Title: Gargle sample is an effective option in a novel molecular point-of-care test for influenza: a multicenter study

Short running head: A novel rapid molecular POC test for Flu

Authors:

Norihito Kaku [a,b, c]#*, Tomohito Urabe [d], Tetsuya Iida [e], Chyuns Yun [f], Yoshiyuki Nishida [g], Yasunori Onitsuka [h], Kohji Hashiguchi [i], Kiyoto Hirose [j], Akimitsu Tomonaga [k], Koichi Izumikawa [l], Hiroshi Mukae [m], Katsunori Yanagihara [a,b]

Affiliations:

[a]Department of Laboratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan

[b]Department of Laboratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Hospital, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan

[c]Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care Medicine, University of Michigan, Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

[d]Urabe Otorhinolaryngology Clinic, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan

[e]Iida Naika Syounika Clinic, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan

[f]Ohisama Pediatric Clinic, Nagayo-cho, Nagasaki, Japan

[g]Nishida Gastrointestinal Internal Medicine Clinic, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan

[h]Onitsuka Internal Medicine Clinic, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan

[i]Department of Respiratory Medicine, Japanese Red Cross Nagasaki Genbaku Hospital,

Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan

[j]Hirose Clinic, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan

[k]Tomonaga Medical Clinic, Omura City, Nagasaki, Japan

[l]Department of Infectious Diseases, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan

[m]Department of Respiratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan

#Address correspondence to Norihito Kaku, norihitk@gmail.com

*Address: Department of Laboratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, 1-7-1 Sakamoto, Nagasaki 852-8501, Japan

Tel: +81-85-819-7574

Fax: +81-95-819-7422

*Present address:

Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Michigan, 4438 BSRB, 109 Zina Pitcher Pl, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA

Abstract

Objectives: We conducted a multicenter study to evaluate a novel transcription-reverse transcription concerted reaction (TRC) that can detect influenza A and B within 15 minutes in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples.

Design & Methods: We collected nasopharyngeal swab and gargle samples obtained from patients who visited or were hospitalized at eight clinics and hospitals with influenza-like illnesses between December 2019 and March 2020. After obtaining informed consent, we collected nasopharyngeal swabs from all patients using two swabs and gargle samples from patients whom the physician judged fit to perform gargling. We evaluated 233 nasopharyngeal swabs and 213 gargle samples from 244 patients.

Results: In nasal swabs, influenza A or B was detected in 96 and 98 patients using conventional reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) and TRC, respectively. Influenza A and B were detected using sequence analysis in four patients with different RT-PCR and TRC results. Based on the combined RT-PCR and sequencing results, the sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) of TRC for influenza detection were 0.990, 1.000, 1.000, and 0.993, respectively. In the gargle samples, influenza A was detected in 100 and 99 patients using RT-PCR and TRC, respectively. Influenza A was detected using sequencing in five patients with different RT-PCR and TRC results. The sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV of the TRC for detecting influenza were 0.970, 0.982, 0.980, and 0.974, respectively.

Conclusions: The novel rapid TRC was comparable to RT-PCR for the detection of influenza in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples.

Keywords: rapid detection; influenza; TRC method; RT-PCR

1. Introduction

Influenza is a major infectious disease that spreads during the winter with clinics receiving many influenza patients during the epidemic. As antiviral agents for influenza, such as neuraminidase inhibitors are already available, it is essential to accurately test and diagnose influenza. Rapid influenza antigen tests have been widely used in clinics because of their simplicity and speed. However, they often have low sensitivity, especially in the early stage of influenza, compared to nucleic acid tests. [1] Recently, molecular point-of-care (POC) tests and highly sensitive automated immunochromatographic antigen tests (digital immunoassays, DIAs) for influenza have been developed and have become popular diagnostic tests. The transcription-reverse transcription concerted reaction (TRC) method is a molecular test that can be performed as a POC test and involves rapid isothermal RNA amplification using an intercalation-activating fluorescence (INAF) probe. It has been used to diagnose tuberculosis, nontuberculous mycobacterial infections, mycoplasma pneumonia, chlamydial infections, and gonorrhea. [2,3] Recently, a novel rapid TRC that can detect influenza A and B within 15 min of nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples without purification was developed by simplifying the sample preparation step. [4] In a previous single-center study, the novel TRC method was of comparable sensitivity to the conventional reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) method for detecting influenza viruses in both nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples. [4] However, in a previous study, we collected gargle samples for half of the study period. In addition, because the study was conducted in only one hospital, it is unclear whether the same results would be obtained by patients visiting other clinics that use rapid diagnostics, such as the novel TRC method. Therefore, we conducted a multicenter study in several clinical settings. This study

aimed to evaluate the efficacy of a novel rapid TRC for detecting influenza viruses in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples obtained from patients with influenza-like illnesses.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Study design

