Short Communication

Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 viral copy number in saliva mouthwash samples using digital droplet PCR

Lisa Oberding[1], Jia Hu[2], Byron Berenger[3,4], Abu Naser Mohon[1], Dylan R. Pillai [1,3,4,5]

1. Department of Microbiology, Immunology, and Infectious Diseases, University of Calgary, AB, Canada
2. Medical Officer of Health Office, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Alberta
3. Clinical Section of Microbiology, Alberta Precision Laboratories, Calgary, AB, Canada
4. Department Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada
5. Department of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

Keywords: COVID 19, SARS-CoV-2, digital droplet PCR, viral load

Corresponding author: Dylan Pillai MD, PhD, 9-3535 Research Road NW, 1W-416
Calgary, AB, Canada, T2L2K8, drpillai@ucalgary.ca, T: 403-770-3338, F: 403-770-3347

Abstract:

Saliva samples were collected through a simple mouth wash procedure and viral load quantified using a technology called digital droplet PCR. Data suggest ddPCR allows for precise quantification of viral load in clinical samples infected with SARS-CoV-2.

58 The shortage of nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs as sample collection devices has prompted clinical
59 laboratories to explore other sample types. We conducted a community survey of patients
60 previously diagnosed with COVID-19. Individuals were requested to gargle, swish, and spit 3 mL
61 of normal saline (NS) into a standard sterile container from 12 individuals (REB 20-0444 and 20-
62 0402, University of Calgary). Participants ranged from days 3 to 16 post symptom-onset. Four
63 hundred µL of saliva in NS was subjected to RNA extraction using the Promega SV total RNA
64 (Promega Corp., Madison, WI) following the manufacturer's instructions; the initial lysis step
65 was modified to add 400 µL of lysis buffer, wait 10 minutes, then add 400 µL 95% EtOH and
66 proceed as normal. Two extracts were performed per sample. Extracted material was amplified
67 using real-time PCR targeting the E gene with modification including the addition of GC clamps
68 at the 3' end of the primers and the shortening and addition of a minor groove binding (MGB)
69 moiety to the hydrolysis probe (1). The sample extract was also evaluated by digital droplet
70 PCR (QX200™ Droplet Digital™ (dd) PCR system, Bio-Rad laboratories, Hercules, CA) using the
71 same primer set as used in the RT-PCR. Briefly, a master mix was made containing (per sample)
72 6.25 µL of One-Step RT–ddPCR Supermix, 2.5 µL of One-Step RT–ddPCR reverse transcriptase,
73 1 µL of 300 mmol/L DTT, 1 µL of both forward and reverse E gene primers and 0.5 µL E gene
74 probe (20 µM primers and 10 µM probe), 5 µL of RNA extract, and 7.5 µL of RNase-free
75 water. Twenty microliters of each template mastermix was added to the sample well of the
76 droplet generation cartridge, along with 70 µL of droplet generation oil for probes. Samples
77 were cycled before measurement and analysis with the QX200™. The thermal cycling conditions
78 were 50°C for 1 hour (reverse transcription) and 95°C for 10 min, followed by 40 cycles of 95°C
79 for 30 sec and 60°C for 60 sec before a final step at 98°C for 10 min. Ramp rates were set to
80 2°C per sec.

81 Our data shows that the SARS-CoV-2 E gene is detectable in saliva obtained with a simple
82 mouth wash approach using NS. The RT-PCR was able to detect the SARS-CoV-2 E gene in 9 of
83 the 12 (75%) patient samples; however, ddPCR was able to detect copies of the E gene in 12/12
84 (100%) samples well above the no template control (NTC, n=14). The ddPCR data suggests that
85 the majority of patients in this study had detectable viral gene copies in their saliva but the RT-
86 PCR is only able to detect a subset of them. This is consistent with the exquisite analytical
87 sensitivity obtained by ddPCR through partitioning the sample into 10-20,000 droplets from
88 which PCR amplification of the template molecules occurs in each individual droplet.
89 Furthermore, ddPCR enables the quantification of target nucleic acids at the single-molecule
90 level. Depending on primer sets, the ddPCR system used in this study has a theoretical lower
91 limit of detection between 2-4 copies per reaction (2). A recent study suggests that above a Ct
92 value of 34 using the E gene RT-PCR assay sample are not infectious *in vitro* (3). Based on this
93 information, 6/12 (50%) of saliva samples collected in this way are potentially infectious.
94 Interestingly, patient 9 had a viral load estimated at 16,522 copies per 5 µL of extracted sample
95 and E gene Ct value of 23.17 indicating high infectivity by all measures. These types of
96 individuals may pose a risk in communal settings without isolation. We conclude that a simple

97 mouth wash approach can be used to identify SARS-CoV-2 in saliva and that ddPCR may be
98 useful in quantifying viral load with greater precision than reference RT-PCR.

Figure 1. Correlation of E gene copy number and E gene RT-qPCR Ct value for saliva samples from patients infected with SARS-CoV-2. Graph shows ddPCR quantification (copies per 5 mL sample) with positive E gene RT-qPCR samples indicated in green. Copies are average of duplicate measurements with error bars showing SEM. Fourteen no template controls (NTC) were run. The ddPCR positive control contains 5 copies of template added per reaction. Ct values are shown below for E gene RT-qPCR for each corresponding sample. * Sample is either below or above the linear range of the QX200.

References:

1. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW, Bleicker T, Brünink S, Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DGJC, Haagmans BL, van der Veer B, van den Brink S, Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette J-L, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C, Koopmans MPG, Drosten C. 2020. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull 25.

2. Taylor SC, Carbonneau J, Shelton DN, Boivin G. 2015. Optimization of Droplet Digital PCR from RNA and DNA extracts with direct comparison to RT-qPCR: Clinical implications for quantification of Oseltamivir-resistant subpopulations. J Virol Methods 224:58–66.

3. La Scola B, Le Bideau M, Andreani J, Hoang VT, Grimaldier C, Colson P, Gautret P, Raoult D. 2020. Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol 39:1059–1061.



E Gene RT-PCR	
Patient	Cycle threshold (Ct)
1	31.92
2	34.24
3	30.65
4	31.91
5	N/A
6	37.28
7	27.38
8	37.2
9	23.17
10	33.35
11	N/A
12	N/A