local rates of infection and patients' symptoms and characteristics. I denote it as  $\pi_X = P(y = 1|X)$  where  $X$  stands for a vector of covariates observed by the clinician.

The predictive values are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} PPV &= P(y = 1|t = 1, X) = \frac{\theta_1 \pi_X}{\theta_1 \pi_X + (1 - \theta_0)(1 - \pi_X)} \\ NPV &= P(y = 0|t = 0, X) = \frac{\theta_0(1 - \pi_X)}{\theta_0(1 - \pi_X) + (1 - \theta_1)\pi_X}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Manski (2020) provides bounds on predictive values for COVID-19 antibody tests using point identified values of  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$ , when the pre-test probability  $\pi_X$  is bounded. The author notes that the analysis can be generalized to take bounds rather than exact values of  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$  as inputs. Ziegler (2021) extends the analysis of predictive values when  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$  are partially identified due to an imperfect reference test, assuming that  $s_0 = 1$ . The bounds below do not require that  $s_0 = 1$  in the performance study.

Note that in (16)  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$  appear to be independent of  $X$ . This is not generally true according to Willis (2008). It is conceivable that for patients with severe symptoms tests may exhibit higher sensitivity compared to that for patients with mild clinical manifestations. However, this question is primarily one of external validity of  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  rather than of independence. Mulherin and Miller (2002) clarify that clinicians should consider study samples used to find  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  carefully to determine whether the results are generalizable to their specific patient population. The omission of  $X$  does not mean that sensitivity or specificity do not depend on it, but that their measurements in (16) have been made in study populations with similar relevant traits in  $X$ . I follow this practice and keep  $X$  implicit.

Assume that the externally valid identification region  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  and the pre-test probability of the clinician  $\pi_X$  are known. From (16), it can be seen that both PPV and NPV increase with  $\theta_1$

and  $\theta_0$ . Thus, the bounds are:

$$\begin{aligned} PPV &\in \left[ \frac{\theta_1^L \pi_X}{\theta_1^L \pi_X + (1 - \theta_0^L)(1 - \pi_X)}, \frac{\theta_1^H \pi_X}{\theta_1^H \pi_X + (1 - \theta_0^H)(1 - \pi_X)} \right] \\ NPV &\in \left[ \frac{\theta_0^L (1 - \pi_X)}{\theta_0^L (1 - \pi_X) + (1 - \theta_1^L) \pi_X}, \frac{\theta_0^H (1 - \pi_X)}{\theta_0^H (1 - \pi_X) + (1 - \theta_1^H) \pi_X} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

If the clinician is not willing to settle on a single value of  $\pi_X$ , rather on a range of values  $\pi_X \in [\pi_L, \pi_H]$ , the bounds are simply:

$$\begin{aligned} PPV &\in \left[ \frac{\theta_1^L \pi_L}{\theta_1^L \pi_L + (1 - \theta_0^L)(1 - \pi_L)}, \frac{\theta_1^H \pi_H}{\theta_1^H \pi_H + (1 - \theta_0^H)(1 - \pi_H)} \right] \\ NPV &\in \left[ \frac{\theta_0^L \pi_H}{\theta_0^L \pi_H + (1 - \theta_1^L)(1 - \pi_H)}, \frac{\theta_0^H \pi_L}{\theta_0^H \pi_L + (1 - \theta_1^H)(1 - \pi_L)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The bounds are generalizable analogously to the previously outlined case for bounding prevalence when when the identification region  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  is expanded to  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} PPV &\in \left[ \min_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})} \left\{ \frac{\theta_1 \pi_L}{\theta_1 \pi_L + (1 - \theta_0)(1 - \pi_L)} \right\}, \max_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})} \left\{ \frac{\theta_1 \pi_H}{\theta_1 \pi_H + (1 - \theta_0)(1 - \pi_H)} \right\} \right] \\ NPV &\in \left[ \min_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})} \left\{ \frac{\theta_0 \pi_H}{\theta_0 \pi_H + (1 - \theta_1)(1 - \pi_H)} \right\}, \max_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})} \left\{ \frac{\theta_0 \pi_L}{\theta_0 \pi_L + (1 - \theta_1)(1 - \pi_L)} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

## 4 Sample Data

Identified sets for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  in Section 2 can be found when  $P(t, r)$  is fully known. In practice, researchers must use sample data to estimate the identified set and do inference on the points in the set. I demonstrate consistent estimation of the identified set and construction of confidence sets for the points in the identified set that are uniformly consistent in level over a family of permissible distributions that is relevant in the application of this paper.

### 4.1 Estimation

Let  $W_i = (t_i, r_i) \in \{0, 1\}^2$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  constitute the observed data of  $n$  i.i.d observations from the distribution  $P(t, r) \in \mathbf{P}$ , where  $\mathbf{P}$  is a family of categorical distributions with 4 categories. Let  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  denote an arbitrary identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  given  $(s_1, s_0)$  from any of the propositions above, and  $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0)$  the corresponding identified set for  $\theta_j$  with  $j = 0, 1$ . A natural way of estimating  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  is to replace the population parameters in the closed form expressions for the bounds with consistent sample estimators. This is known as a plug-in estimator of the identified set.

Let  $\mathbb{1}\{\cdot\}$  denote the indicator function. Suppose first that  $(s_1, s_0)$  are known. Under the assumptions,

$\hat{P}(t = j, r = k) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{t_i=j, r_i=k\}}}{n}$  are consistent estimators of  $P(t = j, r = k)$  for all  $(j, k) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ . Combining  $\hat{P}(t = j, r = k)$  with the knowledge of  $(s_1, s_0)$  yields  $\hat{P}_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l)$  for every  $k, l \in \{0, 1\}^2$ . Next, the plug-in estimator  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0)$  for the identified set of a single parameter  $\theta_j$  follows immediately by inputting  $\hat{P}(t = j, r = k)$  and  $\hat{P}_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l)$  into the bounds in Proposition 1, or Proposition 2. Finally, by searching for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  over a fine grid covering  $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ , one can find all values  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  that correspond to values in  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0)$ . These will form a line segment and constitute a consistent plug-in estimator  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  of the joint identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ .

**Remark 6.** *Manski and Pepper (1998) note that consistency of plug in estimators when the bounds consist of maxima and minima of population parameters is easy to establish, as long as the parameters can be consistently estimated. The plug-in estimator of the bounds is consistent for the true identified set in the sense that the Hausdorff distance  $d_H(\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0), \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .<sup>12</sup>*

To see this, note that  $\hat{P}(t = j, r = k) \xrightarrow{P} P(t = j, r = k)$ ,  $\hat{P}(t = j) \xrightarrow{P} P(t = j)$ , and hence  $\hat{P}_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l) \xrightarrow{P} P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l)$  by the continuous mapping theorem as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Denote  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\hat{\theta}_j^L, \hat{\theta}_j^H]$  and  $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\theta_j^L, \theta_j^H]$ . The continuity of the maximum and minimum imply that  $\hat{\theta}_j^L \xrightarrow{P} \theta_j^L$  and  $\hat{\theta}_j^H \xrightarrow{P} \theta_j^H$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Consistency of  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  follows from  $\forall_{(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_0) \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)} : \hat{\theta}_0 = \hat{\theta}_1 \frac{\hat{P}_{s_1, s_0}(y=1)}{\hat{P}_{s_1, s_0}(y=0)} + 1 - \frac{\hat{P}(t=1)}{\hat{P}_{s_1, s_0}(y=0)}$  and the facts that  $\hat{P}_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) = \frac{\hat{P}(t=1)+s_0-1}{s_1+s_0-1}$  and  $\hat{P}(t = j) \xrightarrow{P} P(t = j)$  for  $j = 0, 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

In the case when  $(s_1, s_0)$  are only known to be bounded by some compact set  $\mathcal{S}$ , one can obtain the consistent estimator  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ . This is done by finding a union of consistent estimators  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  over a fine grid of  $(s_1, s_0)$  imposed on top of  $\mathcal{S}$ . The procedure requires two nested grid-search algorithms, and the level of coarseness of the two grids can impact computation time.

## 4.2 Inference

All diagnostic performance studies must report confidence intervals for  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$ . This is a requirement imposed by the FDA to "quantify the statistical uncertainty in the estimates due to the subject/sample selection process" in the Statistical Guidance on Reporting Results Evaluating Diagnostic Tests. Therefore, inference is of key importance both to applied researchers and to regulators. I show how one can use the method for inference based on moment inequalities from Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014) to form confidence sets that cover the true parameters with at least some pre-specified probability  $1 - \alpha$  and that are uniformly consistent over a family of permissible distributions  $\mathbf{P}$  that is relevant in the application.

Let  $C_n$  be the confidence set of interest and let  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$  be an identification region for  $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_0, s_1, s_0)$  that depends on  $P \in \mathbf{P}$ , and where  $\mathcal{S}$  can be a singleton.<sup>13</sup> Note

12. For sets  $A$  and  $B$  that are closed subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , the Hausdorff distance is defined as  $d_H(A, B) = \max(\sup_{a \in A} \inf_{b \in B} \rho(a, b), \sup_{b \in B} \inf_{a \in A} \rho(a, b))$ , where  $\rho(\cdot, \cdot)$  is some metric defined on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

13. More precisely, we are interested in  $C_n$  for the points in  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) = \{(\theta_1, \theta_0) : \theta \in \Theta(P)\}$ . When  $P(t, r)$  is known, whether one defines the identified set as  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$  or  $\Theta(P)$  is inconsequential.

that  $\theta$  includes reference test performance measures  $(s_1, s_0)$ . This is done to facilitate convenient definition of moment inequalities that represent the identified set of interest, regardless of whether  $(s_1, s_0)$  are known exactly or not. The confidence set  $C_n$  should satisfy:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta(P)} P(\theta \in C_n) \geq (1 - \alpha). \quad (20)$$

One may also be interested in a confidence set  $C_n$  such that:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathbf{P}} P(\Theta(P) \subseteq C_n) \geq (1 - \alpha). \quad (21)$$

The set from (21) asymptotically covers the whole identified set with probability of at least  $1 - \alpha$  uniformly over  $P \in \mathbf{P}$ . Imbens and Manski (2004) show that  $C_n$  defined as (20) is always a subset and can be a proper subset of the one defined as in (21). Therefore, the former will generally be smaller than the latter. Owing to the fact that they then cover the parameters of interest  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  with a probability closer to the nominal level, I restrict my approach to  $C_n$  defined as in (20).

Canay and Shaikh (2017) provide an overview of the recent advances in inference based on moment inequalities that are focused on finding  $C_n$  in partially identified models. They underline the importance of uniform consistency of  $C_n$  in level in these settings. If it fails, it is possible to construct a distribution of the data  $P(t, r)$  such that for any sample size, finite-sample coverage probability of the confidence set is arbitrarily low. In that sense, inference based on confidence intervals that are consistent only pointwise in level may be severely misleading in finite samples.

