

1 **Saliva Sample as a Non-Invasive Specimen for the Diagnosis of Coronavirus Disease-**  
2 **2019 (COVID-19): a Cross-Sectional Study**

3 Ekawat Pasomsub<sup>1</sup>, Siriorn P. Watcharananan<sup>2</sup>, Kochawan Boonyawat<sup>2</sup>, Pareena

4 Janchompoo<sup>1</sup>, Garanyuta Wongtabtim<sup>1</sup>, Worramin Suksuwan<sup>2</sup>, Somnuek Sungkanuparph<sup>3</sup>,

5 Angsana Phuphuakrat<sup>2\*</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Pathology, Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University,

7 Bangkok, Thailand

8 <sup>2</sup>Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University,

9 Bangkok, Thailand

10 <sup>3</sup>Chakri Naruebodindra Medical Institute, Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital,

11 Mahidol University, Samut Prakan, Thailand

12

13 **Running title:** Saliva for the diagnosis of COVID-19

14

15

16 **\*Corresponding author:**

17 Angsana Phuphuakrat, MD, PhD

18 Assistant Professor

19 Department of Medicine,

20 Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital,

21 Mahidol University

22 270 Rama VI Rd., Bangkok 10400, Thailand.

23 Tel. +662 201 1581, Fax. +662 201 2232

24 E-mail: [angsana.phu@mahidol.ac.th](mailto:angsana.phu@mahidol.ac.th)

25

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

26 **Abstract**

27 **Objectives.** Amid the increasing number of global pandemic coronavirus disease 2019  
28 (COVID-19) cases, there is a need for a quick and easy method to obtain a non-invasive  
29 sample for the detection of this novel coronavirus 2019 (SARS-CoV-2). We aimed to  
30 investigate the potential use of saliva samples as a non-invasive tool for the diagnosis of  
31 COVID-19.

32 **Methods.** From 27 March to 4 April, 2020, we prospectively collected saliva samples and a  
33 standard nasopharyngeal and throat swab in persons seeking care at an acute respiratory  
34 infection clinic in a university hospital during the outbreak of COVID-19. Real-time  
35 polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) was performed, and the results of the two specimens  
36 were compared.

37 **Results.** Two-hundred pairs of the samples were collected. Sixty-nine (34.5%) patients were  
38 male, and the median (interquartile) age was 36 (28-48) years. Using nasopharyngeal and  
39 throat swab RT-PCR as the reference standard, the prevalence of COVID-19 diagnosed by  
40 nasopharyngeal and throat swab RT-PCR was 9.5%. The sensitivity and specificity of the  
41 saliva sample RT-PCR were 84.2% [95% confidence interval (CI) 79.2%-89.3%], and 98.9%  
42 (95% CI 97.5-100.3%), respectively. An analysis of the agreement between the two  
43 specimens demonstrated 97.5% observed agreement (kappa coefficient 0.851, 95% CI 0.723-  
44 0.979;  $p < 0.001$ ).

45 **Conclusions.** Saliva specimens can be used for the diagnosis of COVID-19. The collection  
46 method is non-invasive, and non-aerosol generating. Using a saliva sample as a specimen for  
47 the detection of SARS-CoV-2 could facilitate the diagnosis of the disease, which is one of the  
48 strategies that helps in controlling the epidemic.

49

50 **Keywords:** COVID-19, nasopharyngeal swab, RT-PCR, saliva, SARS-CoV-2, throat swab

51

## 52 **Introduction**

53           Since December 2019, the outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), caused  
54 by the novel coronavirus 2019 (SARS-CoV-2) has emerged in Hebei Province of China and  
55 has spread to other parts of the world [1, 2]. The number of cases has been increasing rapidly,  
56 with a case-fatality rate of 2.3% [3].

57           Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in patient specimens is the first crucial step for the  
58 guidance of treatment, effective infection control in the hospital and control of infection in  
59 the community. Screening of infection in suspected cases with a nucleic acid amplification  
60 test (NAAT), such as real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), in respiratory  
61 specimens, is recommended by the World Health Organization [4]. However, the collection  
62 of nasopharyngeal and/or oropharyngeal swab specimens is a relatively invasive method and  
63 the procedure might put healthcare workers at higher risk for disease transmission during  
64 patients' gag reflex, cough, or sneezing.

65           As SARS-CoV-2 viral load was demonstrated to present near presentation onset [5],  
66 using a saliva sample as the specimen for the screening of the disease is appealing. To  
67 determine the potential of using a saliva sample for the diagnosis of COVID-19, we  
68 conducted a prospective study investigating the correlation of detection of SARS-CoV-2 in a  
69 saliva sample, and nasopharyngeal and throat swabs in patients under investigation at an  
70 acute respiratory infection clinic at a university hospital in Bangkok, Thailand during the  
71 COVID-19 outbreak.

