Cotton tipped plastic swabs for SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR diagnosis to prevent supplies shortage.

Byron Freire-Paspuel[1], Patricio Vega[2], Alberto Velez[2], Paulina Castillo[2], Ileana Elizabeth Gomez-Santos[3], Marilyn Cruz[2] and Miguel Angel Garcia-Bereguiain[1*].

1. One Health Research Group. Universidad de Las Américas. Quito. Ecuador.
2. Agencia de Regulación y Control de la Bioseguridad y Cuarentena para Galápagos. Puerto Ayora. Ecuador.
3. Hospital República del Ecuador. Ministerio de Salud Pública. Puerto Ayora. Ecuador.

*corresponding author: Miguel Angel Garcia-Bereguiain (magbereguiain@gmail.com).

Abstract. Nasopharyngeal sampling protocols for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) diagnosis guidelines only recommend synthetic fiber swabs. We show that simple and cheap cotton tipped plastic swabs do not inhibit PCR and have equivalent performance to rayon swabs. Cotton tipped plastic swabs are massively produced worldwide and would prevent swabs supplies shortage during current high SARS-CoV-2 testing demands, particularly on developing countries.

Nasopharyngeal (NP) swab is the reference sampling method for SARS CoV2 diagnosis, as recommended by World Health Organization (WHO) and Center for Diseases Control and Prevention (CDC) (1-3). CDC only endorses the use of synthetic fiber tipped swabs like rayon or nylon swabs on their recent guidelines for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis (3). However, while the general guidelines for respiratory sample collection by WHO recommends either cotton or synthetic fiber swabs (2), the currently guidelines for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis only mention synthetic fiber swabs (1). We herein validated NP sampling for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis using cheap and easily available cotton tipped plastic swabs with no inhibition effect over PCR reaction. Cotton tipped plastic swabs are massively produced worldwide, including developing countries; its endorsement for sampling collection to perform the molecular diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection on international guidelines would avoid sampling disruption due to swabs supply shortage.

Patients who were suspected of COVID-19 during the surveillance implemented since April 7th 2020 at Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) were subjected to SARS-CoV-2 molecular testing using two different nasopharyngeal plastic swabs: rayon tipped swabs and cotton tipped swabs (Puritan Medical Products LLC, USA; see supplementary image). Each NP swab was inserted in the nostril until they hit the back of the NP cavity, then rotated 5 times and removed. The test was conducted in both nostrils for each patient in a random order for each type of swab, with less than 2 minute of delay among each sample. NP swabs were immersed into a vial containing 0.5 mL TRIS-EDTA (pH 8) and keep refrigerated till arrival to the lab. RNA extraction was performed using PureLink Viral RNA/DNA Mini Kit (Invitrogen, USA) and SARS CoV-2 was detected using the primers and probes designed by the CDC (2019-nCoV CDC EUA kit from IDT, USA). The assay was validated to detect 20 viral RNA copies/uL.

During the surveillance period from April 7th to 14th 2020, forty-four (44) patients were randomly included in this study. A total of thirty-three (33; 75%) patients showed laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 and eleven (11; 25%) were negative, either with plastic rayon tipped or plastic cotton tipped swabs (Table 1). By reference to the gold standard plastic rayon tipped swab NP sampling, the detection of SARS-CoV-2 by plastic cotton tipped swab NP sampling provided a 100% sensitivity and specificity indicating a total agreement among swabs.

Ct (mean±SD) values for N1, N2 and RdRP genes for plastic rayon tipped swabs (N1: 33.71±3.93; N2: 36.84±3.17; RdRP: 33.75±3.05) and plastic cotton tipped swabs (N1: 32.55±5.14; N2: 34.37±5.25; RdRP: 27.66±2.95) were statistically not different for viral specific genes N1 and N2 ($p = 0.30$ and 0.052, respectively), but statistically significant ($p<0.001$) for the RNA extraction quality control housekeeping gene RdRP, indicating a better RNA yield for plastic cotton tipped swabs (Table 2).

We herein report that the molecular detection of SARS-CoV-2 using plastic cotton tipped swabs NP sampling is as reliable as using plastic synthetic fiber tipped like rayon swabs, considered as the gold standard by CDC (3). The use of cotton tipped swabs for respiratory specimens collection is included at WHO guidelines (2) and it has been reported specifically reliable for respiratory retroviruses like influenza (4). We also excluded any inhibitory effect over PCR reaction associated to plastic cotton tipped swabs. However, our data do not endorse to use any kind of cotton tipped swabs as wooden made ones as some chemicals derived from the wood could interfere with PCR reaction. Plastic cotton tipped swabs are cheap and made worldwide even in developing countries like Ecuador; and based on our results do not compromise neither sensitivity nor specificity for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis. Its endorsement on international guidelines upon more independent validation studies would help to prevent SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis disruption due to swab supply shortage as recently happened in Ecuador.

To our knowledge, this is the the second study comparing swabs for SARS-CoV-2 testing (5), but the first of its kind providing a cheap and worldwide available alternative like the plastic cotton tipped swab. Additionally, high sensitivity was recently reported for nasal versus NP sampling for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis (6); taking together this finding and ours, even sterile short plastic cotton tipped swabs like the one use for ear hygiene could represent an option under lack of NP swabs supply. We call upon the worldwide microbiology community, particularly at developing countries, to consider those findings to enhance the testing capacity to fight the spread of the current COVID-19 pandemic.

Acknowledgments

We thank the medical personnel from "Ministerio de Salud Pública" at Galapagos Islands and the staff from the "Agencia de Regulación y Control de la Bioseguridad y Cuarentena para Galápagos" for their support. We also thank Dr Ronald Cedeño from OPS/WHO for his work during Covid 19 surveillance in Galapagos Islands. We specially thank Gabriel Iturralde, Oscar Espinosa and Dr Tannya Lozada from "Dirección General de Investigación de la Universidad de Las Américas" for logistic support to make SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis possible in Galapagos Islands.

Disclaimers

The study recieved ethical approval by "COE Regional de Galápagos" that it is the Comission in charge of covid19 surveillance at Galápagos Islands.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References.

1. Laboratory testing for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in suspected human cases. Interim guidance 19 March 2020. World Health Organization.

2. Guidelines for the collection of clinical specimens during field investigation of outbreaks. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/ihr/publications/WHO_CDS_CSR_EDC_2000_4/en/

3. Interim Guidelines for Collecting, Handling, and Testing Clinical Specimens from Persons for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Center for Diseases Control and Prevention, USA. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html (last access 04/20/20).

4. Catherine Moore, Sally Corden, Jaisi Sinha, Rachel Jones. Dry cotton or flocked respiratory swabs as a simple collection technique for the molecular detection of respiratory viruses using real-time NASBA. Journal of Virological Methods. 2008; 153: 84–89.

5. Christie Vermeiren, Xavier Marchand-Senécal, Elena Sheldrake, David Bulir, Marek Smieja, Sylvia Chong, Jessica D. Forbes, Kevin Katz. Comparison of Copan Eswab and FLOQswab for COVID-19 PCR diagnosis: working around a supply shortage. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. April 15, 2020. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.00669-20.

6. Hélène Péré, Isabelle Podglajen, Maxime Wack, Edouard Flamarion, Tristan Mirault, Guillaume Goudot, Caroline Hauw-Berlemont, Laetitia Le, Eric Caudron, Sophie Carrabin, Julien Rodary, Tatiana Ribeyre, Laurent Bélec, David Veyer. Nasal swab sampling for SARS-CoV-2: A convenient alternative in time of nasopharyngeal swab shortage. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. April 15, 2020. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.00721-20.

Table 1. Plastic cotton tipped swabs and plastic rayon tipped swabs performance for NP sampling for SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR diagnosis.

	Cotton Swab SARS CoV-2 Positive	**Cotton Swab SARS CoV-2 Negative**
Rayon Swab SARS CoV-2 Positive	**33**	**0**
Rayon Swab SARS CoV-2 Negative	**0**	**11**

Table 2. RT-qPCR Ct values for N1, N2 and RdRP probes for nasopharyngeal samples with cotton and rayon swabs (mean +/- SD). NA mean "not amplified".

N	Sample	N1 Ct		N2 Ct		RdRP Ct	
		Cotton Swab	Rayon Swab	Cotton Swab	Rayon Swab	Cotton Swab	Rayon Swab
1	OCOL	21,11	26,42	26,48	33,2	25,1	30,66
2	ELCA	NA	NA	NA	NA	25,37	29,3
3	MAPI	NA	NA	NA	NA	27,6	26,09
4	CEMI	34,17	34,27	>40	39,94	28,47	29,84
5	460	NA	NA	NA	NA	28,02	34,41
6	462	NA	NA	NA	NA	27,31	33,91
7	465	NA	NA	NA	NA	29,64	33,32
8	467	NA	NA	NA	NA	33,57	36,12
9	471	NA	NA	NA	NA	32,92	34,24
10	474	NA	NA	NA	NA	29,36	36,84
11	943	30,34	32,41	33,23	36,46	25,32	31,43
12	944	31,75	37,41	34,4	>40	21,73	29,76
13	945	32,24	35,05	34,87	>40	23,17	30,8
14	946	37,53	35,8	39,62	40,00	25,27	30,2
15	947	38,1	34,99	>40	>40	23,11	31,45
16	949	27,31	34,95	29,82	>40	25,43	36,68
17	950	23,34	37,31	25,16	>40	22,69	34,6
18	952	38,58	34,65	40,00	39,77	27,74	35,53
19	954	38,12	37,19	>40	>40	26,6	35,73
20	955	35,33	34,6	37,47	40,00	26,37	33
21	963	30,42	32,66	32,37	38,06	29,23	34,64
22	965	31,62	26,7	33,76	32,92	27,32	35,75

23	966	25,53	32,76	28,02	37,49	26,11	27,44
24	967	26,05	31,34	27,94	36,15	26,12	32,29
25	968	23,02	27,3	24,8	31,96	25,04	33,02
26	970	36,01	36,26	40,00	>40	24,87	36,41
27	977	30,37	30,4	33,3	35,31	25,29	29,14
28	978	NA	NA	NA	NA	25,6	37,18
20	979	38,2	38,44	>40	>40	26,97	38,23
30	980	NA	NA	NA	NA	27,77	36,45
31	986	33,9	32,31	37,34	37,12	26,26	36,02
32	987	37,15	>40	37,96	>40	28,84	35,53
33	988	34,76	35,59	36,8	39,27	32,08	34,22
34	989	35,81	36,36	37,05	>40	29,83	36,36
35	990	39,75	37,6	>40	>40	31,55	35,62
36	991	28,8	33,51	29,98	38,74	28,39	38,2
37	992	36,45	26,06	>40	30,08	28,55	30,46
38	993	36,1	39,58	40,00	>40	28,67	34,78
39	996	38,33	38,63	>40	>40	28,86	36,71
40	997	28,27	33,11	29,82	38,4	30,58	38,3
41	999	36,94	29,86	>40	34,04	36,37	35,83
42	1008	28,11	26,86	29,54	32,46	28,98	35,99
43	1009	30,64	31,9	32,08	35	30,05	31,11
44	1010	NA	NA	NA	NA	29,02	31,47

Supplementary image. Cotton and Rayon tipped plastic swabs used on the study.