International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN: 2319-7064
SJIF (2022): 7.942

Diagnostic Accuracy in Molecular Laboratories

Chiamaka Francisca Igweonu

Department of Biological Sciences, Western Illinois University, USA
Email: *cf-igweonu[at]wiu.edu*

Abstract: ***Molecular diagnostics have transformed laboratory medicine by offering enhanced sensitivity, specificity, and faster turnaround times compared to traditional techniques. This review explores the accuracy of molecular tests across diverse clinical applications. Diagnostic accuracy is central to ensuring reliable results in molecular laboratories, influencing patient outcomes, treatment planning, and public health responses. Techniques such as PCR, NGS, and microarray assays are pivotal in modern diagnostics but also introduce challenges related to reproducibility and precision. The review defines key parameters including sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV, and evaluates methodological advances, common errors, and quality assurance mechanisms. Real-world case studies such as SARS-CoV-2 and HPV testing highlight the practical implications of diagnostic variability. Emphasis is placed on regulatory frameworks, proficiency testing, and emerging tools such as AI and digital integration. A systems-level approach is advocated to strengthen diagnostic reliability, especially in high-volume and resource-limited settings.***

Keywords: Diagnostic accuracy; Molecular diagnostics; PCR; Quality assurance; Laboratory errors; Bioinformatics

1. Introduction

1.1 Importance of Molecular Diagnostics

Accurate diagnosis is foundational to effective clinical care, disease control, and research. Molecular diagnostics has emerged as a revolutionary tool, enabling precise detection of pathogens, genetic abnormalities, and malignancies with unmatched sensitivity and specificity. Unlike traditional diagnostic tools that rely on morphological or biochemical indicators, molecular assays target nucleic acids DNA and RNA offering direct insights into disease mechanisms [1, 2].

Advancements such as PCR, qPCR, NGS, and CRISPR have expanded diagnostic capabilities. PCR and qPCR are now routine for identifying infections like HIV, hepatitis, and SARS-CoV-2, while NGS supports precision oncology by identifying tumor-specific mutations [3,4]. In genetic medicine, tools like whole-genome and exome sequencing inform reproductive risk assessments and predict susceptibility to complex diseases. These technologies are also integral in antimicrobial resistance surveillance by detecting resistance genes, thus guiding appropriate therapy [5].

However, with expanded clinical applications comes an increased need to assure test accuracy. False results either positive or negative can mislead treatment decisions, delay care, or cause undue anxiety. Given the central role of molecular testing in therapeutic pathways, accuracy evaluation and optimization are vital.

1.2 Evolution of Diagnostic Accuracy Concepts

Diagnostic accuracy comprises sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV, which together describe how well a test distinguishes affected from unaffected individuals [6]. These metrics are affected by assay design, disease prevalence, and patient-specific factors. Analytical validation initially focused on technical limits, but modern evaluation includes clinical validation and utility assessing whether the test predicts disease and improves care outcomes [7]. Global frameworks such as STARD and IVDR have standardized accuracy assessments, while ISO 15189 enforces ongoing quality measures [8]. Diagnostic stewardship emphasizes ordering the right test at the right time and interpreting results in clinical context, integrating laboratory data with decision-making in real time.

1.3 Scope and Objectives of the Review

This review explores diagnostic accuracy within molecular laboratories, focusing on methodological, clinical, and regulatory aspects. It covers accuracy parameters, performance traits of major molecular platforms (e.g., PCR, NGS), sources of diagnostic error across all testing phases, quality assurance strategies, and regulatory standards. Real-world examples like COVID-19 and HPV testing illustrate implications of variability. The review also highlights future directions, including AI integration, personalized medicine, and harmonized regulation. The ultimate goal is to promote diagnostic reliability, patient safety, and health system resilience.