72

## 73 **Methods**

### 74 *Study population*

75           A prospective study was conducted among 200 patients under investigation who  
76 attended an acute respiratory infection clinic at Ramathibodi Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand,

77 during 27 March and 4 April, 2020. The inclusion criteria were those who presented with a  
78 history of fever or acute respiratory symptoms together with 1) travel history from an  
79 endemic area of COVID-19 within 14 days, or 2) contact with an individual who was  
80 confirmed or suspected having COVID-19. Patients aged less than 18 years old were  
81 excluded.

82 Patient characteristics, symptoms at presentation, and risk factors were collected. As a  
83 standard protocol, nasopharyngeal and throat swabs from a patient were collected using  
84 Copan FLOQSwabs® and a sterile tube containing Copan's Universal Transport Medium™  
85 (UTM®) (Copan Diagnostics). Prior to collecting the swabs, patients were asked to provide a  
86 saliva sample, void of coughing, in a sputum collection container containing the UTM®.

87 The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Ethical Clearance Committee  
88 on Human Right Related to Research Involving Human Subjects of the Faculty of Medicine  
89 Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University.

#### 90 ***Specimen processing***

91 Nasopharyngeal and throat swab in a tube and saliva sample from the collection  
92 container were treated with the lysis buffer (BioMerieux) to inactivate the SARS-CoV-2.  
93 Viral RNA was extracted from 200 µl of the samples within 26 minutes using MagDEA® Dx  
94 reagents (Precision System Science) fully automated nucleic acid extraction system,  
95 according to the manufacturer's instructions.

#### 96 ***RT-PCR workflow***

97 The detection of SARS-CoV-2 in the specimens was performed by real-time RT-PCR  
98 amplification of SARS-CoV-2 *ORF1AB* and *N* gene fragments, using a SARS-CoV-2  
99 Nucleic Acid Diagnostic Kit (Sansure Biotech) which was approved for detection of the  
100 SARS-CoV-2 by the National Medical Products Administration (NMPA) and certified by the

101 China Food and Drug Administration (CFDA) [6]. The lower limit of detection of the test  
102 was 200 copies/sample. RT-PCR was performed by the CFX96 Real-Time Detection System  
103 (Bio-Rad). The result was considered positive if the cycle threshold (Ct) values of both target  
104 genes were  $\leq 38$ , and negative when Ct values of both targets were  $> 38$ . Retesting was done  
105 among the samples with discordancy of the Ct values; i.e. samples with one target gene with  
106 a Ct value of  $\leq 38$  and another showing a Ct value of  $> 38$ . Among the retesting, the specimens  
107 with repeated discordancy were reported as negative. The turnaround time of the diagnosis  
108 was approximately four hours.

### 109 *Statistical analysis*

110 Data were analysed for normality and descriptive statistics presented as a number  
111 (percent) for categorical variables and mean $\pm$ standard deviation (SD) or median (interquartile  
112 range; IQR) for continuous variables. Chi-square or Fisher's exact test was used for  
113 categorical variables. Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative  
114 predictive value (NPV) and a 95% confidence interval (CI) were calculated to assess  
115 diagnostic performance. The kappa coefficient [7] was used to estimate for the agreement  
116 between the saliva RT-PCR and nasopharyngeal and throat swab RT-PCR results. All  
117 statistical analyses were performed using Stata statistical software version 15.1 (StataCorp,  
118 College Station, TX, 2018).

119

### 120 **Results**

121 Two-hundred pairs of samples of nasopharyngeal and throat swab, and saliva samples  
122 were collected. Sixty-nine (34.5%) patients were male. The median (IQR) age was 36 (28-48)  
123 years. Median (IQR) onset of symptoms was 3 (2-7) days. Characteristics of the patients are  
124 presented in Table 1. The prevalence of COVID-19 diagnosed by nasopharyngeal and throat  
125 swab RT-PCR, and saliva RT-PCR in this study were 9.5% and 9.0%, respectively.

126           Among 19 patients diagnosed with COVID-19 by nasopharyngeal swab RT-PCR, the  
127 median age was 33 (26-44) years. Fever as defined by temperature  $\geq 37.5^{\circ}\text{C}$  was presented in  
128 3 (15.8%) patients. The mean $\pm$ SD temperature was  $37\pm 0.46^{\circ}\text{C}$  and the mean $\pm$ SD onset of  
129 symptoms prior to the test was  $6.35\pm 5.7$  days. Common symptoms at presentation were  
130 cough (11, 57.9%), dyspnoea (7, 36.8%), and runny nose (5, 26.3%). When compared with  
131 181 patients with negative nasopharyngeal and throat swab RT-PCR, only a sore throat at  
132 presentation was significantly lower in the COVID-19 patients. Other characteristics,  
133 symptoms at presentation and risk factors were not significantly different (Table 1).

134           To determine the diagnostic test performance of RT-PCR of the saliva, RT-PCR  
135 results of the nasopharyngeal and throat swabs were used as the reference standard. The  
136 sensitivity and specificity of saliva samples were 84.2% (95% CI 79.2%-89.3%), and 98.9%  
137 (95% CI 97.5-100.3%), respectively (Table 2). PPV and NPV were 88.9% (95% CI 84.5%-  
138 93.2%), and 98.4% (95% CI 96.6-100.1%), respectively. An analysis of the agreement  
139 between the two specimens revealed a 97.5% observed agreement (kappa coefficient 0.851,  
140 95% CI 0.723-0.979;  $p < 0.001$ ).

141

## 142 **Discussion**

143           The present study showed the value of testing a saliva sample as a non-invasive  
144 detection of SARS-CoV-2. The Saliva PCR test demonstrated high sensitivity and  
145 comparable performance to the current standard of nasopharyngeal and throat swab. The  
146 kappa coefficient value showed a strong agreement of the diagnosis between the standard  
147 nasopharyngeal and throat swab and the saliva sample.

148           Like severe acute respiratory syndrome-coronavirus (SARS-CoV), a causative agent  
149 of the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), SARS-CoV-2 employs the host-cell  
150 angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) as the main host receptor for cellular entry [8].

151 Previous experimental studies showed a higher level of ACE2 expression in minor salivary  
152 glands, as compared to that in the lungs [9] and that the epithelial cells lining salivary gland  
153 duct were early targets cells of SARS-CoV infection in rhesus macaques [10]. SARS-CoV  
154 was also detected in saliva samples [11]. This suggested that the salivary glands could be a  
155 potential target for SAR-CoV-2 infection, and hence saliva could be a potential sample for  
156 SARS-CoV-2 detection.

157 From recent findings, SARS-CoV-2 was detected from posterior oropharyngeal saliva  
158 samples, with a notable high viral load at the disease presentation. [5, 12]. In their protocol,  
159 an early morning saliva was collected after coughing up by clearing the throat. In our study, a  
160 saliva sample was the patient's self-generated, without a need for coughing up. This non-  
161 invasive procedure might be less aerosol-generating and might reduce the risk of infection for  
162 health care workers working in the clinic.

163 Although testing of saliva might provide an advantage as an easy procedure, a  
164 comparison study between saliva and confirmed case of bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) fluid  
165 or convalescence serum titre has not been available. A recent study that detected the virus  
166 from multiple sites showed a lower test positivity rate from the nasal swab (63%), as  
167 compared to the bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (93%) [13]. Therefore, a false negative test of  
168 the SARS-CoV-2 from saliva sample might possible, and this would be an area for further  
169 exploration. However, the spectrum of the disease ranges from asymptomatic, upper  
170 respiratory tract symptoms, pneumonia, and acute respiratory distress syndrome [14, 15].  
171 Hence, the discrepancy of SARS-CoV-2 detection from different specimens might also be  
172 possible.

173 The study had several strengths. We prospectively collected data on consecutive  
174 patients who were at high risk of COVID-19 infection including those with acute respiratory  
175 symptoms and having risk factors, thus minimizing potential spectrum effect. All enrolled

176 patients were verified with the reference standard. As for the limitations, two specimens had  
177 detectable of SARS-CoV-2 from saliva samples, but were undetectable from nasopharyngeal  
178 and throat swab. The significance of these positive results are unknown since we do not have  
179 clinical data on any follow-up of these patients.

180           With the current situation of a shortage supply of personal protective equipment  
181 during the pandemic and moderate risk of infection among healthcare workers, a saliva  
182 sample is an alternative specimen collection for the diagnosis of COVID-19, especially in  
183 resource-limited settings.

184

#### 185 **Conflict of interest**

186           All authors declare that there is no conflicts of interest.

187

#### 188 **Funding**

189           This study was supported by a grant from Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital,  
190 Mahidol University.

191

#### 192 **Acknowledgements**

193           We are grateful to physicians and nurses at the acute respiratory infection clinic at  
194 Ramathibodi Hospital for their help in collecting the samples.

195

#### 196 **Contribution of authors**

197           EP, SPW, and AP designed the study, and wrote the manuscript. PJ, GW, and WS  
198 performed the study. KB and AP analysed the data. KB and SS edited the manuscript.

199

#### 200 **References**



- 201 [1] Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH, To KK, Chu H, Yang J, et al. A familial cluster of  
202 pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person  
203 transmission: a study of a family cluster. *Lancet* 2020;395(10223):514-23.
- 204 [2] Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients  
205 infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet* 2020;395(10223):497-  
206 506.
- 207 [3] Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al. Clinical Characteristics of  
208 Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med* 2020;10.1056/NEJMoa2002032.
- 209 [4] World Health Organization. Laboratory testing for 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-  
210 nCoV) in suspected human cases 2020 [Available from:  
211 [https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117)  
212 [in-suspected-human-cases-20200117](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117)].
- 213 [5] To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, et al. Temporal profiles of  
214 viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses  
215 during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*  
216 2020;10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30196-1.
- 217 [6] Loeffelholz MJ, Tang YW. Laboratory diagnosis of emerging human coronavirus  
218 infections - the state of the art. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2020;9(1):747-56.
- 219 [7] McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*  
220 2012;22(3):276-82.
- 221 [8] Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Kruger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S, et al.  
222 SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a  
223 Clinically Proven Protease Inhibitor. *Cell* 2020;10.1016/j.cell.2020.02.052.
- 224 [9] Xu J, Li Y, Gan F, Du Y, Yao Y. Salivary Glands: Potential Reservoirs for COVID-19  
225 Asymptomatic Infection. *J Dent Res* 2020;10.1177/0022034520918518.

226

227 [10] Liu L, Wei Q, Alvarez X, Wang H, Du Y, Zhu H, et al. Epithelial cells lining salivary  
228 gland ducts are early target cells of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus  
229 infection in the upper respiratory tracts of rhesus macaques. *J Virol* 2011;85(8):4025-  
230 30.

231 [11] Wang WK, Chen SY, Liu IJ, Chen YC, Chen HL, Yang CF, et al. Detection of SARS-  
232 associated coronavirus in throat wash and saliva in early diagnosis. *Emerg Infect Dis*  
233 2004;10(7):1213-9.

234 [12] To KK, Tsang OT, Chik-Yan Yip C, Chan KH, Wu TC, Chan JMC, et al. Consistent  
235 detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in saliva. *Clin Infect Dis*  
236 2020;10.1093/cid/ciaa149.

237 [13] Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in  
238 Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA* 2020;10.1001/jama.2020.3786.

239 [14] Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, Tian F, Jin DY, Chen L, et al. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier  
240 Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA* 2020;10.1001/jama.2020.2565.

241 [15] Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus  
242 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72314 Cases  
243 From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA*  
244 2020;10.1001/jama.2020.2648.

245

246

247  
248  
249  
250  
251

**Tables**

**Table 1.** Characteristics of patients under investigation diagnosed with COVID-19 by RT-PCR from nasopharyngeal and throat swabs

	<b>Overall (n=200)</b>	<b>COVID-19 (n=19)*</b>	<b>Non COVID-19 (n=181)</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Age, years, median (IQR)</b>	36 (28-47.8)	33 (26-44)	36 (28-48)	0.207
<b>Male, n (%)</b>	69 (34.5)	9 (47.4)	60 (33.1)	0.217
<b>Fever (BT ≥37.5°C)</b>	18 (9)	3 (15.8)	15 (8.3)	0.383
<b>BT, (°C), mean±SD</b>	36.9 (0.5)	37 (0.5)	36.9 (0.5)	0.293
<b>Onset of symptoms prior to the test, days, median (IQR)</b>	3 (2-7)	3 (2-11)	3 (2-7)	0.378
<b>Symptoms at presentation</b>				
Cough, n (%)	108 (54)	11 (57.9)	97 (53.6)	0.813
Sore throat, n (%)	102 (51)	4 (21.1)	98 (54.1)	0.007
Runny nose, n (%)	68 (34)	5 (26.3)	63 (34.8)	0.613
Sneezing, n (%)	26 (13.2)	1 (5.3)	25(13.8)	0.478
Dyspnea, n (%)	59 (29.5)	7 (36.8)	52 (28.7)	0.599
Difficulty to breath, n (%)	22 (11)	2 (10.5)	20 (11)	0.999
<b>Risk factors</b>				
Return from other countries, n (%)	15 (7.5)	3 (15.8)	12 (6.6)	0.162
Close contact, n (%)	170 (85)	18 (94.7)	152 (84)	0.478

252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260

\* Detectable SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR from nasopharyngeal swabs

**Abbreviations:** BT, body temperature; °C, degree Celsius; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; IQR, interquartile range; SD, standard deviation;

261 **Table 2.** The comparison for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR between  
262 nasopharyngeal and throat swab, and saliva sample

263

<b>Saliva sample</b>	<b>Nasopharyngeal and throat swab</b>		<b>Total</b>
	Negative	Positive	
<b>Negative</b>	179	3	182
<b>Positive</b>	2	16	18
<b>Total</b>	181	19	200

264

265

266