1 Usability and performance of the MicroGEM Sal6830[™], an RT-

- 2 PCR saliva-based point-of-care platform to detect SARS-CoV-2 in
- 3 primary healthcare settings with non-laboratory trained
- 4 operators.
- 5
- 6 Vanessa Mills¹, Teresa Owens Tyson², Rachel Helton², Paula Hill-Collins², Sarah
- 7 Hubbard², Anchi Scott³, Jeff A. Hickey³, Brian E. Root³, Rory O'Brien³, Jillian
- 8 Conte³, Jo-Ann L. Stanton^{3*}, Jeff D. Chapman³.
- 9
- ¹Care 4 U Community Health Centre, Miami, Florida, USA.
- ¹¹ ² St. Mary's Health Wagon, Wise, Virginia, USA.
- ¹² ³ MicroGEM, Charlottesville, Virginia, United States of America.
- 13
- 14 *Corresponding author
- 15 E-mail: joannstanton5@gmail.com
- 16 Author Contributions
- 17 VM, TOT, RH, PH-C, SH: Study design, staff and participant recruitment, clinical site management
- 18 JLS, RO, JC: Manuscript preparation, data analysis, editing
- 19 AS, JAH, BER: Study design, sample preparation, data analysis, editing
- NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice. 20 JDC: Project oversight, funding, study design.

21 Abstract

22 The beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated how few 23 point-of-care diagnostic tools were available that could be safely and easily operated by healthcare workers with no laboratory training. The 24 gold-standard test, and initially the only test, used RT-PCR with nasal 25 pharyngeal swabs (NPS). Two issues guickly emerged: 1) RT-PCR required 26 central laboratory processing leading to significant time delays and 2) NPS 27 collection causes discomfort, is inappropriate for ongoing repeat 28 sampling of individuals (e.g., frontline healthcare workers) and poses 29 difficulty when obtaining samples from some sections of the population 30 (e.g. some elderly and young children). The Sal6830[™] platform is a fully 31 self-contained, RT-PCR point-of-care device for detecting SARS-CoV-2 32 from saliva that takes less than thirty minutes to complete. In this study 33 we tested the usability of the Sal6830[™] platform by healthcare workers 34 unfamiliar with the instrument at two community clinics: Care 4 U 35 Community Health Center (Miami, Florida, USA) and St. Mary's Health 36 Wagon (Wise, Virginia, USA). Staff participated in three tests: 1) 37 determining SARS-CoV-2 status from blinded positive and negative saliva 38 samples, 2) a clinical study comparing SARS-CoV-2 detection with a 39

comparator point-of-care technology from the same patient and 3) 40 completing a survey designed to measure comfort and confidence using 41 Sal6830™ point-of-care device having received no training. 42 the Participants overwhelming found the Sal6830[™] platform easy and 43 intuitive to use, successfully called SARS-CoV-2 status of contrived, 44 blinded samples and measured a 93.3% overall percent agreement when 45 comparing patient samples across two point-of-care technologies. 46

47

48 Introduction

COVID-19 spread rapidly from first detection of SARS-CoV-2 in late 49 2019 to the declaration of a pandemic by March 2020. The gold standard 50 51 to diagnose and track the virus is reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR), a highly accurate test but, at the time, anchored to 52 central laboratory facilities in the hands of highly trained specialists [1]. 53 Turn-around times on test results could be as long as five days leading to 54 patient loss-to-follow-up, increased opportunity for viral spread, and the 55 unnecessary guarantine of uninfected people. In addition, the available 56 tests required nasopharyngeal swab (NPS) samples that increase medical 57 professionals' exposure to potentially contagious patients, caused patient 58

discomfort, and contributed to inadequate sampling leading to
inconsistent results [2–4]. For certain patient groups, such as pediatric
patients and patients with mental disabilities, collection of NPS samples
can be difficult or unattainable [3].

