

Saliva as a non-invasive sample for the detection of SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review

Running Title: Saliva to detect SARS-CoV-2

Word Counts: Abstract: 231

Text Body: 1747

Zohaib Khurshid¹, Sana Zohaib², Chaitanya Joshi³, Syed Faraz Moin⁴, Muhammad Sohail Zafar⁵, David J. Speicher^{6,7,#}

¹Department of Prosthodontics and Dental Implantology, College of Dentistry, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

²Department of Biomedical Engineering, College of Engineering, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

³Institute of Dentistry, School of Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK

⁴National Center for Proteomics, University of Karachi, Pakistan

⁵Department of Restorative Dentistry, College of Dentistry, Taibah University, Madinah Al Munawwarah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

⁶Department of Laboratory Medicine, St. Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

⁷M.G. DeGroot Institute for Infectious Disease Research, Department of Biochemistry and Biomedical Sciences, DeGroot School of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

#Corresponding author: Dr. David J. Speicher; speichdj@mcmaster.ca
Department of Biochemistry & Biomedical Sciences
McMaster University
1200 Main Street West, Room HSC 4N59
Hamilton Ontario L8N 3Z5, Canada
Phone: 905-525-9140 x21663
FAX 905-522-9033

Keywords: saliva, diagnostics, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2

Abstract

The accepted gold standard for diagnosing coronavirus disease (COVID-19) is the detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) RNA from nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS). However, shortage of reagents has made NPS collection challenging, and alternative samples need to be explored. Due to its non-invasive nature, saliva has considerable diagnostic potential. Therefore, to guide diagnostic laboratories globally, we conducted a systematic review to determine the utility of saliva for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. A systematic search of major databases (PubMed, ISI Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar) was performed to identify published studies in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. There was a total of 10 publications that fit the criteria for review. Most studies collected drooled whole saliva from hospitalized patients or pipetted saliva from intubated patients. Saliva was positive in 31-92% of patients depending on the cohort and length of hospitalization. Viral loads in saliva are comparable to those in NPS and ranged from 9.9×10^2 to 1.2×10^8 copies/mL during the first week of symptoms and decrease over time. Saliva can be positive up to 20 days post-symptom onset with viral loads correlating with symptom severity and degree of tissue damage. Based on these findings, we made suggestions to guide the clinical laboratory and suggest the need for diagnostic accuracy studies for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 from saliva.

Introduction

The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic has affected the entire world, especially the most vulnerable population (i.e. the elderly living in nursing homes). The high demand of nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS), and the low supply of laboratory reagents and test kits highlight the need for alternative methods to facilitate accurate universal screening of COVID-19. The aetiological agent of COVID-19 is the novel *Betacoronavirus*, subgenus *Sarbecovirus*, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which originated in Hubei Province, China (1, 2). SARS-CoV-2 is a large, roughly spherical, enveloped virus, with a non-segmented positive-sense strand RNA genome ~30 kb in length (3). Since the initial outbreak, clinical symptoms have ranged from mild to severe atypical pneumonia with the disease spreading through human-to-human transmission (1). With an estimated incubation period of 5.1 days, and less than 2.5% of individuals displaying symptoms within 2.2 days of exposure, asymptomatic spread is possible, especially in children and healthy adults (4). The community transmission of SARS-CoV-2, especially asymptomatic spread, can be detrimental to both acute care hospitals and community settings, such as nursing homes. Therefore, robust diagnostics algorithms for SARS-CoV-2 are essential to quarantine infected individuals to prevent the spread of disease.

The current gold standard to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA is by reverse transcription real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-rtPCR) in NPS. NPS is invasive to collect, and due to widespread universal testing and a huge strain on supply lines, alternative diagnostic algorithms are needed (5-7). Saliva has considerable diagnostic potential: it is non-invasive, abundant, easily collected, and representative of oral and systemic health (8). The use of saliva looks promising as SARS-CoV-2 RNA is present in saliva with loads and sensitivity comparable to NPS (9-11). However,

salivary endonucleases make proper sample handling critical for accurate testing (12). Therefore, we conducted a systematic review to evaluate the potential of using saliva for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 and make suggestions for the clinical diagnostic laboratory.