This prospective observational study was conducted between December 16, 2019 and March 25, 2020. The original plan was to collect samples until May 31, 2022 but the study was suspended early on March 25, 2020 when the spread of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) began in Japan. [5–7] Due to the continued COVID-19 pandemic, the study was not resumed, and the analysis was conducted on the samples collected by March 25, 2020. Patients who visited or were hospitalized at the Urabe Otorhinolaryngology Clinic, Iida Naika Syounika Clinic, Ohisama Pediatric Clinic, Nishida Gastrointestinal Intermedicine Clinic, Onitsuka Internal Medicine Clinic, Japanese Red Cross Nagasaki Genbaku Hospital, Hirose Clinic, and Tomonaga Medical Clinic with influenza-like illness (ILI), as defined by the World Health Organization's case definitions, [8] were included in this study. Patients were excluded if they were administered anti-influenza agents within one month before sampling. After obtaining informed consent, nasopharyngeal swab and gargle samples were collected. Nasopharyngeal swabs were collected from all the patients using two swabs. Gargle samples were collected from patients whom the physician judged to be able to perform gargling. Digital immunoassays (DIAs) using silver amplification immunochromatography for influenza (FUJI DRI-CHEM IMMUNO AG Cartridge FluAB; Fujifilm, Kanagawa, Japan) [9] was performed in clinics and hospitals. The physicians determined the clinical diagnosis based on medical history, physical findings, and DIAs results, from which they produced a clinical report for each patient. Nasopharyngeal swabs

and gargle samples for TRC and RT-PCR were stored at −20 °C until further analysis. The samples were transferred to Tosoh Corporation for TRC and RT-PCR. All information, such as clinical report forms and TRC and RT-PCR results, was summarized and analyzed at Nagasaki University Hospital. If the results of TRC were different from those of RT-PCR, the samples were analyzed by sequencing at Tosoh Corporation.

2.2 Ethics

This study was approved by the ethics committee of Nagasaki University Hospital (approval number:19121603) and registered in the UMIN Clinical Trials Registry (reference number: UMIN000038276). Before sample collection, written informed consent for the participation and publication of this study was obtained from all participants.

2.3 Data collection

To compile data on patient characteristics, we collected information on sex, age, underlying diseases, history of influenza vaccination, time since onset of symptoms, body temperature at the time of consultation, clinical diagnosis, results of DIAs, treatment for ILI, and the following signs and symptoms: fever (body temperature ≥37.5 °C), cough, sore throat, nasal discharge, headache, arthralgia and myalgia, fatigue, nausea, and diarrhea.

2.4 Genetic analysis

We performed rapid TRC, RT-PCR, and sequencing, as described in a previous study. [4] Briefly, for TRC, we soaked a new swab in a gargle sample. A nasopharyngeal or gargle swab was mixed with 1 mL extraction buffer containing surfactant and incubated at 52 °C for 1 min. We then

mixed 30 μL of the sample with a dry reagent containing enzymes, substrates, primers, and INAF probes and incubated it at 46 °C to monitor fluorescence. Samples with indeterminate TRC were treated as negative. For RT-PCR, total RNA was isolated from 140 μL of TRC extraction buffer mixed with a nasopharyngeal swab or 140 μL of a gargle specimen using a QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). RT-PCR was performed using the One-Step PrimeScript™ RT-PCR Kit (TAKARA BIO, Shiga, Japan) and QuantStudio5 Real-Time PCR System (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA) according to the Influenza Diagnosis Manual 3rd edition (National Institute of Infectious Diseases, 2014). [4,10] We also performed a sequence analysis of the TRC and RT-PCR products based on the same manual. [4,10]

2.5 Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using R (the R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria; version 4.0.3). Fisher's exact test was used to compare categorical variables and the Mann–Whitney U test was used to compare continuous variables. The statistical significance level was set at $p < 0.05$. The sensitivity (Se), specificity (Sp), positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) of the TRC against the combined results of RT-PCR and sequencing were calculated with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI).

3. Results

3.1 Patient characteristics

During the study period, 286 patients with ILI participated. One patient was excluded due to withdrawal of consent, another due to testing protocol deviation, and 40 patients were excluded

due to failure of the freezer at the clinic where the samples were stored (Fig.1). Finally, the samples obtained from 244 patients were evaluated. Patient characteristics are shown in Table 1. The average age of the patients was 39.3 ± 21.2. The proportion of patients with underlying diseases and a history of influenza vaccination was 33.2% and 50.0%, respectively. Of the patients, 68.9% visited a hospital within 24 h of symptom onset. The most common symptoms were fever (93.0%), fatigue (79.5%), nasal discharge (64.8%), cough (64.3%), headache (62.3%), and sore throat (61.5%). In the clinical diagnosis based on history, physical findings, and the results of DIAs, 44.3% of the patients were diagnosed with influenza and 43.0% were diagnosed with acute upper respiratory infection. All patients in whom only nasopharyngeal swabs were collected were children.

