

1 **Title: Self-Collected Oral Fluid and Nasal Swabs Demonstrate Comparable Sensitivity**
2 **to Clinician Collected Nasopharyngeal Swabs for Covid-19 Detection**

3

4 Kojima N¹, Turner F², Slepnev V², Bacelar A², Deming, L², Kodeboyina, S² and Klausner
5 JD^{1,3}

6

7 ¹ Department of Medicine, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, 90095

8 ² Curative Inc., Menlo Park, CA

9 ³ Fielding School of Public Health, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA

10 90024

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Corresponding Author Contact Information:**

25 Department of Medicine at UCLA, 10833 Le Conte Ave, Los Angeles, CA

26 90095. Email: nkojima@ucla.edu

Final Version

1

27 **Abstract**

28 **Background:** Currently, there is a pandemic caused by the 2019 severe acute respiratory
29 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which causes Covid-19. We wanted to compare
30 specimen types and collection methods to explore if a simpler to collect specimen type
31 could expand access to testing.

32 **Methods:** We recruited individuals recently tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection through a
33 “drive-through” testing program. In participants’ homes, we assessed the performance of
34 self-collected oral fluid swab specimens with and without clinician supervision, clinician-
35 supervised self-collected mid-turbinate (nasal) swab specimens, and clinician-collected
36 nasopharyngeal swab specimens. We tested specimens with a validated reverse
37 transcription-quantitative polymerase chain reaction assay for the detection of SARS-CoV-2
38 and measured cycle threshold values. Symptom status and date of onset of symptoms was
39 also recorded for each participant.

40 **Results:** We recruited 45 participants. The median age of study participant was 42 years
41 old (Interquartile range, 31 to 52 years). Of the participants, 29 had at least one specimen
42 test positive for SARS-CoV-2. Of those, 21 (73%) of 29 reported active symptoms. By
43 specimen type and home-based collection method, clinician-supervised self-collected oral
44 fluid swab specimens detected 26 (90%) of 29 infected individuals, clinician-supervised
45 self-collected nasal swab specimens detected 23 (85%) of 27, clinician-collected posterior
46 nasopharyngeal swab specimens detected 23 (79%) of 29, and unmonitored self-collected
47 oral fluid swab specimens detected 19 (66%) of 29. Despite nasopharyngeal swabs being
48 considered the gold standard, 4 participants tested negative by clinician-collected
49 nasopharyngeal swab and positive by the 3 other specimen types. Additionally, false
50 negative results by each sample type were seen to generally not overlap.

51 **Conclusions:** Supervised self-collected oral fluid and nasal swab specimens performed
52 similarly to, if not better than clinician-collected nasopharyngeal swab specimens for the

53 detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection. No sample type captured all SARS-CoV-2 infections,
54 suggesting potential heterogeneity in the distribution of viral load in different parts of the
55 respiratory tract between individuals. Supervised self-collection performed comparably to
56 clinician collection and would allow for rapid expansion of testing capacity in the United
57 States by reducing the need for trained healthcare workers, reducing exposure of
58 healthcare workers, and reducing the amount of PPE (personal protective equipment) being
59 used for testing during a critical shortage.

60

61 **MAIN TEXT**

62 The 2019 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which causes
63 Covid-19, was first detected in Wuhan, China in late 2019.¹ On 20 January 2020, the first
64 case of SARS-CoV-2 infection was reported in the United States.² After more than 118,000
65 cases were detected in 114 countries with over 4,000 deaths, the World Health
66 Organization declared that Covid-19 pandemic.³

67
68 The ideal specimen for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 is unknown. Currently, trained health
69 care professionals and specialized collection devices are recommended for the collection of
70 nasopharyngeal swab specimens.⁴ That requires staffing of health care workers, who could
71 be performing other duties, and the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), during a
72 severe shortage. Additionally, patients report discomfort during nasopharyngeal swab
73 specimen collection, which may deter patients from being tested. The use of nasal swab
74 and oral fluid specimens could potentially greatly increase health worker safety and the
75 number of persons tested. We recruited participants recently tested for SARS-CoV-2
76 infection to assess differences in specimen types and collection methods for Covid-19
77 testing.

