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

Wan-chen Tu, MS,[*a] Ingrid H. Robertson, 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; [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
[§]Co- corresponding 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. Gregory P. DeMuri, Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Department of Pediatrics, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health 600 Highland Ave H6/570, Madison, WI, 53792-4108, [demuri@pediatrics.wisc.edu], 608-333-2569. Ellen R. Wald, Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Department of Pediatrics, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health 600 Highland Ave H6/570, Madison, WI, 53792-4108, [erwald@wisc.edu], 608-265-6050.

Authors

Wan-chen Tu [wanchent@uw.edu]
Ingrid H. Robertson [ingridj@uw.edu]
Andrea Blom [andreascopel@hotmail.com]
Elena Alfaro [elalfaro@wisc.edu]
Victoria A. M. Shinkawa [shinkawavicky@gmail.com]
Daniel B. Hatchett [danhatch@uw.edu]
Juan C. Sanchez [jsc758@uw.edu]
Anika M. McManamen [mcanikam@gmail.com]
Xiaojing Su [xsu7@uw.edu]
Erwin Berthier [erwinberthier@gmail.com]
Sanitta Thongpang [sanitta.tho@gmail.com]
Ellen R. Wald [erwald@wisc.edu]
Gregory P. DeMuri [demuri@pediatrics.wisc.edu]
Ashleigh B. Theberge [abt1@uw.edu]

Conflict of Interest 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.

Source of funding:

This work was 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.

Trial Registration:

Registry name: ClinicalTrials.gov
ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT05175196
Weblink: https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05175196

Abstract

State the purpose: 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. Here, we determined the efficacy of 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.

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 CandyCollect for children 5 years and older. Twenty-three of 30 children "really like" the taste and 24/30 would prefer to use CandyCollect if a future test were needed. All caregivers (30/30) and most children (28/30) would be willing to use CandyCollect at home.

Conclusion: All participants tested positive for GAS on all three collection methods (pharyngeal swab, mouth swab, and CandyCollect). While both caregivers and children like CandyCollect, some caregivers would prefer a shorter collection time. Future work includes additional studies with larger cohorts presenting with pharyngitis of unknown etiology and shortening collection time while maintaining the attractive form of the device.

Translational Impact Statement

Obtaining oral samples for the diagnosis of streptococcal pharyngitis is of great importance for children. To address the challenges associated with traditional pharyngeal swab sampling, we developed the CandyCollect device, a lollipop-inspired open mesofluidic saliva sampling system. In this study, saliva samples were collected from children, aged 5-14 years, with CandyCollect and mouth swabs and analyzed via qPCR. The results show CandyCollect is the child preferred collection tool and had 100% concordance with the results from traditional diagnosis methods as part of their clinical care.

Keywords: Pediatric diagnostics; Group A Streptococcus; patient centric sample collection, point-of-care; open microfluidics

115 **Introduction**

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

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

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

139 The CandyCollect, a lollipop-inspired open-fluidic sampling device, was first introduced in
140 our 2021 in-lab study that showed its ability to capture and accumulate *Streptococcus*
141 *pyogenes* for analysis.[9] In 2022, we tested the device with a remote, at-home human subjects
142 study in which the CandyCollect devices effectively captured commensal bacteria
143 (*Streptococcus mutans* and *Staphylococcus aureus*) from healthy adults.[10] The CandyCollect
144 devices were shipped to the lab in dry tubes under ambient conditions to be quantified using
145 qPCR from the elution fluid.[10] Ours is not the only lollipop-inspired device; there are at least
146 three other collection or testing devices with a similar lollipop form already on the market,
147 although these alternative devices do not look like a traditional candy lollipop and also do
148 not provide flavor. The Self-LolliSponge™ by Copan has the user keep the sponge stick in
149 their mouth for a "few minutes" with a lemon scented cap to improve the experience.[11] The
150 V-Chek COVID-19 Saliva Antigen Test provides a "'Lollipop' Saliva Swab" that the user
151 places in their mouth for 90 seconds and then attaches to a lateral flow assay cassette.[12] The
152 Whistling COVID-19 Saliva Antigen Rapid Test combines an absorbent material attached to
153 a handle that the user places in their mouth with an immunochromatographic assay.[12]
154 Obtaining high-quality samples to diagnose GAS pharyngitis in pediatric patients
155 is important for treatment; however, the current collection tools are not child friendly. Here
156 we aimed to demonstrate the feasibility of the CandyCollect device by collecting salivary
157 samples from 30 pediatric patients aged 5-17 years with known GAS pharyngitis. Further
158 we aimed to compare user preference for CandyCollect, conventional pharyngeal swabs, or
159 mouth swabs among children with pharyngitis and their caregivers.
160

