

1 **Manuscript Title**

2 The Accuracy of Healthcare Worker versus Self Collected (2-in-1) Oropharyngeal and Bilateral Mid-
3 Turbinate (OPMT) Swabs and Saliva Samples for SARS-CoV-2

4 Seow Yen Tan^{1¶*}, Hong Liang Tey^{2¶}, Ernest Tian Hong Lim^{3¶}, Song Tar Toh^{4¶}, Yiong Huak Chan⁵,
5 Pei Ting Tan⁶, Sing Ai Lee⁷, Cheryl Xiaotong Tan⁸, Gerald Choon Huat Koh^{9&}, Thean Yen Tan^{10&},
6 Chuin Siau^{11&}

7

8 * Corresponding Author

9 Email: tan.seow.yen@singhealth.com.sg (SYT)

10

11 ¹ Department of Infectious Diseases, Changi General Hospital, Singapore

12 ² Department of Dermatology, National Skin Centre, Singapore

13 ³ Emergency Department, Woodlands Health Campus, Singapore

14 ⁴ Department of Otorhinolaryngology- Head and Neck Surgery, Singapore General Hospital,
15 Singapore

16 ⁵ Biostatistics Unit, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, Singapore

17 ⁶ Clinical Trials and Research Unit, Changi General Hospital, Singapore

18 ⁷ Sheares Healthcare Group Pte Ltd, Singapore

19 ⁸ Temasek Holdings, Singapore

20 ⁹ MOH Office for Healthcare Transformation, Singapore

21 ¹⁰ Department of Laboratory Medicine, Changi General Hospital, Singapore

22 ¹¹ Department of Respiratory & Critical Care Medicine, Changi General Hospital, Singapore

23 [¶] These authors contributed equally to this work.

24 [&] GCHK, TYT, CS are Joint Senior Authors.

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background**

27 Self-sampling for SARS-CoV-2 would significantly raise testing capacity and reduce healthcare
28 worker (HCW) exposure to infectious droplets personal, and protective equipment (PPE) use.

29 **Methods**

30 We conducted a diagnostic accuracy study where subjects with a confirmed diagnosis of COVID-19
31 (n=401) and healthy volunteers (n=100) were asked to self-swab from their oropharynx and mid-
32 turbinate (OPMT), and self-collect saliva. The results of these samples were compared to an OPMT
33 performed by a HCW in the same patient at the same session.

34 **Results**

35 In subjects confirmed to have COVID-19, the detection rates of the HCW-swab, self-swab, saliva, and
36 combined self-swab plus saliva samples were 82.8%, 75.1%, 74.3% and 86.5% respectively. All
37 samples obtained from healthy volunteers were tested negative. Compared to HCW-swab, the
38 detection rates of a self-swab sample and saliva sample were inferior by 8.7% (95%CI: 2.4% to
39 15.0%, p=0.006) and 9.5% (95%CI: 3.1% to 15.8%, p=0.003) respectively. The combined detection
40 rate of self-swab and saliva had a higher detection rate of 2.7% (95%CI: -2.6% to 8.0%, p=0.321).
41 The sensitivity of both the self-collection methods are higher when the Ct value of the HCW swab is
42 less than 30. The negative correctness of both the self-swab and saliva testing was 100% (95% CI
43 96.4% to 100%).

44

45 **Conclusion**

46 Our study provides evidence that detection rates of self-collected OPMT swab and saliva samples
47 were inferior to a HCW swab, but they could still be useful testing tools in the appropriate clinical
48 settings.

49

50 **Introduction**

51 The current “gold standard” for testing for SARS-CoV-2 requires health care workers to collect a
52 nasopharyngeal (NP) sample from a patient. NP sampling is very uncomfortable for the patient and
53 requires deployment of trained personnel and use of personal protective equipment (PPE) which are in
54 limited supply.

