

1 Sensitivity of Nasopharyngeal, Nasal and Throat Swab for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2

2

3 Byron M. Berenger^{1,2}, Kevin Fonseca^{1,3}, Angela R. Schneider⁴, Jia Hu⁵, and Nathan Zelyas^{1,6}

4 ¹Alberta Public Health Laboratory, Alberta Precision Laboratories, Calgary, AB, Canada

5 ²Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

6 ³Department of Microbiology, Immunology and Infectious Diseases, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB,
7 Canada

8 ⁴Department of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB

9 ⁵Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

10 ⁶Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

11 **Running Title:** Sensitivity of different swab sources for SARS-CoV-2

12 **Key Words:** Specimen handling, SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19 diagnostic testing, molecular diagnostic
13 techniques, nasopharyngeal swab, throat swab, oropharyngeal swab, nasal swab

14 **Corresponding Author:**

15 Byron Berenger

16 3030 Hospital Drive NW

17 Calgary, AB, Canada

18 T2N 4W4

19 byron.berenger@ucalgary.ca

20

21 **Abstract**

22 Nasopharyngeal (NP), nasal and throat swabs are the most practical specimen sources to test for upper
23 respiratory pathogens. We compared the sensitivity of NP, nasal and throat swabs to detect SARS-CoV-2
24 in community patients. Using detection at any site as the standard, the sensitivities were 90%, 80% and
25 87% for NP, nasal and throat respectively (n=30 positive at any site). Throat swabs are likely a suitable
26 alternative to NP swabs for the detection of COVID-19 infections.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Introduction**

49 The specimen source of choice for the screening of coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) varies globally.
50 Generally, the ideal specimen type for viruses causing respiratory tract infections is a nasopharyngeal
51 (NP) swab (1). Lower respiratory tract specimens may be of benefit in severe cases of COVID-19, but
52 most cases have mild upper respiratory tract disease (2–4). However, due to worldwide shortages of
53 swabs and collection media, it has become necessary to identify alternate methods to NP swabs for
54 sample collection for COVID-19 testing. We enrolled COVID-19 positive community patients on home
55 isolation to determine the sensitivity of NP, nasal and throat swabs.

56 **Methods**

57 Alberta Health Services (AHS) Public Health provided a list of people who had tested positive for COVID-
58 19. Oral consent by phone was obtained for collection of NP, nasal, and throat swabs in the participant's
59 home. NP swabs were collected using the Flexible Mini Tip Flocked Swab (Copan S.P.A, Italy) in Universal
60 Transport Media (UTM, Copan), nasal swabs using APTIMA Unisex Collection Kit (Hologic Inc.,
61 Marlborough, Mass), and throat swabs using the APTIMA Multitest Collection Kit. Collectors were given
62 instructions on how to perform swabs. For NP swabs the AHS collection guide was used (5). For nasal
63 collection, both nares were swabbed to a depth of at least 3 cm (or until resistance felt) and rotated
64 three times. Throat swabs were collected from both sides of the oropharynx and the posterior
65 pharyngeal wall under the uvula. The University of Calgary Research Ethics board approved this study
66 (REB20-444).

67 Testing for SARS-CoV-2 was performed by a multiplex reverse transcriptase real time-polymerase chain
68 reaction (RT-PCR). The RT-PCR was developed, validated and performed at the Alberta Public Health
69 Laboratory (ProvLab) targeting the envelope region (modified from (6)) and the RNA-dependent RNA
70 polymerase encoding regions (E and RdRp genes, respectively). The test was validated against

71 proficiency panels provided by the Public Health Agency of Canada National Microbiology Laboratory
72 (Winnipeg, MB). Spiking APTIMA media with a positive NP swab UTM specimen showed minimal
73 difference in the Ct values for our SARS-CoV-2 PCR and a 2 log dilution series in APTIMA, stored at 4°C
74 and room temperature for 48 h, showed minimal difference from time zero (≤ 0.6 change in Ct value).
75 Graph Pad Prism v8.4.1 (Graphpad Prism Software L.L.C, San Diego, CA) was used for statistical analysis.

76 **Results**

77 Of 82 COVID-19 positive individuals contacted, 36 consented (41% female, mean age 44.6 (range 18-
78 61)). Initial diagnosis was made by NP (n=15) or nasal swab (n=21). Participants were swabbed for the
79 study a mean of 4.1 days (range 1 to 6) after the initial diagnostic test and 10 days (range 4 to 23) after
80 symptom onset. Thirty of the thirty-six participants tested positive again at one or more of the three
81 sites swabbed. The mean time from symptom onset and study swabs was 12.6 days (range 5-18) for
82 those testing negative at all three sites and compared to 10.0 days (range 4-23) for those with a positive
83 result at any site. Using a reference standard of a positive result at any site, NP swab had a sensitivity of
84 90% (95%CI 74.4-96.5), throat swab 87% (70.3-94.7) and nasal swab 80% (62.7-90.5) (Wilson/Brown
85 Method, Table 1). In only two cases was only one specimen positive (both nasal). Seven participants
86 were positive from only two sources (n=2 NP and nasal, n=5 NP and throat).

