

1 **Large parallel screen of saliva and nasopharyngeal swabs in a test center**
2 **setting proofs utility of saliva as alternate specimen for SARS-CoV-2**
3 **detection by RT-PCR**

4
5 Michael Huber¹, Peter W. Schreiber^{2*}, Thomas Scheier^{2*}, Annette Audigé¹, Roberto Buonomano³,
6 Alain Rudiger⁴, Dominique L. Braun², Gerhard Eich⁵, Dagmar Keller⁶, Barbara Hasse², Christoph
7 Berger⁷, Amapola Manrique¹, Huldrych F. Günthard^{1,2}, Jürg Böni¹, Alexandra Trkola^{1§}

8
9 ¹ Institute of Medical Virology, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

10 ² Division of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Epidemiology, University Hospital Zurich and
11 University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

12 ³ Division of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Hygiene, Spital Limmattal, Schlieren, Switzerland

13 ⁴ Division of Medicine, Spital Limmattal, Schlieren, Switzerland

14 ⁵ Division of Infectious Diseases, Hospital Hygiene and Occupational Medicine, Stadtspital Triemli,
15 Zurich, Switzerland

16 ⁶ Emergency Unit, University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

17 ⁷ Division of Infectious Diseases and Hospital Epidemiology, University Children's Hospital Zurich,
18 Zurich, Switzerland.

19
20 * shared contribution

21 [§] corresponding author

22
23 Key points: Comparison with nasopharyngeal swabs in a large test center-based study shows that
24 saliva is a reliable and convenient material for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR in adults and
25 children.

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background**

28 A high volume of testing followed by rapid isolation and quarantine measures is critical to the
29 containment of SARS-CoV-2. RT-PCR of nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS) has been established as
30 sensitive gold standard for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Yet, additional test strategies are
31 in demand to increase and broaden testing opportunities. As one attractive option, saliva has been
32 discussed as an alternative to NPS as its collection is simple, non-invasive, suited for children and
33 amenable for mass- and home-testing.

34 **Methods**

35 Here, we report on the outcome of a head-to-head comparison of SARS-CoV-2 detection by RT-PCR
36 in saliva and nasopharyngeal swab (NPS) of 1187 adults and children reporting to outpatient test
37 centers and an emergency unit for an initial SARS-CoV-2 screen.
38

39 **Results**

40 In total, 252 individuals were tested SARS-CoV-2 positive in either NPS or saliva. SARS-CoV-2 RT-
41 PCR results in the two specimens showed a high agreement (Overall Percent Agreement = 98.0%).
42 Despite lower viral loads in saliva, we observed sensitive detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva up to a
43 threshold of Ct 33 in the corresponding NPS (Positive Percent Agreement = 97.7%). In patients with
44 Ct above 33 in NPS, agreement rate dropped but still reaches notable 55.9%.
45

46 **Conclusion**

47 The comprehensive parallel analysis of NPS and saliva reported here establishes saliva as a reliable
48 specimen for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 that can be readily added to the diagnostic portfolio to
49 increase and facilitate testing.
50

51 **Introduction**

52 The current gold standard for the diagnosis of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2
53 (SARS-CoV-2) infection relies on the detection by quantitative reverse-transcription polymerase chain
54 reaction (RT-qPCR) in nasopharyngeal swabs. A range of RT-qPCRs methods have been developed
55 and proven highly sensitive, accurate and reliable [1, 2]. Nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS) are considered
56 the optimal material for detection, particularly in early infection [2]. However, viral load in the
57 nasopharynx can wane in later disease stages, while the virus remains detectable in alternate specimen
58 such as bronchoalveolar lavage or sputum, necessitating a validation of diagnostics tests in these
59 specimens [3-5]. In addition, to overcome limitations in mass screening for early detection of SARS-
60 CoV-2, saliva has been considered as alternate material to NPS [6-10]. NPS collection requires trained
61 personnel while saliva collection is comparatively easy, needs little instruction and is amenable for
62 self-collection. Importantly, saliva collection is non-invasive and it does not create discomfort for the
63 patient. Saliva would thus be of particular advantage for testing children, for whom often parents and
64 pediatricians refrain from testing due to the need to conduct a nasopharyngeal swab. Likewise, the
65 possibility to switch to saliva would also be a relief for adults when frequent testing or large scale
66 screens are required, respectively. Further, considering the current high level of SARS-CoV-2 testing
67 by RT-PCR and antigen tests, which both require nasopharyngeal swabs, shortage in swab supplies
68 may occur. Establishing the possibility to switch to saliva collection in this situation to allow RT-PCR
69 testing to continue is thus highly advisable.

