

1 **Article type:** Original Research Article

2

3 **Running headline:** Highly sensitive virus detection from saliva

4

5 **Title:** Development of a simple and highly sensitive virion concentration method to
6 detect SARS-CoV-2 in saliva

7

8 **Authors:** Yasuko Yamazaki, Uxía Alonso Alonso, Remil L. Galay, Wataru Yamazaki

9

10 **Affiliations:**

11 Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, 46 Shimoadachi-cho, Yoshida,

12 Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan (Y. Yamazaki, yasuko.y@cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp; U.

13 Alonso Alonso, alonsouxia93@gmail.com; R. L. Galay, rlgalay@up.edu.ph; W.

14 Yamazaki, yamazaki@cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp)

15 Animal Medicine and Health at Institut de Recerca i Tecnologia Agroalimentàries

16 (IRTA) – Centre de Recerca en Sanitat Animal (CReSA), Spain (U. Alonso Alonso)

17 Department of Veterinary Paraclinical Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine,

18 University of the Philippines Los Baños, Los Baños, Laguna 4031, Philippines (R. L.

19 Galay)

20 Kyoto University School of Public Health, Konoe-cho, Yoshida, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-

21 8303, Japan (W. Yamazaki).

22

23 **Address for correspondence:**

24 Wataru Yamazaki, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, 46

25 Shimoadachi-cho, Yoshida, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan; email:

26 yamazaki@cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp

27

28 **Abbreviations:**

29 ATCC, American Type Culture Collection

30 LOD, Limit of detection

31 PBS, Phosphate-buffered saline

32 PEG, Polyethylene glycol

33 RT-qPCR, Reverse transcription quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction

34 SAP, Semi-alkaline proteinase

35 SARS-CoV-2, Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

36

37 **Highlight:**

38 ☐ A method has been developed to detect SARS-CoV-2 from human saliva with
39 100 times higher sensitivity than conventional methods.

40 ☐ The developed method combines simple pretreatment within 60 min with
41 conventional nucleic acid extraction and RT-qPCR.

42 ☐ This method can be applied for more sensitive virus testing from individual saliva.

43 ☐ This method can potentially be applied to screening more than 100 saliva
44 samples while maintaining the equivalent detection power of conventional
45 methods.

46 ☐ The method can be adapted to improve the sensitivity of detecting various
47 pathogens from human and animal saliva.

48

49 **Abstract**

50 **Background:** Controlling novel coronavirus pandemic infection (COVID-19) is a
51 global challenge, and highly sensitive testing is essential for effective control. The
52 saliva is a promising sample for high-sensitivity testing because it is easier to collect
53 than nasopharyngeal swab samples and allows large-volume testing.

54 **Results:** We developed a simple SARS-CoV-2 concentration method from saliva
55 samples that can be completed in less than 60 min. We performed a spike test using
56 12 ml of saliva samples obtained from healthy volunteer people, and the developed
57 method performance was evaluated by comparison using a combination of automatic
58 nucleic acid extraction followed by RT-qPCR detection. In saliva spike tests using a
59 10-fold dilution series of SARS-CoV-2, the developed method was consistently 100-
60 fold more sensitive than the conventional method.

61 **Conclusions:** The developed method can improve the sensitivity of the SARS-CoV-
62 2 test using saliva and speed up and save labor in screening tests by pooling many
63 samples. Furthermore, the developed method has the potential to contribute to the
64 highly sensitive detection of various human and animal viral pathogens from the
65 saliva and various clinical samples.

66

67 **Keywords:** Concentration, COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2, Semi Alkaline Proteinase;
68 virion, virus

69

70 **Introduction**

71 The COVID-19 epidemic continues as of 2023 and remains a public health threat
72 (WHO). Virus detection using purified RNA obtained by extraction kits and real-time
73 reverse transcription quantitative PCR (RT-qPCR) has been universally used due to
74 its high detection sensitivity and low incidence of false negatives due to nonspecific
75 amplification (Lu *et al.*, 2020; Vogels *et al.*, 2020). Virus detection using saliva has
76 been used to diagnose respiratory infections such as COVID-19 and influenza
77 because of its easy sampling and low burden on patients (Azzi *et al.*, 2020; To *et al.*,
78 2017; Vogels *et al.*, 2020). However, because of its somewhat lower detection
79 sensitivity compared to nasopharyngeal swab samples, false-negative results occur
80 in samples collected early in infection or late in recovery when viral load is low,
81 meaning that patients who slip through the test may not receive appropriate
82 quarantine measures and become a potential source of infection (Azzi *et al.*, 2020;
83 To *et al.*, 2017; Vogels *et al.*, 2020; Yamazaki *et al.*, 2021).