161 **Method**

162 **Mouth swabs and CandyCollect devices**

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

168 *CandyCollect device stick fabrication:* The CandyCollect device is milled from a sheet of
169 4 mm polystyrene (Goodfellow, Cat# 700-272-86) using the DATRON Neo computerized
170 numerical control (CNC) mill as previously described.[9] The Fusion file and an engineering
171 drawing of the CandyCollect device are included in the Supplemental Material
172 (Supplemental Figure 1). After sanding rough edges, devices were sonicated in
173 isopropanol (IPA) (FisherScientific, A451-4) and 70% v/v ethanol (FisherScientific,
174 Decon™ Labs, 07-678-004).

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

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

187 Candy was prepared by gradually adding isomalt to water while heating to a target
188 temperature of 171°C, then adding food coloring. Next, the isomalt mixture was cooled in
189 a room temperature water bath while strawberry candy flavoring was added. Plasma
190 treated CandyCollect sticks were cleaned using hot water and dish soap. After the sticks
191 were dry, small amounts of isomalt candy were re-melted and added to silicone molds with
192 the CandyCollect sticks. Once the candy was cooled, the mass was recorded, and the
193 device was heat-sealed in a polypropylene bag. Devices were stored in Ziploc® storage
194 bags with a food safe desiccant (Amazon, Cat# B00DYKTS9C) until being sent to UW-
195 Madison for the clinical study.
196

197 **Clinical Study Procedures**

198 *Subjects and Specimens*

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

205 A parent or legal guardian (aka "caregiver") provided verbal consent for their own
206 participation in the study and caregiver permission for their child, and all children provided
207 verbal assent. Eligible children needed to be able to suck on swabs and the CandyCollect
208 devices and could not have a sensitivity to sugar-free products; additionally, a parent or
209 legal guardian needed to be present and enroll in the study along with the child.
210 Immediately after the clinic visit, in which the traditional pharyngeal swab was obtained,

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

218 *Testing Preference Survey*

219 After sample collection was complete, the research nurse gave a paper-based survey to
220 both the child and their caregiver. All survey questions are included in supplementary
221 materials, Supplemental Table 1-2. The research nurse provided instructions about the
222 Wong-Baker FACES® Pain Rating Scale to all child participants, explaining that each
223 face represents a person who has no pain (hurt), or some, or a lot of pain (Supplemental
224 Figure 2).[15] The nurse asked the participants to choose the face that best describes the pain
225 they experienced during each type of testing. The research nurse assisted children with
226 completing the form if they needed help reading or understanding. The research nurse gave
227 caregivers privacy in completing their surveys, to encourage honest responses, only
228 answering questions as needed. Participants were also asked to provide suggestions and
229 free responses about the main reasons for their preferences. All free response questions
230 are included in Supplemental Table 3.

231

232 **Specimen Processing and Laboratory Analysis**

233 The detailed specimen processing and laboratory analysis procedures were previously
234 described.[10] In brief, the mouth swab and CandyCollect sample collection was directed by

235 a research nurse. Samples were stored in -20 °C and then transferred to storage at -80 °C
236 within 12 days. Samples were shipped to the University of Washington on dry ice and then
237 stored at -80 °C before processing. All laboratory procedures were performed in
238 accordance with Biosafety Level-2 laboratory practices and the University of Washington
239 Site-Specific Bloodborne Pathogen Exposure Control Plan. CandyCollect devices and
240 mouth swabs were processed as previously described;[10] additional details are in the
241 Supplemental Material. Briefly, the material on the CandyCollect device was eluted by
242 phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) (Gibco™, Cat# 10010023) with 5% Proteinase K
243 (Thermo Scientific™, Cat# EO0491); for mouth swab samples, *S. pyogenes* DNA was
244 isolated using MagMAX™ Total Nucleic Acid Isolation Kit (ThermoFisher Scientific,
245 Cat# AM1840) according to the protocol supplied by the manufacturer. After elution and
246 lysis, the samples were also enriched and purified using MagMAX™ Total Nucleic Acid
247 Isolation Kit following the protocol supplied by the manufacturer. [10]
248 qPCR was performed for the detection of *S. pyogenes* genomic DNA as previously
249 described.[9, 10] The results were expressed as Cycle threshold (Ct, number of cycles until
250 the sample was detected above the threshold). Any Ct value below or equal to Ct values
251 for the lowest concentration of DNA standards (5 fg) on the same plate was considered
252 positive; this cut-off was determined from standard curves performed with genomic DNA
253 isolated from *S. pyogenes*.[9]
254 Statistics: Statistical analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism 9 software. Paired t-
255 tests were used to evaluate the significance of pairwise comparisons.
256
257 **Preparation of positive and negative controls**
258 Preparation of positive controls (via in-lab capture of *S. pyogenes*) and negative controls

