

1 **Original Article**

2 **Self-collection: an appropriate alternative during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.**

3

4 Michael C. Wehrhahn^{1*}, F.R.A.C.P., F.R.C.P.A, Jennifer Robson^{2*}, F.R.A.C.P., F.R.C.P.A.,
5 Suzanne Brown³, Evan Bursle² F.R.A.C.P., F.R.C.P.A., Shane Byrne² F.A.S.M, David New⁴,
6 F.R.A.C.P., F.R.C.P.A., Smathi Chong⁴, F.R.A.C.P., F.R.C.P.A., James P. Newcombe¹,
7 F.R.A.C.P, F.R.C.P.A., Terri Siversten¹, Narelle Hadlow⁴, F.R.C.P.A.

8

9 ^{1.} Douglass Hanly Moir Pathology, 14 Giffnock Ave Macquarie Park NSW 2113 Australia

10 ^{2.} Sullivan Nicolaides Pathology, 24 Hurworth St, Bowen Hills QLD 4006 Australia

11 ^{3.} Department of Endocrinology & Diabetes, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital
12 Hospital Ave, Nedlands, WA 6009 Australia

13 ^{4.} Clinipath Pathology 310 Selby St, North Osborne Park WA 6017, Australia

14

15 *Drs Wehrhahn and Robson contributed equally to this article.

16 Corresponding author: Michael Wehrhahn: Douglass Hanly Moir Pathology, 14 Giffnock
17 Ave, Macquarie Park, NSW, Australia; +612 9855 5287; mwehrhahn@dhm.com.au

18

19

20

21 **ABSTRACT**

22

23 **BACKGROUND**

24 Swabs for SARS-CoV-2 are routinely collected by health care workers, putting them at risk
25 of infection and requiring use of personal protective equipment (PPE). Self-collected swabs
26 offer many advantages provided detection rate of SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory viruses
27 is not compromised.

28 **METHODS**

29 In a prospective study, patients attending dedicated COVID-19 collection clinics were offered
30 the option to first self-collect (SC) nasal and throat swabs prior to health worker collection
31 (HC). Two different laboratory services participated, with HC at Site 1 collecting nasal and
32 throat swabs and at Site 2 nasopharyngeal (NP) and throat swabs. Samples were analysed for
33 SARS-CoV-2 as well as common respiratory viruses. Concordance of results between
34 methods was assessed using Cohen's kappa (κ).

35 **RESULTS**

36 Of 236 patients sampled by HC and SC, 25 had COVID-19 (24 by HC and 25 by SC) and 63
37 had other respiratory viruses (56 by HC and 58 by SC). SC was highly concordant with HC
38 ($\kappa = 0.890$) for all viruses including SARS-CoV-2 and more concordant than HC to positive
39 results by any method ($\kappa = 0.959$ vs 0.933).

40 **CONCLUSIONS**

41 Self-collection of throat and nasal swabs offers a reliable alternative to health worker
42 collection for the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 and other common respiratory viruses. High
43 viral load of SARS-CoV-2 throughout the respiratory tract and sensitive molecular methods

44 may explain these findings. Self-collection also provides patients with easier access to
45 testing, reduces the exposure of the community and health workers to those undergoing
46 testing and reduces the requirement for PPE.

47

48 **Introduction**

49 On the 11th March 2020, the World Health Organisation (WHO) announced COVID-19 as a
50 pandemic.¹ The WHO Director-General issued a call for urgent action and encouraged all
51 countries to ‘innovate and learn’ in their response to this crisis.

52 Demands on health services have increased and a commensurate decrease in availability of
53 personal protective equipment (PPE) has occurred whilst the protection of health staff and the
54 community remain paramount. Self-collected swabs in the community for SARS-CoV-2, the
55 agent of COVID-19, and for other respiratory viruses offers potential significant benefit in
56 the current pandemic by reducing requirement for PPE, and limiting exposure of patients and
57 staff to infection.

