

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

Filip Obradović*

January, 2023

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 “apparent” performance or performance with respect to the reference, but not true performance. This paper provides the smallest possible bounds on the measures of true performance - sensitivity (true positive rate) and specificity (true negative rate), or equivalently false positive and negative rates, in standard settings. Implied bounds on policy-relevant parameters are derived: 1) Prevalence in screened populations; 2) Predictive values. Methods for inference based on moment inequalities are used to construct uniformly consistent confidence sets in level over a relevant family of data distributions. Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) and independent study data for the BinaxNOW COVID-19 antigen test demonstrate that the bounds can be very informative. Analysis reveals that the estimated false negative rates for symptomatic and asymptomatic patients are up to 3.17 and 4.59 times higher than the frequently cited “apparent” false negative rate.

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

JEL classification codes: C14, I10

*Northwestern University, Department of Economics, 2211 Campus Drive, Evanston 60208 IL, USA. Email: obradovic-filip@u.northwestern.edu

I am deeply grateful to Charles 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, Eric Auerbach, and Francesca Molinari for valuable suggestions. I thank the participants at the Econometrics Seminar, Econometrics Reading Group, 501 Seminar at Northwestern and the 2022 Annual Health Econometrics Workshop at Emory University 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. The definition is often attributed to Yerushalmy (1947), but Binney, Hyde, and Bossuyt (2021) note that their use dates back to early twentieth century. The two parameters are also referred to as performance measures or operating characteristics. Sensitivity (true positive rate) is the probability that a test will return a positive result for an individual who truly has the underlying condition, while specificity (true negative rate) 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 most often 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.¹ They measure performance with respect to the reference test and not true performance. Hence, they are typically not of interest. Furthermore, I show that true performance measures are usually partially identified. In other words, there exists a set of parameter values that are consistent with the observed data, called the identified set. The smallest such set under maintained assumptions, or the set that exhausts all information from the data, is known as the sharp identified set. This paper addresses the issue of finding, estimating and doing inference on the points in the sharp identified set for sensitivity and specificity, or equivalently false negative and positive rates, under standard assumptions used in the literature.

I provide the sharp joint identified set for the true performance measures without imposing any assumptions on the statistical dependence between the index (test of interest) and reference tests conditional on health status, assuming exact or approximate knowledge of the reference test characteristics. If the reference test performance is known exactly, this set is a line segment in the unit square $[0, 1]^2$. Otherwise, it is a union of line segments. The framework 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 one can further reduce the size of the sharp identified set by layering assumptions regarding the dependence between the two tests conditional on health status. In doing so, I formalize an informally stated assumption in the literature. 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

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

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.

I show how the derived identified sets may be estimated consistently. The FDA Statistical Guidance on Reporting Results Evaluating Diagnostic Tests² requires that all diagnostic performance studies report confidence intervals for index test sensitivity and specificity to quantify the statistical uncertainty in the estimates. To conform to the practice, this paper demonstrates 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 large family of permissible distributions relevant in the application. Namely, the confidence sets asymptotically cover all points in the identified set uniformly over the family of population distributions with probability of at least $1 - \alpha$, where α is the chosen significance level.

The methodological framework offers solutions to two issues in the current research practice guidelines set forth by the FDA Statistical Guidance as explained by Remark 5: 1) Inability to measure true test performance in common settings; 2) Inability to demonstrate that the index test can outperform the reference.

Given that sensitivity and specificity are frequently used to obtain other policy-relevant parameters, I present how the derived identified sets may be used to bound prevalence, or the population rate of illness, in screened populations. The specific shape of the identified set for test characteristics is critical for the sharpness of bounds on prevalence. Implied bounds on predictive values, i.e. probabilities that a patient is sick conditional on observing a test result are discussed in Appendix A.

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).³ 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. I construct the confidence sets and estimates of the identified sets for sensitivity and specificity, and consequently false negative and positive rates. The bound estimates can be very informative and they are found to have width as small as 0.007 for sensitivity and 0.003 for specificity in the independent study under plausible assumptions.

Based on the EUA study interim and final results, the widely-cited estimated “apparent” false negative rates are 8.3% and 15.4%, respectively. Following the results found in the literature (Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020), Kanji et al. (2021), Fitzpatrick 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. Estimated “apparent” false negative rates are understating even the estimated lower bound for the true false negative rate. The estimated average number of infected people missed by the antigen test is up to 2.41 and 2.88 times higher than the test users may be led to believe by the final and interim study results, respectively.

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

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

Data from Shah et al. (2021) show that the estimated true false negative rate can be up to 3.17 and 4.59 times higher for symptomatic and asymptomatic patients than the cited interim figure, respectively. Depending on interpretation, the results from both studies 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, implying the need for alternative testing protocols.

The outlined approach may be viewed 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.⁴ Since the method requires no changes to the 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.

1.1 Related Literature

The medical profession refers to the difference between the “apparent” and true performance measures as gold standard 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, assuming exactly known reference test performance measures. Valenstein (1990), Hui and Zhou (1998) and Emerson et al. (2018) elaborate that conditional independence may frequently be untenable. A salient case is when the two tests are physiologically related, such as when they rely on the same type of sample (e.g. nasal swab or capillary blood) or measure the same quantities (e.g. antibody reaction to tuberculin).

Several authors have studied how different dependence structures may affect the difference between “apparent” and true performance. Deneef (1987) shows that if the two tests are conditionally independent, “apparent” performance will be lower than true performance, and that when 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. 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. This leaves them open for interpretation and it 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 researchers to determine whether their estimates are biased upwards or downwards. Correlation between the results of the two tests

4. Available from: https://github.com/obradovicfilip/bounding_test_performance

conditional on the health status cannot be observed, as it conditions on an unobservable random variable, diminishing the practical relevance of some findings. Additionally, one could argue that the magnitude is perhaps even more important than the direction of the bias.

A formal approach to the issue of unknown bias magnitude is found in Thibodeau (1981). Assuming that the reference and index tests are positively correlated, and that the reference is at least as accurate as the index, the author bounds the bias at the population level. The framework presented below does not require such an assumption. More recently, Emerson et al. (2018) sketch an argument for individual bounds on sensitivity and specificity when the conditional independence assumption is not imposed. This study goes beyond published work by deriving the sharp joint identified set, formalizing and incorporating existing dependence assumptions to further reduce its size, bounding derived parameters of interest, and providing an appropriate uniform inference procedure. Ziegler (2021) uses a setting similar to the one in this paper to characterize 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 epidemiological research such as, Bhattacharya, Shaikh, and Vytlačil (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), Chernozhukov, Lee, and Rosen (2013), Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014), Canay and Shaikh (2017), Bugni, Canay, and Shi (2017), Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2019), Kaido, Molinari, and Stoye (2019), Bai, Santos, and Shaikh (2021)). Finally, the study aims 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)).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the identification argument. Section 3 demonstrates identification of prevalence. 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. All proofs are collected in Appendix E.

2 Identification

Studies quantifying the performance of a test of interest, also known as an index test, require knowledge of the true health status. Health status is usually unobservable, so it is determined by an alternative test, called the reference test. Even though the reference test should be the best available test for the

underlying condition, it is almost always imperfect in practice, giving rise to identification issues. In this section, I present the setting and assumptions, and derive the sharp joint identified sets for index test performance measures - sensitivity and specificity, as defined below.

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.⁵ We are interested in learning the sensitivity and specificity of the index test:

$$\text{Sensitivity: } \theta_1 = P(t = 1|y = 1) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Specificity: } \theta_0 = P(t = 0|y = 0) \quad (2)$$

which are defined when $P(y = 1) \in (0, 1)$ in the study population. Equivalently, one can study the false negative and false positive rates, $1 - \theta_1$ and $1 - \theta_0$. 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 $P(t, r)$. “Apparent” sensitivity and specificity are defined whenever $P(r = 1) \in (0, 1)$:

$$\text{“Apparent” sensitivity: } \tilde{\theta}_1 = P(t = 1|r = 1) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{“Apparent” specificity: } \tilde{\theta}_0 = P(t = 0|r = 0). \quad (4)$$

A common approach is to assume that the reference test is perfect, so that $r = y$. Then, “apparent” measures are equal to the parameters of interest (θ_1, θ_0) . This is rarely the case in practice. Generally, $\tilde{\theta}_j \neq \theta_j$ for some $j = 0, 1$, which referred to as *gold standard bias*. Interpreting $(\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_0)$ as true performance measures can lead to severely misleading conclusions due to the bias. Alternatively, researchers may explicitly study $(\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_0)$. However, they only measure performance of t with respect to r , and not y . If one wishes to learn about true performance (θ_1, θ_0) , then these parameters are not of interest.

Remark 1. *Index test t is usually a novel test, evaluated against the best currently available test r . In some settings, use of r may not be practical outside the performance study due to high costs, long turnaround time or invasiveness. For example, a common reference test for Alzheimer’s disease is a postmortem neuropathological report which is not helpful for diagnosis. Viral antigen tests may be preferred over reference RT-PCR tests for screening purposes due to lower resource requirements.*

Focusing the analysis on binary tests and binary health statuses is standard procedure. FDA Statistical Guidance on Reporting Results Evaluating Diagnostic Tests 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).” Many tests that yield discrete or continuous test results, such as RT-PCR tests, are reduced to binary tests by thresholding in practice. While the results

5. 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.

of this paper can be extended to cases in which ranges of t and r are finite sets, I limit the analysis to the binary setting to conform to current research practice.

The section begins by outlining the formal assumptions used. I then provide the set of parameter values (θ_1, θ_0) consistent with the observed data, also known as the identified set, without imposing any assumptions on the statistical dependence between t and r . The set is sharp, or the smallest possible under maintained assumptions. 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 further reduce the size of the sharp 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 set.