Methodology

Literature Search and Selection Criteria

This scoping review follows the guidelines of Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Metanalysis (PRISMA). A systematic search was performed on four major databases (PubMed, ISI Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar) by two independent reviewers to identify articles published in English prior to April 25, 2020 to answer, “Can saliva be used for to detect SARS-CoV-2 and diagnose COVID-19?” The systematic search was performed using the following Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and keywords: "COVID-19" OR "COVID-2019" OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2" OR "2019-nCoV" OR "SARS-CoV-2" AND "saliva". Manuscripts were included if they aligned with the following PECOS (Patient, Exposure, Comparator and Outcome) guidelines: (P) male or female of any age group visiting the Emergency Department; (E) SARS-CoV-2 infected; (C) Systematically healthy patients as control; (O) salivary viral load. Manuscripts were excluded if they were letters to the editor, perspectives or review papers. Given the explosion of new research, preprints were included from BioRxiv and medRxiv if the inclusion criteria were met. Both reviewers mutually agreed to use the same inclusion and exclusion criteria for the search, and disagreements were resolved by discussion. Ethics approval was not required.

Data Extraction

Data extraction was performed independently by two investigators and confirmed by a third. Each study was examined for saliva sampling protocol, nucleic acid extraction procedure, SARS-CoV-2 detection, and primary findings. Discrepancies were resolved by consensus.

Results

Search Results and Cohorts Studied

We identified 25 potential articles from database searches that investigated the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva (Figure 1). After removing the duplicates and reviewing the abstracts for inclusion and exclusion criteria, the full-text of 10 papers were scrutinized for this systematic review. Studies were from China (n=10), Italy (n=2), USA (n=1) and South Korea (n=1). Apart from case reports, studies enrolled hospitalized patients and compared saliva to NPS for the initial diagnosis and viral load monitoring. Apart for two studies, study cohorts were small (range: 12-44) with a relatively equal number of males and females with an average age of 61 years (range: 18-92 years) (Table 1). The specimen collected varied by study and included saliva (n=6), sputum or deep saliva (n=4), and oropharyngeal swabs (OPS, n=3). No study revealed transportation or storage conditions. There is great variation in the extraction and amplification kits used, but most extractions were performed manually with commercial spin columns (n=6), and two studies did automated extraction with the NucliSENS® easyMag® (9, 13). PCR amplification was performed with a mix of lab-developed tests (LDT, n=6) and commercial assays (n=4) targeting a wide range of genes.

Salivary Diagnostics

Despite the heterogeneity of oral samples used, based on these limited studies, it is evident that saliva is comparable, if not superior to NPS for initial detection of SARS-CoV-2 upon hospitalization and is more consistent for monitoring viremia. In most comparative studies, drooled saliva had higher positivity rates than deep saliva/sputum and was useful from initial screening to intubation. Positivity of saliva was 31-92% depending on the cohort and length of hospitalization. Viral load in saliva was highest during the first week of symptom onset, ranging from 9.9×10^2 to 1.2×10^8 copies/mL, and then gradually declined (9, 14). At initial screening viral loads and positivity rates were comparable to NPS, but one study found salivary loads were five-times higher than in NPS (15). Higher salivary viral loads were also found in patients with more severe disease (16) and correlated to tissue damage (17). In a study screening 98 asymptomatic health care workers all NPS were negative, but two were positive in saliva (15). Studies monitoring viral loads reported that initially saliva was comparable to NPS, but over time NPS became negative while saliva remained positive up to 20 days post-symptom onset, even after respiratory symptoms became negative. However, after the first week positivity rates in saliva decreased, and positivity in anal swabs increased, suggesting a possible shift in viral infection as disease progresses (18).

Discussion

Initial studies examining the utility of saliva for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA are comparable, if not superior to NPS for screening and monitoring viral loads. With NPS reagents increasingly in short supply, saliva is a possible alternative sample for diagnostic algorithms. Infectious cell-free SARS-CoV-2 virion is transmitted in salivary droplets by infected people breathing, talking, coughing, or sneezing in close contact and infecting another nearby person

through the mouth, nose or eyes (10). SARS-CoV-2 infects human epithelial cells through the host cell receptor angiotensin-converting enzyme II (ACE2), which is expressed on cells lining the lungs, oral buccal and gingiva (19). This infectious virion is both detectable in saliva and culturable on Vero E6 cells making saliva both a non-invasive sample that is easy to collect but also a potential exposure risk for front-line healthcare workers (9).