To use inference methods based on moment inequalities to construct  $C_n$ , the identified set  $\Theta(P)$  must be equivalent to some set  $\tilde{\Theta}(P)$ :

$$\tilde{\Theta}(P) = \{\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S} : E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0 \text{ for } j \in J_1, E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) = 0 \text{ for } j \in J_2\} \quad (22)$$

where  $m_j(W_i, \theta)$  for  $j \in J_1 \cup J_2$  are the components of a random function  $m : \{0, 1\}^2 \times [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  such that  $|J_1| + |J_2| = k$ . Construction of the uniformly consistent confidence set for points in the identified set  $\tilde{\Theta}(P)$  is done by imposing a fine grid over the parameter space  $[0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$  for  $\theta$  and performing test inversion using inference methods such as those in Andrews and Soares (2010), Andrews and Barwick (2012), Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014), and Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2019).<sup>14</sup>

Identified sets derived in the previous section are representable by (22). Focus in particular on the bounds

---

14. We are interested in the confidence set for  $\theta' = (\theta_1, \theta_0)$ . When  $\mathcal{S}$  is a singleton, then the distinction between the confidence sets for  $\theta'$  and  $\theta$  is immaterial. When  $\mathcal{S}$  is not a singleton, the projection of the confidence set for  $\theta'$  may be conservative, in which case subvector inference methods outlined in Bugni, Canay, and Shi (2017) and Kaido, Molinari, and Stoye (2019) may exhibit higher power. However, they also warrant additional assumptions on  $\mathbf{P}$ . Since the full parameter space is low-dimensional, I limit myself to projections in this paper.

for  $\theta_1$  in Proposition 1 given  $(s_1, s_0)$  for intuition. The bounds were:

$$\theta_1 \in \left[ \max\left(0, P(t=1, r=1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r=1, y=0)\right) + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r=0, y=1) - P(t=0, r=0)\right), \right. \\ \left. \min\left(P(t=1, r=0), P_{s_1, s_0}(r=0, y=1)\right) + \min\left(P(t=1, r=1), P_{s_1, s_0}(r=1, y=1)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y=1)}.$$

There are four possible values determined by the population parameters that are all lower bounds on  $\theta_1$  given  $(s_1, s_0)$ . Similarly there are four values that are all upper bounds. Any  $\theta_1$  in the identified set must be between these eight values. One value of the lower bound is trivial, it only states  $\theta_1 \geq 0$ . The same is true for one upper bound value,  $\theta_1 \leq 1$ . Both can be omitted since  $\theta_1 \in [0, 1]$  by definition.

We can represent the bound on  $\theta_1$  using six moment inequalities, corresponding to the six non-trivial boundary values of the identified set.<sup>15</sup> Proposition 1 implies that we only need to include one additional moment equality to represent the joint identification region for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ . Then the moment function  $m(W_i, \theta)$  representing the identified set  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$  for  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  from Proposition 1 will have  $k = 7$ , where  $J_1 = \{1, \dots, 6\}$  and  $J_2 = \{7\}$ .

**Proposition 4.** *Let the moment function  $m$  be:*

$$m(W_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} m_1(W_i, \theta) \\ m_2(W_i, \theta) \\ m_3(W_i, \theta) \\ m_4(W_i, \theta) \\ m_5(W_i, \theta) \\ m_6(W_i, \theta) \\ m_7(W_i, \theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (-\theta_1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1)r_i \\ (-\theta_1 + 1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (r_i - 1)(1 - t_i) \\ (-\theta_1 + 1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1) \\ \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \\ (\theta_1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i(1 - r_i) \\ (\theta_1 - 1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i \\ (\theta_0 - 1) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right) - \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + t_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

*Moment inequalities defined by  $m$  represent the joint identification region  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$  for  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  defined in Proposition 1. For each  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$  such that  $E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ , it must be that  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ . Conversely, if  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ , then  $E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ .*

See proof on page 43.

The system in (23) is simple to adapt to the cases considered in Section 2.3. I do this first when the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for  $y = 1$  as in Proposition 2. Again note that there are three non-trivial values that are lower bounds, identical to the ones in the previous case. There

<sup>15</sup> The bounds on  $\theta_1$  are sums of intersection bounds on  $P(t=1, r=j, y=1)$  over  $j=0,1$ . An alternative route may be to expand the approach of Chernozhukov, Lee, and Rosen (2013). In the current form, it is unable to capture the linear relationship between  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  which is shown to be important for sharp bounds on derived parameters in Section 3. Moment inequality methods require no adaptation and are a natural choice in this setting.

are now four non-trivial values that are upper bounds. One of them being:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) &\leq \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2} + P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1) = \frac{1 + s_1}{2} P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \\ \Leftrightarrow \theta_1 &\leq \frac{1 + s_1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

There are no parameters pertaining to the population distribution in (24). This is a restriction on the parameter space for  $\theta_1$ . It then holds that there are three relevant cases for the upper bound on  $\theta_1$ , when the parameter space is appropriately limited. More precisely, since  $\theta_1$  can now only take values  $\theta_1 \in [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}]$ , the relevant parameter space for  $\theta$  when the two tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for  $y = 1$  is  $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}] \times [0, 1] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$ , which will be used below.

**Remark 7.** *The restriction on the parameter space when the two tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for  $y = 1$  still allows  $\theta_1$  to be higher than  $s_1$ , but not by more than  $\frac{1-s_1}{2}$ .*

**Proposition 5.** *Assume that the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for  $y = 1$ . Let the moment function  $\bar{m}^1$  be:*

$$\bar{m}^1(W_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{m}_1^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_2^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_3^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_4^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_5^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (-\theta_1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1)r_i \\ (-\theta_1 + 1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (r_i - 1)(1 - t_i) \\ (-\theta_1 + 1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1) \\ \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \\ (\theta_1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i(1 - r_i) \\ \left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2}\right) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i \\ (\theta_0 - 1) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right) - \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + t_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

Moment inequalities and equalities defined by  $\bar{m}^1$  for  $J_1 = \{1, \dots, 6\}$  and  $J_2 = \{7\}$  represent the joint identification region  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$  for  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  defined in Proposition 2 for  $y = 1$ . For each  $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}] \times [0, 1] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$  such that  $E_P(\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ , it must be that  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ . Conversely, if  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ , then  $E_P(\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ .

See proof on page 45.

Next, assume that the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for  $y = 0$ . By established logic, we decompose the appropriate bounds on  $\theta_0$  to construct the appropriate moment inequalities. As in the previous case, the three non-trivial lower-bound values are identical to the ones when

there is no tendency to wrongly agree for any  $y$ . There are four cases for the upper bound, one of which is:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_0 P_{s_1, s_0}(y=0) &\leq \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r=1, y=0)}{2} + P_{s_1, s_0}(r=0, y=0) = \frac{1+s_0}{2} P_{s_1, s_0}(y=0) \\ \Leftrightarrow \theta_0 &\leq \frac{1+s_0}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Again, this is a restriction on the parameter space, since it states only that  $\theta_0 \in [0, \frac{1+s_0}{2}]$ . The relevant parameter space for  $\theta$  when the two tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for  $y=0$  is  $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, 1] \times [0, \frac{1+s_0}{2}] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$ . Symmetrically, the restriction allows  $\theta_0 > s_0$ , but not by more than  $\frac{1-s_0}{2}$ .

**Remark 8.** *If the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for  $y=0$ , then the function  $\bar{m}^0$  defining moment inequalities that represent the corresponding identified set for  $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, 1] \times [0, \frac{1+s_0}{2}] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$  would be:*

$$\bar{m}^0(W_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{m}_1^0(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_2^0(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_3^0(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_4^0(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_5^0(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_6^0(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_7^0(W_i, \theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (-\theta_0 + s_0) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right) + (r_i - 1)t_i \\ (-\theta_0 + 1 - s_0) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right) - t_i r_i \\ (-\theta_0 + 1) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right) - t_i \\ \theta_0 \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right) + (t_i - 1) \\ (\theta_0 - s_0) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right) - r_i(1 - t_i) \\ \left(\theta_0 + \frac{-1 + s_0}{2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right) - (1 - t_i)(1 - r_i) \\ (\theta_0 - 1) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right) - \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + t_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

The proof is analogous to that of Proposition 5.

Finally, the same steps yield a moment function that defines the identified set when the tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for both  $y=1$  and  $y=0$ . As in the case where the tendency exists only for  $y=1$ , the appropriate parameter space is  $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}] \times [0, 1] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$ .

**Proposition 6.** *Assume that the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for  $y=1$  and  $y=0$ . Let the moment function  $\bar{m}$  be equal to  $\bar{m}^1$  in (25) in all components except  $\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta)$ , and  $\bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta)$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta) &= \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i + \frac{1}{2} \left( r_i - s_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right) \\ \bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta) &= \left( \theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2} \right) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i + \frac{1}{2} \left( r_i - s_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Then  $\bar{m}$  represents the identified set  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$  for  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  defined in Proposition 2. For each  $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}] \times [0, 1] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$  such that  $E_P(\bar{m}_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j=1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ , it must be that  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ . Conversely, if  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ , then  $E_P(\bar{m}_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j=1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ .

See proof on page 46.

Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014), Theorem 3.1 provides sufficient conditions for uniform consistency of confidence sets over a large family of distributions. Assumption 4 defines a family  $\mathbf{P}$  to which the conclusions of Theorem 3.1 apply. This is demonstrated by Theorem 1 below.

**Assumption 4.** *There exists a number  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $P(t = j, r = k) \geq \varepsilon$  for all  $(j, k) \in \{0, 1\}^2$  and any  $P(t, r) \in \mathbf{P}$ .*

The assumption restricts  $\mathbf{P}$  to distributions  $P(t, r)$  such that all outcomes  $(t, r) \in \{0, 1\}^2$  have probability that is bounded away from zero. It serves a technical purpose, ensuring that the uniform integrability condition required by Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014), Theorem 3.1 holds. The assumption appears reasonable in the analyzed data, as discussed in Section 5.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2A, 3, and 4 hold. Then for any component  $m_j(W_i, \theta)$  in (23), (25), (27), and (28):*

1.  $Var_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) > 0$  and for all  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ ;
2.  $\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta(P)} E_P \left[ \left( \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right)^2 \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right| > \lambda \right\} \right] = 0$ ;

where  $\mu_j(\theta, P) = E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta))$  and  $\sigma_j(\theta, P) = Var_P(m_j(W_i, \theta))$ .

See proof on page 47.

Theorem 1 enables us to use the inference method from Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014) to construct confidence sets  $C_n$  for points  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  in the identified sets defined by Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 that satisfy (20) when the relevant family of population distributions conforms to Assumption 4.

## 5 Application - Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Antigen Test

In this section, I apply the developed method to existing study data to provide confidence and estimated identified sets for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  of the rapid antigen COVID-19 test with the currently highest market share in the United States - *Abbott BinaxNOW COVID-19 Ag2 CARD* test.

Testing has been a crucial containment measure during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Several rapid tests have been made available to the general public under the FDA Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) protocol. The United States leadership plans to expand access to rapid testing by providing one billion free tests to the domestic population. With such widespread use, one would expect that the true performance of the tests is well known. Yet, Fitzpatrick et al. (2021) explain that may not be the case. They emphasize that the false negative rate of the *BinaxNOW* test may be severely understated by the reported “apparent” analog due to imperfect reference tests. The rate is a particularly important parameter for organizations using the test for screening. They highlight that “apparent” measures can unjustifiably lead the users to believe that the test must have high sensitivity, even when this is not true.



Template for Developers of Antigen Tests required by the FDA for EUA requires: “*The comparator test should be one of the more sensitive RT-PCR assays authorized by FDA ... Candidate tests should demonstrate a minimum sensitivity of 80% for all sample types submitted.*”<sup>16</sup> However, Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020), Kucirka et al. (2020), Kanji et al. (2021), Dramé et al. (2020), and Hernández-Huerta et al. (2020) explain that RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 tests are imperfectly sensitive. Using them as a reference yields “apparent” and generally not real sensitivity and specificity. Interpreting the results as measures of true performance may be severely misleading.

