Usability of saliva collection devices for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics

Mary E. Petrone*[1†], Devyn Yolda-Carr*[1], Mallery Breban[1], Hannah Walsh[2], Orchid Allicock[1], Anne E. Watkins[1], Jessica E. Rothman[1], Shelli F. Farhadian[2], Nathan D. Grubaugh[1], Anne L. Wyllie[1†]
*These authors contributed equally
[1]Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT 06510,
[2]Department of Medicine, Section of Infectious Diseases, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, 06510, USA
[†]Correspondence: Mary E. Petrone (mary.petrone@yale.edu), Anne L. Wyllie (anne.wyllie@yale.edu)

ABSTRACT
There is an urgent need to expand testing for SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory pathogens as the global community struggles to control the COVID-19 pandemic. Current diagnostic methods can be affected by supply chain bottlenecks and require the assistance of medical professionals, impeding the implementation of large-scale testing. Self-collection of saliva may solve these problems because it can be completed without specialized training and uses generic materials. In this study, we observed thirty individuals who self-collected saliva using four different collection devices and analyzed their feedback. These devices enabled the safe collection of saliva that was acceptable for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic testing.

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated the need for scalable methods designed to detect respiratory infections in the general population. Self-collection of saliva for diagnostic testing is one such method. Saliva is an equally sensitive substrate for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 as nasopharyngeal swabs (Wyllie et al. 2020; Byrne et al. 2020). There is also a growing body of evidence that saliva can be used to detect other respiratory viruses and even co-infections (Yoon et al. 2017; Kim et al. 2017; Robinson et al. 2008). Self-collection of saliva is non-invasive and, unlike collection of nasopharyngeal swabs, does not require specialized training to perform (Marty, Chen, and Verrill 2020). Moreover, SARS-CoV-2 RNA is stable in saliva at a broad range of temperatures and for an extended period of time, obviating the need for preservatives or buffers that would increase the costs of collection tubes (Ott et al. 2020).

Despite these advantages, if saliva is collected improperly, it is difficult to handle in the laboratory (Landry, Criscuolo, and Peaper 2020). Improper self-collection may also pose a safety risk if potentially biohazardous materials are mishandled. Therefore, it is essential that self-collection of saliva is safe and can produce testable samples. Equally important is establishing the acceptability of self-collection among the general public because methods that are deemed uncomfortable, difficult, or confusing are unlikely to gain traction in the population.

In this study, we evaluated the experience of thirty individuals who self-collected saliva using four different saliva collection devices: a P1000 pipette tip, a Salimetrics Saliva Collection Aid, a funnel, and a bulb pipette (**Fig. 1a**). We found that all four devices enabled the consistent and safe collection of true saliva that was acceptable for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic testing with a RT-qPCR-based assay (Vogels et al. 2020). Our findings demonstrate the suitability of multiple device options for use in saliva collection kits. This variety may not only help to avoid supply chain bottlenecks but could also promote broader acceptance of this method by improving the ease of self-collection.

METHODS

Ethics

This study was conducted in accordance with an Institutional Review Board protocol reviewed and approved by the Yale University Human Research Protection Program (IRB Protocol ID: 2000028394).

Study design

We enrolled hirty participants between the ages of 20 and 80 years were enrolled in this study. Individuals who had previously provided a saliva sample, who had relevant, career-level laboratory experience, or who were experiencing symptoms of respiratory infection were excluded from enrollment. Once informed consent was provided, participants received a collection kit containing (**1**) the four saliva collection devices (**Fig. 1a**), (**2**) corresponding collection instructions (**Supplement**), (**3**) a biohazard bag, and (**4**) five alcohol wipes. Participants self-collected four saliva samples consecutively and in a randomized order. Members of the study team observed these collections via a video platform. The observer turned off video and audio on their device for the duration of the four collections. Both the observer and the participant completed a survey about their experience following each collection, scoring responses on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) (**Supp. Fig. 1**). All of the samples (n = 120) were tested for SARS-CoV-2 using SalivaDirect (Vogels et al. 2020). A laboratory survey assessing the sample quality was completed by the technician during testing.

