medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Title: Clinical performance of oral sponge sampling for detection by RT-PCR of SARS-CoV-2

Authors: Charles Hugo Marquette[1,2]*, Jacques Boutros[1], Jonathan Benzaquen[1,2], Eric Selva[2,3] , Mickelina Labaky[4]; Didier Benchetrit[4], Thibaut Lavrut[5], Sylvie Leroy[1,6], Richard Chemla[7], Michel Carles[8], Virginie Tanga[2,3], Charlotte Maniel[1], Olivier Bordone[2,3], Maryline Allégra[2,3], Virginie Lespinet[2,3], Julien Fayada[2,3], Jennifer Griffonnet[1], Véronique Hofman[2,3] and Paul Hofman [2,3].

Institutions :

1. Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, FHU OncoAge, Department of Pulmonary Medicine and Thoracic Oncology, Nice, France
2. Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS, INSERM, Institute of Research on Cancer and Aging (IRCAN), Nice, France
3. Université Côte d'Azur, FHU OncoAge, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, Laboratory of Clinical and Experimental Pathology, Hospital-Related Biobank (BB-0033-00025), Nice, France
4. SYNLAB Barla, 41 boulevard Louis Braille, Nice, France
5. Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice, Laboratoire de Virologie, CHU de Nice, Nice, France
6. CNRS UMR 7275 - Institut de Pharmacologie Moléculaire et Cellulaire - Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, France
7. Ville de Nice, Nice, France
8. Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Hopsitalier Universitaire de Nice, Department of Infectious Diseases, Nice, France

***Corresponding author:** Dept of Pulmonary Medicine and Thoracic Oncology, Hôpital Pasteur, 30 av de la voie romaine, 06001 Nice, France (marquette.c@chu-nice.fr)

Abstract

Background: The current standard for coronavirus 2019 disease (COVID-19) diagnosis is reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) testing of naso-pharyngeal swabs (NPS), Sampling with NPS is invasive and requires specialized and trained personnel, which limits rapid and repeated screening for the disease. A less invasive and possibly self-administered sampling method may increase the capacity for testing and be more effective in identifying, isolating, and filtering out currently infected persons.

Methods: Over a period of three months, we included volunteers presenting with recent symptoms suggestive of a SARS-CoV-2 infection at a free COVID-19 screening center in the city of Nice, France. NPS as well as nasal and oral sponges were collected in parallel and analyzed by RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2.

Results: One hundred and forty-seven subjects were included, of whom, 41.5% were diagnosed with COVID-19 using NPS RT-PCR. RT-PCR on nasal and oral sponges showed a sensitivity of 87 to 98% and 72 to 87%, respectively for diagnosis of COVID-19 in symptomatic subjects, depending on the type of RT-PCR technique used. The specificity was 100% whatever the RT-PCR test. The viral load determined with the oral samples was significantly lower than with NPS.

Conclusion: Taken together, these results demonstrated that the oral sponge sampling method can be standardized, is easy to use and cheap. The acceptability makes it a repeatable test, notably for elderly people or children. It may become a high-frequency - low analytical sensitive testing strategy.

Summary of the "take home" message: Oral sponge sampling for SARS-CoV2 RT-PCR, is easy to use, can be self-administered with a sensitivity of up to 87 % in symptomatic patients.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

To date, reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) testing of naso-pharyngeal swab (NPS) specimens is the gold standard for diagnosis of coronavirus 2019 disease (COVID-19) [1–4]. While its specificity is 100%, its sensitivity depends on the operator and on the moment the sampling is performed during the course of the infection which is 80-90% during the first 10 days for a COVID-19 positive subject [5, 6]. RT-PCR with, NPS, known as a "high analytical sensitivity" technique, is particularly well suited for symptomatic patients. However, in the context of a pandemic it is not very well suited to the management of contact tracing of the general population. Not only does it require dedicated trained staff, its acceptability by the population is limited due to its unpleasant or even painful nature, especially when it involves repeating samples. When repeated testing is required, as for residents of nursing homes and health care workers, or in cases of massive testing of university students or of the population of a town or region for the purpose of monitoring lockdown/lockdown easing, the use of NPS for RT-PCR is not appropriate [7].

Antigen-detecting rapid diagnostic tests (Ag-RDT) are quick, simple, inexpensive and allow the decentralization of testing of symptomatic people at the point of care. As for a conventional RT-PCR test, they are performed with a NPS and thus need to be done by a trained operator [8]. Their sensitivity varies considerably (60 to 95%) [8–10] and their invasiveness makes Ag-RDT poorly suited for repeated testing of populations.

Sampling of saliva offers a promising alternative to NPS. [11] Various pathophysiological pathways explain the presence of the SARS-CoV-2 in saliva of patients with COVID-19 [12–17]. Tests with saliva involve amplification of viral RNA by RT-PCR or by Reverse Transcriptase Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification (RT-LAMP). They are non-invasive, easily repeatable and can be performed without the need of trained staff to collect the sample. Although saliva testing has been the subject of many studies, routine application is still rare due to the lack of well-standardized clinically validated protocols [11, 12, 18–22]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Based on our clinical experience on the management of COVID-19 patients and our research on the respiratory epithelium and on COVID-19 [23–27] we aimed to evaluate non-invasive alternatives to NPS for RT-PCR for the diagnosis of COVID-19.

METHODS

Preliminary data.

We investigated in 31 healthy volunteers (unpublished data) sampling with small hydroxylated polyvinyl acetate (PVA) sponges (Merocel® Standard Dressing, réf 400400, Medtronic), used as haemostatic material in the management of acute epistaxis, to collect nasal secretions and saliva. As show, in figures 1S and 2S (supplementary appendix) the sponges were placed in the nasal cavity (between the nasal septum and the inferior turbinate or in the mouth [28]). To facilitate the collection of nasal secretions or saliva, each sponge was placed in a tube containing 2 ml of 0.9 % saline (figure 3S). This medium does not interfere with the techniques of gene amplification by RT-PCR [29]. The nasal secretions and saliva were then obtained by squeezing the sponge (figure 4S). The sponges recovered on average 0.56 ml (range 0.06 - 2.74 ml) of nasal secretions and 2.09 ml (range 0.54 - 5.74 ml) of oral secretions, respectively. Considering the dilution factor linked to the addition of physiological serum (a factor of 1/5 for nasal secretions and 1/2 for saliva), we showed that the collected nasal secretions and saliva had a cellularity of 279 ± 467 and 109 ± 183 cells / µl, respectively. Nasal secretions were rich in ciliated epithelial cells and poor in squamous cells. Saliva contained exclusively squamous cells (data not shown).

Current study

After signing agreement to participate, all participants were interviewed and then four samples were taken: bilateral NPS, nasal sponge (NS) and oral sponge (OS) were administered in a random order. The NPS and NS sampling was performed by the same practitioner (CHM). OS were placed in the mouth by the subjects themselves, taken out after one minute and inserted into the collection tube (Figures 3S to 5S in the appendix). One NPS was transported within 4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

hours in 3 ml medium (Remel MicroTest ™ M4RT®) along with the tubes containing the sponges in 2 ml of 0.9 % saline to the Idylla platform of the Laboratory of Clinical and Experimental Pathology (LPCE), (Pavilion I, Hôpital Pasteur 1, Nice) accredited by COFRAC according to the ISO 15189 standard to perform molecular biology analyses (www.cofrac.fr), the biobank of which is S96-900 certified by AFNOR [25]. The second NPS was transported within 4 hours in 400 µl of medium (DA0940. Da An Gene Co., Ltd. of Sun Yat-sen University. Changzou, Guangdong, China) to the Synlab Barla laboratory (Nice, France), one to the Métropole Nice Côte d'Azur's partners for COVID-19 screening.