84

85 In addition, in the early stages of an epidemic, when there are few positive
86 patients, it is crucial to test a large number of samples from a large number of people
87 for negative confirmation to prevent the spread of infection (Barat *et al.*, 2021;
88 Watkins *et al.*, 2021). In this case, to save cost and labor, pooling of samples, such
89 as saliva (Barat *et al.*, 2021; Watkins *et al.*, 2021), and nasal, nasopharyngeal and
90 oropharyngeal swabs (Ayaz *et al.*, 2022; Praharaaj *et al.*, 2020; Pratelli *et al.*, 2022)
91 from several people and testing them together is sometimes used for screening.

92

93 However, since the positive samples could be diluted by mixing with negative
94 samples, leading to low virus concentration in the pooled sample, the test can

95 become a false negative if it is below the detection limit; hence, accurate detection
96 may not be possible. As a solution, we have developed a method for detecting
97 concentrated viruses in samples through immunomagnetic beads (Yamazaki *et al.*,
98 2019; Makino *et al.*, 2020). Still, it is not versatile because it requires specific
99 antibodies for each virus.

100

101 The Polyethylene glycol (PEG) precipitation method has been used worldwide
102 to enrich and detect norovirus and other viruses from oysters (Lowther *et al.*, 2019;
103 National Institute of Health Sciences, Japan (NIHS) 2010; Yamazaki *et al.*, 2022).
104 While this method can concentrate any virus, the presence of sample-derived
105 inhibitors reduces concentration performance (Lowther *et al.*, 2019; Miura *et al.*,
106 2018; Yamazaki *et al.*, 2022). In our previous studies, we have shown that a
107 combination of a very short, low centrifugation process (900 g, 1 min) and a normal
108 centrifugation process (10,000-20,000 g, 5 min) as a pretreatment step for simple
109 concentration detection of target bacteria in chicken cecal contents (Sabike *et al.*,
110 2016). Also, we have demonstrated that genetic testing for SARS-CoV-2 is possible
111 without using an extraction kit by digesting human saliva containing potential genetic
112 testing inhibitors with semi-alkaline protease (SAP) (Yamazaki *et al.*, 2021). Here,
113 we report the successful development of a new method for the concentration and
114 detection of SARS-CoV-2 from a large volume of saliva by improving and integrating
115 our previously published methods.

116

117 **Materials and Methods**

118 *Saliva sampling*

119 Saliva samples were collected from three healthy volunteers, i.e., the three authors

120 of this paper (YY, UAA, and WY), by repeatedly transferring drool collected in the
121 oral cavity into a 50-ml sterile tube. After each saliva was thoroughly mixed by
122 vortexing, the multiple saliva was promptly mixed in a new 50-ml tube to produce
123 approximately 49 ml of pooled saliva. The three saliva samples used were confirmed
124 to be SARS-CoV-2 negative by two RNA extraction methods (conventional and
125 developed) and RT-qPCR detection, as described below, before the experiment.

126

127 *Preparation of a 10-fold dilution series of SARS-CoV-2 spiked saliva*

128 A 10-fold dilution series of heat-inactivated SARS-CoV-2 (ATCC VR-1986HK;
129 American Type Culture Collection, Manassas, VA, USA) in PBS was prepared. The
130 pooled saliva was dispensed into four 50-ml tubes of 12.2 ml each. SARS-CoV-2-
131 containing saliva from neat to 10(-4) fold dilutions was prepared by sequentially
132 spiking the 10-fold dilution series of SARS-CoV-2 into the 50 ml tubes containing
133 pooled saliva and then vortexed thoroughly (Table 1).

134

135 *RNA extraction by the conventional method*

136 According to the pathogen detection manual 2019-nCoV issued by the National
137 Institute of Infectious Diseases, Japan (NIID-J), two sets of the 100 µl saliva-spiked
138 SARS-CoV-2 were collected into 1.5-ml microcentrifuge tubes and diluted 1:3 with
139 300 µl of PBS and sputum homogenizer SAP (Semi-Alkaline Proteinase,
140 Suputazyme; Kyokuto Pharmaceutical Industrial, Tokyo, Japan), respectively. After
141 sufficient vortexing, both (PBS and SAP) of the 1:3 dilutions containing SARS-CoV-2
142 were centrifuged at 20,000 g for 30 min, the former immediately and the latter after
143 15-min incubation with ten manual inversions mixing every 3 min at room
144 temperature. The resulting 200 µl of the supernatant was transferred in a new 1.5-ml

145 microcentrifuge tube and was set in an automated nucleic acid extractor MagLead
146 6GC (Precision System Science, Co., Ltd, Matsudo, Japan) with MagDEA Dx SV
147 reagent cartridge (Precision System Science) and were extracted and purified as
148 RNA in 50 µl of distilled water.