2. Foundations of Diagnostic Accuracy

2.1. Core Metrics: Sensitivity, Specificity, PPV, and NPV

Diagnostic accuracy reflects a test's ability to correctly identify or exclude a condition. The core metrics include:

Sensitivity: The ability to detect true positives (TP / [TP + FN]), Specificity: The ability to correctly exclude true negatives (TN / [TN + FP]), Positive Predictive Value (PPV): The likelihood that a positive result indicates actual disease (TP / [TP + FP]), Negative Predictive Value (NPV): The likelihood that a negative result indicates absence of disease (TN / [TN + FN]).

These values are critical in clinical decision-making. In infectious disease testing or cancer screening, high sensitivity minimizes missed diagnoses, while high specificity prevents unnecessary interventions. Context matters—population prevalence and clinical urgency influence whether sensitivity or specificity is prioritized.

2.2. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curves and AUC

Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves illustrate the trade-off between sensitivity and 1-specificity across varying thresholds. The Area Under the Curve (AUC) quantifies overall performance, with 1.0 indicating perfect accuracy and 0.5 indicating randomness [9].

ROC analysis is essential in optimizing thresholds in qPCR, digital PCR, and biomarker-based assays. It supports clinical validation by balancing false positives and false negatives.

2.3 Analytical vs. Clinical Accuracy

Analytical accuracy evaluates test performance under laboratory conditions, focusing on reproducibility, precision, and limits of detection. Clinical accuracy assesses performance in real-world scenarios, accounting for specimen variability, disease states, and patient factors [10].

A test may show excellent analytical accuracy but poor clinical utility if applied outside the appropriate diagnostic window or if residual nucleic acids are detected post-infection. Both measures are essential for full validation and must be assessed prior to clinical rollout.

2.4 Prevalence and Bayesian Considerations

Test performance is influenced by disease prevalence. Even a highly specific test can produce many false positives in low-prevalence settings, reducing PPV. Bayesian analysis incorporates pre-test probability to better interpret results [11].

During early COVID-19 testing, high-sensitivity PCR tests returned questionable positives in asymptomatic, low-prevalence groups, prompting reconsideration of testing strategies.

2.5 Confidence Intervals and Statistical Uncertainty

Reporting sensitivity or specificity without confidence intervals (CIs) limits interpretability. Wider CIs indicate lower precision, often due to small sample sizes or high variability. CIs allow comparisons across assays and platforms and guide regulatory acceptance [12].

2.6 Composite and Reference Standards

Diagnostic accuracy requires comparison to a gold standard. In molecular testing, true gold standards may be unavailable, prompting use of composite or surrogate standards. When imperfect references are used, latent class modeling or consensus-based approaches help mitigate bias.

Blinded comparative testing and clinical follow-up improve accuracy assessments when ideal references are lacking.

3. Molecular Testing Modalities

3.1 Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) and Quantitative PCR (qPCR)

PCR remains the cornerstone of molecular diagnostics due to its speed, sensitivity, and affordability. Real-time PCR (qPCR) quantifies nucleic acids using fluorescent probes, allowing real-time tracking of amplification. It is widely used for detecting pathogens, gene mutations, and monitoring viral loads [13].

Diagnostic accuracy hinges on primer design, reagent quality, thermal cycling precision, and contamination control. False positives may stem from non-specific amplification or lab contamination, while false negatives may result from low nucleic acid yield or inhibitors.

Validation involves determining the limit of detection, amplification efficiency, and linearity. Internal controls are essential to detect inhibition and ensure reaction validity.

3.2 Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS)

NGS allows massive parallel sequencing of entire genomes, exomes, or targeted regions. It is transformative in oncology, inherited disease testing, and infectious disease surveillance [14].

Accuracy in NGS depends on read depth, quality of base calling, alignment algorithms, and variant calling pipelines. Challenges include false positives from low-frequency variants and false negatives in GC-rich or repetitive regions.

Standardization of bioinformatics workflows, confirmation via orthogonal methods (e.g., Sanger sequencing), and participation in external quality programs are vital for reliability.

3.3 Microarrays and Hybridization-Based Assays

Microarrays use hybridization-based techniques to analyze thousands of targets simultaneously. Though largely supplanted by NGS in some domains, they remain relevant for gene expression profiling and cytogenetic screening.