2.1 Assumptions

The framework in this paper relies on common assumptions maintained in the literature.

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 point 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 $(s_1, s_0) = (1, 1)$. The analysis is first done for the simple case when (s_1, s_0) are known exactly. The approach is generalized in Section 2.4 by assuming $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$, where \mathcal{S} is some known set. Hence, reference test performance needs to be known only approximately. The generalization can also be used to perform sensitivity analyses. Section 2.4.1 contains the discussion on credibility of these assumptions.

I further maintain that $s_1 > 1 - s_0$, or that the reference test is reasonable.⁶ DiCiccio et al. (2021) refer to such r as a test that has diagnostic value. If $s_1 = 1 - s_0$, one can show that $r \perp\!\!\!\perp y$, 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 $P(y = 1)$ satisfies $0 < P(y = 1) < 1$.*

In a study population in which all participants are either healthy or diseased, either θ_1 or θ_0 is undefined. The assumption is implicitly found in diagnostic test performance studies measuring sensitivity

6. 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.

and specificity. Assumptions 2 and 3 jointly imply that $P(t = 1) \in (1 - s_0, s_1)$. If the condition fails, at least one of the two assumptions are refuted.

If in addition to the assumptions above one maintains that $t \perp\!\!\!\perp r|y$, then (θ_1, θ_0) are point identified (Gart and Buck (1966), Staquet et al. (1981), and Zhou, McClish, and Obuchowski (2009)). However, it is well established that conditional independence is generally untenable (Valenstein (1990), Hui and Zhou (1998) and Emerson et al. (2018)). Dependence may arise t and r are physiologically related, such as when they rely on the same type of sample or measure the same quantities. For example, tine and Mantoux tests may be dependent since they both rely on the antibody reaction to tuberculin (Vacek (1985)), and direct immunoassay and culture swab tests for *Group A streptococci* may be related since they rely on the same type of sample (Valenstein (1990)). Since y is unobserved, the dependence structure is latent, and multiple structures may be consistent with the data distribution $P(t, r)$. This leads to a possibly non-singleton set of values (θ_1, θ_0) that are consistent with the data, called the identified set. We would first like to learn this set without imposing any assumptions on the statistical dependence structure between t and r conditional on y . Additional assumptions on the possible dependence structures may then be used to reduce the size of the identified set, as shown in Section 2.3.

2.2 Identified Set for (θ_1, θ_0)

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. By the law of total probability and $s_1 \neq 1 - s_0$ from Assumption 2:

$$P(r = 1) = s_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) + (1 - s_0) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0) \Leftrightarrow P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) = \frac{P(r = 1) + s_0 - 1}{s_1 + s_0 - 1}. \quad (5)$$

$P_{s_1, s_0}(r, y)$ is then known from $P_{s_1, s_0}(r, y) = P_{s_1, s_0}(r|y)P_{s_1, s_0}(y)$, since (s_1, s_0) fully characterize $P_{s_1, s_0}(r|y)$. To outline the idea of finding the identified set, first note that for $j = 0, 1$:

$$\theta_j = P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j|y = j) = \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 0, y = j) + P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1, y = j)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}. \quad (6)$$

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:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j) &= P(t = j, r = k) - P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - j) \\ &\geq \max\left(0, P(t = j, r = k) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Note that these coincide with Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds for $P(t = j, y = j | r = k)$ multiplied by $P(r = k)$. Proof of Proposition 1 demonstrates that any pair of values for $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 0, y = j)$ and $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1, y = j)$ within their respective bounds is consistent with the observed data. Hence, sharp bounds on $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, y = j)$ are obtained by summing the two individual set of bounds. The sharp bounds for θ_j then follow directly from (5) and (6). Finally, the sharp joint identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) is derived using $P(t = 1) = \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) + (1 - \theta_0) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)$. Observe that no restrictions beyond those set by the distribution $P(t, r)$ are imposed on the latent dependence structure of t and r conditional on y .

Proposition 1. *The sharp identified set $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ for (θ_1, θ_0) given reference test sensitivity s_1 and specificity s_0 is:*

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

where $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\theta_j^L, \theta_j^U]$ is the sharp bound on θ_j defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_j^L &= \left[\max\left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ \theta_j^U &= \left[\min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Remark 2. *Bounds on θ_j , could be formed directly from the marginals $P(t = j)$ and $P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)$ as $\theta_j \in \left[\max\left(0, P(t = j) + P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1 - j)\right), \min\left(P(t = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}$. The literature on data combination suggests that these are not sharp, as outlined by Ridder and Moffitt (2007). Lemma 2 in Appendix D shows that they are at least as wide as those in Proposition 1.*

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 θ_j as in (9) and do not discuss sharpness or the joint identified set. Proposition 1 goes further by proving that both individual bounds and the joint identified sets are the smallest possible under the assumptions. Section 3 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 policy-relevant parameters, such as the illness rate in screened populations, otherwise known as prevalence. Resulting bounds on prevalence are unnecessarily wide if one supposes that the joint identified set is a rectangle $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0) \times \mathcal{H}_{\theta_0}(s_1, s_0)$. Observe also that $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ directly yields the sharp joint identified set for false negative and false positive rates $(1 - \theta_1, 1 - \theta_0)$. The same will hold for other identified sets for (θ_1, θ_0) below.

Example 1. Consider a study in which $(s_1, s_0) = (0.9, 0.9)$, $P(t = j, r = j) = 0.45$ and $P(t = j, r = 1 - j) = 0.05$ for $j = 0, 1$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ is a line segment with end points $(0.8, 0.8)$ and $(1, 1)$.

The identified set for (θ_1, θ_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.

Remark 3. It is possible that $(\theta_1, \theta_0) > (s_1, s_0)$ component-wise for some $(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$, as in Example 1. Conventional studies assume that the reference test is perfect so $(s_1, s_0) = (1, 1) \geq (\theta_1, \theta_0)$ component-wise. In that sense, the bounds overcome an important limitation of conventional studies in which the index can never be shown to outperform the reference test.

Conventional studies maintain that the reference test is perfect. Under the assumption, the index test t can logically only be as most as accurate as the reference r . In practice t may outperform r . The approach in this paper may be used to determine whether it is possible that the index test is more accurate than the reference.

Remark 4. “Apparent” measures $(\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_0)$ need not be contained in the identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) . In that sense, $(\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\theta}_0)$ may be over- or understating (θ_1, θ_0) . A relevant empirical example is found in Section 5.

Remark 5. The FDA Statistical Guidance defines a reference standard for a condition as: “The best available method for establishing the presence or absence of the target condition. ... 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 used as a reference test, the estimates may be reported as pertaining to sensitivity and specificity, even though the estimands are “apparent” measures when it is imperfect. This practice can be misleading. Tests other than the reference standard may be used as reference tests. However, then the estimates should be reported as “apparent”. If one wishes to learn true test performance, they are typically 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. The method outlined in this paper proposes a solution by forming the smallest possible bounds on the true performance measures under standard assumptions. Furthermore, the guidance emphasizes that the index test can never be shown to be superior to any 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.

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 (θ_1, θ_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 . Researchers may scrutinize the credibility of such assumptions based on 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 $P(t \neq y | r \neq y, y) = P(t = 1 - y | r = 1 - y, y) = 1$ for all y . I formalize this assumption and derive the resulting sharp identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) . Given that its plausibility may vary across health statuses, I allow it to hold only for a particular value of y .

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

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. 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. Let θ_j^L be as in (9). When the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for $y = j$, the sharp bounds on θ_j given (s_1, s_0) are $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\theta_j^L, \bar{\theta}_j^U]$, where:

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

If the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for $y = 0$ and $y = 1$, the sharp bounds

on θ_j for $j = 0, 1$ given (s_1, s_0) are $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\theta_j^L, \bar{\theta}_j^U]$, where:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}_j^U = & \left[\min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}\right) \right. \\ & \left. + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)}{2}, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Sharp joint identified sets $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ for (θ_1, θ_0) given (s_1, s_0) follow from (8).

Proposition 2 provides sharp identified sets for (θ_1, θ_0) when the researcher maintains that the tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for only one or both health statuses.⁷ Both sets given (s_1, s_0) are again line segments in $[0, 1]^2$. The bounds $[\theta_j^L, \bar{\theta}_j^U]$, and $[\theta_j^L, \bar{\theta}_j^U]$ 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. This can be seen in Example 2 below.

Example 2. Consider the study as in Example 1. If the tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for $y = 1$, $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ is a line segment with end points $(0.8, 0.8)$ and $(0.95, 0.95)$. If they have a tendency to wrongly agree for any y , $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ is a line segment with end points $(0.8, 0.8)$ and $(0.9, 0.9)$.

Remark 6. 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 values of (θ_1, θ_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 sharp identified set obtained under further assumptions on the statistical dependence of t , r , and y will be a subset of $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$.

One case where it may 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 performance, i.e. sensitivity and specificity 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

7. One can also define the tendency to correctly disagree for disease status \bar{y} as $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - \bar{y} | r = 1 - \bar{y}, y = \bar{y}) \leq P_{s_1, s_0}(t = \bar{y} | r = 1 - \bar{y}, y = \bar{y})$. Identified sets that follow can be derived symmetrically. Thibodeau (1981) emphasizes that tests are generally not expected to exhibit negative dependence.

not to make the same error using a swab from the same location.⁸ This would be equivalent to a claim that the two tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for $y = 1$. We will use the assumption in the empirical application in Section 5.

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. 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.