55 A prior study has shown that a combination of oropharyngeal and anterior nares swabs is equivalent
56 in sensitivity to an NP swab in 190 ambulatory symptomatic patients.¹ Another study on 236
57 ambulatory, literate, mostly adult subjects the performance of self-collected nasal and throat swabs
58 was at least equivalent to that of health worker collected swabs for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 and
59 other respiratory viruses.²

60 The international community is actively searching for an even less invasive means of sample
61 collection: saliva. In a recent study by Yale University on 29 subjects,³ it was suggested that a large
62 volume sample of saliva collected from COVID-19 inpatients can be more sensitive than NP swabs
63 for SARS-CoV-2 detection, and saliva samples had significantly higher COVID-19 viral titres than
64 NP swabs ($p=0.001$). Furthermore, the same study showed that sensitivity of COVID-19 in saliva was
65 more consistent throughout extended hospitalization compared to NP swabs.

66 In addition, there are a number of studies done on saliva testing for COVID-19 which have shown
67 promising results, reporting 91.7%, and 100% positivity in saliva samples of COVID-19 patients.^{4,5}
68 Iwasaki et al found an overall concordance rate of 97.4% for COVID-19 detection with a strong
69 concordance between NP swabs and saliva sampling ($\kappa=0.874$) among 66 COVID-19 negative and 10
70 COVID-19 positive subjects.⁶ Furthermore, a study done by To et al. showed that viral RNA could
71 still be detected in saliva samples in a third of their twenty-three patients 20 days or longer after
72 symptoms onset despite the development of COVID-19 antibodies.⁷ A meta-analysis conducted on 26
73 saliva studies also showed a positive detection rate of 91%, comparable to the detection rate of 98%

74 from nasopharyngeal swabs.⁸ All these studies had small sample sizes (all <30 COVID-positive
75 subjects) and only one study also sampled COVID-negative subjects.

76 It is still currently unknown whether self-collected combined OPMT sample, or a self-collected saliva
77 sample is equivalent to a swab done by a health care worker (HCW). Self-collection of samples would
78 reduce very significantly on the reliance of trained personnel to collect samples and ramp up testing
79 capacity. It would also reduce greatly the biosafety risk that is posed to HCWs and help with PPE
80 conservation efforts.

81

82 **Materials and methods**

83 **Study design and trial oversight**

84 This was a prospective study involving 401 subjects who were previously tested positive for COVID-
85 19 by RT-PCR, and 100 healthy volunteers. This study was approved by the SingHealth Centralised
86 Institutional Review Board. Written informed consent was obtained from the subjects.

87

88 **Participants**

89 The first group consisted of patients who were confirmed to have COVID-19, and who were cared for
90 in either a hospital (Changi General Hospital), or a community care facility (Community Care Facility
91 @ EXPO). Inclusion criteria for the study were patients that were admitted within 3 days prior to
92 recruitment to the study sites. The second group comprised of healthy volunteers who were
93 asymptomatic and well on the day of the study, with no recent COVID-19 exposure. Subjects had to
94 be able to understand and comply with the study instructions.

95

96 **Test Procedures**

97 Study subjects underwent three sequential test sample collection procedures within one study episode
98 in the following order:

99 1. Each subject self-collected a sample combining OP and bilateral MT swabs using a single swab
100 stick;

101 2. A trained healthcare worker then collected a combined OP and bilateral MT swab using another
102 single swab stick;

103 3. The subject then self-collected a saliva sample.

104 Study subjects were shown instructional videos for both the OPMT self-swab and saliva collection
105 prior to commencing the test procedures. There are two main methods of saliva collection that has
106 been described in the literature; one is the drooling method, while the other is the spitting method,
107 which results in collection of oropharyngeal sputum. For this study, we used the spitting method for
108 saliva collection. Synthetic fibre swabs were used for collection of the OP and MT samples by both
109 subject and healthcare worker, and immediately placed in universal transport medium (UTM), while
110 saliva samples were collected using the SAFER-Sample™ (by Lucence Diagnostics). All samples
111 were double bagged and stored at room temperature in a chiller bag and transported to assigned
112 laboratory on the same day.