Accuracy depends on probe design, hybridization stringency, and fluorescence quantification. Cross-hybridization and low signal intensity can compromise specificity. Replication, internal controls, and data normalization are used to ensure reliability.

3.4 CRISPR-Based Diagnostics

CRISPR-Cas systems, originally known for genome editing, have been adapted for diagnostics. Platforms like SHERLOCK and DETECTR combine nucleic acid detection with reporter-based readouts, offering rapid and sensitive detection [15].

These tools show promise in point-of-care settings due to speed and low infrastructure needs. However, they remain early in clinical validation. Guide RNA specificity, temperature sensitivity, and reproducibility across sample types must be rigorously assessed before widespread adoption.

Table 1: Comparison of Molecular Diagnostic Modalities

Method	Diagnostic Targets	Sensitivity	Specificity	Throughput	Turnaround Time	Key Limitations
qPCR	Specific genes, pathogens, mutations	High (≥95%)	High (≥95%)	Moderate	Hours	Contamination, primer design
NGS	Genomes, exomes, transcriptomes	Very High (≥99%)	High (≥97%)	Very High	Days	Complex analysis, costly, variable depth
Microarray	SNPs, gene expression, pathogens	Moderate to High	Moderate to High	High	1–2 days	Cross-hybridization, limited dynamic range
CRISPR-based assays	RNA/DNA from pathogens or mutations	High (≥90%)	High (≥95%)	Low to Moderate	<1 hour	Early-stage, limited clinical data

4. Sources of Error in Molecular Laboratories

4.1 Pre-analytical Errors

Pre-analytical variables are the most common source of diagnostic error, often exceeding 60% of all laboratory mistakes [16]. They include: specimen type errors, poor collection technique, delays in transport or improper storage leading to nucleic acid degradation, mislabeling, which compromises result validity.

Strict adherence to SOPs, staff training, and standardized specimen handling protocols reduce these risks.

4.2 Analytical Errors

Analytical-phase errors occur during nucleic acid extraction, amplification, or detection: Inhibitors can suppress amplification, cross-contamination may cause false positives, thermal cycler miscalibration or reagent degradation impacts performance, improper primer/probe design leads to off-target amplification.

Automation helps reduce pipetting errors, while internal controls and regular equipment maintenance are critical for consistency [17].

4.3 Post-analytical Errors

Post-analytical issues affect data interpretation and reporting: variant misclassification, transcription errors when entering results, delayed communication of results to clinicians, bioinformatics errors, such as using outdated reference databases.

A robust laboratory information system (LIS), double-checking results, and interdisciplinary review for complex cases help mitigate post-analytical inaccuracies.

Table 2: Sources of Diagnostic Error in Molecular Laboratories

Phase	Error Type	Example Scenarios	Impact on Accuracy
Pre-analytical	Specimen integrity	RNA degradation due to delayed processing	Increased false negatives
	Sample contamination	Environmental or cross-sample contamination	Increased false positives
	Incorrect specimen type	Using EDTA instead of citrate for specific tests	Inhibition or invalid results
Analytical	Reagent or equipment failure	Expired reagents or miscalibrated thermal cycler	Variable results
	Amplification inhibition	Presence of hemoglobin or bile salts	False negatives
	Cross-contamination	Carryover between samples	False positives
Post-analytical	Interpretation errors	Misreading melting curves or variant classifications	Diagnostic misclassification
	Reporting or transcription mistakes	Manual entry errors into laboratory information system (LIS)	Data integrity compromised
	Inadequate result contextualization	Failing to correlate test with clinical presentation	Misleading conclusions

5. Enhancing Diagnostic Accuracy

5.1 Standardization and Quality Assurance

Quality assurance encompasses internal quality control (IQC) and external quality assessment (EQA): IQC uses known positive and negative controls in each assay to detect anomalies. EQA involves blind sample testing across laboratories. Programs such as CAP and QCMD benchmark performance and detect systematic issues [18].

Standardizing protocols such as nucleic acid extraction, thermocycling, and data analysis, reduces variability.