The more recent FDA Template for Developers of Molecular and Antigen Diagnostic COVID-19 Tests for Home Use<sup>17</sup> amends the wording by stating that the tests must instead demonstrate at least 80% *positive agreement* with an approved RT-PCR test. Positive agreement is equivalent to “apparent” sensitivity. However, since “apparent” measures do not represent true test performance, they are not of interest. In practice, FDA approves tests which have at least 80% estimated positive agreement.

I revisit the study results in the submitted EUA documentation<sup>18</sup>, as well as in an independent study by Shah et al. (2021) performed during a mass surge testing campaign. I compare the results with the corresponding “apparent” estimates from the original documentation and the instructions for use pamphlet.

To construct the confidence sets, I implement the test relying on the maximum statistic from Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014) denoted by  $\phi_n^{RSW2}$  in Bai, Santos, and Shaikh (2021). I perform test inversion over a fine grid of  $10^5$  points for the relevant parameter space for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ , and additionally over 10 points over  $\mathcal{S}$ , where applicable. Following the original paper, I use 500 bootstrap samples to find the critical values and set  $\beta = \alpha/10$ .

## 5.1 Identification Assumptions

To apply the method, one must first need to determine a credible set of values  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$  for the reference RT-PCR test. Following Kucirka et al. (2020) who cite perfect analytical specificity, I maintain that  $s_0 = 1$ . The same assumption has been used in existing work, such as Manski (2020), Kanji et al. (2021), Ziegler (2021), and Stoye (2022). To the extent of my knowledge, its plausibility has not been challenged in the literature. While it is possible to encounter false positive results with perfect analytical specificity, those would arise as a result of specimen contamination. I assume that does not happen in a well-conducted study.

In the absence of a perfect gold standard, it is impossible to identify sensitivity of the RT-PCR tests by means of a conventional diagnostic test performance study. Some studies use alternative approaches to estimate the parameter of interest. Kanji et al. (2021) provide a discordant result analysis of the RT-PCR test used for frontline testing of symptomatic individuals in Alberta, Canada. The authors define discordant results as initial negative RT-PCR findings followed by a positive test result within the incubation period. The initial negative samples were retested by three alternative RT-PCR assays targeting different genes. If

16. <https://www.fda.gov/media/137907/download>

17. Link:<https://www.fda.gov/media/140615/download>

18. Link:<https://www.fda.gov/media/141570/download>

at least one alternative test yielded a positive result, the initial result was treated as a false negative finding. Assuming perfect specificities of each of the three alternative tests, and perfect sensitivity of the combined testing procedure, they estimate the sensitivity of the used RT-PCR test at 90.3%. Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020) use data from 34 observational studies to estimate false negative rates, defining false negatives to be patients who were symptomatic and negative, but subsequently positive on the same or different RT-PCR test within the incubation period. They emphasize that the estimates obtained on some of the studies can be severely biased and state that the corresponding findings may have "very low certainty of evidence". There are two estimates based on data from the United States, only one of which they do not consider to be at high risk of being biased. That estimate is 10%, yielding the corresponding estimate of sensitivity of 90%. Following the two references, I assume that  $s_1 = 0.9$ .

RT-PCR tests may differ in terms of sensitivity. Fitzpatrick et al. (2021) stress that the fact that studies often do not specify the used RT-PCR test may be a source of additional ambiguity. The majority of estimates obtained from the 34 data sets used by Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020) indicate that the sensitivity may be lower than 90% for some tests. To accommodate for that possibility in the studies analyzed here, I further assume that the corresponding false negative rate may be up to twice as high as the one implied by  $s_1 = 0.9$ . Therefore, I also provide results assuming  $s_1 \in [0.8, 0.9]$ . The set  $\mathcal{S}$  is either  $\mathcal{S} = \{(0.9, 1)\}$  or  $\mathcal{S} = [0.8, 0.9] \times \{1\}$ .

Finally, I assume that the antigen and RT-PCR tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for  $y = 1$  and all assumed  $(s_1, s_0)$ , following the reasoning outlined in Section 2.3. The plausibility of the tendency to wrongly agree for  $y = 0$  is difficult to establish. Therefore, I do not maintain that assumption.

## 5.2 Data and Results

The study measuring the performance is outlined in the EUA documentation and the instructions for use. The estimates were obtained in a sample of 460 participants who were tested within 7 days of symptom onset. Shah et al. (2021) perform the same analysis based on an independent sample of 2110 individuals enrolled at a community testing site. This number includes 1188 symptomatic individuals, where 929 were tested within 7 days of symptom onset. I omit the symptomatic individuals tested more than 7 days after initial symptoms for comparability with the EUA study. I also separately analyze the performance on 877 asymptomatic participants to provide plausible estimates of performance in the absence of symptoms. The data is summarized in Table 1.

In all three samples, estimates of joint probabilities  $\hat{P}(t = j, r = k)$  for  $(r, k) \in \{0, 1\}^2$  are bounded away from zero. I find it reasonable to maintain that population distributions which generated the observed samples are found in a family  $\mathbf{P}$  for which Assumption 4 holds.

The original EUA was granted based on interim results of the study in which the test exhibited estimated "apparent" sensitivity and specificity of (91.7%, 100%), implying an estimated "apparent" false negative rate of 8.3%. Observe that this is lower than the estimated false negative rate for certain RT-PCR tests

Data	$N$	$(t_i, r_i)$			
		(1, 1)	(0, 1)	(1, 0)	(0, 0)
EUA Sx	460	99	18	5	338
Shah et al. (2021) Sx	929	199	44	2	686
Shah et al. (2021) ASx	877	33	15	5	824

Table 1: Number of outcomes  $(t_i, r_i)$  in analyzed studies. Sx denotes the symptomatic, and ASx the asymptomatic individuals.

which should be more sensitive than antigen tests. Subsequent results of the full study yielded “apparent” operating characteristics estimates (84.6%, 98.5%), with the corresponding false negative rate of 15.4%. Public statements and media releases erroneously cite all of the estimates as estimates of true performance.<sup>19</sup> Both the interim and final estimates are reported on the instructions-for-use pamphlet accompanying the test. I present the confidence and estimated identified sets for the true sensitivity and specificity in the figures below and compare them with the estimates of “apparent” measures. To preserve the particular structure of the identified set that is lost through projection, the results are represented graphically. Regardless, projected bounds can be very informative and their estimates are given in Table 2.

Figure 1 (a) is drawn under the assumption that  $\mathcal{S} = \{(0.9, 1)\}$ . The estimated projected bounds for  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$  are  $[0.761, 0.800]$  and  $[0.985, 1.000]$ , respectively. The bounds are revealing. The whole estimated identified set is shifted with respect to the estimated “apparent” measures. “Apparent” measures overstate the sensitivity and understate the specificity. The estimate of “apparent” sensitivity does not lie in the projected bounds for true sensitivity.<sup>20</sup> The hatched red region is the 95% joint projection Clopper-Pearson exact confidence set for the “apparent” measures, and the green region is the 95% confidence set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ . The areas of the two confidence sets are similar.

Panel (b) relaxes the assumption to  $\mathcal{S} = [0.8, 0.9] \times \{1\}$ . The solid red region now represents the estimated identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ . It is no longer a line. Both the confidence and the estimated identified set are larger, but they remain informative. The estimated projected bounds for  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$  are  $[0.677, 0.800]$  and  $[0.984, 1.000]$ , respectively.

In both panels the red dot representing the estimate of “apparent” measures is outside the confidence set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ . While this is not a formal test of equality of two random vectors, we can still see that at the 5% significance level the hypothesis  $H_0 : (\theta_1, \theta_0) = (84.6\%, 98.5\%)$  would be rejected. In other words, under the assumptions, the true sensitivity and specificity are not jointly equal to currently often cited “apparent” values (84.6%, 98.5%) at the ubiquitous level of significance. The same argument holds for the interim “apparent” estimates (91.7%, 100%).

**Remark 9.** *The results from the EUA study data show that under the assumptions and depending on*

<sup>19</sup>. For example: <https://www.bloomberg.com/press-releases/2020-12-16/abbott-s-binaxnow-covid-19-rapid-test-receives-fda-emergency-use-authorization-for-first-virtually-guided-at-home-rapid-test-u>.

<sup>20</sup>. Assuming lower values of  $s_1$  with  $s_0 = 1$  further increases the differences.




Figure 1: Confidence sets and estimated identified sets for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  in the EUA study. In panel (a)  $\mathcal{S} = \{(0.9, 1)\}$ , and  $\mathcal{S} = [0.8, 0.9] \times \{1\}$  in panel (b). Red region is the joint projection Clopper-Pearson confidence set for the “apparent” measures.

*interpretation, the test may not satisfy FDA’s original requirement of at least 80% estimated sensitivity. In that case, the FDA requires further exploration of alternative methods of test use, such as serial testing.*

**Remark 10.** *The estimated false negative rate in the EUA study is between 20% and 23.9% for  $(s_1, s_0) = (0.9, 1)$ . These are 1.3 and 1.55 times larger than the corresponding estimates of “apparent” false negative rate in the final EUA study. Comparing to often-cited interim results, the estimate of the false negative rate is between 2.41 and 2.88 times larger than the “apparent” analog. Relaxing the assumption to imperfectly known  $(s_1, s_0)$  further magnifies the difference. The estimated false negative rate is then up to 3.89 times higher than the analogous interim result.*

*The average number of people who are infected and missed by the antigen test is up to 3.89 higher than the test users may be led to believe by the reported “apparent” estimates.*

Panels (a) and (b) of Figure 2 represent the results obtained from the data for symptomatic participants in Shah et al. (2021). The projected estimated bounds on  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$  when  $s_1 = 0.9$  are  $[0.737, 0.744]$  and  $[0.997, 1.000]$ . The bounds are narrow and again show a substantial difference between estimates of the true and “apparent” sensitivity. Relaxing the assumption of known  $s_1$  yields wider, but still informative, projected estimated bounds. For  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_0$  they are  $[0.655, 0.744]$  and  $[0.997, 1.000]$ .

As expected, the results for the asymptomatic population in Figure 3 demonstrate even lower estimates than in the symptomatic one. A striking finding is that the estimated false negative rate can be up to 5.4 times greater in asymptomatic patients than the “apparent” counterpart in the interim results for symptomatic patients. While this finding can vary substantially with the assumptions posed for  $\mathcal{S}$ , assuming lower possible values for  $s_1$  would further magnify this difference. If one were to use the lowest estimate  $s_1 = 0.42$  from Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020) as the true  $s_1$ , the estimated false negative rate would be 8.56 times larger. However, it important to emphasize that this estimate has low credibility according to the authors.




Figure 2: Confidence sets and estimated identified sets for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  in the symptomatic population of Shah et al. (2021). In panel (a)  $\mathcal{S} = \{(0.9, 1)\}$ , and  $\mathcal{S} = [0.8, 0.9] \times \{1\}$  in panel (b). Red region is the joint projection Clopper-Pearson confidence set for the “apparent” measures.

Hadgu (1999) highlights in their critique of discrepant analysis that the an errors in measurement of 2.9 percentage points for sensitivity and 2.8 percentage points for specificity are significant. The differences I find in this paper between the estimates of “apparent” and true sensitivity are substantially larger under plausible assumptions. The differences vary between 4.6 and 16.9 percentage points using the EUA study final data. Results from Shah et al. (2021) exacerbate the discrepancies when compared to the final EUA study “apparent” sensitivity to as much 19.1 percentage points in the symptomatic population and 28.6 percentage points in the asymptomatic population. Even though the estimates of specificity remain close to the estimates of “apparent” specificity, the findings for sensitivity warrant further attention.