SARS-CoV-2 has been detected in a variety of oral samples, including whole saliva, oral swabs, oropharyngeal swabs, and deep saliva/sputum. There is a wide range of commercially available saliva collection devices but given the high sampling demand and limited stocks of swabs, 1-3 mL of unstimulated whole saliva expectorated into a sterile urine container or 50 mL conical tube is the easiest and most reliable sample to collect, unless the patient is a hyposalivator or intubated. For an intubated patient, young child, or elderly person pipetted saliva or oral swab placed in 1 mL viral transport media (VTM) will suffice (17, 20). Saliva should always be collected before or 30-60 minutes after eating, drinking, smoking or chewing gum with the mouth rinsed with water prior to collection to void the mouth of debris (21). If a patient is having difficulty salivating rubbing the outside of the cheek may help. As sample positivity is essential in hospitalized patients, due to the effect of diurnal variation on levels of salivary biomarkers, two studies collected saliva first thing in the morning prior to food or brushing of teeth (14, 15). The other studies did not account for circadian rhythm, but found the viral load to be highest in saliva for the first week after the onset of symptoms, suggesting that adequate salivary samples can be collected at anytime. However, due to salivary enzymes, it is essential, especially if samples require transportation, that whole saliva be chilled immediately after collection (e.g. shipped on ice packs)

or stored in a commercial stabilizer (e.g. RNAlater and VTM) and extracted as soon as possible (12, 22).

Extraction of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from saliva samples has been done with commercial spin columns or automated on the NucliSENS[®] easyMAG[®]. Processing saliva can be laborious as viscosity varies greatly and samples high in mucin can clog spin columns and automated extractors. To overcome this problem, several studies mixed saliva in 2 mL VTM or PBS prior to extraction. As saliva contains cell-free infectious virion, it may be possible to centrifuge the saliva collected in sterile 50 mL conical tubes at 2,800 \times g, 10-minutes, 4°C, aspirate the supernatant, and proceed with extraction (22). Small samples (1-2 mL) can be centrifuged at 13,000 \times g, 4 minutes, 4°C in microcentrifuge tubes. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA can then be performed with any validated LDT or commercially available assay (5). Subsequent whole genome analysis on positives using Oxford Nanopore MinION or by bait capture hybridization probes coupled with Illumina sequencing for surveillance and outbreak analysis (14, 23).

The utility of saliva for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 appears clinically useful, but controlled diagnostic accuracy studies comparing saliva to matched NPS in positive and negative patients are desperately needed. As outlined by the US FDA, the use of saliva for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 requires a clinical study comparing whole saliva to NPS collected at the same time from a minimum of 30 positive/30 negative pairs with discordant results resolved with further testing (24). Similar validations could also be performed for other types oral fluids. Future studies could also compare salivary and serum IgG as a screen for immunity (25). Nonetheless, properly

conducted comparative studies must be performed as soon as possible to help direct the clinical laboratory in the fight against COVID-19.

Conclusion

In conclusion, saliva can be used to detect SARS-CoV-2 in both symptomatic patients and asymptomatic carriers. Studies to date have shown that viral loads in saliva are comparable or higher than in NPS after the onset of symptoms and remain detectable in saliva after respiratory symptoms dissipate and NPS test negative. However, due to salivary enzymes, samples must be handled correctly and processed in a timely manner. Well conducted diagnostic accuracy studies are desperately needed to validate the use of saliva for the diagnosis of COVID-19.

References

1. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, Zhang L, Fan G, Xu J, Gu X, Cheng Z, Yu T, Xia J, Wei Y, Wu W, Xie X, Yin W, Li H, Liu M, Xiao Y, Gao H, Guo L, Xie J, Wang G, Jiang R, Gao Z, Jin Q, Wang J, Cao B. 2020. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet* 395:497-506.
2. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, Zhao X, Huang B, Shi W, Lu R, Niu P, Zhan F, Ma X, Wang D, Xu W, Wu G, Gao GF, Tan W, China Novel Coronavirus I, Research T. 2020. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med* 382:727-733.
3. Coronaviridae Study Group of the International Committee on Taxonomy of V. 2020. The species Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus: classifying 2019-nCoV and naming it SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Microbiol* 5:536-544.
4. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, Azman AS, Reich NG, Lessler J. 2020. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Ann Intern Med* doi:10.7326/M20-0504.
5. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, Bleicker T, Brunink S, Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DG, Haagmans BL, van der Veer B, van den Brink S, Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette JL, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C, Koopmans MP, Drosten C. 2020. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveill* 25.
6. Sullivan PS, Sailey C, Guest JL, Guarner J, Kelley C, Siegler AJ, Valentine-Graves M, Gravens L, Del Rio C, Sanchez TH. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and Antibodies