2.4 Imperfect Knowledge of Reference Test Characteristics

For simplicity of exposition, previously derived identified sets for (θ_1, θ_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 weaker form of Assumption 2, since it is implied by it. Similarly, jointly with Assumption 3, Assumption 2A implies that $\forall (s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S} : P(t = 1) \in (1 - s_0, s_1)$. If the condition fails, at least one of the two assumptions is refuted. Compactness of \mathcal{S} is not relevant for identification, but it is utilized in the inference procedure defined in Section 4.

For an arbitrary element $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$, the identified set $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ for (θ_1, θ_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 (θ_1, θ_0) when (s_1, s_0) is known to be in \mathcal{S} . All values (θ_1, θ_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 (θ_1, θ_0) that are consistent with the observed data and at least one $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$. We can formally define:

$$\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0). \quad (12)$$

8. 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. In other words, 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 (θ_1, θ_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 (12) is a sharp identified set for (θ_1, θ_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 (θ_1, θ_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 (θ_1, θ_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 θ_1 and θ_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 of positive and bounded slopes. Hence, it will not be rectangular. It is still possible to demonstrate that t may be more precise than r . As in Remark 3, it is feasible that for some $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ there may exist $(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$ $(\theta_1, \theta_0) > (s_1, s_0)$ component-wise.

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. Assumption 2 or even 2A might appear untenable. Yet, the former is routinely maintained by researchers in practice, usually as $(s_1, s_0) = (1, 1)$. Hence, identifying assumptions of conventional studies are at least as strong as the ones in question.

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 may not require a reference test with known (s_1, s_0) . The latter is used to choose s_1 in Section 5 of this paper. Such methods and standard performance studies rely on different sets of assumptions, 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 often expected to have precisely measured analytical performance, which may provide some information on how the tests will perform in clinical settings. For example, Kucirka et al. (2020) maintain that COVID-19 RT-PCR tests are perfectly specific owing to the absence of cross-reactivity with other viruses, that is, perfect analytical specificity.⁹

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 invasive tests that are not always suited for use as references, such as

9. Specificity on contrived laboratory samples containing other pathogens, but not SARS-CoV-2.

biopsies or pathology reports following prophylactic surgeries.¹⁰

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 Bounding Prevalence in Screened Populations

Sensitivity and specificity are often used to derive other parameters of interest. Notable examples are prevalence in a population being screened and predictive values. When (θ_1, θ_0) are partially identified, the derived parameters are generally also partially identified. In this section, I show how the specific structure of the identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) helps reduce the width of implied bounds on prevalence. Bounds on predictive values are discussed in Appendix A.

Population disease prevalence is both a research- and policy-relevant parameter. Suppose that we are interested in learning the true prevalence $P(y = 1)$ in a population that is undergoing screening using a test t , and that is similar to the performance study population. Assume that each individual is tested exactly once. This is a standard problem in epidemiology, where the prevalence can be found for known identified operating characteristics (θ_1, θ_0) , as explained by Gart and Buck (1966), Greenland (1996) and Diggle (2011). In the population of interest it follows that:

$$P(y = 1) = \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0 - 1}{\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1}. \quad (13)$$

Proposition 3 extends the identity above to the case when (θ_1, θ_0) are partially identified.

Proposition 3. *Let $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ be the sharp identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) for a known (s_1, s_0) . Let θ_j^L and θ_j^U be the smallest and largest values of θ_j in the set. The sharp bounds on prevalence are:*

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

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.

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 θ_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 θ_1 and θ_0 .

10. It can be argued that this knowledge of index test performance will also increase through use. However, often its performance must be known to the policy makers before they approve the test for use.

Remark 7. If we were to disregard the linear structure of the sharp 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:

$$P(y = 1) \in \left[\frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^L - 1}{\theta_1^H + \theta_0^L - 1}, \frac{P(t = 1) + \theta_0^H - 1}{\theta_1^L + \theta_0^H - 1} \right] = \bar{\Pi}_{s_1, s_0}. \quad (15)$$

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 $\theta_j^U > \theta_j^L$ for $j \in \{0, 1\}$. Disregarding the linear structure of the identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) yields strictly wider bounds on prevalence.

Bounds in (15) would follow from methods that do not establish the linear structure of $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$, such as Thibodeau (1981) and Emerson et al. (2018). Section 5 demonstrates on an empirical example that this can produce substantially wider bounds on prevalence. Moreover, prevalence will necessarily be partially identified whenever (θ_1, θ_0) are. On the other hand, (14) suggests that even when (θ_1, θ_0) are not point identified, there may exist a value of $P(t = 1)$ for which prevalence is identified.

If a test with identified performance measures is available, then using it for screening in place of t would always identify the prevalence. For example, r could be one such test when (s_1, s_0) are assumed to be known. However, these tests may not always be appropriate for screening due to high costs, long turnover time or invasiveness. A prominent example was the use of antigen rather than RT-PCR tests for screening purposes in university settings during the COVID-19 pandemic. When test t is used, the bounds in Proposition 3 for population prevalence are the smallest possible. If such testing is performed repeatedly, a time series of prevalence bounds can be made. When there is selection into testing, appropriate bounds on prevalence are provided by Stoye (2022), for which the bounds on (θ_1, θ_0) derived here are natural inputs.

Corollary 2. Let $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$ be the sharp identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) where $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$. The sharp bounds on prevalence are:

$$P(y = 1) \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \Pi_{s_1, s_0} = \Pi_{\mathcal{S}} \quad (16)$$

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 (15) can still be formed, and it would hold that $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} \subset \bar{\Pi}_{\mathcal{S}}$.

In practice, test performance and prevalence measurements are commonly done in separate studies. Hence, the performance measures are generally extrapolated to a different set of individuals. The researcher must find it credible that the test will perform similarly in both populations. This is an often maintained assumption both in the literature and in clinical settings, 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.

4 Estimation and Inference

Identified sets for (θ_1, θ_0) in Section 2 can be found when $P(t, r)$ is known. In practice, researchers must use sample data to estimate the identified set and conduct inference. This section demonstrates 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 large family of permissible distributions.

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 (θ_1, θ_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 θ_j with $j = 0, 1$. Replacing population parameters with their consistent estimators in closed form expressions for $\mathcal{G}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0)$ and $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ yields the consistent plug-in estimator of the identified sets (Manski and Pepper (1998), Tamer (2010)).

Let $\mathbb{1}\{\cdot\}$ denote the indicator function. Suppose first that (s_1, s_0) are known. $\hat{P}(t = j, r = k) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{t_i=j, r_i=k\}}{n}$ 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 θ_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. Consistent estimator $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ of the joint identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) follows from (8).

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 $\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ over a fine grid of (s_1, s_0) covering \mathcal{S} . The procedure requires two nested grid-search algorithms, and the level of coarseness of the two grids can impact computation time.

All diagnostic performance studies must report confidence intervals for θ_1 and θ_0 according to the FDA Statistical Guidance on Reporting Results Evaluating Diagnostic Tests. 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 large family of permissible distributions \mathbf{P} .

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.¹¹ Note that θ 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

11. 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.

(s_1, s_0) are known exactly or not. The confidence set C_n should satisfy:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta(P)} P(\theta \in C_n) \geq (1 - \alpha). \quad (17)$$

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 may be possible to construct a distribution of the data $P(t, r)$ such that for any sample size finite-sample coverage probability of some points in the identified set is arbitrarily low. In that sense, inference based on confidence intervals that are consistent only pointwise may be severely misleading in finite samples. To exploit existing inference methods based on moment inequalities to construct C_n , the identified set $\Theta(P)$ must be equivalent to some set $\tilde{\Theta}(P)$:

$$\tilde{\Theta}(P) = \{\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S} : E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) \leq 0 \text{ for } j \in J_1, E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta)) = 0 \text{ for } j \in J_2\} \quad (18)$$

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 θ and performing test inversion.

Identified sets derived in the previous section are representable by (18). Focus on the bounds for θ_1 in Proposition 2 when the tests have the tendency to wrongly agree for $y = 1$ for intuition:

$$\theta_1 \in \left[\max\left(0, P(t = 1, r = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)\right) + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 0, r = 0)\right), \right. \\ \left. \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 0), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2}\right) + \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 1), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)}.$$

Observe that there are four values that are all lower bounds on θ_1 given (s_1, s_0) . Similarly there are four values that are all upper bounds. One of the lower bounds is trivial: $\theta_1 \geq 0$. One upper bound is:

$$\theta_1 \leq \left(\frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2} + P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1) \right) \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)} = \frac{1 + s_1}{2} \quad (19)$$

There are no parameters pertaining to the population distribution in (19). This is a restriction on the parameter space, under which $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}] \times [0, 1] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$. With the appropriate parameter space, there are six relevant values for the bounds on θ_1 that depend on parameters of the population distribution, three for the upper and three for the lower bound. Hence, we can represent the bounds on θ_1 using six moment inequalities.

Proposition 2 implies that we only need to include one additional moment equality to represent the joint identification region $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ for (θ_1, θ_0) . Then the moment function $\bar{m}^1(W_i, \theta)$ representing

the identified set $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$ will have $k = 7$, where $J_1 = \{1, \dots, 6\}$ and $J_2 = \{7\}$.

Remark 8. *The restriction on the parameter space when the two tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for $y = 1$ still allows θ_1 to be higher than s_1 , but not by more than $\frac{1-s_1}{2}$.*

Proposition 4. *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:*

$$\bar{m}^1(W_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{m}_1^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_2^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_3^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_4^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_5^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (-\theta_1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1)r_i \\ (-\theta_1 + 1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (r_i - 1)(1 - t_i) \\ (-\theta_1 + 1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1) \\ \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \\ (\theta_1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i(1 - r_i) \\ \left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2} \right) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i \\ (\theta_0 - 1) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right) - \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + t_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

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 $E_P(\bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta)) = 0$.

