

1

2 **Prospective comparison of saliva and nasopharyngeal swab sampling for mass screening**
3 **for COVID-19**

4 *Mathieu Nacher^{1,2}, Mayka Mergeay-Fabre¹, Denis Blanchet³, Orelie Benois⁴, Tristan Pozl⁴, Pauline*
5 *Mesphoule⁴, Vincent Sainte-Rose³, Véronique Vialette³, Bruno Toulet³, Aurélie Moua³, MONA*
6 *Saout⁵, Stéphane Simon³, Manon Guidarelli¹, Muriel Galindo¹, Barbara Biche¹, William Faurous¹,*
7 *Fanny Abad¹, Aniza Fahrasmane¹, Devi Rochemont¹, Nicolas Vignier¹, Astrid Vabret⁶, Magalie*
8 *Demar^{3,5}*

9

10

11

12 *1/CIC INSERM 1424, Centre Hospitalier de Cayenne Andrée Rosemon, 97300, Cayenne, French*
13 *Guiana*

14 *2/DFR Santé, Université de Guyane, 97300, Cayenne, French Guiana*

15 *3/Laboratoire, Centre Hospitalier de Cayenne Andrée Rosemon, 97300, Cayenne, French Guiana*

16 *4/Centre de Ressources Biologiques (CRB) Amazonie, Centre Hospitalier de Cayenne Andrée*
17 *Rosemon, 97300, Cayenne, French Guiana*

18 *5/Unité mixte de recherche TBIP, Université de Guyane, 97300, Cayenne, French Guiana*

19 *6/Service de Virologie, CHU de Caen, 14000 Caen, France*

20 **Abstract**

21 Current testing for COVID-19 relies on quantitative reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain
22 reaction from a nasopharyngeal swab specimen. Saliva samples have advantages regarding
23 ease and painlessness of collection, which does not require trained staff and may allow self-
24 sampling. We enrolled 776 persons at various field-testing sites and collected
25 nasopharyngeal and pooled saliva samples. 162 had a positive COVID-19 RT-PCR, 61% were
26 mildly symptomatic and 39% asymptomatic. The sensitivity of RT-PCR on saliva samples
27 versus nasopharyngeal swabs varied depending on the patient groups considered or on Ct
28 thresholds. There were 10 (6.2%) patients with a positive saliva sample and a negative
29 nasopharyngeal swab, all of whom had Ct values<25. For symptomatic patients for whom
30 the interval between symptoms onset and sampling was <10 days sensitivity was 77% but
31 when excluding persons with isolated Ngen positivity (54/162), sensitivity was 90%. In
32 asymptomatic patients, the sensitivity was only 24%. When we looked at patients with Cts
33 <30, sensitivity was 83% or 88.9% when considering 2 genes. The relatively good
34 performance for patients with low Cts suggests that Saliva testing could be a useful and
35 acceptable tool to identify infectious persons in mass screening contexts, a strategically
36 important task for contact tracing and isolation in the community.

37

38 **Introduction**

39 Current testing for COVID-19 relies on quantitative reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain
40 reaction (RT-PCR) from a nasopharyngeal swab specimen. (1) Nasopharyngeal sampling

41 requires human resources and training, personal protective equipment and swabs, and time,
42 generating testing bottlenecks and potential exposure to transmission at crowded testing
43 sites. Moreover, the unpleasantness of the procedure and the long waiting delays may
44 dissuade some persons to get tested or to repeat tests when they are negative. There is an
45 urgent need for innovative testing strategies to rapidly identify cases, reduce waiting delays,
46 and facilitate mass screening. Saliva samples have advantages regarding ease and
47 painlessness of collection, which does not require trained staff and may allow self-sampling.
48 The comparison of real time PCR results on salivary and nasopharyngeal samples has shown
49 discrepancies between studies, with most finding greater sensitivity and lower RT-PCR Cts
50 in nasopharyngeal swab samples(2–4) whereas others found greater sensitivity in saliva
51 samples(5, 6). The sources of variation may have been the study population (hospitalized
52 patients versus screening of contacts or mildly symptomatic patients), saliva collection
53 techniques and timing, conditioning and delays in processing raw saliva samples, or
54 differences in the RT-PCR techniques used.

55 We here report the first prospective study of the performance of saliva testing compared to
56 nasopharyngeal swabs in a field context of mass screening in French Guiana.

57 **Methods**

58 *Context*

59 This French territory neighboring Amapa state in Brazil has been highly impacted by
60 COVID-19 with 3.2% of the population having had a confirmed infection, notably among the
61 poorest populations.(7) In this context, testing and tracking were implemented throughout
62 the epidemic, testing tents and mobile testing teams including the remote health centers, the
63 Red Cross, Médecins du Monde, and the reinforcements from the Réserve Sanitaire were
64 coordinated by the regional health agency to investigate around clusters of cases. The testing
65 efforts for this small population peaked to nearly 0.5% of the population screened in a day.