58 Self-collection for respiratory viruses is not a new concept. Benefits include increased
59 convenience and access for patients and timeliness of a sample receipt.^{2,3} Patients report self-
60 collected nasal swabs are easy to perform^{2,4,5} and highly acceptable.^{2,4} A meta-analysis of 9
61 studies comparing self-collect (SC) and health care worker collect (HC) for influenza testing
62 reported a pooled sensitivity of 87% and specificity of 99% for SC compared to HC⁶ however
63 sensitivity for other respiratory viruses was not studied. Irving et al⁷ studied paired samples
64 from 240 adults and found sensitivity using nasal or nasopharyngeal (NP) collection for
65 influenza did not vary significantly when using a highly sensitive molecular test.⁷ A study in
66 230 children reported equivalent sensitivity for all respiratory viruses except respiratory
67 syncytial virus (RSV) when comparing nasal swab and NP aspirate.⁸ Larios et al⁹

68 demonstrated that using flocked swabs and sensitive molecular methods, equivalent
69 sensitivity and specificity was obtained for 76 matched self-collected mid-turbinate nasal
70 swabs and NP swabs in 38 individuals for a range of respiratory viruses including human
71 coronaviruses (hCoV 229E/NL63 and hCoV OC43/HKU1).

72 Recent reports on SARS-CoV-2 in respiratory specimens indicate early high viral loads in
73 symptomatic and asymptomatic patients in a variety of clinical specimens including nasal and
74 throat swabs, sputum and saliva samples.¹⁰⁻¹⁴ Wang et al reported that in 205 patients with
75 COVID-19 the highest positive rates were found from bronchoalveolar lavage fluid, sputum
76 and nasal swabs respectively.¹⁵ Wolfel¹⁴ and colleagues reported that in hospitalized cases of
77 COVID-19 there was no discernible difference between NP and throat swabs with high viral
78 load present in both specimens early in the illness and suggested that simple throat swabs
79 may provide sufficient sensitivity when patients are first tested with mild symptoms of
80 COVID-19.

81 The aim of this study was to compare prospectively the performance of HC with separate SC
82 nasal (SCN) and throat swabs (SCT) and the combination of the two (SCNT) for respiratory
83 viruses including SARS-CoV-2.

84

85 **Methods**

86 This study was conducted across two laboratory sites (Site 1 and Site 2) and had ethics
87 approval from the Western Australian branch of the Australian Medical Association, with all
88 participants providing informed consent. For a period of one week in March 2020, patients
89 presenting for SARS-CoV-2 testing at dedicated COVID-19 collection rooms were offered
90 participation in the study. Demographic data was recorded including the address postcode to
91 assess the Index of Education and Occupation (IEO) which assesses education level based on

92 a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest level of education.¹⁶ A questionnaire assessing
93 acceptability of SC based on that of Akmatov⁴ was provided to patients. Printed instructions
94 including diagrams were provided on how to collect throat and nasal swab (See
95 Supplementary Information). Self-collection kits included two swab packets each containing
96 a single swab and screw-top container with 2mL liquid Amies medium, a tongue depressor
97 and a zip lock sample bag. SC samples were taken immediately prior to trained HC samples
98 to reduce ‘training bias.’ For SC and HC at Site 1 and SC at Site 2, open-cell polyurethane
99 foam swabs (Σ Transwab[®] ref MW940, Medical Wire & Equipment (MWE), Wiltshire,
100 England) were used. Throat swabs were collected from the posterior throat and tonsil areas
101 while nasal swabs were inserted as far as comfortably possible and at least 2-3 cm inside one
102 nostril, rotating the swab 5 times and leaving in place for 5-10 seconds. For HC at Site 2, a
103 flocked NP swab and a foam throat swab (Σ Transwab[®] ref MW819 and MW940) were used.
104 In addition, because the expected SARS-CoV-2 positivity rate at the time was estimated to be
105 less than 1%, a subset of 24 patients recently diagnosed with COVID-19 performed SC in
106 their homes.

107 At site 1, testing for SARS-CoV-2 was on the Allplex[™] 2019-nCoV Assay (Seegene, Seoul,
108 South Korea) and followed sample extraction using MagNA Pure 96 (Roche, Basel,
109 Switzerland) with amplification utilising CFX96 Touch RT-PCR Detection Systems (BioRad,
110 Hercules, California USA). Samples were confirmed as SARS-CoV-2 positive if all three
111 gene targets (E/RdRp and N genes) were detected within 40 cycles. At site 2, the same
112 extraction method was used. Testing for SARS-CoV-2 was performed using an in-house
113 developed Taqman assay targeting the E gene.¹⁷ All positive samples then underwent 3
114 supplementary RT-PCRs targeting the N gene.¹⁸ Both laboratories utilised the Seegene RV
115 Essential assay to detect other respiratory viruses (influenza A, influenza B, parainfluenza,
116 RSV, human metapneumovirus (HMPV), adenovirus and rhinovirus).

117 Statistical methods

118 A positive result on either HC or SC was defined as the benchmark result All Positives (AP).

119 Concordance between HC and SC swabs and AP was calculated using Cohen's Kappa (κ),

120 which measures agreement between the categorical assignments given by two methods. The

121 statistic takes values typically between zero and one. A $\kappa > 0.80$ indicates very good

122 agreement, while $\kappa = 1$ indicates perfect concordance. Cycle threshold (Ct) values were

123 recorded for all positive test results as a surrogate measure for viral load. Mean Ct was

124 compared between HC and SCNT (combined category using the lowest Ct of either SCN or

125 SCT), using linear mixed effects models, with a random effect for patient identification. HC

126 and SC SARS-CoV-2 positivity rates were compared with Pearson's χ^2 test.

127 From power calculations assuming a significance level of 5% and a null hypothesis of low

128 concordance between the HC and SC methods ($H_0: \kappa = 0.3$), there was at least 80% power to

129 detect a concordance of 0.6 or more with a sample size of 66. Significance level α was set at

130 0.05, however for concordance and regression analyses, a Bonferroni multiple testing

131 correction was applied such that minimum $\alpha' = 0.05/8 = 0.0063$. Statistical analyses were

132 completed in the R statistical computing environment,¹⁹ including the package *irr*.

133

134 **Results**

135 A total of 236 participants across the two sites took part in this study. Median age of

136 participants was 40 (range 9-81) years and 60% were female. Twenty-five patients were

137 positive for SARS-CoV-2 and 63 patients positive for other common respiratory viruses. For

138 SARS-CoV-2 cases, 24/25 were detected by HC and 25/25 by SC. For common respiratory

139 viruses 56/63 (89%) were detected by HC and 58/63 (92%) by SC (Table 1). A positive result

140 on either HC or SCNT was included in the group AP.

141 Table 2 summarises the respiratory viruses detected by the different methods of collection. At
142 Site 1, co-detection of rhinovirus (Ct 29) + influenza A (Ct 41) was found in one patient by
143 SC only and RSV (Ct 24) + rhinovirus (Ct 35) in one patient by HC only. Two parainfluenza
144 cases and one rhinovirus case were detected only by SC. Overall the detection rate was 6%
145 higher in SC compared with HC swabs for non-SARS-CoV-2 respiratory viruses which
146 equated to 3/20 (15%) additional positive results. At Site 2, no co-detections occurred.
147 Collection of samples for the 13 SARS-CoV-2 positive patients ranged from 2 to 9 days
148 following onset of symptoms with a mean of 4.8 days. One positive patient retested 6 days
149 after symptom onset using the screening E-gene assay, was detected only on SCN but not the
150 HC. A second positive patient was detected using HC and SCT but not SCN. Of the patients
151 with detectable respiratory viruses other than SARS-CoV-2, at site 1, 8/23 (35%) had virus
152 only detectable on one of SCN or SCT while the proportion was 14/35 (40%) at site 2.
153
154 When all detections by HC and SCNT were compared with AP, the sensitivity of SCNT and
155 HC to detect COVID-19 was 1.0 (95%CI: 0.86-1) and 0.96 (95%CI: 0.8-1) respectively; for
156 other respiratory viruses it was 0.94 (95%CI: 0.87-0.98) and 0.91 (95%CI: 0.83-0.96)
157 respectively.
158 Table 3 summarises concordance between AP and each collection method. Both SCNT and
159 HC showed very high concordance with AP at each site and overall, with SCNT slightly
160 higher ($\kappa=1, 0.934, 0.959$ at Site1, Site2, Combined Sites) than HC ($\kappa=0.929, 0.934, 0.933$).
161 Additionally, SCNT was highly concordant with HC ($\kappa=0.929, 0.863, 0.890$ at Site 1, Site 2,
162 Combined Sites). When Ct values for COVID-19 cases were compared by collection method
163 (Figure 1), mean E-gene Ct did not differ between HC and SCNT or SCN ($p=0.236, 0.083$,
164 against $\alpha=0.0083$) but was significantly higher in SCT compared with HC ($\beta=7.31, p<0.001$).
165 Mean N-gene Ct was not significantly higher in SCNT compared with HC ($p=0.041$;

166 α' =0.0083) but was higher in SCN and SCT (β =4.00, p =0.006; β =7.63, p <0.001). In
167 rhinovirus cases (Figure 2), mean Ct was not significantly higher in SCNT compared with
168 HC (p =0.036; α' =0.017) but was higher in SCN and SCT (β =2.50, p =0.002; β =6.68,
169 p <0.001). In parainfluenza cases, mean Ct differed between HC and SCN (β =4.67, p =0.014)
170 but not the other methods (SCNT v HC, p =0.231; SCT v HC, p =0.119; α' =0.017).

171

172 At Site 1 an analysis of acceptability was performed using a questionnaire and was completed
173 by 42/70 (60%) participants with 31/42 (74%) preferring self-collection over trained
174 collectors, with all considering it acceptable. Analysis of the IEO found that the Median (LQ,
175 UQ) IEO was 3 (2, 4) with participants identified across all educational levels but the
176 majority (30/42, 71%) were in the 3 lowest education levels and a smaller proportion (12/42,
177 29%) in the highest 2 levels.

178 Following this study, Site 1 has since processed a small percentage of SC swabs (7% of all
179 collections). There was no significant difference in the SARS-CoV-2 detections between HC
180 with 242/13851 (1.8%) and SC with 20/1035 (1.9%) (p =0.753 from χ^2 test).

181

182 **Discussion**

183 In our group of 236 ambulatory, literate, mostly adult patients, the performance of self-
184 collected nasal and throat swabs was at least equivalent to that of health care worker collected
185 swabs for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory viruses.

186 This study included two different sites using two different methods of HC (combined N + T
187 and combined NP + T) and also employed two different molecular strategies for detection of
188 SARS-CoV-2. As such these findings are more widely applicable.

189 At Site 1 where SCNT was compared with HC using the same swab and collection methods,
190 for the 12 patients testing positive to SARS-CoV-2 there was complete concordance between
191 HC and SC samples even though on average 2.5 days had lapsed. In the remaining SARS-
192 CoV-2 negative patients, SC detected 3 additional respiratory viruses, with the overall
193 positivity rate increasing from 34% to 40%. However, the additional 3 SC detections were
194 weak positives based on high Ct values (33-40).

195 At site 2 where comparative HC involving a NP and T swab occurred at the same time as the
196 SCN and SCT for the SARS-CoV-2 positive patients, SCNT detected all 13 positive patients
197 while one patient was negative by HC. Detection of other respiratory viruses by SCNT was
198 highly concordant with HC detecting only 1 less respiratory virus and may relate to the fact
199 that SCNT sampling was compared with NP +T sampling.

200 When data from each site was combined, concordance between SCNT or HC with the All
201 Positive rate was very high, slightly favouring SCNT. The similar SARS-CoV-2 percent-
202 positivity rate in ongoing comparison data between those having only HC or SC provides
203 further reassurance that SCNT is equivalent to HC.

204 The advantages of self-collection are evident and even more important at a time of global
205 health crisis. Self-collection greatly reduces the number of patients requiring trained health
206 worker collection and PPE, thus preserving the limited supplies of PPE. Access to testing is
207 increased, as swab kits can be provided quickly by clinicians or available at dedicated
208 COVID-19 collection centres aiding timeliness of testing^{2,3} which is critical in the current
209 pandemic. There is increased safety for both patients and staff using a SC model as exposure
210 to others is limited.