Data	$\theta_1$ Estimates			$\theta_0$ Estimates		
	Appar.	$s_1 = 0.9$	$s_1 \in [0.8, 0.9]$	Appar.	$s_1 = 0.9$	$s_1 \in [0.8, 0.9]$
EUA Sx	0.846	[0.761, 0.800]	[0.677, 0.800]	0.985	[0.985, 1.000]	[0.984, 1.000]
Shah et al. (2021) Sx	0.819	[0.737, 0.744]	[0.655, 0.744]	0.997	[0.997, 1.000]	[0.997, 1.000]
Shah et al. (2021) ASx	0.688	[0.619, 0.669]	[0.550, 0.669]	0.994	[0.994, 0.997]	[0.994, 0.997]

Table 2: Apparent estimated values and estimated projected bounds for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  for different  $\mathcal{S}$ . Sx denotes the symptomatic, and ASx the asymptomatic individuals.




Figure 3: Confidence sets and estimated identified sets for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  in the asymptotic population of Shah et al. (2021). In panel (a)  $\mathcal{S} = \{(0.9, 1)\}$ , and  $\mathcal{S} = [0.8, 0.9] \times \{1\}$  in panel (b). Red region is the joint projection Clopper-Pearson confidence set for the “apparent” measures.

## 6 Conclusion

Measuring diagnostic test performance requires the knowledge of study participants’ true health statuses. If the statuses were observable, testing would be redundant. They are thus replaced with results from a reference test, which itself is typically imperfect. This results in partial identification of test performance measures.

The paper presents sharp identified sets for sensitivity and specificity in standard settings, assuming at least approximate knowledge of the reference test performance measures, and demonstrates consistent estimation and inference procedures. It is sensible to believe that researchers have at least some approximate knowledge on the performance of the test, making the procedure viable. They may also account for ambiguity by assuming that the operating characteristics are contained in a compact set, rather than exactly known. If no such knowledge exists, one cannot reasonably expect to use the test as a reference.

The ubiquitous approach relies on a stronger and frequently implausible explicit assumption that the reference test is perfect. Consequently, researchers implicitly assume that they know its performance measures exactly. The framework outlined here is a weakening of both the explicit and implicit assumptions. Furthermore, rather than reporting “apparent” performance when required due to reference test imperfection, the provided method enables researchers to obtain the smallest bounds on true performance measures.

The demonstrated differences between the estimated real and “apparent” sensitivities and specificities for an extensively used COVID-19 antigen test are substantial under plausible assumptions drawn from existing literature. They may have important policy or practical implications. Other rapid COVID-19 antigen tests may similarly exhibit significantly higher false negative rates than suggested by previously reported estimates. These results warrant further investigation.

## References

- Andrews, Donald WK, and Panle Jia Barwick. 2012. “Inference for parameters defined by moment inequalities: A recommended moment selection procedure.” *Econometrica* 80 (6): 2805–2826.
- Andrews, Donald WK, and Gustavo Soares. 2010. “Inference for parameters defined by moment inequalities using generalized moment selection.” *Econometrica* 78 (1): 119–157.
- Arevalo-Rodriguez, Ingrid, Diana Buitrago-Garcia, Daniel Simancas-Racines, Paula Zambrano-Achig, Rosa Del Campo, Agustin Ciapponi, Omar Sued, Laura Martinez-Garcia, Anne W Rutjes, Nicola Low, et al. 2020. “False-negative results of initial RT-PCR assays for COVID-19: a systematic review.” *PloS one* 15 (12): e0242958.
- Bai, Yuehao, Andres Santos, and Azeem M Shaikh. 2021. “A Two-Step Method for Testing Many Moment Inequalities.” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 1–11.

- Bhattacharya, Jay, Azeem M Shaikh, and Edward Vytlačil. 2012. “Treatment effect bounds: An application to Swan–Ganz catheterization.” *Journal of Econometrics* 168 (2): 223–243.
- Binney, Nicholas, Christopher Hyde, and Patrick M Bossuyt. 2021. “On the Origin of Sensitivity and Specificity.” *Annals of Internal Medicine* 174 (3): 401–407.
- Boyko, Edward J, Beth W Alderman, and Anna E Baron. 1988. “Reference test errors bias the evaluation of diagnostic tests for ischemic heart disease.” *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 3 (5): 476–481.
- Bugni, Federico A, Ivan A Canay, and Xiaoxia Shi. 2017. “Inference for subvectors and other functions of partially identified parameters in moment inequality models.” *Quantitative Economics* 8 (1): 1–38.
- Canay, Ivan A, and Azeem M Shaikh. 2017. “Practical and theoretical advances in inference for partially identified models.” *Advances in Economics and Econometrics* 2:271–306.
- Chernozhukov, Victor, Denis Chetverikov, and Kengo Kato. 2019. “Inference on causal and structural parameters using many moment inequalities.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 86 (5): 1867–1900.
- Chernozhukov, Victor, Sokbae Lee, and Adam M Rosen. 2013. “Intersection bounds: estimation and inference.” *Econometrica* 81 (2): 667–737.
- Deneef, Peter. 1987. “Evaluating rapid tests for streptococcal pharyngitis: the apparent accuracy of a diagnostic test when there are errors in the standard of comparison.” *Medical Decision Making* 7 (2): 92–96.
- DiCiccio, Thomas J, David M Ritzwoller, Joseph P Romano, and Azeem M Shaikh. 2021. “Confidence Intervals for Seroprevalence.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.15018*.
- Diggle, Peter J. 2011. “Estimating prevalence using an imperfect test.” *Epidemiology Research International* 2011.
- Dramé, Moustapha, Maturin Tabue Tegu, Emeline Proye, Fanny Hequet, Maxime Hentzien, Lukshe Kanagaratnam, and Lidvine Godaert. 2020. “Should RT-PCR be considered a gold standard in the diagnosis of Covid-19?” *Journal of Medical Virology*.
- Emerson, Sarah C, Sushrut S Waikar, Claudio Fuentes, Joseph V Bonventre, and Rebecca A Betensky. 2018. “Biomarker validation with an imperfect reference: Issues and bounds.” *Statistical methods in medical research* 27 (10): 2933–2945.
- Feinstein, A. 2002. “Misguided efforts and future challenges for research on” diagnostic tests”.” *Journal of epidemiology and community health* 56 (5): 330.
- Fitzpatrick, Meagan C, Abhishek Pandey, Chad R Wells, Pratha Sah, and Alison P Galvani. 2021. “Buyer beware: inflated claims of sensitivity for rapid COVID-19 tests.” *The Lancet* 397 (10268): 24–25.



- Gart, John J, and Alfred A Buck. 1966. “Comparison of a Screening Test and a Reference Test in Epidemiologic Studies: A Probabilistic Model for the Comparison of Diagnostic Tests.” *American Journal of Epidemiology* 83 (3): 593–602.
- Greenland, Sander. 1996. “Basic methods for sensitivity analysis of biases.” *International journal of epidemiology* 25 (6): 1107–1116.
- Hadgu, Alula. 1999. “Discrepant analysis: a biased and an unscientific method for estimating test sensitivity and specificity.” *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 52 (12): 1231–1237.
- Hernández-Huerta, María Teresa, Laura Pérez-Campos Mayoral, Luis Manuel Sánchez Navarro, Gabriel Mayoral-Andrade, Eduardo Pérez-Campos Mayoral, Edgar Zenteno, and Eduardo Pérez-Campos. 2020. “Should RT-PCR be considered a gold standard in the diagnosis of Covid-19?” *Journal of Medical Virology*.
- Hui, Siu L, and Xiao H Zhou. 1998. “Evaluation of diagnostic tests without gold standards.” *Statistical methods in medical research* 7 (4): 354–370.
- Hui, Sui L, and Steven D Walter. 1980. “Estimating the error rates of diagnostic tests.” *Biometrics*, 167–171.
- Imbens, Guido W, and Charles F Manski. 2004. “Confidence intervals for partially identified parameters.” *Econometrica* 72 (6): 1845–1857.
- Kaido, Hiroaki, Francesca Molinari, and Jörg Stoye. 2019. “Confidence intervals for projections of partially identified parameters.” *Econometrica* 87 (4): 1397–1432.
- Kanji, Jamil N, Nathan Zelyas, Clayton MacDonald, Kanti Pabbaraju, Muhammad Naeem Khan, Abhaya Prasad, Jia Hu, Mathew Diggle, Byron M Berenger, and Graham Tipples. 2021. “False negative rate of COVID-19 PCR testing: a discordant testing analysis.” *Virology journal* 18 (1): 1–6.
- Kucirka, Lauren M, Stephen A Lauer, Oliver Laeyendecker, Denali Boon, and Justin Lessler. 2020. “Variation in false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction–based SARS-CoV-2 tests by time since exposure.” *Annals of Internal Medicine*.
- Manski, Charles F. 2003. *Partial identification of probability distributions*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- . 2007. *Identification for Prediction and Decision*. Harvard University Press.
- . 2020. “Bounding the accuracy of diagnostic tests, with application to COVID-19 antibody tests.” *Epidemiology* 32 (2): 162–167.
- Manski, Charles F, and Francesca Molinari. 2021. “Estimating the COVID-19 infection rate: Anatomy of an inference problem.” *Journal of Econometrics*.

- Manski, Charles F, and John V Pepper. 1998. *Monotone instrumental variables with an application to the returns to schooling*.
- Mulherin, Stephanie A, and William C Miller. 2002. "Spectrum bias or spectrum effect? Subgroup variation in diagnostic test evaluation." *Annals of internal medicine* 137 (7): 598–602.
- Pollock, Nira R, Jesica R Jacobs, Kristine Tran, Amber E Cranston, Sita Smith, Claire Y O’Kane, Tyler J Roady, Anne Moran, Alison Scarry, Melissa Carroll, et al. 2021. "Performance and implementation evaluation of the Abbott BinaxNOW rapid antigen test in a high-throughput drive-through community testing site in Massachusetts." *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 59 (5): e00083–21.
- Romano, Joseph P, Azeem M Shaikh, and Michael Wolf. 2014. "A practical two-step method for testing moment inequalities." *Econometrica* 82 (5): 1979–2002.
- Shah, Melisa M, Phillip P Salvatore, Laura Ford, Emiko Kamitani, Melissa J Whaley, Kaitlin Mitchell, Dustin W Currie, Clint N Morgan, Hannah E Segaloff, Shirley Lecher, et al. 2021. "Performance of Repeat BinaxNOW Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Antigen Testing in a Community Setting, Wisconsin, November 2020–December 2020." *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 73 (Supplement\_1): S54–S57.
- Siddiqui, Zishan K, Mihir Chaudhary, Matthew L Robinson, Anna B McCall, Ria Peralta, Rogette Esteve, Charles W Callahan, Yukari C Manabe, James D Campbell, J Kristie Johnson, et al. 2021. "Implementation and Accuracy of BinaxNOW Rapid Antigen COVID-19 Test in Asymptomatic and Symptomatic Populations in a High-Volume Self-Referred Testing Site." *Microbiology spectrum* 9 (3): e01008–21.
- Staquet, Maurice, Marcel Rozenzweig, Young Jack Lee, and Franco M Muggia. 1981. "Methodology for the assessment of new dichotomous diagnostic tests." *Journal of chronic diseases* 34 (12): 599–610.
- Stoye, Jörg. 2022. "Bounding infection prevalence by bounding selectivity and accuracy of tests: with application to early COVID-19." *The Econometrics Journal* 25 (1): 1–14.
- Thibodeau, LA. 1981. "Evaluating diagnostic tests." *Biometrics*, 801–804.
- Toulis, Panos. 2021. "Estimation of COVID-19 prevalence from serology tests: A partial identification approach." *Journal of Econometrics* 220 (1): 193–213.
- Vacek, Pamela M. 1985. "The effect of conditional dependence on the evaluation of diagnostic tests." *Biometrics*, 959–968.
- Valenstein, Paul N. 1990. "Evaluating diagnostic tests with imperfect standards." *American Journal of Clinical Pathology* 93 (2): 252–258.
- Watson, Jessica, Penny F Whiting, and John E Brush. 2020. "Interpreting a COVID-19 Test Result." *Bmj* 369.