Similarly, it is possible to define moment inequality functions that represent remaining identified sets in Propositions 1 and 2. They are found in equations (25), (27), and (28) in Appendix B.

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 (20), (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 $\sigma_j(\theta, P) = \text{Var}_P(m_j(W_i, \theta))$.

Theorem 1 enables us to use the method from Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014) to construct confidence sets C_n for points (θ_1, θ_0) in the identified sets defined by Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 that satisfy (17) 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 (θ_1, θ_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.

Template for Developers of Antigen Tests required by the FDA for EUA mandates that the reference for all COVID-19 antigen test studies must be an approved RT-PCR test.¹² However, Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020), Kucirka et al. (2020), Dramé et al. (2020), Hernández-Huerta et al. (2020), and Kanji et al. (2021) explain that these tests are imperfectly sensitive. Using them as a reference yields “apparent” and generally not true sensitivity and specificity. Interpreting the results as measures of true performance may be severely misleading. Fitzpatrick et al. (2021) emphasize that the false negative rate of the *BinaxNOW* test may be substantially understated by the reported “apparent” analog due to imperfect reference tests. 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.

To verify the claim, I revisit the test performance study data from the submitted EUA documentation¹³, as well data from 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. I also use the data to compare the developed method with existing bounds by Thibodeau (1981) and Emerson et al. (2018), henceforth referred to as comparable methods.

By established notation, t is the antigen test, r is the RT-PCR test and y determines whether the person truly has COVID-19. To construct the confidence sets, I implement the test from Romano, Shaikh, and Wolf (2014) denoted by ϕ_n^{RSW2} in Bai, Santos, and Shaikh (2021). The test relies on the maximum statistic $T_n = \max \left\{ \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \frac{\sqrt{n} \bar{m}_j}{S_j}, 0 \right\}$, where $\bar{m}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m_j(W_i, \theta)$ and $S_j^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (m_j(W_i, \theta) - \bar{m}_j)^2$ for a value θ and components of the appropriate moment function $m_j(W_i, \theta)$ $j = 1, \dots, k$. The testing procedure consists of two steps: 1) Construction of confidence regions for the moments; 2) Formation of a critical value incorporating information on which moment inequalities are “negative”. I perform test inversion over a fine grid of 10^5 points for the relevant parameter space for (θ_1, θ_0) , and additionally over 10 points over \mathcal{S} , where applicable. Following the original

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

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

paper, I use 500 bootstrap samples to find the critical values and set $\beta = \alpha/10$. The results do not change significantly with alternative values $\beta = \alpha/5$ and $\beta = \alpha/20$.

5.1 Identification Assumptions

Use of comparable and bounds developed in the paper requires 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 other existing work, such as Manski (2020), Manski and Molinari (2021) Kanji et al. (2021), Ziegler (2021), and Stoye (2022).

In the absence of a perfect gold standard, a conventional diagnostic test performance study cannot identify sensitivity s_1 of the RT-PCR tests. Some studies rely on a different set of assumptions to identify 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. The authors define discordant results as initially negative RT-PCR findings followed by a positive test result within the incubation period. The negative samples were retested by three alternative RT-PCR assays targeting different genes. If at least two alternative assays yielded positive results, the initial result was considered to be a false negative finding. Assuming perfect specificities of each assay, and perfect sensitivity of the combined testing procedure, they estimate the sensitivity of the used RT-PCR test at 90.3%. Perfect specificity is maintained based on perfect analytical specificity. Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020) use data from published studies to estimate sensitivity, defining false negatives as patients who were symptomatic and negative, but subsequently positive on an RT-PCR test within the incubation period. It is implicitly maintained that all initial results must have been false negatives. Three estimates are based on data from the United States. Sensitivity of 90% is the only estimate which is not considered to be at high risk of bias according to the QUADAS-2 tool (Whiting et al. (2011)). Following the two references, I assume that $s_1 = 0.9$. Appendix C discusses robustness of findings to different assumed values of s_1 .

Following the reasoning outlined in Section 2.3, I assume that the antigen and RT-PCR tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for $y = 1$. Since it is assumed that $s_0 = 1$, events in which $(r, y) = (1, 0)$ have probability zero. The relevant conditional probabilities $P(t|r = 1, y = 0)$ are hence undefined, so the tendency to wrongly agree for $y = 0$ is not maintained.

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 on 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, of which 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 are 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. That the distributions which have generated the data lie in a family of distributions satisfying Assumption 4 is reasonable.

Table 1: Study Data

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	684
Shah et al. (2021) ASx	877	33	15	5	824

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

Panels (a), (b), and (c) of Figure 1 represent the estimated “apparent” operating characteristics and joint identified sets for (θ_1, θ_0) , as well as corresponding 95% confidence sets. The joint confidence set for apparent measures is the projection Clopper-Pearson exact confidence set. The areas of the two confidence sets are similar. Table 2 show the estimates of projected individual bounds on sensitivity and specificity. The bounds are revealing.

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%). Subsequent results of the full study yielded “apparent” operating characteristics estimates of (84.6%, 98.5%). Public statements and media releases erroneously cite all of the estimates as estimates of true performance.¹⁴ Both the interim and final estimates are reported on the instructions-for-use pamphlet accompanying the test. First two rows of Table 2 show that both estimates of “apparent” sensitivity lie strictly above the projected upper bound for true sensitivity in all samples. Hence, sensitivity may be overstated by the “apparent” analog, as Fitzpatrick et al. (2021) suggest. Similarly, the fifth and sixth rows demonstrate that final estimates of “apparent” specificity are at the projected lower bounds for true specificity.

In Figure 1: (a), the red dot representing the estimate of “apparent” measures is outside the confidence set for (θ_1, θ_0) . 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 argument for the same value holds in all other samples, as well as for the interim “apparent” estimates (91.7%, 100%).

Estimated bounds on false negative rate for symptomatic individuals within 7 days of symptom onset are [20%, 23.9%] in the final EUA study data, which is between 1.3 and 1.55 times larger than the corresponding “apparent” estimate of 15.4%. Comparison with the often-cited interim estimate of 8.3% reveals that the estimated true false negative rate is between 2.41 and 2.88 times larger than

14. 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>.

the “apparent” analog. Data from Shah et al. (2021) yield estimated bounds of [25.6%, 26.3%] for symptomatic and [33.1%, 38.1%] for asymptomatic individuals. These estimates suggest that the true false negative rates may be up to 3.17 and 4.59 times higher than “apparent” interim analogs for symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals, respectively. Appendix Section C shows that assuming lower s_1 further exacerbates the difference between true and “apparent” false negative rates.

Remark 9. *Estimated average number of infected symptomatic people who are missed by the antigen test is up to 3.17 times higher than the test users may be led to believe by reported “apparent” estimates.*

Hadgu (1999) highlights that the errors in measurement of 2.9 percentage points for sensitivity 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 8.5 percentage points using the final EUA study data. Results from Shah et al. (2021) exacerbate the discrepancies when compared to the final EUA study “apparent” sensitivity to as much 10.9 percentage points in the symptomatic population and 22.7 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.

Remark 10. *FDA has granted EUA to tests demonstrating at least 80% estimated sensitivity. The result show that, depending on interpretation, the test may not satisfy the requirement.*


Panels (d), (e), and (f) of Figure 1 show estimates of the identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) and compare them with estimates obtained using comparable methods. Results are represented graphically in order preserve the specific linear structure of the identified set that is lost through projection. The sharp identified set provides a substantial reduction in size in all three samples over the comparable methods, and can be very informative. Estimates of the identified set do not contain the estimates of “apparent” measures in any of the samples. Owing to the lack of sharpness, bounds estimated using other methods do not necessarily exclude the “apparent” measures.

Table 2 shows that projected bounds on θ_1 and θ_0 can also be proper subsets of those produced by comparable methods. However, projections do not fully capture the benefits stemming from the particular shape of the sharp joint identified set. Even when the projected bounds are not strictly narrower compared to other methods, the identified set can yield substantially narrower bounds on derived parameters. Panels (g), (h), and (i) of Figure 1 depict the width of prevalence bounds implied by estimates from the three methods as a function of $P(t = 1)$ in screened populations. Solid line represents bound width given the estimates of the identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) and (14) for various hypothetical values of $P(t = 1)$. As previously highlighted, there may exist values of $P(t = 1)$ for which the prevalence becomes point-identified, despite (θ_1, θ_0) being only partially identified. The remaining lines refer to widths of bounds in (15), following from estimates obtained by comparable methods which yield rectangular bounds on (θ_1, θ_0) . The resulting sharp bounds on prevalence are always proper subsets of bounds found via the other two methods.


Table 2: Estimates and Estimated Projection Bounds

		Data		
		EUA Sx	Shah et al. (2021) Sx	Shah et al. (2021) ASx
θ_1 Estimates	Apparent	0.846	0.819	0.688
	Projection	[0.761, 0.800]	[0.737, 0.744]	[0.619, 0.669]
	Emerson et al. (2018)	[0.761, 0.800]	[0.737, 0.744]	[0.619, 0.712]
	Thibodeau (1981)	[0.761, 0.846]	[0.737, 0.819]	[0.619, 0.688]
θ_0 Estimates	Apparent	0.985	0.997	0.994
	Projection	[0.985, 1.000]	[0.997, 1.000]	[0.994, 0.997]
	Emerson et al. (2018)	[0.985, 1.000]	[0.997, 1.000]	[0.994, 1.000]
	Thibodeau (1981)	[0.985, 1.000]	[0.997, 1.000]	[0.994, 0.998]


Note: Estimates of “apparent” performance measures and projections of estimated identified sets for (θ_1, θ_0) shown in Figure 1. Sx denotes the symptomatic, and ASx the asymptomatic individuals.