Analysis of samples

RT-PCR with NPS using the Idylla platform has been described previously (Hofman et al, submitted). RT-PCR with NS and OS was performed upon arrival of the tubes at the LPCE. After homogenization by pipetting from top to bottom of the eluate of the nasal and oral sponges soaked in saline (using D. Dutscher pipettes, reference 134000), they were placed in the Idylla ™ cartridge for SARS-CoV-2 (Biocartis, Belgium, reference A1042/6 and A1043/6) detection, which was performed on a fully automated system for extraction, amplification and detection of nucleic acids using a single-use cartridge (see processing of the sponges in the appendix). After treatment, the residual volume of media was immediately aliquoted and stored at -80°C in the Nice COVID-19 biobank [25]. According to the manufacturer, the Idylla SARS-CoV-2 test provides a qualitative result for the presence or absence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA with a corresponding quality status. The Biocartis SARS-CoV-2 test included 2 genes (N, Orf1b) covered by 5 PCR targets (2 N targets and 3 Orf1b targets). A positive result required at least 2 amplified N targets [by setting a quantification cycle (Cq) of 41.9] and/or at least one or more amplified Orf1b targets. As Orf1b is highly specific no threshold was required for this gene.

External validation

RT-PCR with NPS, at the Synlab Barla laboratory, was routinely performed with the DAAgene Kit (NE / CA09 / 170 / D01 / IVD / 016-03) (Da An Gene Co., Ltd. Sun Yat-sen University,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Guangzhou, Guangdong, China) processed on an AGS 4800 thermal cycler (Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China). For RT-PCR with NPS a cycle threshold (Ct) value of 36 was used as the cut-off according to the recommendations of the French Society of Microbiology [30]

The residual eluates of the NS and OS stored at -80°C in the COVID-19 biobank were sent to the Synlab Barla laboratory for RT-PCR testing with the DAAgene Kit. For RT-PCR of NS and OS, the analysis was carried out using two threshold values: 36 and 40. These Ct values are recommended by the manufacturer of the DAAgene Kit. The different analyses were processed in a double-blind way: the results of the reference standard test were unavailable to the readers of the index test and vice versa.

Calculation of the sample size

In the absence of data into the sensitivity of the technique, we calculated the sensitivity after the first 40 samples, which was 85%. Given this estimate, and a desired lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for sensitivity of at least 80%, 144 volunteers were needed to complete the study. To deal with the dropout risk we decided to include 149 volunteers.

Statistical analysis

The result of RT-PCR with NPS was the reference (standard of care) to determine the clinical performance of RT-PCR on the NS and the OS (index tests). Continuous variables are presented as means (± SD), and categorical variables as numbers and percentages. Baseline characteristics between patients with and without COVID-19 were compared using the Student's *t*-test or Wilcoxon - Mann Whitney for quantitative variables based on the normality of the distribution of parameters or using the Chi-Square test for qualitative variables.

Ethics and regulatory authorizations

The promoter of the study was the Center Hospitalier Universitaire de Nice. The agreement for the study of the Institutional review board Sud Méditerranée V was obtained on April 22, 2020

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(registration # 20.04014.35208). SHAM liability insurance (n ° 159087). The study is registered in ClinicalTrial.gov (NCT04418206).

Role of sponsors

The organizations that supported this study played no role in its design, patient selection, data collection, analysis or interpretation, report writing, or decision to submit the document for publication. Authors had full access to all data and responsibility of submission for publication.

RESULTS

One hundred and forty-nine subjects with COVID-19 symptoms were included during the 15-week study period (September 21, 2020 to January 6, 2021). Two subjects declined to continue sampling after the NPS was performed and were excluded from subsequent analyses. One had a positive NPS RT-PCR, and the other was negative. The study therefore covers the remaining 147 participants.

The interval between symptom onset and testing was 3.6 ± 2.6 days and most participants (107/147 [72.8%]) were sampled at the early stage of the disease, *i.e.,* within 4 days of symptom onset. Participants were predominantly women 86/147 (58.5%). The mean age was 40 ± 15 years. Of these 147 subjects, 61 (41.5%) had a positive RT-PCR with NPS and were therefore diagnosed with COVID-19. No clinical symptoms were distinctive between RT-PCR positive and negative subjects (Figure 1), with the exception of anosmia and dysgeusia, which were more frequent in RT-PCR positive subjects (42% vs. 10%, $p < 0.001$ and 38 vs. 16%, $p = 0.004$) and sore throat which was significantly more common in RT-PCR negative subjects (36 vs. 10%, $p = 0.001$). There was no significant difference between the oxygen saturation levels measured by pulse oximetry between RT-PCR positive (SpO_2 = 98.3% ± 1.88%) and negative subjects (SpO_2 = 97.7 ± 1.89%) ($p = 0.17$).

NS sampling, although significantly more comfortable than NPS sampling, required an experienced operator to be properly positioned between the nasal septum and the inferior turbinate.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Since our primary goal was to develop a self-sampling technique, we abandoned nasal sponge sampling after the 101st volunteer.

Oral sampling using OS was obtained from all 147 volunteers. In two cases, external validation by the Synlab Barla laboratory was not possible since there was not enough residual eluate.

Comparison of viral loads between each kind of sampling method, as assessed by the Ct for the Orf1b and the N gene showed a statistically significant gradient between the oral cavity and the nasopharynx and between the nose and the nasopharynx (Figure 2).

NS RT-PCR showed a sensitivity of 78 to 98% depending on the RT-PCR technique used and the positivity threshold selected (Table 1). OS RT-PCR showed a sensitivity of 57 to 87% depending on the RT-PCR technique and the positivity threshold used (Table 1). The specificity was 100%, whatever the technique and whatever the threshold used.

DISCUSSION

Our results showed that the respective sensitivities of RT-PCR for diagnosing COVID-19 in symptomatic subjects using NS and OS were 98 and 87%, respectively on the Idylla platform and 87 and 72% on the Synlab Barla platform, with a specificity of 100% for both.

During the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic, many molecular tests and immunoassays were rapidly developed and validated on archived biological samples of known virological status, albeit many still await clinical validation [22]. The present study was carried out according to the standards recommended by the French Haute Autorité de Santé for evaluating the clinical performance of diagnostic tests for COVID-19 [8]. *i.e.* a prospective comparative clinical study relating to a series of individuals of unknown COVID-19 status, recruited consecutively. We found a significantly different viral load between the nasopharynx, the nasal and the oral cavities (Figure 2). This gradient has a pathophysiological origin, since it is known that the nasopharynx is rich in ciliated epithelial cells and, as we showed, the genes associated with viral entry are highly expressed in these cells, unlike in the oral cavity [26, 27]. Such a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

gradient in viral load between NPS and OS has already been reported [2, 31–33] and explains why the diagnostic yield of NPS is considered to be higher than that of throat swabs [32, 33] and why RT-PCR with NPS specimens became the gold standard for diagnosis of COVID-19 in symptomatic subjects. Because of this gradient, the positivity threshold recommended by the French Society of Microbiology cannot be used for OS, for which a threshold of 40 or more is more appropriate.

The external validation of our approach in a private laboratory (Synlab Barla platform) showed a sensitivity of 10 to 30% lower than that obtained with the Idylla platform (Table 1). This discrepancy may be due to at least three factors. The first is the cut-off used by the private laboratory (Ct ≤ 36) which, as discussed above, is lower. The second is the delay in performing the RT-PCR on the Synlab Barla platform with biobanked samples. This factor probably plays only a minor role since the preservation conditions (-80 ° C in an experienced biobank) do not alter the nucleic acids. The third may be related to the fact that the Idylla platform uses 3 Orf1 and 2 N targets while the Synlab Barla platform uses only one Orf1 and one N target. Other factors that may have contributed are differences in algorithms for Ct value determination, overall test design, extraction efficiencies, amount of sample equivalent tested per PCR reaction, and workflow integration.