- Weissleder, Ralph, Hakho Lee, Jina Ko, and Mikael J Pittet. 2020. "COVID-19 diagnostics in context." *Science translational medicine* 12 (546).
- Willis, Brian H. 2008. "Spectrum bias—why clinicians need to be cautious when applying diagnostic test studies." *Family Practice* 25 (5): 390–396.
- Woloshin, Steven, Neeraj Patel, and Aaron S Kesselheim. 2020. "False negative tests for SARS-CoV-2 infection—challenges and implications." *New England Journal of Medicine* 383 (6): e38.
- Yerushalmy, Jacob. 1947. "Statistical problems in assessing methods of medical diagnosis, with special reference to X-ray techniques." *Public Health Reports (1896-1970)*, 1432–1449.
- Zhou, Xiao-Hua, Donna K McClish, and Nancy A Obuchowski. 2009. *Statistical methods in diagnostic medicine*. Vol. 569. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ziegler, Gabriel. 2021. "Binary Classification Tests, Imperfect Standards, and Ambiguous Information," arXiv: 2012.11215 [econ.EM].

# Appendices

## Appendix A Proofs

**Proposition 1.** *The sharp identified set  $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0)$  for parameter  $\theta_j$  and  $j = 0, 1$ , given reference test sensitivity  $s_1$  and specificity  $s_0$  is an interval  $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\theta_j^L, \theta_j^U]$ , where:*

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_j^L &= \left[ \max\left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ \theta_j^U &= \left[ \min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}.\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

The sharp identified set  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  given reference test sensitivity  $s_1$  and specificity  $s_0$  is:

$$\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) = \left\{ (t_1, t_0) : t_0 = t_1 \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)} + 1 - \frac{P(t = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)}, t_1 \in \mathcal{H}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0) \right\}.\tag{5}$$

*Proof of Proposition 1.* The proof follows through a series of claims.

**Claim 1.** *Bounds on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l)$  for any  $(j, k, l) \in \{0, 1\}^3$  are:*

$$\begin{aligned}P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l) &\in \left[ \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k)\right), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \min\left(P(t = j, r = k), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l)\right) \right].\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

*Proof.* Probability  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l)$  for any  $(j, k, l) \in \{0, 1\}^3$  is the probability of the intersection of events  $P_{s_1, s_0}(\{t = j, r = k\} \cap \{r = k, y = l\})$ . An upper bound on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l)$  is then:

$$P_{s_1, s_0}(\{t = j, r = k\} \cap \{r = k, y = l\}) \leq \min\left(P(t = j, r = k), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l)\right).\tag{30}$$

The upper (30) holds for any  $(j, k, l) \in \{0, 1\}^3$ . The lower bound on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l)$  is then:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l) &= P(t = j, r = k) - P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - l) \\
&\geq P(t = j, r = k) - \min\left(P(t = j, r = k), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - l)\right) \\
&= \max\left(0, P(t = j, r = k) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - l)\right) \\
&= \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k)\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Suppressing the subscript in  $P_{s_1, s_0}$  for clarity, the final line of (31) follows from:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(t = j, r = k) - P(r = k, y = 1 - l) &= \\
&= P(t = j, r = k, y = l) + P(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - l) - P(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - l) \\
&= P(t = j, r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - l) \\
&= P(t = j, r = k, y = l) + P(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - l) \\
&= P(r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k)
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

□

**Claim 2.** Bounds (30) on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j)$  and  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  are sharp. Bounds are independent in the sense that any pair of points within the two bounds is attainable.

*Proof.* Write all eight joint and observable probabilities as a matrix equation:

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}} \begin{pmatrix} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, r = 1, y = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, r = 1, y = 0) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 0, r = 1, y = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 0, r = 1, y = 0) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, r = 0, y = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, r = 0, y = 0) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 0, r = 0, y = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 0, r = 0, y = 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} P(t = 1, r = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1) \\ P(t = 0, r = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0) \\ P(t = 1, r = 0) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) \\ P(t = 0, r = 0) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 0) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{33}$$

Matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  has rank 6. The bottom four rows cannot be represented as a linear combination using any of the top four rows. The bottom four rows are only mutually linearly dependent. Similarly, the top four rows are only mutually linearly dependent. Including marginal probabilities  $P(t)$  and  $P(r)$  will not change this structure. Therefore, the value of  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - k, y = l)$  does not affect the values of  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l)$  for  $(j, l) \in \{0, 1\}^2$  within their respective bounds.

There exist two separate systems of equations, one for each value of  $r$ . Focus on one system for an arbitrary  $r = k$ :

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}'} \begin{pmatrix} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - j) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = j) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - j) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} P(t = j, r = k) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = j) \\ P(t = 1 - j, r = k) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (34)$$

Matrix  $\mathbf{A}'$  has rank 3. I show that both the upper and lower bounds on any of the joint probabilities  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l)$  in (34) are attainable for  $(j, l) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ . Focus on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j)$ . Assume that it is equal to its upper bound,  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j) = \min(P(t = j, r = k), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = j))$ . Let first  $P(t = j, r = k) < P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = j)$ . From (32),  $P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j) < P(t = 1 - j, r = k)$ . Then from (34):

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j) &= P(t = j, r = k) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - j) &= 0 \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = j) &= P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = j) - P(t = j, r = k) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - j) &= P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

By assumption,  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j)$  is equal to its upper bound. Consequently,  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - j)$  is equal to  $0 = \max(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k))$  which is its lower bound. Similarly,  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = j) = P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = j) - P(t = j, r = k) = \max(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = j) - P(t = j, r = k))$ , which is its lower bound. Finally,  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - j) = P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j) = \min(P(t = 1 - j, r = k), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j))$ , representing the upper bound. All four probabilities achieve their corresponding upper and lower bounds.

Let now  $P(t = j, r = k) \geq P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = j)$ , or equivalently  $P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j) \geq P(t = 1 - j, r = k)$ . The system then is:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j) &= P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = j) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - j) &= P(t = j, r = k) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = j) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = j) &= 0 \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - j) &= P(t = 1 - j, r = k). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

As before,  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j)$  and  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - j)$  are equal to their respective upper bounds.  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - j)$  and  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = j)$  attain the lower bounds. That  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j)$  and  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - j)$  attain lower bounds when  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r =$

$k, y = 1 - j$ ) and  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = j)$  are equal to their upper bounds can be shown symmetrically. Thus, for an arbitrary  $r = k$ , all probabilities can be equal to their upper and lower bounds.

From (34), reducing any probability that is on the upper bound will lead to an increase in the probabilities at lower bounds and a decrease in the remaining probability at the upper bound. Any value in the interior of the bounds must be feasible. Therefore, the bounds (29) must be sharp for  $P(t = j, r = k, y = l)$  and any  $(j, l) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ . This is true for an arbitrary  $r = k$ , hence the bounds are sharp for any  $P(t = j, r = k, y = l)$  such that  $(j, k, l) \in \{0, 1\}^3$ .

Finally, from (33), the value which  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j)$  takes does not influence the value of  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$ . Any pair of values coming from the Cartesian product of the bounds on the two probabilities is feasible.  $\square$

By Claim 2, the sharp bounds on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, y = 1) = P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j) + P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  are a sum of the sharp bounds on individual probabilities. Hence, the sharp bounds on  $\theta_j$  are:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_j &\geq \frac{\max\left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)\right) + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j)\right)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ \theta_j &\leq \frac{\min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)\right) + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

**Claim 3.** *The sharp joint identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  is:*

$$\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) = \left\{ (t_1, t_0) : t_0 = t_1 \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)} + 1 - \frac{P(t = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)}, t_1 \in \mathcal{H}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0) \right\}.$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} P(t = 1) &= P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, y = 1) + P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, y = 0) = \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) + P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0) - \theta_0 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

For any value  $t_1 \in \mathcal{H}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0)$ , it must be that  $t_0 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0) = t_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) + P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0) - P(t = 1)$ . Since  $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0)$  is sharp,  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  is a sharp joint identification region for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ .  $\square$

$\square$

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose that the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for  $y = j$ . The sharp identified set  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0)$  for parameter  $\theta_j$   $j = 0, 1$ , given reference test sensitivity  $s_1$  and specificity*

$s_0$  is an interval  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\bar{\theta}_j^L, \bar{\theta}_j^U]$ , where:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\theta}_j^L &= \left[ \max\left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ \bar{\theta}_j^U &= \left[ \min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}.\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

The corresponding sharp joint identification region  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  is:

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) = \left\{ (t_1, t_0) : t_0 = t_1 \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)} + 1 - \frac{P(t = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)}, t_j \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) \right\}.\tag{8}$$

If the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for  $y = 0$  and  $y = 1$ , the sharp joint identification region  $\bar{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  for parameters  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ , given reference test sensitivity  $s_1$  and specificity  $s_0$  is:

$$\bar{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) = \left\{ (t_1, t_0) : t_0 = t_1 \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)} + 1 - \frac{P(t = 1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)}, t_1 \in \bar{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}_{(\theta_1)}(s_1, s_0) \right\},\tag{9}$$

where  $\bar{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}_{(\theta_1)}(s_1, s_0) = [\bar{\theta}_1^L, \bar{\theta}_1^U]$ , for:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\theta}_1^L &= \left[ \max\left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ \bar{\theta}_1^U &= \left[ \min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)}{2}, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}.\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.* First, I prove a lemma used below. The proof then follows through a series of claims.

**Lemma 1.** *The index test has a tendency to wrongly agree with the reference test for  $y = j$  for a given  $(s_1, s_0)$ , if and only if  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \geq \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}$ .*

*Proof.* It holds that  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j, y = j) + P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j) = P(r = 1 - j, y = j)$ . For sufficiency, note that  $2P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j, y = j) = P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(t =$



$j, r = 1 - j, y = j) + P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \geq P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)$ , since by assumption  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \geq P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$ . Necessity is immediate.  $\square$

**Claim 4.** *Assume that the tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for  $y = j$ . The sharp identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  is  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ .*

*Proof.* From Lemma 1,  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \geq \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r=1-j, y=j)}{2}$ . Then,  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \leq \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r=1-j, y=j)}{2} \leq P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)$ . Using this and following the steps taken to obtain (30):

$$P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \leq \min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}\right). \quad (39)$$

The lower bound on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  is derived from the upper bound on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  which is unaffected by the assumption. Substituting the upper bound into the system (34) yields the lower bound  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \geq \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j)\right)$ , as in (31).