3.2 Performance of TRC in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples

The results of the RT-PCR and TRC assays are shown in Table 2. Influenza was detected in nasopharyngeal swabs using RT-PCR and TRC in 41.2% and 42.1% of patients, respectively. The positive rate for influenza was highest 24–48 h after the onset of symptoms in both methods (Fig. 2A). The positive rate for influenza within 6 h after the onset of symptoms in RT-PCR and TRC was 22.6% and 25.8%, respectively, which were two times higher than that in DIAs (12.9%). Four samples showed different results in RT-PCR and TRC: one tested positive for influenza A with RT-PCR but negative for TRC; two tested positive for influenza A with TRC but negative with RT-PCR; and one tested positive for influenza B with TRC but negative with RT-PCR. Influenza was detected in all four samples by sequencing. Based on the combined RT-PCR and sequencing results, the Se, Sp, PPV, and NPV of TRC in nasopharyngeal swabs were 0.990, 1.000, 1.000, and 0.993, respectively (Table 3).

For gargle samples, influenza was detected using RT-PCR and TRC in 46.9% and 46.5% of cases, respectively. The positive rate for influenza was highest 24–48 h after the onset of symptoms in both methods (Fig. 2B). Five samples showed different results in RT-PCR and TRC: three tested positive for influenza A with RT-PCR but negative for TRC, and two tested positive for influenza A with TRC but negative with RT-PCR. Influenza was detected in all five samples by sequencing. Based on the combined RT-PCR and sequencing results, the Se, Sp, PPV, and NPV of TRC in nasopharyngeal swabs were 0.970, 0.982, 0.980, and 0.974, respectively (Table 3).

3.3 Comparison of results between nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples

We evaluated RT-PCR and TRC results in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples from 202 patients. In RT-PCR, there were different results between nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples in 13 patients (Fig. 3A): six patients tested positive for influenza A in nasopharyngeal swabs but negative in gargle samples and seven patients tested positive for influenza A in gargle samples but negative in nasopharyngeal samples. In the TRC, there were different results between nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples in 14 patients (Fig. 3B): seven patients tested positive for influenza A in nasopharyngeal swabs but negative in gargle samples, one patient tested positive for influenza B in nasopharyngeal swabs but negative in gargle samples, and six patients tested positive for influenza A in gargle samples but negative in nasopharyngeal samples. Table S1 shows the background of the patients with conflicting results from nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples. The percentage of females was significantly higher in patients who were positive only for nasopharyngeal swabs in RT-PCR (p = 0.003), but there were no significant differences in other factors.

4. **Discussion**

The novel rapid TRC showed greater sensitivity and specificity in both nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples compared to the combined RT-PCR and sequencing. The sensitivity/specificity of the rapid TRC in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples were 0.990/1.000 and 0.971/1.000, respectively, which are similar to those of the previous single-center study (1.000/1.000 and 0.946/1.000, respectively). [4] However, there were differences in patient backgrounds between this study and the previous study, other than the number of participating institutions. The average age in this study was 39.3—ten years younger than that in the previous study. This was because this study included minors (15.2%), whereas previous studies included only adults. In addition, the percentage of patients with underlying diseases in this study (33.2%) was much lower than that in a previous study (50.0%). While the previous study was conducted at a single secondary hospital, the addition of seven clinics in this study might have involved younger patients without underlying diseases. There were also differences in the symptoms between the two studies. The percentages of patients with symptoms such as fever, fatigue, nasal discharge, headache, sore throat, arthralgia, and myalgia in this study were higher than those in the previous study (93.0% vs. 76.1%, 79.5% vs. 54.8%, 64.8% vs. 52.7%, 62.3% vs. 37.2%, 61.5% vs. 53.2%, 52.9% vs. 29.8%, and 39.8% vs. 29.8%, respectively). Fewer patients visited clinics and hospitals 72 hours after symptom onset compared to those in the previous study (2.9% versus 13.8%), which might have influenced the difference. Thus, despite differences in patient backgrounds and other factors, the novel rapid TRC showed the same test performance in both studies.