- in Diverse Samples: Protocol to Validate the Sufficiency of Provider-Observed, Home-
Collected Blood, Saliva, and Oropharyngeal Samples. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*
6:e19054.
7. Chu DKW, Pan Y, Cheng SMS, Hui KPY, Krishnan P, Liu Y, Ng DYM, Wan CKC, Yang P, Wang Q, Peiris M, Poon LLM. 2020. Molecular Diagnosis of a Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Causing an Outbreak of Pneumonia. *Clin Chem* 66:549-555.
 8. Khurshid Z, Zohaib S, Najeeb S, Zafar MS, Slowey PD, Almas K. 2016. Human Saliva Collection Devices for Proteomics: An Update. *Int J Mol Sci* 17.
 9. To KK, Tsang OT, Chik-Yan Yip C, Chan KH, Wu TC, Chan JMC, Leung WS, Chik TS, Choi CY, Kandamby DH, Lung DC, Tam AR, Poon RW, Fung AY, Hung IF, Cheng VC, Chan JF, Yuen KY. 2020. Consistent detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in saliva. *Clin Infect Dis* doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa149.
 10. Xu R, Cui B, Duan X, Zhang P, Zhou X, Yuan Q. 2020. Saliva: potential diagnostic value and transmission of 2019-nCoV. *Int J Oral Sci* 12:11.
 11. Khurshid Z, Asiri FYI, Al Wadaani H. 2020. Human Saliva: Non-Invasive Fluid for Detecting Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV). *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 17.
 12. Speicher DJ, Wanzala P, D'Lima M, Johnson KE, Johnson NW. 2015. Detecting DNA viruses in oral fluids: evaluation of collection and storage methods. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* 82:120-7.
 13. Cheng VCC, Wong SC, Chen JHK, Yip CCY, Chuang VWM, Tsang OTY, Sridhar S, Chan JFW, Ho PL, Yuen KY. 2020. Escalating infection control response to the rapidly evolving epidemiology of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) due to SARS-CoV-2 in Hong Kong. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 41:493-498.

14. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, Yip CC, Cai JP, Chan JM, Chik TS, Lau DP, Choi CY, Chen LL, Chan WM, Chan KH, Ip JD, Ng AC, Poon RW, Luo CT, Cheng VC, Chan JF, Hung IF, Chen Z, Chen H, Yuen KY. 2020. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 20:565-574.
15. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar P, Geng B, Muenker MC, Moore AJ, Vogels CBF, Petrone ME, Ott IM, Lu P, Lu-Culligan A, Klein J, Venkataraman A, Earnest R, Simonov M, Datta R, Handoko R, Naushad N, Sewanan LR, Valdez J, White EB, Lapidus S, Kalinich CC, Jiang X, Kim DJ, Kudo E, Linehan M, Mao T, Moriyama M, Oh JE, Park A, Silva J, Song E, Takahashi T, Taura M, Weizman O-E, Wong P, Yang Y, Bermejo S, Odio C, Omer SB, Dela Cruz CS, Farhadian S, Martinello RA, Iwasaki A, Grubaugh ND, Ko AI. 2020. Saliva is more sensitive for SARS-CoV-2 detection in COVID-19 patients than nasopharyngeal swabs. medRxiv doi:10.1101/2020.04.16.20067835:2020.04.16.20067835.
16. Zheng S, Fan J, Yu F, Feng B, Lou B, Zou Q, Xie G, Lin S, Wang R, Yang X, Chen W, Wang Q, Zhang D, Liu Y, Gong R, Ma Z, Lu S, Xiao Y, Gu Y, Zhang J, Yao H, Xu K, Lu X, Wei G, Zhou J, Fang Q, Cai H, Qiu Y, Sheng J, Chen Y, Liang T. 2020. Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-March 2020: retrospective cohort study. *BMJ* 369:m1443.
17. Azzi L, Carcano G, Gianfagna F, Grossi P, Gasperina DD, Genoni A, Fasano M, Sessa F, Tettamanti L, Carinci F, Maurino V, Rossi A, Tagliabue A, Baj A. 2020. Saliva is a reliable tool to detect SARS-CoV-2. *J Infect* doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.005.

