Accuracy of upper respiratory tract samples to diagnose Mycobacterium tuberculosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Helen R. Savage, Hannah M Rickman, Rachael M Burke, Maria Lisa Odland, Martina Savio, Beate Ringwald, Luis E Cuevas, Peter MacPherson.

Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, United Kingdom (HR Savage MBChB, Prof LE Cuevas MTropMed, DSc, P MacPherson PhD)

London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom (HM Rickman MBBChir, RM Burke MRCP, P MacPherson PhD)

Malawi Liverpool-Wellcome Programme, Blantyre, Malawi (HM Rickman MBBChir, RM Burke MRCP, ML Odland PhD, P MacPherson PhD)

The Department of Public Health and Nursing, The Norwegian University of Science and Technology (ML Odland PhD)

The LIGHT Consortium, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, United Kingdom (M Savio MPhil, B Ringwald PhD)

Corresponding author: Dr Helen R Savage, Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, L3 5QA, United Kingdom. Helen.savage@lstmed.ac.uk

Keywords: Tuberculosis, diagnosis, systematic review, upper respiratory tract, swab, oral
Word count: Abstract, 297; Manuscript, 3335

Structured summary (300 words)

Background

Pulmonary tuberculosis (PTB) due to *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (Mtb) can be challenging to diagnose because of difficulty obtaining samples, and suboptimal sensitivity of existing tests. We investigated the performance characteristics and diagnostic accuracy of upper respiratory tract tests for diagnosing PTB and hypothesised they would have sufficient accuracy and utility to improve PTB diagnosis.

Methods

A systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted by searching MEDLINE, Cinahl, Web of Science, Global Health, and Global Health Archive databases up to 27/5/2022 to identify studies that reported on the accuracy of upper respiratory tract sampling for TB diagnosis compared to microbiological reference standards. We used a random-effects meta-analysis with a bivariate hierarchical model to estimate pooled sensitivity and specificity, stratified by sampling method. Bias was assessed using QUADAS-2 criteria. Study registered with PROSPERO (CRD42021262392).

Findings

9860 titles were screened for inclusion, 263 studies were assessed for full text review, and 63, comprising 111 test comparisons published between 1933 and 2022 were included in the systematic review (49 in meta-analysis). For laryngeal swabs, pooled sensitivity was 57.8% (95% CI 50.5-65.0%), specificity was 93.8% (95% CI 88.4-96.8%) and diagnostic odds ratio (DOR) was 20.7 (95% CI 11.1-38.8). Nasopharyngeal aspirate sensitivity was 65.2% (95% CI 52.0-76.4%), specificity was 97.9% (95% CI 96.0-99.0%) and DOR was 91.0 (95% CI 37.8-218.8). Oral swabs sensitivity was 58.9% (95% CI 42.9-73.2%), specificity was 85.5% (95% CI 72.9-92.8%), and DOR was 8.47 (95% CI 3.5-20.4).

Interpretation

Upper respiratory tract sampling holds promise to expand access to TB diagnosis, including for people who can't produce sputum. Exploring historical methods using modern microbiological techniques may further increase the options for alternative sample types. Prospective studies are needed to optimise accuracy and utility of sampling methods in clinical practice.

Funding

HRS is funded by the MRC through the MRC DTP programme at LSTM [Grant number MR/N013514/1].

Research in context

Evidence before this study

Globally in 2021, an estimated 4.2 million of 10.6 million people with incident tuberculosis (TB) disease went undiagnosed, emphasising the urgent need for new diagnostic methodologies. Most TB diagnostics are performed on sputum samples, but people who need TB tests are often unable to produce sputum. Upper respiratory tract sampling for TB diagnosis was widely used historically and holds promise to expand non-sputum-based diagnosis.

Added value of this study

We systematically reviewed and synthesised through meta-analysis diagnostic accuracy evaluations of upper respiratory tract sampling for TB. Historically, upper respiratory tract sampling for TB diagnosis was commonly used, with 39/63 studies conducted before 1970, although in recent years there has been a resurgence of interest in oral sampling. We show that upper respiratory tract samples have acceptable sensitivity and specificity compared to sputum culture, and, if testing is optimised using newer molecular and culture-based methods, may be capable of meeting WHO target produce profiles.

Implications of all the available evidence

Upper respiratory tract sampling methodologies for TB (oral sampling, and sampling from the larynx and nasopharynx) may hold promise to expand access to TB diagnosis, including for people who can’t produce sputum. These sampling strategies can be optimised using modern microbiological techniques to increase access to diagnostics for TB.

Introduction

Pulmonary disease due to *Mycobacterium tuberculosis (Mtb)* can be challenging to diagnose because of lack of access to testing services, difficulty obtaining samples, and suboptimal sensitivity of tests. In 2021, of the estimated 10.6 million people with incident tuberculosis (TB) over 4.2 million went undiagnosed (1), and of those diagnosed with pulmonary TB (PTB) only 63% were bacteriologically confirmed. Bacterial confirmation is important to ensure correct diagnosis and for identification of drug resistance, so that the most effective treatment regime can be identified (1).

The most common sample used for PTB diagnosis is sputum, which can be tested by smear microscopy, culture, or using nucleic acid amplification tests (NAAT) such as Xpert (Cepheid) or Truenat (Molbio). These methods rely on people producing a sputum sample for analysis. However not everyone being investigated for PTB can produce sputum. For adults in the WHO consolidated guidelines on TB (2) sputum or induced sputum are the recommended sample types for diagnosis of PTB and, if HIV positive, urine using the ALERE-LAM. No alternative non-sputum options are recommended for a microbiological diagnosis of PTB to allow confirmation and resistance testing.

Children commonly do not produce sputum and therefore the WHO recommends alternative sample types for diagnosis of PTB, these include induced sputum, gastric aspirate, gastric lavage, nasopharyngeal aspirate (NPA) and stool (3). Gastric aspirate has a sensitivity of 73% (Xpert MTB/RIF) compared to microbiological reference standard (32% compared to composite reference standard), but is invasive, requires fasting and early morning testing with low caregiver acceptability (2,3). NPA is less invasive however still requires specialist equipment (for suction) and has moderate caregiver acceptability, sensitivity against a microbiological reference standard is 46% (Xpert MTB/RIF, based on four studies) (2,3).

Stool is a newly recommended specimen type in the 2021 update, has high acceptability, and is non-invasive; sensitivity of stool Xpert MTB/RIF is 61% against microbiological reference standard (16% against clinical reference standard) (2,3). However stool testing requires waiting for a bowel movement.

Alternative accessible sample types that can be processed with both existing and novel tests, are patient-centred, and can be collected at the time of consultation, are urgently required. WHO Target Product Profiles (TPPs) have defined the minimal and optimal diagnostic accuracy standards for tests to diagnose TB in clinical settings, as well as defining desirable characteristics, including using non-sputum samples such as urine, stool, oral mucosal transudates, saliva, exhaled air, or blood from a fingerstick (4). Apart from stool, currently available alternative sample types, such as gastric aspirate or in adults broncho-alveolar lavage are invasive, need fasting and often admission to a hospital with specialist equipment. This can be a barrier to microbiological diagnosis both in terms of availability of the tests, costs, and accessibility.

In Europe in the early 1900s, physicians investigating patients for TB encountered similar concerns and laryngeal swabs were investigated as an alternative sample type for diagnosis of PTB (5–7); however with the decline of TB in Europe this practice fell out of use. More recently, when looking for alternatives to sputum in children, NPA (a procedure where a catheter is inserted into the nostril and suction applied to produce a sample) has been used, and oral mucosa specimens (samples taken by swabbing either the inside of the cheek or the tongue) from South Africa, Moldova and Kenya have successfully been used to diagnose TB (8–10). Sampling of the upper respiratory tract (from the mouth and nose, tonsils, down to the level of the larynx/vocal cords) which is non/minimally invasive, and can be performed

quickly as an outpatient, offers a potential alternative to expand access to microbiological TB diagnosis in those that cannot produce sputum.

We therefore set out to systematically appraise the evidence for the performance characteristics and diagnostic accuracy of upper respiratory tract sampling for diagnosing active PTB disease. We hypothesised that upper respiratory tract tests would have sufficient accuracy and utility to increase access to TB diagnosis.

Methods

We undertook a systematic review and meta-analysis; the published protocol is available online (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=262392). We developed a search strategy with information specialists at the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine library (Supplemental Table S1). We searched the following databases up to 27/5/2022: MEDLINE; Cinahl; Web of Science; Global Health; and Global Health Archive.

We included studies that evaluated the accuracy of upper respiratory tract sampling (index tests) for a microbiological (culture and nucleic acid amplification tests [NAAT] including automated platforms and laboratory PCR) diagnosis of TB disease, compared to a microbiological reference standard using either sputum or gastric lavage. We included cohort, cross-sectional, and randomised controlled studies (either published in peer-reviewed manuscripts, or as pre-prints) that recruited participants from any community or clinical setting; we placed no restrictions on publication language. We excluded: studies where the index or reference standard used histological or biomarker-based testing; post-mortem studies; studies in non-human animal species; case reports; clinical guidelines; and studies testing for latent TB infection (where active TB disease was not tested for).

Titles and abstracts were imported into a Rayyan.ai database(11), and screened by one reviewer (HRS), with a random subset of 10% checked for agreement by a blinded second reviewer (HMR or RMB). The full text of selected manuscripts was then independently assessed by two reviewers (two of HRS, HMR, RMB) for inclusion; in cases of disagreement, the third reviewer acted as an arbitrator. Risk of bias was assessed using the QUADAS-2 tool (12).

Data were extracted using a piloted extraction form into a study database. Manuscripts published in languages other than English were translated prior to full text review and data extraction.

For each included manuscript, we extracted data on: year; author; country; type of publication; original language; report variable if multiple data sets; study design; setting; population; swab/device used; technique of sampling; site of sampling; number of samples per participant; timing of swabs; swab preparation; transport; storage; method of testing; test cut-off; participants; inclusion criteria; number of samples sets taken; number included in analysis; sex; HIV status; median age; index test positive; index test negative; missing result; reference test positive; reference test negative; missing result; true positive; control population; number of samples sets taken, index test positive, and index test negative.

If a manuscript contained multiple index tests, reference tests or cohorts of patients, each data set was included as a separate report. As participants within a particular study may have been included in more than one index test comparison, we reported the number of sample sets included in the analysis for each test comparison undertaken.

Data synthesis and analysis

We summarised study characteristics and, separately for each upper respiratory tract sampling methodology, graphed forest plots and calculated the pooled sensitivity and specificity of the index test compared to reference standards using a bivariate hierarchical random effects model, fitted using the lme4 package in R (version 4.2.1) based on the Cochrane handbook for Systematic Reviews of Diagnostic Test Accuracy(13). If studies were of children a second model, using a composite reference standard, including microbiological and clinical cases of PTB was performed (as in the recent WHO consolidated guidelines (2,3)). Definitions of how clinical cases were defined are provided in the Supplementary Material. Data and code to reproduce analysis are available at: https://osf.io/9nuvq/?view_only=a00f5d373c27461c8b19517673c383aa . This study was registered in PROSPERO (CRD42021262392).

Funding source

HRS is funded by the MRC through the MRC DTP programme at LSTM [Grant number MR/N013514/1]. This research was funded in whole, or in part, by the Wellcome Trust [Grant number 200901/Z/16/Z]. This work was supported by UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office ("Leaving no-one behind: transforming gendered pathways to health for TB") and partially funded by UK aid from the UK government (to MS, BR, LEC, and PM); however, the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies. RMB and HMR are supported by Wellcome PhD Fellowships (203905/Z/16/Z and 225482/Z/22/Z). For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

The funder of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

Results

9860 studies were identified during the initial search period up to 31/01/2021, and a further 933 when extended to 27/5/2022 (Figure 1). We removed 769 duplicates, leaving 9880 studies that were screened for inclusion. We reviewed the full text of 263 manuscripts. Overall, 63 studies were included in the systematic review, comprising 111 reports on index test comparisons; 49 were included in meta-analyses. Full details of excluded studies and reasons for exclusion are in Supplemental Table S2.

Figure 1: PRISMA 2020 Flow diagram for systematic review.

From included manuscripts (Table 1; Supplementary Table S3 includes full methodological details and results for each study), we classified types of upper respiratory tract sampling into four groups: laryngeal swabs (32 studies); NPAs (nine studies); oral swabs (13 studies); and other (mouthwash: three studies; nasal swabs: one study; saliva: two studies; other mucosa/dental samples: three studies). Studies were published between 1933 and 2022 from South Africa (nine studies), Norway (seven studies), UK (seven studies), Peru (four studies), Uganda (four studies), Canada (three studies), India (three studies), USA (three studies), Australia (two studies), Kenya (two studies), and one study from each of Brazil, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Moldova, Mozambique, Spain, South East Asia (not specified), Sweden, Taiwan, and Turkey. Overall, we included data on 23767 index test samples from participants in hospitals (24 studies); TB sanatoria (nine studies); Chest clinics (nine studies); TB hospitals (eight studies), hospital outpatients (five studies); primary care clinics (three studies); mass screening/asymptomatic/contact interventions (two studies); outpatient treatment centres (one study), prisons (one study) and studies where the setting was unknown (four studies). Eleven

studies were in children aged 16 years or younger. In studies that reported demographic data, 56.5% of participants were male (data from 18 studies) and 16.7% were HIV-positive (with 19 out of 29 studies conducted after 1981 presenting data on HIV prevalence in study participants).

Table 1: Study Characteristics

Year	Author	Country	Study design	Setting	Technique and Device	Site of sampling	Participants	Index test analysis	Reference test	Included in analysis	Male	HIV positive (if study after 1981)
Laryngeal swab												
1933	Kereszturi (14)	USA	Diagnostics evaluation	Hospital	Throat swab		Children with TB	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	10	NR	
1937	Allodi (15)	Italy	Diagnostics evaluation	Clinic	Nichrome swab passed to larynx with 'fenestrated' cannula using a mirror.		Clinic patients	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	40	NR	
1941	Nassau (6)	UK	Diagnostics evaluation	Sanatorium	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.		Discharged 1940 – unable to expectorate	Culture	Sputum culture culture	166	NR	

1948	Forbes (16)	UK	Diagnostics evaluation	Tuberculosis Hospital	Sterilised angulated nichrome swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Inpatient sputum culture negative	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	100	100	
1948	Hounslow (7)	UK	Diagnostics evaluation	Tuberculosis Hospital	Sterilised angulated nichrome swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Hospital patients – unable to expectorate	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	193	NR	
1950	Duggan(17)	Canada	Diagnostics evaluation	Sanatorium	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Inpatients and Outpatients both adults and children	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	100	NR	
1950	Renoux(18)	France	Diagnostics evaluation	Sanatorium	Sterilised angulated nichrome swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Sanatorium patients – sputum negative	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	56	NR	
1951	Armstrong (19)	Canada	Diagnostics evaluation	Hospital	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Hospital patients on TB treatment	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	1024	NR	
1951	Szabo(20)	Hungary	Diagnostics	Not stated	Not described	Smear negative TB patients	Culture	NR	2174	NR	

			evaluation								
1953	Chaves (21)	USA	Diagnostics evaluation	Chest clinic	Sterilised angulated nichrome swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Clinic patients presumptive TB	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	1418	NR	
1954	Frostad (22)	Norway	Diagnostics evaluation	TB Hospital	Not described	TB hospital patients	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	1500	NR	
1955	Campbell (23)	Australia	Diagnostics evaluation	Chest clinic	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Chest clinic – unable to expectorate	Culture	Sputum culture	578	NR	
1955	Lees (24)	UK	Diagnostics evaluation	Mass screening/asymptomatic	Not described	Mass screening admitted for swabs	Culture	Bronchial lavage culture	144	NR	
1955	Lind (25)	Sweden	Diagnostics evaluation	Not stated	Stainless wire with calcium alginate advanced to glottis and cough	Patients with lesions on XR	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	121	NR	
1955	Wallace(26)	UK	Diagnostics evaluation	Hospital	Either cotton wool AC or alginate BDE	Inpatients on TB treatment	Culture	Sputum cultu	163	NR	

								re			
1956	Edwards (27)	English	Diagnostics evaluation	Chest clinic	Not described	Outpatients – presumptive TB	Culture	NR	1019	NR	
1956	Engbaek (28)	Denmark	Diagnostics evaluation	Hospital	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Outpatients – unable to expectorate	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	1231	NR	
1956	Tonge (29)	Australia	Diagnostics evaluation	Chest clinic	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Outpatients – presumed and known TB, unable to expectorate	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	465	NR	
1962	Hsing (30)	Taiwan	Diagnostics evaluation	Hospital	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Hospital patients	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	1320	NR	
1962	Velu (31)	India	Diagnostics evaluation	Outpatient treatment study	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough.	Outpatients – bacteriologically confirmed TB	Culture	Sputum culture	2809	NR	
1962	Kertay(32)	Germany	Diagnostics evaluation	State TB institute	Not described	TB hospital patients treated for TB	Culture	Sputum culture	212	NR	
1965	Hauge (33)	Norway	Diagnostics	Hospital	Not described	Hospital patients – PTB	Culture	NR	157	NR	

			evaluation			on XR and clinical					
1966	Pechacek (5)	Czech republic	Diagnostics evaluation	TB hospital	Not described	TB hospital patients – referred as PTB some already treated	Culture	Sputum culture	525	NR	
1968	Lloyd (34)	English	Diagnostics evaluation	Hospital	Stainless steel wire, wet cotton wool, bent to angle	Paediatric inpatients with PTB	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	60	NR	
1970	Mankiewicz (35)	Canada	Diagnostics evaluation	Screening/ Contacts/Asymptomatic	Alginate wool sterilised angulated swab, into larynx and cough	Outpatients – unable to expectorate	Culture	NR	1199	NR	
1999	Thakur (36)	India	Diagnostics evaluation	Hospital outpatients	Sterilised angulated swab, passed to larynx and cough.	Outpatients – children under 14 probable TB	Culture	NR	51	33	
1948	Gilje(37)	Norway	Diagnostics evaluation	Sanitorium	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough (Laryngeal streak)	Inpatients – unable to expectorate	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	400	NR	
1950	Lundar (38)	Norway	Diagnostics evaluation	Sanitorium	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough (Laryngeal streak)	Inpatients – unable to expectorate	Culture	Gastric lavage cultu	304	NR	

								re			
1951	Gilje(39)	Norway	Diagnostics evaluation	Sanitorium	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough (Laryngeal streak)	Inpatients – unable to expectorate	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	863	NR	
1952	Roald (40)	Norway	Diagnostics evaluation	Sanitorium	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough (Laryngeal streak)	Inpatients	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	483	NR	
1952	Smedsrud (41)	Norway	Diagnostics evaluation	Sanitorium	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough (Laryngeal streak)	Inpatients	Culture	Sputum culture	71	NR	
1953	Laes (42)	Finland	Diagnostics evaluation	Sanitorium	Sterilised angulated swab with cotton wool, passed to larynx and cough (Laryngeal streak)	Inpatients – negative Ziehl-Nielson	Culture	Gastric lavage culture	232	NR	
Nasopharyngeal aspirate											
1998	Franchi (43)	Peru	Diagnostic evaluation	Hospital	Feeding catheter	Oropharynx	Children presumptive TB	Culture/PCR	Gastric aspirate culture	64	NR	0
2007	Owens (	Uganda	Diagnostic	Hospital	Graduated	Oropharyn	Children	Cultu	Induc	94	57	44

	44)		evaluation		suction catheter	x	presumptive TB	re	ed sputum culture			
2018	Cakir (45)	Turkey	Diagnostic evaluation	Hospital	Suction catheter	Oropharynx	Children presumptive TB	Culture	Gastric aspirate culture	40	18	NR
2012	Zar (46)	South Africa	Diagnostic evaluation	Hospital	Sterile catheter with mucus trap	Nasopharynx	Children presumptive TB	Culture/Xpert MTB/RIF	Induced sputum culture	535	NR	117
2013	Zar (47)	South Africa	Diagnostic evaluation	Primary care clinic	Sterile catheter with mucus trap	Nasopharynx	Children presumptive TB	Xpert MTB/RIF	Induced sputum culture	384	181	31
2018	Hanrahan (48)	South Africa	Diagnostic evaluation	Primary care clinic	Fasted 2 hours sterile catheter and mucus trap	Nasopharynx	Children presumptive TB	Culture/Xpert MTB/RIF	Induced sputum culture	105	63	21
2019	Zar (49)	South Africa	Diagnostic evaluation	Hospital	Sterile catheter with mucus trap	Nasopharynx	Hospitalised presumptive PTB	Xpert Ultra	Induced sputu	195	NR	32

									m cultu re			
2021	Song (50)	Kenya	Cross sectional	Inpatient and Outpatient	French tubing and mucus trap	Nasophary nx	Children presumptive TB	Xpert MTB /RIF / MGI T	Gastr ic aspir ate MGI T	294	14 9	73
2020	Osorio(5 1)	Mozambiq ue	Retrospecti ve cross-sectional	Hospital	Not stated	Nasophary nx	Children with severe acute malnutrition	Xpert MTB /RIF / MGI T	NR	45	24	10
Oral swab												
2014	Wood (5 2)	South East Asia	Conference abstract	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	54	N R	NR
2015	Wood(5 3)	South Africa	Case control	TB clinic	Omniswab	Inside of cheek 10 seconds	TB clinic patients	PCR	Sput um Xpert MTB /RIF	20	8	0
2019	Luabeya (8)	South Africa	Case control	TB Clinic	Omniswab x 3, Puritan Purflock Ultra x 1 cheek	Tongue swabs	TB clinic patients	PCR	Sput um Xpert MTB /RIF	130	N R	NR
2019	Mesman (54)	Peru	Case control	TB clinic	Omniswab in lysis buffer, Omniswab in PBS, FTA	Cheek	TB clinic patients	Xpert MTB /RIF	Sput um MGI T	33	N R	NR

					card							
2019	Nicol (55)	South Africa	Prospective diagnostic evaluation	Hospital	Omniswab/Puritan Purflock	Cheek (right and left)	Presumptive pulmonary TB	PCR	Induced sputum Xpert MTB/RIF	165	78	18
2020	Flores (56)	Peru	Prospective diagnostic evaluation	Not stated	Omniswab in sterile lysis buffer or EasiCollect FTA card	Inside of both cheeks 10 seconds	Presumptive pulmonary TB	PCR	Bacteriologically confirmed	288	NR	0
2020	Mesman (57)	Peru	Case control	Health centres	Omniswab, Easicollect FTA card	Inside of each cheek 10 seconds	Culture confirmed TB	PCR	Sputum culture	123	82	4
2020	Molina-Moya (58)	Moldova	Cross sectional	Hospital	Primeswab	Swab cheek 7-8 seconds	Clinical diagnosis presumptive TB	PCR	Sputum culture	266	157	NR
2020	Lima (59)	Brazil	Case control	Prison	Not stated	Tongue 10 seconds	Sputum Xpert positive	Xpert Ultra	Sputum Xpert Ultra	128	NR	NR
2021	Ealand (60)	South Africa	Case control	Hospital	Copan swab	Tongue 6-8 seconds	Young children less than equal 5 clinically diagnosed with TB	Culture, Auramine/spogliotyp	Gastric aspirate culture/Xp	35	25	6

								ing. MTBC DNA	ert			
2021	Song (61)	China	Prospective diagnostic evaluation	TB Hospital	Swab	Dorsum tongue 7-8 times	> 16 years symptoms suggestive pulmonary TB	TB-LAMP	MGIT/Xpert MTB/RIF	101	69	0
2021	Wood (62)	Uganda	Prospective diagnostic evaluation	TB Hospital and Outpatient	Copan FLOQSwab	Front 2/3 tongue 15-20seconds	Presumptive TB	qPCR/ Culture	Sputum culture/Xpert Ultra	103	NR	NR
2022	LaCourse (10)	Kenya	Cross-sectional	Outpatient Clinic	OmniSwab	Left and Right buccal surface	Presumptive TB	qPCR	Sputum culture/Xpert MTB/RIF	100	52	54
Mouth wash												
1955	Rogers (63)	USA	Diagnostic evaluation	Hospital	Mouthwash	Pharynx	Proven or presumptive TB	Culture	Sputum culture	43	NR	
1994	Evans (64)	UK	Case control	Outpatient clinic	Mouthwash	Pharynx	Active TB and controls	Lysed rRNA PCR	Sputum culture	39	NR	NR

2009	Davis (65)	Uganda	Diagnostic evaluation	Hospital	Mouthwash	Pharynx	Outpatients and inpatients	PCR	Sputum culture	127	NR	58
Nasal swab												
1996	Warndorff (66)	Malawi	Case control	Hospital	Cotton wool nasal swab	Nose	Inpatients and contacts	PCR	Sputum culture	52	NR	NR
Saliva												
2013	Shenai (67)	South Africa/Korea	Diagnostic evaluation	Hospital	Salivette saliva collector	Mouth	Adult PTB diagnosed patients	Xpert MTB/RIF	Sputum culture	26	NR	0
2015	Gonzalez (68)	Spain	Case control	Hospital	Spitting method into sterile container	Mouth	Adult presumptive TB	Culture	Sputum culture	32	21	NR
Other												
2003	Eguchi (69)	Japan	Case control	Hospital	Unstimulated saliva in test tube	Mouth	Patients with TB	Culture/PCR	Culture	75	67	0
2012	Palakuru (70)	India	Case control	Outpatient clinic	Unstimulated saliva in sterile vial	Mouth	Pulmonary TB	PCR	Acid-fast bacilli positive	25	NR	0
2016	Balcells(71)	Chile	Cross sectional	Outpatient clinic	Bilateral nasopharynge	Nasopharyngeal	Adult contacts of smear	Xpert MTB	N/A	77	34	NR

					al COPAN FLOQswab		positive cases	/TIF				

NR: Not reported

Laryngeal swabs

Forty-one reports that evaluated the accuracy of laryngeal swabs were included, of which 23 contributed data to the meta-analysis (Supplementary Table S4). Studies were published between 1941 and 1968, with sample sizes ranging from 10 to 2809. A variety of angulated metal swabs with cotton wool or other absorbent materials were used to sample from the larynx, and processed using acidic preparations (Table 1 and Supplemental Table S3). Samples (both index and reference) were then cultured using methodologies available at the time of the study including modified Petragnani's medium, Lowenstein-Jensen solid medium, liquid oleic acid albumin mediaand guinea pig inoculation. In all studies, the reference test used was culture of sputum or gastric lavage fluid (using either expectorated sputum [eight studies] or gastric lavage [15 studies]). Random-effects model estimated sensitivity was 57.8% (95% CI: 50.5-65.0%), specificity 93.8% (95% CI: 88.4-96.8%), diagnostics odds ratio (DOR) 20.7 (95% CI: 11.1-38.8), positive likelihood ratio (PLR) 9.3 (95% CI: 5.1-17.0), and negative likelihood ratio 0.45 (95%CI 0.38-0.53) – Figure 2 (SROC Supplementary Figure S1).

Figure 2: Sensitivity and specificity of laryngeal sampling for active pulmonary tuberculosis, with random effects meta-analysis



Nasopharyngeal aspirates

Nine studies that included data on the accuracy of NPA were included, providing 17 test comparisons, of which 10 were included in the meta-analysis. All studies were conducted among children and published between 1998 and 2021, with the number of sample sets ranging from 64 to 535. Multiple index testing methodologies (non-automated culture [four reports], MGIT [one report], Xpert MTB/RIF [three reports], Xpert Ultra [one report], PCR [one report]) were carried out on samples and each was included as a separate comparison. For the microbiological reference test induced sputum culture (6 reports) or gastric aspirate culture (4 reports) were used – Supplementary Table S5. The proportion of children with a microbiologically confirmed diagnosis of PTB ranged from 3% (48) to 38% (43) within the included studies. Model-estimated sensitivity was 65.2% (95%CI 52.0-76.4%), specificity 97.9% (95% CI 96.0-99.0%), DOR 91.0 (95%CI 37.8-218.8), PLR 32.2 (95% CI 15.8-66.1) and NLR 0.35 (95%CI 0.25-0.51) – Figure 3 (SROC, Supplementary Figure 2).

Figure 3: Sensitivity and specificity of nasopharyngeal aspirate for active pulmonary tuberculosis with microbiological reference standard, with random effects meta-analysis



A second model was calculated of reports that included study data of a composite reference standard (both microbiological and clinical diagnosis of PTB, see Supplementary Table 6 for inclusion criteria), with 12 comparisons included in the analysis (Supplementary Table S7). The random effects model gave an estimate of sensitivity 9.1% (95%CI 5.6-14.6%), specificity 99.9% (95% CI 93.6-99.9%), DOR 168.4 (95%CI 1.57-17959.1), PLR 153.1 (95% CI 1.43-16343.5) and NLR 0.91 (95%CI 0.87-0.95) – Figure 4 (SROC, Supplementary Figure 3).

Figure 4: Sensitivity and specificity of nasopharyngeal aspirate for active pulmonary tuberculosis when clinical diagnosis used as a reference standard, with random effects meta-analysis.



Oral swab

Thirteen studies, with 39 comparisons of oral swab samplings to microbiological reference standards were identified; of these sixteen (2015-2022) were included in the meta-analysis. Nine used PCR for analysis, two used culture and one comparison each used Xpert Ultra, Xpert MTB/RIF, TB-LAMP, spogliotyping and auramine smear. Eight comparisons had sputum culture as reference standard, two used sputum culture and Xpert, two used sputum Xpert alone, and four used gastric lavage culture and Xpert (Supplementary Table S8). Six comparisons included children as participants and ten adults. Pooled sensitivity of oral swab samples was 58.5% (95%CI 43.7-71.7%), specificity 85.6% (95% CI 73.9-92.9%), DOR 8.37 (95%CI 3.5-19.9), PLR 4.1 (95% CI 2.1-7.9) and NLR 0.49 (95%CI 0.35-0.68) – Figure 5.

Figure 5: Sensitivity and specificity of oral swab for active pulmonary tuberculosis, with random effects meta-analysis



Other sample types

We identified only a small number of studies of alternative sample types, so meta-analysis was not undertaken. Of these three studies compared the accuracy of mouthwash samples, saliva (one study), oral cavity samples (two studies) and nasopharyngeal swabs (one study) - Supplementary Table S9. A further study on nasal swabs and another on saliva did not contain sufficient information to permit summary of results.

Risk of bias assessment

The QUADAS-2 tool was used to assess the risk of bias for each study included (Figure 6, and for individual studies - Supplementary Figures S5 and S6). Overall, studies performed before the 1950s did not report on multiple domains, especially participant selection and use of index tests. In newer studies there was a high risk of bias in Domain 1 (participant selection) due to case control designs and variability in reference standards used, with some reference standards less likely to correctly classify true TB status.

Figure 6: Risk of bias assessment



Discussion

Diagnosing PTB is challenging, and new, accurate sampling approaches that utilise easier-to-obtain specimens are urgently required. In this systematic review and meta-analysis, which included data on 23767 sample comparisons from studies conducted over an 89-year period between 1933 and 2022, we found that three upper respiratory tract sample types show promise for accurately diagnosing PTB: laryngeal swabs with a pooled sensitivity of 57.8% and a specificity of 93.8%; NPA with a pooled sensitivity and specificity of 65.2% and 97.9%; and oral swabs with 58.5% and 85.6% against microbiological reference standards. These accuracy estimates are similar to currently approved TB diagnostic tools on non-sputum samples such as urine lateral flow lipoarabinomannan assays in those who are HIV-positive (72) and stool in children (3).

Studies that used laryngeal swabs as a sample type were mostly from Europe in the early 20th century and gave a pooled sensitivity of 57.8% against microbiological reference standards (gastric lavage or sputum culture), here there was large variation in swabbing and culture methodologies used over time as new medias and techniques were invented, and all were conducted before the advent of molecular diagnostics. The studies were mostly carried out

among outpatients being investigated for TB, who were unable to produce sputum, with the predominant reference standard being culture of gastric lavage. Use of laryngeal swab testing was discontinued with the advent of chemotherapy and the rapid decline of TB cases in Northern Europe and the closure of sanatoria (73,74), however the original rationale for investigating this sample type, needing an outpatient test that was quick and well-tolerated, reflects similar diagnostic challenges still being faced in high burden countries and the requirements of the WHO TPP (4). Laryngeal swabs may hold promise as an alternative to expand access to TB diagnosis if re-evaluated in prospective studies using modern diagnostic platforms and culture..

The second sample type reviewed was NPA, which were mostly studied in children. NPAs had a sensitivity 65.5% compared to culture of gastric aspirate or induced sputum samples. However as microbiological tests of TB in children have a low sensitivity(75) we also compared NPA to a clinical reference standard for TB, where sensitivity fell to 9%. This reflects the very high proportion of children who were clinically diagnosed with TB in the absence of any positive microbiological test: a common occurrence in clinical practice which reflects the urgent need for improved diagnostic strategies in children. NPA and laryngeal swabs have the benefit of being able to be performed as an outpatient test rather than requiring admission, which could make them a viable alternative in settings where access to hospital services and admission are limited due to cost, distance, and availability. Further research is needed to investigate whether sensitivity can be improved by optimising sample preparation, collection or analysis, how NPA performs in adults, and how NPA could be used within diagnostic algorithms to increase microbiological diagnosis (50).

Oral swabs gave a pooled sensitivity of 58.5% against microbiological reference standards. However, many of the studies that evaluated oral swabs were case control studies with small numbers which have a high risk of bias and would be expected to over-estimate sensitivity.

There was also a wide variability in the swab types, sampling methodologies, and specimen processing and analysis. Nevertheless, oral swabs do offer an easy option for sample collection and transport, potentially widening access to TB diagnosis. Further research is needed including prospective diagnostic evaluations to find standardised methodologies and assess its accuracy in a wide range of populations, including children.

Limitations for this systematic review and meta-analysis include the variability of the methods of sample collection and analysis. We mitigated against this by stratifying studies into groups of sample types for meta-analysis; however, some within-group variability remains. For some studies from the early 20th century, we were unable to identify the full text despite extensive searches with librarians, and especially if they were published in a language other than English; this may have biased results to studies in more prominent journals that were more likely to be archived in libraries and those in English. Newer studies, particularly those that examined the accuracy of oral swabs, mainly used case control designs, and had small sample sizes.

Although upper respiratory tract sampling seems a promising avenue for improving access to TB diagnostic testing, further prospective studies are needed to optimise sampling and microbiological methodologies to maximise sensitivity. In children, where novel diagnostics are urgently needed NPA, potentially laryngeal swabs, and a combination of sample sites may offer an alternative sampling methodology that can be used in outpatient settings to widen access. Historical methods using laryngeal swabs showed similar sensitivity and higher specificity than modern studies using oral swabbing in much larger numbers of patients, some of whom were unable to expectorate. Updated evaluations of laryngeal swabbing is required to determine whether these findings are replicated in modern diagnostic accuracy evaluations and across a range of populations. Oral swabs are simple to collect and transport, however this review has shown that more prospective study data is needed to

understand whether sensitivity is sufficient for use in clinical practice. If so, this may give a sample type that could be used in outpatient settings in children and adults who are unable to expectorate or in an inpatient setting in those too unwell to produce a sample. Overall upper respiratory tract sampling may offer an alternative non-invasive sample type that can be used to increase access to microbiological diagnosis for Mtb.

Contributors: The study was conceived by HRS and LEC. The study design was developed by HRS, LEC and PMP. Data extraction was conducted by HRS, MLO, MS and BR. Data analysis and interpretation were conducted by HRS, PMP, HMR and RMB. The initial manuscript was prepared by HRS and PMP. All authors edited and approved the final manuscript (HRS, HMR, RMB, MLO, MS, BR, LEC and PMP).

Declaration of interests: We declare no competing interests.

Data sharing:

Data of studies and analytical code available at:

https://osf.io/9nuvq/?view_only=a00f5d373c27461c8b19517673c383aa

References

1. World Health Organization. Global tuberculosis report 2022 [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 2]. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/363752

2. World Health Organization. WHO consolidated guidelines on tuberculosis: Module 3: Diagnosis: Rapid diagnostics for tuberculosis detection [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 17]. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/363752

3. World Health Organization. WHO operational handbook on tuberculosis: Module 5: Management of tuberculosis in children and adolescents [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 17]. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/359147

4. World Health Organization. High-priority target product profiles for new tuberculosis diagnostics: report of a consensus meeting. 2014;(April):1–96.

5. PechÁCek M. Comparative Study on Cultivation of Mycobacterium tuberculosis from Sputum, Bronchial Washout and Laryngeal Swabs. / Srovnávací studie o kultvaci Myco the ze sputa, bronchiálních výplachu a laryngeá lních výteru. Rozhledy v Tuberkulose. 1966;26(8):537–40.

6. Nassau E. The Culture of Tubercle Bacilli from Laryngeal Swabs. Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine. 1941;34(7):397–400.

7. Hounslow AG, Usher G. Examination for tubercle bacilli by gastric lavage and by laryngeal swab: a comparative study. Tubercle. 1948 Feb;29(2):25–31.

8. Luabeya AK, Wood RC, Shenje J, Filander E, Ontong C, Mabwe S, et al. Noninvasive Detection of Tuberculosis by Oral Swab Analysis. Miller MB, editor. J Clin Microbiol. 2019 Mar;57(3):e01847-18.

9. Molina-Moya J B: Ciobanu, N: Hernandez, M: Prat Aymerich, C: Crudu, V: Adams, ER: Codreanu, A: Sloan, DJ: Cuevas, LE: Dominguez. Molecular Detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis in Oral Mucosa from Patients with Presumptive Tuberculosis. Journal of Clinical Medicine [Internet]. 2020;9(12). Available from: <Go to ISI>://WOS:000601933600001

10. LaCourse SM, Seko E, Wood R, Bundi W, Ouma GS, Agaya J, et al. Diagnostic performance of oral swabs for non-sputum based TB diagnosis in a TB/HIV endemic setting. Hasnain SE, editor. PLoS ONE. 2022 Jan 13;17(1):e0262123.

11. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. Syst Rev. 2016 Dec;5(1):210.

12. University of Bristol. QUADAS-2 [Internet]. University of Bristol; 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 14]. Available from: https://www.bristol.ac.uk/population-health-sciences/projects/quadas/quadas-2/

13. Takwoingi Y, Dendukuri N, Schiller I, Rücker G, Jones HE, Partlett C, et al. Supplementary material 1 to Chapter 10: Code for undertaking meta-analysis. 2022;83.

14. Kereszturi C. ACID-FAST BACILLI IN THE STOMACH LAVAGE AND FECES OF TUBERCULOUS CHILDREN. JAMA. 1933 May 13;100(19):1481.

15. Allodi A, Silorata AB, Marpillero P. 1937 Allodi et al PDF.pdf. Pubblicazone mensile dell'Ospedale Maria Vittoria di Torino. 1937 Dec;19(6):721.

16. Forbes VH GB: Hurford, JV: Smith, BJD: Springett. The Laryngeal Swab in Early and Convalescent Cases of Pulmonary Tuberculosis. Lancet. 1948;141–3.

17. Duggan L M: Delamater. Laryngeal vs. gastric cultures in the detection of tubercle bacilli. Canadian Medical Association journal. 1950;62(1):54–6.

18. Renoux A GE: Francais. [Detection of the tubercle bacillus by culture of the laryngeal swab; comparison with the results of slide examinations and culture of gastric lavage fluid]. La Presse medicale. 1950;58(22):392–3.

19. Armstrong AR. The Laryngeal Swab Specimen in the Cultural Diagnosis of Pulmonary Tuberculosis. Canadian Medical Association Journal. 1951;65(6):575–8.

20. Szabo I. Experiences with the Cultivation of Tubercle Bacilli in Sula's Fluid Ascitic Medium. / Nase zkusenosti s kultivaci myco tbc v tekute ascitove pude podle Suly. Casopis Lekaru Ceskych. 1951;90(26):811–3.

21. Chaves D AD: Peizer, LR: Widelock. A Comparative Study of the Effectiveness of Laryngeal Swabs and Gastric Aspiration for the Detection of M. tuberculosis in Chest Clinic Patients. American Review of Tuberculosis and Pulmonary Diseases. 1953;67(5):598–603.

22. Frostad S. On the Reliability of the Laryngeal Swab Method and the Gastric Lavage Method for Tubercle Bacilli Demonstration. Acta Tuberculosea Scandinavica. 1954;29(3):214–22.

23. Campbell J AH: Kelly, JH: Banks. Laryngeal Swabs for the Detection of Tubercle Bacilli in Patients without Sputum. Medical Journal of Australia. 1955;2(21):852–4.

24. Lees AW, Miller TJR, Roberts GBS. BRONCHIAL LAVAGE FOR THE RECOVERY OF THE TUBERCLE BACILLUS. The Lancet. 1955 Oct;266(6894):800–1.

25. Lind A A: Lundin. The Laryngeal Swab Method for Detection of Tubercle Bacilli in Pulmonary Tuberculosis. A Comparison between Inoculation and Cultivation from Gastric Lavage, Sputum and Laryngeal Swab Specimens. Acta Tuberculosea Scandinavica. 1955;31(2):178–84.

26. Wallace AT, Ross JD, Schiller E. Laryngeal swabs for isolation of tubercle bacilli. British Journal of Tuberculosis and Diseases of the Chest. 1955 Jul;49(3):225–30.

27. Edwards JMB. The Storage of Laryngeal Swabs. Monthly Bull Ministry of Health & Pub Health Lab Service (directed by Med Res Council). 1956;15:95–8.

28. Engbaek V HC: Holm, S: Melton. Examination for Tubercle Bacilli by the Gastric Lavage and Laryngeal Swab Methods. A Gomparitive Study. Acta Tuberculosea Scandinavica. 1956;32(3):315–21.

29. Tonge PG JI: Hughes. A Comparative Study of Laryngeal Swabs and Gastric Lavage, in the Detection of Tubercle Bacilli. American Review of Tuberculosis and Pulmonary Diseases. 1956;73(6):930–9.

30. Hsing YT CT: Ma. A Comparative Study of the Efficacy of the Laryngeal Swab, Bronchial Lavage, Gastric Lavage, and Direct Sputum Examination Methods in detecting Tubercle Bacilli in a Series of 1,320 Patients. American Review of Respiratory Disease. 1962;86(1):16–20.

31. Velu TV S: Narayana, ASL: Subbaiah. A Comparison of the Results of Bacteriological Examination of a Sputum Collection and a Pair of Laryngeal Swab Specimens in Patients receiving Chemotherapy for Pulmonary Tuberculosis. Tubercle. 1962;43(1):1–10.

32. Kertay N, Marton S. [Comparative bacteriological investigations of the detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis, using bronchial secretions obtained with the Marton method]. Acta Tuberc Pneumol Scand. 1962;41:161–8.

33. Hauge J HE: Schaanning. The Value of Repeated Laryngeal Swab Examinations during the Day. Acta Tuberculosea et Pneumol Scandinavica. 1965;46(2):141–3.

34. Lloyd AVC. Bacteriological diagnosis of tuberculosis in children. A comparative study of gastric lavage and laryngeal swab methods. East African Medical Journal. 1968;45(3):140–3.

35. Mankiewi.E I : Shimro. LARYNGEAL SWAB METHOD FOR DETECTION OF TUBERCLE BACILLI IN PULMONARY TUBERCULOSIS. European Journal of Clinical and Biological Research. 1970;15(3):328-.

36. Thakur CA A: Coulter, JB: Zutshi, K: Pande, HK: Sharma, M: Banerjee, A: Richardson, K: Hart. Laryngeal swabs for diagnosing tuberculosis. Annals of tropical paediatrics. 1999;19(4):333–6.

37. Gilje A. Cultural Demonstration of Tubercle Bacilli by Laryngeal Swabbing. / Dyrking av larynxavstryk for påvising av tuberkelbasiller. Nordisk Medicin. 1948;40(44):1995–6.

38. Lundar J. [A comparison of laryngeal swabbing and gastric lavage as methods of demonstrating the tubercle bacillus]. Nordisk medicin. 1950;44(33):1306–7.

39. 1951 Gilje et al.pdf.

40. Roald OK S: Thomassen. Reliability of the Laryngeal Swab Method for Tubercle Bacilli Cultures. / Larynxkulturers pålitelighet for påvising av tuberkelbasiller. Nordisk Medicin. 1952;48(47):1619–20.

41. Smedsrud K. Cultures from Laryngeal Swabs as a Method of assessing the Quantity of Bacilli in Pulmonary Tuberculosis. / Larynxkultur til kvantitativ vur-dering av basillutskillelsen ved tuberkulose. Deres betydning i det praktiske tuberkulosear-beid. Nordisk Medicin. 1952;47(19):623–6.

42. 1953 Laes et al.pdf.

43. Franchi P LM: Cama, RI: Gilman, RH: Montenegro James, S: Sheen. Detection of Myobacterium tuberculosis in nasopharyngeal aspirate samples in children. Lancet (British edition). 1998;352(9141):1681–2.

44. Owens S, Abdel-Rahman IE, Balyejusa S, Musoke P, Cooke RPD, Parry CM, et al. Nasopharyngeal aspiration for diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis. Archives of Disease in Childhood. 2007 Apr 11;92(8):693–6.

45. Cakr M E: Özdemir, A: Daskaya, H: Umutoglu, T: Yüksel. The value of nasopharyngeal aspirate, gastric aspirate and bronchoalveolar lavage fluid in the diagnosis of childhood tuberculosis. Turkish Journal of Pediatrics. 2018;60(1):10–3.

46. Zar MP Heather J: Workman, Lesley: Isaacs, Washiefa: Munro, Jacinta: Black, Faye: Eley, Brian: Allen, Veronica: Boehme, Catharina C: Zemanay, Widaad: Nicol. Rapid molecular diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis in children using nasopharyngeal specimens. Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2012;55(8):1088–95.

47. Zar MP Heather J: Workman, Lesley: Isaacs, Washiefa: Dheda, Keertan: Zemanay, Widaad: Nicol. Rapid diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis in African children in a primary care setting by use of Xpert MTB/RIF on respiratory specimens: a prospective study. The Lancet Global health. 2013;1(2):e97–104.

48. Hanrahan CF, Dansey H, Mutunga L, France H, Omar SV, Ismail N, et al. Diagnostic strategies for childhood tuberculosis in the context of primary care in a high burden setting: the value of alternative sampling methods. Paediatrics and International Child Health. 2019 Apr 3;39(2):88–94.

49. Zar MP HJ: Workman, LJ: Prins, M: Bateman, LJ: Mbhele, SP: Whitman, CB: Denkinger, CM: Nicol. Tuberculosis diagnosis in children using Xpert ultra on different respiratory specimens. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine. 2019;200(12):1531–8.

50. Song R, Click ES, McCarthy KD, Heilig CM, Mchembere W, Smith JP, et al. Sensitive and Feasible Specimen Collection and Testing Strategies for Diagnosing Tuberculosis in Young Children. JAMA Pediatr. 2021 May 3;175(5):e206069.

51. Osório DV, Munyangaju I, Muhiwa A, Nacarapa E, Nhangave AV, Ramos JM. Lipoarabinomannan Antigen Assay (TB-LAM) for Diagnosing Pulmonary Tuberculosis in Children with Severe Acute Malnutrition in Mozambique. Journal of Tropical Pediatrics. 2021 Jul 2;67(3):fmaa072.

52. Wood G R: Luabeya, A: Wilbur, A: Jones Engel, L: Filander, E: Hatherill, M: Cangelosi. Analysis of prevalent tuberculosis by using oral swab PCR. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2014;21:263–263.

53. Wood RC, Luabeya AK, Weigel KM, Wilbur AK, Jones-Engel L, Hatherill M, et al. Detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis DNA on the oral mucosa of tuberculosis patients. Sci Rep. 2015 Aug;5(1):8668.

54. Mesman AW, Calderon R, Soto M, Coit J, Aliaga J, Mendoza M, et al. Mycobacterium tuberculosis detection from oral swabs with Xpert MTB/RIF ULTRA: a pilot study. BMC Res Notes. 2019 Dec;12(1):349.

55. Nicol MP, Wood RC, Workman L, Prins M, Whitman C, Ghebrekristos Y, et al. Microbiological diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis in children by oral swab polymerase chain reaction. Scientific Reports. 2019;9(1):1–5.

56. Flores JA, Calderón R, Mesman AW, Soto M, Coit J, Aliaga J, et al. Detection of Mycobacterium Tuberculosis DNA in Buccal Swab Samples from Children in Lima, Peru. Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal. 2020 Nov;39(11):e376–80.

57. Mesman MF AW: Calderon, RI: Pollock, NR: Soto, M: Mendoza, M: Coit, J: Zhang, ZB: Aliaga, J: Lecca, L: Holmberg, RC: Franke. Molecular detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis from buccal swabs among adult in Peru. Scientific Reports [Internet]. 2020;10(1). Available from: <Go to ISI>://WOS:000603258300040

58. Molina-Moya B, Ciobanu N, Hernandez M, Prat-Aymerich C, Crudu V, Adams ER, et al. Molecular Detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis in Oral Mucosa from Patients with Presumptive Tuberculosis. JCM. 2020 Dec 21;9(12):4124.

59. Lima F, Santos AS, Oliveira RD, Silva CCR, Gonçalves CCM, Andrews JR, et al. Oral swab testing by Xpert® MTB/RIF Ultra for mass tuberculosis screening in prisons. Journal of Clinical Tuberculosis and Other Mycobacterial Diseases. 2020 May;19:100148.

60. Ealand C, Peters J, Jacobs O, Sewcharran A, Ghoor A, Golub J, et al. Detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis Complex Bacilli and Nucleic Acids From Tongue Swabs in Young, Hospitalized Children. Front Cell Infect Microbiol. 2021 Jun 14;11:696379.

61. Song Y, Ma Y, Liu R, Shang Y, Ma L, Huo F, et al. Diagnostic Yield of Oral Swab Testing by TB-LAMP for Diagnosis of Pulmonary Tuberculosis. IDR. 2021 Jan;Volume 14:89–95.

62. Wood RC, Andama A, Hermansky G, Burkot S, Asege L, Job M, et al. Characterization of oral swab samples for diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis. PLoS ONE. 2021;16(5 May 2021):1–13.

63. ROGERS DE, COOKE GM, MEYERS CE. The detection of tubercle bacilli in mouth wash specimens by the use of membrane filter cultures. American review of tuberculosis. 1955;71(3, Part 1):371–81.

64. Evans D, Goyal M, Taylor IK, Shaw RJ. Identification of M. tuberculosis ribosomal RNA in mouthwash samples from patients with tuberculosis. Respiratory Medicine. 1994 Oct;88(9):687–91.

65. Davis JL, Huang L, Kovacs JA, Masur H, Murray P, Havlir DV, et al. Polymerase Chain Reaction of *secA1* on Sputum or Oral Wash Samples for the Diagnosis of Pulmonary Tuberculosis. CLIN INFECT DIS. 2009 Mar 15;48(6):725–32.

66. Warndoff D, Glynn J, Fine P, Jamil S, de Wit M, Munthali M, et al. Polymerase chain reaction of nasal swabs from Tuberculosis patients and their contacts. International Journal of Leprosy. 1996;64(4):404–8.

67. Shenai S, Amisano D, Ronacher K, Kriel M, Banada PP, Song T, et al. Exploring Alternative Biomaterials for Diagnosis of Pulmonary Tuberculosis in HIV-Negative Patients by Use of the GeneXpert MTB/RIF Assay. J Clin Microbiol. 2013 Dec;51(12):4161–6.

68. González Mediero P G: Vázquez Gallardo, R: Pérez Del Molino, ML: Diz Dios. Evaluation of two commercial nucleic acid amplification kits for detecting Mycobacterium tuberculosis in saliva samples. Oral diseases. 2015;21(4):451–5.

69. Eguchi J, Ishihara K, Watanabe A, Fukumoto Y, Okuda K. PCR method is essential for detecting Mycobacterium tuberculosis in oral cavity samples. Oral Microbiology and Immunology. 2003;18(3):156–9.

70. Palakuru SK, Lakshman VK, Bhat KG. Microbiological analysis of oral samples for detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis by nested polymerase chain reaction in tuberculosis patients with periodontitis. Dental Research Journal. 2012;9(6):6.

71. Balcells ME, Huilcaman M, Pena C, Castillo C, Carvajal C, Scioscia N, et al. M. tuberculosis DNA detection in nasopharyngeal mucosa can precede tuberculosis development in contacts. International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease. 2016;20(6):848–52.

72. Bulterys MA, Wagner B, Redard-Jacot M, Suresh A, Pollock NR, Moreau E, et al. Point-Of-Care Urine LAM Tests for Tuberculosis Diagnosis: A Status Update. JCM. 2019 Dec 31;9(1):111.

73. Murray JF. A Century of Tuberculosis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2004 Jun 1;169(11):1181–6.

74. Glaziou P, Floyd K, Raviglione M. Trends in tuberculosis in the UK. Thorax. 2018 Aug;73(8):702–3.

75. Zar HJ, Hanslo D, Apolles P, Swingler G, Hussey G. Induced sputum versus gastric lavage for microbiological confirmation of pulmonary tuberculosis in infants and young children: a prospective study. The Lancet. 2005 Jan;365(9454):130–4.

List of tables

Table 1: Study details included studies.

List of figures

Figure 1: PRISMA 2020 Flow diagram

Figure 2: Sensitivity and specificity of laryngeal sampling for active pulmonary tuberculosis, with random effects meta-analysis

Figure 3: Sensitivity and specificity of nasopharyngeal aspirate for active pulmonary tuberculosis, with random effects meta-analysis

Figure 4: Sensitivity and specificity of nasopharyngeal aspirate for active pulmonary tuberculosis when clinical diagnosis used as a reference standard, with random effects meta-analysis

Figure 5: Sensitivity and specificity of oral swab for active pulmonary tuberculosis, with random effects meta-analysis

Figure 6: A bar chart to show the percentage of studies with High, Low or unclear bias for each domain.

Supplementary Table

S1: Search strategy

S2: Excluded studies

S3: Full study information

S4: Table of data from laryngeal swab reports used in meta-analysis.

S5: Table of data from naso-pharyngeal aspirate reports used in meta-analysis.

S6: Table to show definition of confirmed, probable or not PTB by study.

S7: Table of data from naso-pharyngeal aspirate reports and clinical diagnosis as a reference standard used in the meta-analysis.

S8: Data table to show analysis of reports of oral swabs as sample type.

S9: Data table to show analysis of reports of other sample type data.

Supplementary Figures:

SF1: Sensitivity and specificity of laryngeal sampling for active pulmonary tuberculosis, with random effects meta-analysis

SF2: Sensitivity and specificity of nasopharyngeal aspirate for active pulmonary tuberculosis, with random effects meta-analysis

SF3: Sensitivity and specificity of nasopharyngeal aspirate for active pulmonary tuberculosis when clinical diagnosis used as a reference standard, with random effects meta-analysis

SF4: Sensitivity and specificity of oral swab for active pulmonary tuberculosis, with random effects meta-analysis

SF5: Bias of individual studies presented via each domain question and overall rating.

SF6: Bias of individual studies presented by domain.



From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71. For more information, visit: http://www.prisma-statement.org/