259 is described in our prior publications [9, 10] and the Supplemental Material. In brief, *S.*
260 *pyogenes* was prepared from *Streptococcus pyogenes* Rosenbach (American Type Culture
261 Collection, ATCC®, Cat# 700294™), and cultured in Todd-Hewitt Yeast broth.[16] *S.*
262 *pyogenes* culture was inoculated one day prior to experiments. For positive controls, 50
263 μL of *S. pyogenes* culture media were added to the CandyCollect devices, and mouth
264 swabs were soaked in the *S. pyogenes* culture media for 10 seconds. PBS was used as the
265 negative control sample.
266
267 **Results**
268 *Demographic Characteristics*
269 In this study, 30 pediatric child-caregiver dyads were enrolled at a clinic in Madison,
270 Wisconsin. Enrolled child participants were aged 5 to 14 years with GAS pharyngitis,
271 which is consistent with the age range in which GAS pharyngitis is most common;[1] the
272 mean age of participants was 8.8 years (Figure 2 and Supplemental Table 4). More than
273 90% of child participants were white and not Hispanic. (Supplemental Table 4).
274
275 *qPCR analysis of GAS in CandyCollect devices and mouth swabs*
276 Each sample was analyzed using qPCR and the Ct is shown in Figure 3. The samples
277 collected by CandyCollect devices have an average Ct of 31.28 (range=19.1-38.6) and
278 mouth swabs have an average Ct of 32.08 (range=19.5-38.1); the Ct from the two sampling
279 methods of the 30 participants are not significantly different ($p>0.05$). Nine samples
280 collected by CandyCollect devices have a higher Ct than the corresponding mouth swabs
281 and the Ct of 13 samples collected by CandyCollect devices is lower than the
282 corresponding mouth swabs. Two different versions of the CandyCollect device (with 0.5

283 g and 1.3 g candy) were used, with half of the participants using each size. The comparison
284 of the Ct values from two different sizes of candy (15 participants each size), shown in
285 Supplemental Figure 3, are not significantly different ($p>0.05$). There is also no notable
286 correlation between the CandyCollect device consumption time and the Ct values (Figure
287 4).
288
289 *User Feedback of CandyCollect devices and two other commercial collection tools*
290 All 30 children and their caregivers completed feedback surveys. Twenty-nine of 30
291 children responded that they did not feel any pain or discomfort while using the
292 CandyCollect devices; in comparison, more than half of participants felt pain/discomfort
293 with the traditional throat swabs (Figure 5). Twenty-seven of 30 caregivers ranked the
294 CandyCollect as a good sampling method overall; 29/30 caregivers indicated that using
295 the CandyCollect device was a pleasant experience for their child (Figure 5). The majority
296 of children reported that the CandyCollect device is easy to use (17/30), and they "really
297 like" the taste (n= 23/30) (Figure 6). The majority of caregivers reported that the
298 appearance of the CandyCollect was appealing (n= 26/30) (Figure 6). When asked to
299 consider using CandyCollect, mouth swab, or throat swab if they needed another GAS
300 pharyngitis diagnostic test next week, more than a half of the children (24/30) and
301 caregivers (17/30) preferred to use the CandyCollect device, with the remaining children
302 and caregivers preferring the mouth swab; no participants selected the throat swab (Figure
303 6). For caregivers of children who consumed the 0.5 g CandyCollect device (consumption
304 time range 2.3-5.9 min; 3.3 min median), 12/15 preferred the CandyCollect device and
305 3/15 preferred the mouth swab; for caregivers of children who consumed the 1.3 g
306 CandyCollect device (consumption time range 4.3-14.2 min; 6.5 min median), 5/15

307 preferred the CandyCollect device and 10/15 preferred the mouth swab. Almost all
308 children (28 out of 30) and all caregivers (30 out of 30) stated that they would be willing
309 to use the CandyCollect device at home (Figure 6). All caregivers report they would
310 recommend using the CandyCollect device (Figure 6) for children 5 years and older. All
311 survey questions are included in Supplemental Table 1-2.
312

313 **Discussion**

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

326 From the user feedback surveys, many caregivers noted the CandyCollect device is less
327 frightening for children than other sampling methods, especially in comparison to throat
328 swabs. Several caregivers noted that the CandyCollect device is easy, fun, and non-
329 invasive. Some caregivers indicated that the CandyCollect device could help children be
330 less afraid of going to the doctor or even be excited to do the test. All survey free responses

331 and suggestions are included in Supplemental Table 3. When asked for suggestions to
332 improve CandyCollect devices, the most common suggestion was to shorten the sampling
333 time. We responded to this suggestion mid-study by using a CandyCollect device that
334 afforded a shorter sampling time for the second half of participants. As noted in the Results,
335 caregivers indicated a preference for either the CandyCollect device or the mouth swab,
336 with no caregivers (and no children) preferring the throat swab. Notably, more caregivers
337 preferred their children to use CandyCollect devices rather than mouth swabs when their
338 child used smaller CandyCollect devices with a faster dissolving time (12/15) in
339 comparison to caregivers of children who used the larger CandyCollect devices with a
340 longer dissolving time (5/15). Slightly more children also preferred using CandyCollect
341 devices when they used faster-dissolving CandyCollect devices (13/15 vs. 11/15).
342 Schuster et al., also reported the same reasoning for sampling preferences: 73% of
343 participants preferred the nasal swab compared to saliva collection by drooling due to the
344 faster sampling time.[17] We are currently working to modify the CandyCollect device so as
345 to have faster dissolving candy.
346 There are three major limitations for this study. First, this pilot study was performed with
347 a relatively small sample size; we have ongoing studies with larger sample sizes in adults
348 and children with GAS and other respiratory illnesses. Second, participants were recruited
349 from a single site with relatively homogenous demographics, although we have no reason
350 to suspect that demographics influence capture of pathogens in saliva. Our ongoing work
351 includes remote nationwide studies with enrollment demographics matching national
352 distribution of race/ethnicities. Finally, to maximize the number of positive cases tested
353 with CandyCollect devices in this feasibility study, we only included children who tested
354 positive for GAS on pharyngeal swabs analyzed with RADT during their clinic visits;

future studies will include children with pharyngitis of unknown etiology evaluated with standard clinical and research protocols.

Conclusion

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

This work was 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.

We would 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.

Author contributions

W-c. T. 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. I. J. 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. A. B. 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. E. A. 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. V. A. M. S., D. B. H., and J. C. S. fabricated the CandyCollect devices and prepared devices for human subject research, including designing experimental protocols/engineering designs, and critically reviewed and revised the manuscript. A. M. M. and X. S. designed the sample processing protocol and drafted, critically reviewed, and revised the manuscript. E. B. conceptualized the research, advised on study design and interpretation, and critically reviewed and revised the manuscript. A. B. T., G. P. D., E. R. W., and S. T. conceptualized the research, designed the study, oversaw study execution, interpreted the data, and critically reviewed and revised the manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript as submitted and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

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: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: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: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 (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. Subject demographics. Thirty participants, aged 5-14 years, were enrolled in this study. Of all the participants, 16 were females and 14 were males.



Figure 3. (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 of all 30 participants 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 the Ct of the CandyCollect devices; the participant numbers were randomly re-numbered. Any Ct value below or equal to Ct values for the lowest concentration of DNA standards (5 fg) on the same plate was considered positive; this cut-off was determined from standard curves prepared with genomic DNA isolated from *S. pyogenes*; all points plotted are positive results.



Figure 4. Collection time of CandyCollect devices vs. Ct values of samples collected from 15 participants using the large CandyCollect devices (Candy = 1.3 g, green) and from 15 participants using small CandyCollect devices (Candy = 0.5 g, purple).



Figure 5. Survey responses to assess the comparison of three collection methods. All survey questions are included in Supplemental Table 1 and 2: (A) Supplemental Table 1 questions 1-3 (B) Supplemental Table 2 questions 2, 4, and 6 (C) Supplemental Table 2 questions 1, 3, and 5.



Figure 6. Survey responses to assess the ranking of CandyCollect devices and user preferences. All survey questions are included in Supplemental Table 1 and 2. (A) Supplemental Table 2 question 10 (B) Supplemental Table 1 questions 6 and 7 (C) Supplemental Table 1 question 5 and Supplemental Table 2 question 9 (D) Supplemental Table 1 question 4 and Supplemental Table 2 question 7 (E) Supplemental Table 2 question 8 (F) Supplemental Table 2 question 11.