

1 Evaluation of symptomatic patient saliva as a sample type for the Abbott ID NOW COVID-19

2 assay

3

4 Jeffrey A. SoRelle, MD^{1,*}, Lenin Mahimainathan, PhD, MB(ASCP)^{1,*}, Clare McCormick-Baw, MD¹,

5 PhD, FCAP, Dominick Cavuoti, DO¹, Francesca Lee, MD^{1,2}, Anjali Bararia, MSc., M(ASCP)^{CM1}, Abey

6 Thomas, MD², Ravi Sarode, MD^{1, 2}, Andrew E. Clark^{1,†} PhD, D(ABMM), Alagarraju Muthukumar^{1,†}

7 PhD, DABCC

8

9 ¹ Department of Pathology and Clinical Laboratory Services, University of Texas Southwestern

10 Medical Center, Dallas, Texas

11 ² Department of Internal Medicine, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas,

12 Texas

13

14 †Send correspondence to:

15 Alagarraju Muthukumar, PhD or Andrew E. Clark, PhD

16 Department of Pathology

17 5323 Harry Hines Blvd

18 Dallas, TX 75390

19 Tel:214-645-5103

20 Email: Alagarraju.Muthukumar@UTSouthwestern.edu; Andrew.Clark@UTSouthwestern.edu

21

22

23 The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic has
24 presented significant challenges for laboratories including supply chain limitations with restricted
25 access to reagents and sample collection materials (i.e. swabs, viral transport media (VTM)) for
26 patients testing. Therefore, saliva has been evaluated as an alternative specimen for COVID-19
27 diagnosis. The collection of the saliva specimen does not require specialized materials, is non-
28 invasive, and can be self-collected (1, 2).

29 Access to rapid and accurate testing is essential to limit the SARS-CoV-2 community
30 spread and curtail COVID-19 resurgence. The Abbott ID NOW (ID NOW, Abbott Diagnostics,
31 Sarborough, ME) is a point-of-care (POC) isothermal amplification-based platform that detects
32 SARS-CoV-2 from patient specimens in approximately five minutes. ID NOW is currently used in
33 pharmacies, hospitals, and various outpatient settings in all 50 states, and has a production
34 capacity of 2 million tests per month by June 2020 (3).

35 Recently, concerns regarding ID NOW sensitivity compared to RT-PCR assays have been
36 raised during clinical validations (4-7). The manufacturer has updated the specimen types
37 indicated for use and the product information directing confirmatory testing with another
38 molecular assay in cases of negative results with high clinical suspicion for COVID-19 (8). The
39 comparable performance between dry nasal swabs (NS) and nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS)
40 collected in VTM has been observed with the ID NOW for SARS-CoV-2 (4); the majority of false-
41 negative results occur with higher cycle number (CN) or cycle threshold (Ct) values suggesting
42 low viral load in these specimens (5, 7).

43 In the setting of limited specimen collection resources and an unknown optimal sample
44 type for POC testing, we examined the performance of the ID NOW COVID-19 assay using

45 symptomatic patient saliva. We tested a total of 96 patient saliva samples on the ID NOW. Sixty-
46 seven specimens were paired collections with NPS in VTM. We first compared IDNOW saliva
47 results with results from paired NPS specimens tested by either the Xpert® Xpress SARS-CoV-2
48 (Cepheid, Sunnyvale, CA) or Real-Time SARS-CoV-2 (Abbott Molecular, Des Plaines, IL) RT-PCR
49 assays. All testing was performed per manufacturer’s instructions, with 200µL of saliva being
50 used for ID NOW testing.

51 The limit of detection for the ID NOW was verified at 2000 copies/mL using synthetic RNA
52 (SARS-CoV-2 standard, Exact Diagnostics, Ft. Worth, TX), consistent with previously published
53 reports (7). We found a 78% (18/23) positive percent agreement (PPA) and 100% (43/43)
54 negative percent agreement (NPA) for saliva tested by ID NOW compared with NPS in VTM (Table
55 1). False-negative (FN) saliva samples were associated with elevated NPS CN (Abbott, N2: 30.44)
56 or Ct values (Cepheid, E: 33.0, 36.5, 40.6, 43.3; N2: 35.9, 36.1, 38.5, 39.0), consistent with
57 previous reports for NPS (7).

58 We recently validated the Cepheid assay for use with saliva (9) and compared the
59 performance of ID NOW using 49 saliva specimens (Table 1). In this comparison, we observed
60 83% (19/23) PPA and 100% NPA (25/25). FN samples by ID NOW again exhibited elevated Ct
61 values (E: 36.4, 36.5, 42.7, 43.3; N2: 36.1, 37.6, 39, 41.2). Chart review of all FN samples in this
62 work revealed a majority (n=4/7, 2 were common) were tested >2 weeks after symptom onset,
63 with most already receiving a diagnosis of COVID-19. Three of the FN patients had a previous
64 diagnosis of COVID-19, another was diagnosed by ID NOW on an NPS specimen and retested
65 while in the hospital, one was de-identified with no information and the last had no previous

66 diagnosis but had an atypical presentation of weakness, and diarrhea for two weeks with subtle
67 hazy opacities of the lung base indicative of minor respiratory disease.

68 Stability studies were undertaken to evaluate ID NOW performance as specimens aged
69 (i.e. conditions simulating self-collection). NPS has exhibited reliable SARS-CoV-2 stability over a
70 range of times and temperatures in a variety of storage media (10), but studies examining saliva
71 are lacking. Six SARS-CoV-2-positive saliva specimens were evaluated by the ID NOW daily over
72 5-days post-collection stored at room temperature (22-25°C). All specimens were found to
73 remain positive during serial testing with 200µL volumes over that time.

74 Resurgence in COVID-19 cases as social distancing and travel restrictions are relaxed
75 necessitate expanded accessibility to POC devices. Saliva utilization for ID NOW testing supports
76 self-collection and facilitates retesting of invalid or questionable results without the need for the
77 recollection of a second NS or NPS due to specimen exhaustion. This could also limit the exposure
78 of medical staff to potentially infectious patients. Therefore, we propose further investigation of
79 saliva as an alternative sample type for testing symptomatic patients with ID NOW as a promising
80 method to address COVID-19 testing.

81

82 Acknowledgments: The authors thank Julia Sweetnam MT(ASCP), Juancho Franco MT(ASCP), and
83 Bryan Allen MT(ASCP) for excellent technical assistance.

84

85 References

- 86 1. United States Food and Drug Administration. 2020. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update: FDA
87 Authorizes First Diagnostic Test Using At-Home Collection of Saliva Specimens.
88 <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update->

- 89 [fda-authorizes-first-diagnostic-test-using-home-collection-saliva](#). Accessed May 27th,
90 2020.
- 91 2. Han P, Ivanovski S. 2020. Saliva-Friend and Foe in the COVID-19 Outbreak. *Diagnostics*
92 (Basel) 10.
- 93 3. Abbott. 2020. An update on Abbott's work on COVID-19 testing.
94 [https://www.abbott.com/corpnewsroom/product-and-innovation/an-update-on-](https://www.abbott.com/corpnewsroom/product-and-innovation/an-update-on-abbotts-work-on-COVID-19-testing.html)
95 [abbotts-work-on-COVID-19-testing.html](https://www.abbott.com/corpnewsroom/product-and-innovation/an-update-on-abbotts-work-on-COVID-19-testing.html). Accessed May 30th, 2020.
- 96 4. Basu A, Zinger T, Inglima K, Woo K-m, Atie O, Yurasits L, See B, Agüero-Rosenfeld ME.
97 2020. Performance of Abbott ID NOW COVID-19 rapid nucleic acid amplification test in
98 nasopharyngeal swabs transported in viral media and dry nasal swabs, in a New York City
99 academic institution. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* doi:10.1128/JCM.01136-
100 20:JCM.01136-20.
- 101 5. Moore NM, Li H, Schejbal D, Lindsley J, Hayden MK. 2020. Comparison of two commercial
102 molecular tests and a laboratory-developed modification of the CDC 2019-nCoV RT-PCR
103 assay for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*
104 doi:10.1128/JCM.00938-20:JCM.00938-20.
- 105 6. Zhen W, Smith E, Manji R, Schron D, Berry GJ. 2020. Clinical Evaluation of Three Sample-
106 To-Answer Platforms for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*
107 doi:10.1128/JCM.00783-20:JCM.00783-20.
- 108 7. Harrington A, Cox B, Snowdon J, Bakst J, Ley E, Grajales P, Maggiore J, Kahn S. 2020.
109 Comparison of Abbott ID Now and Abbott m2000 methods for the detection of SARS-CoV-
110 2 from nasopharyngeal and nasal swabs from symptomatic patients. *Journal of Clinical*
111 *Microbiology* doi:10.1128/JCM.00798-20:JCM.00798-20.
- 112 8. Abbott. 2020. Reducing risk by diagnosing with reliable point-of-care testing.
113 [https://www.abbott.com/corpnewsroom/product-and-innovation/reducing-risk-with-](https://www.abbott.com/corpnewsroom/product-and-innovation/reducing-risk-with-reliable-point-of-care-testing.html)
114 [reliable-point-of-care-testing.html](https://www.abbott.com/corpnewsroom/product-and-innovation/reducing-risk-with-reliable-point-of-care-testing.html). Accessed May 30th, 2020.
- 115 9. McCormick-Baw C, Morgan K, Gaffney D, Cazares Y, Jaworski K, Byrd A, Molberg K, Cavuoti
116 D. 2020. Saliva as an Alternate Specimen Source for Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
117 Symptomatic Patients Using Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of Clinical*
118 *Microbiology* doi:10.1128/JCM.01109-20:JCM.01109-20.
- 119 10. Rogers AA, Baumann RE, Borillo GA, Kagan RM, Batterman HJ, Galdzicka M, Marlowe EM.
120 2020. Evaluation of Transport Media and Specimen Transport Conditions for the
121 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Using Real Time Reverse Transcription PCR. *Journal of Clinical*
122 *Microbiology* doi:10.1128/JCM.00708-20:JCM.00708-20.

123

124

125 **Table 1:** Saliva as sample type for ID NOW COVID-19 assay performance comparison
126 against the Cepheid Real-Time PCR assay

Sample type	(n)	TP	FP	TN	FN	IN	PPA % (95%CI)	NPA % (95%CI)	PPV* %	NPV* %
Saliva Vs NPS (RT-PCR)	67	18	0	44	5	0	78 (56-93)	100 (92-100)	100	99
Saliva Vs Saliva (Cepheid)	49	19	0	25	4	1	83 (61-95)	100 (86-100)	100	99

127
128 * PPV and NPV calculated based upon an institutional prevalence of 6.4% as
129 determined through the analysis of all positive SARS-CoV-2 tests at this institution from
130 3/8-5/20/2020.

131
132 PPA: Positive percent agreement, NPA: Negative percent agreement, PPV: Positive
133 predictive value, NPV: Negative predictive value, TP: True Positive, FP: False positive,
134 TN: True negative, FN: False negative, IN: invalid
135