

1 **Sensitivity of nasopharyngeal, oropharyngeal and nasal washes**
2 **specimens for SARS-CoV-2 detection in the setting of sampling device shortage**

3 Calame Adrien^{*,1,2,3}, Mazza Léna^{*,1,2,3}, Renzoni Adriana¹, Kaiser Laurent^{#,1,2,3}, Schibler
4 Manuel^{#,1,2}

5 *Calame Adrien and Mazza Léna contributed equally to this work.

6 # Kaiser Laurent and Schibler Manuel contributed equally to this work.

7

8 **Affiliations:**

- 9 1. Laboratory of Virology, Laboratory Medicine Division, Diagnostic Department,
10 Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland
11 2. Division of Infectious Disease, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland
12 3. Faculty of Medicine of Geneva, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
13

14 Submitted to: European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases
15

16 Running title: Alternative sampling methods for SARS-CoV-2 detection
17

18 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, diagnostic techniques, nasopharyngeal swab, nasal washes,
19 oropharyngeal swab, upper respiratory tract infection
20
21

22 NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 **Author contributions**

24 All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation and data
25 collection were performed by Calame Adrien and Mazza Léna. Laboratory analyses were
26 performed by Renzoni Adriana. Statistical analyses were performed by Calame Adrien. The
27 first draft of the manuscript was written by Calame Adrien and Mazza Léna. The final version
28 of the manuscript was written and corrected by Calame Adrien, Mazza Léna, Kaiser Laurent
29 and Schibler Manuel. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

30

31

32

33

34

35 **Corresponding author:*

36 Adrien Calame

37 Laboratory of Virology, Division of Infectious Diseases

38 Geneva University Hospitals

39 Rue Gabrielle-Perret-Gentil 4

40 1205 Geneva 14

41 Switzerland

42 Tel: ++41 22 372 40 96 ; fax: ++41 22 372 40 97

43 Email: Adrien.calame@hcuge.ch

44 **Abstract**

45 In the context of an unprecedented shortage of nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS) or sample
46 transport media during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) crisis, alternative methods
47 for sample collection are needed. To address this need, we validated a cell culture medium as a
48 viral transport medium, and compared the analytical sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 real-time RT-
49 PCR in nasal wash (NW), oropharyngeal swab (OPS) and NPS specimens. Both the clinical
50 and analytical sensitivity were comparable in these three sample types. OPS and NW specimens
51 may therefore represent suitable alternatives to NPS for SARS-CoV-2 detection.

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69 **Introduction**

70 In the ongoing Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic caused by severe acute
71 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), a broad testing strategy is crucial to
72 identify infected persons, including less typical clinical presentations of the disease [1].
73 However, during this pandemic, broad screening is sometimes hampered by equipment and
74 reagent shortages occurring worldwide [2]. Affected items include sampling devices, as well
75 as molecular testing reagents and viral transport medium.

76 The Human Coronaviruses (HCoVs) have been identified in a variety of specimens, including
77 oropharyngeal, nasopharyngeal, nasal, sputum and bronchial fluid specimens [3, 5]. The
78 detection of the sarbecovirus SARS-CoV-2, which causes COVID-19, by real-time reverse-
79 transcription PCR (rRT-PCR) using a nasopharyngeal specimen is by now the most
80 commonly accepted method and is recommended by the American CDC and others
81 [<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-criteria.html>]. SARS-CoV-2 can also
82 be found in oropharyngeal, sputum or even saliva specimens [6-10]. The WHO recommends
83 collecting nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS), oropharyngeal swabs (OPS) or nasal wash (NW)
84 specimens from ambulatory patients with COVID-19 disease
85 [<https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331329?locale-attribute=fr&>].

86 In this crisis setting our institution, like many others, risked facing an unprecedented shortage
87 of equipment, including NPS. We therefore tested several procedures in order to validate
88 alternative solutions in house. OPS and NW are the two alternative procedures presented in
89 this article. They are compared to the gold standard, the NPS. Finally, we validated the use of
90 Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM) as a transport medium for SARS-CoV-2
91 specimens.

92

93

94 **Material and methods**

95 *Participants*

96 Eligible participants were ≥ 18 years old and hospitalized in the internal medicine wards at the
97 Geneva University Hospitals, who had a positive SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR in a NPS specimen
98 in the preceding one to six days. ICU patients were excluded.