For the bounds defined by (31) and (39) on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  to be sharp, all values contained between them must be feasible for a given population distribution. The lower bound is identical as in Proposition 1. The upper bound in (39) is at most as large as the upper bound (30) in Proposition 1. Thus, all points in the bounds on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  are attainable by the same argument as in Claim 2 in the proof of Proposition 1. Hence, the bounds defined by (31) and (39) are sharp. Sharp bounds on probabilities  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = k, r = j, y = l)$  from (29) are unaffected by the assumption for  $(k, l) \in \{0, 1\}^2$  as they form an independent system of equations from (33). Using the reasoning in Claims 2, and 3 of Proposition 1,  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  is a sharp identification region for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ .  $\square$

**Claim 5.** *Assume that the tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for  $y = 0$  and  $y = 1$ . The sharp identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  is  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 1,  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \geq \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r=1-j, y=j)}{2}$  for  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ . The sharp upper bound on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  is again as in (39). The sharp upper bound on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j)$  is no longer equivalent to (30). Analogously to the steps used to derive (39):

$$P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j) \leq \min\left(P(t = j, r = j) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)}{2}, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right), \quad (40)$$

where the first value in the minimum is derived using Lemma 1 and:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j) &= P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = 1 - j) \\ &\leq P(t = j, r = j) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

**Remark 11.** Only the upper bounds on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  and  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j)$  are changed by the assumption that tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for  $y \in \{0, 1\}$ . The lower bounds remain as in (31).

To see this, observe from (33) that the bounds on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  and  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j)$  belong to separate systems of equations and will not affect each other. The bounds on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  hold as in the Claim 4. The bounds on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j)$  are derived using  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = 1 - j)$  which is affected only from below by the assumption. From (34) it can be seen that substituting  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = 1 - j)$  with its upper bound  $\min\left(P(t = j, r = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)\right)$  yields an identical lower bound for  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j)$  as in (31).

Bounds (31) and (39) on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$  were shown to be sharp in the previous claim. Using the same argument, bounds (31) and (40) on  $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j)$  are also sharp. Any pair of points in the bounds for the two probabilities is feasible. Hence,  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  is the sharp identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$ . □

□

**Proposition 3.** Let  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  be an identified set for  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  obtained from an externally valid study for a known  $(s_1, s_0)$ . Let  $\theta_j^L$  and  $\theta_j^H$  be the smallest and largest values of  $\theta_j$  in the identified set. Then:

$$P(y = 1) \in \left[ \min \left\{ \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^L - 1}{\theta_1^L + \theta_0^L - 1}, \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^H - 1}{\theta_1^H + \theta_0^H - 1} \right\}, \max \left\{ \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^L - 1}{\theta_1^L + \theta_0^L - 1}, \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^H - 1}{\theta_1^H + \theta_0^H - 1} \right\} \right] = \Pi_{s_1, s_0} \quad (13)$$

when  $\forall (\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) : \theta_1 \neq 1 - \theta_0$ , and  $P(y = 1) \in [0, 1]$  otherwise.

*Proof of Proposition 3.* The bounds on  $P(y = 1)$  are:

$$P(y = 1) \in \left[ \min_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)} \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0 - 1}{\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1}, \max_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)} \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0 - 1}{\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1} \right] \quad (42)$$

The value  $\frac{P(t=1)+\theta_0-1}{\theta_1+\theta_0-1}$  is increasing in  $\theta_0$  and decreasing in  $\theta_1$ . The extreme values occur for boundary values of  $(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ , when  $\forall (\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) : \theta_1 \neq 1 - \theta_0$ . To show this, let the joint probability distributions used to find  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  in the test performance study be denoted with  $P^*(t, r)$  and  $P_{s_1, s_0}^*(r, y)$ , and the marginal distributions  $P^*(t)$ ,  $P^*(r)$ , and  $P_{s_1, s_0}^*(y)$ .  $P(t)$  and  $P(y)$  pertain to the screening study and as such are not the same as  $P^*(t)$  and  $P_{s_1, s_0}^*(y)$  from the performance study. Then:

$$P(y = 1) = \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0 - 1}{\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1} = \frac{P(t = 1)P_{s_1, s_0}^*(y = 0) + \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}^*(y = 1) - P^*(t = 1)}{\theta_1 - P^*(t = 1)} \quad (43)$$

The second equality follows from  $\theta_0 = \theta_1 \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}^*(y=1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}^*(y=0)} + 1 - \frac{P^*(t=1)}{P_{s_1, s_0}^*(y=0)}$  which is true for all  $(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  by Propositions 1 and 2. The first derivative (43) with respect to  $\theta_1$  is  $\frac{(P^*(t=1) - P(t=1))P_{s_1, s_0}^*(y=0)}{(P^*(t=1) - \theta_1)^2}$  which is either positive or negative for all  $\theta_1$  in the identified set. Then, the lower bound for  $P(y=1)$  occurs either at  $\theta_1^L$  or  $\theta_1^H$ . Conversely, the upper bound will be at the opposite extreme value of  $\theta_1$ . Finally,  $\theta_1^L$  or  $\theta_1^H$  correspond to  $\theta_0^L$  and  $\theta_0^H$  in  $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ , respectively, giving (13).

If  $\theta_1 = 1 - \theta_0$  is feasible, then  $P(y=1) \in [0, 1]$  since it is possible that  $t \perp\!\!\!\perp y$ , as in Section 2.1. □

**Proposition 4.** *Let the moment function  $m$  be:*

$$m(W_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} m_1(W_i, \theta) \\ m_2(W_i, \theta) \\ m_3(W_i, \theta) \\ m_4(W_i, \theta) \\ m_5(W_i, \theta) \\ m_6(W_i, \theta) \\ m_7(W_i, \theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (-\theta_1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1)r_i \\ (-\theta_1 + 1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (r_i - 1)(1 - t_i) \\ (-\theta_1 + 1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1) \\ \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \\ (\theta_1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i(1 - r_i) \\ (\theta_1 - 1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i \\ (\theta_0 - 1)(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}) - \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + t_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Moment inequalities defined by  $m$  represent the joint identification region  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$  for  $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  defined in Proposition 1. For each  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$  such that  $E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ , it must be that  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ . Conversely, if  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ , then  $E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ .

*Proof of Proposition 4.* I prove this by finding  $E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta))$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, 7$  and demonstrating that the resulting system is equivalent to the bounds defined in Proposition 1 extended to  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$ . Suppose that  $E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ . From (23):

$$\begin{aligned} E_P(m_1(W_i, \theta)) &= -\theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y=1) + P_{s_1, s_0}(r=1, y=1) - P(r=1) + P(t=1, r=1) \\ &= P(t=1, r=1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r=1, y=1) - \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y=1) \leq 0 \\ E_P(m_2(W_i, \theta)) &= (-\theta_1 + 1 - s_1) P_{s_1, s_0}(y=1) - P(t=0, r=0) \\ &= P_{s_1, s_0}(r=0, y=1) - P(t=0, r=0) - \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y=1) \leq 0 \\ E_P(m_3(W_i, \theta)) &= (-\theta_1 + 1) P_{s_1, s_0}(y=1) + P(t=1) - 1 \\ &= P_{s_1, s_0}(y=1) s_1 - P(r=1) + P_{s_1, s_0}(y=1)(1 - s_1) + P(t=1) - P(r=0) - \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y=1) \\ &= P(t=1, r=1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r=1, y=0) + P_{s_1, s_0}(r=0, y=1) - P(t=0, r=0) \\ &\quad - \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y=1) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Note further that if  $\theta_1 \in [0, 1]$ , which is true by definition, the three inequalities above yield the lower bound from Proposition 1 for  $\theta_1 \in \mathcal{H}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0)$  given an arbitrary  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ :

$$\theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \geq \max\left(0, P(t = 1, r = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)\right) + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 0, r = 0)\right). \quad (45)$$

This is equivalent to the lower bound for the element  $\theta_1$  of  $(\theta_1, \theta_0, s_1, s_0) \in \Theta(P)$ . Consider next:

$$\begin{aligned} E_P(m_4(W_i, \theta)) &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - t \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 0) - P(t = 1, r = 1) \leq 0 \\ E_P(m_5(W_i, \theta)) &= (\theta_1 - s_1) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 0) \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 0) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1) \leq 0 \\ E_P(m_6(W_i, \theta)) &= (\theta_1 - 1 + s_1) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 1) \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 1) \leq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Similarly, the upper bound from Proposition 1 is obtained for the element  $\theta_1$  of  $(\theta_1, \theta_0, s_1, s_0) \in \Theta(P)$ :

$$\theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \leq \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 1 - 1), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - 1, y = 1)\right) + \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 1), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1)\right). \quad (47)$$

Taking the expected value of the final component of the moment function yields:

$$E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) = (\theta_0 - 1)(1 - P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)) - \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) + P(t = 1) = 0 \quad (48)$$

It is then true that  $\theta_0 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0) = P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0) + \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1)$ . This is the linear relationship between  $(\theta_1, \theta_0)$  in the identified set from Proposition 1. Going in the other direction, it is immediate that if the two bounds and the linear relationship hold so that  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ , then  $E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ , demonstrating that the expected values of moment functions represent the joint identification region  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.** *Assume that the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for  $y = 1$ .*

Let the moment function  $\bar{m}^1$  be:

$$\bar{m}^1(W_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{m}_1^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_2^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_3^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_4^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_5^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (-\theta_1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1)r_i \\ (-\theta_1 + 1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (r_i - 1)(1 - t_i) \\ (-\theta_1 + 1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1) \\ \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \\ (\theta_1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i(1 - r_i) \\ \left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2}\right) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i \\ (\theta_0 - 1) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right) - \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + t_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

Moment inequalities and equalities defined by  $\bar{m}^1$  for  $J_1 = \{1, \dots, 6\}$  and  $J_2 = \{7\}$  represent the joint identification region  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$  for  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  defined in Proposition 2 for  $y = 1$ . For each  $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}] \times [0, 1] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$  such that  $E_P(\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ , it must be that  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ . Conversely, if  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ , then  $E_P(\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ .

*Proof of Proposition 5.* The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 4. From the definition of  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0)$  for  $y = 1$  in Proposition 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) &\geq \max\left(0, P(t = 1, r = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)\right) + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 0, r = 0)\right) \\ \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) &\leq \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 0), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2}\right) + \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 1), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Suppose that  $E_P(\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ . From (25):

$$\begin{aligned} E_P(\bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta)) &= \left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2}\right) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 1) \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2} - P(t = 1, r = 1) \leq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Using  $E_P(\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta)) = E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta))$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 5$ ,  $E_P(\bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta)) = E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta))$ , (44), (46), (48), and (50), yields that moment inequalities  $E_P(\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 7$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta)) = 0$  represent the joint identification region  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$  by the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.** Assume that the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for  $y = 1$  and

$y = 0$ . Let the moment function  $\bar{m}$  be equal to  $\bar{m}^1$  in (25) in all components except  $\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta)$ , and  $\bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta) &= \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i + \frac{1}{2} \left( r_i - s_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right) \\ \bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta) &= \left( \theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2} \right) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i + \frac{1}{2} \left( r_i - s_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right)\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

Then  $\bar{m}$  represents the identified set  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$  for  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$  defined in Proposition 2. For each  $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}] \times [0, 1] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$  such that  $E_P(\bar{m}_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ , it must be that  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ . Conversely, if  $\theta \in \Theta(P)$ , then  $E_P(\bar{m}_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ .

*Proof of Proposition 6.* The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 4. From the definition of  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0)$  for  $j = 1$  in Proposition 2:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) &\geq \max\left(0, P(t = 1, r = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)\right) + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 0, r = 0)\right) \\ \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) &\leq \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 0), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2}\right) \\ &\quad + \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 1) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)}{2}, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1)\right).\end{aligned}\tag{51}$$

Suppose that  $E_P(\bar{m}_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$ . From (28):

$$\begin{aligned}E_P(\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta)) &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1) + \frac{1}{2} \left( P(r = 1) - s_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \right) \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 0) - P(t = 1, r = 1) + \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)}{2} \leq 0 \\ E(\bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta)) &= \left( \theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2} \right) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 1) + \frac{1}{2} \left( P(r = 1) - s_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \right) \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2} - P(t = 1, r = 1) + \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)}{2} \leq 0\end{aligned}\tag{52}$$

Using  $E_P(\bar{m}_j(W_i, \theta)) = E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta))$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3, 5$ ,  $E_P(\bar{m}_7(W_i, \theta)) = E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta))$ , (44), (46), (48), and (52) yields that moment inequalities  $E_P(\bar{m}_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 6$  and  $E_P(\bar{m}_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$  represent the joint identification  $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left( \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$  by the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2A, 3, and 4 hold. Then for any component  $m_j(W_i, \theta)$  in (23), (25), (27), and (28):*

1.  $\text{Var}_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) > 0$  and for all  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ ;

2.  $\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta(P)} E_P \left[ \left( \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right)^2 \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right| > \lambda \right\} \right] = 0$ ;

where  $\mu_j(\theta, P) = E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta))$  and  $\sigma_j(\theta, P) = \text{Var}_P(m_j(W_i, \theta))$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.* I first show that under the assumptions  $\text{Var}_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) > \frac{1}{M_j^2} > 0$ , for any  $j \in 1, \dots, 7$  in (23), where  $M_j$  do not depend on  $P$  and  $\theta$ . I then demonstrate the same for components (25), (27), and (28) that are not identical. Finally, I show that  $m_j(W_i, \theta)$  are bounded irrespective of  $P$  and  $\theta$ , and use that to prove that the second claim is true.

Let  $\rho_P(X, Y) = \frac{\text{Cov}_P(X, Y)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_P(X)\text{Var}_P(Y)}}$  for some binary random vector  $(X, Y)$  with distribution  $P \in \mathbf{P}$ . The following Lemma will be used to bound the variances from below.

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose that Assumption 4 holds. Then for any  $P \in \mathbf{P}$ , the following are true:*

1.  $\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2 = (1 - 4\varepsilon)^2 < 1$ ;
2.  $\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - t_i))^2 = (1 - 4\varepsilon)^2 < 1$ ;
3.  $\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i)^2 = h(\varepsilon)$ ;
4.  $\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i) t_i)^2 = h(\varepsilon)$
5.  $\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, r_i (1 - t_i))^2 = h(\varepsilon)$
6.  $\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)(1 - t_i))^2 = h(\varepsilon)$

where  $h(\varepsilon) = \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in [0.2, 0.25]\} \frac{2-6\varepsilon}{3-6\varepsilon} + \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in (0, 0.2)\} \left(1 - \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^2}{(1+\varepsilon)^2}\right) \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* Denote  $P(t_i = j, r_i = k) = P_{jk}$ . Assumption 4 states that for  $(j, k) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ ,  $P_{jk} \geq \varepsilon > 0$ , and implies that  $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}$ .

### Statements 1 and 2

Parameter  $\rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2$  is the largest when either  $P_{01} = P_{10} = \varepsilon$  or  $P_{11} = P_{00} = \varepsilon$ . I prove the statement for  $P_{01} = P_{10} = \varepsilon$ , and the argument for the  $P_{11} = P_{00} = \varepsilon$  is symmetric. The maximal  $\rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2$  must then be for  $P_{11} + P_{00} = 1 - 2\varepsilon$  and  $P(t_i = 1) = P(r_i = 1)$ .

Next, let  $P_{11} = \alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon)$ ,  $P_{00} = (1 - \alpha)(1 - 2\varepsilon)$  for some  $\alpha \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon}, \frac{1-3\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon}]$ , and  $P(t_i = 1) = P(r_i = 1) = \alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon) + \varepsilon$ . By plugging in the relevant probabilities,  $\rho_P(r_i, t_i)$  becomes a function of  $\alpha$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\alpha(r_i, t_i) &= \frac{P_{11} - P(t_i = 1)P(r_i = 1)}{\sqrt{P(t_i = 1)(1 - P(t_i = 1))P(r_i = 1)(1 - P(r_i = 1))}} = \\ &= \frac{\alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon) - (\alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon) + \varepsilon)^2}{(\alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon) + \varepsilon)(1 - \alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon) - \varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Since we are considering the case  $P_{01} = P_{10} = \varepsilon$ , the correlation is positive. By maximizing  $\rho_\alpha(r_i, t_i)$  with respect to  $\alpha$ , we obtain the upper bound on  $\rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2$ . The second order condition confirms that this is a concave optimization problem. The first order condition yields the maximizing  $\alpha^* = \frac{1}{2}$ .

For any  $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}$ , it is true that  $\alpha^* \in [\frac{\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon}, \frac{1-3\varepsilon}{1-2\varepsilon}]$ . To conclude the proof of statement 1, plug in  $\alpha^*$  into (53) to find  $\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, t_i) = \rho_{\alpha^*}(r_i, t_i) = (1 - 4\varepsilon)$ .

By using Statement 1 and replacing  $\tilde{t}_i = 1 - t_i$ , it follows directly that  $\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - t_i)) = \max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, \tilde{t}_i) = \rho_{\alpha^*}(r_i, \tilde{t}_i) = (1 - 4\varepsilon)$ .

**Statement 3**

From the definition of  $\rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i) &= \frac{Cov_P(r_i, t_i r_i)}{\sqrt{Var_P(r_i) Var_P(t_i r_i)}} = \frac{E_P(t_i r_i)(1 - E_P(r_i))}{\sqrt{E_P(r_i)(1 - E_P(r_i)) E_P(t_i r_i)(1 - E_P(t_i r_i))}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{E_P(t_i r_i)(1 - E_P(r_i))}{E_P(r_i)(1 - E_P(t_i r_i))}} = \sqrt{\frac{P_{11}(1 - P(r_i = 1))}{P(r_i = 1)(1 - P_{11})}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{P_{11}(1 - P_{11} - P_{01})}{(P_{11} + P_{01})(1 - P_{11})}}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Notice that  $\rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i)$  decreases in  $P_{01}$ , so at the maximum,  $P_{01} = \varepsilon$ . Therefore, we only need to maximize  $\rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i)^2$  with respect to feasible  $P_{11}$ . The maximization problem is:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i) = \max_{P_{11} \in [\varepsilon, 1 - 3\varepsilon]} \sqrt{\frac{P_{11}(1 - P_{11} - \varepsilon)}{(P_{11} + \varepsilon)(1 - P_{11})}}. \quad (55)$$

The objective function is concave. The first order condition implies that for an interior maximum, the maximizing  $P_{11}$  is  $\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}$ . If  $\varepsilon \in [0.2, 0.25]$ , the constraint  $P_{11} \leq 1 - 3\varepsilon$  will bind. Therefore, the value of the parameter at the maximum is  $P_{11}^* = \min\{\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}, 1 - 3\varepsilon\}$ . The maximum of the objective function obtained by plugging in  $P_{11}^*$  into (54) is:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i)^2 = \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in [0.2, 0.25]\} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3 - 6\varepsilon}\right) + \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in (0, 0.2)\} \left(1 - \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^2}{(1 + \varepsilon)^2}\right) \in (0, 1) \quad (56)$$

**Statements 4, 5, and 6**

Following the definition of  $\rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i) &= \frac{Cov_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)}{\sqrt{Var_P(r_i) Var_P((1 - r_i)t_i)}} \\ &= \frac{-E_P(r_i)E_P((1 - r_i)t_i)}{\sqrt{E_P(r_i)(1 - E_P(r_i)) E_P((1 - r_i)t_i)(1 - E_P((1 - r_i)t_i))}} \\ &= -\sqrt{\frac{E_P(r_i)E_P((1 - r_i)t_i)}{(1 - E_P(r_i))(1 - E_P((1 - r_i)t_i))}} \\ &= -\sqrt{\frac{P(r_i = 1)P_{10}}{(1 - P(r_i = 1))(1 - P_{10})}}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

The square of the correlation is increasing in both  $P(r_i = 1) = P_{11} + P_{01}$  and  $P_{10}$ . Consequently, at the maximum, together they will be at the upper bound, meaning that  $P_{11} + P_{01} + P_{10} = 1 - \varepsilon$ , or equivalently,



that  $P(r_i = 1) = 1 - \varepsilon - P_{10}$ . We can then rewrite the problem as:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)^2 = \max_{P_{10} \in [\varepsilon, 1 - 3\varepsilon]} \frac{(1 - \varepsilon - P_{10})P_{10}}{(\varepsilon + P_{10})(1 - P_{10})}. \quad (58)$$

In this form, the problem is identical to the one in (55). Following the same steps:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)^2 = \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in [0.2, 0.25]\} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3 - 6\varepsilon}\right) + \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in (0, 0.2)\} \left(1 - \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^2}{(1 + \varepsilon)^2}\right) < 1. \quad (59)$$

Analogously to the proof of Statement 3, for  $\rho(r_i, (1 - t_i)r_i)^2$  in Statement 5, the optimization problem can be represented as:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, r_i(1 - t_i))^2 = \max_{P_{01} \in [\varepsilon, 1 - 3\varepsilon]} \frac{(1 - \varepsilon - P_{01})P_{01}}{(\varepsilon + P_{01})(1 - P_{01})}. \quad (60)$$

Following the steps in the proof of Statement 4  $\rho(r_i, (1 - r_i)(1 - t_i))^2$  in Statement 6, the optimization problem will be:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)^2 = \max_{P_{10} \in [\varepsilon, 1 - 3\varepsilon]} \frac{(1 - \varepsilon - P_{00})P_{00}}{(\varepsilon + P_{00}P)(1 - P_{00})}. \quad (61)$$

Consequently, from the solutions to (55) and (57), (60) and (61) will yield the same upper bounds on their corresponding squares of correlations:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, r_i(1 - t_i))^2 &= \max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in [0.2, 0.25]\} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3 - 6\varepsilon}\right) + \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in (0, 0.2)\} \left(1 - \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^2}{(1 + \varepsilon)^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

□

**Claim 6.** For any  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$  it holds that  $\text{Var}_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) > 0$  for all  $m_j(W_i, \theta)$  in 23.

*Proof.* Consider first a component of  $m$  that pertains to the upper bound of  $\theta_1$ . The variance  $\text{Var}_P(m_4(W_i, \theta))$  for some  $\theta$  and  $P$  is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_P(m_4(W_i, \theta)) &= \text{Var}_P \left( \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{\theta_1}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right)^2 \text{Var}_P(r_i) + \text{Var}_P(t_i) - 2 \frac{\theta_1}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \text{Cov}_P(r_i, t_i). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Fix any  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ . As shown in Section 2.1,  $P(r = 1) \in (1 - s_0, s_1)$  so  $\text{Var}_P(r_i) > 0$ . The value  $\theta_1^*$  where  $\text{Var}_P(m_4(W_i, \theta))$  is globally minimized given  $s_1$  and  $s_0$  from the first order condition is:

$$\frac{\partial \text{Var}_P(m_4(W_i, \theta))}{\partial \theta_1} : \theta_1^* = (s_1 - 1 + s_0) \frac{\text{Cov}_P(r_i, t_i)}{\text{Var}_P(r_i)}. \quad (64)$$

The second order condition shows that this indeed is a minimization problem. Let  $\theta^* = (\theta_1^*, \theta_0, s_1, s_0)$ , where I suppress the dependence  $\theta_1^*(s_1, s_0)$  for clarity. The minimum variance for any  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$  is then:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_4(W_i, \theta^*)) &= \frac{(Cov_P(r_i, t_i))^2}{Var_P(r_i)} + Var_P(t_i) - 2 \frac{(Cov_P(r_i, t_i))^2}{Var_P(r_i)} \\ &= Var_P(t_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2). \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

For any  $\theta$  it follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_4(W_i, \theta)) &\geq Var_P(m_4(W_i, \theta^*)) = Var_P(t_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2) \\ &\geq 2\varepsilon(1 - 2\varepsilon) (1 - (1 - 4\varepsilon)^2) = \frac{1}{M_4^2} > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of  $\theta^*$ . Focus on the second inequality. We wish to find the lower bound on the variance  $\frac{1}{M_4^2}$  over all possible  $P \in \mathbf{P}$ . One such bound is equal to the expression at the smallest value of  $Var_P(t_i)$  and the largest value of  $\rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2$ . The second is given by Lemma 2, and the first follows directly from Assumption 4 which implies that  $P(t_i = 1) \in [2\varepsilon, 1 - 2\varepsilon]$ , so  $Var_P(t_i) \geq 2\varepsilon(1 - 2\varepsilon)$ .<sup>21</sup> Therefore,  $Var_P(m_4(W_i, \theta)) \geq \frac{1}{M_4^2} > 0$  for all  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ .

Following the same steps for the remaining components pertaining to the upper bound, the smallest variances for any  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta$  are:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_5(W_i, \theta^*)) &= Var_P(t_i(1 - r_i)) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i(1 - r_i))^2) \geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) (1 - h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_5^2} > 0 \\ Var_P(m_6(W_i, \theta^*)) &= Var_P(t_i r_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i r_i)^2) \geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) (1 - h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_6^2} > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where the inequalities follow from the definition of  $\theta^*$ , the fact that  $Var_P(t_i(1 - r_i)) \geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)$  and  $Var_P(t_i r_i) \geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)$ , and Lemma 2.

Next observe the components pertaining to the lower bound. First for  $Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta))$  for any  $\theta$  and  $P$ :

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta)) &= Var_P \left( (-\theta_1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1)r_i \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{s_1 - \theta_1}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right)^2 Var_P(r_i) + Var_P((t_i - 1)r_i) - 2 \frac{s_1 - \theta_1}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} Cov_P((1 - t_i)r_i, r_i) \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Fix an arbitrary  $s_1$  and  $s_0$ . The value  $\theta_1^*$  where  $Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta))$  is globally minimized given  $s_1$  and  $s_0$  from the first order condition is:

$$\frac{\partial Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta))}{\partial \theta_1} : \theta_1^* = (s_1 - 1 + s_0) \frac{Cov_P((1 - t_i)r_i, r_i)}{Var_P(r_i)} + s_1. \quad (69)$$

---

21. As long as  $\varepsilon < 0.25$ , the inequality is strict, since the largest value of  $\rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2$  warrants that  $P(t_i = 1, r_i = 1) = \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{2}$  while the smallest  $Var_P(t_i)$  requires  $P(t_i = 1, r_i = 1) = \varepsilon$  or  $P(t_i = 1, r_i = 1) = 1 - 3\varepsilon$ .

The second order condition shows that this indeed is a minimization problem. The minimum variance  $Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta^*))$  for an arbitrary  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$  is:

$$\begin{aligned}
Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta^*)) &= \left( -\frac{Cov_P((1-t_i)r_i, r_i)}{Var_P(r_i)} \right)^2 Var_P(r_i) + Var_P((1-t_i)r_i) \\
&\quad - 2 \left( \frac{Cov_P((1-t_i)r_i, r_i)}{Var_P(r_i)} \right) Cov_P((1-t_i)r_i, r_i) \\
&= Var_P((1-t_i)r_i) \left( 1 - \frac{(Cov_P((1-t_i)r_i, r_i))^2}{Var_P(r_i)Var_P((1-t_i)r_i)} \right) \\
&= Var_P((1-t_i)r_i) (1 - \rho_P((1-t_i)r_i, r_i)^2) \\
&\geq \varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)(1-h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_1^2} > 0
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of  $\theta^*$ . And the second follows from Lemma 2 and  $Var_P(t_i r_i) \geq \varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)$ . Therefore  $Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta)) \geq \frac{1}{M_1^2} > 0$  for all  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ .

Again, following the same steps for the remaining components pertaining to the lower bound, the smallest variances for any  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta$  are:

$$\begin{aligned}
Var_P(m_2(W_i, \theta^*)) &= Var_P((1-t_i)(1-r_i)) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, (1-t_i)(1-r_i))^2) \geq \varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)(1-h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_2^2} > 0 \\
Var_P(m_3(W_i, \theta^*)) &= Var_P(1-t_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, (1-t_i))^2) \geq 2\varepsilon(1-2\varepsilon)(1-(1-4\varepsilon)^2) = \frac{1}{M_3^2} > 0
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Finally, consider the component pertaining to the moment equality  $Var(m_7(W_i, \theta))$ . It is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
Var_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) &= Var_P \left( (1-\theta_0) \left( 1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right) + \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \right) \\
&= Var_P \left( (\theta_0 + \theta_1 - 1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \right) \\
&= Var_P \left( \bar{\theta} \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \right) \\
&= \left( \frac{\bar{\theta}}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right)^2 Var_P(r_i) + Var_P(t_i) - 2 \frac{\bar{\theta}}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} Cov_P(r_i, t_i)
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

for  $\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1 = \bar{\theta}$ . Notice how the function (72) resembles (63). Following the same steps as for finding  $\frac{1}{M_4^2}$ , we obtain that  $Var(m_7(W_i, \theta)) \geq 2\varepsilon(1-2\varepsilon)(1-(1-4\varepsilon)^2) = \frac{1}{M_7^2} > 0$  for all  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

**Claim 7.** For any  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$  it holds that  $Var_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) > 0$  for all  $m_j(W_i, \theta)$  in (25), (27), and (28).

*Proof.* Functions  $\bar{m}$  and  $m$  are such that  $\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta) \neq m_j(W_i, \theta)$  only if  $j = 6$ . Thus for all components that are equal, the proof follows from Claim 6, so  $Var_P(\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta)) \geq \frac{1}{M_j^2} > 0$  for  $j \neq 6$ .

The variance  $Var_P(\bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta))$  for some  $\theta$  and  $P$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(\bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta)) &= Var_P\left(\left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2}\right) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2}}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right)^2 Var_P(r_i) + Var_P(r_i t_i) - 2 \frac{\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2}}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} Cov_P(r_i, r_i t_i). \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

Fix any  $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ . The value  $\theta_1^*$  where  $Var_P(m_6(W_i, \theta))$  is globally minimized given  $s_1$  and  $s_0$  from the first order condition is:

$$\frac{\partial Var_P(\bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta))}{\partial \theta_1} : \theta_1^* = (s_1 - 1 + s_0) \frac{Cov_P(r_i, r_i t_i)}{Var_P(r_i)} + \frac{1 - s_1}{2}. \quad (74)$$

The second order condition shows that this indeed is a minimization problem. Following the same steps as before, for any  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(Cov_P(r_i, r_i t_i)(W_i, \theta)) &\geq Var_P(Cov_P(r_i, r_i t_i)(W_i, \theta^*)) = Var_P(r_i t_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i)^2) \\ &\geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) (1 - h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_6^2} > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

The case for  $\bar{m}_j^0(W_i, \theta)$  is symmetric and using the same method of proof it follows that  $Var_P(\bar{m}_j^0(W_i, \theta)) \geq \frac{1}{M_j^2} > 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, 7$ ,  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ .

Likewise, for  $\bar{m}$  note that  $\bar{m}_j(W_i, \theta) = \bar{m}_j(W_i, \theta)$  except for  $j \in \{4, 6\}$ . From (28):

$$\begin{aligned} V_P(\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta)) &= V_P\left(\theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i + \frac{1}{2}\left(r_i - s_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right)\right) \\ &= V_P\left(\left(\frac{\theta_1 - \frac{s_1}{2}}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + \frac{1}{2}\right) r_i - t_i\right) \\ V_P(\bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta)) &= V_P\left(\left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2}\right) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i + \frac{1}{2}\left(r_i - s_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right)\right) \\ &= V_P\left(\left(\frac{\theta_1 - \frac{1}{2}}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + \frac{1}{2}\right) r_i - t_i r_i\right). \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

As above, for any  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} V_P(\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta)) &\geq V_P(\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta^*)) = V_P(t_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2) \\ &\geq 2\varepsilon(1 - 2\varepsilon) (1 - (1 - 4\varepsilon)^2) = \frac{1}{M_4^2} > 0 \\ V_P(\bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta)) &\geq V_P(\bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta^*)) = V_P(t_i r_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i r_i)^2) \\ &\geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) (1 - h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_6^2} > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

It is true that  $Var_P(\bar{m}_j^0(W_i, \theta)) \geq \frac{1}{M_j^2} > 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, 7$ ,  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

**Claim 8.** For any  $P \in \mathbf{P}$ ,  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ , and  $m_j(W_i, \theta)$  in (23), (25), (27), and (28):

$$\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta(P)} E_P \left[ \left( \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right)^2 \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right| > \lambda \right\} \right] = 0. \quad (78)$$

We have shown above that for any  $\sigma_j(\theta, P)$  corresponding to components  $m_j(W_i, \theta)$  in (23), (25), (27), and (28), there exists a finite constant  $M_j > 0$  such that  $\sigma_j(\theta, P) \geq \frac{1}{M_j} > 0$  for all  $P \in \mathbf{P}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$ .

Then for any  $j$ ,  $P \in \mathbf{P}$ ,  $\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$  and  $\lambda$ :

$$E_P \left[ M_j^2 (m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P))^2 \mathbb{1} \left\{ |m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)| > \frac{\lambda}{M_j} \right\} \right] \quad (79)$$

$$\geq E_P \left[ \left( \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right)^2 \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right| > \lambda \right\} \right] \geq 0. \quad (80)$$

As  $W_i = (t_i, r_i) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ , and  $\mathcal{S}$  is a compact set such that  $\forall_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} : s_1 > 1 - s_0$ ,  $|m_j(W_i, \theta)| \leq B_j(\theta) \leq B_j^* < \infty$  for each  $j$ , where  $B_j^* = \max_{\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}} B_j(\theta)$ . That implies that  $|\mu_j(\theta, P)| \leq B_j^* < \infty$ , and  $(m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P))^2 \leq 4B_j^{*2}$ . Consequently:

$$4M_j^2 B_j^{*2} \mathbb{1} \left\{ 2B_j^* > \frac{\lambda}{M_j} \right\} \geq E_P \left[ \left( \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right)^2 \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right| > \lambda \right\} \right] \geq 0. \quad (81)$$

Finally, since neither  $B_j^*$  nor  $M_j$  depend on  $P$  or  $\theta$ , it follows that (78) holds, concluding the proof.  $\square$