Saliva as testing sample for SARS-CoV-2 detection by RT-PCR in low prevalence community setting.

D.Gavars[1], M.Gavars[1], D.Perminovs[1], J.Stasulans[1], J.Stana[1], Z.Metla[1], J.Pavare[3], E.Tauckels[1], E.Gulbis[1], U.Dumpis[2]

[1]E.Gulbja Laboratory
[2] Pauls Stradins Clinical University Hospital, University of Latvia
[3] Children's CIlinical University Hospital, Riga Stradins University

Abstract

The aim of our study was to demonstrate that saliva can be used as an effective material for SARS-CoV-2 testing and screening of large population groups to identify Covid-19 clusters.
The most important aspect of saliva sampling approach is the convenience of obtaining material by self-sampling that is even possible at home.
In our experiments, saliva was sufficiently stable for testing for at least 24 hours after collection.
The results obtained from the saliva of a SARS-CoV-2 positive patient were consistent with those obtained from nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs from the same patient with the sensitivity 90% and specificity 100% during the first two weeks after the onset of symptoms.
To demonstrate the usefulness of testing saliva material for mass screening, crowd sampling with pooling was performed on 3660 people in 3-day time (44 samples were tested positive).
We conclude that saliva testing is an appropriate tool for screening campaigns and cluster detection, that is able to detect more infected people in a shorter period of time with little human resources and thus help to stop the epidemic spread more quickly.

Introduction

Since December 31st 2019 huge resources of most countries have been dedicated to finding an effective way to successfully control and mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic.

The testing capacity and accessibility plays a crucial role in monitoring and adjusting the social measures to overcome COVID-19 outbreaks [1].

Viral nucleic acid detection using real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) assay, which has been developed and used for detection of SARS-CoV-2, remains the standard diagnosis of COVID-19 [2].

Due to increased demand of sampling and testing materials globally, limitation of sampling possibilities still occurs. It is especially challenging for counties with low prevalence level as global suppliers administer the delivery schedules and quantities based on the prevalence of the disease

The shortages of supplies, medical staff, irritability of specific patient's categories (children, frequently tested persons) and difficulties of logistics naturally accelerate studies of alternative sample methods for COVID-19 testing [3].

On September 21st, 2020 Latvia recorded 14-day cumulative number of COVID-19 cases per 100 000 was 5,1 [4]. In October 10, the cumulative number increased to 66. During this epidemic increase, laboratory services have experienced significant overload. Rapid efficient solutions to increase testing capacity were needed.

The main goal of our study was to confirm that saliva is a suitable specimen comparable to nasopharyngeal swab for SARS-Cov-2 detection in special patient populations. We also evaluated pooling approach in order to employ it in field conditions for extensive screening of different high-risk populations groups.

Materials and Methods

Sample collection and treatment.

Self-collection kits were distributed consisting of specimen vial, registration form, alcohol pads for disinfection, two safety plastic bags. Patients were requested to collect saliva in discrete place (keeping at least 5m distance from other persons or objects), preferably outdoors, at home or in own car. The saliva was collected in a container without any additive and delivered to laboratory as soon as possible.

Immediately after arrival to laboratory samples were pretreated by adding 1 ml of phosphate-buffered saline (PBS).

Nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs for RT-qPCR were collected using the standard method used in our laboratory [5].

Extraction of RNA and RT-PCR testing was identical for both swab and pre-treated saliva samples.

Viral RNA was extracted with standard commercial extraction methods (QIAGEN, Germany and LifeRiver, China) used in our laboratory.

RT-qPCR was performed using our laboratory-developed and validated test method which detects S and N genes of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Our validated and verified limit of detection (LOD) is 1 cp/rxn.

Results

Stability of saliva specimens

To confirm the stability of saliva samples, we performed 36 serial tests of 8 primary positive saliva samples which were collected from COVID-19 patients 2 days after their oropharyngeal and nasopharyngeal swabs were tested positive. Data summarized in Tables 1-3.

	0	**after 8h**	**after 24h**	**after 25h**
	1st 14:00	*2nd 22:00*	*3rd 14:00*	*4th 15:00*
1	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive
2	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive
3	Positive	W- Positive	Positive	W- Positive
4	Positive	Positive	Positive	No sample left
5	Positive	W- Positive	Positive	W- Positive

Tab.1 ***Run #1****. Saliva stability measurements of 5 samples collected 2-4h before first testing. W-Positive means Weak Positive result. Measurement after 25h was made to confirm previous result.*

	0	after 12h	after 22h	after 22h rep.
	1st 12:00	*2nd 00:00*	*3rd 10:00*	*4th 10:00*
6	W- Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive
Ct	*35*	*36*	*37*	*37*
7	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive
Ct	*32*	*33*	*30*	*31*

Tab.2 ***Run #2****. Saliva stability serial measurements of 2 samples collected 2-4h before first testing with indicated Ct values and repeated last measurement. (Rep.-repeats.)*

	0	after 3h	after 12h	after 24h
	1st 11:00	*2nd 14:00*	*3rd 02:00*	*4th 11:00*
8	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive
Ct	*34*	*30*	*33*	*35*
8 rep.	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive
Ct	*34*	*27*	*31*	*35*

Tab.3 ***Run #3****. Saliva repeatability measurements of 1 sample collected 2-4h before first testing with indicated Ct values. (Rep.-repeats.)*

Testing was randomized by different time intervals, daily hours and shifts of technicians. It includes 2 repeat testing after 22h (Run #2) and serial repeats of one sample (Run #3) with Ct value reporting.

All results confirm positive result after 22-25h of first testing. Samples were stored refrigerated at 2-6°C between measurements.

Comparison of saliva and nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal samples

Between May 13th and September 21st, 2020, 443 tests of saliva and saliva + nasal liquid were performed, and results were compared with nasopharyngeal / oropharyngeal RT-PCR tests results. There were 104 PCR positive samples and 208 negative patients, including 125 pediatric samples 5-17 years old (average 11,3 years). The observed RT-PCR positive results were divided according to days after symptoms onset in groups: 0-14 days (22 patients); 15-30 days (52 patients); 31-70 days (20 patients) and 10 asymptomatic patients. Results of comparison showed in Table 4.

		NP Swab							
Days after start of symptoms		0-14		15-30		31-70		Asymptomatic	
RT-PCR result		Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative
Saliva	Positive	18	0	22	3	5	2	5	1
	Negative	2	2	12	15	2	11	2	2
Sensitivity %		90		64.7		71.4		71.4	
Specificity %		100		83.3		84.6		66.7	

Tab.4 Saliva samples compared to results of nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal samples.

Calculated sensitivity and specificity for the respective groups were: 90%/100%; 64,7%/83,3%; 71,4%/84,6 and 71,4%/66,7%. The mean Ct values for the groups are: 33,9 for NP and 33,8 for saliva (0-14 days), 34,8 for NP and 34 for saliva (15-30 days) and 36,5 for NP and 39 for saliva in asymptomatic.

Pooling of saliva

To evaluate the pooling option of saliva samples, testing of 37 pools was performed. There were 15 pools of 5 samples (4 negatives+1 positive), 13 pools of 10 samples (9 negatives+1 positive) and 9 pools of 20 samples (19 negatives+1 positive). The RT-PCR testing for each pool was repeated twice. Total No of measurements- 74. All results of pools were 100% positive.

Number of tests per sample are calculated as follows- number of tests divided by a total number of samples. Example: 500 samples are tested in pools of 10 = 50 tests are needed. At positivity rate of 1% = maximum 5 pools will give a positive result (if each positive sample is in a different pool). 50 samples will have to be retested individually (each of the 5 positive pools contain 10 samples). Result: Total of 100 tests to report 500 samples and the number of tests per sample is 100/500=0.2.

The positivity rate as of September 23rd, 2020 in Latvia was 0.5%.

The approximate positivity rate at which pooling of 5 samples becomes more efficient than pooling of 10 samples is 3% (2-4% depending on test price, laboratory load, tests per sample).

Field study

To test usefulness of saliva sample pool testing by RT-PCR in eld conditions, town Kuldīga (total population 10 352) with a recorded outbreak of COVID-19 in the textile factory was selected. In collaboration with local authority, self-sampling kits were distributed to inhabitants. In total, over the period of 3 days 4 100 saliva sampling kits were distributed in specially established distribution point. There were 4 dedicated persons involved for distribution of kits and 4 additional delivery cars with drivers to transport samples to testing laboratory in Riga (150 km one way). During the study period, 3660 saliva samples were returned (response rate 91,5%), delivered to laboratory and tested by saliva pools in 10 samples per pool. In total, 366 pools were tested. The 43 pools were found to be positive and samples from these pools were re-tested one by one. The saliva samples from 44 patients were confirmed as positive by RT-PCR. In mean Ct values of pooled samples were by 13% higher than individually tested Ct (31,6 versus 27,6). Positivity rate of tested population was 1,2%. In total 796 Rt-PCR tests were performed. At the time of the sample collection 68.2% (30/44) of patients did not record any symptoms in the questionnaire form.

