

1 **TITLE:**

2 Patient-collected tongue, nasal, and mid-turbinate swabs for SARS-CoV-2 yield equivalent
3 sensitivity to health care worker collected nasopharyngeal swabs

4
5 **AUTHORS:**

6 Tu YP¹, Jennings R², Hart B², Cangelosi GA³, Wood RC³, Wehber K², Verma P², Vojta D²,
7 Berke EM²

8
9 **AFFILIATIONS**

- 10 1. The Everett Clinic, Optum, Everett, WA
11 2. UnitedHealth Group, Research and Development, Minnetonka, MN
12 3. Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, University of
13 Washington, Seattle, WA

14
15 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

16 The authors acknowledge the contributions of Karen Heichman, Andrew Trister, Daniel
17 Wattendorf, Jessica Lee and Emily Turner from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Shawna
18 Cooper and Philip Su from Audere, Kris Weigel and Alaina Olson from the University of
19 Washington, John Tamerius from Quidel, Nigel Clarke and James Devlin from Quest
20 Diagnostics, Franklin Cockerill (consultant to Quest Diagnostics), Hunter McCawley and
21 Jiameng Wang from UnitedHealth Group, and Garrett Galbreath, the health care workers, and

- 22 staff from The Everett Clinic. GA Cangelosi and RC Wood were supported by the Bill &
- 23 Melinda Gates Foundation.

24 **ABSTRACT**

25 **Background:** Current testing for SARS-CoV-2 requires health care workers to collect a
26 nasopharyngeal (NP) sample from a patient. NP sampling requires the use of personal protective
27 equipment that are in limited supply, is uncomfortable for the patient, and reduces clinical
28 efficiency. This study explored the equivalency of patient-collected tongue, anterior nares
29 (nasal), and mid-turbinate (MT) samples to health care worker-collected NP samples for
30 detecting SARS-CoV-2.

31 **Methods:** Patients presenting to five urgent care facilities with symptoms indicative of an upper
32 respiratory infection provided self-collected samples from three anatomic sites along with a
33 health care worker-collected NP sample. Using NP as the comparator, sensitivities and one-sided
34 95% confidence intervals for the tongue, nasal, and MT samples for detection of SARS-CoV-2
35 were calculated.

36 **Results:** The sensitivity for detecting SARS-CoV-2 in patient-collected tongue, nasal, and mid-
37 turbinate samples was 89.8% (95% CI: 80.2 -100.0), 94.0 (95% CI: 84.6-100.0) and 96.2 (95%
38 CI: 87.7-100.0), respectively. Among samples yielding positive results, cycle threshold (Ct)
39 values (a measure of viral load) had correlation coefficients of 0.48, 0.78, and 0.86 between the
40 NP samples and the tongue, nasal, and MT samples, respectively.

41 **Conclusions:** Patient-collected nasal and MT samples demonstrated high sensitivity for SARS-
42 CoV-2 detection using health care worker-collected NP samples as the comparator. Among
43 patients testing positive with NP samples, nasal and MT Ct values demonstrated high
44 correlations with those Ct values of the NP samples. Patient-collected nasal or MT sampling may

- 45 improve efficiency for COVID-19 testing while reducing the risk of exposure of the health
- 46 workforce.

47 **Introduction:**

48 The early medical response to the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States has been highlighted
49 by limitations in the availability of testing among symptomatic people. By the time the total
50 number of confirmed cases in the United States reached 33,404 on March 23, 2020 with 400
51 deaths¹, public health officials in areas with high proportion of cases recommended against
52 ambulatory testing in favor of higher risk individuals^{2,3}. In vitro diagnostic testing in the face of
53 epidemic spread to provide both clinical care and inform public health efforts is well
54 established⁴. Current guidelines for testing of people with suspected COVID-19 require a swab
55 of the oropharynx (OP) or nasopharynx (NP) to extract and amplify any viral RNA by real-time
56 reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR)⁵. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to
57 health care workers has been described extensively^{6,7}. The use of personal protective equipment
58 (PPE) by health care workers obtaining testing samples is critical to reduce transmission, but
59 there are shortages of such equipment in many hospitals⁸.

60 For other virus-mediated upper respiratory infections, such as influenza, viral material can be
61 detected from swabs of the lower nares and mid-turbinate region^{9,10,11}. Experience with
62 respiratory pathogens such as tuberculosis have also shown that samples obtained from tongue-
63 swabs have sufficient accuracy for diagnosis^{12,13}. In these other clinical experiences, obtaining a
64 tongue, nasal, or mid-turbinate (MT) sample is faster, better tolerated, and causes less potential
65 for sneezing, coughing and gagging, than an NP swab. Additional recent evidence supports the
66 validity of non-NP samples for SARS-CoV-2 detection^{14,15}.

67 We investigate whether self-collected tongue, nasal, or MT samples from symptomatic people
68 with suspected COVID-19 are equivalent to health care worker-collected NP samples for
69 detecting SARS-CoV-2.

70 **Methods:**

71 **Population and Sample Collection**

72 People seen in any one of five ambulatory clinics in the Puget Sound region with symptoms
73 indicative of upper respiratory infection between the dates March 16 and March 21 were eligible
74 for participation. We enrolled all people who were willing and able to participate in the self-
75 collection of all three anatomic sites: tongue, nasal and MT and health care worker-collection
76 from the NP. Inclusion criteria included evidence of symptoms suggestive of an upper
77 respiratory illness (subjective and objective fevers, cough, sore throat, fevers, myalgia, or
78 rhinorrhea, indicating higher risk of COVID-19 in this community) and the ability to consent and
79 agree to participate in the study. People who were not able to demonstrate understanding of the
80 study, not willing to commit to having all four samples collected, had a history of nosebleed in
81 the past 24 hours, nasal surgery in the past two weeks, chemotherapy treatment with documented
82 low platelet and low white blood cell counts, or acute facial trauma were excluded from the
83 study.

84 Health care workers used a spoken script to explain the study and give eligible patients the
85 opportunity to decline. Any patient who had all four samples collected is considered as having
86 willingly participated in the study as they allowed the sample collection and the use of the data
87 produced from the sample. This study protocol was deemed to be an operational project by the
88 Office of Human Research Affairs at UnitedHealth Group.

89 Participants were provided instructions and asked to self-collect tongue, nasal, and MT samples,
90 in that order (see Supplement). Tongue samples were collected with a nylon flocced swab
91 (Copan FLOQSwab 502CS01) via the following steps: 1) Extending the tongue, and 2) firmly

92 but gently brushing the swab along the length of the anterior 2/3 of dorsum of the tongue for 10
93 seconds. Nasal samples were collected with a foam swab (Puritan 25-1506 1PF100) via the
94 following steps: 1) gently inserting the swab in the vertical position into one nasal passage until
95 there is gentle resistance, 2) leaving the swab in place for 10-15 seconds, rotating the swab, and
96 3) repeating the procedure on the other side with the same swab. MT samples were collected
97 with a nylon flocked swab (MDL NasoSwab A362CS02.MDL) via the following steps: 1)
98 inserting the swab in the horizontal position until gentle resistance was met, 2) leaving the swab
99 in for 10-15 seconds on each side, rotating the swab, 3) repeating in the other nostril with the
100 same swab. After patient sampling was completed, NP samples were collected by a health care
101 worker using a polyester tipped swab on a skinny wire (Puritan 25-800-2PDBG) via the
102 following steps: 1) pass the swab along the floor of the nose until meeting gentle resistance as
103 the swab touches the posterior pharynx, in the nostril corresponding to the patient's dominant
104 hand, and 2) rotate the swab several times and withdraw the swab.

105 All samples were stored in viral transport media and refrigerated at 4°C before shipping on ice
106 packs to a reference laboratory for rRT-PCR testing (Quest Diagnostics, San Juan Capistrano,
107 CA). Patient results were transmitted back to the clinical practice via the standard lab
108 information system and electronic health record protocol. Additionally, cycle threshold (Ct)
109 values for all samples that tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 were reported back to the clinical
110 sites. A higher Ct value corresponds to a lower viral load.

111 **Statistical Analysis**

112 The study was powered to a one-sided, one-sample test of proportions with a continuity
113 correction to determine whether the percentage of patients with a positive result on the NP test
114 that were also positive for a patient-collected test was significantly greater than 90%, assuming

115 the true sensitivity is 98%. Forty-eight positive NP test results are needed for 80% power at 0.05
116 significance. Based on recent clinical experience in these centers, we assumed a 9% prevalence
117 of COVID-19 among symptomatic people visiting these five ambulatory centers, resulting in a
118 total sample size of 533 patients to observe 48 positive results. Three separate analyses were
119 performed: one comparing tongue samples to NP samples, a second comparing nasal samples to
120 NP samples, and a third comparing MT samples to NP samples; all used health care worker-
121 collected NP samples as the comparator. Samples included in the final analysis had rRT-PCR
122 results returned for both samples in question (i.e. NP and one patient-collected sample) at the
123 time of data freeze. All statistical analysis was performed using R version 3.6.1¹⁶.

124 **Results:**

125 We enrolled patients aged 15 months to 94 years old presenting with symptoms indicative of an
126 upper respiratory infection, visiting one of five ambulatory clinical sites in the Puget Sound
127 metropolitan area over five days (March 16 to March 21, 2020). 501 patients had a result for
128 both the tongue and NP samples, 498 had a result for the nasal and NP samples, and 504 had a
129 result for both the MT and NP samples.

130 Table 1 summarizes the positivity rate in each of the three analysis populations broken out by
131 demographics and self-reported symptoms. Using the NP results, patients had overall positivity
132 rates of 9.8%, 10.0%, and 10.3% for SARS CoV-2 among patients who also returned a tongue,
133 nasal, and MT result, respectively.

134 Tables 2, 3, and 4 show 2x2 tables for test results between health care worker - collected NP
135 samples and the patient-collected tongue, nasal, and MT samples, respectively. These tables also
136 provide the estimated sensitivity of the patient-collected samples and one-side 95% confidence

137 intervals. Namely, using health care worker-collected NP samples as the comparator, sensitivity
138 of the patient-collected tongue, nasal, and MT samples were 89.8% (95% CI: 80.2 – 100.0),
139 94.0% (95% CI 84.6 – 100.0), and 96.2% (95% CI: 87.7 – 100.0), respectively (Tables 2-4).

140 While the sensitivity of the nasal and MT samples were greater than 90%, none of the patient-
141 sample sensitivities were statistically significant when tested using a one-sided test of
142 proportions (p-values 0.50, 0.24, and 0.11 for tongue, nasal, and MT, respectively). The power
143 calculations, which assumed a true sensitivity of 98%, required 48 positive NP results for each
144 pairwise comparison while the data ultimately showed 49, 50, and 52 NP positives. All three
145 comparisons reached the required sample size, but the observed effect sizes was less than
146 assumed for the power analysis (89.8%, 94.0%, and 95.8% for tongue, nasal, and MT
147 respectively vs 98.0% assumed for the power analysis). Despite this drawback, the estimated
148 sensitivities for nasal and MT samples exceeded 90%. To our knowledge, this study represents
149 the largest available sample directly comparing patient-collected tongue, nasal, and MT samples
150 to health care worker-collected NP samples for COVID-19.

151 Ct values calculated by the rRT-PCR analysis demonstrated Pearson correlation coefficients of
152 0.48, 0.78, and 0.86 between the positive NP results the positive tongue, nasal, and MT results,
153 respectively. Figure 1 shows plots of the Ct values for the patient collected sites against the NP
154 site, with a linear regression fit super-imposed on the scatterplot.

155 **Discussion:**

156 This work demonstrates the clinical utility and equivalency of using patient-collected tongue,
157 nasal, or MT sampling to health care worker-collect NP sampling for diagnosis of COVID-19.
158 Sensitivity of nasal and MT patient collected methods was calculated to be above 90%, and in

159 cohorts of more than 490 patients with respiratory symptoms, patient-collected sampling was
160 feasible in ambulatory practice. The ability to allow patients to self-collect confers a number of
161 benefits to both patient, provider, and system. First, patients are likely to tolerate the alternate
162 collections locations of MT, anterior nares or tongue over NP. NP sampling can cause coughing
163 and sneezing which may be uncomfortable to the patient and increase the risk of aerosol
164 transmission of SARS-CoV2 transmission to health care workers. A patient-collected sample
165 reduces personal protective equipment use, which is currently in short supply. When patients
166 collect their own samples, health care workers can focus on other patients or other parts of the
167 clinical encounter, increasing practice efficiency though optimizing staff utilization.

168 Other respiratory illnesses have leveraged self-collected samples from locations other than NP.
169 MT collection using a nylon, flocculated swab were found to be equivalent to nurse collected in
170 one study¹⁷, while self-collected MT swabs were found to be a reliable alternative to health
171 worker collection for influenza A and B virus RT-PCR analysis in another study¹⁸. Similarly,
172 saliva collected from the tongue has also held promise. In a two-phase study, tongue swabs (two
173 per subject) exhibited a combined sensitivity of 92.8% relative to sputum for tuberculosis
174 detection in adults¹², and exhibited promise as non-invasive samples for diagnosis of pediatric
175 tuberculosis¹³.