99

100 *Oropharyngeal swabs sampling*

101 PCR tubes (Cobas™ Roche Reference No. 07976577001-3) were filled with 3ml of DMEM.
102 Nylon flocked NPS (COPAN Reference No.A305CS01) and cotton OPS (VWR Reference
103 No. 300260) were used for sampling. Consecutive OP and then NP samples from 29 patients
104 were obtained in parallel and inserted into DMEM Cobas tubes. The OPS was always
105 performed first. OPS specimens were obtained by swabbing the oropharyngeal posterior wall
106 and turning once in each direction. They were then transferred into the Cobas PCR tube. NPS
107 were performed according to the usual technique [4, 11]. Specimens were stored at 4°C after
108 being collected.

109

110 *Nasal wash sampling*

111 PCR tubes (Cobas™ Roche Reference No. 07976577001-3) were filled with 1 ml of DMEM
112 and 2ml of NaCl 0,9% was added in half of them. Consecutive NW and NPS specimens from
113 20 volunteers were obtained. NW was always performed first, and as follows: 3 ml of sterile
114 saline solution was injected into the nostril using a 3 ml syringe and recovered into a plastic
115 cup by leaning patients' heads forward. Using the same syringe, a total 2 ml volume of the
116 NW was transferred into a Cobas PCR tube containing 1 ml of DMEM media. NPS were
117 performed according to the usual technique [4, 11]. They were then transferred into a Cobas

118 PCR tube containing 1ml of DMEM media and 2ml of NaCl 0,9% in order to compare the
119 two techniques using equal media dilutions. Specimens were stored at 4°C after being
120 collected.

121 *Video demonstrating the NW procedure available at:*

122 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3cMoR7hSPF8&feature=emb_title

123

124 *SARS-CoV-2 RNA extraction and rRT-PCR*

125 Viral RNA genome detection was performed by real-time RT-PCR using the Roche Cobas
126 6800 system (Cobas SARS-CoV-2 Ref 09175431190; Cobas SARS-CoV-2 Control kit Ref
127 09175440190; Cobas 6800/8800 Buffer Negative Control kit Ref 07002238190). This
128 technology allows nucleic acid extraction, purification, PCR amplification and detection of
129 SARS-CoV-2, targeting ORF1a/b and a pan-Sarbecovirus conserved region of the E protein
130 gene.

131

132 *Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium validation*

133 We assessed the suitability of the Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM) for use in
134 testing specimens by comparing it to the Universal Transport Medium (UTM). Ten positive
135 NPS specimens were simultaneously spiked in 3ml DMEM and 3ml UTM and then analyzed
136 by rRT-PCR using the Roche Cobas 6800 system.

137

138 *Statistical analyses*

139 The correlation between the Ct values for ORF1 (arbitrary chosen for comparison) in NPS
140 and in OPS or in NW specimens was evaluated using the Pearson correlation coefficient (r).
141 The negative specimen by NW was arbitrarily assigned a Ct value of 45 and the two negative
142 specimens by both OPS and NPS were excluded from the analysis. Correlation was also

143 represented graphically using a simple linear regression (*figures 1 and 2*). Statistical analyses
144 were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 25.

145

146 **Results**

147 *Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium validation*

148 The resulting cycle threshold (Ct) values were very similar when comparing the DMEM to
149 the UTM. The delta Ct values ranged from 0.01 to 2.59 with a mean delta Ct value of 0.53 for
150 ORF-1 and 0.67 for E-gene (*supplementary data, table 1*).

151

152 *Sampling methods comparison*

153 We compared the techniques in two groups of volunteers: the first group comprised 20 cases
154 where a NW specimen was collected followed by a NPS specimen. The second group
155 comprised 29 cases where an OPS specimen was collected followed by a NPS specimen. The
156 clinical sensitivities of NW and OPS specimens were compared to those of the NPS
157 specimens using the Ct values obtained by SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR (*supplementary data,*
158 *table 2*). Out of 20 cases, one patient that was positive with the NPS sampling with Ct values
159 of 33.46 for ORF1 and 35.12 for the E-protein gene had negative results with the NW
160 sampling. When comparing the NW sampling to NPS sampling, the mean delta Ct values
161 were 1.77 (range -6.82 to 7.06) and 1.73 (range -7.79 to 8.25) for ORF1 and E-protein gene
162 respectively (*supplementary data, table 2*). The Pearson r was 0.75 ($p < 0.01$), showing a
163 statistically significant correlation between the ORF1 Ct values for the NPS and the NW
164 specimens (*figure 1*).