87 Comparing the samples where all targets were positive and Ct values were available (n=19 for E gene
88 and n=18 RdRp), the Ct values for NP swabs was lower than throat swabs for the E gene ($p=0.028$,
89 $p>0.22$ for other site comparisons) (Friedman Test). The median Ct values for the E gene were 25.5 (10th
90 to -90th percentile: 20.5-29.5) for NP, 27.6 (24.7-32.4) for nasal and 28.7 (23.5-34.2) for throat; median
91 Ct values for the RdRp gene were 27.9 (23.5-32.4), 30.5 (27.5-35.0), and 31.3 (26.5-35.5), for the same
92 sites, respectively ($p>0.09$).

93

94 **Discussion**

95 Our study demonstrates that the sensitivity of nasal swabs is somewhat inferior to NP or throat swabs
96 whereas throat and NP swabs have comparable sensitivity. This finding was despite the Ct value being
97 higher in throat swabs compared to NP swabs. Consequently, when NP swabs are not available, throat
98 swabs are a preferable alternative to nasal swabs for COVID-19 testing.

99 Péré *et al* also found nasal swabs to be less sensitive than NP swabs (8). They reported a sensitivity of
100 89.2% (4/37 NP positives were false negative) with NP swabs as the reference standard. Using NP swabs
101 as the reference standard in our study, the sensitivity of nasal swabs was 82.5% (5/27 NP positives were
102 false negative). It is important to note that in our study NP swabs missed 3 positives that other sources
103 detected (n=2 detected by nasal and n=1 throat). Combining results from Péré *et al* and our study gives
104 a sensitivity for nasal swabs of 85.9%. Differences between studies included a different patient
105 population (patients seen in hospital vs. community), PCR assay used and collection media. Although
106 our study represents the general population with COVID-19, the results may differ in inpatients as they
107 may have higher viral loads (9).

108 Contrary to our findings, Wang *et al* (10) reported 73% of patients with a positive NP swab result tested
109 negative by throat/oropharyngeal swab. A potential explanation is that Wang *et al* did not instruct
110 collectors to swab under the epiglottis. Therefore, viral shedding from the nasopharynx may have not
111 been optimally sampled in the Wang *et al* cohort.

112 One limitation of our study is the small number of samples validated. We chose thirty to have a high
113 likelihood to detect 90% agreement (11). A hindrance of performing studies of this nature with a large
114 sample size is that sampling puts collectors at risk of infection even with appropriate personal protective
115 equipment. Our study was also performed a mean of 10 days after symptom onset, so the site of
116 optimal sampling may have differed if participants were swabbed closer to symptom onset. In early

117 disease, throat swabs may be falsely negative compared to CT scan findings, though it is not clear
118 whether NP and nasal swabs also lack sensitivity early in the disease progress (12).

119 The sensitivity of the sample type is dependent on proper sampling procedure. In our jurisdiction, nasal
120 swabs were initially implemented due to reports of lower Ct values than those seen in throat swabs (13).
121 Despite education and routine observation of the technique used at COVID-19 community assessment
122 centres, multiple accounts of sampling the anterior nares instead of the posterior nares/lower
123 turbinates were reported to the laboratory by patients. Sampling errors may also occur with throat and
124 NP swab and may have contributed to some of the false-negative NP swab results despite our collectors
125 being trained health care professionals. Additionally, other studies have since reported that throat
126 swabs have equivalent or higher SARS-CoV-2 viral loads compared to NP or nasal swabs, respectively
127 (14,15). Based on our results and familiarity of health care providers with throat swabs (as opposed to
128 nasal swabs), we currently recommend in our jurisdiction the collection of throat swabs if NP swabs are
129 not available.

130

131

132

133 **Acknowledgements:**

134 This study was performed using operational funds of Alberta Health Services (AHS) and Alberta Precision
135 Laboratories. AHS Mobile Integrated Health Care for collecting the samples, particularly Ryan Kozicky
136 and Michel Smith for coordinating. ProvLab for supporting the study and the ProvLab staff for running
137 the tests.

