

1 **Title:** Self-Collected Anterior Nasal and Saliva Specimens versus Healthcare Worker-Collected

2 Nasopharyngeal Swabs for the Molecular Detection of SARS-CoV-2

3

4 **Running Title:** Diagnostic specimen type comparison for SARS-CoV-2

5

6 **Authors:** Hanson KE<sup>1,2</sup>, Barker AP<sup>2</sup>, Hillyard DR<sup>2</sup>, Gilmore N<sup>3</sup>, Barrett JW<sup>3</sup>, Orlandi RR<sup>4</sup>, and Shakir SM<sup>2</sup>

7 **Affiliations:**

8 <sup>1</sup>Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt

9 Lake City, Utah, USA

10 <sup>2</sup>Department of Pathology, Section of Clinical Microbiology, University of Utah and ARUP Laboratories,

11 Salt Lake City, Utah, USA

12 <sup>3</sup>University of Utah Hospital and Clinics, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA

13 <sup>4</sup>Department of Surgery, Division of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery, University of Utah School

14 of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT

15

16 **Corresponding author**

17 Kimberly E. Hanson, MD, MHS

18 University of Utah School of Medicine,

19 30N 1900E, Room 4B319, Salt Lake City, UT 84132

20 [kim.hanson@hsc.utah.edu](mailto:kim.hanson@hsc.utah.edu)

21 **Abstract:** We prospectively compared healthcare worker-collected nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS) to self-  
22 collected anterior nasal swabs (ANS) and straight saliva for the diagnosis of COVID-19 in 354 patients.  
23 The positive percent agreement between NPS and ANS or saliva was 86.3% (95% CI: 76.7-92.9) and  
24 93.8% (95% CI: 86.0-97.9), respectively. Negative percent agreement was 99.6% (95% CI: 98-100) for  
25 NPS vs. ANS and 97.8% (95% CI: 95.3 – 99.2) for NPS vs. saliva. NPS (n=80) and saliva (n=81) detected  
26 more cases than ANS (n=70), but no single specimen type detected all SARS-CoV2 infections.

27

28 **Introduction:** Rapid and accurate diagnostic tests are essential for controlling the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.  
29 The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) currently recommends collecting and testing an upper respiratory  
30 tract specimen for initial SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic testing (1), but the most sensitive specimen type has not  
31 been defined. Nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS) have historically been considered the reference method for  
32 respiratory virus detection. In addition, anterior nasal swabs (ANS) are used routinely for influenza  
33 nucleic acid amplification testing (NAAT). Recurrent shortages of swabs and personal protective  
34 equipment (PPE), however, have prompted evaluation of alternatives to NPS including the use of patient  
35 self-collected ANS and saliva.

36 The advantages of ANS and saliva are the minimally invasive nature of sampling and potential for  
37 patient self-collection, which may reduce healthcare worker exposure to infectious aerosols. Saliva also  
38 has the added benefit being a “swab-free” specimen type known to contain high concentrations of  
39 SARS-CoV-2 RNA (2-4). Surprisingly few studies have assessed the performance of self-collected ANS for  
40 SARS-CoV-2 testing (5, 6). Small sample sizes and use of selected cases limits the available evidence for  
41 ANS. More performance data exists for saliva (7), but published studies vary substantially in the way the  
42 specimens were obtained. Many saliva protocols require patients to cough before pooling saliva in their  
43 mouth (2, 3, 8), entail avoidance of food, water, or tooth brushing prior to testing (9), and/or rely on

44 RNA stabilization reagents as a part of the collection device. Forced cough, if performed in the presence  
45 of a healthcare worker, necessitates the need for PPE and restrictions on eating and drinking are not  
46 feasible in all care settings. Furthermore, RNA stabilizers increase the cost of testing, are vulnerable to  
47 supply shortages, and may not be compatible with all NAAT chemistries. Larger studies that compare  
48 the performance of self-collected ANS and “straight” saliva to NPS for SARS-CoV-2 detection are needed.  
49 Therefore, we performed a prospective comparative study to evaluate the performance of self-collected  
50 ANS and saliva versus healthcare provider-collected NPS for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic testing.

51

## 52 **Methods:**

53 **Study Subjects-** Adult patients presenting to a drive-thru test center with symptoms suggestive of  
54 COVID-19 were included. After obtaining consent, subjects were instructed to swab both nostrils, pool  
55 saliva in their mouth, and then repeatedly spit a minimum of 1 mL saliva into a sterile tube in the  
56 presence of a healthcare worker. The NPS was collected last in the sampling sequence. The University of  
57 Utah Institutional Review Board approved all study procedures.

58 **Specimen collection** - Flocked mini-tip and foam swabs (Puritan Medical Products) were used for  
59 the nasopharyngeal and nasal collections. Swabs placed in 3 mL of sterile saline and straight saliva were  
60 transported to the clinical laboratory at 4°C. Saliva was diluted 1:1 in ARUP Laboratories universal  
61 transport media™ (UTM) prior to testing.

62 **SARS-CoV-2 detection** - All specimens were analyzed using the Hologic Aptima SARS-CoV-2  
63 transcription mediated amplification (TMA) test (Hologic Inc.). Discrepant NAAT results across  
64 specimens collected from the same patient triggered repeat testing using the Hologic Panther Fusion  
65 (Hologic Inc.), a PCR-based platform, to assess crossing thresholds (Cts) as a surrogate measure of RNA  
66 concentration. Cts of  $\leq 42$  by PCR are considered positive.

67           **Statistical methods** – The standard of care NPS results by TMA were used as the benchmark for  
68 assessments of test agreement. GraphPad Quick Calcs software was used to calculate kappa coefficients  
69 ( $\kappa$ ) and proportions ( $p$  value) by the Chi Square test. Percent positive or negative agreement for  
70 categorical variables were calculated in Microsoft Excel using the Analyse-it software package.

71

72           **Results:** A total of 1104 paired specimens were collected from 368 unique patients between May 29<sup>th</sup>  
73 and June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2020. The average age of study participants was 35 (range 18-75 years), 47% female and  
74 53% male. Saliva samples from 12 patients (3.3%) generated invalid TMA results due to automated  
75 sample processing errors or internal control failure and an additional 2 patients did not provide  
76 adequate saliva volume for testing. Patients with missing saliva data (n=14) were excluded from the  
77 primary analysis.

78           **Tables 1 and 2** contain the summary of all TMA results. There was near perfect qualitative  
79 agreement across sample types (NPS vs. saliva  $\kappa=0.912$  [95%CI: 0.86-0.96]; NPS vs. ANS  $\kappa=0.889$  [95%CI:  
80 0.84-0.95]). In all, 66 (18.6%) patients had SARS-CoV-2 detected in all 3 specimens types, 13 (3.7%) in 2  
81 specimens, 7 (2.0%) in 1 specimen, and 268 (75.7%) had completely negative testing. The 7 single  
82 specimen positive detections included 2 (28.6%) infections detected by NPS only and 5 (71.4%) by saliva  
83 only. Positivity rates were higher for NPS (22.5%; 80/354) and saliva (22.9%; 81/354) compared to ANS  
84 (19.7%; 70/354) alone, but this did not reach statistical significance ( $p = 0.408$  for the NPS vs. ANS  
85 comparison). The greatest case detection rate combines NPS sampling with saliva (23.6%; 86/354).

86           Adequate residual sample volume was available for 15 of 19 discrepant specimen sets to  
87 perform repeat PCR testing. The average Ct values for NPS positive only or saliva positive only  
88 specimens were 27.0 (range 19.7 – 32.7) and 28.2 (range 18.3 – 37.5), respectively. Similar Ct ranges  
89 (22.0-35.7) were seen in the NPS positive/ANS negative specimens. For comparison, **Figure 1** displays

90 the distribution of all Ct values generated by the Panther Fusion SARS-Co-V2 assay performed as a part  
91 of routine clinical testing in our clinical laboratory since March 2020.

92

93 **Discussion:** Sensitive detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA is critical for patient management decisions, hospital  
94 infection prevention, and curbing the ongoing Public Health emergency. The selection and adequate  
95 collection of clinical specimens plays an essential role in diagnostic test performance, and this holds true  
96 for sensitive NAAT methods. Both the CDC (1) and Infectious Diseases Society of America (10) endorse  
97 use of NPS or ANS (either healthcare worker or patient collected) for the diagnosis of COVID-19.  
98 However, little data exists comparing the performance of different sample types collected from the  
99 same patient, at the same time, and using U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) authorized NAAT  
100 platforms.

101 This study represents one of the largest prospective specimen type comparisons to date and  
102 demonstrates excellent agreement between provider-collected NPS and patient-self collected saliva and  
103 ANS. The majority (91.9%) of patients with positive results had SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid detected in at  
104 least two specimen types concurrently. NPS and saliva samples had the greatest positivity rates overall.  
105 Given that all participants had a strong clinical suspicion for COVID-19, and molecular testing in general  
106 has very high specificity, it is likely that the NPS or saliva positive only specimens are true positives; but  
107 the lack of an accepted external reference standard precludes calculations of clinical sensitivity and  
108 specificity. Even though there was excellent qualitative agreement across specimen types, relying on  
109 ANS alone could have missed infection in 10 to 11 patients compared with NPS or saliva, respectively.  
110 Missed COVID-19 cases have major clinical implications affecting isolation decisions for symptomatic  
111 patients and are a lost opportunity for contact tracing.

112 No single sample type detected all potential cases and discrepant results were not always  
113 explained by high Ct values (i.e. low RNA concentrations near the limit of detection of the test). There  
114 are several potential explanations for “false negative” results. First, inadequate swab collection  
115 technique is possible. We did not include a host genomic marker to assure presence of respiratory  
116 epithelial cells on the swab, nor did we compare self-collection to healthcare provider-collected ANS.  
117 Previous respiratory virus studies, however, suggest that self-collected is equivalent to provider-  
118 collected ANS (11). Additionally, the level of viral replication in the nasopharynx or posterior  
119 oropharynx/salivary glands may vary over the course of infection. We did not collect information on the  
120 duration or type of symptoms at the time of specimen collection, which is an additional limitation of the  
121 study. Lastly, in an attempt to exclude RNA degradation in straight saliva as a potential explanation for  
122 “false negatives”, we performed stability studies at ambient and refrigerated temperatures for up to 5  
123 days and saw no reduced TMA or PCR signal (data not shown).

124 In conclusion, NPS and saliva were superior to ANS alone for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in  
125 symptomatic patients. These observations, along with other recent reports (9, 12), suggest that  
126 straight saliva is an acceptable specimen type for symptomatic patients especially if swab or PPE  
127 supplies are limited. However, not all patients could provide adequate volume and saliva is a complex  
128 matrix that requires clinical laboratories to validate this specimen type on their respective NAAT  
129 platforms. An increased indeterminate or invalid rate (3.3% for saliva vs. 0% for swabs in saline) was  
130 observed using the Hologic Panther despite a 1:1 dilution in UTM. This could be related to issues of  
131 sample viscosity affecting the automated pipetting and/or internal control inhibition. We did not test  
132 whether an additional dilution step would reduce the invalid rate without loss of sensitivity.  
133 Combination testing with simultaneous sample collection from multiple anatomic sites may increase  
134 SARS-CoV-2 detection rates slightly, but multisite testing could be impractical given current swab and  
135 reagent shortages. Requiring two separate NAAT reactions would also increase costs.

136 **Acknowledgements:** This study was supported by the ARUP Institute for Clinical and Experimental  
137 Pathology.

138 **Table 1. Qualitative Result Comparisons across All Specimen Types**

A.		Saliva			
Nasopharyngeal		+	-	Total	
	+	75	5	80	
	-	6	268	274	
	Total	81	273	354	

B.		Anterior Nasal			
Nasopharyngeal		+	-	Total	
	+	69	11	80	
	-	1	273	274	
	Total	70	284	354	

c.		Anterior Nasal			
Saliva		+	-	Total	
	+	67	14	81	
	-	3	270	274	
	Total	70	284	354	

139


140 Abbreviations: Positive (+), Negative (-)

141

142 **Table 2. Percent Agreement between Nasopharyngeal Swabs and Alternative Specimen Types**

	Saliva vs. Nasopharyngeal	Nasal vs. Nasopharyngeal
<b>Positive Agreement (%)</b>	93.8 (95% CI: 86.0-97.9)	86.3 (95% CI: 76.7-92.9)
<b>Negative Agreement (%)</b>	97.8 (95% CI: 95.3-99.2)	99.6% (95% CI: 98.0 – 100.0)

143 **Figure 1. Distribution of PCR Crossing Thresholds (Cts) for all Clinical Specimens**



144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153 **References:**

- 154 1. **Control CfD.** 2020. Interim Guidelines for Collecting, Handling, and Testing Clinical Specimens  
155 for COVID-19. Accessed July 14, 2020.
- 156 2. **To KK, Tsang OT, Chik-Yan Yip C, Chan KH, Wu TC, Chan JMC, Leung WS, Chik TS, Choi CY,**  
157 **Kandamby DH, Lung DC, Tam AR, Poon RW, Fung AY, Hung IF, Cheng VC, Chan JF, Yuen KY.**  
158 2020. Consistent detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in saliva. *Clin Infect Dis*  
159 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa149.
- 160 3. **To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, Yip CC, Cai JP, Chan JM, Chik TS, Lau DP,**  
161 **Choi CY, Chen LL, Chan WM, Chan KH, Ip JD, Ng AC, Poon RW, Luo CT, Cheng VC, Chan JF, Hung**  
162 **IF, Chen Z, Chen H, Yuen KY.** 2020. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal  
163 saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational  
164 cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* **20**:565-574.
- 165 4. **Yoon JG, Yoon J, Song JY, Yoon SY, Lim CS, Seong H, Noh JY, Cheong HJ, Kim WJ.** 2020. Clinical  
166 Significance of a High SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in the Saliva. *J Korean Med Sci* **35**:e195.
- 167 5. **Altamirano J, Govindarajan P, Blomkalns AL, Kushner LE, Stevens BA, Pinsky BA, Maldonado Y.**  
168 2020. Assessment of Sensitivity and Specificity of Patient-Collected Lower Nasal Specimens for  
169 Sudden Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Testing. *JAMA Network Open* **3**:e2012005-  
170 e2012005.
- 171 6. **Noah Kojima FT, Vlad Slepnev, Agatha Bacelar, Laura Deming, Siri Kodeboyina, Jeffrey D**  
172 **Klausner.** 2020. Self-Collected Oral Fluid and Nasal Swabs Demonstrate Comparable Sensitivity  
173 to Clinician Collected Nasopharyngeal Swabs for Covid-19 Detection. medRxiv doi:  
174 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.11.20062372>.
- 175 7. **Zohaib Khurshid SZ, Chaitanya Joshi, Syed Faraz Moin, Muhammad Sohail Zafar, David J**  
176 **Speicher.** 2020. Saliva as a non-invasive sample for the detection of SARS-CoV-2: a systematic  
177 review. medRxiv doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.09.20096354>.
- 178 8. **Chen JH, Yip CC, Poon RW, Chan KH, Cheng VC, Hung IF, Chan JF, Yuen KY, To KK.** 2020.  
179 Evaluating the use of posterior oropharyngeal saliva in a point-of-care assay for the detection of  
180 SARS-CoV-2. *Emerg Microbes Infect* **9**:1356-1359.
- 181 9. **Anne Louise Wyllie JF, Arnau Casanovas-Massana, Melissa Campbell, Maria Tokuyama,**  
182 **Pavithra Vijayakumar, Bertie Geng, M. Catherine Muenker, Adam J. Moore, Chantal B. F.**  
183 **Vogels, Mary E. Petrone, Isabel M. Ott, Peiwen Lu, Alice Lu-Culligan, Jonathan Klein, Arvind**  
184 **Venkataraman, Rebecca Earnest, Michael Simonov, Rupak Datta, Ryan Handoko, Nida**  
185 **Naushad, Lorenzo R. Sewanan, Jordan Valdez, Elizabeth B. White, Sarah Lapidus, Chaney C.**  
186 **Kalinich, Xiaodong Jiang, Daniel J. Kim, Eriko Kudo, Melissa Linehan, Tianyang Mao, Miyu**  
187 **Moriyama, Ji Eun Oh, Annsea Park, Julio Silva, Eric Song, Takehiro Takahashi, Manabu Taura,**  
188 **Orr-El Weizman, Patrick Wong, Yexin Yang, Santos Bermejo, Camila Odio, Saad B. Omer,**  
189 **Charles S. Dela Cruz, Shelli Farhadian, Richard A. Martinello, Akiko Iwasaki, Nathan D.**  
190 **Grubaugh, Albert I. Ko.** 2020. Saliva is more sensitive for SARS-CoV-2 detection in COVID-19  
191 patients than nasopharyngeal swabs. medRxiv doi:  
192 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067835>.
- 193 10. **Hanson KE, Caliendo AM, Arias CA, Englund JA, Lee MJ, Loeb M, Patel R, El Alayli A, Kalot MA,**  
194 **Falck-Ytter Y, Lavergne V, Morgan RL, Murad MH, Sultan S, Bhimraj A, Mustafa RA.** 2020.  
195 Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Diagnosis of COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis*  
196 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa760.
- 197 11. **Akmatov MK, Gatzemeier A, Schughart K, Pessler F.** 2012. Equivalence of self- and staff-  
198 collected nasal swabs for the detection of viral respiratory pathogens. *PLoS One* **7**:e48508.

199 12. **Williams E, Bond K, Zhang B, Putland M, Williamson DA.** 2020. Saliva as a non-invasive  
200 specimen for detection of SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Microbiol doi:10.1128/jcm.00776-20.

201