The novel rapid TRC evaluated in this study can detect influenza A and B within 15 min. The most common rapid influenza diagnostic tests are antigen tests using immunochromatography in nasopharyngeal swabs. However, because conventional antigen tests have very low sensitivity in the early stages of influenza, [1] high-sensitivity DIAs and molecular POC tests have been developed. In this study, commercially available DIAs using silver amplification immunochromatography, whose detection ability was eight times and 32–64 times higher for influenza A and B, respectively, were used at clinics and hospitals. [9] However, the positive rate for influenza in DIAs was obviously lower than that of RT-PCR and TRC in this study. In particular, for patients who visited clinics or hospitals within 6 hours from the onset of symptoms, the positive rate for influenza in the automated antigen test was half of that for RT-PCR and TRC. No previous study has compared the DIAs used in this study and molecular POC tests, but a previous study comparing other DIAs and molecular POC tests reported that the positive rate for influenza with molecular POC tests was much higher than that with DIAs. [11–13] A previous meta-analysis revealed that pooled sensitivity of the molecular POC tests was higher than that of DIAs (91.6% versus 80.0%). [14] Therefore, molecular POC tests, including TRC, can contribute to the accurate diagnosis of influenza compared with DIAs. There are several rapid RT-PCR technologies for the detection of influenza other than TRC, such as the cobas® Liat® PCR System (Liat), ID NOW (formerly Alere™ i), and GeneXpert Xpress (Xpert). Some multicenter studies have reported their sensitivity and specificity for influenza. The sensitivity of Liat, ID NOW, and Xpert for influenza A and B was reported as 0.996/0.975 and 0.993/0.997, [15] 0.978–0.993/0.966–0.981 and 0.929–0.976/0.983–1.000, [16,17] and 0.953–1.000/0.948–1.000 and 0.938-1.000/0.995-1.000. [18–20] A previous single-center study compared the performance of Liat, ID NOW, and Xpert, and their sensitivity/specificity for influenza were

0.960/0.976, 0.905/0.994, and 0.970/0.982, respectively. [21] . Compared to the results of these previous studies, rapid TRC showed comparable sensitivity and specificity in nasopharyngeal swabs.

The novel rapid TRC is unique because it can detect influenza in gargle samples, and it showed great sensitivity/specificity in this study and previous single-center studies. [4] Some studies have reported the performance of molecular POC tests on gargle samples. A previous study on Xpert reported the sensitivity of Xpert for influenza detection in gargle samples to be 0.917 (11/12 samples), which was the same as that of in-house RT-PCR. [22] Another study reported that the sensitivity of Liat for detecting influenza was 1.000 (15/15 samples) compared to in-house RT-PCR. [23] In addition to gargle samples, several non-nasopharyngeal swab specimens, such as nasal aspirate-wash, throat swabs, nasopharyngeal aspirate, and saliva have been evaluated. The sensitivity and specificity of Xpert in the nasal aspirate wash for influenza A and B compared to RT-PCR were 0.900/1.000 and 1.000/1.000, respectively [19] and those of ID NOW in throat swabs were 0.75/0.98 and 0.83/0.98, respectively. [24] The sensitivity/specificity of Xpert in nasopharyngeal aspirate for influenza A and B compared to patients' infection status were 0.980/0.988 and 1.000/0.995, respectively, and those in saliva were 0.918/1.000 and 0.750/1.000, respectively. [25] The sensitivity of rapid TRC in gargle samples is considered to be higher than that in nasal aspirate wash, throat swabs, and saliva and is similar to that of nasopharyngeal aspirate. In this study, the positive rate for influenza in the gargle samples was higher using RT-PCR and TRC. Thirteen patients in the RT-PCR and 14 patients in the TRC had different results between nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples, but there were no significant differences in the patient background other than the percentage of females. Therefore, it is not clear which cases of gargle samples should be used in preference to nasopharyngeal swabs.

However, nasopharyngeal swabs are sometimes difficult to obtain and cause discomfort to patients during sample collection. [26] In addition, because healthcare workers must wear personal protective equipment when they obtain nasopharyngeal swabs from patients with respiratory infection symptoms during the COVID-19 pandemic, specimens such as saliva and gargle samples, which patients can collect themselves, have been used for molecular tests. [7,27] Thus, rapid TRC using gargle samples is useful for the diagnosis of influenza during and after the COVID-19 pandemic.

This study had some limitations. We could only collect samples for one season because of the COVID-19 pandemic, as described in the Materials and Methods section. Only one patient with an influenza B infection was included in this study. The rapid TRC showed high sensitivity and specificity for influenza B in nasopharyngeal swabs in a previous study [4] but its performance in gargle samples remains unknown. In addition, rapid TRC has not been compared with other molecular POC tests. Further investigations are needed to clarify these findings.

