

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

Tongue swab testing on two automated tuberculosis diagnostic platforms, Cepheid Xpert® MTB/RIF Ultra and Molbio Truenat® MTB Ultima

Rachel C. Wood¹, Angelique K. Luabeya², Rane B. Dragovich¹, Alaina M. Olson¹, Katherine A. Lochner¹, Kris M. Weigel¹, Renée Codsì¹, Humphrey Mulenga², Margaretha de Vos³, Mikashmi Kohli³, Adam Penn-Nicholson³, Mark Hatherill², Gerard A. Cangelosi¹

¹University of Washington, Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, Seattle, United States of America; ²South African Tuberculosis Vaccine Initiative, Institute of Infectious Disease & Molecular Medicine and Department of Pathology, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa; ³FIND, Geneva, Switzerland

ABSTRACT

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

Tongue dorsum swabbing is a potential alternative to sputum collection for tuberculosis (TB) testing. Previous studies showed that Cepheid Xpert® MTB/RIF Ultra (Xpert Ultra) can detect *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (MTB) DNA in tongue swabs stored in buffer, with 72% sensitivity and 100% specificity relative to a sputum microbiological reference standard (sputum MRS). The present study evaluated a more convenient sample collection protocol (dry swab storage), combined with streamlined sample processing protocols, for side-by-side analysis using two commercial TB diagnostic tests: Xpert Ultra and Molbio Truenat® MTB Ultima (MTB Ultima). Copan FLOQSwabs were self-collected, or collected by study workers, from 321 participants in Western Cape, South Africa. All participants had symptoms suggestive of TB, and 245 of them had sputum MRS-confirmed TB (by sputum culture and/or Xpert Ultra). One tongue swab per participant was tested on Xpert Ultra and another tongue swab was tested with MTB Ultima. Xpert Ultra was 75.4% sensitive and 100% specific, and MTB Ultima was 71.6% sensitive and 96.9% specific, relative to sputum MRS. When sample lysates that were false-negative by MTB Ultima were frozen, thawed, and re-tested, MTB Ultima sensitivity rose to 79.1%. Both tests were more sensitive with swabs from participants with higher sputum Xpert semi-quantitative results. The protocol for Xpert Ultra enabled fast and easy testing of dry-stored swabs with no loss of accuracy relative to previous methods. MTB Ultima testing of dry-stored swabs exhibited comparable performance to Xpert Ultra. These results further support tongue swabs as easy-to-collect samples for high-throughput TB testing.

37 INTRODUCTION

38

39 Tuberculosis disease (TB), caused by *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (MTB), remains a
40 major global cause of morbidity and mortality (1). The standard patient sample for
41 microbiological diagnosis of TB is sputum, a viscous material expectorated from airways. The
42 availability of alternative, noninvasive samples, which could be collected outside of a clinic,
43 would greatly facilitate testing for active TB in community settings such as schools, workplaces,
44 and institutions (2-4).

45 Researchers have sought sputum alternatives for years, but few materials have been
46 identified that are both 1) easier than sputum to collect; and 2) reasonably accurate, relative to
47 sputum testing (2, 3). To address this need, we and others have found that MTB cells and/or
48 DNA can be detected by oral swab (OS) testing (5-17). In TB OS testing, the dorsum of the
49 tongue is gently brushed with a swab for at least 10 seconds. The material collected by the
50 swab is then subjected to nucleic acid amplification testing (NAAT) targeting MTB DNA. Tongue
51 swabbing is fast, painless, and does not require specific infrastructure for privacy or infectious
52 aerosol control. Everyone, including children and people living with HIV (PLWH), can be easily
53 swabbed in any setting (18, 19).

54 Early evaluations of TB OS (9-11), as well as some more recent studies (5, 7, 8, 14),
55 used in-house manual quantitative PCR (qPCR) methods to detect MTB DNA in tongue swab
56 samples. Other evaluations used the commercial and WHO-approved Cepheid Xpert® MTB/RIF
57 Ultra automated qPCR system (Xpert Ultra). Most evaluations of Xpert Ultra testing of tongue
58 swabs used sample preparation protocols that mimicked those used for Xpert Ultra testing of
59 sputum (12, 13, 17, 20). These approaches often yielded modestly accurate results when the
60 sensitivity and specificity of OS were calculated relative to the sputum microbiological reference
61 standard (sputum MRS). In a collaborative study conducted in Uganda, we evaluated new swab

62 sample processing protocols that were designed explicitly for testing swabs in Xpert Ultra (6).
63 These approaches yielded better accuracy, with 72% sensitivity relative to sputum MRS
64 (incorporating both sputum Xpert Ultra and sputum culture), and 78% sensitivity relative to
65 sputum Xpert Ultra alone. Specificity was 100% relative to these reference standards (6).