165 Out of 29 patients, two cases were negatives in both the OPS and the NPS specimens. When
166 comparing OPS to NPS sampling, the mean delta Ct values were 1.24 (range -4.24 to 5.8) and
167 1.32 (range -4.63 to 7.6) for ORF1 and E-protein gene respectively (*supplementary data,*

168 *table 2*). The Pearson r was 0.88 ($p < 0.01$), showing a statistically significant correlation
169 between the ORF1 Ct values for the NPS and the OPS specimens (*figure 2*).

170

171 **Discussion**

172 Several studies have compared different types of upper respiratory tract specimens, and
173 various collection methods have been compared to the gold standard method, the NPS [4, 11-
174 13]. NW have also displayed promising upper respiratory virus detection rates [12, 14].
175 Regarding the NW samples, based on our results the clinical sensitivity seemed comparable to
176 that of NPS specimens. A single NW sample was rRT-PCR negative, whereas the NPS one
177 collected consecutively from the same patient was positive. However the high Ct values of
178 these samples suggest that the viral RNA present in both specimens from this volunteer was
179 close to the limit of detection, and we cannot affirm that the clinical sensitivity of NW is
180 below that of NPS specimens for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection based on this single
181 observation. On the quantitative level, the mean delta Ct values seemed acceptable and the
182 correlation between NW and NPS was reinforced by the statistical analyses.

183 Our results also indicate a comparable clinical sensitivity between OPS and NPS at the
184 qualitative level, since all patients with positive SARS-CoV-2 rRT-PCR results from NPS
185 specimens, even those with high Ct values, also tested positive by OPS. Regarding the
186 analytical sensitivity at the quantitative level, we obtained a significant correlation between
187 OPS and NPS specimens.

188 Concerning the transport medium, our results suggest that the DMEM seems to be suitable for
189 SARS-CoV-2 detection.

190 On the practical side, OPS and NW appeared to be better tolerated by patients, although this
191 needs to be confirmed by using appropriate patient scoring. Another practical advantage of
192 OPS over NPS in an equipment shortage setting is that adequate rigid swabs are much more

193 readily available than those used for NPS. Nasal washes present a valuable advantage as they
194 can be performed without the need of specific swabs and with a minimal use of tools that are
195 unlikely to be in shortage anyway. Moreover, both procedures seemed to cause less coughing
196 than the NPS procedure, which represents a major advantage when considering the exposure
197 of healthcare workers to SARS-CoV-2.

198 Limitations to our study include the relatively small sample size, and further evaluation would
199 be needed to reach a definitive conclusion. The statistical analyses were also underpowered
200 and should be interpreted with caution.

201 In conclusion, OPS and NW seem to be reliable alternative upper respiratory tract sampling
202 methods for the molecular detection of SARS-CoV-2, and DMEM can be used as an
203 alternative to commercial UTM, particularly in crisis settings. Further studies with a higher
204 number of samples would still be needed to firmly conclude to an equivalence between these
205 sampling methods. Nevertheless, the increased testing versatility offered by these substitutes
206 should be greatly welcomed in the COVID-19 global crisis setting.

207

208 **Acknowledgments**

209 We would like to thank Benedikt Huttner for his help concerning statistical analyses, and Erik
210 Boehm for his help in writing and correcting the manuscript.

211

212 **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

213 *Conflict of interest*

214 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

215

216

217

218 *Research involving human participants*

219 According to the Swiss Ethics Committees on Research Involving Humans standards, this
220 study took place in the context of a method quality validation in an emergency setting, and
221 therefore did not require any authorization by our ethic committee.

222

223 *Consent to participate*

224 Oral informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243 **References**

244

245 1. Vetter P, Vu DL, L'Huillier AG, Schibler M, Kaiser L, Jacquieroz F. Clinical features
246 of covid-19. *BMJ*. 2020 Apr 17;369:m1470.

247 2. Vermeiren C, Marchand-Senécal X, Sheldrake E, Bulir D, Smieja M, Chong S, et al.
248 Comparison of Copan Eswab and FLOQswab for COVID-19 PCR diagnosis: working around
249 a supply shortage. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2020 Apr 15;

250 3. Charlton CL, Babady E, Ginocchio CC, Hatchette TF, Jerris RC, Li Y, et al. Practical
251 Guidance for Clinical Microbiology Laboratories: Viruses Causing Acute Respiratory Tract
252 Infections. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2019;32(1).