149

150 *Viral concentration and RNA extraction by developed method*

151 An overview is shown in Figure 1. Specifically, 12 ml of SAP (Kyokuto) was added to
152 the remaining 12 ml of saliva containing SARS-CoV-2. After vortexing, the mixture
153 was kept at room temperature for 15 min. During the 15-min incubation, ten inversion
154 mixings were performed manually every 3 min. Then, 4,000 g, 5 min initial
155 centrifugation was performed. Taking care not to inhale the pellet derived from the
156 formed saliva components, 18 ml (75% of the initial mixture volume) of the
157 centrifugal supernatant was prudently transferred to a new 50-ml tube. 15 ml of SAP
158 (Kyokuto) was added and incubated for 15 min at room temperature. Then, 13.2 ml
159 of PEG solution (40% PEG-NaCl, see details in our previous publication, Yamazaki
160 *et al.*, 2022) was added and thoroughly mixed by vortexing, followed immediately by
161 a second centrifugation at 8,000 g for 20 min. The supernatant was carefully
162 removed after the second centrifugation. To prevent contamination, 100 µl of PBS in
163 a 1-ml long tip, which is longer than the 50 ml tube, was added. Pipetting was
164 performed with the 1-ml long tip set pipet from the bottom of the tube to the area
165 where the pellet had adhered during the first centrifugation, where precipitates of
166 PEG-virus particle complex are assumed to be attached, although it cannot be seen
167 with the naked eye. In addition, to completely detach any PEG-virus particle complex
168 precipitates that may still be adhering to the tube wall, the 1-ml short tip was added
169 to the 50-ml tube, the lid was closed, and the tube was thoroughly vortexed.

170 Approximately 200 µl of the mixture of about 100 µl of PBS (containing PEG-virus
171 particles) added to the around 100 µl of supernatant remaining on the inner wall of
172 the 50-ml tube obtained by flushing was transferred into a 1.5-ml screw cap tube
173 using a 1-ml long tip. The mixture was then extracted and purified as 50 µl of RNA
174 using an automated nucleic acid extractor (Precision System Science), as described
175 above. When the extracted RNA could not be tested immediately, it was stored at -
176 80°C until use.

177

178 *Conducting RT-qPCR and determination of LOD*

179 RT-qPCR was performed with 4 µl of the extracted RNA in 20 µl of the reaction
180 mixture using a QuantStudio 3 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc., Waltham, MA,
181 U.S.A.), according to the method by Lu and colleagues (2020). The amplification
182 time was slightly extended to ensure detection, as described below. Details of the
183 reagents used are as follows: 20-µl RT-qPCR reactions comprised 10 µl of
184 SuperScript III Platinum One-step RT-qPCR 2x reaction (Thermo Fisher Scientific),
185 0.4 µl of SuperScript III/Platinum *Taq* Mix (Thermo Fisher Scientific), 2 µl of primer
186 (Hokkaido System Science Co. Ltd., Sapporo, Japan) probe (Integrated DNA
187 Technologies, Inc, Singapore) mix for SARS-CoV-2 N2 detection reported by
188 Emergency Use Authorization issued by the US Food and Drug Administration
189 issued by the FDA (Lu *et al.*, 2020), 2 µl of magnesium sulfate (50 mM, Thermo
190 Fisher Scientific), 0.2 µl of Rox Dye (Thermo Fisher Scientific) diluted 1:5 with
191 distilled water, 1.4 µl of nuclease-free water, and 4 µl of the RNA template. The
192 cycling conditions were as follows: one cycle at 50°C for 900 sec and 95°C for 120
193 sec, followed by 50 cycles each at 95°C for 15 sec and 55°C for 60 sec. The
194 automatically calculated Ct value was adopted, and the Ct cut-off value was set at

195 40.000. Positive results were determined if all three Ct values were within 40.000 in
196 triplicate. Samples that showed only one or two positive Ct values in the triplicate
197 analysis were interpreted as negative. The mean and standard deviation of the Ct
198 were calculated for all samples interpreted as positive.