66 This study builds upon our previous work (6) in several ways. First, the previous study
67 used swabs that were collected (either singly or in tandem) into 2-mL storage/transport tubes
68 that were pre-filled with a sterile buffer, whereas this study used single swabs that were
69 collected, cold-stored, and transported dry in 2-mL tubes, without buffer. Dry collection and
70 storage may be more user-friendly for patients and providers, especially in community (non-
71 clinical) settings (19). Second, the current study used a streamlined protocol for swab sample
72 processing (about 15 minutes from sample tube to start of test, compared to 45 to 60 minutes
73 for the methods described previously (6)). Third, the current study evaluated an alternative
74 commercial TB diagnostic test, the Molbio Truenat® MTB Ultima (MTB Ultima) (3), applied to
75 additional tongue swabs collected from the same participants. Finally, with 245 participants with
76 confirmed TB by sputum MRS (culture and/or Xpert Ultra), this is the largest sensitivity study
77 reported to date.

78 To our knowledge this is the first clinical evaluation of dry-stored tongue swabs for non-
79 invasive, non-sputum TB testing, and the first side-by-side evaluation of Xpert Ultra and MTB
80 Ultima applied to tongue swabs.

81
82
83
84

METHODS

85 **Study setting.** The study was conducted in Worcester, located in the Cape Winelands of
86 the Western Cape province of South Africa. Tuberculosis (TB) burden in this area is high with a
87 TB incidence rate of 700 per 100 000.

88 **Study Participants.** Participants were recruited at the local TB clinics in two cohorts with
89 distinct study designs. Cohort 1 (April 2021 – February 2022) was designed to study the impacts
90 of patient oral hygiene behaviors and food /drink intake on OS testing results (21), and
91 consisted solely of TB patients confirmed by sputum Xpert Ultra (N = 100). Sampling was split
92 into 3 cases: Case 1 swabs were collected prior to eating/drinking or performing oral hygiene;
93 only Case 1 samples were included in this analysis.

94 Cohort 2 (July 2021 – March 2023) was designed to assess OS analytical methods. All
95 participants were asked not to eat or drink or perform any oral hygiene for at least 30 minutes
96 prior to providing samples. Cohort 2 had two phases. In the first phase we enrolled patients with
97 symptoms suggestive of TB, prior to confirmation of their disease. After enrollment of 96
98 participants, we observed that most (N = 79/96) did not have TB confirmed by MRS. Therefore,
99 to meet target numbers of enrollees with confirmed TB, the Cohort 2 protocol was amended to
100 enroll only people with sputum Xpert-confirmed TB.

101 This project was approved by the University of Cape Town Human Research Ethics
102 Committee (reference number 160/2020) and the University of Washington Human Subjects
103 Division (STUDY00001840).

104 **Sample collection.** Swabs were Copan FLOQSwabs (520CS01), which are sterile,
105 single-use, and individually packaged, with a break point at 30 mm. All swabs were collected
106 within three days of initiation of TB treatment.

107 During their first visit, Cohort 1 participants provided oral swabs if they met the oral
108 hygiene criteria of the first Case to which they were assigned. If they did not meet the criteria,
109 their first oral swabs were collected during a subsequent visit to the participant's home. During
110 the participant's Case 1 visit, 6 FLOQswabs were collected.

111 Cohort 2 participants were brought to the research site on Day 1 for informed consent,
112 oral swabs, and sputum sample collection. On Day 1, five swabs were collected at the research

113 site by the study team. On Day 2, two more swabs were self-collected by participants at their
114 homes. The first two Day 1 swabs and the two Day 2 swabs were designated for assessment of
115 OS analytical methods (including this study). Additional Day 1 swabs were saved for secondary
116 analyses or for use as backups if instrument errors occurred.

117 In both Cohorts, oral swabs were collected by study workers if the swabbing took place at
118 the clinic or on site at the South African Tuberculosis Vaccine Initiative (SATVI) offices.
119 Participants swabbed themselves under the supervision of study workers during home visits.
120 The protocols for provider-collected swabs and supervised self-swabbing are provided
121 elsewhere (19). After the swab was collected, either the study worker or the participant placed
122 the swab into an empty 2-mL screw-cap tube (Sarstedt, 72.694.106) held by the study worker.
123 The worker then broke or cut off the head of the swab into the tube and discarded the shaft. The
124 tube was closed and placed into storage at -80 °C within 12 hours of collection. The samples
125 were stored at -80 °C and shipped on dry ice. Upon receipt in Seattle, they were immediately
126 transferred to the -80 °C freezer where they were stored until testing.

127 **Sample analysis.** Prior to sample analysis, swab samples from both cohorts were
128 randomized by collection day and collection order between the two test platforms, to prevent
129 bias. Testing of Cohort 2 samples was blinded as to TB status.

130 The Molbio Truenat® MTB Ultima chip was run on the Molbio Truelab® machine,
131 executing an automated PCR targeting IS6110 and IS1081 (3). Prior to the PCR assay, the
132 swab samples had to be processed to render them safe to handle, and to release MTB DNA
133 from bacilli. This was accomplished as follows. The wells of a heat block were filled with water
134 and it was pre-heated to 100 °C. The water facilitated heat distribution. After pre-heating, the
135 samples were removed from the freezer and immediately placed into the heat block where they
136 were heated for 10 minutes. Samples were removed from the heat block and 500 µL TE buffer
137 was added to the tubes, followed by vortexing (Vortex-Genie 2, SI-0236) for 15 seconds.

138 Samples were returned to the heat block and heated to 100 °C for another 10 minutes to
139 facilitate lysis and elution of cells/DNA off the swab. Samples were then removed, briefly
140 centrifuged, and allowed to cool for 5 minutes. Glass disruption beads (150 mg RPI 0.1 mm,
141 pre-weighed and stored in individual tubes) were added, and samples were bead-beaten at max
142 speed for 10 minutes on a vortexer using a vortex adapter (Mo Bio, 13000-V1-24). After a brief
143 spin (5 seconds in a mini-centrifuge), the lysate was removed and transferred to a labeled 1.5-
144 mL snap-cap tube. Six microliters of this lysate was run on the MTB Ultima chip, following the
145 manufacturer's instructions. Two Truelab® Duos were used to run the samples, with a capacity
146 for running 2 samples each at a time. The lysis protocol for 4 samples took about 45 minutes,
147 while the MTB Ultima assay took about 40 minutes.

148 This manual lysis protocol is considered off-label, as Molbio recommends using their
149 Trueprep® AUTO v2 cartridge-based sample prep device for sample lysis and concentration.
150 The Trueprep® cartridges contain an internal positive control (IPC) that is added to each sample
151 during processing. Since we did not use the Trueprep®, there was no IPC in our samples.
152 Instead, we monitored the performance of the MTB Ultima chips and Truelab® with a
153 designated positive control from the Truenat® Positive Control Kit – Panel 1 after every 20 runs.
154 If the positive control failed, the preceding 20 runs were considered not valid.

155 In the Xpert Ultra assay, cell lysis and PCR are conducted entirely within the Xpert Ultra
156 cartridge. Therefore, the sample preparation protocol for Xpert could be shorter, taking an
157 estimated 15 minutes per set of 4 samples. As in the Molbio protocol, the swabs were heated at
158 100 °C for 10 minutes in a water-filled heat block. Tubes were removed from the heat block and
159 1 mL TE buffer was added, followed by vortexing for 30 seconds. The 1-mL sample was
160 transferred to the Xpert Ultra cartridge. Another 1 mL of TE was added to the original tube
161 containing the swab. After another 30 second vortex, this additional 1-mL sample was added to
162 the Xpert Ultra cartridge. The cartridge was then loaded into a 4-module GeneXpert instrument

163 for analysis. If an error occurred during the Xpert test, a backup swab was selected, and the
164 testing was repeated.

165
166
167

RESULTS

168

169 **Study population characteristics.** Three hundred and thirty participants (N = 330) were
170 enrolled and N = 321 were included in the analysis. Cohort 1 had N = 100 participants. Cohort 2
171 had N = 222, of whom N = 145 were TB-positive patients by sputum MRS (sputum culture
172 and/or Xpert Ultra positive), and N = 76 TB-negative patients. Some participants were excluded
173 from the analysis due to incomplete sample collection. **Table 1** shows their characteristics, with
174 Cohort 2 divided between TB positive and TB negative participants as defined by sputum MRS.

175 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics of participants recruited for cohort1 and cohort 2.**

Variables	Cohort 1 (sputum TB positive)	Cohort 2 (sputum TB positive)	Cohort 2 (sputum TB negative)
N	100	145	76
Age (median, IQR)	34 (27-44)	35(25-45)	38.5 (31.5-47.4)
Gender (Male)	63(63%)	86 (59.3%)	31 (40.8%)
Mixed-race ancestry	77 (77.0%)	106 (73.1%)	52 (68.4%)
Black	23 (23.0%)	38 (26.2%)	22 (28.9%)
White	0	1(0.7) %	1 (1.3%)
Asian	0	0	1 (1.3%)
Employed	31 (31.0%)	47 (32.4%)	36 (47.4%)
Previous TB	37 (37.0%)	54 (37.2%)	42 (55.3%)
HIV positive	35 (35.0%)	49 (34.0%)	23 (30.3%)

176

177 **Sensitivity and specificity of TB testing platforms applied to tongue swab samples.**

178 Both Xpert Ultra and MTB Ultima exhibited better sensitivity in Cohort 2 than in Cohort 1 (**Table**
179 **2**), though the difference in cohort positivity for either platform was not statistically significant (p
180 = 0.21 and $p = 0.08$, respectively, by 2-tailed z score). When the results of both cohorts were
181 combined, Xpert Ultra was 75.4% sensitive and 100% specific relative to sputum MRS. MTB
182 Ultima was 71.6% sensitive and 96.9% specific relative to sputum MRS (**Table 2**).

183

184 **Table 2: Sensitivity and specificity of swab testing by Xpert Ultra and MTB Ultima, based**
 185 **on all samples tested.**

Co-hort	Sensitivity				Specificity			
	Xpert Ultra		MTB Ultima		Xpert Ultra		MTB Ultima	
	N	Percent (95% CI)	N	Percent (95% CI)	N	Percent (95% CI)	N	Percent (95% CI)
1	71/100	71.0 (61.1, 79.6)	58/89	65.2 (54.3, 75.0)	-*	-*	-*	-*
2	113/144	78.5 (70.9, 84.9)	103/136	75.7 (67.7, 82.7)	72/72	100.0 (95.0, 100.0)	62/64	96.9 (89.2, 99.6)
1+2	184/244**	75.4 (69.5, 80.7)	161/225**	71.6 (65.2, 77.4)	72/72**	100.0 (95.0, 100.0)	62/64**	96.9 (89.2, 99.6)

186 *Cohort 1 consisted entirely of TB-positive participants by sputum MRS

187 **Totals fell below the total enrollment of 320 participants due to invalid results, which differed
 188 between the two test platforms

189

190 **Table 3: Sensitivity and specificity of swab testing by Xpert Ultra and MTB Ultima, based**
 191 **on samples from participants whose swabs were tested by both methods.**

Co-hort	Sensitivity				Specificity			
	Xpert Ultra		MTB Ultima		Xpert Ultra		MTB Ultima	
	N	Percent (95% CI)	N	Percent (95% CI)	N	Percent (95% CI)	N	Percent (95% CI)
1	63/89	70.8 (60.2, 80.0)	58/89	65.2 (54.3, 75.0)	-*	-*	-*	-*
2	107/136	78.7 (70.8, 85.2)	103/136	75.7 (67.6, 82.7)	62/62	100.0 (94.2, 100.0)	60/62	96.8 (88.8, 99.6)
1+2	170/225	75.6 (69.4, 81.0)	161/225	71.6 (65.2, 77.4)	62/62	100.0 (94.2, 100.0)	60/62	96.8 (88.8, 99.6)

192 *Cohort 1 consisted entirely of confirmed TB-positive participants by sputum MRS

193

194 Due to instrument error messages, results deemed not valid after positive control runs
 195 (see Methods), or a lack of available samples for retesting, some results (N = 9 Xpert Ultra and
 196 34 MTB Ultima) were excluded from the overall results in Table 2. Therefore, the Xpert Ultra and
 197 MTB Ultima sample sets in Table 2 do not precisely align. **Table 3** shows a smaller sample set
 198 (N = 287) that consists entirely of samples from Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 participants whose
 199 swabs were tested by both methods. In this paired analysis set, Xpert Ultra appeared to have
 200 slightly higher sensitivity than MTB Ultima. However, the difference was not statistically
 201 significant ($p = 0.34$ by 2-tailed z score).

202 **Tongue swab sensitivity varied with sputum Xpert Ultra semi-quantitative results.**

203 Sputum Xpert semi-quantitative data was available for a subset of Cohort 2 participants with

204 sputum MRS-confirmed TB (N = 93). By both Xpert Ultra and MTB Ultima, tongue swab

205 positivity was more common among patients who had higher sputum semi-quantitative results
206 (Table 4).

207 **Table 4: Sensitivity relative to sputum semi-quantitative results. Sputum semi-**
208 **quantitative data were available for N = 93 participants with confirmed TB in Cohort 2.**

Sputum semi-quantitative results	Sensitivity, Xpert Ultra		Sensitivity, MTB Ultima	
	N	Percent (95% CI)	N	Percent (95% CI)
High	43/43	100 (91.8, 100)	38/40	95 (83.1, 99.4)
Medium	16/16	100 (79.4, 100)	13/15	86.7 (59.5, 98.3)
Low	16/23	69.6 (47.1, 86.8)	13/21	61.9 (38.4, 81.9)
Very low	3/8	37.5 (8.5, 75.5)	4/7	57.1 (18.4, 90.1)
Trace	0/3	0 (0, 70.8)	0/3	0 (0, 70.8)
Total	78/93	83.9 (74.8, 90.9)	68/86	79.1 (69, 87.1)

209

210 **Increased MTB Ultima sensitivity upon re-testing of swab sample lysates.** Our swab
211 sample processing protocol for MTB Ultima generated ~500 μ L of crude lysate, of which only 6
212 μ L was tested with the MTB Ultima chip. The remaining ~494 μ L was returned to the -80 °C
213 freezer. We asked whether we might see improved overall sensitivity if the frozen material was
214 thawed and re-tested by running another 6 μ L aliquot on MTB Ultima chips.

