ISSN: 2538-5887; Pathobiology Research. 2026; 29 (2): 43-48
DOI: 10.48311/mjms.2026.121122.82627

False results in urine drug screening tests: Mechanisms, clinical interpretation and practical considerations

Review History:
Received: 2026-06-08
Revised: 2026-06-12
Accepted: 2026-06-17

Article Type:
Original Research

Authors:
Bamdad Riahi-Zanjani[*1]

1. Medical Toxicology Research Center, Basic Sciences Research Institute, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Mashhad, Iran.

**** Corresponding author:***
Bamdad Riahi-Zanjani
Tel: (+98) 51 38002271
Email: riahib@mums.ac.ir
ORCID: 0000-0003-1780-8164

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Urine drug screening remains one of the most widely used toxicological testing modalities in clinical medicine, occupational health, forensic investigations, pain management, addiction medicine, and emergency care. The popularity of these tests is due to low cost, ease of specimen collection, rapid turnaround times, and relatively long detection windows for many substances. Despite these advantages, urine drug testing is associated with significant limitations. The most important of these limitations are false-results, which may lead to improper clinical decisions, legal consequences, workplace sanctions, and adverse patient outcomes. Most screening assays rely on immunoassay technology, which is designed to provide rapid presumptive results rather than definitive identification of drugs.

Methods: Based on the valid references, our review examines the scientific basis of urine drug screening, the leading causes of false-results, drug-specific considerations, and interpretation to improve diagnostic accuracy and patient care.

Results: Cross-reactivity with medications, metabolites, and endogenous compounds can produce false-positive findings, while assay limitations, specimen adulteration, dilution, timing of specimen collection, and restricted detection windows may result in false-negative findings.

Conclusion: Understanding the mechanisms underlying erroneous results is essential for clinicians, laboratorians, and policymakers. Finally, confirmatory testing using GC-MS or LC-MS/MS should be considered mandatory whenever results are unexpected or associated with important consequences.

Keywords: Urine drug screening, False-results, Immunoassay, Toxicology, Drug testing, Interpretation.

Introduction

Urine drug screening is a foundation of modern toxicology. It is routinely used in emergency departments to aid diagnosis, in workplace programs to ensure safety, in addiction treatment settings to monitor abstinence, and in pain management clinics to assess adherence to prescribed therapies. Compared to blood testing, urine testing is less invasive, easier to collect, and generally provides a longer window of detection for many drugs and metabolites (1). Most urine drug testing programs employ a two-step approach. The first step involves a screening assay, usually an immunoassay, designed to rapidly detect the presence of a drug class. The second step includes a confirmatory assay using highly specific analytical techniques such as gas chromatography–mass spectrometry (GC-MS) or liquid chromatography–tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS). Screening assays are intended to be sensitive rather than perfectly specific, meaning that they may detect compounds structurally similar to the target analyte. Consequently, screening results should be regarded as presumptive until confirmed (2). The growing complexity of prescribed medications, designer drugs, synthetic opioids, and novel psychoactive substances has increased the challenge of interpreting urine drug screening test results. Clinicians must understand not only what a positive or negative result means but also the limitations inherent in the testing methodology. Failure to recognize these limitations can lead to significant medical, social, occupational, and legal consequences (3).

Principles of urine drug screening

Urine contains parent drugs, metabolites, and

excreted breakdown products that may remain detectable after clinical effects have subsided. Detection depends on numerous factors, including dose, frequency of use, metabolism, body mass, hydration status, renal function, and analytical sensitivity. Immunoassays are the most commonly and widely used screening techniques. These assays use antibodies directed against specific drugs or metabolites. Common panels include testing for some abused drug such as amphetamines, cocaine metabolites, cannabinoids, opioids, benzodiazepines, barbiturates, methadone, and phencyclidine. The primary advantages of immunoassays include speed, automation, and low cost. However, immunoassays have important limitations. Antibodies may react with compounds that share structural similarities to the target analyte. Furthermore, many immunoassays are optimized for specific metabolites and may fail to detect structurally different compounds within the same pharmacologic class. These limitations form the basis for many false-positive and false-negative results (2, 3).