199

200 **Results**

201 Tables 1 and 2 show that the developed concentration method enabled 100-fold
202 more sensitive detection than the conventional method by adding only a simple
203 pretreatment within 60 min before the conventional extraction method. The
204 developed method required only a centrifuge machine for 50 ml tubes up to 8,000 g
205 and a vortex for mixing the liquid in the 50 ml tubes and did not need expensive
206 equipment such as an ultracentrifuge.

207

208 As shown in Tables 1 and 2, the conventional method required 20,000 to
209 40,000 copies of virus per ml of saliva to detect SARS-CoV-2, whereas the
210 developed method required only 200 copies of virus per ml of saliva. In other words,
211 the developed method was at least 100 times more sensitive than the conventional
212 method. Furthermore, a comparison of the number of viral copies per RT-qPCR
213 reaction tube showed that 32 to 64 and 58 copies were required for detection by the
214 conventional and developed methods, respectively. Namely, LOD per reaction tube
215 was comparable for the two methods.

216

217 **Discussion**

218 In Japan, the airport quarantine for COVID-19 recommends collecting and
219 submitting approximately 5 ml of saliva. Still, following the protocol of the NIID-J

220 (2020), 200 μ l of the supernatant is generally used after diluting 200 μ l within the
221 range of 1:1 to 1:3 ratios and centrifuging at 20,000 g for 30 min. In other words, only
222 50-100 μ l of saliva is used for the testing, and the remaining saliva of around 5 ml is
223 used for nothing but retests. If all the unused samples were simply submitted to the
224 concentration method developed in this study, the detection sensitivity would be
225 dramatically increased up to 100 times. Hence, a more accurate quarantine control
226 measure would be possible.

227

228 The disadvantage of pool testing is decreased LOD (Barat *et al.*, 2021;
229 Praharaj *et al.*, 2020; To *et al.*, 2017; Watkins *et al.*, 2021), but the developed
230 concentration method can solve this problem. Hence, the developed method is ideal
231 for labor-saving large-scale screening in the early stages of an outbreak when the
232 positivity rate is low. When a new variant emerges in the future, the concentration
233 method could be used as a large-scale screening test to reasonably enhance
234 quarantine control measures and contribute to efficient epidemic control. The
235 developed method is theoretically capable of 180-fold virus concentration (Figures 1
236 and 2). Since the actual measured value is about 100-fold (Tables 1 and 2), it should
237 be noted that the recovery rate could be reduced by approximately 50%. In the
238 conventional method, the 12-ml saliva sample is equivalent to 240 pooled samples of
239 50 μ l of saliva per individual. Still, considering the recovery rate, a pool of more than
240 100 samples can be expected to have a detection sensitivity equivalent to or better
241 than that of the conventional method.

242

243 In our previous study, an immunomagnetic bead method using specific
244 antibodies was successfully used to detect influenza A viruses added to PBS, duck

245 feces, and chicken meat at 10- to 1,000-fold sensitive concentration (Yamazaki *et*
246 *al.*, 2019; Makino *et al.*, 2020). Although this method is extremely sensitive, it is not
247 very versatile because it requires the preparation of specific antibodies for each virus
248 species and has the disadvantage that the LOD is reduced when the samples
249 contain many inhibitory substances, such as components of the duck feces and
250 chicken meat. In the present study, this problem has been successfully overcome by
251 improving the pretreatment method with the combination of SAP, a sputum
252 dissolving agent, and the PEG precipitation method to achieve highly sensitive
253 SARS-CoV-2 concentration and detection in saliva.

254

255 The PEG precipitation method customarily includes an overnight 4°C
256 incubation process for virion capture (Lowther *et al.*, 2017; Yamazaki *et al.*, 2022).
257 However, the NIH protocol (2010) states that the virion-PEG complex can be
258 recovered from the oyster midgut gland immediately by centrifugation at 8,000 *g* for
259 20 min without an overnight incubation. In the present study, we referred to this
260 finding and confirmed that SARS-CoV-2 in saliva could be concentrated immediately
261 after being centrifuged at 8,000 *g* for 20 min without needing overnight incubation
262 before the centrifuge, as expected. This allowed us to establish a rapid protocol
263 successfully. This study's limitations include the inability to evaluate SARS-CoV-2-
264 positive clinical samples and the fact that, although the concentration process is
265 simple, the number of steps involved requires care by the examiner to avoid
266 contamination and laboratory infection.

267

268 When the PEG-NaCl solution is mixed with a liquid sample containing trace
269 amounts of virions, PEG, a polymer, adsorbs water molecules, causing the virions to

270 aggregate. By centrifuging, the agglomerated virions-PEG complex can be
271 precipitated on the wall of the tube. On the other hand, if the liquid sample contains
272 impurities, this reaction is inhibited, and the recovery rate of virus particles is
273 reduced. As shown in Table 1, the developed method is more sensitive than the
274 conventional method, but the estimated number of copies of virus per reaction tube
275 may be higher for the developed method to obtain a positive result. For example, as
276 shown in Tables 1 and 2, Test 2 showed Ct values at 36.104 and 36.310 for the
277 conventional method (64 copies/RT-qPCR reaction tube) versus the Ct value at
278 38.320 for developed method (115 copies/RT-qPCR reaction tube). This suggests
279 that, although carefully collected, there is some residual material in the supernatant
280 after centrifugation that inhibits virion-PEG complex formation or that there reduced
281 viral recovery, resulting in an increase of the Ct value in the developed method.

282

283 In the developed method, only 75% of the saliva centrifugal supernatant is
284 used and the remaining 25% must be discarded without use, as shown in Figure 1,
285 Process 2. In our preliminary experiment, the maximum amount of centrifugal
286 supernatant corresponding to more than 90% was collected, and concentration
287 detection was attempted. However, contrary to expectations, the recovery rate was
288 more than 10 times lower than the theoretical value (data not shown). In this case, a
289 large pellet was identified on the tube by the naked eye in process 6 of Figure 1. In
290 other words, although the centrifugal supernatant appeared clear by the naked eye
291 observation in Processes 2-5, we speculated that saliva components were mixed in
292 and inhibited the formation of virion-PEG complexes. Therefore, we did not use the
293 lower portion of the centrifugal supernatant, which was presumed to contain more
294 saliva components due to the gradient caused by centrifugation but used only the

295 upper 75% to obtain a stable recovery rate.

296

297 Nevertheless, the developed method has the potential to solve the technical
298 limitation of conventional genetic testing methods, i.e., the problem that samples
299 carrying trace amounts of the virus have been judged as false negative because they
300 are below the LOD (Barat *et al.*, 2021; Praharaaj *et al.*, 2020; To *et al.*, 2017; Watkins
301 *et al.*, 2021; Yamazaki *et al.* 2019). For example, rabies is transmitted from dogs to
302 humans via dog saliva. Still, definitive diagnosis requires dog brain emulsion
303 containing large amounts of rabies virus, not the dog saliva, due to lack of the virus
304 amount, and there is an animal welfare issue of euthanasia of dogs for sampling.
305 The oral pulse oximeter used for anesthesia monitoring in veterinary clinics caused
306 the transmission of severe fever thrombocytopenia syndrome (SFTS) virus
307 transmission to cats due to contamination. However, the low amount of the virus was
308 not detectable (Mekata *et al.*, 2023). Both cases demonstrate the problem that
309 current genetic testing cannot accurately detect trace amounts of virus in saliva,
310 leading to false-negative diagnoses.

311

312 **Conclusions**

313 We have successfully developed a simple and highly sensitive method for
314 concentrating SARS-CoV-2 in saliva. We demonstrated that the developed method
315 has an extremely sensitive detection performance that is at least 100 times higher
316 than the conventional method. We further showed that this method has the potential
317 to screen more than 100 saliva samples with power comparable to conventional
318 extraction methods. In the future, this method may be applied to highly sensitive
319 diagnosis of various human and animal viral infections that can be tested from saliva,

320 as well as to rapid screening by pooled testing of a large number of samples.

321

322 **Ethics approval**

323 The Ethics Committee of Kyoto University Graduate School and the Faculty of
324 Medicine approved this study (R2379), and consent to participate was waived from
325 three volunteer saliva sample donors who are also authors.

326

327 **Declaration of Availability of data and materials**

328 All data obtained in this study is included in the paper and Supplemental Table 1. In
329 addition, the data sets in this study are available from the corresponding author upon
330 reasonable request.

331

332 **Declaration of Competing Interests**

333 The authors declare that they have no known competing interests.

334

335 **Declaration of Consent for publication**

336 Consent for publication has waived the need to obtain informed consent from three
337 volunteer saliva sample donors who are also authors.

338

339 **Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing** 340 **process**

341 During the preparation of this work, the authors used DeepL (DeepL SE,
342 Cologne, Germany) to improve readability and language. After using this tool, the
343 authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and took full responsibility for the
344 content of the publication.

345

346 **Declaration of Submission**

347 The authors confirm that this manuscript or data has not been previously published
348 and is not being considered for publication elsewhere. The authors further confirm
349 that all authors have contributed to the study and have approved the final version.

350

351 **Funding**

352 This research was supported by AMED Number JP20he0622031, JSPS KAKENHI
353 Numbers JP21H03180, JP22K05950, JP22KK0097, JSPS Bilateral Program
354 Number JPJSBP120199944, and the Joint Usage/Research Center for Global
355 Collaborative Research, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University.

356

357 **Authors' contributions**

358 **YY:** Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Resources,
359 Validation, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **UAA:**
360 Methodology, Resources. **RLG:** Formal analysis, Writing - review & editing. **WY:**
361 Conceptualization, Data curation, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project
362 administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing - original
363 draft, Writing - review & editing.

364

365 **Reference**

- 366 1. Ayaz A, Demir AGO, Ozturk G, Kocak M. A pooled RT-PCR testing strategy for
367 more efficient COVID-19 pandemic management. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2022;116:1-6.
368 doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2021.12.328
- 369 2. Azzi L, Carcano G, Gianfagna F, Grossi P, Gasperina DD, Genoni A, et al.
370 Saliva is a reliable tool to detect SARS-CoV-2. *J Infect.* 2020;81:e45-e50.

- 371 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.005>
- 372 3. Barat B, Das S, De Giorgi V, Henderson DK, Kopka S, Lau AF, Miller T, Moriarty
373 T, Palmore TN, Sawney S, Spalding C, Tanjutco P, Wortmann G, Zelazny AM,
374 Frank KM. Pooled Saliva Specimens for SARS-CoV-2 Testing. *J Clin Microbiol.*
375 2021 Feb 18;59(3):e02486-20. doi: 10.1128/JCM.02486-20.
- 376 4. Lowther JA, Bosch A, Butot S, Ollivier J, Mäde D, Rutjes SA, Hardouin G,
377 Lombard B, In't Veld P, Leclercq A. Validation of EN ISO method 15216 - Part 1 -
378 Quantification of hepatitis A virus and norovirus in food matrices. *Int J Food*
379 *Microbiol.* 2019 Jan 2;288:82-90. doi: 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2017.11.014.
- 380 5. Lu X, Wang L, Sakthivel SK, Whitaker B, Murray J, Kamili S, et al. US CDC
381 Real-Time Reverse Transcription PCR Panel for Detection of Severe Acute
382 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(8):1654-1665.
383 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2608.201246>
- 384 6. Mekata H, Umeki K, Yamada K, Umekita K, Okabayashi T. Nosocomial Severe
385 Fever with Thrombocytopenia Syndrome in Companion Animals, Japan, 2022.
386 *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2023 Mar;29(3):614-617. doi: 10.3201/eid2903.220720.
- 387 7. Miura T, Schaeffer J, Le Saux JC, Le Mehaute P, Le Guyader FS. Virus Type-
388 Specific Removal in a Full-Scale Membrane Bioreactor Treatment Process. *Food*
389 *Environ Virol.* 2018 Jun;10(2):176-186. doi: 10.1007/s12560-017-9330-4.
- 390 8. National Institute of Health Sciences (NIHS), Committee for Standard Test
391 Methods for Viruses in Foods. Concentration of viruses from bivalve mollusks
392 (oysters). August 20, 2010 (in Japanese).
393 http://www.nihs.go.jp/fhm/csvdf/kentest/csvdf001_wg_100820.pdf (accessed
394 December 15, 2023).
- 395 9. National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Japan (NIID-J), Pathogen detection

- 396 manual 2019-nCoV. March 19, 2020 (in Japanese).
397 <https://www.niid.go.jp/niid/images/lab-manual/2019-nCoV20200319.pdf>
398 (accessed December 15, 2023).
- 399 10. Praharaj I, Jain A, Singh M, et al. Pooled testing for COVID-19 diagnosis by real-
400 time RT-PCR: A multi-site comparative evaluation of 5- & 10-sample pooling.
401 Indian J Med Res. 2020;152(1 & 2):88-94. doi:10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_2304_20
402 11. Pratelli A, Pellegrini F, Ceci L, et al. Severe acute respiratory syndrome
403 coronavirus 2 detection by real time polymerase chain reaction using pooling
404 strategy of nasal samples. Front Microbiol. 2022;13:957957. Published 2022 Jul
405 22. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2022.957957
406 12. Sabike, II, Uemura, R, Kirino, Y, Mekata, H, Sekiguchi, S, Farid, AS, Goto, Y,
407 Horii, Y, Yamazaki, W. Assessment of the *Campylobacter jejuni* and *C. coli* in
408 broiler chicken ceca by conventional culture and loop-mediated isothermal
409 amplification method. Food Control, 74, 2017,107-111.
410 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2016.11.037>
411 13. To KK, Lu L, Yip CC, Poon RW, Fung AM, Cheng A, Lui DH, Ho DT, Hung IF,
412 Chan KH, Yuen KY. Additional molecular testing of saliva specimens improves
413 the detection of respiratory viruses. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2017 Jun 7;6(6):e49.
414 doi: 10.1038/emi.2017.35
415 14. Vogels CB, Watkins AE, Harden CA, Brackney D, Shafer J, Wang J, et al.
416 SalivaDirect: A simplified and flexible platform to enhance SARS-CoV-2 testing
417 capacity. Med. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medj.2020.12.010>.
418 15. Watkins AE, Fenichel EP, Weinberger DM, Vogels CBF, Brackney DE,
419 Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Fournier J, Bermejo S, Datta R, Dela Cruz
420 CS, Farhadian SF, Iwasaki A, Ko AI, Grubaugh ND, Wyllie AL; Yale IMPACT

- 421 Research Team2. Increased SARS-CoV-2 Testing Capacity with Pooled Saliva
422 Samples. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2021 Apr;27(4):1184–7. doi:
423 10.3201/eid2704.204200.
- 424 16. World Health Organization (WHO). Weekly epidemiological update on COVID-19
425 - 1 June 2023. [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---1-june-2023)
426 [update-on-covid-19---1-june-2023](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---1-june-2023) (accessed June 5, 2023).
- 427 17. Yamazaki W, Makino R, Nagao K, Mekata H, Tsukamoto K. New Micro-amount
428 of Virion Enrichment Technique (MiVET) to detect influenza A virus in the duck
429 faeces. *Transbound Emerg Dis.* 2019 Jan;66(1):341-348. doi:
430 10.1111/tbed.13027.
- 431 18. Yamazaki W, Matsumura Y, Thongchankaew-Seo U, Yamazaki Y, Nagao M.
432 Development of a point-of-care test to detect SARS-CoV-2 from saliva which
433 combines a simple RNA extraction method with colorimetric reverse transcription
434 loop-mediated isothermal amplification detection. *J Clin Virol.* 2021
435 Mar;136:104760. doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2021.104760.
- 436 19. Yamazaki Y, Thongchankaew-Seo U, Yamazaki W. Very low likelihood that
437 cultivated oysters are a vehicle for SARS-CoV-2: 2021-2022 seasonal survey at
438 supermarkets in Kyoto, Japan. *Heliyon.* 2022 Oct;8(10):e10864. doi:
439 10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10864.
- 440
441

442 Table 1. LOD determination of developed and conventional methods using saliva spiked with a 10-fold dilution series of SARS-
 443 CoV-2.
 444

| Test 1 | Virus dilution | Neat | 1:10 | 1:100 | 1:1000 | 1:10000 |
|--------|--|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------|
| | Number of virus copies spiked per ml of saliva | 100,000 | 10,000 | 1,000 | 100 | 10 |
| | Estimated virus number of copies per PCR reaction tube | 28,800 | 2,880 | 288 | 29 | 3 |
| | Developed method | ND | 31.507±0.222 | 36.078±0.198 | No. Ct | No. Ct |
| | Estimated virus number of copies per PCR reaction tube | 160 | 16 | 2 | 0.2 | 0.02 |
| | Conventional method (PBS) | 38.211±0.457 | (38.967*) | No. Ct | No. Ct | ND |
| | Conventional method (SAP) | 37.526±0.952 | (38.694 ⁺) | No. Ct | No. Ct | ND |
| Test 2 | Virus dilution | Neat | 1:10 | 1:100 | 1:1000 | 1:10000 |
| | Number of virus copies spiked per ml of saliva | 40,000 | 4,000 | 400 | 40 | 4 |
| | Estimated virus number of copies per PCR reaction tube | 11,520 | 1,152 | 115 | 12 | 1 |
| | Developed method | ND | 36.1627±0.429 | 38.320±1.083 | (39.374*) | No. Ct |
| | Estimated virus number of copies per PCR reaction tube | 64 | 6 | 0.6 | 0.06 | 0.006 |
| | Conventional method (PBS) | 36.104±0.917 | (39.666 ⁺) | No. Ct | No. Ct | ND |
| | Conventional method (SAP) | 36.310±1.291 | No. Ct | No. Ct | No. Ct | ND |
| Test 3 | Virus dilution | Neat | 1:10 | 1:100 | 1:1000 | |
| | Number of virus copies spiked per ml of saliva | 20,000 | 2,000 | 200 | 20 | |
| | Estimated virus number of copies per PCR reaction tube | 5,760 | 576 | 58 | 6 | |
| | Developed method | 29.2142±0.180 | 32.280±0.379 | 38.089±0.029 | No. Ct | |
| | Estimated virus number of copies per PCR reaction tube | 32 | 3 | 0.3 | 0.03 | |
| | Conventional method (PBS) | 37.718±0.705 | No. Ct | No. Ct | No. Ct | |
| | Conventional method (SAP) | (38.933 ⁺) | (39.651*) | No. Ct | No. Ct | |

445
446

447 LOD, Limit of detection.

448 No. Ct, No threshold cycle values detected using real-time PCR.

449 PBS, Phosphate-buffered saline.

450 RT-qPCR, Reverse transcription quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction.

451 SAP, Semi-alkaline proteinase.

452 SARS-CoV-2, Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

453

454 Positive results were determined only if all three Ct values were within 40.000 in triplicate.

455 LODs are shown in bold.

456 The figures in parentheses indicate one or two positive results out of three.

457 *, One positive in triplicate analysis.

458 †, Two positives in triplicate analysis.

459

460 Table 2. Comparison of LOD between developed and conventional methods by RT-qPCR.

461

| | LOD per ml of saliva | LOD per RT-qPCR reaction tube |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Developed | 200 | 58 |
| Conventional (PBS) | 20,000 | 32 |
| Conventional (SAP) | 40,000 | 64 |

462

463

464 LOD, Limit of detection.

465 PBS, Phosphate-buffered saline.

466 RT-qPCR, Reverse transcription quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction.

467 SAP, Semi-alkaline proteinase.

468

469 **Figure legends.**

470

471 Figure 1. Developed protocol for virion concentration from saliva.

472

473 SAP, Semi-alkaline proteinase.

474

475 1. Mix 12 ml of saliva with 12 ml of SAP (1:1) and keep for 15 min at room temperature.

476 2. After centrifugation at 4,000 g for 5 min, carefully transfer 18 ml of the supernatant into a new 50-ml tube.

477 3. Add 15 ml of SAP to 18 ml of the supernatant, mix using a vortex and then keep at room temperature for 15 min.

478 4. After adding 13.2 ml of PEG-NaCl solution, mix by vortexing.

479 5. After centrifugation at 8,000 g for 20 min, carefully discard the supernatant.

480 6. Add 100 µl of PBS and dissolve the invisible precipitates by pipetting and scraping with a 1-ml long tip (10 times each).

481 7. Place a 1-ml short tip into a 50-ml tube and vortex to completely dissolve the precipitate (supernatant residue after flushing +

482 PBS \doteq 200 µl), and then transfer to an RNA extraction tube.

483

484 Figure 2. Virus detection from saliva with developed and conventional methods.

485

486 SAP, Semi-alkaline proteinase.

487 Conventional method: Nucleic acid extraction of 200 μ l of centrifuged supernatant comprising of saliva 50 μ l + PBS or SAP 150uL
488 (4x dilution).

489 Developed method: Nucleic acid extraction after a simple concentration of 12ml of saliva.

490

491

492 The illustrations are cited from the following sources, all used in compliance with the terms and conditions.

493 Pipettes and Micropipettes: Irasutoya (irasutoya.com)

494 Vortex mixer: Kagaku Irasuto (science-illust.com)

495 50 ml tubes: Kenkyu Net (wdb.com/kenq/illust)

496 Automatic nucleic acid extractor: Precision System Science Co. Ltd. (pss.co.jp/)

497

Fig. 1

Developed protocol for virion concentration from saliva




Fig. 2 Virus detection from saliva with developed and conventional methods