66 *Study conduct*

67 Between July 27th and September 10th, we prospectively enrolled consecutive, persons aged 3
68 years or more with mild symptoms suggestive of COVID-19 and high-risk asymptomatic
69 persons at various testing sites and mobile testing brigades in French Guiana reaching
70 remote sites up to 240 km in the Amazonian Forest. During screening missions, mobile
71 teams, consisting of Healthcare personnel (doctors, nurses) were coordinated by the Health
72 Regional Agency of French Guiana, targeting villages, neighborhoods, where the virus was
73 circulating collected persons often out of doors or in health centers. These mobile teams were
74 made up of staff from the Red Cross, Médecins du Monde, the Cayenne hospital PASS and
75 the health reserve. Team travel was coordinated and decided by the health regional agency
76 of French Guiana each week during a weekly update and was guided the knowledge of
77 clusters or a screening campaign in different neighborhoods. Inclusion criteria were: males or
78 females with an indication to perform a COVID diagnostic test (symptomatology, contact
79 case, systematic screening, etc.), aged at least 3 years old. Non-inclusion criteria were refusal
80 of the patient or his legal representative, person taking treatments that reduce salivary
81 volume (anticholinergic activity), impossibility of carrying out the NPS, and persons under

82 guardianship or curatorship, or placed under protective measures. All study participants
83 were enrolled and sampled in accordance with the protocol. An investigator explained the
84 objectives of the study and obtain the consent of the patient or his legal representative. The
85 form was completed by the investigator or a person delegated by the investigator. The
86 trained nurse present during the testing mission performed the nasopharyngeal swab
87 collected the salivary sputum sample in a urine container. A trained agent carried out a short
88 questionnaire. At the end of each day, all completed forms and samples were sent to
89 Cayenne hospital and stored at 4°C before analysis. Samples and participant information
90 were non-individually identifiable and collected with a unique identifying number.

91 *Laboratory analysis*

92 The same technique was used for the 2 samples throughout the study: the QIA Symphony
93 and GeneFinder kit, a Real-time PCR assay. GeneFinder™ COVID-19 detects SARS-CoV-2 by
94 amplification of RdRp gene, E gene and N gene according to WHO's recommended protocol.
95 Viral nucleic acid was extracted by using the QIAamp DSP viral kit on the QIA Symphony
96 RGQ, an integrated fully automated nucleic acid extraction (chemical lysis and paramagnetic
97 bead binding) and sample preparation platform (Qiagen GmbH, Germany). The real-time
98 PCR assays for SARS Cov2 were performed with an Applied 7500 cycler (ThermoFisher) with
99 the Genefinder kit (Ellitech group) that could detect the Ngen, RdRP and E gen. As the
100 Nucleic acid extraction methods could affect the results of viral nucleic acid amplification
101 tests, we treated the couple saliva-nasopharyngeal specimens with the same method and
102 most of the time in the same series, the eluates were obtained from 200µl of specimens (300
103 µL minus 100 µL dead volume). The remainder of each sample was divided into paired
104 aliquots kept in a biorepository for further studies evaluating new screening tools.

105 *Statistical analysis*

106 Statistical analysis was performed using STATA® 16 (Stata corporation, College Station,
107 Texas, USA). Cross tabulations considering different subgroups was performed. We
108 considered the specific genes for SARS-Cov2 RdRp and Ngene to calculate different Ct
109 categories.

110 *Ethical*

111 The protocol received ethical approval from the Comité de Protection des Personnes under
112 the number 2020-A02009-30/SI:20.07.07.54744.

113 **Results**

114 We included 776 patients, 162 (20.9%) of whom had a positive result (152 nasopharyngeal
115 and 86 saliva) (Figure 1). The sex ratio (M/F) was 1.6, the mean age was 40 (standard
116 deviation=16.8). Overall, 61% were mildly symptomatic and 39% were asymptomatic.

117 For symptomatic patients, 84% had a symptoms onset <10 days, and 4% were hospitalized
118 within 2 weeks after inclusion. The sensitivity of RT-PCR on saliva samples versus
119 nasopharyngeal swabs varied depending on the patient groups considered (Fig 2a) or on Ct

120 thresholds (Fig 2b). There were 10 (6.2%) patients with a positive saliva sample and a
121 negative nasopharyngeal swab, all of whom had Ct values <25. For symptomatic patients for
122 whom the interval between symptoms onset and sampling was <10 days sensitivity was 77%
123 but when excluding persons with isolated Ngen positivity (54/162), sensitivity was 90%. In
124 asymptomatic patients, the sensitivity was only 24% (Fig 2a). Recent studies have argued
125 that transmission potential -estimated by the capacity to infect cell cultures- was restrained
126 to those with low Cts (8, 9), a proxy for high viral load. When we looked at patients with Cts
127 <30, sensitivity was 83% or 88.9% when considering 2 genes. Figure 3 shows a trend for
128 fanning towards the higher Ct values the nasopharyngeal versus saliva sample scatterplots
129 for the different genes amplified by RT PCR. The positive predictive value of saliva samples
130 was 88.4% and the negative predictive value was 88.9%.

131 **Discussion**

132 Contrarily to 2 studies suggesting a greater positivity rate for saliva(5, 6), we observed that
133 saliva testing was less sensitive than nasopharyngeal swabs. Whereas most studies were
134 hospital-based collecting saliva in the early morning before mouth rinsing and breakfast, our
135 study was a screening study that was performed in difficult field conditions targeting hard
136 to reach populations after breakfast and teeth brushing, moreover out of doors in a tropical
137 context. The poor sensitivity on asymptomatic positive nasopharyngeal swabs was
138 presumably also linked to the inclusion of non-infectious patients in the denominator. The
139 relatively good performance for patients with low Cts suggests that Saliva testing could be a
140 useful and acceptable tool to identify infectious persons in mass screening contexts, a
141 strategically important task for contact tracing and isolation in the community. With the
142 considerable testing bottlenecks, although the time and workload for RT-PCR itself would be
143 similar, alleviating the workload and shortening the sample collection time would be
144 improvements that could reduce waiting times to get tested and human-resource costs. The
145 sensitivity saliva samples for asymptomatic persons seemed insufficient but without any
146 temporal indication about the onset of infection, it should be further studied by Ct values
147 with a larger sample size. In view of the present results the French Health authorities have
148 officially declared that saliva testing may be used on symptomatic patients only.(10)

149

150 **Acknowledgements**

151 *We wish to express our gratitude to the directions and personnel of the Agence Régionale de Santé de*
152 *Guyane, Centre Hospitalier de Cayenne, the Croix Rouge Française, Médecins du Monde, the*
153 *Permanence d'Accès aux Soins de Santé, the Réserve Sanitaire, Santé Publique France, the Centres*
154 *Délocalisés de Prévention et de Soins and numerous Health mediators, and REACTing*

155 **Figure legends**

156 Fig 1a. Sensitivity of saliva testing versus nasopharyngeal swabs for RT-PCR for different
157 groups in a community screening context; Fig 1b. Sensitivity of saliva testing versus
158 nasopharyngeal swabs for different RT-PCR Cts in a community screening context.

159 Figure 2. Scatterplot matrix for the Ct of different genes in the nasopharyngeal and saliva
160 samples. There was a “fanning” pattern with greater dispersion at higher Ct values for
161 different genes in the nasopharyngeal and saliva samples.

162

163 **References**

- 164 1. Tang Y-W, Schmitz JE, Persing DH, Stratton CW. 2020. Laboratory Diagnosis of COVID-19:
165 Current Issues and Challenges. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 58.
- 166 2. Chen JH-K, Yip CC-Y, Poon RW-S, Chan K-H, Cheng VC-C, Hung IF-N, Chan JF-W, Yuen K-Y, To KK-
167 W. 2020. Evaluating the use of posterior oropharyngeal saliva in a point-of-care assay for the
168 detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Emerging Microbes & Infections* 1–14.
- 169 3. Miguères M, Mengelle C, Dimeglio C, Didier A, Alvarez M, Delobel P, Mansuy J-M, Izopet J.
170 2020. Saliva sampling for diagnosing SARS-CoV-2 infections in symptomatic patients and
171 asymptomatic carriers. *Journal of Clinical Virology*.
- 172 4. Williams E, Bond K, Zhang B, Putland M, Williamson DA. 2020. Saliva as a non-invasive
173 specimen for detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of clinical microbiology*.
- 174 5. Rao M, Rashid FA, Sabri FS, Jamil NN, Zain R, Hashim R, Amran F, Kok HT, Samad MAA, Ahmad
175 N. 2020. Comparing nasopharyngeal swab and early morning saliva for the identification of
176 SARS-CoV-2. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*.
- 177 6. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P, Warren
178 JL, Geng B, Muenker MC, Moore AJ. 2020. Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for
179 Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *New England Journal of Medicine*.
- 180 7. Point Epidémiologique Régionale hebdomadaire “Spécial COVID-19.”

181 8. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. 2020. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1 and
182 MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding and infectiousness: a living systematic
183 review and meta-analysis. medRxiv.

184 9. Rhee C, Kanjilal S, Baker M, Klompas M. 2020. Duration of SARS-CoV-2 Infectivity: When is it
185 Safe to Discontinue Isolation? Clinical Infectious Diseases.

186 10. COVID-19 : les tests salivaires peuvent compléter les tests nasopharyngés chez les personnes
187 symptomatiques. Haute Autorité de Santé.

188

189