215 As shown in Table 2, the first-pass MTB Ultima analysis of 225 swab samples from
216 participants with confirmed TB identified 161 swabs that were true-positive relative to sputum
217 MRS, and 60 that were false-negative. Fifty-seven of the false-negative lysates were thawed
218 and re-tested in fresh MTB Ultima chips. One of these samples yielded an invalid result. Of the
219 56 samples with valid results, 39 remained false-negative, while 17 yielded true-positive results
220 on the second try. Positive swab results on the second run included “Very low” (N = 8), “Low” (N
221 = 6), “Medium” (N = 2), and “High” (N = 1) MTB Ultima semi-quantitative values from swabs.
222 When the 17 samples that became true-positive upon re-testing are added to the 161 samples
223 that were true positive in the first pass, the adjusted sensitivity of MTB Ultima relative to sputum
224 MRS increases to 178/225, or 79.1% (95% CI 73.2%, 84.2%).

225 In addition to false-negative samples, we also thawed and re-tested 28 true-negative
226 samples (swabs from sputum MRS-negative participants that were negative by MTB Ultima on
227 the first pass). All 28 of these samples (100%) yielded negative results upon re-testing.

228
229

230 DISCUSSION

231
232

233 This study expanded on previous studies in three significant ways. It is among the first
234 studies to evaluate dry collection/storage of tongue swab samples from TB patients. Dry swabs
235 are likely to be easier to handle than buffer-filled tubes in the context of high-throughput
236 community settings, which are often envisioned for non-sputum sampling (2-4, 18). Second, the
237 current study used a streamlined protocol for swab sample processing for Xpert Ultra (about 15
238 minutes from sample tube to start of test, compared to 45 to 60 minutes for the methods
239 described previously (6)). For occupational safety, an initial heat inactivation step (10 min at 100
240 °C) was conducted on the closed swab tube before it was opened for the first time. Third, we
241 assessed a second commercial TB diagnostic NAAT test, MTB Ultima, that was applied to
242 replicate tongue swabs collected from the same participants.

243 For Xpert Ultra testing of swabs, we found that the use of dry-stored swabs with a
244 streamlined protocol resulted in a low error rate of 1%, with no loss of accuracy relative to
245 previous methods that used wet-stored swabs and a lengthier protocol. The overall sensitivity of
246 75% observed here is similar to the previously reported sensitivity of 72% relative to sputum
247 MRS and 78% relative to sputum Xpert Ultra (6). Specificity relative to sputum MRS was 100%
248 in both studies. These similarities are notable given that the two studies were conducted in
249 different settings and populations (Worcester, South Africa and Kampala, Uganda, respectively).
250 While higher sensitivity relative to sputum MRS would be desirable and appears feasible based

251 on results from studies that used manual methods (8, 14), the consistency observed between
252 these two studies shows promise for the biological reproducibility of tongue swab sampling.

253 MTB Ultima testing of swabs yielded an error rate of 1.7% and an initial sensitivity value
254 that was similar to Xpert Ultra testing. Within the subset of participants (Table 3) for whom side-
255 by-side comparison of replicate swabs was possible, sensitivities relative to sputum MRS were
256 75.6% and 71.6% for Xpert Ultra and MTB Ultima, respectively. Specificity of both methods was
257 high at >95%.

258 Both molecular tests exhibited higher sensitivities in Cohort 2 than in Cohort 1, though
259 the differences were not significant. The two cohorts had different, but overlapping, time
260 periods. Most Cohort 1 participants were enrolled in 2021, while most Cohort 2 participants with
261 confirmed TB were enrolled in 2022 and 2023. The evolving COVID-19 pandemic may have
262 affected the timing of care-seeking behaviors.

263 In our previous evaluation of Xpert Ultra analysis of tongue swabs (6), there appeared to
264 be a relationship between tongue swab positivity and sputum swab Xpert Ultra semi-quantitative
265 results. Positivity ranged from 100% (21/21) in patients with “high” sputum semi-quantitative
266 results, down to 0% (0/8) in patients with “very low” or “trace” sputum results (6). Similarly, when
267 stratified by sputum Xpert Ultra semi-quantitative results, both platforms used here were very
268 sensitive in participants with higher semi-quantitative results, but less so in those with lower
269 semi-quantitative results (**Table 4**). These findings suggest that tongue swab testing for pauci-
270 bacillary TB, such as would be expected in PLWHIV, children and mild subclinical disease,
271 would need further optimization of sample collection and assay methods to improve
272 performance relative to active TB with high bacillary burden.

273 Based on the results of our analysis of re-frozen and thawed lysates, there may be room
274 for improvement in our MTB Ultima sample preparation protocol. Of 56 samples that were false-
275 negative by MTB Ultima, 17 became true-positive upon re-testing. The reasons for this are not

276 known. Sample contamination during re-testing does not seem likely given the 100% specificity
277 observed with 28 re-tested true-negative samples. One possibility is that the additional freeze-
278 thaw cycle may have further disrupted MTB bacilli that were damaged, but not disintegrated, in
279 our initial bead-beating protocol. Freeze-thaw cycles are reported to enhance disruption of
280 other bacteria (22). An alternative explanation is stochastic. Because our bead-beating protocol
281 does not fully solubilize the material in swab samples, lysates have particulate cellular debris
282 that may associate with MTB DNA in ways that are not uniform throughout the 500 μ L
283 suspensions. If so, then 6 μ L aliquots applied to the Truenat chip may not always have
284 representative amounts of target MTB DNA. Consistent with this possibility, of the 17 false-
285 negative samples that became positive upon re-testing, 3 had MTB Ultima semi-quantitative
286 signals that were quite robust on the second pass (semi-quantitative “Medium” or “High”). Thus,
287 the effects of re-testing were non-uniform and greater than incremental in a few cases,
288 consistent with a stochastic model. In view of these possibilities, improvements to the Truenat
289 method could include enhanced mechanical disruptions (14, 23) and/or concentration of MTB
290 DNA by methods such as magnetic particle hybridization capture (24, 25).

291 Strengths of our study included the side-by-side evaluation of two different molecular
292 testing platforms. Moreover, our participant population included 245 participants with sputum
293 MRS-confirmed TB, a much larger N than our previous study of Xpert Ultra applied to tongue
294 swabs (6). There were several limitations. Because swabs evaluated in this study were collected
295 in South Africa and tested in the USA, all of them underwent an initial freeze-thaw cycle for
296 storage and shipment, a process that could have affected sensitivity in either direction. Sample
297 preparation protocols for both tests required equipment (heat block, vortexer, and vortex
298 adapter) which, although inexpensive, might not be available in all settings. A more powerful
299 Biospec bead-beater was reported by Steadman et al (14) to yield excellent results when paired
300 with a manual MTB qPCR applied to swabs, however the Biospec is expensive and not common

301 outside of research laboratories. Finally, both commercial test platforms evaluated in this study
302 were engineered to test sputum, not swabs, and there may be limitations to how well they can
303 ever perform with swab samples.

304 Despite these limitations, our observations expand the evidence supporting tongue
305 swabs as alternatives to sputum collection in settings where sputum collection is not possible.
306 Tongue swabs are easier and faster to collect than any TB sample type that we are aware of,
307 and their use could help increase access to TB testing and decrease occupational risks to
308 healthcare workers. Further development of testing methods designed explicitly for TB tongue
309 swabs, such as the high-volume qPCR approach described by Steadman et al (14), may deliver
310 further improvements in accuracy relative to sputum testing. As we learned when anterior nasal
311 sampling was introduced for COVID-19 testing (2, 3, 26), sample types that are non-invasive
312 and easy to self-collect can be invaluable tools in the fight against transmissible diseases.

313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (#INV-004527, OPP 1213054), by NIH grant R01AI139254, and by the Australian Government. KAL was supported in part by a Mary Gates Undergraduate Research Fellowship. RC was supported in part by a University of Washington Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Top Scholar Award. We are grateful to Copan Italia for providing swabs. We are grateful to B.R. Sivakumar, Akron D'Souza, Winnie Gonsalves of Molbio, and Gayatri Chilambi of Rutgers University, for facilitating access to Molbio tests and instruments.

329 **Literature cited**

330

- 331 1. World Health Organization. 2022. Global Tuberculosis Report 2022
- 332 2. Pai M, Dewan PK, Swaminathan S. 2023. Transforming tuberculosis diagnosis. *Nat Microbiol*
333 8:756-759.
- 334 3. Branigan D. 2022. 2022 Tuberculosis Diagnostics Pipeline Report. Treatment Action Group, New
335 York, NY
- 336 4. Reid M, Agbassi YJP, Arinaminpathy N, Bercasio A, Bhargava A, Bhargava M, Bloom A,
337 Cattamanchi A, Chaisson R, Chin D, Churchyard G, Cox H, Denkinger CM, Ditiu L, Dowdy D,
338 Dybul M, Fauci A, Fedaku E, Gidado M, Harrington M, Hauser J, Heitkamp P, Herbert N, Herna
339 Sari A, Hopewell P, Kendall E, Khan A, Kim A, Koek I, Kondratyuk S, Krishnan N, Ku C-C,
340 Lessem E, McConnell EV, Nahid P, Oliver M, Pai M, Raviglione M, Ryckman T, Schäferhoff M,
341 Silva S, Small P, Stallworthy G, Temesgen Z, van Weezenbeek K, Vassall A, Velásquez GE,
342 Venkatesan N, Yamey G, Zimmerman A, et al. Scientific advances and the end of tuberculosis: a
343 report from the Lancet Commission on Tuberculosis. *The Lancet* doi:10.1016/S0140-
344 6736(23)01379-X.
- 345 5. LaCourse SM, Seko E, Wood R, Bundi W, Ouma GS, Agaya J, Richardson BA, John-Stewart G,
346 Wandiga S, Cangelosi GA. 2022. Diagnostic performance of oral swabs for non-sputum based
347 TB diagnosis in a TB/HIV endemic setting. *PLoS One* 17:e0262123.
- 348 6. Andama A, Whitman GR, Crowder R, Reza TF, Jaganath D, Mulondo J, Nalugwa TK, Semitala
349 FC, Worodria W, Cook C, Wood RC, Weigel KM, Olson AM, Lohmiller Shaw J, Kato-Maeda M,
350 Denkinger CM, Nahid P, Cangelosi GA, Cattamanchi A. 2022. Accuracy of Tongue Swab Testing
351 Using Xpert MTB-RIF Ultra for Tuberculosis Diagnosis. *J Clin Microbiol* doi:10.1128/jcm.00421-
352 22:e0042122.
- 353 7. Shapiro AE, Olson AM, Kidoguchi L, Niu X, Ngcobo Z, Magcaba ZP, Ngwane MW, Whitman GR,
354 Weigel KM, Wood RC, Wilson DPK, Drain PK, Cangelosi GA. 2022. Complementary Nonsputum
355 Diagnostic Testing for Tuberculosis in People with HIV Using Oral Swab PCR and Urine
356 Lipoarabinomannan Detection. *J Clin Microbiol* 60:e0043122.
- 357 8. Wood RC, Andama A, Hermansky G, Burkot S, Asege L, Job M, Katumba D, Nakaye M, Mwebe
358 SZ, Mulondo J, Bachman CM, Nichols KP, Le Ny A-LM, Ortega C, Olson RN, Weigel KM, Olson
359 AM, Madan D, Bell D, Cattamanchi A, Worodria W, Semitala FC, Somoskovi A, Cangelosi GA,
360 Minch KJ. 2021. Characterization of oral swab samples for diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis.
361 *PLOS ONE* 16:e0251422.
- 362 9. Luabeya AK, Wood RC, Shenje J, Filander E, Ontong C, Mabwe S, Africa H, Nguyen FK, Olson
363 A, Weigel KM, Jones-Engel L, Hatherill M, Cangelosi GA. 2019. Noninvasive Detection of
364 Tuberculosis by Oral Swab Analysis. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 57:e01847-18.
- 365 10. Nicol MP, Wood RC, Workman L, Prins M, Whitman C, Ghebrekristos Y, Mbhele S, Olson A,
366 Jones-Engel LE, Zar HJ, Cangelosi GA. 2019. Microbiological diagnosis of pulmonary
367 tuberculosis in children by oral swab polymerase chain reaction. *Scientific Reports* 9:10789.
- 368 11. Wood RC, Luabeya AK, Weigel KM, Wilbur AK, Jones-Engel L, Hatherill M, Cangelosi GA. 2015.
369 Detection of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* DNA on the oral mucosa of tuberculosis patients. *Sci*
370 *Rep* 5.
- 371 12. Flores JA, Calderon R, Mesman AW, Soto M, Coit J, Aliaga J, Mendoza M, Leon SR, Konda K,
372 Mestanza FM, Mendoza CJ, Lecca L, Murray MB, Holmberg RC, Pollock NR, Franke MF. 2020.
373 Detection of *Mycobacterium Tuberculosis* DNA in Buccal Swab Samples from Children in Lima,
374 Peru. *The Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal* 39.
- 375 13. Mesman AW, Calderon R, Soto M, Coit J, Aliaga J, Mendoza M, Franke MF. 2019.
376 *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* detection from oral swabs with Xpert MTB/RIF ULTRA: a pilot study.
377 *BMC Res Notes* 12:349-349.
- 378 14. Steadman A, Andama A, Ball A, Mukwatamundu J, Khimani K, Mochizuki T, Asege L, Bukirwa A,
379 Kato JB, Katumba D, Kisakye E, Mangeni W, Mwebe S, Nakaye M, Nasuna I, Nyawere J, Visente
380 D, Cook C, Nalugwa T, Bachman CM, Semitalia F, Weigl BH, Connelly J, Worodria W,
381 Cattamanchi A. 2023. New manual qPCR assay validated on tongue swabs collected and

382 processed in Uganda shows sensitivity that rivals sputum-based molecular TB diagnostics.
383 medRxiv doi:10.1101/2023.08.10.23293680:2023.08.10.23293680.

- 384 15. Song Y, Ma Y, Liu R, Shang Y, Ma L, Huo F, Li Y, Shu W, Wang Y, Gao M, Pang Y. 2021.
385 Diagnostic Yield of Oral Swab Testing by TB-LAMP for Diagnosis of Pulmonary Tuberculosis.
386 *Infection and drug resistance* 14:89-95.
- 387 16. Kang Y, Koo B, Kim O-H, Park J, Kim H, Lee H, Kim M, Jang Y, Koo Y, Shin Y, Lee SW, Kim S-
388 H. 2021. Gene-Based Diagnosis of Tuberculosis from Oral Swabs with a New Generation
389 Pathogen Enrichment Technique in Real-World Practice. *SSRN Electronic Journal*
390 doi:10.2139/ssrn.3781639.
- 391 17. Lima F, Santos AS, Oliveira RD, Silva CCR, Gonzalves CCM, Andrews JR, Croda J. 2020. Oral
392 swab testing by Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra for mass tuberculosis screening in prisons. *Journal of*
393 *Clinical Tuberculosis and Other Mycobacterial Diseases* 19:100148.
- 394 18. Valinetz ED, Cangelosi GA. 2021. A Look Inside: Oral Sampling for Detection of Non-Oral
395 Infectious Diseases. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* doi:10.1128/jcm.02360-20:JCM.02360-20.
- 396 19. Codsí R, Errett NA, Luabeya AK, Van As D, Hatherill M, Shapiro AE, Lochner KA, Vingino AR,
397 Kohn MJ, Cangelosi GA. 2023. Preferences of healthcare workers using tongue swabs for
398 tuberculosis diagnosis during COVID-19. *PLOS Global Public Health* 3:e0001430.
- 399 20. Cox H, Workman L, Bateman L, Franckling-Smith Z, Prins M, Luiz J, Van Heerden J, Edries LAT,
400 Africa S, Allen V, Baard C, Zemanay W, Nicol MP, Zar HJ. 2022. Oral swabs tested with Xpert
401 MTB/RIF Ultra for diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis in children: a diagnostic accuracy study.
402 *Clin Infect Dis* doi:10.1093/cid/ciac332.
- 403 21. Luabeya AK, Olson AM, As DV, Peterson C, Hadley K, Wood RC, Mambwe S, Mulenga H, Yan
404 A, Yager P, Hatherill M, Cangelosi GA. Effects of oral hygiene and food intake on oral swab
405 qPCR results in South African tuberculosis patients. *Union World Conference on Lung Health*
406 2022.
- 407 22. Xin Y, Xie J, Nan B, Tang C, Xiao Y, Wu Q, Lin Y, Zhang X, Shen H. 2021. Freeze-Thaw
408 Pretreatment Can Improve Efficiency of Bacterial DNA Extraction From Meconium. *Frontiers in*
409 *Microbiology* 12.
- 410 23. Vandeventer PE, Weigel KM, Salazar J, Erwin B, Irvine B, Doebler R, Nadim A, Cangelosi GA,
411 Niemz A. 2011. Mechanical Disruption of Lysis-Resistant Bacteria using a Miniature, Low Power,
412 Disposable Device. *J Clin Micro* 49:2533-2539.
- 413 24. Reed JL, Basu D, Butzler MA, McFall SM. 2017. XtracTB Assay, a Mycobacterium tuberculosis
414 molecular screening test with sensitivity approaching culture. *Sci Rep* 7:3653.
- 415 25. Oreskovic A, Panpradist N, Marangu D, Ngwane MW, Magcaba ZP, Ngcobo S, Ngcobo Z, Horne
416 DJ, Wilson DPK, Shapiro AE, Drain PK, Lutz BR. 2021. Diagnosing Pulmonary Tuberculosis by
417 Using Sequence-Specific Purification of Urine Cell-Free DNA. *J Clin Microbiol* 59:e0007421.
- 418 26. Tu YP, Jennings R, Hart B, Cangelosi GA, Wood RC, Wehber K, Verma P, Vojta D, Berke EM.
419 2020. Swabs Collected by Patients or Health Care Workers for SARS-CoV-2 Testing. *New*
420 *England Journal of Medicine* 383:494-496.