138

139 **References**

- 140 1. Miller JM, Binnicker MJ, Campbell S, Carroll KC, Chapin KC, Gilligan PH, et al. A Guide to Utilization
141 of the Microbiology Laboratory for Diagnosis of Infectious Diseases: 2018 Update by the Infectious
142 Diseases Society of America and the American Society for Microbiology. *Clinical Infectious*
143 *Diseases*. 2018. Aug 31;67(6):e1–94. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciy381>
- 144 2. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the
145 EU/EEA and the UK – eighth update. [Internet]. ECDC, Stockholm, Sweden; 2020 [cited 2020 Apr
146 19]. Available from: [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-rapid-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-rapid-risk-assessment-coronavirus-disease-2019-eighth-update-8-april-2020.pdf)
147 [risk-assessment-coronavirus-disease-2019-eighth-update-8-april-2020.pdf](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-rapid-risk-assessment-coronavirus-disease-2019-eighth-update-8-april-2020.pdf)
- 148 3. World Health Organization. Laboratory testing for 2019 novel coronavirus (2019 - nCoV) in
149 suspected human cases. Interim guidance. [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 17]. Available from:
150 [https://www.who.int/publications - 112 detail/laboratory -testing -for -2019 -novel -coronavirus -](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases)
151 [in -suspected -human -cases - 113 20200117](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases)
- 152 4. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of
153 Clinical Specimens. *JAMA*. 2020 Mar 11. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.3786>
- 154 5. Alberta Health Services. Collection of Nasopharyngeal and Throat Swab for Detection of
155 Respiratory Infection. 2017 [cited 2020 Apr 19]. Available from:
156 [https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/wf/plab/wf-provlab-collection-of-nasopharyngeal-](https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/wf/plab/wf-provlab-collection-of-nasopharyngeal-and-throat-swab.pdf)
157 [and-throat-swab.pdf](https://www.albertahealthservices.ca/assets/wf/plab/wf-provlab-collection-of-nasopharyngeal-and-throat-swab.pdf)
- 158 6. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW, Bleicker T, Brünink S, Schneider
159 Julia, Schmidt L, Mulders Daphne GJC, Haagmans BL, van der Veer B, van den Brink S, Wijsman
160 L, Goderski G, Romette J-L, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C, Koopmans

- 161 MPG, Drosten C. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro
162 Surveill. 2020;25(3):pii=2000045. <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.20000459>
- 163 8. Péré H, Podglajen I, Wack M, Flamarion E, Mirault T, Goudot G, et al. Nasal swab sampling for
164 SARS-CoV-2: A convenient alternative in time of nasopharyngeal swab shortage. J Clin Microbiol.
165 2020 Apr 15;JCM.00721-20. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00721-20>
- 166 9. Liu Y, Yan L-M, Wan L, Xiang T-X, Le A, Liu J-M, et al. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of
167 COVID-19. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30232-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30232-2)
- 168 10. Wang X, Tan L, Wang X, Liu W, Lu Y, Cheng L, et al. Comparison of nasopharyngeal and
169 oropharyngeal swabs for SARS-CoV-2 detection in 353 patients received tests with both specimens
170 simultaneously. International Journal of Infectious Diseases .
171 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.04.023>
- 172 11. Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). Verification of Commercial Microbial Identification
173 and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing Systems. 1st ed. CLSI Guideline M52. Clinical and
174 Laboratory Standards Institute; 2015.
- 175 12. Ai T, Yang Z, Hou H, Zhan C, Chen C, Lv W, et al. Correlation of Chest CT and RT-PCR Testing in
176 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China: A Report of 1014 Cases. Radiology [Internet]. 2020
177 Feb 26; 200642. <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2020200642>
- 178 13. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper
179 Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. N Engl J Med. 2020 Feb 19;382(12):1177–9.
180 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2001737>

181 14. Yu F, Yan L, Wang N, Yang S, Wang L, Tang Y, et al. Quantitative Detection and Viral Load Analysis
182 of SARS-CoV-2 in Infected Patients. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020 Mar 28;ciaa345.
183 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa345/5812997>

184 15. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Virological
185 assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*. 2020. Apr 1. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x)
186 [10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x)

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200 **Table 1a.** COVID-19 PCR Results for NP and Nasal swabs

		Nasal	
		Pos	Neg
NP	Pos	22	5
	Neg	2	7

201

202 **Table 1b.** COVID-19 PCR Results for Nasal and Throat Swabs

		Throat	
		Pos	Neg
Nasal	Pos	20	4
	Neg	6	6

203

204 **Table 1c.** COVID-19 PCR Results for NP and Throat Swabs

		Throat	
		Pos	Neg
NP	Pos	25	2
	Neg	1	8

205

206

207

208