18. Zhang W, Du RH, Li B, Zheng XS, Yang XL, Hu B, Wang YY, Xiao GF, Yan B, Shi ZL, Zhou P. 2020. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 9:386-389.
19. Xu H, Zhong L, Deng J, Peng J, Dan H, Zeng X, Li T, Chen Q. 2020. High expression of ACE2 receptor of 2019-nCoV on the epithelial cells of oral mucosa. *Int J Oral Sci* 12:8.
20. Kojima N, Turner F, Slepnev V, Bacelar A, Deming L, Kodeboyina S, Klausner JD. 2020. Self-Collected Oral Fluid and Nasal Swabs Demonstrate Comparable Sensitivity to Clinician Collected Nasopharyngeal Swabs for Covid-19 Detection. medRxiv doi:10.1101/2020.04.11.20062372:2020.04.11.20062372.
21. Yoshizawa JM, Schafer CA, Schafer JJ, Farrell JJ, Paster BJ, Wong DT. 2013. Salivary biomarkers: toward future clinical and diagnostic utilities. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 26:781-91.
22. Henson BS, Wong DT. 2010. Collection, storage, and processing of saliva samples for downstream molecular applications. *Methods Mol Biol* 666:21-30.
23. Nasir JA, Speicher DJ, Kozak RA, Poinar HN, Millar MS, McArthur AG. 2020. Rapid Design of a Bait Capture Platform for Culture- and Amplification-Free Next-Generation Sequencing of SARS-CoV-2. Preprints doi:10.20944/preprints202002.0385.v1.
24. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration Center for Devices and Radiological Health. 2020. Policy for Coronavirus Disease-2019 Tests During the Public Health Emergency (Revised). <https://www.fda.gov/media/135659/download>.
25. Speicher DJ, Luinstra K, Smith EJ, Castriciano S, Smieja M. 2020. Non-invasive detection of IgG antibodies from common, pathogenic virus using Oral flocked swabs. *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease* doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2020.115038:115038>.

26. Azzi L, Carcano G, Dalla Gasperina D, Sessa F, Maurino V, Baj A. 2020. Two cases of COVID-19 with positive salivary and negative pharyngeal or respiratory swabs at hospital discharge: a rising concern. *Oral Dis* doi:10.1111/odi.13368.
27. Chen L, Zhao J, Peng J, Li X, Deng X, Geng Z, Shen Z, Guo F, Zhang Q, Jin Y, Wang L, Wang S. 2020. Detection of 2019-nCoV in Saliva and Characterization of Oral Symptoms in COVID-19 Patients. SSRN doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3557140>.
28. Han MS, Seong MW, Heo EY, Park JH, Kim N, Shin S, Cho SI, Park SS, Choi EH. 2020. Sequential analysis of viral load in a neonate and her mother infected with SARS-CoV-2. *Clin Infect Dis* doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa447.

Figure 1: A PRISMA flow diagram of the search strategy for saliva, COVID-19, and SARS-CoV-

2.




Figure 2: Suggested method for collection and processing of saliva for the detection of SARS-CoV-2.

Sample Collection

- Saliva – 1-3 mL drooled unstimulated saliva in a sterile urine cup or 50mL conical tube
- Oral swab placed in 1 mL VTM or PBS (children, elderly, hyposalivators)
- Pipetted saliva from intubated patients
- Note: Collect before or 30-60 minutes after eating, drinking, smoking or chewing gum.
Rinse mouth water before collection to void the mouth of debris and excess muscin.
If patient has difficulty producing saliva have them rub cheeks to induce salivation.

Transportation

- Saliva - chill and transport as soon as possible on ice packs
- Oral swabs can be transported at room temperature

Storage

- Short-term storage at 2-4°C
- Long-term storage at -80°C
- Note: Salivary enzymes are still active at -80°C. Best to extract and then store.

Extraction

- Extract as soon as possible.
- Extraction can be done directly on non-viscous oral fluids
- Samples can diluted 1:1 in VTM or PBS and then extracted
- For 1-2 mL viscous samples centrifuge at 13,000 $x g$, 4 min, 4°C and extract the supernatant
- Manually with spin column kits (e.g. QIAmp Viral RNA mini kit, Qiagen or High Pure Viral RNA Kit, Roche)
- Automated on the NucliSENS® easyMAG® (BioMerieux)

Detection

- Any validated RT-rtPCR assay for SARS-CoV-2
- Whole genome sequencing can also be performed on positives

Table 1: Systemic search findings evaluating saliva for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA.