70 Several recent studies have evaluated saliva as alternate specimen [6-29]. While these studies
71 generally agree that detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva is possible, comparative analyses came to
72 different conclusions, with some studies noting a better performance of saliva, while others found a
73 substantially lower sensitivity. With few exceptions, patient cohorts tested thus far were in most
74 studies relatively small and often included both hospitalized individuals with advanced SARS-CoV-2
75 infection as well as outpatients who were newly screened for infection, leaving uncertainty in which
76 situation saliva may be best used. The overall sensitivity and thus utility of saliva in comparison to
77 NPS remains thus differentially debated and needs to be defined. To resolve these issues, we
78 embarked on a large-scale head-to-head comparison of saliva and NPS in a test center setting. The
79 high number of individuals tested (N = 1187) and the high number of positives detected (N = 252),
80 paired with a true-to-life screening in test centers, empowered a highly controlled analysis of
81 agreement and supports the applicability of saliva in routine testing.

82 **Materials and Methods**

83 *Study population*

84 Adults and children (N = 1187) opting for a voluntary SARS-CoV-2 test at one of five participating
85 test centers were included. Four centers were dedicated test centers for outpatients and one was an
86 emergency care unit. The study population comprised individuals with SARS-CoV-2 related
87 symptoms based on Swiss testing criteria and asymptomatic individuals with relevant exposure to a
88 SARS-CoV-2 index case. Hospitalized patients were not included. Individuals were included without
89 further selection to avoid skewing. Information on symptomatic or asymptomatic status was collected
90 as part of the regular procedure for SARS-COV-2 testing and reporting based on self-evaluation
91 (asymptomatic/mild/strong) by the participants, as they did not see a physician in the test center
92 setting.

93 *Ethical approval*

94 The Zurich Cantonal Ethics Commission waived the necessity for a formal ethical evaluation based on
95 the Swiss law on research on human subjects, as the collection of saliva in parallel to a scheduled
96 nasopharyngeal swab induces no risk and no additional personal data beyond the usual information on
97 symptoms and duration required by the FOPH for all SARS-CoV-2 tests in Switzerland was collected
98 (Req-2020-00398). Due to the ethics waiver no informed consent had to be collected.

99 *Sample collection*

100 Test centers were advised to use their regular swab and virus transport medium (VTM)/universal
101 transport medium (UTM) for nasopharyngeal sampling. Transport media used by the centers included
102 Cobas PCR Medium (Roche), Liquid amies preservation medium (Copan), Virus Preservative
103 Medium (Improviral), and in-house VTM (HEPES, DMEM, FCS, antibiotics, antimycotics).
104 Collection kits for saliva were supplied to the test centers: one tube for saliva collection (Sarsted
105 62.555.001) and a separate tube with 3 ml VTM (Axonlab AL0607). The procedure for saliva
106 collection was described in an instruction leaflet (Figure 1). In Study Arm 1, “Basic”, individuals were
107 asked to clear the throat thoroughly and collect saliva one or two times into the same tube (N = 835).
108 As a guidance for the volume of saliva to be sampled, participants were instructed by study teams to
109 collect 0.5 – 1 ml (approx. a teaspoon full). To investigate a possible influence on SARS-CoV-2
110 detection in saliva through differences in saliva collection, a subset of patients (N = 352) in Study Arm
111 2, “Enhanced”, was asked to clear their throat three times thoroughly and collect saliva into the same
112 tube. Emphasis in this study arm was on enhanced throat clearing to ascertain sampling material from
113 the posterior oropharynx. Immediately after saliva collection, VTM was added to the crude saliva and
114 the content mixed through gentle twisting. Saliva was collected directly after NPS and both specimens
115 immediately sent for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing.

116 *Quantitative SARS-CoV-2 PCR*

117 NPS and Saliva were processed identically using the procedures established for NPS in the diagnostics
118 laboratory of the Institute of Medical Virology. 500 ul of NPS or saliva in VTM were diluted in 500 ul
119 of Nuclisens easyMAG Lysis Buffer (BioMérieux), centrifuged (2000 rpm, 5 min) and analyzed with
120 the Cobas SARS-CoV-2 IVD test (Roche) on a Cobas 6800. All testing for NPS and saliva was done
121 in parallel on the same day. SARS-CoV-2 detection was further quantified using SARS-CoV-2
122 Frankfurt 1 RNA as calibrator (European Virus Archive, 004N-02005) allowing to report both Ct and
123 genome equivalents.

124 *Verification by in-house SARS-CoV-2 E-gene and GAPDH PCR*

125 Discordant results of the Cobas SARS-CoV-2 test between NPS and saliva were re-analyzed using an
126 in-house RT-qPCR targeting the E-gene based on Corman et al. [1]. GAPDH was measured as input
127 control as described [30]. Both assays used AgPath-ID One-Step RT-PCR chemistry (Ambion,
128 ThermoFisher).

129 *Data analysis*

130 E-gene Ct values were used for comparison. If E-gene reported negative but ORF1 reported positive
131 by the Cobas SARS-CoV-2 IVD test, the ORF1 result was considered and the respective sample rated
132 positive for SARS-CoV-2. This was the case for one saliva sample.

133 Data was analyzed using R (version 4.0.2) [31]. 95% confidence intervals were calculated with the
134 epiR package (version 1.0.15). Method comparison and regression analysis (Passing-Bablok
135 Regression [32] and Bland-Altman Plot [33]) was performed with the mcr package (version 1.2.1).

136 **Results**

137 *Head-to-head comparison of saliva and nasopharyngeal swabs as material for SARS-CoV-2 detection* 138 *by RT-PCR*

139 In our protocol we advised participants to collect approx. 0.5 ml saliva into a wide (30 ml, 30 mm
140 diameter) tube (Figure 1). Initial attempts in a pilot experiment with smaller tubes (15 ml, 17 mm
141 diameter) showed that spitting into narrower tubes is problematic for some participants, leading to a
142 contamination of the outside of the tube with saliva in some cases. Sampling with the wider tubes was
143 in contrast unproblematic and thus deemed safe. Saliva sampling in children was found equally
144 unproblematic, children were collaborating and able to expectorate.

145 Our study included five different test sites to ensure that data are not skewed due to specific
146 procedures at one site. In Study Arm “Basic” (N = 835) saliva sampling was done with one-time throat
147 clearing followed by expectorating saliva one to two times. In Study Arm “Enhanced” (N = 352)
148 participants cleared their throat 3x times followed by spitting. Saliva was mixed with VTM

149 immediately after collection. The thus diluted material was unproblematic for further processing in the
150 laboratory, no complications in pipetting or invalid results due to the intrinsic viscosity of saliva or
151 congealing were observed.

152 *High positive predictive agreement of SARS-CoV-2 detection in saliva and nasopharyngeal swabs*

153 Adults and children that qualified for a regular SARS-CoV-2 test according to the FOPH and reported
154 to one of the participating test centers or emergency units were enrolled from October 20, 2020 to
155 November 4, 2020. In total 1187 individuals (male 54.8%/female 45.2%) were included (Table 1).
156 Median age was 35 with an age range of 5 – 98 years. 89 participants were under the age of 18. The
157 majority of participants were symptomatic 71.9%. Median Days of symptoms ranged from 1 to 30
158 with a median of 2 days. The overall daily positivity rate of SARS-CoV-2 tests by RT-PCR during the
159 study period at our diagnostics unit ranged between 14% and 22%. The positivity rate amongst study
160 participants was 21%.