(a) EUA: Results




(b) Shah et al. (2021) Sx: Results




(c) Shah et al. (2021) ASx: Results




(d) EUA: Methods Comparison




(e) Shah et al. (2021) Sx: Methods Comparison




(f) Shah et al. (2021) ASx: Methods Comparison



(g) EUA: Prevalence Bounds Width



(h) Shah et al. (2021) Sx: Prevalence Bounds Width



(i) Shah et al. (2021) ASx: Prevalence Bounds Width

Figure 1: Assumed $\mathcal{S} = \{(0.9, 1)\}$. Sx denotes symptomatic, and ASx asymptomatic individuals. First row depicts estimates, and 95% confidence sets for “apparent” measures and points in the identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) . Second row compares estimated identified sets with estimates by comparable methods. Bottom row compares widths of prevalence bounds implied by the estimates.

6 Concluding Remarks

This paper derives the smallest possible identified set for sensitivity and specificity of a diagnostic test of interest in standard settings, when the reference test is imperfect. It formalizes an existing assumption on dependence between the reference and the test of interest, and shows how it can further reduce the size of the identified set. Finally, it develops an appropriate uniform inference procedure for the points in the identified set, enabling construction of confidence sets.

The framework is proposed as a solution to a ubiquitous problem in diagnostic test performance studies, and it can be directly applied to existing study data to bound true test performance. Doing so demonstrates that a widely used COVID-19 antigen test tends to produce significantly more false negative results than what the currently cited figures suggest. Since other rapid COVID-19 antigen tests may exhibit similar tendencies, these findings 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 Vytlacil. 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 Teguo, 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.
- Joe, Harry. 1997. *Multivariate models and multivariate dependence concepts*. CRC press.
- 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. 2020. “Bounding the accuracy of diagnostic tests, with application to COVID-19 antibody tests.” *Epidemiology* 32 (2): 162–167.
- . 2007. *Identification for Prediction and Decision*. Harvard University Press.
- . 2003. *Partial identification of probability distributions*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- 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, Jessica 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.
- Ridder, Geert, and Robert Moffitt. 2007. “The econometrics of data combination.” *Handbook of econometrics* 6:5469–5547.
- 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.
- Tamer, Elie. 2010. "Partial identification in econometrics." *Annu. Rev. Econ.* 2 (1): 167–195.
- 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).
- Whiting, Penny F, Anne WS Rutjes, Marie E Westwood, Susan Mallett, Jonathan J Deeks, Johannes B Reitsma, Mariska MG Leeftang, Jonathan AC Sterne, Patrick MM Bossuyt, and QUADAS-2 Group*. 2011. "QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies." *Annals of internal medicine* 155 (8): 529–536.
- Willis, Brian H. 2008. "Spectrum bias—why clinicians need to be cautious when applying diagnostic test studies." *Family Practice* 25 (5): 390–396.
- 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 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 can be 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.

Manski (2020) provides bounds on predictive values for COVID-19 antibody tests using point identified values of θ_1 and θ_0 , when the pre-test probability π_X is bounded. The author notes that the analysis can be generalized to take bounds rather than exact values of θ_1 and θ_0 as inputs. Ziegler (2021) extends the analysis of predictive values when θ_1 and θ_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.

The predictive values are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} PPV &= P(y = 1|t = 1, X) = \frac{\theta_1 \pi_X}{\theta_1 \pi_X + (1 - \theta_0)(1 - \pi_X)} \\ NPV &= P(y = 0|t = 0, X) = \frac{\theta_0(1 - \pi_X)}{\theta_0(1 - \pi_X) + (1 - \theta_1)\pi_X}. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Note that in (21), θ_1 and θ_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 (θ_1, θ_0) rather than of independence. Mulherin and Miller (2002) clarify that clinicians should consider study samples used to find (θ_1, θ_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 (21) have been made in study populations with similar relevant traits in X . I follow this practice and keep X implicit.

Assume that the sharp identification region $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ for (θ_1, θ_0) and the pre-test probability of the clinician π_X are known. From (21), it can be seen that both PPV and NPV increase with θ_1 and

θ_0 . Thus, the sharp bounds are:

$$\begin{aligned} PPV &\in \left[\frac{\theta_1^L \pi_X}{\theta_1^L \pi_X + (1 - \theta_0^L)(1 - \pi_X)}, \frac{\theta_1^H \pi_X}{\theta_1^H \pi_X + (1 - \theta_0^H)(1 - \pi_X)} \right] \\ NPV &\in \left[\frac{\theta_0^L (1 - \pi_X)}{\theta_0^L (1 - \pi_X) + (1 - \theta_1^L) \pi_X}, \frac{\theta_0^H (1 - \pi_X)}{\theta_0^H (1 - \pi_X) + (1 - \theta_1^H) \pi_X} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} PPV &\in \left[\frac{\theta_1^L \pi_L}{\theta_1^L \pi_L + (1 - \theta_0^L)(1 - \pi_L)}, \frac{\theta_1^H \pi_H}{\theta_1^H \pi_H + (1 - \theta_0^H)(1 - \pi_H)} \right] \\ NPV &\in \left[\frac{\theta_0^L \pi_H}{\theta_0^L \pi_H + (1 - \theta_1^L)(1 - \pi_H)}, \frac{\theta_0^H \pi_L}{\theta_0^H \pi_L + (1 - \theta_1^H)(1 - \pi_L)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

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 $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})$:

$$\begin{aligned} PPV &\in \left[\min_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})} \left\{ \frac{\theta_1 \pi_L}{\theta_1 \pi_L + (1 - \theta_0)(1 - \pi_L)} \right\}, \max_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})} \left\{ \frac{\theta_1 \pi_H}{\theta_1 \pi_H + (1 - \theta_0)(1 - \pi_H)} \right\} \right] \\ NPV &\in \left[\min_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})} \left\{ \frac{\theta_0 \pi_H}{\theta_0 \pi_H + (1 - \theta_1)(1 - \pi_H)} \right\}, \max_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(\mathcal{S})} \left\{ \frac{\theta_0 \pi_L}{\theta_0 \pi_L + (1 - \theta_1)(1 - \pi_L)} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Appendix B Additional Moment Functions

This section defines moment functions for remaining identified sets in Propositions 1 and 2 when the tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for $y = 0$, and for both $y = 1$ and $y = 0$. All proofs are collected in Appendix E.

Focus first on the bounds on θ_1 from Proposition 1. Following the reasoning in Section 4, we decompose the bounds on θ_1 to construct the appropriate moment inequalities. Note that there are four values determined by the population parameters that are all lower bounds, and four values that are all upper bounds on θ_1 given (s_1, s_0) . One lower and one upper bound are trivial since they state that $\theta_1 \geq 0$ and $\theta_1 \leq 1$. Both can be omitted since $\theta_1 \in [0, 1]$ by definition. We can then represent the bound on θ_1 using six moment inequalities, corresponding to the six non-trivial boundary values of the identified set. One additional moment equality is needed to represent the joint identification region.

Proposition 5. *Let the moment function m be:*

$$m(W_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} m_1(W_i, \theta) \\ m_2(W_i, \theta) \\ m_3(W_i, \theta) \\ m_4(W_i, \theta) \\ m_5(W_i, \theta) \\ m_6(W_i, \theta) \\ m_7(W_i, \theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (-\theta_1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1)r_i \\ (-\theta_1 + 1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (r_i - 1)(1 - t_i) \\ (-\theta_1 + 1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1) \\ \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \\ (\theta_1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i(1 - r_i) \\ (\theta_1 - 1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i \\ (\theta_0 - 1)(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}) - \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + t_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

Joint identification region $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$ with $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ defined in Proposition 1 is represented by the moment function m . 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 $E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$.

The same reasoning applies for other bounds. Assume that the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for $y = 0$. As in the case when the tests have a tendency to wrongly agree only for $y = 1$, 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:

$$\theta_0 \leq \left(\frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)}{2} + P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 0) \right) \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0)} = \frac{1 + s_0}{2} \quad (26)$$

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 θ when the two tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for $y = 0$ is $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, 1] \times [0, \frac{1+s_0}{2}] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$. The restriction allows $\theta_0 > s_0$, but not by more than $\frac{1-s_0}{2}$.

Remark 11. *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:*

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

The proof is analogous to that of Proposition 4.

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 $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}] \times [0, \frac{1+s_0}{2}] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$.

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 (20) 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 $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}] \times [0, \frac{1+s_0}{2}] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$ 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 $E_P(\bar{m}_7(W_i, \theta)) = 0$.

Appendix C Sensitivity Analysis

The majority of estimates obtained from the 34 data sets used by Arevalo-Rodriguez et al. (2020) indicate that s_1 may be even lower than 90%. To explore the implications of that possibility, I perform a sensitivity analysis. For exposition purposes, I assume $s_1 \in [0.8, 0.9]$, so $\mathcal{S} = [0.8, 0.9] \times \{1\}$. Values $s_1 < 0.8$ yield the same conclusion. Estimates of the identified set as well as the corresponding 95% confidence sets are found using data from each of the three samples, and presented together with findings from Section 5 in Figures 2, 3 and 4 to facilitate comparison. Panel (b) of each Figure depicts the results under the alternative assumption. The solid red region represents the estimated identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) . It is no longer a line. In all figures both the confidence and the estimated identified set become larger, but remain informative. Table 3 shows estimates of the projected bounds. Bounds for specificity are unchanged, while those for sensitivity expand only downwards. Assumed values $s_1 < 0.8$ accentuate this effect. The tendency of “apparent” sensitivity to overestimate true sensitivity increases as s_1 is reduced. On the other hand, allowing for $s_1 > 0.9$ enlarges the estimated upper bounds on sensitivity, but for values of $s_1 < 1$ it never surpasses “apparent” sensitivity. Hence, the finding that “apparent” sensitivity overestimates true sensitivity is robust to different assumed values of s_1 .