False-positive results

Definition and Significance

A false-positive result occurs when a test shows the presence of a drug despite the absence of actual exposure to the targeted substance. False-positive findings may be particularly harmful because they can result in accusations of illicit drug use, rejection of employment opportunities, discontinuation of therapy, loss of child custody, or legal sanctions (4).

Mechanisms of False-positives

Cross-reactivity is the most common mechanism. Antibodies recognize molecular structures rather than the exact identity of a compound. Medications with structural features similar to the targeted drug may bind to assay antibodies and generate positive results. Variability between manufacturers means that one immunoassay may exhibit cross-reactivity whereas another may not. Analytical interference may also occur due to endogenous substances, specimen contamination, or technical limitations. Although laboratory quality assurance procedures reduce these risks, they cannot eliminate them entirely (3-5).

False-positive Amphetamine results

Amphetamine immunoassays are among the least specific screening tests. Numerous medications have been implicated in false-positive results. These include pseudoephedrine, ephedrine, phenylephrine, bupropion, desipramine, fluoxetine, ranitidine, trazodone, amantadine, labetalol, and selegiline (table 1). Because many of these agents are widely prescribed or available over the counter, clinicians frequently encounter unexpected positive amphetamine screens. Bupropion deserves particular attention because it is commonly prescribed for depression and smoking cessation. Several studies have identified it as a major cause of false-positive amphetamine screens in clinical practice (3, 6).

False-positive Opiate results

Traditional opiate assays are designed primarily to detect morphine-related compounds. Cross-reactivity may occur with quinolone antibiotics, rifampin, diphenhydramine, and dextromethorphan. Historically, ingestion of poppy seeds generated positive opiate tests because of naturally occurring morphine and codeine residues (table 1). Although modern cutoffs have reduced this problem, it has not been completely eliminated (3, 7, 8).

False-positive Cannabinoid results

Cannabinoid immunoassays have improved substantially over time. Earlier generations exhibited cross-reactivity with nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs such as ibuprofen and naproxen. False-positive results have also been reported with proton pump inhibitors and efavirenz (table 1). Although less common today, clinicians should remain aware of these possibilities (8-10).

False-positive Benzodiazepine results

Sertraline and oxaprozin (table 1) are among the medications most commonly associated with false-positive benzodiazepine screens (2, 3). In patients receiving long-term antidepressant therapy, unexpected benzodiazepine positivity should therefore be interpreted cautiously (8-10).

False-positive Phencyclidine results

Phencyclidine assays are notorious for poor specificity. Venlafaxine, tramadol, diphenhydramine, ketamine, and dextromethorphan have all been associated with false-positive phencyclidine screens (table 1). Such findings are particularly important because Phencyclidine use carries substantial stigma and may significantly influence clinical decision-making (10-14).

Table 1. Cases that may cause false-positive results through urine drug screening tests

Drug class	Interfering drugs
Amphetamines	Pseudoephedrine, Ephedrine, Phenylephrine, Bupropion, Desipramine, Fluoxetine, Ranitidine, Trazodone, Amantadine, Labetalol, Selegiline
Opiates	Quinolone antibiotics, Rifampin, Diphenhydramine, Dextromethorphan, Poppy seeds
Cannabinoides	Ibuprofen, Naproxen, Efavirenz, proton pump inhibitors
Benzodiazepines	Sertraline, Oxaprozin
Phencyclidine	Venlafaxine, Tramadol, Diphenhydramine, Ketamine, Dextromethorphan

False-negative results

Definition and Significance

A false-negative result occurs when a drug or metabolite is present in the specimen but remains undetected. In many clinical settings, false negatives may be more dangerous than false positives because they can create a false impression of abstinence, compliance, or absence of intoxication.