One solution that offered to overcome some of these challenges 63 was to test patients at the point-of-care (POC) in real time in order to 64 reduce wait time for results. However, early in the pandemic, 65 technologies for RT-PCR that could be operated by non-laboratory trained 66 healthcare workers at the POC were limited. There were some RT-PCR 67 POC platforms available early in the pandemic, such as the Xpert Xpress 68 SARS-CoV-2 test (Cepheid) and the cobas[®] SARS-CoV-2 & Influenza A/B 69 Nucleic Acid Test for use on the cobas® Liat System (Roche Molecular 70 Systems, Inc.) [5]. These technologies utilized eluate from a healthcare 71 provider-collected or instructed NPS placed in a variety of viral transport 72 media. In these systems a subsample of the eluate is transferred to an 73 assay-specific detection platform where the sample is processed and 74 undergoes RT-PCR; this additional sample handling introduces the 75 opportunity for cross-contamination between different samples or 76 patient ID mix up. Also, the operator may be exposed to a potentially 77

hazardous infectious material during sample transfer. The off-platform
sample handling can also present difficulty for non-laboratory trained
individuals to operate safely with confidence.

It was determined early in the pandemic that SARS-CoV-2 can be 81 detected in a variety of biological sample types [6]. Saliva can be collected 82 via swabbing or from stimulated or unstimulated manipulation of the 83 salivary gland and provides non-invasive, lower cost biospecimen 84 collection [7]. SARS-CoV-2 can be detected reliably from saliva [7]. Connor 85 et al. found in their comparative study that substituting a saliva sample 86 for NPS in a laboratory based SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR assay without adjusting 87 for sample-type, was acceptable for diagnostic testing, particularly when 88 89 required for repeat-testing or working with challenging patients [3]. Tarantini *et al.* also noted that in addition to patient discomfort when 90 NPS are collected, incorrect application of the swab can mean the 91 nasopharynx target site is not reached [8] with a significant negative 92 93 impact upon test reproducibility, reliability, and standardisation. The skill of the sample collector does not similarly impact self-collection of a saliva 94 sample. 95

Even after multiple waves of SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks around the 96 world and many more POC in vitro diagnostic devices issued with 97 emergency use authorization by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, a 98 call for a saliva-based, RT-PCR, POC device has not received a good 99 response [9]. The MicroGEM Sal6830[™] SARS-CoV-2 Saliva Test is the first 100 such test with emergency use authorization to respond to this call and in 101 doing so to overcome many of the challenges described here. The 102 Sal6830[™] uses saliva that the patient self-deposits directly into the all-in-103 one processing cartridge which they cap/seal themselves, protecting the 104 operator from handling a potential biohazard and, as the test is run 105 immediately, significantly reducing the possibility of patient sample mix 106 up. Figure 1 illustrates the processing of COVID-19 saliva samples using 107 the Sal6830[™] system. The Sal6830[™] cartridge chemistry has been 108 optimised for saliva and a bead-based viral capture system traps and 109 concentrates intact virions rather than viral debris or un-encapsulated 110 viral RNA, potentially differentiating between infectious and non-111 infectious patients. 112







Obtain Saliva Sample

Connect Sample to Cartridge

Insert and Run Test

Fig 1: Sample collection and test run using Sal6830[™]. The patient 114 deposits approximately 1 ml of saliva directly into the Sal6830[™] collection 115 cup and twist-seals the cap in place to permanently contain the sample 116 within the extraction tube assembly. The act of twisting the cap releases 117 viral capture reagent into the sample which is then gently swirled to mix 118 before being placed into the test cartridge and slotted into the Sal6830[™] 119 instrument. The run is initiated via a touch screen and a result (Detected, 120 Not Detected or Invalid) is displayed on the screen after approximately 121 thirty minutes. The spent cartridge is removed from the device and 122 deposited directly into biohazard waste. 123

124

113

125 The ability to rapidly triage patients as they present to the clinic (i.e. 126 the POC) enables healthcare workers to immediately provide proper care 127 and to direct resources appropriately. Prompt triage means that

treatments can be administered earlier, infected and non-infected 128 patients can be rapidly identified, and isolated as needed, and valuable 129 personal protective equipment can be prioritised for use with those 130 patients known to have COVID-19 infection. However, a POC approach 131 can only be successfully implemented to maintain patient flow if 132 healthcare workers are confident to use it and can demonstrate that the 133 results they generate from the platform are accurate. In this study, we 134 135 investigated whether healthcare workers without previous laboratory training were able to use the Sal6830[™] system with confidence and 136 accuracy to detect patients with COVID-19 at the POC. 137