Figure 3: Estimates, and 95% confidence sets for “apparent” measures and points in the identified set for (θ_1, θ_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).




Figure 2: Estimates, and 95% confidence sets for “apparent” measures and points in the identified set for (θ_1, θ_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).

Table 3: Estimates

Data	θ_1 Estimates			θ_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]

Note: Apparent estimated values and estimated projected bounds for (θ_1, θ_0) for different \mathcal{S} . Sx denotes the symptomatic, and ASx the asymptomatic individuals.




Figure 4: Estimates, and 95% confidence sets for “apparent” measures and points in the identified set for (θ_1, θ_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).

Appendix D Auxiliary Results

Lemma 1. For a fixed (s_1, s_0) and any $(j, k, l) \in \{0, 1\}^3$ it holds that:

$$P(t = j, r = k) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - l) = P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k). \quad (29)$$

Proof. Suppressing the subscript in P_{s_1, s_0} for clarity:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(t = j, r = k) - P(r = k, y = 1 - l) = \\
& = P(t = j, r = k, y = l) + P(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - l) \\
& - P(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - l) \\
& = P(t = j, r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - l) \\
& = P(t = j, r = k, y = l) + P(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = l) \\
& - P(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - l) \\
& = P(r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k).
\end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

□

Lemma 2. Let $P(t, r)$ and (s_1, s_0) be known, and $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\theta_j^L, \theta_j^U]$ as in (9). Define:

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = \left[\max\left(0, P(t = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1 - j)\right), \min\left(P(t = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \quad (31)$$

Then $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0)$.

Proof. By Lemma 1, the lower bound in (31) is equivalent to $\max\left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y =$

$1 - j) + P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j) \Big) \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \leq \theta_j^L$ since the maximum of a sum of functions is at most the sum of individual maxima. Similarly, the upper bound is $\min \Big(P(t = j, r = j) + P(t = j, r = 1 - j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j) + P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) \Big) \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \geq \theta_j^U$. \square

Appendix E Proofs

Proposition 1. *The sharp identified set $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ for (θ_1, θ_0) given reference test sensitivity s_1 and specificity s_0 is:*

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

where $\mathcal{H}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\theta_j^L, \theta_j^U]$ is the sharp bound on θ_j defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_j^L &= \left[\max \left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max \left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j) \right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ \theta_j^U &= \left[\min \left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \min \left(P(t = j, r = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j) \right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Proof of Proposition 1. A direct proof can be obtained using Theorem 3.10 from Joe (1997).¹⁵ Here, I offer an alternative proof that follows through a series of claims. Intermediate results will be used to prove other propositions. First we derive bounds on $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l)$ for $(j, k, l) \in \{0, 1\}^3$. We then show that the pair of bounds on $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j)$ and $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j)$ for a fixed j are sharp and that any two points in these bounds are attainable simultaneously. The sharp bound on θ_j follows directly. Finally, the sharp joint identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) is immediate by the law of total probability.

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:*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l) \in \left[\max \left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k) \right), \right. \\ \left. \min \left(P(t = j, r = k), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

¹⁵ I am grateful to Gabriel Ziegler for bringing this to my attention.

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:

$$P_{s_1, s_0}(\{t = j, r = k\} \cap \{r = k, y = l\}) \leq \min(P(t = j, r = k), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l)). \quad (33)$$

The upper (33) 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:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = l) &= P(t = j, r = k) - P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - l) \\ &\geq P(t = j, r = k) - \min(P(t = j, r = k), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - l)) \\ &= \max(0, P(t = j, r = k) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - l)) \\ &= \max(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = k, y = l) - P(t = 1 - j, r = k)) \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where the final line of (34) follows from Lemma 1. \square

Claim 2. *Bounds (33) 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:

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}} \begin{pmatrix} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, r = 1, y = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, r = 1, y = 0) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 0, r = 1, y = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 0, r = 1, y = 0) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, r = 0, y = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, r = 0, y = 0) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 0, r = 0, y = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 0, r = 0, y = 0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} P(t = 1, r = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1) \\ P(t = 0, r = 1) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0) \\ P(t = 1, r = 0) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) \\ P(t = 0, r = 0) \\ P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 0) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (35)$$

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 $r = k$:

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}'} \begin{pmatrix} P_{s_1,s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j) \\ P_{s_1,s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - j) \\ P_{s_1,s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = j) \\ P_{s_1,s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - j) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} P(t = j, r = k) \\ P_{s_1,s_0}(r = k, y = j) \\ P(t = 1 - j, r = k) \\ P_{s_1,s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

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 (36) 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 Lemma 1, $P_{s_1,s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j) < P(t = 1 - j, r = k)$. Then from (36):

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s_1,s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = j) &= P(t = j, r = k) \\ P_{s_1,s_0}(t = j, r = k, y = 1 - j) &= 0 \\ P_{s_1,s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = j) &= P_{s_1,s_0}(r = k, y = j) - P(t = j, r = k) \\ P_{s_1,s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = k, y = 1 - j) &= P_{s_1,s_0}(r = k, y = 1 - j). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

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:

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

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 (36), 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 (32) 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 (35), 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 θ_j are:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_j &\geq \frac{\max\left(0, P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)\right)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j) - P(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j)\right)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)} \\ \theta_j &\leq \frac{\min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)\right) + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right)}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}\end{aligned}\tag{39}$$

Claim 3. *The sharp joint identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) is:*

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

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}P(t = 1) &= P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, y = 1) + P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1, y = 0) = \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) + P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0) - \theta_0 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 0).\end{aligned}\tag{40}$$

Set $j = 1$ without loss of generality. 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 (θ_1, θ_0) . \square

\square

Proposition 2. *Let θ_j^L be as in (9). When the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly*

agree only for $y = j$, the sharp bounds on θ_j given (s_1, s_0) are $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\theta_j^L, \bar{\theta}_j^U]$, where:

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

If the index and reference tests have a tendency to wrongly agree for $y = 0$ and $y = 1$, the sharp bounds on θ_j for $j = 0, 1$ given (s_1, s_0) are $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_j}(s_1, s_0) = [\theta_j^L, \bar{\theta}_j^U]$, where:

$$\bar{\theta}_j^U = \left[\min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}\right) + \min\left(P(t = j, r = j) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)}{2}, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right) \right] \frac{1}{P_{s_1, s_0}(y = j)}. \quad (11)$$

Sharp joint identified sets $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ for (θ_1, θ_0) given (s_1, s_0) follow from (8).

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

Lemma 3. *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 (θ_1, θ_0) is $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$.*

Proof. From Lemma 3, $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \geq \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}$. 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 (33):

$$P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \leq \min\left(P(t = j, r = 1 - j), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}\right). \quad (41)$$

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 (36) 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 (34).

For the bounds defined by (34) and (41) 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 (41) is at most as large as the upper bound (33) 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 (34) and (41) are sharp. Sharp bounds on probabilities $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = k, r = j, y = l)$ from (32) are unaffected by the assumption for $(k, l) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ as they form an independent system of equations from (35). 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 (θ_1, θ_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 (θ_1, θ_0) is $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3, $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = 1 - j, r = 1 - j, y = j) \geq \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - j, y = j)}{2}$ 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 (41). The sharp upper bound on $P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j)$ is no longer equivalent to (33). Analogously to the steps used to derive (41):

$$P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j) \leq \min\left(P(t = j, r = j) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)}{2}, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = j)\right), \quad (42)$$

where the first value in the minimum is derived using Lemma 3 and:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = j) &= P(t = j, r = j) - P_{s_1, s_0}(t = j, r = j, y = 1 - j) \\ &\leq P(t = j, r = j) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = j, y = 1 - j)}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Remark 12. *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 (34).*

To see this, observe from (35) 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 (36) 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 (34).

Bounds (34) and (41) 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 (34) and (42) 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 (θ_1, θ_0) .

□

□

Proposition 3. Let $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ be the sharp identified set for (θ_1, θ_0) for a known (s_1, s_0) . Let θ_j^L and θ_j^U be the smallest and largest values of θ_j in the set. The sharp bounds on prevalence are:

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

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:

$$P(y=1) \in \left[\min_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)} \frac{P(t=1) + \theta_0 - 1}{\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1}, \max_{(\theta_1, \theta_0) \in \mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)} \frac{P(t=1) + \theta_0 - 1}{\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1} \right] \quad (44)$$

The value $\frac{P(t=1) + \theta_0 - 1}{\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1}$ is increasing in θ_0 and decreasing in θ_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:

$$P(y=1) = \frac{P(t=1) + \theta_0 - 1}{\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1} = \frac{P(t=1)P_{s_1, s_0}^*(y=0) + \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}^*(y=1) - P^*(t=1)}{\theta_1 - P^*(t=1)} \quad (45)$$

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 (45) with respect to θ_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 θ_1 in the identified set. Then, the lower bound for $P(y=1)$ occurs either at θ_1^L or θ_1^H . Conversely, the upper bound will be at the opposite extreme value of θ_1 . Finally, θ_1^L or θ_1^H correspond to θ_0^L and θ_0^H in $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$, respectively, giving (14). Since $\mathcal{G}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ is sharp, it is immediate that (14) is sharp.