253 4. Ek P, Böttiger B, Dahlman D, Hansen KB, Nyman M, Nilsson AC. A combination of
254 naso- and oropharyngeal swabs improves the diagnostic yield of respiratory viruses in adult
255 emergency department patients. *Infect Dis (Lond)*. 2019;51(4):241–8.

256 5. Falsey AR, Formica MA, Walsh EE. Simple method for combining sputum and nasal
257 samples for virus detection by reverse transcriptase PCR. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2012
258 Aug;50(8):2835.

259 6. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
260 Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA*. 2020 Mar 11;

261 7. Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical
262 samples. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(4):411–2.

263 8. Won J, Lee S, Park M, Kim TY, Park MG, Choi BY, et al. Development of a
264 Laboratory-safe and Low-cost Detection Protocol for SARS-CoV-2 of the Coronavirus
265 Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Exp Neurobiol*. 2020 Mar 11;

266 9. Loeffelholz MJ, Tang Y-W. Laboratory diagnosis of emerging human coronavirus
267 infections - the state of the art. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2020 Dec;9(1):747–56.

268 10. Williams E, Bond K, Zhang B, Putland M, Williamson DA. Saliva as a non-invasive
269 specimen for detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* [Internet]. 2020
270 Apr 21 [cited 2020 Apr 27]; Available from:
271 <https://jcm.asm.org/content/early/2020/04/17/JCM.00776-20>

272 11. Hernes SS, Quarsten H, Hagen E, Lyngroth AL, Pripp AH, Bjorvatn B, et al.
273 Swabbing for respiratory viral infections in older patients: a comparison of rayon and nylon
274 flocked swabs. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2011 Feb;30(2):159–65.

275 12. Lieberman D, Lieberman D, Shimoni A, Keren-Naus A, Steinberg R, Shemer-Avni Y.
276 Identification of respiratory viruses in adults: nasopharyngeal versus oropharyngeal sampling.
277 *J Clin Microbiol*. 2009 Nov;47(11):3439–43.

278 13. Li L, Chen Q-Y, Li Y-Y, Wang Y-F, Yang Z-F, Zhong N-S. Comparison among
279 nasopharyngeal swab, nasal wash, and oropharyngeal swab for respiratory virus detection in
280 adults with acute pharyngitis. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2013 Jun 20;13:281.

281 14. Spyridaki IS, Christodoulou I, de Beer L, Hovland V, Kurowski M, Olszewska-Ziaber
282 A, et al. Comparison of four nasal sampling methods for the detection of viral pathogens by
283 RT-PCR-A GA(2)LEN project. *J Virol Methods*. 2009 Mar;156(1–2):102–6.

284

Figures




Figure 1. Correlation between rRT-PCR Cycle threshold (Ct) values obtained with nasal washes (NW) and with nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS).

Each dot represents one of the 20 patients who had a NW and a NPS. One negative specimen by NW was arbitrary fixed at a Ct value of 45. The trend line is estimated by a simple linear regression, and the correlation coefficient R^2 (square of the Pearson r value) is represented on the top right corner.




Figure 2. Correlation between rRT-PCR Cycle threshold (Ct) values obtained with oropharyngeal swabs (OPS) and with nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS).

Each dot represents one of the 27 patients who had positive OPS and NPS. The trend line is estimated by a simple linear regression, and the correlation coefficient R^2 (square of the Pearson r value) is represented on the top right corner.

Supplementary data: tables

Patient	DMEM		UTM		Δ Ct values	
	ORF 1	E-gene	ORF 1	E-gene	ORF 1	E-gene
a	ND	ND	36.43	ND	NA	NA
b	28.8	29.39	29.03	30.08	0.23	0.69
c	ND	ND	ND	ND	NA	NA
d	31.17	32.55	28.89	29.96	2.81	2.59
e	ND	37.81	36.3	37.82	NA	0.01
f	24.95	25.43	25.01	25.11	0.06	0.32
g	20.87	21.6	20.84	20.94	0.03	0.66
h	32.22	33.64	31.81	32.73	0.41	0.91
i	28.8	29.51	28.9	29.41	0.1	0.1
j	29.25	30.14	29.17	30.04	0.08	0.1

Supplementary table 1. Comparison of DMEM and UTM media.

The delta Ct value for target ORF 1 between the two transport media containing the same specimen ranged between 0.01 and 2.59. One specimen turned out negative in both media. Two specimens were very close to the detection limit and yielded undetectable results for one or more targets (patient a: ND/ND and 36.43/ND, patient e: ND/37.81 and 36.3/37.82). ND: not detected. NA: not applicable.

a.	NP swab + 1ml DMEM + 2ml NaCl		2ml NASAL WASH + 1ml DMEM		delta CT	
	patients	ORF1 Ct value	E-gene Ct value	ORF1 Ct value	E-gene Ct value	ORF1
1	23.5	23.9	30.56	31.21	7.06	7.31
2	34.28	35.33	27.78	28.67	-6.5	-6.66
3	23.15	23.63	30.88	31.88	7.73	8.25
4	30.95	32.84	32.67	33.95	1.72	1.11
5	24.03	24.06	30.97	31.51	6.94	7.45
6	23.94	24.32	29.88	30.93	5.94	6.61
7	30.38	31.44	31.11	31.71	0.73	0.27
8	19.11	19.43	24.34	24.65	5.23	5.22
9	29.54	30.64	31.21	32.34	1.67	1.7
10	15.45	15.71	16.54	16.64	1.09	0.93
11	31.1	32.28	33.86	35.5	2.76	3.22
12	31.71	33.79	31.83	32.8	0.12	-0.99
13	33.05	34.48	26.23	26.69	-6.82	-7.79
14	16.53	16.69	15.08	15.32	-1.45	-1.37
15	33.46	35.12	NEG	NEG	NA	NA
16	26.17	26.71	24.42	24.47	-1.75	-2.24
17	17.57	18.01	19.83	20.12	2.26	2.11
18	23.09	23.9	26.63	28.32	3.54	4.42
19	30.81	32.7	34.62	37.18	3.81	4.48
20	33.9	35.96	33.38	34.81	-0.52	-1.15
Mean delta CT					1.7663157	1.7305263
					9	2
b.	NP swab + 3ml DMEM		OP swab + 3ml DMEM		Delta Ct values	
	patients	ORF1 Ct value	E-gene Ct value	ORF1 Ct value	E-gene Ct value	ORF1
21	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NA	NA
22	28.4	29	34.2	36.6	5.8	7.6
23	21.1	22	26.88	27.67	5.78	5.67
24	31.2	32.47	35.43	37.83	4.23	5.36
25	25.4	26.3	29.4	30.3	4	4
26	14.7	15.8	18.3	18.7	3.6	2.9
27	27.09	27.5	30.28	30.73	3.19	3.23
28	18	18.38	20.71	21.14	2.71	2.76
29	20.69	21.34	23.33	23.56	2.64	2.22
30	20.9	21.6	23.4	23.9	2.5	2.3
31	31.95	34.17	34.4	36.9	2.45	2.73
32	23.08	23.61	25.33	25.72	2.25	2.11
33	30.75	32	32.99	33.85	2.24	1.85
34	29.25	30.13	31.36	32.62	2.11	2.49
35	22.78	23.45	24.79	25.24	2.01	1.79
36	31.6	32.5	33	34	1.4	1.5
37	29.03	29.97	29.88	30.69	0.85	0.72
38	34.16	36.8	34.49	35.96	0.33	-0.84

39	30.13	31.57	30.45	31.28	0.32	-0.29
40	31.5	34	31.7	33.6	0.2	-0.4
41	32.9	35.1	32.9	34.8	0	-0.3
42	33.69	36.5	33.12	34.43	-0.57	-2.07
43	22.5	23.00	21.5	22.30	-1	-0.7
44	32.1	33.56	30.91	32.96	-1.19	-0.6
45	30.26	31.01	27.53	28.13	-2.73	-2.88
46	34.1	36.6	30.6	32.3	-3.5	-4.3
47	29.03	30.05	24.79	25.42	-4.24	-4.63
48	NEG	NEG	NEG	NEG	NA	NA
49	34.84	36.83	33.14	35.2	-1.7	-1.63
Mean delta					1.2474074	1.1329629
CT					1	6

Table 2. Sampling methods comparison.

a. Ct values of NP swab specimens compared to Ct values of NW specimens by RT-PCR in 20 patients. The mean delta Ct value shows a slightly better overall sensitivity with NP swabs (average 1.7). Patient 15's NW sample was negative despite a positive NP specimen.

b. Ct values of NP swab specimens compared to Ct Values of OP swab specimens in RT-PCR in 29 patients. Patients 1 and 28 were negative both in NP and OP swabs. The mean delta Ct value shows a slightly overall better sensitivity with NP swabs (average 1.2-1.3). The specimen collection was done at the same time.