138

139 Materials and Methods

140 Health clinics and ethical approval.

141 Clinical performance and usability studies were performed at two 142 centres: Care 4 U Community Health Center (Miami, Florida, USA) and St 143 Mary's Health Wagon (Wise, Virginia, USA). Ethical approval for these 144 studies was granted under clinic Institutional Review Board (IRB) Study 145 Numbers 1313475 and 1315538, respectively. The IRB Tracking Number 146 for this study was 2021278. The locations and highest academic

147 qualification of all participating healthcare workers are provided in Table

- 148 1. Saliva used for blind samples was collected under WCG IRB study
- 149 number **1294772**.

150

151 Table 1. Education and title of non-laboratory trained healthcare

152 workers

OPERATOR	TITLE	DEGREES/ASSOCIATIONS	LOCATION
А	Medical Assistant	High School Diploma	St Mary's Health Wagon
В	Nurse	Licensed Practical Nurse	St Mary's Health Wagon
1	Medical Assistant	High School Diploma	Care 4 U
2	Medical Assistant	High School Diploma	Care 4 U
3	Nurse	MSc. Nurse Practitioner	Care 4 U
4	Medical Assistant	High School Diploma	Care 4 U
5	Family Nurse Practitioner	MSc Nursing	Care 4 U
6	Medical Assistant	ВА	Care 4 U
7	Chief Operating Officer	RN, BSN, MPH	Care 4 U

153

154

155 **Preparation of blinded samples for clinical tests**

Verified negative saliva was collected from donors and pooled. A SARS-CoV-2 gamma-irradiated standard supplied by the US Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (BEI Resources, Manassas, VA, USA, catalogue number NR52287, lot number 70039068) was obtained at a

viral stock concentration of 7.65×10^8 genome equivalents (GE)/ml 160 according to the certificate of analysis. The verified negative pooled saliva 161 was stored at -80°C until blinded samples were prepared. Blind positive 162 samples were prepared by diluting the concentrated viral stock to a final 163 concentration of 1.9 × Limit of Detection (LoD) for Sal6830[™], spiked into 164 the verified negative pooled saliva. Blind positive samples were prepared 165 as 1.1 mL aliquots. Blind negative samples were prepared as 1.1 mL 166 aliquots of the verified negative pooled saliva. Blinded samples were 167 stored at -80°C until required. Each sample was labeled with a unique 168 alphanumeric code known only to MicroGEM's clinical trial director (N = 169 48). The blinded samples were shipped by overnight courier to the 170 171 participating clinics. Six non-laboratory trained healthcare workers with no previous experience using Sal6830[™] performed SARS-CoV-2 detection 172 on the blinded samples according to the Sal6830[™] operating instructions. 173 Further details of sample preparation are provided in the Supporting 174 Information. 175

176

177 Clinical performance evaluation of Sal6830[™]

The performance of the Sal6830[™] SARS-CoV-2 Saliva Test at POC 178 was evaluated in a prospective multisite clinical study. A flow chart of the 179 study design is illustrated in Fig 2. Study participants were consented into 180 the study at single presentation to the clinic. All participants were 181 screened against the inclusion/exclusion criteria, gave their informed 182 consent, and provided a baseline survey of subject demographics and 183 COVID-19 status. The study population included individuals aged 5 years 184 185 and over. Pregnant women could participate in the study. Individuals were included if their healthcare provider suspected COVID-19 and they 186 were able to provide consent. Exclusion criteria included an inability to 187 tolerate or provide two samples, involvement in planning and/or 188 189 conducting the study, or previous participation in a Sal6830[™] SARS-CoV-2 Saliva Test study. Further details for consenting participants are available 190 as part of the Supporting Information. 191

192



193

Fig 2. General Study Design for Sal6830[™] clinical comparison. 194

A Tiebreaker test was performed by running a second Cepheid Xpert Xpress 195

CoV-2/Flu/RSV assay if results were discordant. ¹ MT, Mid-Turbinate; ² IUO, 196

Informational Use Only. 197

198

Each participant provided two samples. The first sample was a NPS that 199 was shipped to either Obstetrical Associates Laboratory Services, Fall River, 200 Massachusetts, USA or Intermountain Laboratory Services, Murray, Utah, USA 201

202 for testing on the comparator POC platform. The comparator platform chosen for this study was the Cepheid Xpert Xpress CoV-2/Flu/RSV operated in 203 accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. The second sample was a 204 patient collected saliva sample for processing on the Sal6830[™] as per the 205 instructions for use (IFU). Patients self-deposited a saliva sample directly into 206 the Sal6830[™] extraction tube assembly eliminating any additional sample 207 handling by the operator. The same six non-laboratory trained operators that 208 performed the blind sample evaluation performed all prospective clinical tests 209 undertaken as part of this evaluation. 210

211

212 Sal6830[™] usability questionnaire for point-of-care sites.

The confidence and comfort of non-laboratory staff using the Sal6830™ 213 assessed through a usability questionnaire (Likert Scale). The 214 was questionnaire was completed by the six non-laboratory healthcare workers 215 who took part in the other experiments and an additional three non-216 laboratory staff who also ran the Sal6830[™] platform at Care 4 U Community 217 Health Center on patients not recruited into the formal study. A copy of the 218 detailed data are provided in the Supporting Information. 219

220

221 **Results and Discussion**

222	Results obtained from blinded samples processed on the Sal6830™
223	platform operated by non-laboratory trained healthcare workers are detailed
224	in Table 2. All results of the negative saliva samples and positive samples were
225	concordant with the expected results. One positive sample returned an invalid
226	result, which is not a discordant result. Per the IFU in a real world setting, this
227	patient would have been requested to resubmit a sample for testing rather
228	than being cleared of COVID-19 infection. These results suggest that the
229	Sal6830 [™] can be run safely and correctly by healthcare workers without
230	training in laboratory practice and that the operation of the Sal6830™ platform
231	is straightforward and intuitive.

Table 2. Operator performance of Sal6830[™] with blinded samples at 1.9 ×
LoD at two clinical sites.

	BLINDED PANEL TESTING RESULTS						
SITE & OPERATOR	Positive Samples			Negative samples			
	Number Tested	Pos.	Neg.	Number Tested	Pos.	Neg.	
CARE 4 U TOTALS	12	12	0	12	0	12	
1	3	3	0	3	0	3	
2	3	3	0	3	0	3	
3	3	3	0	3	0	3	
4	3	3	0	3	0	3	
ST MARY'S HEALTH WAGON TOTALS	12	11	0	12	0	12	
Α	6	5	0	6	0	6	

В	6	6	0	6	0	6
STUDY TOTAL	24	23	0	24	0	24

235

236

Sal6830[™] clinical performance in the hands of non-laboratory trained 237 238 healthcare workers was tested in a comparator, prospective trial. The same six healthcare workers who had processed the blinded samples carried out this 239 work. Patients suspected of having COVID-19 were recruited on presentation 240 at the clinic. They provided two samples, one tested using the Sal6830[™] and 241 the second using a different, RT-PCR based POC platform (Cepheid Xpert 242 Xpress CoV-2/Flu/RSV test). Critical differences between the two tests are the 243 sample type (Sal6830[™] uses saliva whereas the Cepheid Xpert Xpress CoV-244 2/Flu/RSV requires a NPS sample) and the degree of sample handing by the 245 operator when running the test. Patients collected their own saliva sample 246 directly into the Sal6830[™] extraction tube assembly ('test cartridge') while the 247 NPS required further steps to transfer swab eluate in viral transport medium 248 to the Cepheid detection cartridge. Table 3 details the clinical performance 249 data for both tests. The positive percent agreement (PPA), negative percent 250 251 agreement (NPA), and overall percent agreement for the clinical study were 87.2% (Confidence Interval (CI) = 74.8% - 94.0%), 97.2% (CI = 90.4% - 99.2%) 252 and 93.3% (CI = 88.6% - 98.1%), respectively. These high levels of agreement 253

between results obtained by non-laboratory trained healthcare workers and
those from central laboratory facilities confirm that Sal6830[™] performed
according to expectations in a POC setting when operated by untrained, lay
operators.

The predictive agreement between the Cepheid and Sal6830[™] POC 258 platforms were similar but not identical. We attribute this to underlying 259 differences in how the two platforms capture SARS-CoV-2 viral material. By 260 processing whole NPS eluate the Cepheid detects both viral particles and 261 associated but non-infectious viral debris [10]. The Sal6830[™] viral capture 262 chemistry only detects intact viral particles that are more likely to be 263 infectious. Detection differences between the two sample types were recently 264 265 reviewed in McPhillip and MacSharry (2022) [11] with saliva from the same patient shown to be positive when NPS is negative, and vice versa. 266

Table 3. Clinical performance of Sal6830[™] SARS-CoV-2 saliva test

Combined Sites*		Cepheid Xpert Xpress CoV-2/Flu/RSV			
		Positive	Negative	Total	
	Positive	41	2	43	
Sal6830™	Negative	6	70	76	
	Total	47	72	119	

²⁶⁸

270 FN = False Negative.

^{269 *}PPA = TP/(TP+FP); NPA = TN/(TF+FP): TP = True Positive; TN = True Negative; FP = False Positive;

271

summary of healthcare workers responses to the usability 272 А questionnaire is provided in Table 4. All healthcare workers participating in 273 this trial found the Sal6830[™] easy to use and they did not require additional 274 technical support. The system and test functions were well integrated, with 275 test results easy to interpret. Overall, it was found that healthcare 276 professionals would learn to use the Sal6830[™] quickly and in the clinics 277 participating in this trial, all users were confident they could conduct the test. 278 What is more, they planned to use Sal6830[™] frequently in POC settings. This 279 confirms healthcare workers were comfortable and confident using Sal6830[™] 280 to process patient samples in a POC setting without technical backup. 281

Table 4. Average response to System Usability Questionnaire for Sal6830[™]. 282

Values were recorded as 1=strongly disagree. 5=strongly agree (N = 9). 283

Question	Average response ± SD*
The MicroGEM Sal6830™ SARS-CoV-2 Saliva test works well in Point- of-Care settings.	4.7 ± 0.47
I found the MicroGEM Sal6830™ SARS-CoV-2 Saliva test was unnecessarily complex.	1.2 ± 0.42
I found the MicroGEM Sal6830™ SARS-CoV-2 Saliva test was easy to use.	4.6 ± 0.68
I will need the support of a technical person to be able to use the MicroGEM Sal6830™ SARS-CoV-2 Saliva test.	1.1 ± 0.31
I found the various functions in the MicroGEM Sal6830 [™] SARS-CoV-2 Saliva test well integrated.	4.7 ± 0.47
I would imagine that most healthcare professionals would learn to use the MicroGEM Sal6830™ SARS-CoV-2 Saliva test quickly.	4.7 ± 0.47
I found the MicroGEM Sal6830™ SARS-CoV-2 Saliva test difficult to use.	1.1 ± 0.31
I felt confident using the MicroGEM Sal6830™ SARS-CoV-2 Saliva test.	4.9 ± 0.31
I needed to learn a lot of things before I could get going with the MicroGEM Sal6830™ SARS-CoV-2 Saliva test.	1.8 ± 1.31
I found the MicroGEM Sal6830 [™] SARS-CoV-2 Saliva test results easy to interpret.	5 ± 0
Would you recommend this device to another (non-laboratory) healthcare professional.	8 participants answered 'Definitely yes'. 1 said 'Probably yes'

284

*Standard deviation shows population variance. 285

286

Conclusion 287

In this report we demonstrate that the Sal6830[™] SARS-CoV-2 saliva test 288 can be used accurately and easily by non-laboratory trained healthcare 289 workers requiring no technical support or user training. Study participants felt 290

confident to use the Sal6830[™] with patient samples and were able to correctly 291 deliver test results. The Sal6830[™] platform returned results equivalent to the 292 293 Cepheid GeneXpert (93.3% overall percent agreement) but was easier to use with no requirement for additional sample handling or for a nurse-collected 294 NPS. Rather, the Sal6830[™] used a simple saliva sample that was easily and 295 painlessly self-supplied by the patient. Sal6830[™] uses the gold-standard RT-296 PCR viral detection technology but is fully compatible with POC settings with 297 non-laboratory trained healthcare workers able to operate the system with 298 confidence. 299

300

301 Acknowledgements

We thank the healthcare workers and participants who took part in this study for their generosity in providing their samples and feedback.

304

305 **References**

1. Wu SY, Yau HS, Yu MY, Tsang HF, Chan LWC, Cho WCS, et al. The diagnostic

307 methods in the COVID-19 pandemic, today and in the future. Expert Rev

308 Mol Diagn. 2020;20: 985–993. doi:10.1080/14737159.2020.1816171

309	2.	Genelhoud G, Adamoski D, Spalanzani RN, Bochnia-Bueno L, de Oliveira JC,
310		Gradia DF, et al. Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 molecular detection in
311		nasopharyngeal swab, saliva, and gargle samples. Diagn Microbiol Infect
312		Dis. 2022;103: 115678. doi:10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2022.115678
313	3.	Connor MC, Copeland M, Curran T. Investigation of saliva, tongue swabs
314		and buccal swabs as alternative specimen types to nasopharyngeal swabs
315		for SARS-CoV-2 testing. J Clin Vir. 2022;146: 105053.
316		doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2021.105053
317	4.	Kinloch NN, Ritchie G, Brumme CJ, Dong W, Dong W, Lawson T, et al.
318		Suboptimal Biological Sampling as a Probable Cause of False-Negative
319		COVID-19 Diagnostic Test Results. J Infect Dis. 2020;222: 899–902.
320		doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa370
321	5.	Health C for D and R. In Vitro Diagnostics EUAs - Molecular Diagnostic Tests
322		for SARS-CoV-2. FDA. 2022 [cited 13 Oct 2022]. Available from:
323		https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19-
324		emergency-use-authorizations-medical-devices/in-vitro-diagnostics-euas-
325		molecular-diagnostic-tests-sars-cov-2

6. Martinez RM. Clinical Samples for SARS-CoV-2 Detection: Review of the 326 Early Literature. Clin Microbiol Newsl. 2020;42: 121–127. 327 328 doi:10.1016/j.clinmicnews.2020.07.001 7. Medeiros da Silva RC, Nogueira Marinho LC, de Araújo Silva DN, Costa de 329 Lima K, Pirih FQ, Luz de Aguino Martins AR. Saliva as a possible tool for the 330 SARS-CoV-2 detection: A review. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2020;38: 101920. 331 doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101920 332 8. Tarantini FS, Wu S, Jenkins H, Tellechea Lopez A, Tomlin H, Hyde R, et al. 333 Direct RT-qPCR Assay for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Saliva Samples. 334 Methods Protoc. 2022;5: 25. doi:10.3390/mps5020025 335 9. Wang Y, Upadhyay A, Pillai S, Khayambashi P, Tran SD. Saliva as a diagnostic 336 specimen for SARS-CoV-2 detection: A scoping review. Oral Dis. 2022 28 337 Suppl 2:2362-2390. doi:10.1111/odi.14216 338 10. Owusu D, Pomeroy MA, Lewis NM, Wadhwa A, Yousaf AR, Whitaker B, 339 Dietrich E, Hall AJ, Chu V, Thornburg N, Christensen K, Kiphibane T, 340 Willardson S, Westergaard R, Dasu T, Pray IW, Bhattacharyya S, Dunn A, 341 Tate JE, Kirking HL, Matanock A; Household Transmission Study Team. 342 Persistent SARS-CoV-2 RNA Shedding Without Evidence of Infectiousness: A 343 Cohort Study of Individuals With COVID-19. J Infect Dis. 2021 Oct 344 21

345 **28;224(8):1362-1371.** doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiab107. PMID: 33649773;

- 346 PMCID: PMC7989388.
- 347 11.McPhillips L, MacSharry J. Saliva as an alternative specimen to
- nasopharyngeal swabs for COVID-19 diagnosis: Review. Access Microbiol.
- 349 2022 May 20;4(5):acmi000366. doi: 10.1099/acmi.0.000366. PMID:
- 350 **36003360; PMCID: PMC9394527**.