5.2 Internal and External Validation

Before clinical use, molecular assays must undergo thorough validation: Analytical validation assesses sensitivity, specificity, linearity, limit of detection (LoD), precision, and accuracy. Clinical validation confirms the test's utility in real-world diagnosis through retrospective or prospective studies [19].

Both in-house and commercial tests require documentation for regulatory approval and laboratory accreditation.

5.3 Integration of Artificial Intelligence and Bioinformatics

In NGS, AI aids in variant calling and prioritizing clinically significant results using databases like ClinVar and COSMIC. In qPCR, it improves threshold determination and curve analysis.

AI models must be transparent, retrained regularly, and validated in clinical scenarios to support and not to replace expert oversight.

5.4 Laboratory Accreditation and Continuous Improvement

Accreditation to standards such as ISO 15189:2022 and CLIA requires: management system audits, staff qualification verification, risk management documentation, corrective action procedures.
Accreditation drives continuous quality improvement and boosts confidence in laboratory outputs.

6. Regulatory and Accreditation Perspectives

6.1 International Standards and Frameworks

One of the most widely adopted regulatory standards is ISO 15189:2022, which outlines requirements for quality and competence in medical laboratories. This includes criteria for staff qualifications, equipment calibration, result traceability, and uncertainty of measurement. Laboratories accredited under ISO 15189 must also implement quality control systems, participate in proficiency testing, and demonstrate continual process improvement [20].

In the United States, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA) regulate all laboratory testing on human samples outside of clinical trials. CLIA mandates the validation of both commercial and laboratory-developed tests (LDTs), along with personnel competency assessments and routine inspections [21]. Similarly, the European Union's In Vitro Diagnostic Regulation (IVDR 2017/746) emphasizes safety, performance evaluation, post-market surveillance, and transparency through platforms like the EUDAMED database [22]. Under IVDR, high-risk molecular tests are subject to rigorous validation and monitoring.

6.2 Laboratory Accreditation Bodies

Accreditation bodies such as the College of American Pathologists (CAP), the United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS), the Standards Council of Canada (SCC), and the South African National Accreditation System (SANAS) evaluate laboratory practices against national and international standards. These organizations conduct regular audits, review quality management systems, assess technical proficiency, and enforce corrective action protocols. Participation in external quality assessment (EQA) and proficiency testing schemes is often a prerequisite for maintaining accreditation.

6.3 Regulation of Laboratory-Developed Tests (LDTs)

The regulation of LDTs varies across regions. In the U.S., LDTs have historically operated under a policy of enforcement discretion by the FDA. However, emerging policies such as the VALID Act propose extending regulatory oversight to these tests to ensure clinical validity and analytical robustness. In the EU, the IVDR already mandates justification for the use of LDTs over commercial assays, requiring documentation, performance validation, and clinical rationale.

6.4 Emerging Regulatory Considerations

Emerging challenges in molecular diagnostics, particularly those involving digital tools and artificial intelligence, are prompting updates to regulatory guidelines. Software that performs diagnostic functions is now classified as Software as a Medical Device (SaMD), and is subject to documentation, performance metrics, and algorithm transparency requirements. Additionally, real-world evidence (RWE) derived from electronic health records and clinical registries is increasingly used to support the evaluation of diagnostic tools in diverse populations. Harmonization efforts through initiatives such as the International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF) aim to align diagnostic regulations globally, reduce duplication, and expedite access to safe and effective diagnostic technologies.

7. Case Studies

7.1 Diagnostic Accuracy in COVID-19 PCR Testing

During the COVID-19 pandemic, reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) emerged as the diagnostic gold standard for detecting SARS-CoV-2. While its analytical sensitivity and specificity were high, performance in clinical settings revealed significant discrepancies. False-negative rates ranged widely, with sensitivity as low as 70% in some contexts [23]. These inaccuracies were attributed to multiple factors: improper swab technique, suboptimal timing of sample collection relative to disease onset, RNA degradation during transport, and the presence of amplification inhibitors such as mucin.

False positives, though less common, were also observed primarily in high-throughput laboratories under pressure to deliver rapid results. These were often linked to contamination from aerosolized nucleic acids, reagent carryover, or flawed assay design. To address these challenges, several mitigation strategies were employed, including dual-target confirmation assays, enhanced training in specimen collection, environmental decontamination protocols, and continuous participation in external quality assessments. The pandemic underscored the necessity for diagnostic agility, robust validation procedures, and rapid implementation of quality improvement measures during public health emergencies.

7.2 False Negatives in HPV Genotyping

Human papillomavirus (HPV) genotyping plays a critical role in cervical cancer screening by identifying high-risk strains such as HPV-16 and HPV-18. Despite the clinical importance of these assays, studies have revealed substantial inter-platform variability and potential for misclassification. Some molecular tests exhibit reduced sensitivity in detecting co-infections or low-viral-load samples, particularly in multigenotype presentations. Others show cross-reactivity between closely related HPV types, contributing to false-positive results.

A comparative study demonstrated that different commercial assays yielded inconsistent results for the same patient population, leading to conflicting clinical recommendations [24]. Factors contributing to this variability included differences in sample preparation, DNA extraction protocols, primer design, and amplification efficiencies. In response, organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO) now advocate for the use of validated HPV assays in national screening programs and recommend confirmatory testing when results are equivocal. These measures aim to minimize diagnostic uncertainty and improve clinical decision-making.

8. Future Directions to Ensure Accurate Diagnosis in Molecular Laboratories

8.1 Point-of-Care Molecular Testing

Point-of-care (POC) molecular diagnostics are transforming how and where testing occurs. Technologies like microfluidics, isothermal amplification (e.g., LAMP, RPA), and portable PCR devices enable rapid molecular testing outside centralized laboratories. Systems such as the Cepheid GeneXpert and Abbott ID NOW have demonstrated significant utility in pandemic response and in resource-limited settings [25,26].

While POC platforms reduce turnaround time and expand diagnostic access, they pose challenges in quality control and standardization. Environmental variables, limited operator training, and restricted external validation can affect performance. Regulatory frameworks are adapting to include POC-specific guidelines for validation, performance monitoring, and ongoing surveillance.

8.2 Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Diagnostics

Artificial intelligence (AI) is playing an expanding role in genomics and molecular diagnostics. Machine learning models are capable of classifying variants of uncertain significance (VUS), predicting treatment responses, and integrating multi-omics data with clinical phenotypes [27]. AI also supports automated interpretation of molecular profiles and standardizes reporting across platforms.

Natural language processing (NLP) algorithms streamline report generation and flag inconsistencies. However, successful integration requires transparency in algorithm development, validation across diverse populations, and regulatory oversight to ensure safety and efficacy.

8.3 Global Harmonization and Equity

Global harmonization of diagnostic standards ensures consistency in test performance across regions and is crucial for coordinated responses to transnational health threats. Organizations such as the Global Harmonization Task Force (GHTF) and International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF) are working to align regulatory frameworks and reduce barriers to international collaboration [28,29].

Equitable access to diagnostics remains a pressing issue. In many low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), laboratory infrastructure is insufficient to support molecular testing. Addressing these disparities requires the development of low-cost, high-performance platforms; local capacity-building; and investment in workforce training and supply chain reliability. International support and sustainable funding mechanisms are necessary to close the diagnostic gap and build global resilience.

8.4 Personalized and Precision Medicine

Molecular diagnostics are at the heart of precision medicine. Companion diagnostics enable personalized therapies by identifying patients most likely to benefit from targeted treatments, such as EGFR or ALK inhibitors in cancer therapy [30]. Pharmacogenomics allows drug selection and dosing based on individual genetic profiles, optimizing efficacy while minimizing adverse reactions [31].

Liquid biopsies non-invasive tests that detect circulating tumor DNA offer dynamic monitoring of treatment response and disease progression [32]. As the pace of biomarker discovery accelerates, multiplex diagnostic platforms capable of simultaneous analysis of genomic, transcriptomic, and proteomic markers will become essential.

8.5 Real-Time Surveillance and Data Integration

Integrating molecular diagnostics into public health surveillance systems enhances outbreak detection, antimicrobial resistance tracking, and health policy responsiveness. Linking laboratory information systems (LIS) with national databases allows for real-time analysis of testing trends, identification of geographic hotspots, and early detection of emerging pathogens [33].

Automated alert systems, geographic information system (GIS) mapping, and predictive analytics are increasingly used to guide interventions. These tools rely on standardized data formats and interoperable systems, underscoring the importance of digital infrastructure and cybersecurity in molecular laboratory operations.

9. Conclusion

Diagnostic accuracy is a cornerstone of modern molecular laboratory practice. As molecular diagnostics become increasingly integrated into clinical care, public health, and research, the demand for reliable, reproducible, and clinically meaningful results continues to grow. This review has outlined the foundational concepts of diagnostic accuracy, examined the strengths and weaknesses of key molecular platforms, and highlighted sources of error across the diagnostic workflow.

To maintain accuracy, laboratories must adopt a comprehensive strategy that includes standardized protocols, rigorous validation, continuous training, and participation in external quality assessments. Technological innovations such

Paper ID: SR23905095756 DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR23905095756

as artificial intelligence and point-of-care diagnostics offer exciting opportunities but must be implemented with robust regulatory oversight and a commitment to equity and transparency.

Real-world examples such as COVID-19 RT-PCR testing and HPV genotyping have underscored the consequences of diagnostic variability. These cases demonstrate that even the most analytically sensitive methods can falter under real-world constraints without proper quality control and contextual interpretation.

Looking ahead, molecular diagnostics will play a central role in personalized medicine, predictive analytics, and global disease surveillance. Achieving the full potential of these technologies requires sustained investment in laboratory infrastructure, harmonization of regulatory standards, and collaboration across disciplines. Above all, diagnostic accuracy must remain a primary goal not only as a technical achievement but as a moral imperative to safeguard patient outcomes and public health.

References

[1] Miller MB, Tang YW. Basic concepts of microarrays and potential applications in clinical microbiology. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2009;22(4):611–33.
[2] Hogan CA, Yang S, Garner OB, Green DA, Gomez CA, Dien Bard J, et al. Clinical impact and implementation challenges of molecular diagnostic assays for infectious diseases. J Clin Microbiol. 2012;50(7):2461–5.
[3] Caliendo AM, Gilbert DN, Ginocchio CC, Hanson KE, May L, Quinn TC, et al. Better tests, better care: Improved diagnostics for infectious diseases. Clin Infect Dis. 2013;57(Suppl 3):S139–70.
[4] Kneuertz PJ, Malleo G. Genomic profiling in surgical oncology: Precision medicine in perioperative care. J Surg Oncol. 2016;114(3):289–96.
[5] Van Belkum A, Bachmann TT, Lüdke G, Lisby JG, Kahlmeter G, Mohess A, et al. Developmental roadmap for antimicrobial susceptibility testing systems. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2019;17(1):51–62.
[6] Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig L, et al. Towards complete and accurate reporting of studies of diagnostic accuracy: the STARD initiative. BMJ. 2003;326(7379):41–4.
[7] Hayden SR, Brown MD. Likelihood ratio: a powerful tool for incorporating the results of a diagnostic test into clinical decision-making. Ann Emerg Med. 2013;61(5):564–70.
[8] International Organization for Standardization (ISO). ISO 15189:2022 Medical laboratories—Requirements for quality and competence. Geneva: ISO; 2022.
[9] Zhou XH, Obuchowski NA, McClish DK. Statistical methods in diagnostic medicine. 2nd ed. Hoboken (NJ): Wiley; 2011.
[10] Kellogg JA, Yen-Lieberman B, Tabb D, Boone J, Knapp C, Tang YW, et al. Quality assurance and quality control in molecular diagnostic testing. Clin Lab Med. 2021;41(3):433–49.
[11] Arevalo-Rodriguez I, Buitrago-Garcia D, Simancas-Racines D, Zambrano-Achig P, Del Campo R, Ciapponi A, et al. False-negative results of initial RT-PCR assays for COVID-19: a systematic review. PLoS One. 2020;15(12):e0242958.
[12] Rutjes AW, Reitsma JB, Coomarasamy A, Khan KS, Bossuyt PM. Evaluation of diagnostic tests when there is no gold standard. A review of methods. Health Technol Assess. 2007;11(50): iii, ix–51.
[13] Kubista M, Andrade JM, Bengtsson M, Forootan A, Jonák J, Lind K, et al. The real-time polymerase chain reaction. Mol Aspects Med. 2006;27(2–3):95–125.
[14] Goodwin S, McPherson JD, McCombie WR. Coming of age: ten years of next-generation sequencing technologies. Nat Rev Genet. 2016;17(6):333–51.
[15] Chen JS, Ma E, Harrington LB, Da Costa M, Tian X, Palefsky JM, et al. CRISPR-Cas12a target binding unleashes indiscriminate single-stranded DNase activity. Science. 2018;360(6387):436–9.
[16] Plebani M. Errors in clinical laboratories or errors in laboratory medicine? Clin Chem Lab Med. 2006;44(6):750–9.
[17] Westgard JO. Basic QC practices: training in statistical quality control for healthcare laboratories. 4th ed. Madison (WI): Westgard QC Inc.; 2016.
[18] Jennings L, Van Deerlin VM, Gulley ML. Recommended principles and practices for validating clinical molecular pathology tests. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 2009;133(5):743–55.
[19] Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA). U.S. Department of Health & Human Services; 2022. Available from: https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Legislation/CLIA
[20] European Commission. Regulation (EU) 2017/746 of the European Parliament and of the Council on in vitro diagnostic medical devices. Off J Eur Union. 2017; L117:176–332.
[21] Woloshin S, Patel N, Kesselheim AS. False negative tests for SARS-CoV-2 infection—challenges and implications. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(6): e38.
[22] Poljak M, Ostrbenk A, Seme K, Učakar V, Potočnik M, Gale N. Comparison of clinical and analytical performance of the Abbott RealTime High Risk HPV assay to the Roche Cobas HPV test and the Qiagen Hybrid Capture 2 HPV DNA test. J Clin Virol. 2016;76:10–6.
[23] Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Berhane S, Taylor M, Adriano A, Davenport C, et al. Rapid, point-of-care antigen and molecular-based tests for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2021;3(3):CD013705.
[24] Loeffelholz MJ, Alland D, Butler-Wu SM, Pandey U, Pritt BS, Rakeman JL, et al. Multicenter evaluation of the Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 test. J Clin Microbiol. 2020;58(8):e00926-20.
[25] Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med. 2019;25(1):44–56.
[26] Patel VL, Shortliffe EH, Stefanelli M, Szolovits P, Berthold MR, Bellazzi R, et al. The coming of age of artificial intelligence in medicine. Artif Intell Med. 2009;46(1):5–17.

[27] Global Harmonization Task Force. Role of standards in the assessment of medical devices. GHTF/SG1/N78:2012.
[28] International Medical Device Regulators Forum (IMDRF). About IMDRF. Available from: https://www.imdrf.org/about
[29] World Health Organization (WHO). Diagnostics and laboratory technology: strengthening diagnostic capacity. Geneva: WHO; 2020.
[30] Frampton GM, Fichtenholtz A, Otto GA, Wang K, Downing SR, He J, et al. Development and validation of a clinical cancer genomic profiling test based on massively parallel DNA sequencing. Nat Biotechnol. 2013;31(11):1023–31.
[31] Relling MV, Evans WE. Pharmacogenomics in the clinic. Nature. 2015;526(7573):343–50.
[32] Wan JCM, Massie C, Garcia-Corbacho J, Mouliere F, Brenton JD, Caldas C, et al. Liquid biopsies come of age: towards implementation of circulating tumour DNA. Nat Rev Cancer. 2017;17(4):223–38.
[33] Vandenberg O, Martiny D, Rochas O, van Belkum A, Kozlakidis Z. Considerations for diagnostic COVID-19 tests. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2021;19(3):171–83.