5. Conclusions

The novel rapid TRC was comparable to RT-PCR for the detection of influenza. Rapid TRC may be useful for diagnosing influenza during and after the COVID-19 pandemic because it is easy to perform, non-invasive, material-saving, and safe for healthcare workers.

6. Funding

Tosoh Corporation funded the study. The sponsor performed RT-PCR, TRC, and sequencing for influenza, but had no control over the interpretation, writing, or publication of this work.

7. Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest directly relevant to the content of this article.

8. Access to Data

The derived data supporting the findings of this study are presented in this paper.

9. Author contributions

All the authors were involved in the study design. TU, TI, CY, YN, YO, KH, KH, and AT acquired the samples and data. NK, KI, HK, and KY were involved in data interpretation and analysis. NK wrote the original manuscript, and all authors revised and approved the manuscript for publication.

References

[1] C. Chartrand, M.M.G. Leeflang, J. Minion, T. Brewer, M. Pai, Accuracy of rapid influenza diagnostic tests: A meta-analysis, Ann. Intern. Med. 156 (2012) 500–511. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-156-7-201204030-00403.

[2] V. Drouillon, G. Delogu, G. Dettori, P.H. Lagrange, M. Benecchi, F. Houriez, K. Baroli, F. Ardito, R. Torelli, C. Chezzi, G. Fadda, J.-L. Herrmann, Multicenter Evaluation of a Transcription-Reverse Transcription Concerted Assay for Rapid Detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis Complex in Clinical Specimens, J. Clin. Microbiol. 47 (2009) 3461–3465. doi:10.1128/JCM.01730-08.

[3] A. Mazzarelli, A. Cannas, C. Venditti, S. D'Arezzo, C. De Giuli, S. Truffa, O. Butera, F. Petroni, M. Paglia, A. Vulcano, F. Palmieri, C. Nisii, A. Di Caro, Clinical evaluation of

TRCReady M.TB for rapid automated detection of M. tuberculosis complex in respiratory samples, Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis. 23 (2019) 260–264. doi:10.5588/ijtld.18.0355.

[4] N. Kaku, K. Hashiguchi, N. Akamatsu, F. Wakigawa, J. Matsuda, K. Komaru, T. Nakao, Y. Harada, A. Hara, N. Uno, K. Sakamoto, Y. Morinaga, T. Kitazaki, H. Hasegawa, T. Miyazaki, M. Fukuda, K. Izumikawa, H. Mukae, K. Yanagihara, Evaluation of a novel rapid TRC assay for the detection of influenza using nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples, Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 40 (2021) 1743–1748. doi:10.1007/S10096-021-04193-7.

[5] N. Kaku, K. Ota, D. Sasaki, N. Akamatsu, N. Uno, K. Sakamoto, K. Kosai, H. Hasegawa, K. Izumikawa, H. Mukae, K. Yanagihara, Had COVID-19 spread in the community before the first confirmed case in Nagasaki, Japan?, Microbes Infect. 23 (2021). doi:10.1016/J.MICINF.2021.104812.

[6] N. Kaku, F. Nishimura, Y. Shigeishi, R. Tachiki, H. Sakai, D. Sasaki, K. Ota, K. Sakamoto, K. Kosai, H. Hasegawa, K. Izumikawa, K. Ariyoshi, H. Mukae, J. Yasuda, K. Morita, S. Kohno, K. Yanagihara, Performance of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing in asymptomatic or mild COVID-19 patients: A retrospective study in outbreak on a cruise ship, PLoS One. 16 (2021) e0257452. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0257452.

[7] K. Ota, K. Yanagihara, D. Sasaki, N. Kaku, N. Uno, K. Sakamoto, K. Kosai, T. Miyazaki, H. Hasegawa, A. Fujita, M. Tashiro, T. Tanaka, K. Izumikawa, K. Ariyoshi, H. Mukae, J. Yasuda, K. Morita, S. Kohno, Detection of SARS-CoV-2 using qRT-PCR in saliva obtained from asymptomatic or mild COVID-19 patients, comparative analysis with matched nasopharyngeal samples, PLoS One. 16 (2021) e0252964. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0252964.

[8] World Health Organization, World Health Organization Global Epidemiological Surveillance Standards for Influenza, 2013.

[9] K. Mitamura, H. Shimizu, M. Yamazaki, M. Ichikawa, K. Nagai, J. Katada, A. Wada, C. Kawakami, N. Sugaya, Clinical evaluation of highly sensitive silver amplification immunochromatography systems for rapid diagnosis of influenza, J. Virol. Methods. 194 (2013) 123–128. doi:10.1016/j.jviromet.2013.08.018.