S/N	Author, year; (Country)	Study participants	Specimen Collected	Sample extraction and Diagnostic Assay	Summary of Results	Reference
1	Azzi et al., 2020 (Italy)	25 COVID-19 positive patients with severe or very severe disease 17 males, 8 females mean age 61.5 years (range: 39 to 85 years)	NPS Drooled saliva Pipetted saliva if intubated 2 nd oral sample 4 days later	Saliva resuspended in 2mL PBS RNA extraction with QIAmp Viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen, Germany) One step RT-rtPCR using Luna Universal qPCR Master Mix (New England BioLabs Ltd., USA) RNA Target: 5'UTR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First saliva sample from all patients was positive (Ct values: mean 27.2, range 18.1- 32.2). • Inverse correlation between LDH values and the Ct values in saliva shows that viral load in saliva correlates to tissue damage • Second saliva sample from 8 patients positive • 2 patients were saliva positive salivary but NPS was negative on the same day 	(17)
2	Azzi et al., 2020 (Italy)	2 COVID-19 positive men (64 & 71 years)	NPS BAL Drooled saliva	Saliva resuspended in 2mL PBS RNA extraction with QIAmp Viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen, Germany) One step RT-rtPCR using Luna Universal qPCR Master Mix (New England BioLab s Ltd., USA) RNA Target: 5'UTR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In both patients, saliva was positive when both NPS and BAL were negative 	(26)
3	Chen et al., 2020 (China)	31 COVID-19 positives (15 males, 16 females) median age of 60.6 years (range: 18 to 86 years). 5/31 were critically ill and on ventilator support.	1.5mL midstream salivary fluid with cotton swabs Oropharyngeal swabs	Extraction method not disclosed RT-qPCR using a commercial test kit (BioGerm. InC, China) on a Roche Cobas z480 PCR Analyzer RNA Target: ORF1ab and N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13/31 (42%) positive in OPS. • 4/13 (31%) OPS positives were saliva positive • 3/4 (75%) of saliva positive patients were critically ill and on ventilators 	(27)
4	Cheng et al., 2020 (Hong Kong, China)	42 COVID-19 positive patients (20 males, 22 females)	Upper respiratory specimens (i.e. NPA, flocked swabs, and throat swabs) Lower respiratory	Total nucleic acid (TNA) extraction with NucliSENS® easyMAG® (BioMerieux, Canada).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The viral loads of the first confirmed case were 3.3×10^6 copies/mL in the pooled nasopharyngeal and throat swabs, whereas 5.9×10^6 copies/mL in saliva on the same day. 	(13)

		median age of 59 years (range, 22–91 years)	specimens (i.e. sputum, endotracheal aspirates, or BAL)	RT-PCR using the LightMix Modular SARS and Wuhan CoV E-gene mix (TIB Molbiol, Germany)		
5	Han et al., 2020 (South Korea)	27-day old neonate and her mother diagnosed with COVID-19	NPS, OPS, Stool, Saliva, Plasma, and Urine	RNA extraction using MagNA Pure 96 DNA and Viral NA small volume kit (Roche, Germany) RNA detected using the PowerChek™ 2019-nCoV Real-time PCR Kit (Kogene Biotech, South Korea) RNA Target: ORF1b and E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In neonate, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in all clinical specimens • Saliva was positive in neonate but not in mother • Neonate’s saliva sample was positive up to 10 days after symptoms onset. • Viral load in neonate’s stool and urine remained high up to 18 days even after the respiratory specimens became negative • Mother’s plasma, urine, and breast milk tested negative 	(28)
6	To et al., 2020 (Hong Kong, China)	12 COVID-19 positive patients (7 males, 5 females) median age: 62.5 years (range: 37-75 years)	NPS Sputum (cough out saliva from throat into a sterile container) collected 0-7 days post hospitalization	Total nucleic acid (TNA) extraction with NucliSENS® easyMag® (BioMerieux, Canada) In-house 1-step RT-qPCR Assay using QuantiNova SYBR Green RT-PCR Kit (Qiagen, Germany) in a LightCycler 480 Real-Time PCR System (Roche, Germany) RNA Target: S gene	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11/12 (91.7%) patients were saliva positive • Median viral load in saliva 3.3×10^6 copies/mL (range, 9.9×10^2 to 1.2×10^8 copies/mL) • Viral load highest in earliest available specimen for 5 patients (83.3%) • In 1 patient saliva was positive 11 days post-hospitalization • In 33 patients whose NPS tested negative corresponding saliva specimens also tested negative 	(9)
7	To et al., 2020 (Hong Kong, China)	23 patients (13 males, 10 females), median age 62 years (range: 37–75) 10 patients (43.5%) had severe COVID-19 requiring oxygen supplementation. 13 patients had mild disease.	Blood, Urine, Posterior oropharyngeal saliva, and Rectal swabs Saliva was collected early morning from the posterior oropharynx (ie, coughed up by clearing the throat) before toothbrushing and breakfast.	Extraction method not disclosed in-house RT-qPCR targeting the SARS-CoV-2 RNA-dependent-RNA-polymerase-helicase gene region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples was highest during the first week of symptom onset then gradually declined. • 3/23 (13%) patients did not produce a positive saliva sample • 7/21 (33%) patients had viral RNA detected in saliva sample for 20 days or longer after the onset of symptoms. • No association between prolonged detection of viral RNA and severity of illness. 	(14)

			If patients were intubated, an endotracheal aspirate was obtained.			
8	Wyllie et al., 2020 (USA)	44 COVID-19 positive (23 males, 21 females), mean age 61 years (range 23–92) 10 (23%) required mechanical ventilation, and 2 (5%) died. 98 asymptomatic healthcare workers were enrolled	NPS and saliva was collected every 3 days. Saliva was self-collected by the patient first thing in the morning prior to food or brushing of teeth. Saliva collected by spitting into a sterile urine cup until ~1/3 full (excluding bubbles)	Total nucleic acid extracted from 300µl of viral transport media from NPS or 300µl of whole saliva using MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Nucleic Acid Isolation kit (ThermoFisher Scientific, USA). US CDC RT-rtPCR primer/probe sets for 2019-nCoV_N1 and 2019-nCoV_N2 and the human RNase P (RP) as an extraction control.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viral loads 5X higher in saliva than in NPS • 21% saliva positives did not have a matched NPS positive. • 8% NPS positives did not have a matched saliva positive. • Saliva yielded greater overall sensitivity. • 2 asymptomatic HCW were saliva positive NPS-negative. 	(15)
9	Zheng et al., 2020 (China)	96 consecutively admitted patients with laboratory confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection: 22 with mild disease and 74 with severe disease. Median age was 55 years (range: 44.3-64.8).	Respiratory, Serum, Stool, and Urine samples were collected daily. Sputum collected from the respiratory tract of patients with sputum. In patients without sputum saliva was collected after deep cough.	Viral RNA was extracted using the MagNA Pure 96 (Roche, Germany). RT-qPCR was performed using a China Food and Drug Administration approved commercial kit specific for SARS-CoV-2 detection (BoJie, China). RNA Target: ORF1ab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infection was confirmed in all patients by testing sputum and saliva samples. • Higher viral loads were found in patients with severe disease compared to those with mild disease. 	(16)
10	Zhang et al. 2020 (China)	178 COVID-19 positive hospitalized patients	Oral swabs, anal swabs and blood samples. For swabs, 1.5 ml DMEM+2% FBS medium was added in each tube. Supernatant was collected after 2500 rpm, 60 s vortex and 15–30 min standing.	RNA was extracted from 200 µL of samples with the High Pure Viral RNA Kit (Roche, Germany). qPCR by HiScript® II One Step RT-qPCR SYBR® Green Kit (Vazyme Biotech Co., Ltd, China) in an ABI 7500. RNA Target: S gene	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the first study, after days of medical treatments 53.3% were oral swabs positive, 27% were anal swabs positive, and 40% were serum positive. • In the second study, at day 0, 80% of positives came from oral swabs, but on day 5, 75% anal swabs and 50% oral swabs were positive. Possible shift in virus location as disease progresses. 	(18)

NPS=nasopharyngeal swabs, OPS=oropharyngeal swabs, BAL=bronchoalveolar lavage, RT-PCR=reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction, RT-qPCR=quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction