

1
2 **Evaluation of nasopharyngeal swab collection techniques for nucleic acid recovery and**
3 **participant experience: recommendations for COVID-19 diagnostics**

4
5 Natalie N. Kinloch^{1,2#}, Aniqah Shahid^{1,2#}, Gordon Ritchie^{3,4}, Winnie Dong², Tanya Lawson³, Julio
6 S.G. Montaner^{2,5}, Marc G. Romney^{3,4}, Aleksandra Stefanovic^{3,4}, Nancy Matic^{3,4}, Chanson J.
7 Brumme^{2,5}, Christopher F. Lowe^{3,4}, Zabrina L. Brumme^{1,2*}, Victor Leung^{3,4,5*}

8
9 # NNK and AS contributed equally to this manuscript

10 * ZLB and VL contributed equally to this manuscript

- 11
12 1. Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, V5A 1S6, Canada
13 2. British Columbia Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS, Vancouver, V6Z 1Y6, Canada.
14 3. Division of Medical Microbiology and Virology, St Paul's Hospital, Vancouver, V6Z 1Y6,
15 Canada.
16 4. Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of British Columbia,
17 Vancouver, V6T 1Z7, Canada.
18 5. Department of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, V6T 1Z3, Canada.

19
20 **Key words:** COVID-19, nasopharyngeal swab, ddPCR, RT-ddPCR, participant experience,
21 biological material, sample quality, ethnicity

22
23 **Running head:** Nasopharyngeal swab technique evaluation

24
25 **<40 word summary:** Nasopharyngeal swabs are critical to COVID-19 diagnostics, but
26 collection techniques vary. Comparison of two collection techniques revealed that swab rotation
27 did not recover more nucleic acid and was more uncomfortable. Discomfort and biological
28 material recovery also varied by participant ethnicity.

29
30 **Word count abstract:** 100

31
32 **Word count text:** 1,999

33
34 **Corresponding author:**

35 Victor Leung, MD FRCPC
36 Infectious Diseases and Medical Microbiology
37 St. Paul's Hospital
38 1081 Burrard St
39 Vancouver, BC, Canada, V6Z 1Y6
40 Tel: 778 879-2339
41 Fax: 604 806-8165

42
43
44
45

46 **Footnotes Page**

47

48 **Sources of Financial support**

49 This work was supported by a Genome BC COVID-19 Rapid Response grant (grant number:
50 COV-115) awarded to CFL and ZLB as co-PIs. NNK holds a Vanier Canada Graduate
51 Scholarship from the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR). AS holds a CIHR
52 Frederick Banting and Charles Best Doctoral Award. ZLB holds a Scholar Award from the
53 Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research.

54

55 **This work has not been previously presented at any conference or meeting.**

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75 **Abstract**

76 Nasopharyngeal swabs are critical to the diagnosis of respiratory infections including
77 COVID-19, but collection techniques vary. We compared two recommended nasopharyngeal
78 swab collection techniques in adult volunteers and found that swab rotation following
79 nasopharyngeal contact did not recover additional nucleic acid (as measured by human
80 DNA/RNA copy number). Rotation was also less tolerable for participants. Notably, both
81 discomfort and nucleic acid recovery were significantly higher in Asians, consistent with nasal
82 anatomy differences. Our results suggest that it is unnecessary to rotate the swab in place
83 following contact with the nasopharynx, and reveal that procedural discomfort levels can differ
84 by ethnicity.

85 **Main text**

86 Nasopharyngeal swabs are critical for accurate diagnosis of respiratory tract infections
87 including COVID-19 [1, 2]. Specimen collection, which involves inserting a long flexible swab
88 through the nostril along the floor of the nasal cavity to a depth of approximately 7 centimetres
89 and into the nasopharynx, must be performed by a trained healthcare professional familiar with
90 the technique and nasal anatomy [1]. There is however no consensus for optimal swab collection.
91 Following contact with the nasopharynx, the WHO for example recommends that the swab be
92 left in place for a few seconds before withdrawal [3] while the US-CDC recommends that the
93 swab be "gently rubbed and rolled" and left in place for several seconds before withdrawal [4].
94 Other guidance documents recommend that the swab be rotated in place before removal [5-8].
95 Given that swab insertion/removal is invasive and uncomfortable [1, 9], a better understanding of
96 the impact of post-insertion collection techniques on sample quality and patient experience may
97 refine collection methods.

98 We recruited adult volunteers to undergo a nasopharyngeal swab with or without rotation,
99 and to provide saliva, an alternative COVID-19 diagnostic specimen [10-12], as a comparator.
100 Participants rated their discomfort during the swab on an 11-point scale [13] and were asked
101 which specimen, swab or saliva, was less unpleasant to give. We assessed nucleic acid recovery
102 as a marker of swab collection quality [2], where human RPP30 [2] and human RNase P copy
103 numbers were used as surrogates for DNA and RNA recovery, respectively.

104 **Methods**

105 We recruited 69 participants over three days in July 2020. A single, experienced
106 healthcare provider collected all nasopharyngeal swabs using the Puritan® UniTranz-RT®
107 transport system (Puritan Medical Products). Participants were alternately assigned to one of two

108 swab collection techniques (see below), and were not informed of the technique until
109 immediately prior to the procedure. Prior to collection, the provider instructed participants to
110 alternatingly apply pressure to each nasal ala to identify the less congested nostril. The provider
111 estimated the depth to the participant's posterior nasopharynx by holding the swab externally
112 from the nasal ala to tragus and viewed the nasal passage to check for mucus and obstructions (if
113 mucus was visible the participant was instructed to blow their nose [1]). With the participant's
114 head tilted back slightly, the provider gently inserted the swab into the identified nostril along the
115 lateral aspect of the nasal cavity floor and into the nasopharynx. For half the participants, the
116 swab was removed after reaching the nasopharynx ("in-out" swab). For the remaining
117 participants, the swab was rotated in place for 10 seconds following placement in the
118 nasopharynx ("rotation" swab) and then removed. Swabs were immediately placed in transport
119 medium. Participants were also asked to provide approximately 2mL saliva into a sterile
120 container (Starplex® Scientific) by focusing on pooling saliva and gently expelling it into the
121 container, repeating until the required volume was achieved. Participants were asked to rate their
122 discomfort during the swab on an 11-point scale [13], where "0" denoted a complete absence of
123 discomfort and "10" denoted the most severe discomfort possible. Finally, participants were
124 offered the hypothetical choice of providing saliva or undergoing a nasopharyngeal swab for a
125 diagnostic purpose, and asked: *purely based on your experience today*, which sample would you
126 prefer to give and why?

127 Swabs were processed within 5 hours of collection. Total nucleic acids were extracted
128 from 1mL of medium on a NucliSens easyMAG (BioMérieux) and eluted in 60µL. Eluates were
129 split into three aliquots and frozen at -80°C until use. Droplet digital PCR (ddPCR) and Reverse-
130 Transcriptase (RT)-ddPCR were used to quantify human RPP30 copy numbers and RNase P

131 transcript numbers, respectively. In this technology, each sample is fractionated into 20,000
132 nanolitre-sized water-in-oil droplets prior to amplification with sequence-specific primers and
133 fluorescent probes, and input template concentrations are calculated at endpoint using Poisson
134 statistics. The RPP30 assay, described previously, yields a final measurement of cells/ μ L extract
135 [2]. In the RNase P assay, nucleic acid extracts were combined with the US-CDC-developed
136 RNaseP-specific primer/probe set [14], XhoI restriction enzyme (New England Biolabs) and the
137 One-Step RT-ddPCR Advanced Kit for Probes (BioRad). Primer and probe sequences are as
138 follows: Forward Primer-AGATTTGGACCTGCGAGCG, Reverse Primer-
139 GAGCGGCTGTCTCCACAAGT, Probe-FAM-TTCTGACCT-ZEN-GAAGGCTCTGCGCG-
140 3IABkFQ (Integrated DNA Technologies; ZEN=internal ZEN quencher; 3IABkFQ=3' Iowa
141 Black Quencher). Droplets were generated using an Automated Droplet Generator (BioRad) and
142 cycled at 50°C for 60 minutes; 40 cycles of (94°C for 30 seconds, 55°C for 1 minute) and 98°C
143 for 10 minutes and analyzed on a QX200 Droplet Reader using QuantaSoft software version
144 1.7.4 (BioRad). Measured RNase P copies were normalized to input volume to determine RNase
145 P copies/ μ L extract. RNase P levels were also assessed using real time reverse transcriptase
146 (RT)-PCR with the same primer/probe set on a Roche Lightcycler 480 according to the US-CDC
147 protocol [15]. All three assays were performed on independent extract aliquots to avoid freeze-
148 thaw. All ddPCR and RT-ddPCR assays were performed in duplicate, and results averaged
149 between replicates. Non-parametric statistics were used for all correlations and between-group
150 comparisons. Contingency tables were analysed using Fisher's exact test. Lin's concordance
151 coefficient was used to calculate concordance between replicates.

152 This study was approved by the Providence Health Care/University of British Columbia
153 and Simon Fraser University Research Ethics Boards. All participants provided written informed
154 consent.

155 **Results**

156 The median age of the 69 participants was 42 years (Interquartile range [IQR] 36- 54
157 years); 43 (62%) were female. Self-reported ethnicities were 44 (64%) White, 21 (30%) Asian
158 (including 14 East, 1 Central, 3 South and 3 South-East), and 4 (6%) Other (including 2 Latino
159 and 2 mixed-ethnicity). For 5 (7.2%) participants, the nasopharyngeal swab was unsuccessful
160 due to obstruction despite attempts through both nares, leaving 64 (34 "in-out" and 30 "rotation")
161 swabs for analysis. Discomfort scores ranged from 1 (minimal discomfort) to 10 (maximum
162 discomfort) in both swab groups, with no significant difference between them (median 5 [IQR
163 3.75- 5] for "in-out" versus 4.5 [IQR 4- 6] for "rotation", $p=0.51$) (Figure 1A). This suggests that
164 most of the discomfort occurs during swab insertion/withdrawal, a notion that is supported by the
165 significantly higher discomfort reported by participants with occlusions ($p<0.001$; Figure 1B).
166 However, responses to additional study questions suggested that swab rotation was less tolerable.
167 Firstly, though most participants preferred giving saliva, 10 of 34 (29.4%) participants in the "in-
168 out" group preferred the swab, versus only 3 of 30 (10%) of participants in the "rotation" group
169 (Fisher's exact test $p=0.068$; Figure 1C), citing that the swab was easier, faster and/or generally
170 less unpleasant than giving saliva. Moreover, two participants in the "rotation" group mentioned
171 that they had previously undergone an "in-out" swab, and that rotation was more uncomfortable.
172 One added that, given the choice between "in-out" swab and saliva, that they preferred the swab,
173 but given the choice between "rotation" swab and saliva, they preferred saliva. Discomfort scores
174 did not differ by sex ($p=0.85$) or age (Spearman's $\rho=0.05$, $p=0.7$). Of note however, Asian

175 participants reported significantly higher discomfort scores compared to White participants
176 (median 5 [IQR 4-7] versus 4 [IQR 3.5- 5] respectively $p=0.047$, Figure 1D).

177 RPP30 (DNA) and RNase P (RNA) copy numbers were measured as surrogates of
178 nucleic acid recovery. Concordance between replicates was high for both targets (Lin's
179 Concordance Coefficient: RPP30=0.98, $p<0.0001$; RNase P=0.91, $p<0.0001$) and measurements
180 of both targets correlated strongly with one another (Spearman's $\rho=0.84$, $p<0.0001$). Both RPP30
181 and RNase P levels varied markedly regardless of swab technique: RPP30 levels extended over a
182 42-fold range (from 42 to 1751 cells/ μ L extract; Figure 2A) while RNase P levels extended over
183 a 20-fold range (from 183 to 3570 copies/ μ L extract; Figure 2B). Moreover, we found no
184 significant differences in RPP30 levels by swab technique (median 500 [IQR 235- 738] cells/ μ L
185 extract for "in-out" versus 503 [IQR 398- 685] for "rotation", $p=0.83$; Figure 2A), or RNase P
186 values by swab technique (median 1338 [IQR 610- 2039] RNase P copies/ μ L extract for "in-out"
187 versus 1309 [IQR 973- 1789] for "rotation", $p=0.84$; Figure 2B). Together, this indicates that
188 swab rotation does not recover more nucleic acid, and suggests that the amount of cellular
189 material recovered is participant-specific. Indeed, when stratified by ethnicity, nucleic acid
190 recovery was significantly higher in Asians: median RPP30 levels were 610 [IQR 430- 780]
191 versus 431 [IQR 223- 621] cells/ μ L extract from Asian versus White participants ($p=0.026$;
192 Figure 2C) while median RNase P levels were 1629 [IQR 1167- 2095] versus 1193 (531- 1758)
193 RNase P copies/ μ L extract from these same groups ($p=0.038$; Figure 2D). No significant
194 differences in RPP30 or RNase P levels were observed by sex, age or recruitment date (a
195 surrogate of nucleic acid extraction run). RNase P levels were also measured using the US-CDC
196 2019-nCoV real-time RT-PCR diagnostic assay [15]. The resulting cycle threshold (Ct) values

197 correlated strongly with those measured using RT-ddPCR (Spearman's $\rho=-0.9$, $p<0.0001$) and
198 yielded results entirely consistent with those described above (data not shown).

199

200 **Discussion**

201 Our observations have the potential to improve nasopharyngeal sample collection. For
202 7.2% of individuals, nasopharyngeal sampling was not possible due to obstructions (*e.g.* nasal
203 polyps or deviated septum) and the procedure caused significantly more discomfort in these
204 individuals. Providers should be aware of the frequency and discomfort implications of such
205 occlusions, and should be issued appropriate guidance (*e.g.* do not force swab; sample
206 ‘midturbinate’ area of the nasal cavity if the nasopharynx cannot be reached and note the swab
207 location). Our observations further indicated that, despite being widely recommended, swab
208 rotation upon contact with the nasopharynx does not enhance nucleic acid recovery and is less
209 tolerable. We speculate that swab saturation is essentially achieved during entry and very brief
210 resting in the nasopharynx, such that rotation does not recover additional material. Since we
211 followed guidance to remove excess mucus prior to swabbing (as it can reduce the collection of
212 desired cellular material [16]), our results are unlikely attributable to mucus collection.

213 The marked spread in discomfort scores was also notable. Though the average score in
214 our study (5 on an 11-point scale) is similar to previous reports for nasopharyngeal swabs (an
215 average of 3 on a 6-point scale [9]), the variation in discomfort from minimal to extreme
216 underscores the need for providers to be mindful of inter-individual differences in experience.
217 Intriguingly, Asian participants reported on average 1-point greater discomfort than White
218 participants. This may be related to differences in the shape, contour and/or size of the nasal
219 cavities and nasopharynx. Indeed, after adjustment for weight, age and sex, a study of facial

220 anthropometric differences by ethnicity reported significantly lower nasal volumes (measured at
221 0-4cm from nostril), lower mean cross-sectional nasal area (at 0-6cm), and longer distances to
222 the minimal cross-sectional area in Asian compared to White individuals [17]. Enhanced nucleic
223 acid recovery on swabs from Asian participants is also consistent with narrower nasal passages in
224 Asian compared to White individuals [17] that could increase both swab discomfort and mucosal
225 contact, though marked variation in nucleic acid recovery across all ethnicities was noted.
226 Nevertheless, healthcare providers should be sensitive to differences in discomfort levels across
227 diverse populations.

228 Some limitations of our study merit mention. We assume that human DNA/RNA targets
229 are appropriate markers of respiratory pathogen collection quality [2], though this is consistent
230 with the inclusion of RNase P in the US-CDC 2019-nCoV real-time RT-PCR diagnostic panel as
231 part of quality control [15]. As swabs vary in design, the absolute discomfort scores and nucleic
232 acid quantities recovered may not be applicable to all swabs, though our general observations
233 should be. Protocol differences also prevent direct comparison of recovered nucleic acid across
234 studies (*e.g.* the swab, silica input and elution volumes differed between the present and a
235 previous study by our group [2]).

236

237 **Conclusion**

238 When performing nasopharyngeal sampling, rotation of the swab upon contact with the
239 nasopharynx does not enhance sample quality. The observation that procedural discomfort levels
240 differ significantly by ethnicity underscores the need for care providers to be sensitive to such
241 differences, and more broadly underscores the importance of diverse participant representation in

- 242 health research. Review and standardization of nasopharyngeal swab collection guidance notes
- 243 should be a priority in the current COVID-19 pandemic.

244 **Acknowledgements**





245 We thank the laboratory teams at the St. Paul's Hospital Virology Laboratory and the BC Centre





246 for Excellence in HIV/AIDS and Dr. Wayne Vogl for technical assistance.

References

- 247
248
- 249 1. Marty FM, Chen K, Verrill KA. How to Obtain a Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimen. *N Engl J*
250 *Med* **2020**.
 - 251 2. Kinloch NN, Ritchie G, Brumme CJ, et al. Suboptimal biological sampling as a probable
252 cause of false-negative COVID-19 diagnostic test results. *J Infect Dis* **2020**.
 - 253 3. WHO. WHO Guidelines for the collection of human specimens for laboratory diagnosis of
254 avian influenza infection. Available at:
255 [https://www.who.int/influenza/human_animal_interface/virology_laboratories_and_vacci](https://www.who.int/influenza/human_animal_interface/virology_laboratories_and_vaccines/guidelines_collection_h5n1_humans/en/)
256 [nes/guidelines_collection_h5n1_humans/en/](https://www.who.int/influenza/human_animal_interface/virology_laboratories_and_vaccines/guidelines_collection_h5n1_humans/en/). Accessed 7 August 2020.
 - 257 4. US-CDC. Interim Guidelines for Collecting, Handling and Testing Clinical Specimens for
258 COVID-19. Available at: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/guidelines-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fguidelines-clinical-specimens.html)
259 [clinical-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fguidelines-clinical-specimens.html)
260 [specimens.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F201](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fguidelines-clinical-specimens.html)
261 [9-ncov%2Fguidelines-clinical-specimens.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fguidelines-clinical-specimens.html). Accessed 7 August 2020.
 - 262 5. Public_Health_Ontario. Virus Respiratory (Nasopharyngeal) Kit Order No.: 390082.
263 Available at: [https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/laboratory-services/kit-test-](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/laboratory-services/kit-test-ordering-instructions/virus-respiratory-kit)
264 [ordering-instructions/virus-respiratory-kit](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/laboratory-services/kit-test-ordering-instructions/virus-respiratory-kit). Accessed 7 August 2020.
 - 265 6. Ottawa_Public_Health. How to collect a Nasopharyngeal (NP) swab. Available at:
266 [https://www.ottawapublichealth.ca/en/professionals-and-partners/how-to-collect-a-](https://www.ottawapublichealth.ca/en/professionals-and-partners/how-to-collect-a-nasopharyngeal--np--swab.aspx)
267 [nasopharyngeal--np--swab.aspx](https://www.ottawapublichealth.ca/en/professionals-and-partners/how-to-collect-a-nasopharyngeal--np--swab.aspx). Accessed 7 August 2020.
 - 268 7. University_of_Nebraska_Medical_Centre. COVID-19 Guidance to providers and patients.
269 Available at: <https://www.nebraskamed.com/for-providers/covid19/ambulatory>.
270 Accessed 7 August 2020.
 - 271 8. BD_Diagnostics. Nasopharyngeal specimen collection for BD Veritor system in-service
272 poster. Available at: [https://www.bd.com/en-us/offerings/capabilities/microbiology-](https://www.bd.com/en-us/offerings/capabilities/microbiology-solutions/microbiology-solutions-resource-library?search=nasopharyngeal)
273 [solutions/microbiology-solutions-resource-library?search=nasopharyngeal](https://www.bd.com/en-us/offerings/capabilities/microbiology-solutions/microbiology-solutions-resource-library?search=nasopharyngeal). Accessed 7
274 August 2020.
 - 275 9. Frazee BW, Rodriguez-Hoces de la Guardia A, Alter H, et al. Accuracy and Discomfort of
276 Different Types of Intranasal Specimen Collection Methods for Molecular Influenza Testing
277 in Emergency Department Patients. *Ann Emerg Med* **2018**; 71:509-17 e1.
 - 278 10. Jamal AJ, Mozafarihashjin M, Coomes E, et al. Sensitivity of nasopharyngeal swabs and
279 saliva for the detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).
280 *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of*
281 *America* **2020**.
 - 282 11. Cheuk S, Wong Y, Tse H, et al. Posterior oropharyngeal saliva for the detection of SARS-
283 CoV-2. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society*
284 *of America* **2020**.
 - 285 12. McCormick-Baw C, Morgan K, Gaffney D, et al. Saliva as an Alternate Specimen Source
286 for Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Symptomatic Patients Using Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-
287 CoV-2. *Journal of clinical microbiology* **2020**; 58.
 - 288 13. National_Institutes_Of_Health_Warren_Grant_Magnuson_Clinical_Center. Pain Intensity
289 Instruments. Available at:
290 [https://www.webcitation.org/6Ag75MDIq?url=http://painconsortium.nih.gov/pain_scales](https://www.webcitation.org/6Ag75MDIq?url=http://painconsortium.nih.gov/pain_scales/NumericRatingScale.pdf)
291 [/NumericRatingScale.pdf](https://www.webcitation.org/6Ag75MDIq?url=http://painconsortium.nih.gov/pain_scales/NumericRatingScale.pdf). Accessed 7 August 2020.

- 292 14. US-CDC. Research Use Only 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-time RT-PCR
293 Primers and Probes. Available at: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-
295 pcr-panel-primer-probes.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-
294 pcr-panel-primer-probes.html). Accessed 1 June 2020.
296 15. U.S. Centres for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-
297 nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel Instructions for use, **2020**.
298 16. Yukon Health and Social Services. Nasopharyngeal Swab Procedure. Available at:
299 <http://www.hss.gov.yk.ca/pdf/npswab.pdf>. Accessed 15 July 2020.
300 17. Morgan NJ, MacGregor FB, Birchall MA, Lund VJ, Sittampalam Y. Racial differences in
301 nasal fossa dimensions determined by acoustic rhinometry. *Rhinology* **1995**; 33:224-8.





1 **Figure legends**

2 **Figure 1: Differences in participant experience by nasopharyngeal swab technique and**

3 **ethnicity. (1A).** No difference in discomfort score between “in-out” (black circles) and

4 “rotation” (white circles) swab groups was observed. **(1B).** Significantly higher discomfort was

5 reported in participants with occlusion (grey squares) compared to those with a successful swab

6 (black and white circles, denoting the groups described in 1A). **(1C).** A greater proportion of

7 “rotation” swab participants preferred to give saliva compared to “in-out” swab participants.

8 **(1D).** Significantly higher discomfort scores were reported in Asian compared to White

9 participants. Individuals of other ethnicities (Latino, mixed ethnicity) were excluded due to low
10 numbers (n=4).

11

12 **Figure 2: Differences in nucleic acid recovery by nasopharyngeal swab technique and**

13 **ethnicity. (2AB).** No difference in DNA (RPP30, cells/ μ L extract, **2A**) or RNA recovery (RNase

14 P, RNase P copies/ μ L extract, **2B**) between “in-out” (black circles) and “rotation” (white circles)

15 swab technique groups was observed. **(2CD).** Significantly higher levels of DNA (RPP30,

16 cells/ μ L extract, **2C**) and RNA (RNase P, RNase P copies/ μ L extract, **2D**) were recovered on

17 swabs from Asian compared to White participants. Individuals of other ethnicities (Latino, mixed

18 ethnicity) were excluded due to low numbers (n=4).

19