[10] National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Manual for virus detection-influenza 3rd edition, (2014). https://www.niid.go.jp/niid/images/lab-manual/Influenza2014.pdf (accessed April 15, 2020).

[11] N. Kaku, H. Kodama, N. Akamatsu, K. Ota, K. Kosai, Y. Morinaga, Y. Narita, Y. Matsumoto, T. Matsushita, Y. Mizuta, K. Izumikawa, H. Mukae, K. Yanagihara, Multicenter evaluation of molecular point-of-care testing and digital immunoassays for influenza virus A/B and respiratory syncytial virus in patients with influenza-like illness, J. Infect. Chemother. 27 (2021) 820–825. doi:10.1016/J.JIAC.2021.01.010.

[12] N. Kanwar, J. Michael, K. Doran, E. Montgomery, R. Selvarangan, Comparison of the ID Now Influenza A & B 2, Cobas Influenza A/B, and Xpert Xpress Flu Point-of-Care Nucleic Acid Amplification Tests for Influenza A/B Virus Detection in Children., J. Clin. Microbiol. 58 (2020). doi:10.1128/JCM.01611-19.

[13] Y. Sato, S. Nirasawa, M. Saeki, Y. Yakuwa, M. Ono, R. Kobayashi, H. Nakafuri, R. Murai, Y. Fujiya, K. Kuronuma, S. Takahashi, Comparative study of rapid antigen testing and two nucleic acid amplification tests for influenza virus detection, 28 (2022) 1033–1036.

[14] J. Merckx, R. Wali, I. Schiller, C. Caya, G.C. Gore, C. Chartrand, N. Dendukuri, J.

Papenburg, Diagnostic accuracy of novel and traditional rapid tests for influenza infection compared with reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction, Ann. Intern. Med. 167 (2017) 395–409. doi:10.7326/M17-0848.

[15] J. Gibson, E.M. Schechter-Perkins, P. Mitchell, S. Mace, Y. Tian, K. Williams, R. Luo, B. Yen-Lieberman, Multi-center evaluation of the cobas® Liat® Influenza A/B & RSV assay for rapid point of care diagnosis., J. Clin. Virol. 95 (2017) 5–9. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2017.08.004.

[16] F. Hassan, J. Crawford, A.B. Bonner, N.A. Ledeboer, R. Selvarangan, Multicenter evaluation of the Alere™ i influenza A&B assay using respiratory specimens collected in viral transport media, Diagn. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 92 (2018) 294–298. doi:10.1016/J.DIAGMICROBIO.2018.07.002.

[17] J. Bell, A. Bonner, D.M. Cohen, R. Birkhahn, R. Yogev, W. Triner, J. Cohen, E. Palavecino, R. Selvarangan, Multicenter clinical evaluation of the novel Alere™ i Influenza A&B isothermal nucleic acid amplification test, J. Clin. Virol. 61 (2014) 81–86. doi:10.1016/J.JCV.2014.06.001.

[18] F. Wolters, M. Grünberg, M. Huber, H.H. Kessler, F. Prüller, L. Saleh, C. Fébreau, J. Rahamat-Langendoen, V. Thibault, W.J.G. Melchers, European multicenter evaluation of Xpert® Xpress SARS-CoV-2/Flu/RSV test, J. Med. Virol. 93 (2021) 5798–5804. doi:10.1002/JMV.27111.

[19] S. Novak-Weekley, E.M. Marlowe, M. Poulter, D. Dwyer, D. Speers, W. Rawlinson, C. Baleriola, C.C. Robinson, Evaluation of the Cepheid Xpert Flu Assay for rapid identification and differentiation of influenza A, influenza A 2009 H1N1, and influenza B viruses, J. Clin. Microbiol. 50 (2012) 1704–1710. doi:10.1128/JCM.06520-11.

[20] D.M. Cohen, J. Kline, L.S. May, G.E. Harnett, J. Gibson, S.Y. Liang, Z. Rafique, C.A. Rodriguez, K.M. McGann, C.A. Gaydos, D. Mayne, D. Phillips, J. Cohen, Accurate PCR Detection of Influenza A/B and Respiratory Syncytial Viruses by Use of Cepheid Xpert Flu+RSV Xpress Assay in Point-of-Care Settings: Comparison to Prodesse ProFlu, J. Clin. Microbiol. 56 (2018). doi:10.1128/JCM.01237-17.

[21] T. Valentin, P. Kieslinger, E. Stelzl, B.I. Santner, A. Groselj-Strele, H.H. Kessler, B. Tiran, Prospective evaluation of three rapid molecular tests for seasonal influenza in patients presenting at an emergency unit, J. Clin. Virol. 111 (2019) 29–32. doi:10.1016/J.JCV.2019.01.003.

[22] S. Bennett, A. MacLean, R. Gunson, Verification of Cepheid Xpert Xpress Flu/RSV assay for use with gargle samples, sputa and endotracheal secretions, 101 (2019) 114–115. doi:10.1016/J.JHIN.2018.07.016.

[23] E.J. Goldstein, R.N. Gunson, In-house validation of the cobas Liat influenza A/B and RSV assay for use with gargles, sputa and endotracheal secretions., J. Hosp. Infect. 101 (2019) 289–291. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2018.10.025.

[24] S. Davis, A.J. Allen, R. O'Leary, M. Power, D.A. Price, A.J. Simpson, A. Tunbridge, L. Vale, M. Whiteside, C. Evans, M. Raza, Diagnostic accuracy and cost analysis of the Alere™ i Influenza A&B near-patient test using throat swabs, J. Hosp. Infect. 97 (2017) 301–309. doi:10.1016/J.JHIN.2017.05.017.

[25] K.K.W. To, C.C.Y. Yip, C.Y.W. Lai, C.K.H. Wong, D.T.Y. Ho, P.K.P. Pang, A.C.K. Ng, K.H. Leung, R.W.S. Poon, K.H. Chan, V.C.C. Cheng, I.F.N. Hung, K.Y. Yuen, Saliva as a diagnostic specimen for testing respiratory virus by a point-of-care molecular assay: a diagnostic validity study, Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 25 (2019) 372–378.

doi:10.1016/J.CMI.2018.06.009.

[26] B.W. Frazee, A. Rodríguez-Hoces de la Guardia, H. Alter, C.G. Chen, E.L. Fuentes, A.K. Holzer, M. Lolas, D. Mitra, J. Vohra, C.L. Dekker, Accuracy and Discomfort of Different Types of Intranasal Specimen Collection Methods for Molecular Influenza Testing in Emergency Department Patients, Ann. Emerg. Med. 71 (2018) 509-517.e1. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2017.09.010.

[27] M. Malecki, J. Lüsebrink, S. Teves, A.F. Wendel, Pharynx gargle samples are suitable for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic use and save personal protective equipment and swabs., Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol. (2020) 1–2. doi:10.1017/ice.2020.229.

Tables

Table 1. Patient characteristics

Characteristic	All N=244		Nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples N=202		Nasopharyngeal swabs only N=31		Gargle samples only N=11	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Age (average ± S.D.)	39.3	± 21.2	44.6	± 16.6	2.9	± 2.9	43.5	± 24.0
Under 16 years old	37	(15.2%)	4	(2.0%)	31	(100%)	2	(18.2%)
Gender, female	138	(56.6%)	119	(58.9%)	14	(45.2%)	5	(45.5%)
Underlying diseases	81	(33.2%)	75	(37.1%)	3	(9.7%)	3	(27.3%)
History of Influenza vaccination	122	(50.0%)	102	(50.5%)	14	(45.2%)	6	(54.5%)
Time since onset of symptoms								
0 - 6 h	33	(13.5%)	26	(12.9%)	5	(16.1%)	2	(18.2%)
6 - 12 h	31	(12.7%)	21	(10.4%)	9	(29.0%)	1	(9.1%)
12 - 24 h	104	(42.6%)	86	(42.6%)	13	(41.9%)	5	(45.5%)
24 - 48 h	45	(18.4%)	41	(20.3%)	3	(9.7%)	1	(9.1%)
48 - 72 h	21	(8.6%)	20	(9.9%)	1	(9.7%)	0	(0.0%)

72 h -	7	(2.9%)	6	(3.0%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(9.1%)
Unknown	1	(0.4%)	1	(0.5%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(%)
Symptoms								
Fever	227	□93.0%□	186	(92.1%)	31	(100%)	10	(90.9%)
Fatigue	194	□79.5%□	177	(87.6%)	1	(3.2%)	8	(72.7%)
Nasal discharge	158	□64.8%□	128	(63.4%)	20	(64.5%)	10	(90.9%)
Cough	157	□64.3%□	137	(67.8%)	18	(58.1%)	2	(18.2%)
Headache	152	□62.3%□	144	(71.3%)	1	(3.2%)	7	(63.6%)
Sore throat	150	□61.5%□	141	(69.8%)	2	(6.5%)	7	(63.6%)
Arthralgia	129	□52.9%□	124	(61.4%)	0	(0.0%)	5	(45.5%)
Myalgia	97	□39.8%□	92	(45.5%)	9	(29.0%)	4	(36.4%)
Diarrhea	15	□6.1%□	14	(6.9%)	1	(3.2%)	1	(9.1%)
Nausea	13	□5.3%□	11	(5.4%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(9.1%)
Results of influenza antigen test using silver amplification immunochromatography								
Influenza A	93	(38.1%)	84	(41.6%)	5	(16.1%)	4	(36.4%)
Influenza B	1	(0.4%)	1	(0.5%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
Negative	150	(61.5%)	117	(57.9%)	26	(83.9%)	7	(63.6%)
Clinical Diagnosis								
Influenza	108	(44.3%)	98	(48.5%)	6	(19.4%)	4	(36.4%)
Acute upper respiratory infection	105	(43.0%)	77	(38.1%)	21	(67.7%)	7	(63.6%)
Acute bronchitis	17	(7.0%)	14	(6.9%)	3	(9.7%)	0	(0.0%)

Others	14 (5.7%)	13 (6.4%)	1 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)

S.D., standard deviation

Table 2. Results of RT-PCR and TRC

Item	Nasopharyngeal swabs (N=233)		Gargle samples (N=213)	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
RT-PCR				
Influenza A	96	(41.2%)	100	(46.9%)
Influenza B	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
Negative	137	(58.8%)	113	(53.1%)
TRC				
Influenza A	97	(41.6%)	99	(46.5%)
Influenza B	1	(0.4%)	0	(0.0%)
Indeterminate	5	(2.1%)	0	(0.0%)
Negative	130	(55.8%)	114	(53.5%)

Table 3. Performance of TRC in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples

	Nasopharyngeal swabs (N=233)	Gargle samples (N=213)
True-positive	98	99
True-negative	134	111
False-positive	0	0

False-negative	1	3
Se (95% CI)	0.990 (0.945-1.000)	0.971 (0.916-0.994)
Sp (95% CI)	1.000 (0.959-1.000)	1.000 (0.951-1.000)
PPV (95% CI)	1.000 (0.945-1.000)	1.000 (0.951-1.000)
NPV (95% CI)	0.993 (0.959-1.000)	1.000 (0.925-0.995)

CI, confidence

Figure legends

Figure 1. Participant flow diagram

Participant flow diagram showing progression through phases of prospective observational study.

Figure 2. Positive rate of influenza in each test by time since onset of symptoms

Nasopharyngeal swabs were collected from all patients using two swabs (A). Gargle samples were collected from patients whom the physician judged fit to perform gargling (B). A highly sensitive automated antigen test was performed using silver amplification immunochromatography for influenza (FUJI DRI-CHEM IMMUNO AG Cartridge FluAB; Fujifilm, Kanagawa, Japan) at clinics and hospitals. Nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples for TRC and RT-PCR were stored at −20 °C until further analysis. The samples were transferred to Tosoh Corporation for TRC and RT-PCR.

Figure 3. Comparison of the results of nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples

Nasopharyngeal swabs were collected from all patients (A). Gargle samples were collected from patients whom the physician judged fit to perform gargling (B). The sensitivity (Se), specificity (Sp), positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) of the gargle samples against the nasopharyngeal swabs were calculated with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI).



Figure 1. Participant flow diagram
Participant flow diagram showing progression through phases of prospective observational study.



Figure 2. Positive rate of influenza in each test by time since onset of symptoms
Nasopharyngeal swabs were collected from all patients using two swabs (A). Gargle samples were collected from patients whom the physician judged fit to perform gargling (B). A highly sensitive automated antigen test was performed using silver amplification immunochromatography for influenza (FUJI DRI-CHEM IMMUNO AG Cartridge FluAB; Fujifilm, Kanagawa, Japan) at clinics and hospitals. Nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples for TRC and RT-PCR were stored at –20 ° C until further analysis. The samples were transferred to Tosoh Corporation for TRC and RT-PCR.

A)

RT-PCR		Nasopharyngeal swabs	
		Positive	Negative
Gargle samples	Positive	86	7
	Negative	6	103

Se: 0.935 (0.863-0.976)
Sp: 0.936 (0.873-0.974)
PPV: 0.925 (0.851-0.969)
NPV: 0.945 (0.884-0.980)

B)

TRC		Nasopharyngeal swabs	
		Positive	Negative
Gargle samples	Positive	86	6
	Negative	8	102

Se: 0.915 (0.839-0.963)
Sp: 0.944 (0.883-0.979)
PPV: 0.935 (0.863-0.976)
NPV: 0.927 (0.862-0.968)

Figure 3. Comparison of the results of nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples
Nasopharyngeal swabs were collected from all patients (A). Gargle samples were collected from patients whom the physician judged fit to perform gargling (B). The sensitivity (Se), specificity (Sp), positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) of the gargle samples against the nasopharyngeal swabs were calculated with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI).