Capture of Group A Streptococcus by Open-Microfluidic CandyCollect Device in Pediatric Patients

Wan-chen Tu, MS,[*a] Ingrid Jeacopello, BS,[*a] Andrea Blom, BSN, RN,[b] Elena Alfaro, BA, MDiv,[b] Victoria A. M. Shinkawa, BS,[a] Daniel B. Hatchett, BS,[a] Juan C. Sanchez, BS,[a] Anika M. McManamen, MS,[a] Xiaojing Su, MS,[a] Erwin Berthier, PhD,[a] Sanitta Thongpang, PhD,[a, c] Ellen R. Wald, MD, F.A.A.P,[b] Gregory P. DeMuri, MD, F.A.A.P,[‡b] Ashleigh B. Theberge, PhD,[‡a,d]

Affiliations: [a]Department of Chemistry, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA; [b]Department of Pediatrics, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, USA; and [c]Department of Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Mahidol University, Nakorn Pathom, Thailand; [d]Department of Urology, School of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

[*]Contributed equally as co-first authors
[‡]Contributed equally as co-senior authors

Address correspondence to: Ashleigh B. Theberge, Department of Chemistry, University of Washington, Box 351700, Seattle, WA 98195-1700, [abt1@uw.edu], 206-685-2330.

Short title: Diagnosis of streptococcal pharyngitis via CandyCollect

Conflict of Interest Disclosures (includes financial disclosures): Ashleigh B. Theberge, Xiaojing Su, Erwin Berthier, and Sanitta Thongpang filed patent 63/152,103 (International Publication Number: WO 2022/178291 Al) through the University of Washington on the CandyCollect oral sampling device. Ashleigh B. Theberge reports filing multiple patents through the University of Washington and receiving a gift to support research outside the submitted work from Ionis Pharmaceuticals. Erwin Berthier is an inventor on multiple patents filed by Tasso, Inc., the University of Washington, and the University of Wisconsin. Sanitta Thongpang has ownership in Salus Discovery, LLC, and Tasso, Inc. Erwin Berthier has ownership in Salus Discovery, LLC, and Tasso, Inc. and is employed by Tasso, Inc. However, this research is not related to these companies. Sanitta Thongpang, Erwin Berthier, and Ashleigh B. Theberge have ownership in Seabright, LLC, which will advance new tools for diagnostics and clinical research, potentially including the CandyCollect device. The terms of this arrangement have been reviewed and approved by the University of Washington in accordance with its policies governing outside work and financial conflicts of interest in research. The other authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Funding/Support: All phases of this study were supported by National Institutes of Health grants (R21AI166120, R35GM128648 (the latter specifically supported some of the in-lab developments and procedure

developments)), the Washington Research Foundation, the Camille and Henry Dreyfus Foundation, and an Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellowship. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health or other funding sources.

Role of Funder/Sponsor (if any): No funder had a role in the design and conduct of the study.

Clinical Trial Registration (if any):
Registry name: ClinicalTrials.gov
ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT05175196
Weblink: https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05175196

Abbreviations:
REDCap: Research Electronic Data Capture
RADT: Rapid Antigen Detection Test
GAS pharyngitis: Group A Streptococcus pharyngitis
S. pyogenes: *Streptococcus pyogenes*
PBS: Phosphate Buffered Saline
qPCR: Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction

Article Summary
This paper reports qPCR data and user feedback from pediatric patients with streptococcal pharyngitis, using a lollipop-inspired sampling device instead of pharyngeal swabs.

What's Known on This Subject
Obtaining high-quality samples to diagnose streptococcal pharyngitis in pediatric patients is challenging, due to discomfort associated with traditional pharyngeal swabs. This may cause reluctance to go to the clinic, inaccurate diagnosis, or inappropriate treatment for children with sore throat.

What This Study Adds
CandyCollect devices, a child-preferred lollipop-inspired salivary pathogen collection tool, had 100% concordance with the positive results from traditional pharyngeal swabs processed with a rapid antigen detection test from pediatric patients. CandyCollect could potentially become an alternative sampling tool for diagnosis of streptococcal pharyngitis.

Contributors Statement Page

Wan-chen Tu designed the sample processing protocol, carried out the sample analysis, performed data analysis, made figures for the manuscript, drafted the initial manuscript, and critically reviewed and revised the manuscript.

Ingrid Jeacopello fabricated the CandyCollect devices and prepared devices for human subject research, interpreted the data, drafted the initial manuscript, and critically reviewed and revised the manuscript.

Andrea Blom advised on study design and execution, enrolled and interacted with the participants, collected the samples and user surveys, accessioned and shipped the samples, interpreted the data, and critically reviewed and revised the manuscript.

Elena Alfaro advised on study design and execution, advised on all regulatory aspects, drafted the study protocol and survey instruments, obtained Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, interpreted the data, and critically reviewed and revised the manuscript.

Victoria A. M. Shinkawa, Daniel B. Hatchett, and Juan C. Sanchez fabricated the CandyCollect devices and prepared devices for human subject research and revised the manuscript.

Anika M. McManamen and Xiaojing Su designed the sample processing protocol and drafted and revised the manuscript.

Erwin Berthier conceptualized the research, advised on study design, and revised the manuscript.

Ashleigh B. Theberge, Gregory P. DeMuri, Ellen R. Wald, and Sanitta Thongpang conceptualized the research, designed the study, oversaw study execution, interpreted the data, critically reviewed the manuscript, and revised the manuscript.

All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript as submitted.

Abstract

Objective

Determine the feasibility of using CandyCollect, a lollipop-inspired open-microfluidic pathogen collection device, to capture Group A Streptococcus (GAS) and compare user preference for CandyCollect, conventional pharyngeal swabs, or mouth swabs in children with pharyngitis and their caregivers.

Methods

Children (aged 5-17 years) with pharyngitis who tested positive for GAS via rapid antigen detection test from a pharyngeal swab were included in the study at an ambulatory care clinic in Madison, WI. Caregiver-child dyads were enrolled in the study so that both could provide user feedback regarding the experience. Immediately after the clinical visit, children were asked to suck on two mouth swabs and two CandyCollect devices. GAS presence was confirmed and measured with qPCR.

Results

All child participants (30/30) were positive for GAS by qPCR on both the mouth swab and CandyCollect. Caregivers ranked CandyCollect as a good sampling method overall (27/30), and all caregivers (30/30) would recommend the CandyCollect for children 5 years and older. Twenty-three of 30 children "really like" the taste and 24/30 would like to use the CandyCollect if another test was needed. All caregivers (30/30) and most children (28/30) would be willing to use the CandyCollect device at home.

Conclusion

All participants (30/30) tested positive for GAS on all three collection methods (pharyngeal swab, mouth swab, and CandyCollect). While both caregivers and children like the CandyCollect device, some caregivers would prefer a shorter collection time. Future work includes extending the capabilities of CandyCollect to additional pathogens and shortening collection time while maintaining the attractive form of the device.

149 **Introduction**

150 Group A Streptococcus (GAS), accounts for over 600 million cases of bacterial
151 pharyngitis worldwide each year,[1] affecting 15% of school-aged children in developed
152 countries. In developing nations the burden is markedly greater, with rates 5-10 times higher.[1]
153 Though symptoms of GAS pharyngitis almost always resolve after 3-4 days, antibiotics are
154 recommended to shorten the course of the infection, lessen spread, and prevent acute
155 suppurative complications.[1] Accurate detection of GAS is imperative; untreated and
156 recurring GAS infections can lead to severe outcomes such as acute rheumatic fever, which
157 causes carditis in 30-45% of cases and is the most common cause of acquired heart disease
158 in children worldwide.[1]