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

□

Proposition 4. 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:

$$\bar{m}^1(W_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{m}_1^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_2^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_3^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_4^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_5^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta) \\ \bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (-\theta_1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1)r_i \\ (-\theta_1 + 1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (r_i - 1)(1 - t_i) \\ (-\theta_1 + 1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1) \\ \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \\ (\theta_1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i(1 - r_i) \\ \left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2} \right) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i \\ (\theta_0 - 1) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right) - \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + t_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) &\geq \max\left(0, P(t = 1, r = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)\right) + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 0, r = 0)\right) \\ \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) &\leq \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 0), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2}\right) + \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 1), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

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 (20):

$$\begin{aligned} E_P(\bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta)) &= \left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2} \right) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 1) \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2} - P(t = 1, r = 1) \leq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Using $E_P(\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta)) = E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta))$ for $j = 1, \dots, 5$, $E_P(\bar{m}_7^1(W_i, \theta)) = E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta))$, (77), (79), (81), and (47), 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 5. \square

Theorem 1. Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2A, 3, and 4 hold. Then for any component $m_j(W_i, \theta)$ in (20), (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 (25), where M_j do not depend on P and θ . I then demonstrate the same for components (20), (27), and (28) that are not identical. Finally, I show that $m_j(W_i, \theta)$ are bounded irrespective of P and θ , 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 4. *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 α :

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\alpha(r_i, t_i) &= \frac{P_{11} - P(t_i = 1)P(r_i = 1)}{\sqrt{P(t_i = 1)(1 - P(t_i = 1))P(r_i = 1)(1 - P(r_i = 1))}} = \\ &= \frac{\alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon) - (\alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon) + \varepsilon)^2}{(\alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon) + \varepsilon)(1 - \alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon) - \varepsilon)}. \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

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 α , 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 α^* into (48) 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 $\rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i) &= \frac{\text{Cov}_P(r_i, t_i r_i)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_P(r_i) \text{Var}_P(t_i r_i)}} = \frac{E_P(t_i r_i)(1 - E_P(r_i))}{\sqrt{E_P(r_i)(1 - E_P(r_i))E_P(t_i r_i)(1 - E_P(t_i r_i))}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{E_P(t_i r_i)(1 - E_P(r_i))}{E_P(r_i)(1 - E_P(t_i r_i))}} = \sqrt{\frac{P_{11}(1 - P(r_i = 1))}{P(r_i = 1)(1 - P_{11})}} \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{P_{11}(1 - P_{11} - P_{01})}{(P_{11} + P_{01})(1 - P_{11})}}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

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:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i) = \max_{P_{11} \in [\varepsilon, 1 - 3\varepsilon]} \sqrt{\frac{P_{11}(1 - P_{11} - \varepsilon)}{(P_{11} + \varepsilon)(1 - P_{11})}}. \quad (50)$$

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 (49) is:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i)^2 = \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in [0.2, 0.25]\} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3 - 6\varepsilon}\right) + \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in (0, 0.2)\} \left(1 - \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^2}{(1 + \varepsilon)^2}\right) \in (0, 1) \quad (51)$$

Statements 4, 5, and 6

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

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i) &= \frac{\text{Cov}_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_P(r_i) \text{Var}_P((1 - r_i)t_i)}} \\ &= \frac{-E_P(r_i)E_P((1 - r_i)t_i)}{\sqrt{E_P(r_i)(1 - E_P(r_i))E_P((1 - r_i)t_i)(1 - E_P((1 - r_i)t_i))}} \\ &= -\sqrt{\frac{E_P(r_i)E_P((1 - r_i)t_i)}{(1 - E_P(r_i))(1 - E_P((1 - r_i)t_i))}} \\ &= -\sqrt{\frac{P(r_i = 1)P_{10}}{(1 - P(r_i = 1))(1 - P_{10})}}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

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:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)^2 = \max_{P_{10} \in [\varepsilon, 1-3\varepsilon]} \frac{(1 - \varepsilon - P_{10})P_{10}}{(\varepsilon + P_{10})(1 - P_{10})}. \quad (53)$$

In this form, the problem is identical to the one in (50). Following the same steps:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)^2 = \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in [0.2, 0.25]\} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3 - 6\varepsilon}\right) + \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in (0, 0.2)\} \left(1 - \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^2}{(1 + \varepsilon)^2}\right) < 1. \quad (54)$$

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:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, r_i(1 - t_i))^2 = \max_{P_{01} \in [\varepsilon, 1-3\varepsilon]} \frac{(1 - \varepsilon - P_{01})P_{01}}{(\varepsilon + P_{01})(1 - P_{01})}. \quad (55)$$

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:

$$\max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)^2 = \max_{P_{10} \in [\varepsilon, 1-3\varepsilon]} \frac{(1 - \varepsilon - P_{00})P_{00}}{(\varepsilon + P_{00}P)(1 - P_{00})}. \quad (56)$$

Consequently, from the solutions to (50) and (52), (55) and (56) will yield the same upper bounds on their corresponding squares of correlations:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, r_i(1 - t_i))^2 &= \max_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \rho_P(r_i, (1 - r_i)t_i)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in [0.2, 0.25]\} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3 - 6\varepsilon}\right) + \mathbb{1}\{\varepsilon \in (0, 0.2)\} \left(1 - \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^2}{(1 + \varepsilon)^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

□

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 (25).

Proof. Consider first a component of m that pertains to the upper bound of θ_1 . The variance $\text{Var}_P(m_4(W_i, \theta))$ for some θ and P is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_P(m_4(W_i, \theta)) &= \text{Var}_P \left(\theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\theta_1}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right)^2 \text{Var}_P(r_i) + \text{Var}_P(t_i) - 2 \frac{\theta_1}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \text{Cov}_P(r_i, t_i). \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

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 θ_1^*

where $Var_P(m_4(W_i, \theta))$ is globally minimized given s_1 and s_0 from the first order condition is:

$$\frac{\partial Var_P(m_4(W_i, \theta))}{\partial \theta_1} : \theta_1^* = (s_1 - 1 + s_0) \frac{Cov_P(r_i, t_i)}{Var_P(r_i)}. \quad (59)$$

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:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_4(W_i, \theta^*)) &= \frac{(Cov_P(r_i, t_i))^2}{Var_P(r_i)} + Var_P(t_i) - 2 \frac{(Cov_P(r_i, t_i))^2}{Var_P(r_i)} \\ &= Var_P(t_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

For any θ it follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_4(W_i, \theta)) &\geq Var_P(m_4(W_i, \theta^*)) = Var_P(t_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2) \\ &\geq 2\varepsilon(1 - 2\varepsilon) (1 - (1 - 4\varepsilon)^2) = \frac{1}{M_4^2} > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of θ^* . 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 4, and the first follows directly from Assumption 4 which implies that $P(t_i = 1) \in [2\varepsilon, 1 - 2\varepsilon]$, so $Var_P(t_i) \geq 2\varepsilon(1 - 2\varepsilon)$.¹⁶ 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 θ are:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_5(W_i, \theta^*)) &= Var_P(t_i(1 - r_i)) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i(1 - r_i))^2) \geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) (1 - h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_5^2} > 0 \\ Var_P(m_6(W_i, \theta^*)) &= Var_P(t_i r_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i r_i)^2) \geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) (1 - h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_6^2} > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

where the inequalities follow from the definition of θ^* , 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 4.

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

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta)) &= Var_P\left(\left(-\theta_1 + s_1\right) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1)r_i\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{s_1 - \theta_1}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}\right)^2 Var_P(r_i) + Var_P((t_i - 1)r_i) - 2 \frac{s_1 - \theta_1}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} Cov_P((1 - t_i)r_i, r_i) \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

16. 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 $P(t_i = 1, r_i = 1) = 1 - 3\varepsilon$.

Fix an arbitrary s_1 and s_0 . The value θ_1^* where $Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta))$ is globally minimized given s_1 and s_0 from the first order condition is:

$$\frac{\partial Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta))}{\partial \theta_1} : \theta_1^* = (s_1 - 1 + s_0) \frac{Cov_P((1 - t_i)r_i, r_i)}{Var_P(r_i)} + s_1. \quad (64)$$

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:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_1(W_i, \theta^*)) &= \left(-\frac{Cov_P((1 - t_i)r_i, r_i)}{Var_P(r_i)} \right)^2 Var_P(r_i) + Var_P((1 - t_i)r_i) \\ &\quad - 2 \left(\frac{Cov_P((1 - t_i)r_i, r_i)}{Var_P(r_i)} \right) Cov_P((1 - t_i)r_i, r_i) \\ &= Var_P((1 - t_i)r_i) \left(1 - \frac{(Cov_P((1 - t_i)r_i, r_i))^2}{Var_P(r_i)Var_P((1 - t_i)r_i)} \right) \\ &= Var_P((1 - t_i)r_i) (1 - \rho_P((1 - t_i)r_i, r_i)^2) \\ &\geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)(1 - h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_1^2} > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of θ^* . And the second follows from Lemma 4 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 θ are:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_2(W_i, \theta^*)) &= Var_P((1 - t_i)(1 - r_i)) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, (1 - t_i)(1 - r_i))^2) \geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) (1 - h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_2^2} > 0 \\ Var_P(m_3(W_i, \theta^*)) &= Var_P(1 - t_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, (1 - t_i))^2) \geq 2\varepsilon(1 - 2\varepsilon) (1 - (1 - 4\varepsilon)^2) = \frac{1}{M_3^2} > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} Var_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) &= Var_P \left((1 - \theta_0) \left(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right) + \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \right) \\ &= Var_P \left((\theta_0 + \theta_1 - 1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \right) \\ &= Var_P \left(\bar{\theta} \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\bar{\theta}}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} \right)^2 Var_P(r_i) + Var_P(t_i) - 2 \frac{\bar{\theta}}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} Cov_P(r_i, t_i) \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

for $\theta_1 + \theta_0 - 1 = \bar{\theta}$. Notice how the function (67) resembles (58). 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

$\theta \in [0, 1]^2 \times \mathcal{S}$. □

Claim 7. 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 (20), (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 $\text{Var}_P(\bar{m}_j^1(W_i, \theta)) \geq \frac{1}{M_j^2} > 0$ for $j \neq 6$.

