Expansion of a low-cost, saliva-based PCR test for the detection of mpox virus

Russell J Thomas[1,2], Devyn Yolda-Carr[1], Katherine Fajardo[1], Orchid M. Allicock[1], Sydney A Steel[1], Theresa Zepeda[3], Maurice Brownlee[4], Shyam Saladi[2,3], James Parkin[3], Anne L Wyllie[1,2]

[1]Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA; [2]SalivaDirect Inc., New Haven, CT, USA; [3]Neelyx Labs, Wood Dale, IL, USA; [4]Wellness Homes of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

Correspondence:
Anne Wyllie
anne.wyllie@yale.edu
60 College St
New Haven
CT 06510

Keywords: mpox, saliva, qPCR, molecular diagnostics

Running title: Detection of mpox in saliva

ABSTRACT

Background. Current recommendations for the diagnosis of mpox rely on lesion-swabs as the gold-standard specimen type even though many patients experience symptoms prior to lesion-onset. Earlier detection could bolster the mpox response by mitigating transmission and facilitating access to antiviral treatments.

Methods. We first compared five PCR assays for their detection of mpox DNA extracted from 30 saliva specimens in collection devices with a stabilizing buffer. Next, we investigated the stability of mpox detection in five raw, unsupplemented saliva samples diluted 1:10 in mpox-negative saliva, after storage at 4°C, room temperature (~19°C), 30°C, and 40°C for 72 hours. We also investigated the stability of virus detection through simulated shipping conditions. Lastly, we performed amplicon sequencing on seven saliva samples and assessed concordance of the PCR assays against mpox virus sequences.

Results. Despite identifying three different substitutions in the CDC's Monkeypox Virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test's forward and reverse primers, we observed no difference in the mean cycle threshold values generated between assays. However, one gene target for one assay performed better for overall detection when validated. Detection following storage at 4°C, ~19°C, and 30°C remained relatively stable for 24-48 hours but this declined by 72 hours. At 40°C, detection was stable at 24 hours but declined by 48 hours. Detection following simulated summer and winter shipping temperature profiles also remained stable.

Conclusions. Findings of this pilot investigation support a flexible, saliva-based, extraction-free PCR test as a promising approach for the low-cost detection of mpox virus. With stability observed for 24-48 hours as well as over simulated shipping temperatures, saliva-based sampling and simplified testing could reduce mpox diagnostic costs, increase access to testing and address hurdles in low- and middle-income countries. Future studies should build upon this and assess the temporal dynamics of mpox virus in saliva.

BACKGROUND

Beginning in April 2022, the world witnessed the unfolding of an international outbreak of mpox virus. Countries in Western and Central Africa have long dealt with outbreaks of mpox virus, and it is believed that a rodent reservoir contributes to continuous spillover events in the region[1]. However, few outbreaks of mpox have happened outside of Africa, and when they have happened, they have been largely self-limiting. This outbreak was unique in that it spread widely across the globe – particularly in the sexual networks of men who have sex with men[2]. As we saw with SARS-CoV-2, public health institutions struggled to respond, leaving many unable to access treatment and prophylaxis as case counts grew rapidly and testing was bottlenecked[2].

The symptom profile of mpox virus infection often follows a pattern of viral prodrome, subsequently followed by the characteristic “pox”, with lesions appearing across the body. As the 2022 outbreak unfolded, studies began to emerge, characterizing the symptom profile experienced by those with mpox. The largest found that out of 528 confirmed cases, 56% of cases experienced lymphadenopathy, 41% experienced mucosal lesions, and 5% reported oropharyngeal symptoms first[2]. This breakdown is consistent with another report from this outbreak, with 55% of patients reporting lymphadenopathy and 7% reporting oral lesions[3]. Both reports are fairly consistent with historical data; a retrospective study from the Democratic Republic of Congo found that out of 216 people 57% had lymphadenopathy and 29% had mouth/throat lesions[4]. Interestingly, 78% of cases also reported a sore throat. Another study on a historical outbreak conducted by Pittman *et al.* found that blood and pharyngeal (throat swab) PCR testing were capable of confirming mpox infection prior to lesion-swab PCR testing, which has important implications for the role of screening and diagnostics of close-contacts[4]. Strikingly, their study found ~2000 virus genomes/mL more in throat swabs as compared to blood[4].