159 A standard method for diagnosing GAS pharyngitis is with a rapid antigen detection
160 test (RADT), which requires a posterior pharyngeal swab sample and provides a positive or
161 negative result within minutes.[2] If the RADT is negative, a throat culture is usually performed
162 on a posterior pharyngeal swab in order to detect false negatives, and laboratory analysis
163 takes more time.[2,3] Another option is a molecular test (e.g., quantitative polymerase chain
164 reaction (qPCR)), again requiring a posterior pharyngeal swab.[4] Pharyngeal swabs are
165 uncomfortable, often acting as a deterrent for children and adults; however, it is important to
166 confidently diagnose bacterial pharyngitis not only for the long-term health of the patient but
167 also to avoid over-prescribing antibiotics.[1] DeMuri, et al. established that mouth swabs
168 (sucked on like a lollipop) provide an adequate sample for the detection of GAS when
169 sensitive methods such as PCR are used.[5]

170 With developments in PCR and RADTs using saliva instead of posterior pharyngeal
171 swabs, more options are now available for salivary detection such as spit tubes
172 (OMNIgene™), passive drooling, mouth swabs (ESwab™), and cotton rolls (Salivette®).[6-8]

173 The CandyCollect, a lollipop-inspired open-fluidic sampling device, was first introduced in
174 our 2021 in-lab study that showed its ability to capture and accumulate *Streptococcus*
175 *pyogenes* for analysis.[9] In 2022, we tested the device with a remote, at-home human subjects
176 study in which the CandyCollect devices effectively captured commensal bacteria
177 (*Streptococcus mutans* and *Staphylococcus aureus*) from healthy adults.[10] The CandyCollect
178 devices were shipped to the lab in dry tubes under ambient conditions to be quantified using
179 qPCR from the elution fluid.[10] Ours is not the only lollipop-inspired device; there are at least
180 three other collection or testing devices with a similar lollipop form already on the market,
181 although these alternative devices do not look like a traditional candy lollipop and also do
182 not provide flavor. The Self-LolliSponge™ by Copan has the user keep the sponge stick in
183 their mouth for a "few minutes" with a lemon scented cap to improve the experience.[11] The
184 V-Chek COVID-19 Saliva Antigen Test provides a "'Lollipop' Saliva Swab" that the user
185 places in their mouth for 90 seconds and then attaches to a lateral flow assay cassette.[12] The
186 Whistling COVID-19 Saliva Antigen Rapid Test combines an absorbent material attached to
187 a handle that the user places in their mouth with an immunochromatographic assay.[12]

188 Obtaining high-quality samples to diagnose GAS pharyngitis in pediatric patients
189 is important for treatment; however, the current collection tools are not child friendly. Here
190 we aimed to demonstrate the feasibility of the CandyCollect device by collecting salivary
191 samples from 30 pediatric patients aged 5-17 years with known GAS pharyngitis. Further
192 we aimed to compare user preference for CandyCollect, conventional pharyngeal swabs, or
193 mouth swabs in children with pharyngitis and their caregivers.

194

195 **Method**

196 **Mouth swabs and CandyCollect devices**

197 *Swabs and media:* The pharyngeal swab used in the clinical visit was a standard of care
198 double swab, BBL™ CultureSwab™ Transport Systems by Copan (FisherScientific, Cat#
199 B4320109). The white-capped ESwab™ with nylon flocked swabs and Liquid Amies
200 media collection kits by Copan (FisherScientific, Cat# R723480) were used as mouth
201 swabs.

202 *CandyCollect device stick fabrication:* The CandyCollect device is milled from a sheet of
203 4 mm polystyrene (Goodfellow, Cat# 700-272-86) using the DATRON Neo computerized
204 numerical control (CNC) mill as previously described.[9] The Fusion file and an engineering
205 drawing of the CandyCollect device are included in the Supplemental Material (Figure
206 S1). After sanding rough edges, devices were sonicated in isopropanol (IPA)
207 (FisherScientific, A451-4) and 70% v/v ethanol (FisherScientific, Decon™ Labs, 07-678-
208 004).

209 *Plasma treatment of CandyCollect devices:* A Zepto LC PC Plasma Treater (Diener
210 Electronic GmbH, Ebhausen, Germany), using oxygen gas, increased hydrophilicity of the
211 device surface. The process includes decreasing the chamber pressure to 0.20-0.25 mbar
212 and adding oxygen gas while 70 W voltage is applied for 5 minutes.[9,10]

213 *Preparation of CandyCollect devices for human subjects study:* CandyCollect devices
214 were prepared as previously described with the exception of storage containers and candy
215 mass.[9,10] Half of the patients (1-15) were sampled with CandyCollects made with 1.2-1.34
216 g isomalt candy, while the second half (16-30) were sampled with 0.45-0.57 g; procedures
217 are duplicated here for convenience. In accordance with the kitchen hygiene guidelines of
218 the Washington State Cottage Food Operations Law (RCW 69.22.040(2b-f(ii-iv))), candy
219 was applied to CandyCollect sticks by lab members who are trained in food safety, have a
220 Food Worker Card (WA State), and wore gloves and a mask during food preparation.

221 Candy was prepared by gradually adding isomalt to water while heating to a target
222 temperature of 171°C, then adding food coloring. Next, the isomalt mixture was cooled in
223 a room temperature water bath while strawberry candy flavoring was added. Plasma
224 treated CandyCollect sticks were cleaned using hot water and dish soap. After the sticks
225 were dry, small amounts of isomalt candy were re-melted and added to silicone molds with
226 the CandyCollect sticks. Once the candy was cooled, the mass was recorded, and the
227 device was heat-sealed in a polypropylene bag. Devices were stored in Ziploc® storage
228 bags with a food safe desiccant (Amazon, Cat# B00DYKTS9C) until being sent to UW-
229 Madison for the clinical study
230

231 **Clinical Study Procedures**

232 *Subjects and Specimens*

233 Caregiver-child dyads were recruited from an ambulatory care clinic that serves children
234 in Madison, Wisconsin. Children were diagnosed with GAS pharyngitis using a traditional
235 pharyngeal swab (throat swab) via RADT. The study was approved by the UW-Madison
236 Health Sciences Institutional Review Board (#2021-1427). Study data were collected and
237 managed using REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) electronic data capture tools
238 hosted at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, School of Medicine and Public
239 Health.[13,14]

240 A parent or legal guardian (aka "caregiver") provided verbal consent and caregiver
241 permission and all children provided verbal assent. Eligible children needed to be able to
242 suck on swabs and the CandyCollect devices and could not have a sensitivity to sugar-free
243 products; additionally, a parent or legal guardian needed to be present and enroll in the
244 study along with the child. Immediately after the visit, in which the traditional pharyngeal

245 swab was obtained, a research nurse guided participants through collecting four oral
246 samples: two commercially available mouth swabs (ESwab™) for 10 seconds each and
247 two CandyCollect devices until the candy was fully dissolved (Figure 1). The samples
248 were stored at -80°C and shipped on dry ice prior to qPCR analysis. Race and ethnicity
249 information was collected based on the requirements of NIH. Race and ethnicity
250 information was taken from the electronic health record, where it had previously been
251 entered based on self-report by the parent/legal guardian.

252 *Testing Preference Survey*

253 After sample collection was complete, the research nurse gave a paper-based survey to
254 both the child and their caregiver. All survey questions are included in Table S1-2. The
255 research nurse provided instructions about the Wong-Baker FACES® Pain Rating Scale
256 to all child participants, explaining that each face represents a person who has no pain
257 (hurt), or some, or a lot of pain (Figure S2).[15] The nurse asked the participants to choose
258 the face that best describes the pain they experienced during each type of testing. The
259 research nurse assisted children with completing the form if they needed help reading or
260 understanding. The research nurse gave caregivers privacy in completing their surveys, to
261 encourage honest responses, only answering questions as needed. Participants were also
262 asked to provide suggestions and free responses about the main reasons for their
263 preferences. All free response questions are included in Table S3.

264

265 **Specimen Processing and Laboratory Analysis**

266 The detailed specimen processing and laboratory analysis procedures were previously
267 described.[10] In brief, the mouth swab and CandyCollect sample collection was obtained
268 by a research nurse. Samples were stored in -20 °C and then transferred to storage at -80

269 °C within 12 days. Samples were shipped to the University of Washington on dry ice and
270 then stored at -80 °C before processing. All laboratory procedures were performed in
271 accordance with Biosafety Level-2 laboratory practices and the University of Washington
272 Site-Specific Bloodborne Pathogen Exposure Control Plan. CandyCollect devices and
273 mouth swabs were processed as previously described;[10] additional details are in the
274 Supplemental Material. Briefly, the material on the CandyCollect device was eluted by
275 phosphate buffered saline (PBS) (Gibco™, Cat# 10010023) with 5% Proteinase K
276 (Thermo Scientific™, Cat# EO0491); for mouth swab samples, *S. pyogenes* DNA was
277 isolated using MagMAX™ Total Nucleic Acid Isolation Kit (ThermoFisher Scientific,
278 Cat# AM1840) according to the protocol supplied by the manufacturer. After elution and
279 lysis, the samples were also enriched and purified using MagMAX™ Total Nucleic Acid
280 Isolation Kit following the protocol supplied by the manufacturer. [10]
281 qPCR was performed for the detection of *S. pyogenes* genomic DNA as previously
282 described.[9, 10] The results were expressed as Cycle threshold (Ct, number of cycles until
283 the sample was detected above the threshold). Ct below 39 are positive for *S. pyogenes*;
284 this cut-off was determined from standard curves prepared with *S. pyogenes* cultures.[9]
285

286 **Preparation of positive and negative controls**

287 Preparation of positive controls (via in-lab capture of *S. pyogenes*) and negative controls
288 is described in our prior publications [9, 10] and the Supplemental Material. In brief, *S.*
289 *pyogenes* was prepared from *Streptococcus pyogenes* Rosenbach (American Type Culture
290 Collection, ATCC®, Cat# 700294™), and cultured in Todd-Hewitt Yeast broth.[16] *S.*
291 *pyogenes* culture was inoculated one day prior to experiments. For positive controls, 50
292 μL of *S. pyogenes* culture media were added to the CandyCollect devices, and mouth

293 swabs were soaked in the *S. pyogenes* culture media for 10 seconds. PBS was used as the
294 negative control sample.
295
296 **Results**
297 *Demographic Characteristics*
298 In this study, 30 pediatric child-caregiver dyads were enrolled at a clinic in Madison,
299 Wisconsin. Enrolled child participants were aged 5 to 14 years with GAS pharyngitis,
300 which is consistent with the age range in which GAS pharyngitis is most common;[1] the
301 mean age of participants was 8.9 years (Figure S3 and Table S4). More than 90% of child
302 participants were white and not Hispanic. (Table S4).
303
304 *qPCR analysis of GAS in CandyCollect devices and mouth swabs*
305 Each sample was analyzed using qPCR and the Ct is shown in Figure 2. The samples
306 collected by CandyCollect devices have an average Ct of 31.28 (range=19.1-38.6) and
307 mouth swabs have an average Ct of 32.08 (range=19.5-38.1); the Ct from the two sampling
308 methods are not significantly different ($p>0.05$). Nine samples collected by CandyCollect
309 devices have a higher Ct than the corresponding mouth swabs and the Ct of 13 samples
310 collected by CandyCollect devices is lower than the corresponding mouth swabs. Two
311 different versions of the CandyCollect device (with 0.5 g and 1.3 g candy) were used, with
312 half of the participants using each size. The comparison of the Ct values from two different
313 sizes of candy, shown in Figure S4, are not significantly different ($p>0.05$). There is also
314 no notable correlation between the CandyCollect device consumption time and the Ct
315 values (Figure S5).
316

317 *User Feedback of CandyCollect devices and two other commercial collection tools*

318 All 30 children and their caregivers completed feedback surveys. Twenty-nine of 30
319 children responded that they did not feel any pain or discomfort while using the
320 CandyCollect devices; in comparison, more than half of participants felt pain/discomfort
321 with the traditional throat swabs (Figure 3). Twenty-seven of 30 caregivers ranked the
322 CandyCollect as a good sampling method overall; 29/30 caregivers indicated that using
323 the CandyCollect device was a pleasant experience for their child (Figure 3). The majority
324 of children reported that the CandyCollect device is easy to use (17/30), and they "really
325 like" the taste (n= 23/30) (Figure 3). The majority of caregivers reported that the
326 appearance of the CandyCollect was appealing (n= 26/30) (Figure 4). When asked to
327 consider using CandyCollect, mouth swab, or throat swab if they needed another GAS
328 pharyngitis diagnostic test next week, more than a half of the children (24/30) and
329 caregivers (17/30) prefer to use the CandyCollect device, with the remaining children and
330 caregivers preferring the mouth swab; no participants selected the throat swab (Figure 4).
331 For caregivers of children who consumed the 0.5 g CandyCollect device (consumption
332 time range 2.3-5.9 min; 3.3 min median), 12/15 preferred the CandyCollect device and
333 3/15 preferred the mouth swab; for caregivers of children who consumed the 1.3 g
334 CandyCollect device (consumption time range 4.3-14.2 min; 6.5 min median), 5/15
335 preferred the CandyCollect device and 10/15 preferred the mouth swab. Almost all
336 children (28 out of 30) and all caregivers (30 out of 30) stated that they would be willing
337 to use the CandyCollect device at home (Figure 4). All caregivers report they would
338 recommend using the CandyCollect device (Figure 4) for children 5 years and older. All
339 survey questions are included in table S1-2.

340

341 **Discussion**

342 The ultimate goal of the CandyCollect device is to capture bacterial pathogens for
343 laboratory detection. In our previous in-lab study, we developed the CandyCollect device
344 to capture *S. pyogenes* in saliva and established a qPCR assay to detect *S. pyogenes* eluted
345 from CandyCollect devices.[9] We also used CandyCollect devices to capture commensal
346 bacteria (*Streptococcus mutans* and *Staphylococcus aureus*) from healthy adults in a home
347 setting as proof-of-concept human subjects research.[10] The present publication is the first
348 human subjects research that used CandyCollect devices with pediatric patients. The
349 results show that all 30 children diagnosed with GAS pharyngitis using a RADT were
350 positive on CandyCollect devices and mouth swabs. As expected in human subjects
351 studies, there was some variability in the amount of bacteria (Ct value) across sampling
352 methods and participants, which was also shown in a previous study comparing throat
353 swabs and mouth swabs.[5]

354 From the user feedback surveys, many caregivers noted the CandyCollect device is less
355 scary for children than other sampling methods, especially in comparison to throat swabs.
356 Several caregivers noted the CandyCollect is easy, fun, and non-invasive. Some caregivers
357 indicated that the CandyCollect device could help children be less afraid of going to the
358 doctor or even be excited to do the test. All survey free responses and suggestions are
359 included in Table S3. When asked for suggestions to improve CandyCollect, the most
360 common suggestion was to shorten the sampling time. We responded to this suggestion
361 mid-study by using a CandyCollect that afforded a shorter sampling time for the second
362 half of participants. As noted in the Results, caregivers indicated a preference for either
363 the CandyCollect or the mouth swab, with no caregivers (and no children) preferring the
364 throat swab. Notably, more caregivers preferred their children to use CandyCollect devices

365 rather than mouth swabs when their child used smaller CandyCollect devices with a faster
366 dissolving time (12/15) in comparison to caregivers of children who used the larger
367 CandyCollect devices with a longer dissolving time (5/15). Slightly more children also
368 preferred using CandyCollect devices when they used faster-dissolving CandyCollect
369 devices (13/15 vs. 11/15). Schuster et al., also reported the same reasoning for sampling
370 preferences: 73% of participants preferred the nasal swab compared to saliva collection
371 by drooling due to the faster sampling time.[17] We are currently working to modify the
372 CandyCollect so as to have faster dissolving candy.
373 There are two major limitations for this study. First, this pilot study was performed with a
374 relatively small sample size; we have ongoing studies with larger sample sizes in adults
375 and children with GAS and other respiratory illnesses. Second, participants were recruited
376 from a single site with relatively homogenous demographics, although we have no reason
377 to suspect that demographics influence capture of pathogen in saliva. Our ongoing work
378 includes remote nationwide studies with enrollment demographics matching national
379 distribution of race/ethnicities.
380

381 **Conclusion**

382 The CandyCollect device, a user-friendly pathogen collection method, is specifically
383 designed to make both in-clinic and at-home sampling more accessible for children. In our
384 inaugural pediatric clinical study, we demonstrated the CandyCollect device successfully
385 captured GAS from 30 children in a clinical setting. Notably, a majority of the children
386 and their caregivers expressed a preference for the CandyCollect device as their chosen
387 method for collecting GAS (compared to traditional throat swabs and mouth swabs). This
388 study represents a significant step towards facilitating collection of samples for the

detection of GAS and other respiratory pathogens. Currently, we are modifying the CandyCollect device based on user feedback to optimize its performance and user experience, and we will enroll more participants to achieve larger sample sizes of children with GAS pharyngitis. The present study paves the way for several exciting research directions, including: (1) integrating existing lateral flow immunoassay techniques with the CandyCollect device to enhance the diagnostic capabilities at home and shorten the diagnostic time, and (2) expanding the range of pathogens that can be captured using the CandyCollect device.

Acknowledgments

We would also like to thank Jason Robertson for his review of the manuscript; Lochlan Hickok and Paul Miller for helping facilitate shipping and logistics; Karen N. Adams advising on work with human subjects study design and regulatory protocols; Alexandra Lindstrom and Bridget L. Johnson advising on study design and execution. Moreover, we thank the participants enrolled in this study.

References

1. Walker MJ, Barnett TC, McArthur JD, et al. Disease Manifestations and Pathogenic Mechanisms of Group A Streptococcus. Clinical Microbiology Reviews. 2014;27(2):264-301. doi:doi:10.1128/cmr.00101-13
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Updated June 27, 2022. Accessed July10, 2023. https://www.cdc.gov/groupastrep/diseases-hcp/strep-throat.html#:~:text=Clinicians%20need%20to%20use%20either,the%20gold%20standard%20diagnostic%20test
3. Shulman ST, Bisno AL, Clegg HW, et al. Clinical Practice Guideline for the Diagnosis and Management of Group A Streptococcal Pharyngitis: 2012 Update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2012;55(10):e86-e102. doi:10.1093/cid/cis629
4. Ralph AP, Holt DC, Islam S, et al. Potential for Molecular Testing for Group A Streptococcus to Improve Diagnosis and Management in a High-Risk Population: A Prospective Study. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2019;6(4):ofz097. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofz097
5. DeMuri G and Wald ER. Detection of Group A Streptococcus in the Saliva of Children Presenting With Pharyngitis Using the cobas Liat PCR System. Clin Pediatr (Phila). 2020;59(9-10):856-858. doi:10.1177/0009922820920936
6. Bellagambi FG, Lomonaco T, Salvo P, et al. Saliva sampling: Methods and devices. An overview. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 2020;124:115781. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2019.115781
7. All-in-one system for the collection and rapid stabilization of microbial DNA and RNA. Accessed August 15, 2023. https://www.dnagenotek.com/row/products/collection-microbiome/omnigene-oral/OME-505.html
8. Melo Costa M., Benoit N, Dormoi J, et al. Al-meras, L. Salivette, a relevant saliva sampling device for SARS-CoV-2 detection. J. Oral Microbiol. 2021; 13, 1920226. doi: 10.1080/20002297.2021.1920226
9. Lee UN, Su X, Hieber DL, et al. CandyCollect: at-home saliva sampling for capture of respiratory pathogens. Lab Chip. 2022;22(18):3555-3564. doi:10.1039/d1lc01132d
10. Tu W-c, McManamen AM, Su X, et al. At-Home Saliva Sampling in Healthy Adults Using CandyCollect, a Lollipop-Inspired Device. Analytical Chemistry. 2023;95(27):10211-10220. doi:10.1021/acs.analchem.3c00462
11. Ottaviano E, Parodi C, Borghi E, et al. Saliva detection of SARS-CoV-2 for mitigating company outbreaks: a surveillance experience, Milan, Italy, March 2021. Epidemiol Infect. 2021;149:e171. doi:10.1017/s0950268821001473
12. De Meyer J, Goris H, Mortelé O, et al. Evaluation of Saliva as a Matrix for RT-PCR Analysis and Two Rapid Antigen Tests for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2. Viruses. 2022;14(9)doi:10.3390/v14091931
13. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. Journal of Biomedical Informatics. 2009;42(2):377-381. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010

14. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. Journal of Biomedical Informatics. 2019;95:103208. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208
15. Wong-Baker FACES® Pain Rating Scale https://wongbakerfaces.org/
16. Gera K, McIver KS. Laboratory growth and maintenance of *Streptococcus pyogenes* (the Group A Streptococcus, GAS). Curr Protoc Microbiol. Oct 2 2013;30:9d.2.1-9d.2.13. doi:10.1002/9780471729259.mc09d02s30
17. Schuster JE, Potts J, Selvarangan R, Mast DK, Goldman JL. A COVID-19 Testing Preference Study in Schools. Pediatrics. 2023;152(Suppl 1) doi:10.1542/peds.2022-060352H



Figure 1. GAS sampling tools used in this study: pharyngeal swab (throat swab), ESwab™ (mouth swab), and the CandyCollect device (from left to right). The components of the CandyCollect device include: 1) strawberry candy to facilitate pleasant user experience of the CandyCollect device and 2) open channels which capture bacterial pathogens.



Figure 2. (A) Pooled cycle threshold (Ct) values of samples collected from 30 child participants with GAS pharyngitis with the mouth swabs (left, light grey) and CandyCollect devices ((right, dark grey). Ct from the two sampling methods are not significantly different ($p>0.05$). (B) individual Ct values collected from the CandyCollect devices (purple, square) and mouth swabs (green, circle). Data are plotted by sorting the Ct of the CandyCollect devices (from lowest to highest). Ct below 39 are positive for *S. pyogenes*; this cut-off was determined from standard curves prepared with *S. pyogenes* cultures; all points plotted are positive results.



Figure 3. Survey responses to assess the comparison of three collection methods: traditional pharyngeal swab, mouth swab, and the CandyCollect device. All survey questions are included in Table S1 and S2: (A) Table S1 question 1-3 (B) Table S2 question 2, 4, and 6 (C) Table S2 question 1, 3, and 5.



Figure 4. Survey responses to assess the ranking of CandyCollect devices and user preferences. All survey questions are included in Table S1 and S2: (A) Table S2 question 10 (B) Table S1 question 6 and 7 (C) Table S1 question 5 and Table S2 question 9 (D) Table S1 question 4 and Table S2 question 7 (E) Table S2 question 8 (F) Table S2 question 11.