113 Nucleic acid extraction was performed using PerkinElmer Nucleic Acid Extraction Kits (KN0212) on
114 the Pre-Nat II Automated Workstation (PerkinElmer®, United States), Extraction of swab samples
115 followed the indicated protocol for oropharyngeal swabs, while extraction of saliva samples followed
116 a protocol consisting of pre-liquefaction with dithiothreitol (protocol attached in supplementary
117 materials). *Reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction* was performed on the Quantstudio™ 5
118 Real Time PCR system (Thermo Fisher, United Kingdom) using the PerkinElmer® SARS-CoV-2
119 Real-time RT-PCR Assay. Any detected Ct value was accepted as a true positive result for SARS-
120 CoV-2 virus.

121

122 **Outcomes**

123 The primary objective of the study was to evaluate the accuracy of self-collected (2-in-1) OPMT
124 swabs and self-collected saliva samples for SARS-Cov-2 versus that of HCW-collected (2-in-1) MT
125 and OP swabs. The secondary objective was to evaluate the correlation of PCR Cycle Threshold (Ct)
126 values of self-collected saliva samples and swabs with comparator healthcare worker-collected swabs.

127

128 **Sample Size**

129 Firstly, we postulated that OPMT self-swabbing was as accurate as HCW-obtained swabs. An error
130 rate of less than 1% was determined to be of clinical relevance so a sample size of at least 400
131 subjects was calculated. With the computed sample size of 400 subjects, a non-inferiority could be
132 achieved with at most a 7% difference for OPMT self-swabbing compared to the HCW-obtained
133 swabs. If the study included only subjects who were diagnosed with COVID-19, all positive results
134 would be regarded as true positives. Hence, to address that gap in the form of specificity of self-swabs
135 and saliva testing in the diagnosis of COVID-19, a further study on 100 healthy subjects was
136 conducted. The hypothesis was that with 100% accuracy, the error rate for a false negative was 3.6%.

137

138 **Statistical Analysis**

139 All analyses were performed using SPSS 25.0 with statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$.
140 The estimates for the positivity results of the 3 methods were presented as numbers and percentages.
141 The differences with 95% confidence interval (CI) between self-collection methods and HCW-
142 obtained swabs to assess for non-inferiority was calculated. Sensitivity and specificity of the two self-
143 collection methods were compared with HCW-obtained swabs and results were stratified by Ct
144 values. Spearman's test was used to assess the correlation of the PCR Ct values across the 3 groups.

145

146 Results

147 A total of 401 COVID-19 positive and 100 COVID-19 negative subjects who were recruited.

148 All subjects went through the test procedures - 400 participants were able to provide all 3 samples,
149 while one participant was unable to provide a saliva sample despite a prolonged attempt. All
150 participants tolerated the test procedures well and did not experience any adverse events.

151 Twenty-seven (6.7%) patients were tested negative across all 3 samples. This may be explained by the
152 fact that they are recovering patients and viral shedding may have ceased at point of testing. Forty-two
153 (10.5%) subjects reported ≥ 1 symptom of acute respiratory infection (ARI) (e.g. fever, cough,
154 rhinorrhoea, sore throat, malaise) on the day of study recruitment while 371 (92.5%) subjects reported
155 being within 7 days from onset of COVID-19 illness.

156 The detection rates of the HCW swab, self-swab, saliva, and combined self-swab plus saliva samples
157 were 82.8%, 75.1%, 74.3% and 86.5% respectively (**Table 1**). Compared to HCW-swabs, the
158 detection rate was lower for self-swab by 8.7% (95% confidence interval, CI=2.4% to 15.0%,
159 $p=0.006$) and for saliva samples by 9.5% (95%CI=3.1% to 15.8%, $p=0.003$). When the results of both
160 the self-swab and saliva testing were combined, the detection rate was higher by 2.7% (95%CI=-2.6%
161 to 8.0%, $p = 0.321$) but this was not statistically significant.

162 **Table 1. Detection rates of various modalities in all subjects.**

	HCW Swab	Self-Swab	Saliva	Self-Swab + Saliva
Count	336	301	297	347
Percentage	83.8%	75.1%	74.3%	86.5%
95% CI	79.8% - 87.3%	70.1% - 79.2%	69.7% - 78.5%	82.8% - 89.7%

163

164 The sensitivities of the self-saliva, saliva and combined self-swab plus saliva testing, when compared
165 to the HCW swab were 83.6%, 80.6% and 92.3% respectively (**Table 2**).