211 Further, data from patients at site 1 suggests that SC is accessible and achievable over a range
212 of education levels with all finding SC acceptable and the majority having a preference for

213 this method over HC as has previously been reported.^{2,4,5} This may relate to the ability of
214 patients to control the comfort level of throat and nasal collection better than a trained
215 collector can.

216 We chose to trial SCN and SCT swabs rather than NP collections because the latter is
217 technically more difficult and uncomfortable for patients. Literature suggests that collection
218 of mid-turbinate nasal swabs is comparable in performance to collection of NP swabs for
219 respiratory viruses including other coronaviruses.⁹ We chose to perform nasal swabs given
220 that mid-turbinate swabs with a safety stopping point are generally not as widely used and
221 more uncomfortable than nasal swabs.

222 Recent studies suggest there is a high viral load in patients with early COVID-19 across the
223 upper and lower respiratory tracts, including nasal and throat sites^{10-12,14} as well as in saliva,¹³
224 even in asymptomatic, mild or prodromal states. Wolfel et al¹⁴ noted no discernible
225 difference between nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal viral loads and detection rates in
226 hospitalized cases of COVID-19 and noted that simple throat swabs provide sufficient
227 sensitivity in early infections. Given these high viral loads throughout the respiratory tract it
228 may be that requiring NP sampling is not as significant for SARS-CoV-2 as for some other
229 respiratory viruses. It may also be that sensitive and specific PCR methods for viral detection
230 are improving the sensitivity of a range of sample and collection methods as shown for a
231 range of respiratory viruses but also Group A Streptococcal detection.^{9,10} We hypothesize that
232 the high viral load of SARS-CoV-2 and sensitive molecular techniques may explain the
233 equivalent sensitivity of SC to HC samples in COVID-19 patients. Additionally viral load at
234 different sites may differ with disease evolution and the SARS-CoV-2 positive patients in this
235 study were tested over a range of 2 to 9 days from symptom onset.

236 Our data support the decision by the Communicable Disease Network of Australia (CDNA)²¹
237 to recommend sampling of both nasal and throat sites for the diagnosis of respiratory viruses
238 including for SARS-CoV-2, due to the concern of a possible missed diagnosis if only one
239 site is sampled. This was the case for two COVID-19 positive patients on SC who were only
240 diagnosed by SCN and another only by SCT. If only one swab site was obtainable, our data
241 suggests the nasal may be the better swab site for the diagnosis of COVID-19 as it had
242 greater concordance with the AP group and showed consistently lower Ct values in the order
243 of 100-1000 fold higher viral load (data not shown).

244 Limitations of this study include the limited number of positive SARS-CoV-2 patients and
245 modest number of other positive respiratory virus cases with the exception of rhinovirus.
246 Further data on self-collection would be helpful to confirm these findings. In the setting of
247 limited resources, both in terms of PPE and health care workers, these findings may be
248 important for other health services. Furthermore, we have instituted use of a single swab to
249 sample both throat then nasal sites. This has the potential to preserve limited supplies of
250 swabs and also provide additional efficiencies in the laboratory as only preparation of a single
251 sample per patient is required.

252

253 **Conclusion**

254 The world is facing unprecedented demands on health care services and health resources
255 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Innovative ways to address this crisis are required and we
256 believe that this study provides early evidence that self-collection of throat and nasal swabs
257 for SARS-CoV-2 offers an acceptable and reliable alternative to health care worker collected
258 samples. This is achieved whilst preserving critically needed PPE supplies, optimizing the
259 time to testing and reducing exposure of health care workers to potentially infected patients.

260

261 **Acknowledgement:**

262 We thank the Training and Patient Services departments, the Collection and Clinical Area
263 Managers, Clinical Supervisors, Collection staff, and Molecular Laboratory staff without
264 whom this study would not have been possible.

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278 ***References***

279

- 280 1. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March
281 2020. 2020, March 11. at [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-
282 remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-
282 remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020).)
- 283 2. Goyal S, Prasert K, Praphasiri P, et al. The acceptability and validity of self-collected nasal
284 swabs for detection of influenza virus infection among older adults in Thailand. *Influenza Other
285 Respir Viruses* 2017;11:412-7.
- 286 3. Jackson ML, Nguyen M, Kirilin B, Madziwa L. Self-Collected Nasal Swabs for Respiratory Virus
287 Surveillance. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2015;2:ofv152.
- 288 4. Akmatov MK, Gatzemeier A, Schughart K, Pessler F. Equivalence of self- and staff-collected
289 nasal swabs for the detection of viral respiratory pathogens. *PLoS One* 2012;7:e48508.
- 290 5. Dhiman N, Miller RM, Finley JL, et al. Effectiveness of patient-collected swabs for influenza
291 testing. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2012;87:548-54.
- 292 6. Seaman CP, Tran LTT, Cowling BJ, Sullivan SG. Self-collected compared with professional-
293 collected swabbing in the diagnosis of influenza in symptomatic individuals: A meta-analysis and
294 assessment of validity. *J Clin Virol* 2019;118:28-35.
- 295 7. Irving SA, Vandermause MF, Shay DK, Belongia EA. Comparison of nasal and nasopharyngeal
296 swabs for influenza detection in adults. *Clin Med Res* 2012;10:215-8.
- 297 8. Heikkinen T, Marttila J, Salmi AA, Ruuskanen O. Nasal swab versus nasopharyngeal aspirate
298 for isolation of respiratory viruses. *J Clin Microbiol* 2002;40:4337-9.
- 299 9. Larios OE, Coleman BL, Drews SJ, et al. Self-collected mid-turbinate swabs for the detection
300 of respiratory viruses in adults with acute respiratory illnesses. *PLoS One* 2011;6:e21335.
- 301 10. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of
302 Infected Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:1177-9.
- 303 11. Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples.
304 *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020.

- 305 12. Kim JY, Ko JH, Kim Y, et al. Viral Load Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in First Two Patients in
306 Korea. *J Korean Med Sci* 2020;35:e86.
- 307 13. To KK, Tsang OT, Chik-Yan Yip C, et al. Consistent detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in
308 saliva. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.
- 309 14. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients
310 with COVID-2019. *Nature* 2020.
- 311 15. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical
312 Specimens. *JAMA* 2020.
- 313 16. Census of Population and Housing: Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) Australia 2016.
314 2018, March 27. at
315 [https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/2033.0.55.001~2016~Main%20F](https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/2033.0.55.001~2016~Main%20Features~IEO~22.)
316 [eatures~IEO~22.\)](https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/2033.0.55.001~2016~Main%20Features~IEO~22.)
- 317 17. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by
318 real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill* 2020;25.
- 319 18. 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-time rRT-PCR Panel Primers and Probes. 2020,
320 January 24. at [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/uscdcr-rt-pcr-panel-primer-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/uscdcr-rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.pdf?sfvrsn=fa29cb4b_2.)
321 [probes.pdf?sfvrsn=fa29cb4b_2.\)](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/uscdcr-rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.pdf?sfvrsn=fa29cb4b_2.)
- 322 19. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical
323 Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2019. at [https://www.R-project.org/.](https://www.R-project.org/))
- 324 20. Murray MA, Schulz LA, Furst JW, et al. Equal performance of self-collected and health care
325 worker-collected pharyngeal swabs for group a streptococcus testing by PCR. *J Clin Microbiol*
326 2015;53:573-8.
- 327 21. Public Health Laboratory Network (PHLN) guidance on laboratory testing for SARS-CoV-2
328 (the virus that causes COVID-19). 2020, April 1. at
329 [https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2020/04/phln-guidance-on-laboratory-](https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2020/04/phln-guidance-on-laboratory-testing-for-sars-cov-2-the-virus-that-causes-covid-19_0.pdf)
330 [testing-for-sars-cov-2-the-virus-that-causes-covid-19_0.pdf](https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2020/04/phln-guidance-on-laboratory-testing-for-sars-cov-2-the-virus-that-causes-covid-19_0.pdf)

331

332 **Table 1:** Summary of COVID19 cases, other respiratory cases and negative test results from both

333 sites, with corresponding detections under the HC and SCNT methods.

N=236	Test Result	Site 1	Site 2	All Patients
HC	Negative	38	117	155 (65.7%)
	Other Respiratory	20	36	56 (23.7%)
	COVID19	12	12	24 (10.2%)
SCNT	Negative	35	118	153 (64.8%)
	Other Respiratory	23	35	58 (24.6%)
	COVID19	12	13	25 (10.6%)
AP	Other Respiratory	23	40	63 (26.7%)
	COVID19	12	13	25 (10.6%)

334 HC: Health worker Collect; SCNT: Self Collect Nasal and Throat; AP: All Positives (positive results from
335 either HC or SCNT).

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343 **Table 2:** Summary of COVID-19 and other respiratory illnesses detected under the HC, SCN, SCT,
 344 SCNT methods and positives from all methods (AP), at the two collection sites.

Site 1	HC	SCN	SCT	SCNT	AP
Rhinovirus	15	15	14	16	16 (22.9%)
Influenza B	2	1	2	2	2 (2.9%)
RSV	1	1	1	1	1 (1.4%)
Adenovirus	1	0	1	1	1 (1.4%)
Parainfluenza	0	2	1	2	2 (2.9%)
HMPV	1	1	0	1	1 (1.4%)
Total Other Respiratory	20 (28.6%)	20	19	23 (32.9%)	23 (32.9%)
SARS-CoV-2 (E,N,RdRp gene)	12 (17.1%)	5/5*	5/5*	12 (17.1%)	12 (17.1%)
Total undergoing HC and SC	70 (100%)			70 (100%)	70 (100%)

345

Site 2	HC	SCN	SCT	SCNT	AP
Rhinovirus	23	19	17	22	25 (15.1%)
Influenza B	1	1	0	1	1 (0.6%)
RSV	1	1	1	1	1 (0.6%)
Adenovirus	2	2	1	3	4 (2.4%)
Parainfluenza	7	4	6	6	7 (4.2%)
HMPV	2	2	2	2	2 (1.2%)
Total Other Respiratory	36 (28.6%)	29	27	35 (21.1%)	40 (24.1%)
SARS-CoV-2 (E gene**)	12 (7.2%)	12	11	13 (7.8%)	13 (7.8%)
Total undergoing HC and SC	166 (100%)	166	166	166 (100%)	166 (100%)

346 HC: Health worker Collect; SCN: Self Collect Nasal; SCT: Self Collect Throat; SCNT: Self Collect Nasal and Throat; AP: All
 347 Positives (positive results from either HC or SCNT); RSV: Respiratory Syncytial Virus; HMPV: human metapneumovirus.
 348 *only a subset of 5 patients at Site 1 had nasal and throat swabs tested individually. **All patients had supplementary N
 349 gene testing: HC 13; SCN 13; SCT 11; SCNT 13 detected.

350

351

352

353 **Table 3:** Concordance (Cohen's κ) between (i) AP and HC, SCN, SCT and SCNT; and (ii) HC and SCNT. A
 354 value of 1 indicates the method detected all COVID-19 and other respiratory cases, while a value
 355 above 0.9 indicates a very high level of detection of all respiratory cases (AP).

Concordance with AP	HC	SCN	SCT	SCNT
Site 1	0.929	0.905 [*]	0.872 [*]	1
Site 2	0.934	0.835	0.789	0.934
Combined Sites	0.933	0.858	0.817	0.959
Concordance between HC and SCNT				
		Site 1	Site 2	Combined Sites
		0.929	0.863	0.890

356

357 HC: Health worker Collect; SCN: Self Collect Nasal; SCT: Self Collect Throat; SCNT: Self Collect Nasal and Throat; AP: All
 358 Positives (positive results from either HC or SCNT).

359 P-value <0.001 for each concordance test. ^{*} SCN and SCT concordance on reduced set of individuals for Site 1 (only 5 of 12
 360 SARS-CoV-2 patients had SCN and SCT testing individually performed).

361

362


363

364

365

366 **Figure 1:** E-gene and N-gene Ct values obtained by the different collection methods for SARS-CoV-2

367 positive patients at both sites.



370 **Figure 2:** Ct values obtained by the different collection methods for rhinovirus and parainfluenza

371 positive patients at both sites.