Nasopharyngeal swab tests and saliva tests were compared with the number of new COVID-19 cases. The findings illustrate that there was a second peak in new cases that occurred 6-7 days after the initial peak. Such findings correspond with a mean incubation period. Results reflect a decrease in new cases in the following observation period. (*See Figure 1*)



Fig.1 No of saliva samples and nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal samples compared to No of new cases.
Blue columns: No of nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal samples
Orange columns: No of saliva samples
Grey area: New cases confirmed by nasopharyngeal/oropharyngeal samples
Yellow area: New cases confirmed by saliva samples

Discussion

More evidence has been provided recently to support saliva as reliable sample type for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic using RT-PCR approach [6, 7, 8]. In recent ECDC recommendations saliva is already mentioned as useful sample [9, 10]. FDA has approved methods for SARS-CoV-2 testing in saliva in a number of laboratories [11, 12]. Saliva as a promising sample type has been included in IFCC COVID-19 Guidelines on Molecular, Serological, and Biochemical/Hematological Testing [13].

The high expression of ACE2 receptors in salivary gland cells is the main factor for virus affinity that could lead to active replication and spreading by saliva droplets in air during coughing or sneezing [14, 15].

The viral RNA has been shown to be quite stable in saliva and can be accepted for testing after transportation and storage within 24h and even up to 7 days [16]. Our stability testing confirmed that saliva samples stayed equally positive up to 24h. It is essential to establish standardized sample collection procedure, safe logistics and reliable testing methods that fulfills requirements of performance.

In analytical context saliva can have the same or even better performance in comparison to nasopharyngeal / oropharyngeal swabs [17]. It has been previously confirmed to be highly sensitive and specific at the early stage of infection 0-14 day after onset of symptoms or in asymptomatic cases [18,19]. Therefore, it is essential to take in consideration the relationship between the dynamics of viral load, Ct values and number of days after symptoms onset. As described in prior publications the CT value is important in determining the infectivity of a patient sample. Ct value above 34 does not emit infectious virus particles, but between 27-34 shows low viability of the viral load. Samples with a CT value of 13-17 show positive virus viability [20]. CT values may vary depending on the different assays up 5 cycles for the same sample [21]. Variation also appears due to quality of the material obtained and the types of treatment used [22]. Some variations we logically expected to get between the nasopharyngeal / oropharyngeal swabs and saliva sample types.

In our pilot testing from 44 positive saliva samples we find out slightly higher (13%) Ct values in pools, compare to individual test. Similar findings were published by other investigators [23]. This observed slight difference could permit safe use of saliva pooling for surveillance purposes with sufficient diagnostic accuracy.

The pooling strategies clearly described in the last update of COVID-19 testing strategies and objectives by ECDC [24].

There is an evidence of benefits from pooling in low prevalence countries with small proportion of positive samples- up to 5%. In recent publications in terms of saliva pooling it is indicated that for populations with prevalence less than 1% pools of 10 or 20 are more beneficial which is totally in agreement with our independent calculations. Comparing different pool size (usefulness and efficiency) correlation with test positivity rate, we concluded that a pool size of 10 is more efficient than a pool size of 5. The calculations are based on test price, reimbursement conditions and number of tests per sample (when using pooling strategy) [25].

The pooling strategy for self-collected saliva samples testing is the most optimal solution that saves the resources and time for diagnostic [26]. In our real-life pilot testing study of "peri-focal" population we successfully tested up to 30% of citizens of Kuldiga town in 3 days. The most important result was fast identification of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 positive persons and patients with mild symptoms to enable timely contact tracing and outbreak containment. Use of nasopharyngeal swabs would require more staff and time with possible patient compliance issues.

Additionally, next steps to be performed would be to implement innovative improvements in logistics of self-sampling kits to patients and back to the laboratory.

Conclusions

Our findings confirm the stability of RNA in saliva, acceptable performance in terms of specificity and sensitivity at early stage of infection and usefulness of pooling strategy in low prevalence population. Ct values reporting and detected/missing gene information is beneficial for interpretation of the results from many aspects, e.g. epidemiological investigation, determination if the patient is infectious at the current stage, etc. Self-sampling would make procedure faster, safer and less resources demanding. Purposeful and targeted distribution of samples significantly increased positivity rate. Saliva pool testing on large scale provided additional tool to contain the outbreak.

Ethical aspects

The study was approved by Ethics Committee of Pauls Stradins Clinical university hospital (record No 300720-18L).

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge all participants for their commitment to participate and time. Special thanks to all team members of trial in E.Gulbja Laboratory for their dedication and work which made this study possible.

Funding institution:

Ministry of Education and Science, Republic of Latvia. Funding number: VPP-COVID-2020/1-0008.

Additional funding was provided by E.Gulbja laboratory.

References:

[1] ECDC, "Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in the EU/EEA and the UK– ninth update". [seen online:24.04.20], [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/rapid-risk-assessment-coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-pandemic-ninth-update]

[2] WHO "Laboratory testing for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in suspected human cases" [seen online:24.04.20], [https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117]

[3] Mohammad Behnam et.al. COVID-19: Overcoming supply shortages for diagnostic testing. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/covid-19-overcoming-supply-shortages-for-diagnostic-testing

[4] ECDC, [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/cases-2019-ncov-eueea]

[5] Francisco M.Marty et al. How to Obtain a Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimen. NEJM, April 17, 2020, [seen online:24.04.20], [https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMvcm2010260?query=featured_home]

[6] Fakheran et al. Infectious Diseases of Poverty (2020) 9:100 [https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-020-00728-w]

[7] Hiba Hamid, Zohaib Khurshid at al. COVID-19 Pandemic and Role of Human Saliva as a Testing Biofluid in Point-of-Care Technology, [seen online:20.09.20], [https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32492721/]

[8] Czumbel LM, Kiss S, Farkas N, Mandel I, Hegyi AE, Nagy AK, et al. Saliva as a Candidate for COVID-19 Diagnostic Testing: A Meta-Analysis. medRxiv. 2020:2020.05.26.20112565.

[9] Objectives for COVID-19 testing in school settings – first update, 21 August 2020. Stockholm: ECDC; 2020.

[10] European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. COVID-19 testing strategies and objectives. 15 September 2020. ECDC: Stockholm; 2020.

[11] U.S. Food & Drug Administration. Accelerated Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) Summary SARS-CoV-2 Assay (Rutgers Clinical Genomics Laboratory). [https://www.fda.gov/media/136875/download]

[12] Rutgers. Rutgers launches genetic testing service for new Coronavirus. Available at: [https://www.rutgers.edu/news/rutgerslaunches-genetic-testing-service-new-coronavirus]. Accessed April2020

[13] Bohn et al.: FCC interim guidelines on molecular testing of SARS-CoV-2 infection. [https://doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2020-1412]. Published online: 07 Oct 2020

[14] Liu L, Wei Q, Alvarez X, et al. Epithelial cells lining salivary gland ducts are early target cells of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus infection in the upper respiratory tracts of rhesus macaques. J Virol 2011; 85:4025–30.

[15] Xu J, Li Y, Gan F, et al. Salivary glands: potential reservoirs for COVID-19 asymptomatic infection. J Dent Res [published ahead of print April 9,2020] doi: 10.1177/0022034520918518

[16] Ott, I. M. et al. Simply saliva: stability of SARS-CoV-2 detection negates the need for expensive collection devices. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS) (2020) doi:10.1101/2020.08.03.20165233.

[17] Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P, et al. Saliva is more sensitive for SARS-CoV-2 detection in COVID-19 patients than nasopharyngeal swabs. medRxiv. 2020:2020.04.16.20067835.

[18] ZhangW, Du RH, Li B, et al. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. Emerg Microbes Infect 2020; 9:386–389

[19] Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, et al. Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2, N Engl J Med 2020; 383:1283-1286

[20] Bernard La Scola et al. Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases volume 39, pages1059–1061(2020)

[21] Nalla AK, Casto AM, Huang MW, et al. Comparative performance of SARS-CoV-2 detection assays using seven different primer-probe sets and one assay kit. J Clin Microbiol. 2020 May 26;58(6)e00557-20.

[22] Rodino KG, Espy MJ, Buckwalter SP, et al. Evaluation of saline, phosphate-buffered saline, and minimum essential medium as potential alternatives to viral transport media for SARS-CoV-2 testing. J Clin Microbiol. 2020 June;58(6)e00590-20.

[23] Stefan Lohse et al. Pooling of samples for testing for SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic people. The Lancet Infect Dis 2020, [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(20)30362-5/fulltext]

[24] ECDC,[https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/covid-19-testing-strategies-and-objectives]

[25] Francesca Regen et al. A Simple Approach to Optimum Pool Size for Pooled SARS-CoV-2 Testing. IJID 4560, [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.08.063]

[26] Andrew Fogarty, Amelia Joseph, *Dominick Shaw. Pooled saliva samples for COVID-19 surveillance programme. The Lancet, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30444-6]