166

167 **Table 2. Sensitivity of Self-Swab, Saliva, and combination of Self-Swab and Saliva in all subjects**
168 **(n=401) compared to HCW Swab.**

	Self-swab	Saliva	Self-swab + Saliva
Sensitivity (95% CI)	83.6% (79.2 - 87.4)	80.6% (75.9 - 84.7)	92.3% (88.9 - 94.9)

169

170 Using the Ct values of HCW swabs as reference, 3 categories of Ct values (i.e. <25, 25-30 and >30)
171 were studied. It was observed that the sensitivity of self-swab (**Table 3**) and saliva testing (**Table 4**)
172 performed better at the lower Ct values, suggesting that the sensitivity of self-collection methods
173 approaches to that of HCW swab, when the viral load was higher

174

175 **Table 3: Sensitivity of Self-swab, stratified by Ct values of HCW swab**

HCW Swab Ct	Number of subjects	Sensitivity
<25	60	100% (94.0 – 100)
25 – 30	81	96.3% (89.6 – 99.2)
>30	195	73.3% (66.5 – 79.4)

176

177 **Table 4: Sensitivity of Saliva, stratified by Ct values of HCW swab**

HCW Swab Ct	Number of subjects	Sensitivity
<25	60	96.7% (88.5 – 99.6)
25 – 30	81	92.6% (84.6 – 97.2)
>30	194	70.6% (63.7 – 76.9)

178

179 There was a good correlation of PCR Ct values between self-swab and HCW swab ($r=0.825$,
180 $p<0.001$) but moderate correlation between saliva samples and HCW swab ($r=0.528$, $p<0.001$).

181

182 One hundred healthy volunteers were recruited, and all of them were able to provide the 3 required
183 samples. All the samples obtained from the healthy volunteers were tested negative for SARS-CoV2.
184 This implies that the negative correctness was 100% (95% CI 96.4% to 100%) with an error rate of
185 3.6% for having a false negative.

186

187 **Discussion**

188 This study shows that the viral detection rates of a self-sample alone or saliva sample alone is lower
189 than HCW swab. However, the detection rate of a combined self-swab and saliva collection is
190 equivalent to that of a health care worker swab. Another significant finding is that the self-swab and
191 saliva samples have a higher sensitivity with higher viral load which occurs during early illness. The
192 sensitivity of both self-swab and saliva testing drops significantly when the Ct values of the HCW
193 swab is more than 30. A study from Singapore (unpublished data) reported that virus cultures were
194 negative from samples with Ct values ≥ 30 (i.e. when viral load is low), and the SARS-CoV-2 virus
195 often cannot be isolated or cultured after day 11 of illness.⁹ Our findings corroborate with existing
196 epidemiologic data which indicates that while viral RNA detection may persist in some patients, such
197 persistent RNA detection likely represents non-viable virus and hence, such patients are non-
198 infectious. Thus, the results of this study support the use of self-testing methods as a replacement for
199 HCW swab in the early phase of COVID-19 illness when viral loads are high.

200 This study included a high proportion of asymptomatic patients who were picked up because of
201 Singapore's proactive mass screening policy. The combination of self-swab and saliva sampling
202 performed well in these asymptomatic subjects, proving that this strategy has the ability for rapid up-
203 scaling to mass screen patients who are asymptomatic. The study results from the healthy volunteers
204 indicate a low false positive rate with self-collection methods. Thus, self-collection methods may be a
205 useful tool for COVID-19 surveillance in a low prevalence population.

206 The study team members observed that, despite clear instructions, many subjects still needed guidance
207 with the self-collection methods. For the self-swab, the most commonly encountered problem was
208 subjects needing some guidance in breaking the swab stick. The saliva collection presented a greater
209 challenge to the subjects. The flow of saliva from the funnel into the collection container was not
210 smooth, and the additional step of adding the stabilising fluid required prompting. These necessitated
211 the presence of a trained staff to troubleshoot and ensure that the correct steps are carried out. We
212 believe that these observations are useful in the re-design of collection containers to enhance results

213 and end users' acceptability. Both the self-swab and saliva collection require dexterity and this would
214 limit its applicability in segments of the population who are not able to do so.

215 We caution against widespread, unsupervised implementation of self-collection methods. The
216 reliability and effectiveness of self-collection methods may be dependent on social and economic
217 drivers. The test performance may vary, due to factors driving the circumstances. For example,
218 individuals who face a potential loss of income or unemployment if tested positive or travellers
219 having a test done at immigration clearance may deliberately do a suboptimal self-test to influence the
220 test outcome.

221 Hence, it is important to have designated personnel to supervise the self-collection process. These
222 personnel need not be a HCW and the supervision process will have a lower exposure risk (supervisor
223 can be >1m away from subject), compared to the HCW-swabbing process where a HCW is <1m away
224 and face-to-face with the subject.

225 The main strength of our study is our large sample size and the inclusion of healthy asymptomatic
226 subjects. A key study limitation however, is that the demographics of the COVID-19-positive
227 population was skewed, consisting solely of male migrant workers, the worst affected group of the
228 pandemic in Singapore, at the time this study was conducted.

229

230

231 **Conclusion**

232 This study demonstrates that while self-collection methods have a detection rate of approximately
233 75%, it is inferior to the rate obtained by the health care worker administered swab (83.8%). The
234 sensitivity of the self-collection methods is, however, higher and correlates better when Ct values of
235 the HCW swabs are less than 30. The combined results of the saliva and self-swab test achieve a rate
236 detection rate equivalent to that of a health care worker administered swab. The negative correctness
237 of the self-collection methods is 100%. Together with a low false positive rates, we postulate that self-

238 collection methods have their roles in diagnosis in early disease and surveillance screening in low
239 prevalence populations.

240

241 **Acknowledgements**

242 We thank all clinical, nursing and allied health staff who provided care for the patients at Changi
243 General Hospital, and Community Care Facility @ EXPO; staff in the Changi General Hospital
244 Clinical Trials & Research Unit for coordinating patient recruitment, logistics management and
245 assistance.

246

247 **References**

- 248 1. LeBlanc JJ, Heinstejn C, MacDonald J, Pettipas J, Hatchette TF, Patriquin G. A combined
249 oropharyngeal/nares swab is a suitable alternative to nasopharyngeal swabs for the detection of SARS-
250 CoV-2. *J Clin Virol.* 2020;128:104442. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104442
- 251 2. Wehrhahn MC, Robson J, Brown S, Bursle E, Byrne S, New D, et al. Self-collection: An
252 appropriate alternative during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *J Clin Virol.* 2020;128:104417.
253 doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104417
- 254 3. Wyllie AL, Fourmier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P,
255 et al. Saliva is more sensitive for SARS-CoV-2 detection in COVID-19 patients than
256 nasopharyngeal swabs. medRxiv 2020 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067835>.
- 257 4. To KK, Tsang OT, Yip CC, Chan K, Wu T, Chan JM, et al. Consistent detection of 2019
258 novel coronavirus in saliva. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020; 71(15):841-3. doi:
259 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa149>
- 260 5. Azzi L, Carcano G, Gianfagna F, Grossi P, Gasperina DD, Genoni A, et al. Saliva is a reliable
261 tool to detect SARS-CoV-2. *J Infect.* 2020;81(1):e45-e50. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.005.

- 262 6. Iwasaki S, Fujisawa S, Nakakubo S, Kamada K, Yamashita Y, Fukumoto T, et al.
263 Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 detection in nasopharyngeal swab and saliva [published online
264 ahead of print, 2020 Jun 4]. *J Infect.* 2020;81(2):e145-e147. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.05.071.
- 265 7. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu T, Lung DC, et al. Temporal profiles of viral
266 load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection
267 by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2020;20(5):565-574.
268 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30196-1.
- 269 8. Czumbel LM, Kiss S, Farkas N, Mandel I, Hegyi I, Nagy A, et al. Saliva as a Candidate for
270 COVID-19 Diagnostic Testing: A Meta-Analysis.
271 medRxiv 2020.05.26.20112565; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.26.20112565>.
- 272 9. Position Statement from the National Centre for Infectious Diseases and the Chapter of
273 Infectious Disease Physicians, Academy of Medicine, Singapore – 23 May 2020