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

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_P(\bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta)) &= \text{Var}_P\left(\left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1+s_1}{2}\right)\frac{r_i-1+s_0}{s_1-1+s_0} - t_i r_i\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\theta_1 + \frac{-1+s_1}{2}}{s_1-1+s_0}\right)^2 \text{Var}_P(r_i) + \text{Var}_P(r_i t_i) - 2\frac{\theta_1 + \frac{-1+s_1}{2}}{s_1-1+s_0} \text{Cov}_P(r_i, r_i t_i). \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Fix any $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$. The value θ_1^* where $\text{Var}_P(m_6(W_i, \theta))$ is globally minimized given s_1 and s_0 from the first order condition is:

$$\frac{\partial \text{Var}_P(\bar{m}_6^1(W_i, \theta))}{\partial \theta_1} : \theta_1^* = (s_1 - 1 + s_0) \frac{\text{Cov}_P(r_i, r_i t_i)}{\text{Var}_P(r_i)} + \frac{1 - s_1}{2}. \quad (69)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_P(\text{Cov}_P(r_i, r_i t_i)(W_i, \theta)) &\geq \text{Var}_P(\text{Cov}_P(r_i, r_i t_i)(W_i, \theta^*)) = \text{Var}_P(r_i t_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, r_i t_i)^2) \\ &\geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)(1 - h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_6^2} > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

The case for $\bar{m}_j^0(W_i, \theta)$ is symmetric and using the same method of proof it follows that $\text{Var}_P(\bar{m}_j^0(W_i, \theta)) \geq \frac{1}{M_j^2} > 0$ 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):

$$\begin{aligned} V_P(\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta)) &= V_P\left(\theta_1 \frac{r_i-1+s_0}{s_1-1+s_0} - t_i + \frac{1}{2}\left(r_i - s_1 \frac{r_i-1+s_0}{s_1-1+s_0}\right)\right) \\ &= V_P\left(\left(\frac{\theta_1 - \frac{s_1}{2}}{s_1-1+s_0} + \frac{1}{2}\right) r_i - t_i\right) \\ V_P(\bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta)) &= V_P\left(\left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1+s_1}{2}\right)\frac{r_i-1+s_0}{s_1-1+s_0} - t_i r_i + \frac{1}{2}\left(r_i - s_1 \frac{r_i-1+s_0}{s_1-1+s_0}\right)\right) \\ &= V_P\left(\left(\frac{\theta_1 - \frac{1}{2}}{s_1-1+s_0} + \frac{1}{2}\right) r_i - t_i r_i\right). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}
V_P(\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta)) &\geq V_P(\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta^*)) = V_P(t_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i)^2) \\
&\geq 2\varepsilon(1 - 2\varepsilon) (1 - (1 - 4\varepsilon)^2) = \frac{1}{M_4^2} > 0 \\
V_P(\bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta)) &\geq V_P(\bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta^*)) = V_P(t_i r_i) (1 - \rho_P(r_i, t_i r_i)^2) \\
&\geq \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon) (1 - h(\varepsilon)) = \frac{1}{M_6^2} > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

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 (25), (20), (27), and (28):

$$\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathbf{P}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta(P)} E_P \left[\left(\frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right)^2 \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right| > \lambda \right\} \right] = 0. \tag{73}$$

We have shown above that for any $\sigma_j(\theta, P)$ corresponding to components $m_j(W_i, \theta)$ in (25), (20), (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 λ :

$$E_P \left[M_j^2 (m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P))^2 \mathbb{1} \left\{ |m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)| > \frac{\lambda}{M_j} \right\} \right] \tag{74}$$

$$\geq E_P \left[\left(\frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right)^2 \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right| > \lambda \right\} \right] \geq 0. \tag{75}$$

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:

$$4M_j^2 B_j^{*2} \mathbb{1} \left\{ 2B_j^* > \frac{\lambda}{M_j} \right\} \geq E_P \left[\left(\frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right)^2 \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| \frac{m_j(W_i, \theta) - \mu_j(\theta, P)}{\sigma_j(\theta, P)} \right| > \lambda \right\} \right] \geq 0. \tag{76}$$

Finally, since neither B_j^* nor M_j depend on P or θ , it follows that (73) holds, concluding the proof. \square

Proposition 5. *Let the moment function m be:*

$$m(W_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} m_1(W_i, \theta) \\ m_2(W_i, \theta) \\ m_3(W_i, \theta) \\ m_4(W_i, \theta) \\ m_5(W_i, \theta) \\ m_6(W_i, \theta) \\ m_7(W_i, \theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (-\theta_1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1)r_i \\ (-\theta_1 + 1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (r_i - 1)(1 - t_i) \\ (-\theta_1 + 1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + (t_i - 1) \\ \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i \\ (\theta_1 - s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i(1 - r_i) \\ (\theta_1 - 1 + s_1) \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} - t_i r_i \\ (\theta_0 - 1)(1 - \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0}) - \theta_1 \frac{r_i - 1 + s_0}{s_1 - 1 + s_0} + t_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

Joint identification region $\Theta(P) = \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0) \times \{(s_1, s_0)\} \right)$ with $\mathcal{H}_{(\theta_1, \theta_0)}(s_1, s_0)$ defined in Proposition 1 is represented by the moment function m . 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 5. 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 (25):

$$\begin{aligned} E_P(m_1(W_i, \theta)) &= -\theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) + P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1) - P(r = 1) + P(t = 1, r = 1) \\ &= P(t = 1, r = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1) - \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \leq 0 \\ E_P(m_2(W_i, \theta)) &= (-\theta_1 + 1 - s_1) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 0, r = 0) \\ &= P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 0, r = 0) - \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \leq 0 \\ E_P(m_3(W_i, \theta)) &= (-\theta_1 + 1) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) + P(t = 1) - 1 \\ &= P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) s_1 - P(r = 1) + P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)(1 - s_1) + P(t = 1) - P(r = 0) - \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \\ &= P(t = 1, r = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0) + P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 0, r = 0) \\ &\quad - \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

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 $(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}$:

$$\theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \geq \max\left(0, P(t = 1, r = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)\right) + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 0, r = 0)\right). \quad (78)$$

This is equivalent to the lower bound for the element θ_1 of $(\theta_1, \theta_0, s_1, s_0) \in \Theta(P)$. Consider next:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_P(m_4(W_i, \theta)) &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - t \\
&= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 0) - P(t = 1, r = 1) \leq 0 \\
E_P(m_5(W_i, \theta)) &= (\theta_1 - s_1) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 0) \\
&= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 0) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1) \leq 0 \\
E_P(m_6(W_i, \theta)) &= (\theta_1 - 1 + s_1) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 1) \\
&= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 1) \leq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Similarly, the upper bound from Proposition 1 is obtained for the element θ_1 of $(\theta_1, \theta_0, s_1, s_0) \in \Theta(P)$:

$$\theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) \leq \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 1 - 1), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1 - 1, y = 1)\right) + \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 1), P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1)\right). \tag{80}$$

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

$$E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta)) = (\theta_0 - 1)(1 - P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)) - \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) + P(t = 1) = 0 \tag{81}$$

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 (θ_1, θ_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 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 (20) 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 $\theta \in \bigcup_{(s_1, s_0) \in \mathcal{S}} [0, \frac{1+s_1}{2}] \times [0, \frac{1+s_0}{2}] \times \{(s_1, s_0)\}$ 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 5. From the definition of

$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\theta_1}(s_1, s_0)$ for $j = 1$ in Proposition 2:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) &\geq \max\left(0, P(t = 1, r = 1) - P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)\right) + \max\left(0, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1) - P(t = 0, r = 0)\right) \\ \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) &\leq \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 0), \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2}\right) \\ &\quad + \min\left(P(t = 1, r = 1) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)}{2}, P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 1)\right).\end{aligned}\tag{82}$$

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):

$$\begin{aligned}E_P(\bar{m}_4(W_i, \theta)) &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1) + \frac{1}{2}\left(P(r = 1) - s_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)\right) \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 0) - P(t = 1, r = 1) + \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)}{2} \leq 0 \\ E(\bar{m}_6(W_i, \theta)) &= \left(\theta_1 + \frac{-1 + s_1}{2}\right) P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - P(t = 1, r = 1) + \frac{1}{2}\left(P(r = 1) - s_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1)\right) \\ &= \theta_1 P_{s_1, s_0}(y = 1) - \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 0, y = 1)}{2} - P(t = 1, r = 1) + \frac{P_{s_1, s_0}(r = 1, y = 0)}{2} \leq 0\end{aligned}\tag{83}$$

Using $E_P(\bar{m}_j(W_i, \theta)) = E_P(m_j(W_i, \theta))$ for $j = 1, 2, 3, 5$, $E_P(\bar{m}_7(W_i, \theta)) = E_P(m_7(W_i, \theta))$, (77), (79), (81), and (83) 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 5. \square