161 Across both study arms NPS and saliva results showed a high overall percent agreement (OPA = 98%)
162 and good positive percent agreement (PPA = 91.9%, Table 2 and 3). In only 24 cases discordant
163 results were observed, with 20 saliva samples and 4 NPS showing a negative results when the other
164 specimen tested positive (Figure 2, Table 2). To investigate if discordant results are due to inadequate
165 sampling, detection problems in the RT-PCR, or reflect true negatives in the respective sample
166 material, all discordant pairs were retested using an in-house RT-PCR for the E-gene in conjunction
167 with a GAPDH measurement to control for input. Mean levels for GAPDH input were Ct = 24.6 (SD
168 = 2.7) for NPS and Ct = 24.7 (SD = 2.1) for saliva. One false-negative saliva sample (E-gene Ct 19.7
169 in NPS) did not contain any material (GAPDH Ct > 40). Excluding this sample, the PPA in the NPS
170 Ct 15 – 20 range reaches 100% (Table 4).

171 Re-assessment with an in-house E-gene PCR confirmed all discordant results. For one case with a
172 negative NPS, a second swab was collected the following day. This sample showed a high viral load,
173 confirming an unsuccessful swab collection the day earlier.

174 Of note, in our head-to-head comparison both NPS (N = 1) and saliva (N = 5; N = 4 excluding the
175 sample that did not contain saliva) produced false-negative results in cases where the other specimen
176 showed a high viral load (Ct < 30) highlighting variability in collection for both specimens.

177 *SARS-CoV-2 loads in saliva and nasopharyngeal swab correlate*

178 Correlation analysis of sample pairs that both tested positive (N = 228) confirmed that saliva and NPS
179 results are in good agreement (Figure 3A). Notably, Ct values in saliva were on average 4.79 higher
180 than the corresponding Ct in NPS. This corresponds to a factor 28 lower viral load (Figure 3B).
181 Notably though, at high Ct values, this difference was less pronounced possibly adding to the high
182 PPA of detection in saliva at low viral load in the corresponding NPS.

183 *Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva from symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals*

184 Our study recorded severity of symptoms (asymptomatic/mild/strong) at the sampling time point by
185 self-evaluation (Figure 4A). We observed a good positive percent agreement of saliva and NPS in
186 symptomatic individuals (PPA = 92.3%). In line with a trend to lower viral loads, i.e. higher Ct values
187 in absence of symptoms (asymptomatic median Ct 28.4; mild symptoms median Ct 23.7; strong
188 symptoms median Ct 21.6), the PPA was lower in asymptomatic participants (PPA = 84.2%). We
189 observed decreasing viral loads with ongoing symptomatic infection in both saliva and NPS,
190 highlighting a transient window of detection in the upper respiratory tract. Interestingly, changes in
191 saliva were overall less dynamic than in NPS (Figure 4B).

192 *Intensified throat clearing with saliva collection is favorable*

193 To investigate if the intensity of saliva collection has an impact, we analyzed the two study arms of
194 saliva collection separately. Participants were either asked to clear the throat thoroughly (“Basic”, N =
195 835) or in an intensified protocol to clear it three times (“Enhanced”, N = 352) and collect about 0.5 –
196 1 ml of saliva. We found that intensified saliva collection appears favorable for samples with low viral
197 load. With the enhanced sampling protocol, PPA with NPS of ct >33 reached 66.7% (CI 35% - 90%),
198 compared to 50.0% (CI 28% - 72%) with the basic protocol (Figure 5 and Table 5). Differences were,
199 however, not statically significant, highlighting robust detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva in the two
200 collection procedures tested.

201 **Discussion**

202 In the present study we sought to devise and evaluate a saliva sampling strategy that provides i)
203 representative sampling of virus containing material, ii) easy and safe sampling in adults and children,
204 iii) possibility for home collection, iv) straight forward processing in the laboratory.

205 We opted for a saliva collection procedure where participants clear their throat to first generate saliva
206 from the back of the throat and then expectorate the saliva into an empty container. We considered
207 clearing the throat important to sample material from the posterior oropharynx where SARS-CoV-2
208 sampling by oropharyngeal swabs is known to be efficient [34, 35]. While gargling with saline or
209 buffer solutions has been suggested as a possibility to sample saliva from the deep throat [36, 37], we
210 rated this procedure as less operable as the gargling solution would need to be optimized for taste to be
211 accepted by individuals, could not include preservatives, and gargling itself may potentially generate
212 aerosols. In addition, gargling is not practicable for many smaller children for whom we in particular
213 sought to create increased possibilities for SARS-CoV-2 testing as NPS collection for children is often
214 not practical.

215 Our study demonstrates an excellent agreement of saliva in the head-to-head comparison with NPS
216 and thus recommends saliva as alternate material for SARS-CoV-2 detection by RT-PCR. Up to a Ct
217 33 (equivalent to approximately 26'000 genome copies/ml) in the corresponding NPS, a notably high

218 PPA (97.6%) is reached. Of note, virus loads in an even lower range are considered to impose a
219 marginal risk for transmission as suggested by contact tracing and in vitro culturing studies [38-40].
220 Considering the observed PPA in detection, saliva may safely be envisaged as substitute for NPS
221 detection in a range of settings. Possible scenarios include i) sampling of children, ii) home collection
222 in quarantine, iii) test centers without trained medical personnel (e.g. schools, universities,
223 companies), iv) non-irritating alternative for persons that need frequent testing due to their occupation
224 or health status, v) fast large-scale screens in institutions (e.g. elderly homes). In situations where
225 besides SARS-CoV-2 other respiratory viruses, e.g., Influenza and RSV, need to be excluded, NPS
226 should, however, remain the standard material of choice as it allows rapid detection with multiplex-
227 PCR from a single specimen. In addition, if SARS-CoV-2 infection has to be ruled out with highest
228 possible sensitivity (e.g. in transplantation), NPS should remain the standard procedure.
229 The majority of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva represents likely virus secreted from infected cells in the
230 nasopharynx and is not locally produced. Collecting material from the posterior oropharynx is thus
231 important. This is also highlighted in our study as the collection protocol with intensified throat
232 clearing shows a trend to increased PPA at low viral loads.
233 It remains possible that eating or drinking shortly before collection may decrease viral content in the
234 oral cavity and throat. In the present study, neither eating, drinking nor smoking was controlled as
235 study subjects came for an elective analysis by NPS and thus could only be informed about the saliva
236 sampling on site immediately before the collection. Abstaining from food and beverage uptake shortly
237 (1h) before saliva collection could be considered in forth-coming applications of saliva as test
238 material, as it may increase the efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 detection in saliva even further.
239 In summary, our analysis rates saliva as valid alternate specimen for SARS-CoV-2 detection by RT-
240 PCR. Saliva collection is non-invasive, thus not strenuous for patients, does not need trained
241 personnel, allows collection at any location, and allows self-collection. Importantly, as we show here,
242 saliva collection does not require any adjustments in the diagnostics tests; established RT-qPCR can
243 be used. Combined with the high reliability in detecting SARS-CoV-2 infection as demonstrated in
244 our head-to-head comparison with the standard NPS, increasing and facilitating test efforts by
245 monitoring SARS-CoV-2 infection in saliva is rapidly attainable and needs to be considered.

246 **Acknowledgments**

247 We thank Martin Ringer and the staff of the participating test centers for coordinating the sample
248 collection, the staff of the Institute of Medical Virology diagnostics unit, sample triage and
249 administration for their support and Urs Karrer and Alexander Wepf for helpful discussions.

250 **Funding**

251 This work was supported by grants of the Swiss federal office of public health (FOPH) and the
252 University of Zurich Foundation to A.T. Roche Diagnostics supported the study with PCR kits and
253 consumables. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to
254 publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

255 References

- 256 1. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by
257 real-time RT-PCR. **2020**; 25(3).
- 258 2. WHO. Target product profiles for priority diagnostics to support response to the COVID-19
259 pandemic v.1.0. Geneva, **2020** Sep 29.
- 260 3. Weiss A, Jellingsø M, Sommer MOA. Spatial and temporal dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 in
261 COVID-19 patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EBioMedicine* **2020**; 58: 102916.
- 262 4. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of
263 COVID-19. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26(5): 672-5.
- 264 5. Fajnzylber J, Regan J, Coxen K, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral load is associated with increased
265 disease severity and mortality. *Nature communications* **2020**; 11(1): 5493.
- 266 6. Berenger BM, Conly JM, Fonseca K, et al. Saliva collected in universal transport media is an
267 effective, simple and high-volume amenable method to detect SARS-CoV-2. *Clin Microbiol*
268 *Infect* **2020**.
- 269 7. Chen JH, Yip CC, Poon RW, et al. Evaluating the use of posterior oropharyngeal saliva in a
270 point-of-care assay for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Emerging microbes & infections* **2020**;
271 9(1): 1356-9.
- 272 8. Moreno-Contreras J, Espinoza MA, Sandoval-Jaime C, et al. Saliva Sampling and Its Direct
273 Lysis, an Excellent Option To Increase the Number of SARS-CoV-2 Diagnostic Tests in
274 Settings with Supply Shortages. *J Clin Microbiol* **2020**; 58(10).
- 275 9. Valentine-Graves M, Hall E, Guest JL, et al. At-home self-collection of saliva, oropharyngeal
276 swabs and dried blood spots for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis and serology: Post-collection
277 acceptability of specimen collection process and patient confidence in specimens. *PloS one*
278 **2020**; 15(8): e0236775.
- 279 10. Yokota I, Shane PY, Okada K, et al. Mass screening of asymptomatic persons for SARS-CoV-
280 2 using saliva. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases*
281 *Society of America* **2020**: ciaa1388.
- 282 11. Azzi L, Carcano G, Gianfagna F, et al. Saliva is a reliable tool to detect SARS-CoV-2. *The*
283 *Journal of infection* **2020**; 81(1): e45-e50.
- 284 12. Fakheran O, Dehghannejad M, Khademi A. Saliva as a diagnostic specimen for detection of
285 SARS-CoV-2 in suspected patients: a scoping review. *Infectious diseases of poverty* **2020**;
286 9(1): 100.
- 287 13. Iwasaki S, Fujisawa S, Nakakubo S, et al. Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 detection in
288 nasopharyngeal swab and saliva. *The Journal of infection* **2020**; 81(2): e145-e7.
- 289 14. Iwata K, Yoshimura K. A concern regarding estimated sensitivities and specificities of
290 nasopharyngeal and saliva specimens for SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Clinical infectious diseases :*
291 *an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* **2020**.
- 292 15. Jamal AJ, Mozafarihashjin M, Coomes E, et al. Sensitivity of nasopharyngeal swabs and
293 saliva for the detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).
294 *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of*
295 *America* **2020**.
- 296 16. Lai CKC, Chen Z, Lui G, et al. Prospective study comparing deep-throat saliva with other
297 respiratory tract specimens in the diagnosis of novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19). *The*
298 *Journal of infectious diseases* **2020**.
- 299 17. Landry ML, Criscuolo J, Peaper DR. Challenges in use of saliva for detection of SARS CoV-2
300 RNA in symptomatic outpatients. *Journal of clinical virology : the official publication of the*
301 *Pan American Society for Clinical Virology* **2020**; 130: 104567.
- 302 18. Leung EC, Chow VC, Lee MK, Lai RW. Deep throat saliva as an alternative diagnostic
303 specimen type for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Med Virol* **2020**.
- 304 19. McCormick-Baw C, Morgan K, Gaffney D, et al. Saliva as an Alternate Specimen Source for
305 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Symptomatic Patients Using Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-
306 2. *Journal of clinical microbiology* **2020**; 58(8).
- 307 20. Miguères M, Mengelle C, Dimeglio C, et al. Saliva sampling for diagnosing SARS-CoV-2
308 infections in symptomatic patients and asymptomatic carriers. *Journal of clinical virology : the*
309 *official publication of the Pan American Society for Clinical Virology* **2020**; 130: 104580.

- 310 21. Pasomsub E, Watcharananan SP, Boonyawat K, et al. Saliva sample as a non-invasive
311 specimen for the diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019: a cross-sectional study. *Clin*
312 *Microbiol Infect* **2020**.
- 313 22. Procop GW, Shrestha NK, Vogel S, et al. A Direct Comparison of Enhanced Saliva to
314 Nasopharyngeal Swab for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Symptomatic Patients. *J Clin*
315 *Microbiol* **2020**; 58(11).
- 316 23. Rao M, Rashid FA, Sabri F, et al. Comparing nasopharyngeal swab and early morning saliva
317 for the identification of SARS-CoV-2. *Clinical infectious diseases* : an official publication of
318 the Infectious Diseases Society of America **2020**.
- 319 24. To KK, Tsang OT, Chik-Yan Yip C, et al. Consistent detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in
320 saliva. *Clinical infectious diseases* : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society
321 of America **2020**.
- 322 25. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior
323 oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-
324 2: an observational cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious diseases* **2020**; 20(5): 565-74.
- 325 26. Uwamino Y, Nagata M, Aoki W, et al. Accuracy and stability of saliva as a sample for reverse
326 transcription PCR detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of clinical pathology* **2020**.
- 327 27. Williams E, Bond K, Zhang B, Putland M, Williamson DA. Saliva as a Noninvasive
328 Specimen for Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of clinical microbiology* **2020**; 58(8).
- 329 28. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, et al. Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab
330 Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 383(13): NEJMc2016359-
331 1286.
- 332 29. Zhu J, Guo J, Xu Y, Chen X. Viral dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva from infected patients.
333 *The Journal of infection* **2020**; 81(3): e48-e50.
- 334 30. Cohrs RJ, Randall J, Smith J, et al. Analysis of individual human trigeminal ganglia for latent
335 herpes simplex virus type 1 and varicella-zoster virus nucleic acids using real-time PCR.
336 *Journal of Virology* **2000**; 74(24): 11464-71.
- 337 31. Team RDC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing: R Foundation for
338 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, **2005**.
- 339 32. Passing H, Bablok. A new biometrical procedure for testing the equality of measurements
340 from two different analytical methods. Application of linear regression procedures for method
341 comparison studies in clinical chemistry, Part I. *J Clin Chem Clin Biochem* **1983**; 21(11): 709-
342 20.
- 343 33. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of
344 clinical measurement. *The Lancet* **1986**; 1(8476): 307-10.
- 345 34. Patel MR, Carroll D, Ussery E, et al. Performance of Oropharyngeal Swab Testing Compared
346 With Nasopharyngeal Swab Testing for Diagnosis of Coronavirus Disease 2019—United
347 States, January 2020–February 2020. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2020**.
- 348 35. Calame A, Mazza L, Renzoni A, Kaiser L, Schibler M. Sensitivity of nasopharyngeal,
349 oropharyngeal, and nasal wash specimens for SARS-CoV-2 detection in the setting of
350 sampling device shortage. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases*
351 **2020**.
- 352 36. Malecki M, Lüsebrink J, Teves S, Wendel AF. Pharynx gargle samples are suitable for SARS-
353 CoV-2 diagnostic use and save personal protective equipment and swabs. *Infect Control Hosp*
354 *Epidemiol* **2020**: 1-2.
- 355 37. Goldfarb DM, Tilley P, Al-Rawahi GN, et al. Self-collected Saline Gargle Samples as an
356 Alternative to Healthcare Worker Collected Nasopharyngeal Swabs for COVID-19 Diagnosis
357 in Outpatients. *medRxiv* : the preprint server for health sciences **2020**: 2020.09.13.20188334.
- 358 38. Busnadiego I, Fernbach S, Pohl MO, et al. Antiviral Activity of Type I, II, and III Interferons
359 Counterbalances ACE2 Inducibility and Restricts SARS-CoV-2. *mBio* **2020**; 11(5).
- 360 39. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, et al. Predicting infectious SARS-CoV-2 from diagnostic samples.
361 *Clinical infectious diseases* : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of
362 America **2020**.
- 363 40. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients
364 with COVID-2019. *Nature* **2020**; 581(7809): 465-9.
- 365

366 **Tables**

367 Table 1: Participant demographics

Total	1187
Male/Female (%)	650 (54.8%)/537 (45.2%)
Age median (range)	35 (5 – 98)
Symptomatic mild (%)	764 (64.4%)
Symptomatic strong (%)	89 (7.5%)
Asymptomatic (%)	291 (24.5%)
No information on symptoms (%)	43 (3.6%)
Median days of symptoms (range)	2 (1 – 30)

368

369

370 Table 2: Contingency table full cohort

	NPS positive	NPS negative	Total
Saliva positive	228	4	232
Saliva negative	20	935	955
Total	248	939	1187

371

372 Table 3: Agreement and Predictive Values

Saliva and NPS Agreement and Predictive Values (reference standard NPS, 95% CI)	
Positive Percent Agreement (PPA)	91.9% (87.8% - 95.0%)
Negative Percent Agreement (NPA)	99.6% (98.9% - 99.8%)
Overall Percent Agreement (OPA)	98.0% (97.0% - 98.7%)

373

374 Table 4: Positive Percent Agreement (PPA) stratified by NPS E-gene Ct-values

NPS (Ct)	>10-15	>15-20	>20-25	>25-30	>30-33	>33-35	>35-40
NPS positive	1	54	90	56	13	13	21
Saliva false negative	0	1 (0*)	2	2	0	5	10
PPA	100%	98.1% (100%*)	97.8%	96.4%	100%	61.5%	52.4%

*Excluding one sample that did not contain saliva as defined by GAPDH measurement.

375 *Table 5: Positive Percent Agreement (PPA) stratified by NPS E-gene Ct-values and saliva sampling*


NPS (Ct)	Full cohort (N = 1187)			Basic Sampling (N = 835)			Enhanced Sampling (N = 352)		
	all	>10-33	>33-40	all	>10-33	>33-40	all	>10-33	>33-40
NPS positive	248	214	34	183	161	22	65	53	12
Saliva false negative	20	5	15	16	5	11	4	0	4
PPA	91.9%	97.7%	55.9%	91.3%	96.9%	50.0%	93.8%	100%	66.7%

376

377 **Figures**

378 *Figure 1: Instruction leaflet for saliva collection*


379 Participants were asked to clear the throat and collect saliva into a collection tube (A). VTM was
380 added to the crude saliva immediately after collection (B), and the content was mixed through gentle
381 twisting (C).



382
383

384 *Figure 2: High agreement of SARS-CoV-2 detection in saliva and nasopharyngeal swabs*

385 Summary of the full cohort (N = 1187 study participants). Roche Cobas E-Gene Ct values of paired
386 NPS and saliva samples are depicted. neg = PCR negative; red dashed line equals identity.




387
388

389 *Figure 3: SARS-CoV-2 levels in saliva and nasopharyngeal swabs correlate*

390 A) Passing-Bablok Regression of E-gene Ct-values of NPS and saliva of all positive pairs from the full
391 cohort (N = 228; $p < 0.0001$). Red dashed line equals identity, blue line shows linear trend.

392 B) Bland-Altman Plot of E-gene Ct-values of NPS and saliva of all positive pairs from the full cohort
393 (N = 228).



394


395

396 *Figure 4: Viral loads in NPS and saliva decrease with ongoing infection*

397 A) E-gene Ct-values of NPS and saliva of all positive pairs from the full cohort (N = 226).


398 B) Duration of symptoms in symptomatic patients (N = 836) versus E-gene Ct value in saliva and

399 NPS. neg = PCR negative, red dashed line equals identity, blue line shows linear trend.



400

401 *Figure 5: Intensified saliva sampling increases low level SARS-COV-2 detection in saliva.*
402 E-gene Ct values of paired NPS and saliva samples of study arm “Basic” (1-2x saliva per tube; N =
403 835) and “Enhanced” saliva collection (3x saliva per tube; N = 352).



404