Statistical analysis

Participant, observer, and laboratory survey questions were tested for internal reliability with Cronbach's alpha using R v.4.0.2 and for significant statistical differences across devices using one-way ANOVA in GraphPad v.8.4.3. Participants who did not provide a response for all four devices were excluded from the analysis for the corresponding question (maximum of 6 for question 10). For the laboratory surveys, responses to questions 2, 3, and 4 were identical across devices and therefore could not be assessed using one-way ANOVA. In these

cases, we reported the mean and standard deviation. Two questions from the observer survey (6 and 7) were excluded from analysis because they could not be observed consistently during the collections.

RESULTS

The four collections devices were deemed usable by the study participants, but individual preference influenced their relative acceptability. We aimed to enroll participants who represented a range of racial and educational backgrounds (**Table 1a**). In 100% of the observed collections, study participants appeared confident in their ability to complete the collection correctly (**Supp. Fig. 1b, 2b**). The majority of participants (93%) understood the importance of following the instructions carefully to avoid incorrect test results, and during only two collections (1.67%), participants appeared to not adequately follow these instructions for proper sample collection (**Supp. Fig. 1a, 2a**).

Of the 10 participant survey questions, only Question 5 ("Was collecting the sample difficult in general?") varied statistically significantly across devices; however, this question was found to not be internally reliable (**Supp. Table 1**). In this case, the bulb pipette scored the least favorably (mean = 3.1) compared to the other devices (pipette tip, mean = 2; funnel, mean = 2.3; collection aid, mean = 1.7) (**Supp. Fig. 1a, 2a**). Participants commented that the bulb pipette introduced bubbles and caused discomfort if it suctioned the inside of their mouth (**Table 1b**). Despite this feedback, all participants provided a sufficient volume of saliva for testing with all four devices, the majority did not think they required assistance during the sample collection (93%), and in only 18 collections (16%), participants did not feel confident that they had collected the sample correctly with the bulb pipette (**Fig. 1c**). Similarly, observers reported that the majority of participants did not appear to struggle with the collection process (115/120, 95.8%, **Supp. Fig. 2b**).

In addition to answering the survey questions, participants were given the opportunity to provide general feedback. Each device received a range of comments from participants reflecting differences in personal preference (**Table 1b**). For example, though the bulb pipette received the largest number of negative comments (n = 11), one participant stated it was their favorite of the four devices. Interestingly, there was no general consensus around an overall preferred device; however, the size of the devices was a common theme among participant feedback. Some participants (4/30, 13%) found the pipette tip and collection aid to be too small, whereas the large size of the funnel and its collection tube were noted to be an advantage. More research is needed to determine which types of devices may be most suitable for specific demographic groups, but it is likely that providing a range of options will promote the general acceptability of saliva self-collection for pathogen diagnostic testing.

Table 1: Diversity in participant demographics and participant experience with self-collection. (a) Participant demographics. **(b)** Comments from participant surveys. The comments presented here are representative but not exhaustive. *Abbreviations:* No. = number

(a)

Category	No. (%)
Sex	
Male	11 (37)
Female	19 (63)
Age	
18-29	7 (23)
30-39	16 (53)
40-49	4 (13)
50-59	0 (0)
60-70	1 (3)
70+	2 (7)
Education	
High School/GED	2 (7)
Bachelors	7 (23)
Masters	10 (33)
PhD/MD	11 (37)
Race	
Black/African American	4 (13)
Hispanic/Latino	4 (13)
Asian/South Asian	6 (20)
White	15 (50)
Native America	1 (3)

(b)

Pipette tip	Collection Aid	Funnel	Bulb Pipette
"Easiest so far."	"Liked the most."	"Very easy!"	"Least favorite."
"Messy."	"Was a little gross"	"Huge tube but clean."	"Lots of work for what felt like little yield."
"Bubbled up not sure what to do."	"Most difficult."	"I think this is the best one."	"Fav[orite] and way quickest method."
"The saliva was getting stuck at the pipette tip making it difficult to pass through."	"Easiest."	"Slow."	"It solved the spilling issue but created too much bubbles which makes it difficult to fillfull [sic] the amount."
"Least fav[orite] collection [because] saliva go [sic] everywhere"	"Favorite collection method but risk of saliva dribble."	"2nd easiest."	"Kept suctioning in mouth instead of saliva, created bubbles and did not collect saliva [efficiently]."

Self-collection of saliva was safe and yielded testable samples. Ensuring the proper handling of potentially biohazardous material is an essential consideration before saliva self-collection can be implemented on a large scale. Specifically, contamination of the collection tube with virus-infected saliva poses the greatest health and safety risk for this method. In our study, though some participants did contaminate the outside of their collection tubes with saliva during collection (30 collections, 27.8%), in all but three cases (2.5%), participants sanitized the collection tube with an alcohol wipe in accordance with the provided instructions. Additionally, 87% of participants washed or sanitized their hands before and after completing the collections.

Our secondary objective was to compare the quality of samples collected using each device. True saliva, which naturally pools in the mouth, can be easily handled in the laboratory. In contrast, saliva samples that are improperly collected may be problematic (Landry, Criscuolo, and Peaper 2020). We found that every sample could be tested for SARS-CoV-2 with SalivaDirect (Vogels et al. 2020). Specifically, laboratory survey responses confirmed that 100% of the samples were easy to pipette and of sufficient volume (**Fig. 1b**). Slight discoloration was noted in 18 samples (15%) and food particles were observed in 20 samples (5 participants, 16.7%), but this did not affect test results. No sample tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. The average cycle threshold (Ct) value for the negative control, RNAse P (RP), was within the expected range (23-28 Cts) for the majority of samples (73%), indicating that the use of different collection methods did not interfere with the diagnostic assay (**Fig. 1b**) (Wyllie et al. 2020). We did not find a significant difference between matched samples across devices using one-way ANOVA (**Fig. 1b, Supp. Fig. 3**).



Figure 1: Collection devices are inexpensive, easy to use, and yield testable samples. Survey responses were reported on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). (**a**) The four collection devices tested are inexpensive and provide users with a range of features to choose from. Prices are shown in US dollars. (**b**) The quality of the samples was adequate for testing with a PCR-based assay. Laboratory survey questions pertaining to the quality of the samples are shown on the x-axis. Cycle threshold (Ct) values for the internal control RNAse P (RP). The horizontal bar indicates the mean Ct value for all samples. Data points represent the mean response or Ct value per participant. A one-way ANOVA test found that values did not statistically differ for individual participants across devices (**Supp. Fig. 3**). The optimal Ct rage, 23-28, is highlighted in blue. (**c**) Participants reported being self-sufficient and confident in their ability to correctly collect saliva samples. The questions are displayed below the corresponding graphs. The mean response value for each device is shown above each bar. Individual data points represent the response recorded by the participant for each device. Blue areas indicate a positive/unproblematic response. Two sets of participant responses were excluded because one participant did not provide a response for all four devices and one did not understand the response scale. *Abbreviations:* P = pipette tip, C = collection aid, F = funnel, B = bulb pipette

DISCUSSION

Here we demonstrate the usability and efficacy of a simple saliva collection method for SARS-CoV-2 detection. The collection approach we used in this study is unique because it does not require special collection tubes that contain buffers or preservatives. Rather, due to the stability of in human saliva (Ott et al. 2020), generic tubes

are acceptable for collection and storage of saliva samples used for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic testing. The four devices are inexpensive (**Fig. 1a**) and, with the exception of the Salimetrics saliva collection aid, generic. All of the devices promoted the collection of "true" saliva, which is acceptable for handling in the laboratory, and were deemed usable by our participants.

This study had some limitations. Our sample size was small, and a majority of study participants held a college degree or higher. We did not enroll individuals under the age of 18 and therefore cannot draw conclusions around the usability of these devices in children. The findings of this study are nevertheless important because all thirty participants succeeded in providing four testable saliva samples. We can conclude that the four devices are usable for saliva self-collection and do not inhibit our PCR-based diagnostic assay. We did not compare the self-collection process with the aid of a collection device to the process without a device, and it may be that no device is needed to ensure that true saliva accumulates in the collection tube. Taken together with the participant feedback we received with respect to the size of the collection devices, a wide-mouth collection tube would likely be acceptable in this case. However, wide-mouth tubes are not conducive when sample processing requires the use of a liquid-handling robot, which are necessary for large-scale testing. Therefore, collection devices allow for an easy collection process that does not restrict laboratory procedures.

Scaling up the use of saliva self-collection as a routine diagnostic tool would expand access to testing for SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory pathogens. A major barrier to frequent testing is the need to schedule an appointment at a medical facility staffed with trained personnel. Self-collection of saliva could be performed in schools or college dormitories where regular testing is essential for safe day-to-day operations. Though our study specifically focused on the detection of SARS-CoV-2, there is evidence that saliva is also an acceptable testing substrate for the detection of other pathogens and viral co-infections (Yoon et al. 2017; Kim et al. 2017; Robinson et al. 2008). Even with the ongoing national vaccination campaign, widespread, routine testing for SARS-CoV-2 will remain a staple of public health disease control strategies for years. Here, we present a feasible, scalable, and affordable approach for realizing this goal.

REFERENCES

Byrne, Rachel Louise, Grant A. Kay, Konstantina Kontogianni, Lottie Brown, Andrea M. Collins, Luis E. Cuevas, Daniela Ferreira, et al. 2020. "Saliva Offers a Sensitive, Specific and Non-Invasive Alternative to Upper Respiratory Swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Diagnosis." *medRxiv*. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.09.20149534v1.abstract.

Kim, Young-Gon, Seung Gyu Yun, Min Young Kim, Kwisung Park, Chi Hyun Cho, Soo Young Yoon, Myung Hyun Nam, Chang Kyu Lee, Yun-Jung Cho, and Chae Seung Lim. 2017. "Comparison between Saliva and Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of Respiratory Viruses by Multiplex Reverse Transcription-PCR." *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 55 (1): 226–33.

Landry, Marie L., Jody Criscuolo, and David R. Peaper. 2020. "Challenges in Use of Saliva for Detection of SARS CoV-2 RNA in Symptomatic Outpatients." *Journal of Clinical Virology: The Official Publication of the Pan American Society for Clinical Virology* 130 (September): 104567.

Marty, Francisco M., Kaiwen Chen, and Kelly A. Verrill. 2020. "How to Obtain a Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimen." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 382 (22): e76.

Ott, Isabel M., Madison S. Strine, Anne E. Watkins, Maikel Boot, Chaney C. Kalinich, Christina A. Harden, Chantal B. F. Vogels, et al. 2020. "Simply Saliva: Stability of SARS-CoV-2 Detection Negates the Need for Expensive Collection Devices." *medRxiv : The Preprint Server for Health Sciences*, August. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.03.20165233.

Robinson, Joan L., Bonita E. Lee, Sushma Kothapalli, William R. Craig, and Julie D. Fox. 2008. "Use of Throat Swab or Saliva Specimens for Detection of Respiratory Viruses in Children." *Clinical Infectious Diseases: An Official Publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 46 (7): e61–64.

Vogels, Chantal B. F., Anne E. Watkins, Christina A. Harden, Doug E. Brackney, Jared Shafer, Jianhui Wang, César Caraballo, et al. 2020. "SalivaDirect: A Simplified and Flexible Platform to Enhance SARS-CoV-2 Testing Capacity." *Med*, December.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medj.2020.12.010.
Wyllie, Anne L., John Fournier, Arnau Casanovas-Massana, Melissa Campbell, Maria Tokuyama, Pavithra Vijayakumar, Joshua L. Warren, et al. 2020. "Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 383 (13): 1283–86.
Yoon, Jung, Seung Gyu Yun, Jeonghun Nam, Sung-Hyuk Choi, and Chae Seung Lim. 2017. "The Use of Saliva Specimens for Detection of Influenza A and B Viruses by Rapid Influenza Diagnostic Tests." *Journal of Virological Methods* 243 (May): 15–19.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
This work was funded by the Yale Center for Clinical Investigation TL1 TR001864 (M.E.P.) and Fast Grant from Emergent Ventures at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University (NDG).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS
A.L.W. and N.D.G. conceived of this study. M.E.P, D.Y-C., M.B., and O.A. observed the collections. M.B., D. Y-C., and A.E.W. performed the diagnostic tests. J.E.R. assisted with the design of the statistical analysis. H.W. and S.F.F. assisted with the coordination and execution of the study. M.E.P., D. Y-C., N.D.G., O.A., and A.L.W. wrote and edited the manuscript. M.E.P. and D. Y-C. analyzed the data.

ETHICS DECLARATIONS
Competing interests
The authors declare no competing interests.

SOURCE DATA
De-identified survey responses and source data for Fig. 1b are available in the **Source-Data** folder in the supplement.