The OS method is fairly well standardized. It does not need sialagogical substances, nor clearing the throat or spitting effort, nor particular constraints such as early morning samples before tooth brushing and breakfast, avoiding eating, drinking, gum chewing, smoking, or vaping. [34–36] It is cheap and simple since there is no need for viral transport medium to be added to the saliva nor for dedicated trained nursing staff. Lastly, its acceptability makes it possible to consider repeating the test even on institutionalized elderly people or on children.

The question as to whether a 72-87% sensitivity (OS sampling method) is good enough to identify SARS-CoV-2 infected people has been recently debated by Mina *et al*. in a landmark position paper [7] in which low-frequency testing with a high analytical sensitivity was compared to high-frequency testing with a low analytical sensitivity. RT-PCR with NPS belongs to the former category and is well suited to diagnosis of COVID-19 in symptomatic subjects.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Whereas the OS method described herein belongs to the latter category and is more effective in identifying, isolating, and thus filtering out currently infected persons, including those who are asymptomatic. Further study is ongoing to clinically validate the performance of this sampling method in the context of broad screening. To do this, it will be necessary to industrialize the process in the form of an "all-in-one" kit for simplified extraction of the biological liquid.

Funding:
This work was supported by Conseil Départemental 06, Ville de Nice, Métropole Nice Côte d'Azur, Fonds de Dotation AVENI, and from private donators.

Acknowledgements:
Special thanks to E. Faidhi, N. Fridlyand, A. Rauscher, E. Maris, the Lauro family and to the many private donators for their generous contribution.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCES

1. Hanson KE, Caliendo AM, Arias CA, Englund JA, Lee MJ, Patel R, Alayli AE, Kalot MA, Falck-Ytter Y, Morgan RL, Murad MH, Sultan S, Bhimraj A, Mustafa RA. Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Diagnosis of COVID-19. : 72.

2. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, Liang L, Huang H, Hong Z, Yu J, Kang M, Song Y, Xia J, Guo Q, Song T, He J, Yen H-L, Peiris M, Wu J. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected Patients. *New England Journal of Medicine* Massachusetts Medical Society; 2020; 382: 1177–1179.

3. Sullivan PS, Sailey C, Guest JL, Guarner J, Kelley C, Siegler AJ, Valentine-Graves M, Gravens L, Del Rio C, Sanchez TH. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and Antibodies in Diverse Samples: Protocol to Validate the Sufficiency of Provider-Observed, Home-Collected Blood, Saliva, and Oropharyngeal Samples. *JMIR Public Health Surveill* 2020; 6: e19054.

4. Pondaven-Letourmy S, Alvin F, Boumghit Y, Simon F. How to perform a nasopharyngeal swab in adults and children in the COVID-19 era. *Eur Ann Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Dis* 2020; 137: 325–327.

5. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by Time Since Exposure. *Ann Intern Med* American College of Physicians; 2020; 173: 262–267.

6. Arevalo-Rodriguez I, Buitrago-Garcia D, Simancas-Racines D, Zambrano-Achig P, Campo RD, Ciapponi A, Sued O, Martinez-García L, Rutjes AW, Low N, Bossuyt PM, Perez-Molina JA, Zamora J. False-negative results of initial RT-PCR assays for COVID-19: A systematic review. *PLOS ONE* Public Library of Science; 2020; 15: e0242958.

7. Mina MJ, Parker R, Larremore DB. Rethinking Covid-19 Test Sensitivity — A Strategy for Containment. *New England Journal of Medicine* Massachusetts Medical Society; 2020; 383: e120.

8. Haute Autorité de Santé. Revue rapide sur les tests de détection antigénique du virus SARS-CoV-2. 8 octobre 2020 (https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2020-10/synthese_tests_antigeniques_vd.pdf). .

9. Organization WH. Antigen-detection in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection using rapid immunoassays: interim guidance, 11 September 2020. World Health Organization; 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 23]; Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/334253.

10. Évaluation de la performance diagnostique de neuf tests rapides antigéniques COVID-19 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jan 22].Available from: https://www.aphp.fr/contenu/evaluation-de-la-performance-diagnostique-de-neuf-tests-rapides-antigeniques-covid-19.

11. Butler-Laporte G, Lawandi A, Schiller I, Yao MC, Dendukuri N, McDonald EG, Lee TC. Comparison of Saliva and Nasopharyngeal Swab Nucleic Acid Amplification Testing for Detection of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern Med* [Internet] 2021 [cited 2021 Jan 22]; Available from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/fullarticle/2775397.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

12. To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Leung W-S, Tam AR, Wu T-C, Lung DC, Yip CC-Y, Cai J-P, Chan JM-C, Chik TS-H, Lau DP-L, Choi CY-C, Chen L-L, Chan W-M, Chan K-H, Ip JD, Ng AC-K, Poon RW-S, Luo C-T, Cheng VC-C, Chan JF-W, Hung IF-N, Chen Z, Chen H, Yuen K-Y. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* Elsevier; 2020; 20: 565–574.

13. Liu L, Wei Q, Alvarez X, Wang H, Du Y, Zhu H, Jiang H, Zhou J, Lam P, Zhang L, Lackner A, Qin C, Chen Z. 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: 4025–4030.

14. Lu B, Huang Y, Huang L, Li B, Zheng Z, Chen Z, Chen J, Hu Q, Wang H. Effect of mucosal and systemic immunization with virus-like particles of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus in mice. *Immunology* 2010; 130: 254–261.

15. Silva-Boghossian CM, Colombo APV, Tanaka M, Rayo C, Xiao Y, Siqueira WL. Quantitative Proteomic Analysis of Gingival Crevicular Fluid in Different Periodontal Conditions. *PLOS ONE* Public Library of Science; 2013; 8: e75898.

16. Xu H, Zhong L, Deng J, Peng J, Dan H, Zeng X, Li T, Chen Q. High expression of ACE2 receptor of 2019-nCoV on the epithelial cells of oral mucosa. *International Journal of Oral Science* Nature Publishing Group; 2020; 12: 1–5.

17. Dawes C, Wong DTW. Role of Saliva and Salivary Diagnostics in the Advancement of Oral Health. *J Dent Res* SAGE Publications Inc; 2019; 98: 133–141.

18. Czumbel LM, Kiss S, Farkas N, Mandel I, Hegyi A, Nagy Á, Szakács Z, Hegyi P, Steward MC, Varga G. Saliva as a Candidate for COVID-19 Diagnostic Testing: A Meta-Analysis. *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2020; : 465–465.

19. Williams E, Bond K, Zhang B, Putland M, Williamson DA. Saliva as a Noninvasive Specimen for Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020; 58.

20. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P, Geng B, Muenker MC, Moore AJ, Vogels CBF, Petrone ME, Ott IM, Lu P, Venkataraman A, Lu-Culligan A, Klein J, Earnest R, Simonov M, Datta R, Handoko R, Naushad N, Sewanan LR, Valdez J, White EB, Lapidus S, Kalinich CC, Jiang X, Kim DJ, Kudo E, Linehan M, et al. Saliva is more sensitive for SARS-CoV-2 detection in COVID-19 patients than nasopharyngeal swabs. *medRxiv* Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press; 2020; : 2020.04.16.20067835.

21. Bhattarai KR, Kim H-R, Chae H-J. Compliance with Saliva Collection Protocol in Healthy Volunteers: Strategies for Managing Risk and Errors. *Int J Med Sci* 2018; 15: 823–831.

22. Vandenberg O, Martiny D, Rochas O, van Belkum A, Kozlakidis Z. Considerations for diagnostic COVID-19 tests. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2020; : 1–13.

23. Deprez M, Zaragosi L-E, Truchi M, Becavin C, Ruiz García S, Arguel M-J, Plaisant M, Magnone V, Lebrigand K, Abelanet S, Brau F, Paquet A, Pe'er D, Marquette C-H, Leroy S, Barbry P. A Single-Cell Atlas of the Human Healthy Airways. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2020; 202: 1636–1645.

24. García SR, Deprez M, Lebrigand K, Cavard A, Paquet A, Arguel M-J, Magnone V, Truchi M, Caballero I, Leroy S, Marquette C-H, Marcet B, Barbry P, Zaragosi L-E. Novel dynamics of human

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

mucociliary differentiation revealed by single-cell RNA sequencing of nasal epithelial cultures. *Development* [Internet] Oxford University Press for The Company of Biologists Limited; 2019 [cited 2021 Jan 22]; 146Available from: https://dev.biologists.org/content/146/20/dev177428.

25. Tanga V, Leroy S, Fayada J, Hamila M, Allegra M, Messaoudi Z, Bonnetaud C, Lespinet V, Bordone O, Washetine K, Griffonnet J, Maniel C, Philibert L, Selva E, Benzaquen J, Ilie M, Long E, Lassalle S, Lantéri E, Marquette C-H, Hofman V, Hofman P. Establishment of a Collection of Blood-Derived Products from COVID-19 Patients for Translational Research: Experience of the LPCE Biobank (Nice, France). *Biopreservation and Biobanking* Mary Ann Liebert, Inc., publishers; 2020; 18: 517–524.

26. Sungnak W, Huang N, Bécavin C, Berg M, Queen R, Litvinukova M, Talavera-López C, Maatz H, Reichart D, Sampaziotis F, Worlock KB, Yoshida M, Barnes JL. SARS-CoV-2 entry factors are highly expressed in nasal epithelial cells together with innate immune genes. *Nature Medicine* Nature Publishing Group; 2020; 26: 681–687.

27. Ziegler CGK, Allon SJ, Nyquist SK, Mbano IM, Miao VN, Tzouanas CN, Cao Y, Yousif AS, Bals J, Hauser BM, Feldman J, Muus C, Wadsworth MH, Kazer SW, Hughes TK, Doran B, Gatter GJ, Vukovic M, Taliaferro F, Mead BE, Guo Z, Wang JP, Gras D, Plaisant M, Ansari M, Angelidis I, Adler H, Sucre JMS, Taylor CJ, Lin B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Receptor ACE2 Is an Interferon-Stimulated Gene in Human Airway Epithelial Cells and Is Detected in Specific Cell Subsets across Tissues. *Cell* 2020; 181: 1016-1035.e19.

28. Watelet J-B, Gevaert P, Holtappels G, Van Cauwenberge P, Bachert C. Collection of nasal secretions for immunological analysis. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 2004; 261: 242–246.

29. Radbel J, Jagpal S, Roy J, Brooks A, Tischfield J, Sheldon M, Bixby C, Witt D, Gennaro ML, Horton DB, Barrett ES, Carson JL, Panettieri RA, Blaser MJ. Detection of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Is Comparable in Clinical Samples Preserved in Saline or Viral Transport Medium. *J Mol Diagn* 2020; 22: 871–875.

30. Avis du 25 septembre 2020 de la Société Française de Microbiologie (SFM) relatif à l'interprétation de la valeur de Ct (estimation de la charge virale) obtenue en cas de RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 positive sur les prélèvements cliniques réalisés à des fins diagnostiques ou de dépistage. Version 3 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 22].Available from: https://www.sfm-microbiologie.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Avis-SFM-valeur-Ct-excre%CC%81tion-virale-_-Version-Finale-07102020-V3.pdf.

31. Vlek ALM, Wesselius TS, Achterberg R, Thijsen SFT. Combined throat/nasal swab sampling for SARS-CoV-2 is equivalent to nasopharyngeal sampling. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2021; 40: 193–195.

32. Wang X, Tan L, Wang X, Liu W, Lu Y, Cheng L, Sun Z. Comparison of nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs for SARS-CoV-2 detection in 353 patients received tests with both specimens simultaneously. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2020; 94: 107–109.

33. Patel MR, Carroll D, Ussery E, Whitham H, Elkins CA, Noble-Wang J, Rasheed JK, Lu X, Lindstrom S, Bowen V, Waller J, Armstrong G, Gerber S, Brooks JT. Performance of Oropharyngeal Swab Testing Compared With Nasopharyngeal Swab Testing for Diagnosis of Coronavirus Disease 2019—United States, January 2020–February 2020. *Clin Infect Dis* [Internet] 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 8]; Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7337670/.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

34. L'Helgouach N, Champigneux P, Schneider FS, Molina L, Espeut J, Alali M, Baptiste J, Cardeur L, Dubuc B, Foulongne V, Galtier F, Makinson A, Marin G, Picot M-C, Prieux-Lejeune A, Quenot M, Robles FC, Salvetat N, Vetter D, Reynes J, Molina F. EasyCOV : LAMP based rapid detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva. *medRxiv* Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press; 2020; : 2020.05.30.20117291.

35. Lai CKC, Chen Z, Lui G, Ling L, Li T, Wong MCS, Ng RWY, Tso EYK, Ho T, Fung KSC, Ng ST, Wong BKC, Boon SS, Hui DSC, Chan PKS. Prospective Study Comparing Deep Throat Saliva With Other Respiratory Tract Specimens in the Diagnosis of Novel Coronavirus Disease 2019. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2020; 222: 1612–1619.

36. 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-W. Evaluating the use of posterior oropharyngeal saliva in a point-of-care assay for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Emerging Microbes & Infections* 2020; 9: 1356–1359.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1: Clinical performance of RT-PCR with oral and nasal sponges

Oral sponge	TP	FP	FN	TN	Sensitivity [CI 95 %]	Specificity [CI 95 %]
Idylla	53	0	8	86	0.87 [0.81-0.92]	1.00 [0.98-1.00]
Synlab (cutoff 36)	34	0	26	85	0.57 [0.49-0.65]	1.00 [0.98-1.00]
Synlab (cutoff 40)	43	0	17	85	0.72 [0.64-0.79]	1.00 [0.98-1.00]
Nasal sponge	**VP**	**FP**	**FN**	**VN**	**Sensitivity [CI 95 %]**	**Specificity [CI 95 %]**
Idylla	45	0	1	55	0.98 [0.95-1.00]	1.00 [0.98-1.00]
Synlab (cutoff 36)	35	0	10	51	0.78 [0.70-0.86]	1.00 [0.98-1.00]
Synlab (cutoff 40)	39	0	6	51	0.87 [0.80-0.94]	1.00 [0.98-1.00]

TP = true positive; FP = false positive; FN = false negative; TN = true negative

Figure 1: Self-reported symptoms (%)



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2: Viral load for each kind of sampling method as assessed using the Ct for the Orf1b and N genes



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX

Figure 1S : naso-pharyngeal swab *vs* nasal sponge *vs* oral sponge.



Figure 2S : The oral sponge is introduced into the mouth by the subject. The subject reopens the mouth after one minute, as soon as he/she feels that the sponge has swollen.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251556; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 3S : The sponge is placed in a 50 ml Falcon tube (D.Dustcher, part no. 352070) containing 2 ml of saline solution.

Figure 4S : The sponge is then placed in the body of a syringe and the liquid it contains is squeezed out of the sponge by pressing the plunger. The liquid is then collected and aliquoted.


Fever
Fatigue
Headache
Myalgia
Anosmia
Cough
Dysgeusia
Digestive signs
Rhinorrhea
Chest pain
Dyspnea
Sore throat
Chills
Dizziness
0,00
10,00
20,00
30,00
40,00
50,00
60,00
70,00
PCR neg n=86
PCR pos n=61


Orf1b (Idylla)
N (Idylla)
Orf1b (Synlab)
N (Synlab)
p = 0,0156
p < 0,0001
p = 0,0081
p < 0,0001
p < 0,0001
p < 0,0001
p < 0,0001
p < 0,0001
Ct
0
10
20
30
40
50
nasopharyngeal swab
nasal sponge
oral sponge