78

79 **Methods**

80 We recruited participants that recently tested for Covid-19 at a Clinical Laboratory
81 Improvement Amendments certified, high-complexity laboratory. The patient population and
82 recruitment methods are described below.

83

84 *Testing population*

85 We recruited non-hospitalized persons tested for Covid-19 in Los Angeles County,
86 California, that included symptomatic adults older than age 65, those with a chronic

87 disease, first responders, and law enforcement officers that may have been exposed to
88 SARS-CoV-2. We aimed to recruit 30 persons that tested negative for Covid-19 and 30
89 persons that tested positive. Participants were contacted via telephone or email and
90 provided with details of the study. Participants were given a study information sheet and
91 gave verbal informed consent.

92

93 *Specimen collection methods*

94 We aimed to study different supervised versus unsupervised, self-collected specimens. We
95 obtained unsupervised self-collected oral fluid swab specimens, clinician-supervised self-
96 collected oral fluid swab specimens, clinician-supervised self-collected mid-turbinate (nasal)
97 swab specimens, and clinician-collected posterior nasopharyngeal swab specimens.
98 For the self-collected oral fluid swab specimens, we provided written instructions with the
99 testing kit, which included a sterile swab and a tube with a ribonucleic acid storage media
100 (DNA/RNA Shield™ solution, Zymo Research Corp., Irvine, CA, USA). Participants were
101 instructed to cough deeply 3-5 times collecting any phlegm or secretions in their mouth, rub
102 the swab on both cheeks, above and below the tongue, both gums, and on the hard palate
103 for a total of 20 seconds to ensure the swab was saturated with oral fluid. Following that,
104 participants were instructed to place the swab into the tube, secure the lid, invert the tube 3-
105 5 times, and place the capped tube into a collection bag. For the clinician-supervised self-
106 collected oral fluid swab specimens, the same instructions were provided and a clinician
107 observed to provide real time feedback. We observed that without feedback, some
108 unsupervised patients did not cough before self-collecting their sample.

109

110 For the clinician-supervised self-collected nasal swab specimen, a kit was provided that
111 included a flocked swab (CLASSIQSwabs™, Copan Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA, USA) and
112 the same collection fluid as described above. The participant was verbally instructed to

113 insert the swab into one nostril to the depth of 3-4 cm, rotate the swab for 5 to 10 seconds,
114 place the swab into the collection tube, invert the tube 3-5 times, and place the capped tube
115 into a collection bag. Posterior nasopharyngeal swab specimens were collected by a
116 clinician with the recommended medical technique using nasopharyngeal swabs (Becton,
117 Dickinson and Company, Franklin Lakes, NJ, USA).⁵

118

119 *Surveying and sampling*

120 We collected samples in private areas of participant homes. We collected symptoms data
121 immediately prior to sampling. Sampling methods are detailed above. For each patient, all
122 samples were collected within a 30-minute window. Samples were transported to the
123 laboratory at ambient temperature for testing on the day of collection.

124

125 *Specimen extraction and testing*

126 We processed samples from the specimen collection tubes. We lysed and extracted RNA
127 from samples (RNA purification kit, Norgen Biotek Corp., Thorold, ON, Canada) using an
128 automated instrument (Resolvex A200, Tecan Group Ltd., Zürich, Switzerland) on a 96-well
129 plate (Norgen Biotek Corp., Thorold, ON, CA). We used a reverse transcription-quantitative
130 polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) assay that utilized a single color TaqMan probe with
131 a modified version of the qualitative detection of Covid-19 (N1, N2 primer/probe assay)
132 designed and validated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), with the
133 addition of N3 (Integrated DNA Technologies, Coralville, IA, USA).⁶ We recorded cycle
134 threshold values for tests. We detected human Ribonuclease P RNA with an additional
135 single color TaqMan assay, in a parallel reaction using an aliquot of the extracted
136 participant specimen to serve as a control for specimen extraction, specimen adequacy,
137 and RT-PCR inhibition. We ran samples on an RT-PCR System (CFX 96™ Touch RT-PCR

138 Detection System or CFX 96™ Connect RT-PCR Detection System, Bio-Rad, Hercules,
139 CA, USA).

140

141 *Ethics statement*

142 The Institutional Review Board of the University of California Los Angeles reviewed and
143 approved the study (reference number 20-000545).

144

145 **Results**

146 We recruited 45 participants. The median age of study participants was 42 years
147 (Interquartile range [IQR], 31 to 52 years). Of the participants, 29 tested positive for SARS-
148 CoV-2 viral RNA in at least one specimen. Of the participants, 23 (51%) of 45 participants
149 reported active symptoms; 21 of those 23 tested positive.

150

151 Overall, we collected 180 samples from 45 participants. Of those specimens, one specimen
152 was lost and two specimens had insufficient sample for laboratory analysis. Therefore, 177
153 specimens yielded results (Figure). Clinician-supervised oral fluid swab specimens detected
154 26 (90%) of 29 infected individuals, clinician-supervised nasal swab specimens detected 23
155 (85%) of 27, clinician-collected posterior nasopharyngeal swab specimens detected 23
156 (79%) of 29, and unsupervised self-collected oral fluid swab specimens detected 19 (66%)
157 of 29. There was no difference in testing performance when comparing those with and
158 without active symptoms.

159

160 When comparing cycle threshold values, clinician-collected posterior nasopharyngeal swab
161 specimens had an average cycle threshold value of 15.96 (SD: 14.91), clinician-supervised
162 self-collected nasal swab specimens had an average cycle threshold value of 19.25 (SD:
163 16.53), clinician-supervised self-collected oral fluid swab specimens had an average cycle

164 threshold value of 19.72 (SD: 17.27), and unsupervised self-collected oral fluid swab
165 specimens had an average cycle threshold value of 18.33 (SD: 18.02).

166

167 **Discussion**

168 We found that self-collection of specimens for SARS-CoV-2 detection was feasible. No
169 single specimen type detected all those with infection. Supervised home-collection of oral
170 fluid and nasal secretions performed as well as, or better than, clinician-collected
171 nasopharyngeal specimens. Unsupervised self-collection of oral fluid specimens might have
172 performed worse in this study sample.

173

174 The CDC currently recommends the use of nasopharyngeal or oropharyngeal swab
175 specimens either collected by a health care worker or self-collected mid-turbinate or
176 anterior nares samples in symptomatic patients in a health care setting, including a
177 supervised drive-through setting, if nasopharyngeal swab specimens are not available.⁴ A
178 prior study reported that Covid-19 detection was similar among sputum and
179 nasopharyngeal swabs specimens.⁷ That study noted that multiple anatomic site testing
180 may improve the sensitivity and reduce false-negative test results.

181

182 There is an urgent need to validate reliable specimen collection methods for the detection
183 of SARS-CoV-2 to increase access to safe and easy testing. We believe this is the first
184 study demonstrating sample collection for SARS-CoV-2 infection testing in a home setting.
185 Our findings support that clinician-supervised self-collected oral fluid and clinician-
186 supervised self-collected nasal swab specimens for the detection of Covid-19 in the home
187 setting are likely equivalent in sensitivity to clinician-collected posterior nasopharyngeal
188 swab specimens. Further research on other supervision means such as video-based
189 instructions or observation and feedback via telehealth is warranted.

190

191 In our sample, there were 6 cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection detected among oral fluid swab
192 specimens, which were not detected in the clinician-collected nasopharyngeal swab
193 specimens. There were also 3 cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection detected among
194 nasopharyngeal specimens, not detected in oral fluid swab specimens. That suggests that
195 testing any single anatomic site may miss some cases of Covid-19 infection, which is
196 consistent with a prior study.⁸ While we did not find significant differences in cycle threshold
197 values between groups, there was a trend toward swab specimens collected in the
198 nasopharynx having lower cycle threshold values than swab specimens collected in the
199 oropharynx, which correspond to higher viral loads in nasal or nasopharyngeal specimens.⁹

200

201 We found that unsupervised self-collected oral fluid swab specimens detected SARS-CoV-2
202 in fewer patients than other specimen types, and this discrepancy was unexpected. We
203 observed that without feedback, some unsupervised participants did not cough before self-
204 collecting their sample. Coughing was included as part of this specimen collection protocol.
205 Laboratory studies and a case series have indicated that oral fluid collected after a
206 participant coughs are reliable specimens.^{10,11} This study suggests that coughing may be a
207 critical step when collecting oral fluid swab specimens for the detection of SARS-CoV-2.

208

209 Our report has several strengths. We were able to perform home-based specimen
210 collection for Covid-19 testing. We studied multiple sample types and collection methods,
211 including unsupervised self-collected specimens and clinician-supervised self-collected
212 specimens. Clinician-collected nasopharyngeal specimens were collected in all patients for
213 comparison. All samples were tested at a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments
214 certified, high-complexity laboratory with a validated Covid-19 assay.

215

216 However, our study had a limited sample size due to the current shortage of testing
217 supplies. Our study was not designed to detect statistical differences between specimen
218 types or collection methods. Given the urgency of obtaining results, recruitment took place
219 over a short period.

220

221 **Conclusions**

222 Supervised self-collected oral fluid and nasal swab specimens performed similarly to
223 clinician-collected nasopharyngeal swab specimens for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. No
224 sample type captured all infections. Supervised self-collected methods were feasible and
225 could enable widespread access to testing by removing the need for a healthcare
226 professional to collect each sample, reducing potential exposure for healthcare
227 professionals and reducing the amount of PPE used for testing.

228

229 **Declarations**

230 *Declaration of competing interests*

231 F.T. and V.S. developed a Covid-19 viral assay for the detection of COVID-19 infection.

232

233 *Acknowledgements*

234 The authors want to acknowledge the staff of University of California Los Angeles, TKSL,
235 Curative Inc. and Korva-Labs Inc.

236 **References**

- 237 1. Munster VJ, Koopmans M, van Doremalen N, van Riel D, de Wit E. A Novel
238 Coronavirus Emerging in China - Key Questions for Impact Assessment. *The New England*
239 *journal of medicine* 2020; **382**(8): 692-4.
- 240 2. Holshue ML, DeBolt C, Lindquist S, et al. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in
241 the United States. *The New England journal of medicine* 2020; **382**(10): 929-36.
- 242 3. World Health Organization. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media
243 briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020.
- 244 4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Guidelines for Clinical Specimens. In:
245 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, editor. Atlanta, GA; 2020.
- 246 5. Baden LR, Drazen JM, Kritek PA, Curfman GD, Morrissey S, Champion EW. H1N1
247 influenza A disease--information for health professionals. *The New England journal of*
248 *medicine* 2009; **360**(25): 2666-7.
- 249 6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC 2019-nCoV Real-Time RT-PCR
250 Diagnostic Panel In: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, editor. Atlanta, Georgia;
251 2020.
- 252 7. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical
253 Specimens. *JAMA* 2020.
- 254 8. Lieberman D, Lieberman D, Shimoni A, Keren-Naus A, Steinberg R, Shemer-Avni Y.
255 Identification of respiratory viruses in adults: nasopharyngeal versus oropharyngeal
256 sampling. *J Clin Microbiol* 2009; **47**(11): 3439-43.
- 257 9. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized
258 patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 2020.
- 259 10. To KK, Tsang OT, Chik-Yan Yip C, et al. Consistent detection of 2019 novel
260 coronavirus in saliva. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.

261 11. Chan JF, Yip CC, To KK, et al. Improved molecular diagnosis of COVID-19 by the
262 novel, highly sensitive and specific COVID-19-RdRp/Hel real-time reverse transcription-
263 polymerase chain reaction assay validated in vitro and with clinical specimens. *J Clin*
264 *Microbiol* 2020.
265