While the study by Pittman *et al.* focused on pharyngeal swabs specifically, other studies have shown mpox virus to be also detectable in saliva specimens[5-8]. Most notably, Allen-Blitz *et al.* demonstrated that clinical testing of saliva of people suspected of mpox accurately identified 22 cases[5]. Of those 22 cases, 16 reported symptoms at the time of testing - four of which did not have a rash. Moreover, one of the 22 cases reported being asymptomatic[5]. Mpox virus has also been detectable in saliva over the course of infection, sometimes at lower qPCR cycle threshold (Ct) values than skin lesions, meaning that there was more virus detected in saliva as compared to the lesion-swabs[6,7]. Hernaez *et. al* found high viral loads in 35 of 41 (85%) saliva samples collected with infectious mpox virus gathered from 22 of 33 (67%) mpox-positive saliva samples, and additionally found that systemic symptoms and the presence of lesions were associated with higher viral loads in saliva[8]. In another instance, mpox virus was detectable in a patient’s saliva 76 days after being diagnosed with mpox[9]. The diagnostic implications for this suggest that mpox virus is circulating systemically prior to the formation of lesions and in some cases following their resolution, meaning that approaches either in combination with or in addition to lesion-swabs are necessary. Of particular concern is the patient who reported to be asymptomatic, yet had detectable virus in saliva[5], which has important implications for control and screening.

Overall, the emerging literature suggests that saliva has potential to be a sensitive clinical specimen type for the detection of mpox virus – its particular advantage being its ability to detect infection prior to lesion-onset. With lesions often considered the most painful part of the disease progression, swabbing lesions may increase patients’ discomfort, which suggests saliva would be a less invasive option.

Detecting infection early in close-contacts of confirmed cases allows for rapid deployment of post-exposure vaccination and/or treatment, which may lessen the severity of disease and improve patient outcomes. It could additionally allow for earlier isolation aiding public health workers in halting transmission chains. As a CDC-recognized source of transmission[10], investigation into mpox virus dynamics in saliva is warranted and could further support the development of diagnostic assays. Therefore, in this study, we built upon our lessons from the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic – namely the challenges in diagnostic development and access – to evaluate the detection of mpox virus in raw, unsupplemented saliva. Our goal was to determine the limits of flexibility in testing for mpox virus in an effort to support effective outbreak response: namely the duration of stability of the detection of mpox virus in saliva as well as the potential for extraction-free workflows.

METHODS

Ethics statement

This study was conducted with Institutional Review Board approval from Yale Human Research Protection Program (Protocol ID. 2000033293), which allowed for the use of remnant clinical samples and was considered as non-human subjects research. No personal identifiable information was used for this study.

Samples

We received 30 known mpox-positive saliva samples in Spectrum SDNA-1000 collection devices[11] from FlowHealth (Culver City, CA)[5]. These collection devices contain patented preservative media to stabilize analytes at ambient temperatures. We additionally received five raw, unsupplemented mpox-positive saliva samples from Neelyx Labs (Wood Dale, IL) that were collected from patients with positive lesion-swabs.

PCR assay performance

We first validated five different PCR assays on the 30 saliva samples received from FlowHealth: the Logix Smart™ Mpox (2-Gene) RUO (Co-Diagnostics, Inc., Salt Lake City, UT)[12], the Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay (Mirimus Labs, Brooklyn, NY), the assay targeting Clade 2 developed by Yu Li *et al.*[13], and the CDC recommended assays consisting of targets for both mpox[14] and non-variola orthopox virus[15] (Table 1). The sequences for the primers and probes of the Logix Smart™ Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay from Co-Diagnostics, Inc. are proprietary, and as such, are not available for inclusion in Table 1.

Table 1. Gene targets, primers, and probe sequences of the mpox PCR assays evaluated

Assay	Supplier	Gene Targets	Component	Sequence
Logix Smart™ Mpox (2-Gene) RUO	Co-Diagnostics, Inc. Salt Lake City, UT	L6R (T3) F8L (T4)	Forward Primer	Proprietary
			Reverse Primer	Proprietary
			Probe	Proprietary

Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR Assay	Mirimus Labs, Brooklyn, NY	G2R (Generic) E9L	Forward Primers	5'-GGA AAA TGT AAA GAC AAC GAA TAC AG-3' 5'-TCA ACT GAA AAG GCC ATC TAT GA-3'
			Reverse Primers	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT GGA AGC GTA-3' 5'-GAG TAT AGA GCA CTA TTT CTA AAT CCC A-3'
			Probes	5'-FAM-AAG CCG TAA TCT A<BHQ-1dT>GT TGT CTA TCG TGT CC-Spacer C6-3' 5'-FAM-CCA TGC AAT A (T–BHQ1) A CGT ACA AGA TAG TAG CCA AC-Phos-3'
Clade II RT-PCR Assay	Yu Li *et. al*	G2R (Clade II)	Forward Primer	5′-CAC ACC GTC TCT TCC ACA GA-3'
			Reverse Primer	5′-GAT ACA GGT TAA TTT CCA CAT CG-3'
			Probe	5′ FAM-AAC CCG TCG TAA CCA GCA ATA CAT TT-3′ BHQ1
CDC Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USA	G2R (Generic)	Forward Primer	5'-GGA AAA TGT AAA GAC AAC GAA TAC AG-3'
			Reverse Primer	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT GGA AGC GTA-3'
			Probe	5'-FAM-AAG CCG TAA TCT A<BHQ-1dT>G TTG TCT ATC GTG TCC-Spacer C6-3'
CDC Non-variola Orthopoxvirus Generic Real-Time PCR Test	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USA	E9L	Forward Primer	5'-TCA ACT GAA AAG GCC ATC TAT GA-3'
			Reverse Primer	5'-GAG TAT AGA GCA CTA TTT CTA AAT CCC A-3'
			Probe	5'-FAM-CCA TGC AAT A (T–BHQ1) A CGT ACA AGA TAG TAG CCA AC-Phos-3'

Extraction-free workflows

We tested the five raw, unsupplemented saliva samples from Neelyx Labs through three different

SalivaDirect extraction-free workflows developed for the detection of SARS-CoV-2[16,17]. Briefly, workflow one includes the addition of proteinase K followed by heat inactivation at 95°C for 5 minutes, workflow two includes heat treatment at 95°C without addition of proteinase K, and workflow three includes heat pre-treatment at 95°C for 30 minutes, followed by addition of proteinase K, then heat inactivation at 95°C for 5 minutes[16,17].

Stability of detection of mpox virus in raw, unsupplemented saliva

Having previously demonstrated the stability of SARS-CoV-2 virus RNA in raw saliva[18], we tested the stability of the detection of mpox virus DNA in the raw, unsupplemented, mpox-positive samples diluted 1:10 and 1:100 in raw, unsupplemented, mpox-negative saliva. When testing, we followed workflow one. Saliva lysates prepared from the 1:10 dilutions were tested with the Logix Smart™ Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay and the lysates prepared from the 1:100 dilutions were tested with the Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay. Time zero values were adjusted based on this dilution factor, for which a dilution of 1:10 would yield approximately a +3 increase in cycle threshold value. To test stability, we assessed the change in Ct values at 24 hours, 48 hours, and 72 hours of incubation at 4°C, room temperature (~19°C), 30°C, and 40°C. Additionally, we assessed the stability of the detection of mpox virus DNA incubated through a modification of the US Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) summer and winter shipping profile conditions, modeled after International Safe Transit Association (ISTA) 7D shipping standard[19]. These modifications were approved by the FDA for our EUA application for SalivaDirect's SARS-CoV-2 PCR assay (SalivaDirect - EUA Summary). Due to limited sample volume, only three samples were run through the simulated shipping profiles (Table 2), and all three samples were diluted 1:5 into mpox-negative saliva.

Table 2. Summer and winter simulated shipping profiles

Cycle Period	Cycle Period (hours)*	Total Time (hours)	Summer Temperature	Winter Temperature
1	8	8	40°C	-20°C
2	4	12	~19-20°C	~19-20°C
3	2	14	40°C	-20°C
4	36	50	30°C	4°C
5	6	56	40°C	-20°C

**Duration of each cycle*[19].

Amplicon sequencing from saliva samples

As genomic sequencing becomes commonplace, we were also interested in exploring the feasibility of sequencing mpox virus from saliva samples. For this, we followed the sequencing protocol developed by Chen *et. al.*[20], after performing DNA extraction on the 30 known-positive samples collected into Spectrum SDNA-1000 tubes using the MagMAX™ Viral/Pathogen Nucleic Acid Isolation Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, MA). After selecting specimens with Ct values <31 following PCR testing using the Logix Smart™ Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay, we proceeded with sequencing seven saliva specimens using the Yale Center for Genomic Analysis' Illumina MiSeq at a depth of 1.5 million reads. We then followed the bioinformatics pipeline used by Chen *et. al*[20].

Following generation of the consensus sequences for these samples, we performed a reference-guided whole genome alignment using a reference sequence retrieved from the National

Center for Biotechnology Information's (NCBI) GenBank. We then compared the primers/probes of the assays used in this study against the aligned sequences for concordance using Geneious Prime® v2023.1.1. Following this, we retrieved an additional 1,560 mpox virus whole genomes from GenBank with collection dates after January 1st, 2022 through April 7th, 2023 to restrict the analysis to currently circulating lineages. The primers and probes of the assays were then compared across the new alignment which included a total of 1,486 sequences after sequence quality checks.

Statistical methods

Statistical analyses were performed using R Version 4.2.2 (2022-10-31) and data visualizations were produced using GraphPad Prism 9.4.1. We used a logistic regression model to see if there was a difference in detection as well as a one-way ANOVA to determine whether there was a significant difference in mean cycle threshold values across assays.

To evaluate the impact of temperature over time, a linear model was used. An interaction term was used to evaluate the effect of time and temperature by sample (time*temperature). The ΔCT value represents the change in the Ct value from saliva under each condition (categorical). The reference group for time was zero, and the reference group for temperature was room temperature (~19°C). P values of less than 0.05 were considered significant.

RESULTS

PCR assay performance

The F8L gene target of the Logix Smart™ Mpox (2-Gene) RUO (Co-Diagnostics, Inc.) assay performed better at overall detection (coded 1/0) of mpox virus ($p < 0.05$). The L6R target performed comparably to the other assays tested. Mean Ct values however, did not differ across the assays ($p = 0.59$).

Extraction-free workflows

Detection of mpox virus in saliva was comparable across all three extraction-free workflows (Figure 1). Due to limited sample size and sample volume it was not possible to statistically quantify the differences in performance of the workflows.



Figure 1. Flexible, extraction-free workflows performed comparably for the detection of mpox virus in raw, unsupplemented, saliva samples. *Cycle threshold (Ct) values of three raw,*

unsupplemented, mpox-positive saliva samples prepared in each of the three extraction-free workflows (SalivaDirect) and tested using the Co-Diagnostics' Logix Smart™ Mpox (2-Gene) RUO PCR assay. Results from the T3 and T4 targets are shown, separately. With limited sample size and volume, statistical analysis of performance was unable to be performed across all workflows.

Stability of detection of mpox virus in saliva

The detection of mpox virus DNA remained relatively stable in raw, unsupplemented saliva for 24-48 hours, with degradation notable at 72 hours (Figure 2). As compared to time zero, we observed an increase of 2.14 Ct, 2.55 Ct, and 4.72 Ct, at 24, 48, and 72 hours, respectively for Co-Diagnostic's T3 target and an increase of 2.70 Ct, 3.05 Ct, and 4.99 Ct, respectively for the T4 target. When fitting the linear model with the interaction term, we found that at 40°C, temperature makes degradation worse over time. We observed similar results for the samples that were diluted 1:100 in negative saliva and tested with the Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay (*see Supplementary Figure 1*).



Figure 2. Stability of mpox virus detection in raw, unsupplemented saliva after prolonged storage at different temperatures. *Raw mpox-positive saliva samples were diluted 1:10 into raw mpox-negative saliva. Prepared saliva lysates were tested in PCR using the Co-Diagnostics Logix Smart™ Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay. The "T3" target cycle threshold values are shown as solid lines, while the "T4" target cycle threshold values are shown as dotted lines. Results suggest that the detection of mpox virus remains relatively stable for approximately 24–48 hours across all storage conditions, with reduced stability in unsupplemented saliva at 40°C.*

Detection of mpox virus in raw saliva also remained stable following the 56 hour incubation through temperatures and time periods simulating summer and winter shipping conditions (Figure 4), suggesting that saliva samples used for the detection of mpox virus may be sent through postal systems while maintaining sensitivity.



Figure 4. Detection of mpox virus in raw, unsupplemented saliva remained stable after cycling through temperatures representing shipping conditions encountered in summer and winter. *Cycle threshold (Ct) values for three different unsupplemented saliva samples that were cycled through simulated summer and winter shipping profiles as recommended by the FDA for the development of molecular diagnostic assays. Raw mpox-positive saliva samples were diluted 1:5 into raw mpox-negative saliva. Saliva lysates were prepared in the extraction-free workflow protocol one then tested in PCR using the Co-Diagnostics Logic Smart™ Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay, CDC Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR assay, CDC Non-variola Orthopoxvirus Generic Real-Time PCR assay, and Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay.*

Amplicon sequencing from saliva samples

We successfully sequenced the whole mpox virus genomes of seven saliva samples according to the amplicon-based sequencing protocol (*see Supplementary Table 1*). After aligning the seven generated consensus sequences to the annotated reference genome NC_063383[21], we visually examined the alignment of the forward primers, reverse primers, and probes across the different assays for which we had access to this information. We found two different mismatches with the CDC's Monkeypox Virus Generic RT-PCR Assay. The sequences had a single nucleotide substitution in the forward and reverse primers.

Importantly, the reference sequence, which was collected from a patient in Nigeria in 2018, only had a mismatch in the forward primer – there was no nucleotide substitution in the reverse primer or the probe. All primers and probes of the other assays were concordant with the generated sequences as well as the reference sequence. The discordant sequences and the primers/probes can be seen in Table 3.

Following, we downloaded 1,560 complete genomes from the NCBI's nucleotide database and aligned them to the reference genome NC_063383. Genomes generated from samples collected after January 1st, 2022 through April 7th, 2023 were retrieved. After removing poor quality sequences a total of 1,484 genomes were included in the alignment. We then tested the primers and probes on the alignment – finding that indeed the primers for the CDC's Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test had several mismatches across the 1,484 genomes. The Clade IIa Assay as well as the CDC's Non-variola Orthopoxvirus Generic Real-Time PCR Test primer and probe sets remained accurate.

These results mostly agree with the results reported by Wu *et al.*[22]. In our study, 100% of the 1,484 sequences had the A6G substitution in the forward primer, while 99.5% (n=1,476) sequences included

in our alignment had the G17A substitution in the reverse primer. Additionally, we observed 3 sequences with a G16A substitution in the reverse primer – all of which were from the United States.

Table 3. CDC Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test primer concordance with 1,483 sequences aligned to reference sequence 'NC_063383'

Nucleotide Type	Nucleotide Sequence	Number Observed
Mpox Sequence	5'-GGA AA**G** TGT AAA GAC AAC GAA TAC AG-3'	1,484 (100%)
Forward Primer	5'-GGA AA**A** TGT AAA GAC AAC GAA TAC AG-3'	
Mpox Sequence	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT G**A**A AGC GTA-3'	1,476 (99.5%)
Reverse Primer	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT G**G**A AGC GTA-3'	
Mpox Sequence	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT **A**AA AGC GTA-3'	3 (0.2%)
Reverse Primer	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT **G**GA AGC GTA-3'	

*Nucleotides underlined and bolded represent substitutions in the mpox sequence pulled from NCBI's Nucleotide database and the corresponding mismatch in the PCR primer.

DISCUSSION

With saliva gaining in popularity as an accessible sample type for diagnostic and surveillance strategies, it featured in a number of studies conducted during the 2022 outbreak of mpox[5-9,23]. Reports found high concordance with mpox-positive lesion swab samples[8,23] and higher viral load (as approximated by Ct values) in comparison to other respiratory samples[23] and sometimes lesion swabs[6,7]. With saliva proving the superior respiratory specimen[23], our study expands upon this investigation into alternative specimens for the detection of mpox by demonstrating the stability of detection of mpox in raw, unsupplemented saliva through temporary storage conditions and simulated shipping conditions. This evidence supports the use of saliva as a sample type in low-resource settings and as an option for direct-to-consumer strategies, which may reduce stigma-related barriers to testing.

These findings are of particular significance to global health, as saliva-based and simplified workflows may reduce the direct costs of the test itself which is helpful in low-resource settings. Saliva offers a more convenient testing method as compared to lesion-swabs. As saliva does not require a healthcare provider for collection, this reduces the risk of nosocomial transmission (which we acknowledge is minimal in the current outbreak) and labor costs associated with offering diagnostic services. Additionally, when collected by a healthcare provider (or self-collected from a patient) lesion-swabs may be collected inappropriately, such as not collecting enough exudate or lesion crusts, which could impact test sensitivity. This is in contrast to saliva – which is an easy sample type to visually confirm whether enough volume has been collected for testing. Moreover, saliva may prove useful to outbreak

response as it is more convenient to serially collect as opposed to waiting for the development of lesions, and if collected alongside lesion-swabs may increase detection rates should a swab test fail. Lastly, serial collection of the saliva of those exposed to mpox virus could help identify cases earlier, prevent further transmission, and facilitate faster access to antivirals.

In addition to being an easy sample to collect, saliva samples may not require a stabilizing buffer. Based on the results from the stability study, we demonstrated stability of mpox virus DNA in raw, unsupplemented saliva for 24-48 hours and following conditions simulating shipping conditions which may be encountered in both summer and winter. This suggests that the collection device used does not need to include transport media to preserve mpox virus DNA in saliva so long as transport to the laboratory occurs within this window. In other words, a sterile collection tube is all that is necessary which reduces the cost of test kits. The evidence from the stability study additionally allows for flexibility in testing infrastructure in low- and middle-income countries, as geographic barriers to PCR testing are reduced as cold-chain transport of specimens is only necessary in settings where temperatures near 40°C. The evidence generated in this study also opens up avenues for self-collection of specimens that can then be sent through postal systems, offering a more discrete option for groups facing stigma.

Once at the clinical laboratory, extraction-free workflows further reduce costs by minimizing the overhead associated with sample processing and requiring less equipment and reagents to receive accurate results. In countries where supply-chain infrastructure for test kit materials as well as reagents and laboratory machinery may be strained, having a flexible platform such as this may reduce barriers to diagnostic testing. The preliminary data we present here, indicates comparable sensitivity between three extraction-free PCR workflows (SalivaDirect) for the detection of mpox virus offering additional flexibility to fit into existing laboratory regulations and/or processes.

Furthermore, we demonstrate the feasibility of amplicon-sequencing of mpox virus from saliva samples, further negating the requirement for swab-based samples which are typically considered as necessary for whole genome sequencing. Importantly, the multiple substitutions that we observed in the forward and reverse primers of the CDC's Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test highlights the ongoing need for routine genomic surveillance of emerging pathogens so as to ensure adequate diagnostic performance in the face of evolution. The discordance documented in our study is different from the TNF deletions seen in three cases in California as reported by the CDC[24], yet provides further evidence to the instability of this region in the mpox virus genome and reaffirms the necessity of multiplexed assays or identification of mpox-specific viral targets for accurate diagnosis.

The sample size of this study remains an important limitation – and emphasizes the need for prospective collection of multiple sample types during outbreaks of emerging pathogens to identify best practices for diagnostics. Additionally, as the samples were diluted into mpox-negative saliva, the composition of the negative saliva may be different than that of an mpox-positive person, disrupting the integrity of the original sample which could have implications for the stability of mpox virus. Despite these limitations, the results of this study contribute to the emerging body of evidence investigating alternative sample types for the detection of mpox virus.

Saliva is increasingly being accepted as a clinical sample type across the globe[25] – and should be considered as a potential tool for the diagnosis and screening of mpox virus. Further research is

needed to assess the temporal dynamics of mpox virus in saliva. Understanding the temporal dynamics of mpox virus in saliva will describe the window at which we can expect patients to become positive and/or infectious through saliva. It may also aid us in prediction of when disease may be at its worst based on viral load. Answers for these questions can be accomplished through prospective screening of close-contacts of confirmed cases, as well as study into the transmission potential of saliva, study designs called for by Coppens *et al*. which we echo here[23]. Our open-source PCR test evaluated here, provides a low-cost option to support this, while offering a sustainable testing option. The urgency of on-going diagnostics development, optimization, and evaluation is accentuated by case reports of reinfection, break-through infection following vaccination, and infection of those who have both prior infection and full vaccination[26–28]. Questions pertaining to asymptomatic transmission/prolonged viral shedding still remain and finding ways to identify these cases is important for halting ongoing human-to-human transmission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
We thank the Grubaugh Laboratory at the Yale School of Public Health for providing guidance on the amplicon-sequencing protocol they developed – in particular Dr. Nathan D. Grubaugh, Nicholas F.G. Chen, and Dr. Chrispin Chaguza. We also would like to thank Mirimus Labs, Co-Diagnostics Inc., and Dr. Delphine Dean at Clemson University for providing us with the PCR assays used in this study. We also thank Yale University's Fund for Lesbian and Gay Studies for financially supporting this research.

ROLE OF THE FUNDER
This work was supported by Yale University's Fund for Lesbian and Gay Studies (FLAGS).

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS.
ALW conceived and designed the study. RJT and ALW managed the study. TZ, MB, SS and JP managed sample collection. RJT, DY-C and KF were responsible for and performed the assays. RJT, OMA and ALW performed the analyses and interpreted the data. RJT, SAS and ALW drafted the manuscript. All authors amended and commented on the final manuscript.

DISCLOSURES
ALW has received consulting and/or advisory board fees from Pfizer, Diasorin, PPS Health, Co-Diagnostics, and Global Diagnostic Systems for work unrelated to this project, and and is Principal Investigator on research grants from Pfizer, Merck and Flambeau Diagnostics to Yale University. All other co-authors declare no potential conflict of interest.

REFERENCES
1. Human Monkeypox—Kasai Oriental, Democratic Republic of Congo, February 1996-October 1997. (n.d.). Retrieved June 8, 2023, from https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/00050245.htm
2. Monkeypox Virus Infection in Humans across 16 Countries—April–June 2022 | NEJM. (n.d.). Retrieved June 8, 2023, from https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/nejmoa2207323
3. Girometti, N., Byrne, R., Bracchi, M., Heskin, J., McOwan, A., Tittle, V., Gedela, K., Scott, C., Patel, S., Gohil, J., Nugent, D., Suchak, T., Dickinson, M., Feeney, M., Mora-Peris, B., Stegmann, K., Plaha, K., Davies, G., Moore, L. S. P., … Whitlock, G. (2022). Demographic and

clinical characteristics of confirmed human monkeypox virus cases in individuals attending a sexual health centre in London, UK: An observational analysis. The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 22(9), 1321–1328. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00411-X

4. Pittman, P. R., Martin, J. W., Kingebeni, P. M., Tamfum, J.-J. M., Wan, Q., Reynolds, M. G., Quinn, X., Norris, S., Townsend, M. B., Satheshkumar, P. S., Soltis, B., Honko, A., Güereña, F. B., Korman, L., Huggins, J. W., & Group, T. K. H. M. I. S. (2022). Clinical characterization of human monkeypox infections in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (p. 2022.05.26.22273379). medRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.26.22273379
5. Allan-Blitz, L.-T., Carragher, K., Sukhija-Cohen, A., Li, H., & Klausner, J. D. (2022). Laboratory Validation and Clinical Implementation of Human Monkeypox Saliva-Based Tests (p. 2022.08.08.22278498). medRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.08.22278498
6. Peiró-Mestres, A., Fuertes, I., Camprubí-Ferrer, D., Marcos, M. Á., Vilella, A., Navarro, M., Rodriguez-Elena, L., Riera, J., Català, A., Martínez, M. J., Blanco, J. L., & Group, on behalf of the H. C. de B. M. S. (2022). Frequent detection of monkeypox virus DNA in saliva, semen, and other clinical samples from 12 patients, Barcelona, Spain, May to June 2022. Eurosurveillance, 27(28), 2200503. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.28.2200503
7. Antinori, A., Mazzotta, V., Vita, S., Carletti, F., Tacconi, D., Lapini, L. E., D'Abramo, A., Cicalini, S., Lapa, D., Pittalis, S., Puro, V., Capparuccia, M. R., Giombini, E., Gruber, C. E. M., Garbuglia, A. R., Marani, A., Vairo, F., Girardi, E., Vaia, F., … Group, the I. M. (2022). Epidemiological, clinical and virological characteristics of four cases of monkeypox support transmission through sexual contact, Italy, May 2022. Eurosurveillance, 27(22), 2200421. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.22.2200421
8. Hernaez, B., Muñoz-Gómez, A., Sanchiz, A., Orviz, E., Valls-Carbo, A., Sagastagoitia, I., Ayerdi, O., Martín, R., Puerta, T., Vera, M., Cabello, N., Vergas, J., Prieto, C., Pardo-Figuerez, M., Negredo, A., Lagarón, J. M., Del Romero, J., Estrada, V., & Alcamí, A. (2023). Monitoring monkeypox virus in saliva and air samples in Spain: A cross-sectional study. The Lancet. Microbe, 4(1), e21–e28. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(22)00291-9
9. Pettke, A., Filén, F., Widgren, K., Jacks, A., Glans, H., Andreasson, S., Muradrasoli, S., Helgesson, S., Hauzenberger, E., Karlberg, M. L., Walai, N., Bjerkner, A., Gourlé, H., Gredmark-Russ, S., Lindsjö, O. K., Sondén, K., & Asgeirsson, H. (n.d.). Ten-Week Follow-Up of Monkeypox Case-Patient, Sweden, 2022—Volume 28, Number 10—October 2022—Emerging Infectious Diseases journal—CDC. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2810.221107
10. CDC Newsroom—CDC Monkeypox Response: Transmission. (2016, January 1). CDC. https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2022/0509-monkeypox-transmission.html
11. SDNA Saliva Collection FDA 510(k) Class II Medical Device Clearance. Spectrum Solutions. Retrieved June 8, 2023, from https://spectrumsolution.com/fda-510k-class-ii-medical-device-clearance-for-sdna-saliva-collection-device/
12. Logix Smart Mpox (2-gene) (RUO). (n.d.). Co-Diagnostics, Inc. Retrieved June 8, 2023, from https://codiagnostics.com/products/research-solutions/logix-smart-mpox2-ruo/
13. Li, Y., Zhao, H., Wilkins, K., Hughes, C., & Damon, I. K. (2010). Real-time PCR assays for the specific detection of monkeypox virus West African and Congo Basin strain DNA. Journal of Virological Methods, 169(1), 223–227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2010.07.012
14. CDC. (2022). Test Procedure: Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test. CDC Poxvirus & Rabies Branch (PRB). https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/mpox/pdf/PCR-Diagnostic-Protocol-508.pdf