Low Drug Concentrations

The most common cause of false-negative results is analyte concentration below the assay cutoff. Concentrations may fall below detection thresholds because of small doses, delayed specimen collection, recent use, rapid metabolism, or substantial fluid intake before testing (table 2).

Detection Window Limitations

Each substance has a characteristic detection window. Cocaine metabolites are generally detectable for two to four days, while amphetamines and opioids are often detectable for one to three days. Chronic cannabis use may be detectable for weeks, whereas occasional use may be detectable for only a few days. Testing outside the detection window frequently results in false-negative findings despite prior exposure (table 2).

Dilution of Specimens

Intentional or unintentional dilution reduces drug concentrations. Excessive water intake before testing can lower analyte levels below assay cutoffs (table 2). Laboratories frequently assess creatinine concentration and specific gravity to identify diluted samples (2, 3, 10, 11).

Adulteration and Tampering

Individuals may attempt to conceal drug use by adding adulterants such as bleach, vinegar, lemon juice, ammonia, drain cleaner, detergents, tablet salt (with mechanisms of high scale variation of environment pH and ionic strength preventing the reaction between antigen and antibody) or commercial masking products such as Stealth (peroxide/peroxidase), Urine Luck (Chromate/Pyridinium chromate) and Urine Clear (Sodium nitrite) with mechanisms of oxidizing and changing the structure of abused drugs (table 2). Such substances may interfere with assay performance and yield false-negative results. Modern laboratories increasingly employ specimen validity testing to detect tampering (3, 10, 11, 15).

Substitution of Specimens

Synthetic urine and substituted specimens represent another important source of false-negative results (table 2). Directly observed collection, temperature monitoring, and chain-of-custody procedures help reduce the risk of substitution (18).

Drug-specific causes of false-negatives

Opioids

Many clinicians assume that a standard opiate screen detects all opioids. This assumption is incorrect. Traditional opiate immunoassays primarily detect morphine and codeine. Synthetic and semisynthetic opioids such as fentanyl, methadone, buprenorphine, tramadol, and oxycodone may not be detected unless specifically included in the testing panel (15-17).

Benzodiazepines

Many benzodiazepine immunoassays target oxazepam-related metabolites. Consequently, alprazolam, lorazepam, and clonazepam may produce negative results despite recent use. This limitation is a common source of confusion in clinical practice (17).

Synthetic Cannabinoids

Routine cannabinoid tests identify tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) metabolites but generally fail to detect synthetic cannabinoids. Users of these substances may therefore test negative on standard screening panels (10, 11, 19).

Table 2. Cases that may cause false-negative results through urine drug screening tests

Mechanism	Explanations
Low dose concentration	Using small doses, Recent use, Delayed specimen collection, Rapid metabolism, Substantial fluid intake before testing
Detection window limitations	Screening outside the drug detection window
Dilution of specimen	Adding fluids directly to container of specimen, Excessive water intake
Adulteration and Tampering	Bleach, Vinegar, Lemon juice, Ammonia, Drain cleaner, Detergents, Tablet salt, Stealth (peroxide/peroxidase), Urine Luck (Chromate/Pyridinium chromate) Urine Clear (Sodium nitrite)
Substitution of Specimens	Using of synthetic urine and substituted specimens
Drug-specific causes of false-negatives	It happens if Inappropriate test is used

Clinical interpretation of urine drug test results

Interpretation of urine drug tests requires integration of laboratory findings with clinical information. Test results should never be interpreted in isolation. Important considerations include medication history, timing of drug exposure, specimen collection procedures, hydration status, renal function, and assay methodology. Medication reconciliation is particularly important. A thorough review of prescribed medications, over-the-counter products, herbal preparations, and dietary supplements may explain unexpected findings. Clinicians should also understand which substances are included in the testing panel and which are not (16, 17). Unexpected positive results should prompt consideration of cross-reactivity and confirmation by definitive analytical methods. Unexpected negative results should raise questions regarding timing, assay sensitivity, dilution, adulteration, or the possibility that the tested drug is not included in the panel (3, 18).

Role of confirmatory testing

Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry

GC-MS has long been regarded as the reference standard for drug confirmation. The technique separates compounds chromatographically and identifies them based on unique mass spectra. Specificity and sensitivity are substantially higher than those of immunoassays.

Liquid Chromatography–Tandem Mass Spectrometry

LC-MS/MS has become increasingly popular because it provides excellent sensitivity, broad analyte coverage, and improved detection of polar compounds. Many modern toxicology laboratories currently use LC-MS/MS as their primary confirmatory platform (18).

Indications for Confirmation

Confirmation should be obtained whenever results are unexpected, disputed, or associated with significant consequences. Workplace disciplinary actions, legal proceedings, addiction treatment decisions, and alterations in pain management regimens should not be based solely on presumptive screening results (18).

Special consideration in pain management

Urine drug testing plays a central role in chronic pain management. Physicians use testing to monitor adherence, identify undisclosed drug use, and reduce the risk of diversion. However, interpretation is often complex. Patients prescribed opioids may demonstrate unexpected metabolites because of metabolic pathways. Conversely, a negative result may reflect sporadic use, delayed testing, laboratory limitations, or diversion of prescribed medication. Consequently, test interpretation should be integrated with prescription monitoring programs, clinical assessment, and patient interviews (20-22).

Forensic and legal implications

Urine drug testing results frequently influence employment decisions, criminal investigations, probation monitoring, and family court proceedings. In these settings, the consequences of inaccurate results may be profound. Confirmatory testing and strict chain-of-custody procedures are therefore essential. Courts and regulatory agencies increasingly recognize that screening immunoassays are presumptive rather than definitive. Failure to obtain confirmation may

compromise the validity of legal proceedings and increase the likelihood of unjust outcomes (5, 18).

Future directions

Advances in analytical toxicology continue to improve test accuracy. High-resolution mass spectrometry, expanded analyte panels, and improved immunoassay design have reduced rates of erroneous results. Nevertheless, the continual emergence of novel psychoactive substances ensures that interpretation challenges will persist. Artificial intelligence and machine-learning play a key role in boosting workplace safety and ensuring compliance with legal and regulatory standards. For instance, with merging predictive analyses, administrations are able to identify potential risks, such as substance abuse and behavioral issues that may compromise workplace safety. Expanded use of LC-MS/MS for primary testing may further reduce dependence on less specific immunoassays (18, 23).

Conclusion

Urine drug screening is an invaluable tool in modern healthcare and forensic practice. Nevertheless, false-positive and false-negative results remain significant limitations, particularly when immunoassay screening methods are used. False positives commonly arise from cross-reactivity with medications and other compounds, whereas false negatives may result from assay limitations, specimen dilution, adulteration, restricted detection windows, and failure to test for specific drugs. Accurate interpretation requires understanding of laboratory methodology, clinical context, pharmacology, and specimen validity. Confirmatory testing using GC-MS or LC-MS/MS should be considered mandatory whenever results are unexpected or associated with important consequences. Recognition of these principles enables clinicians and laboratorians to improve patient care, reduce diagnostic error, and ensure fair application of drug testing programs (18).

Acknowledgment

This review article was supported by Mashhad University of Medical Sciences. The support is appreciated.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agencies.

Authors' contributions

This review article was prepared by only one author.

Data availability

Data available on request from the authors.

Conflict of interest

The author declared no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Moeller KE, Lee KC, Kissack JC. Urine drug screening: practical guide for clinicians. Mayo Clin Proc. 2008;83(1):66-76.
2. Riahi-Zanjani B. Retraining over the principles and mechanisms involved in the occurrence of false results from urine drug screening tests: Adulteration and strategies to defeat. J Birjand Univ Med Sci. 2022;29(3):185-194.
3. Riahi-Zanjani B. False positive and false negative results in urine drug screening tests: Tampering methods and specimen integrity tests. Pharmacologyonline. 2014;1:102-8.
4. Standridge JB, Adams SM, Zotos AP. Urine drug screening: a valuable office procedure. Am Fam Physician. 2010;81(5):635-40.
5. Timcheh-Hariri A, Balali-Mood M, Sadeghi M, Lari N, Riahi-Zanjani B. Comparison of ELISA and TLC Methods for the Morphine Detection in Urine of Drug Abusers. Iran J Toxicol. 2016;10(3):47-50.
6. Brahm NC, Yeager LL, Fox MD, Farmer KC, Palmer TA. Commonly prescribed medications and potential false-positive urine drug screens. Am J Health Syst Pharm. 2010;67(16):1344-50.
7. Reisfield GM, Salazar E, Bertholf RL. Rational use and interpretation of urine drug testing in chronic opioid therapy. Ann Clin Lab Sci. 2007;37(4):301-14.
8. Melanson SEF. Understanding and interpreting urine drug tests. Clin Lab Med. 2012;32(3):429-47.
9. Christo PJ, Manchikanti L, Ruan X, et al. Urine drug testing in chronic pain. Pain Physician. 2011;14(2):123-43.
10. Gourlay DL, Heit HA, Caplan YH. Urine Drug Testing in Clinical Practice: The Art and Science of Patient Care. 6th ed. Stamford (CT): PharmaCom Group; 2015.
11. Langman LJ, Bechtel LK, Holstege CP. Clinical toxicology testing. In: Rifai N, Horvath AR, Wittwer CT, editors. Tietz Textbook of Clinical Chemistry and Molecular Diagnostics. 6th ed. Elsevier; 2018.
12. Vincent EC, Zebelman A, Goodwin C. What common substances can cause false positives on urine drug screens for drugs of abuse? J Fam Pract. 2006; 55(10): 893-4.
13. Brahm NC, Yeager LL, Fox MD, Farmer KC, Palmer

TA. Commonly prescribed medications and potential false positive urine drug screens. Am J Health-Syst Pharm. 2010; 67(16): 1344-50.

14. Woelfel JA. Drug abuse urine tests: false-positive results. Pharmacist's Letter/Prescriber's Letter. 2005; 21(3): 1-5.
15. Mikel C, Almazan P, West R. Interpretation challenges in urine drug testing. J Med Toxicol. 2019;15(2):130-9.
16. George S, Braithwaite RA. Use of on-site testing for drugs of abuse. Clin Chem. 2002;48(10):1639-46.
17. Snyder ML, Fantz CR, Melanson SEF. Immunoassay-based drug tests and common sources of interference. Clin Lab News. 2017;43(5):8-12.
18. Pesce AJ, Rosenthal M, West C, West C, Crews B, Mikel C, et al. An evaluation of the diagnostic accuracy of liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry versus immunoassay drug testing. Pain Physician. 2010;13(3):273-81.
19. Ninnemann AL, Lechner WV, Borges A, Lejuez CW. Synthetic cannabinoids to avoid urine drug screens: Implications for contingency management and other treatments for drug dependence. Addict Behav. 2016;63:72–73.
20. Hammett-Stabler CA, Pesce AJ, Cannon DJ. Urine drug screening in the medical setting. Clin Chim Acta. 2002;315(1-2):125-35.
21. Levy S, Siqueira LM. Testing for drugs of abuse in children and adolescents. Pediatrics. 2014;133(6):e1798-e1807.
22. American Society of Addiction Medicine. Appropriate Use of Drug Testing in Clinical Addiction Medicine. Rockville (MD): ASAM; 2017.
23. Shenouda A, Senthilkumar S, Mourad Y, Xie J, Peker E, Zeeshan S, Ahmed Z. Artificial intelligence to investigate metabolomics data for precision medicine. Metabolomics. 2026;27;22(2):29.