176 This study has a number of limitations. Samples were collected in five urgent care clinics
177 located in a single region of the US. Our analysis was cross-sectional and limited to single
178 comparisons to NP. With additional analysis and longitudinal data collection, we hope to
179 understand how self-collection of samples from multiple upper respiratory anatomical sites
180 contribute to test performance.

181 Despite these limitations, we believe that self-collected samples for SARS-CoV-2 testing from
182 sites other than NP is a useful approach during the COVID-19 pandemic.

183 **Table 1:** Demographics and self-reported clinical symptoms.

	Tongue & NP $\frac{n \text{ positive}}{n \text{ total}}$ (%)	Nasal & NP $\frac{n \text{ positive}}{n \text{ total}}$ (%)	MT & NP $\frac{n \text{ positive}}{n \text{ total}}$ (%)
Total Participants	49/501 (9.8%)	50/498 (10.0%)	52/504 (10.3%)
Sex			
Female	27/299 (9.0%)	27/296 (9.1%)	29/303 (9.6%)
Male	22/200 (10.9%)	23/202 (11.4%)	23/201 (11.4%)
Smoker/Vaper			
Yes	9/112 (8.0%)	10/118 (8.5%)	10/117 (8.5%)
No	38/356 (10.7%)	37/353 (10.5%)	39/354 (11.0%)
Self-report Symptoms			
Fever	15/71 (21.1%)	14/71 (19.7%)	14/74 (18.9%)
Ear Pain/Drainage	10/130 (7.7%)	11/133 (8.3%)	11/135 (8.1%)
Vomiting	2/46 (4.3%)	2/46 (4.3%)	2/46 (4.3%)
Cough	39/385 (10.1%)	39/388 (10.1%)	41/388 (10.6%)
Diarrhea	10/149 (6.7%)	12/151 (7.9%)	12/150 (8.0%)
Difficulty Breathing	25/246 (10.2%)	25/248 (10.0%)	24/253 (9.5%)
Age			
< 30	5/116 (4.3%)	4/115 (3.5%)	5/116 (4.3%)
30 - 39	14/116 (12.1%)	15/118 (12.7%)	14/116 (12.1%)
40 - 49	6/94 (6.4%)	6/86 (7.0%)	7/92 (7.6%)
50 - 59	10/81 (12.3%)	12/88 (13.6%)	13/87 (14.9%)

≥ 60	14/94 (14.9%)		13/91 (14.3%)		13/93 (14.0%)	
	Mean (SD)		Mean (SD)		Mean (SD)	
	Among Pos.	Among Neg.	Among Pos.	Among Neg.	Among Pos.	Among Neg.
Temperature (°F)	98.8 (0.9)	98.5 (0.7)	98.8 (0.9)	98.5 (0.7)	98.8 (0.9)	98.5 (0.7)
Pulse	86.5 (12.8)	84.1 (16.2)	85.3 (12.3)	84.7 (16.0)	86.0 (12.8)	84.4 (16.1)
Days Since First Symptoms	6.8 (5.3)	7.1 (8.0)	6.7 (5.4)	7.1 (7.9)	6.7 (5.2)	6.9 (7.7)

184

185

186 **Table 2:** A 2x2 table of the test results for all patients who had an NP and a Tongue sample
187 tested.

Sensitivity (95% CI): 89.8% (80.2%, 100.0%)		Tongue		
		Negative	Positive	Total
NP	Negative	450	2	452
	Positive	5	44	49
	Total	455	46	501

188

189

190 **Table 3:** A 2x2 table of the test results for all patients who had an NP and a Nasal sample tested.

Sensitivity (95% CI): 94.0% (84.6%, 100.0%)		Nasal		
		Negative	Positive	Total
NP	Negative	447	1	448
	Positive	3	47	50
	Total	450	48	498

191


192

193 **Table 4:** A 2x2 table of the test results for all patients who had an NP and a MT sample tested.

Sensitivity (95% CI): 96.2% (87.7%, 100%)		MT		
		Negative	Positive	Total
NP	Negative	452	0	452
	Positive	2	50	52
	Total	454	50	504

194

195 **Figure 1:** Plots showing the Cycle Threshold (Ct) values of the tongue, nasal, and MT tests
196 against those of the comparator NP test. The correlation coefficient is superimposed on each sub-
197 figure along with a trend line estimated using a simple linear regression. Figure 1a) shows Ct
198 values from the 43 patients that had positive tongue and NP results and available Ct values.
199 Figure 1b) shows Ct values from the 46 patients that had positive nasal and NP results and
200 available Ct values. Figure 1c) shows Ct values from the 48 patients that had positive MT and
201 NP results and available Ct values.



202

203

204 **REFERENCES:**

- 205 1 CDC. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
206 2020. [cited 2020 Mar 22] (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/index.html>)
- 207 2 California Department of Public Health. CDPH Guidance for Prioritization of Patients for
208 Laboratory Testing for COVID-19. [cited 2020 Mar 22]
209 ([https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-
210 19/GuidanceforPrioritizationofPatientsforLaboratoryTestingforCOVID19.aspx](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/GuidanceforPrioritizationofPatientsforLaboratoryTestingforCOVID19.aspx))
- 211 3 New York State Department of Health. COVID-19 Testing [cited 2020 Mar 22]
212 (<https://coronavirus.health.ny.gov/covid-19-testing>)
- 213 4 Woolhouse M, Rambaut A, Kellam P. Lessons from Ebola: improving infectious disease
214 surveillance to inform outbreak management. *Science Translational Medicine*; 7(307): 307rv5.
- 215 5 CDC. Interim Guidelines for Collecting, Handling and Testing Clinical Specimens from
216 Persons for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). 2020. [cited 2020 Mar 21]
217 (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html>)
- 218 6 Chang D, Xu H, Rebaza A, et al. Protecting healthcare workers from subclinical coronavirus
219 infection. *Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. Published February 13, 2020. (doi.org/10.1016/S2213-
220 2600(20)30066-7)
- 221 7 Wang J, Zhou M, Fangfei. Exploring the reasons for healthcare workers infected with novel
222 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. *J Hospital Infection*.
223 (doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.03.002)
- 224 8. Padilla M. ‘It feels like a war zone’: Doctors and nurses plead for masks on social media. *New*
225 *York Times*. Published March 19, 2020.

- 226 9 Seaman CP, Tran LTT, Cowling BJ, Sullivan SG. Self-collected compared with professional-
227 collected swabbing in the diagnosis of influenza in symptomatic individuals: A meta-analysis
228 and assessment of validity. *J Clin Virol* 2019;118:28–35.
- 229 10 Haussig JM, Targosz A, Engelhart S, et al. Feasibility study for the use of self-collected nasal
230 swabs to identify pathogens among participants of a population-based surveillance system for
231 acute respiratory infections (GrippeWeb-Plus)-Germany, 2016. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*
232 2019;13(4):319–30.
- 233 11 Frazee BW, Rodriguez-Hoces de la Guardia A, Alter H, et al. Accuracy and discomfort of
234 different types of intranasal specimen collection methods for molecular influenza testing in
235 emergency department patients. *Ann Emer Med* 2018; 71(4):509-517. e 1.
- 236 12 Luabeya AK, Wood RC, Shenje J, et al. Noninvasive detection of tuberculosis by oral swab
237 analysis. *J Clin Microbiol* 2018;57(3):e01847-18, /jcm/57/3/JCM.01847-18.atom.
- 238 13 Nicol MP, Wood RC, Workman L, et al. Microbiological diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis
239 in children by oral swab polymerase chain reaction. *Sci Rep* 2019;9(1):10789.
- 240 14 Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in different types of clinical
241 specimens. *JAMA* 2020. Published March 11, 2020. (doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3786)
- 242 15 To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Chik-Yan Yip C, et al. Consistent detection of 2019 novel
243 coronavirus in saliva. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.
- 244 16 R: The R Project for Statistical Computing [Internet]. [cited 2020 Mar 21]. ([https://www.r-](https://www.r-project.org/)
245 [project.org/](https://www.r-project.org/))
- 246 17 Larios OE, Coleman BL, Drews SJ, et al. Self-collected mid-turbinate swabs for the detection
247 of respiratory viruses in adults with acute respiratory illnesses. *PLoS ONE* 2011;6(6):e21335.

248 18 Dhiman N, Miller RM, Finley JL, et al. Effectiveness of patient-collected swabs for influenza
249 testing. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2012;87(6):548–554.
250