Study	TN T	N + FP	Pro	oportion	95%-CI
Test type = ELISA Balamurugan (2007) Balamurugan (2021) Cheng (2017) Choi (2003) Choi (2005) Manzoor (2020) Singh (2004a) Singh (2004b) Singh (2006) Zhang (2012) Random effects model Heterogeneity: I ² = 86%,		338 148 377 75 733 36 967 336 1731 488 5229 9, <i>p</i> < 0.01		0.980 [0 0.995 [0 0.907 [0 0.985 [0 0.833 [0 0.984 [0 0.929 [0 0.971 [0	0.989; 1.000] 0.942; 0.996] 0.981; 0.999] 0.817; 0.962] 0.973; 0.992] 0.672; 0.936] 0.975; 0.991] 0.896; 0.954] 0.961; 0.978] 0.940; 0.976] 0.948; 0.989]
Test type = cELISA Munir (2009) Zhang (2013) Random effects mode Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 98\%$, Random effects mode Prediction interval	181 679 el τ ² = 0.684	220 706 926	——————————————————————————————————————	0.962 [0 0.916 [0 0.969 [0	0.766; 0.871] 0.945; 0.975] 0.771; 0.972] 0.938; 0.985] 0.648; 0.998]
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.4838$, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_1^2 = 3.19$, df = 1 ($p = 0.07$)			0.65 0.7 0.75 0.8 0.85 0.9 0.95 1 Specificity	Į	J.040, U.330]