15. CDC. (2022). Test Procedure: Non-variola Orthopoxvirus Generic Real-Time PCR Test. CDC Poxvirus & Rabies Branch (PRB). https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/mpox/pdf/Non-variola-Orthopoxvirus-Generic-Real-Time-PCR-Test.pdf
16. United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2022). Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) Summary: SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Assay: SalivaDirect assay EUA Summary. https://www.fda.gov/media/141192/download#:~:text=SalivaDirect%20is%20intended%20for%20use,Drug%20Administration%27s%20Emergency%20Use%20Authorization
17. Allicock, O. M., Yolda-Carr, D., Earnest, R., Breban, M. I., Vega, N., Ott, I. M., Kalinich, C., Alpert, T., Petrone, M. E., & Wyllie, A. L. (2021). Method versatility in RNA extraction-free PCR detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva samples (p. 2021.12.27.21268334). medRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.27.21268334
18. Allicock, O. M., Yolda-Carr, D., Earnest, R., Breban, M. I., Vega, N., Ott, I. M., Kalinich, C., Alpert, T., Petrone, M. E., & Wyllie, A. L. (2021). Method versatility in RNA extraction-free PCR detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva samples (p. 2021.12.27.21268334). medRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.27.21268334
19. United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2021). Template for Developers of Home Specimen Collection Devices for Use with Molecular Diagnostic Tests. https://www.fda.gov/media/138412/download
20. Chen, N. F. G., Chaguza, C., Gagne, L., Doucette, M., Smole, S., Buzby, E., Hall, J., Ash, S., Harrington, R., Cofsky, S., Clancy, S., Kapsak, C. J., Sevinsky, J., Libuit, K., Park, D. J., Hemarajata, P., Garrigues, J. M., Green, N. M., Sierra-Patev, S., … Vogels, C. B. F. (2023). Development of an amplicon-based sequencing approach in response to the global emergence of human monkeypox virus (p. 2022.10.14.22280783). medRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.10.14.22280783
21. Monkeypox virus, complete genome (2246531121). (2022). [Data set]. NCBI Nucleotide Database. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/NC_063383.1
22. Wu, F., Oghuan, J., Gitter, A., Mena, K. D., & Brown, E. L. (2023). Wide mismatches in the sequences of primers and probes for monkeypox virus diagnostic assays. Journal of Medical Virology, 95(1), e28395. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.28395
23. Coppens, J., Vanroye, F., Brosius, I., Liesenborghs, L., van Henten, S., Vanbaelen, T., Bracke, S., Berens-Riha, N., De Baetselier, I., Kenyon, C., Soentjens, P., Florence, E., Van Griensven, J., Ariën, K. K., Jacobs, B. K. M., Van den Bossche, D., Van Esbroeck, M., & Vercauteren, K. (2023). Alternative sampling specimens for the molecular detection of mpox (formerly monkeypox) virus. Journal of Clinical Virology, 159, 105372. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2022.105372
24. 09/02/2022: Lab Alert: MPXV TNF Receptor Gene Deletion May Lead to False Negative Results with Some MPXV Specific LDTs. (2023, January 31). https://www.cdc.gov/locs/2022/09-02-2022-lab-alert-MPXV_TNF_Receptor_Gene_Deletion_May_Lead_False_Negative_Results_Some_MPXV_Specific_LDTs.html
25. Tobik, E. R., Kitfield-Vernon, L. B., Thomas, R. J., Steel, S. A., Tan, S. H., Allicock, O. M., Choate, B. L., Akbarzada, S., & Wyllie, A. L. (2022). Saliva as a sample type for SARS-CoV-2 detection: Implementation successes and opportunities around the globe. Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics, 22(5), 519–535. https://doi.org/10.1080/14737159.2022.2094250
26. Accordini, S., Cordioli, M., Pomari, E., Tacconelli, E., & Castilletti, C. (2023). People with asymptomatic or unrecognised infection potentially contribute to monkeypox virus

transmission. The Lancet. Microbe, 4(4), e209. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(22)00379-2

27. Low, N., Bachmann, L. H., Ogoina, D., McDonald, R., Ipekci, A. M., Quilter, L. A. S., & Cevik, M. (2023). Mpox virus and transmission through sexual contact: Defining the research agenda. PLOS Medicine, 20(1), e1004163. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004163
28. Musumeci, S., Najjar, I., Amari, E. B. E., Schibler, M., Jacquerioz, F., Yerly, S., Renzoni, A., Calmy, A., & Kaiser, L. (2023). A Case of Mpox Reinfection. Clinical Infectious Diseases, ciad147. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciad147