1 Comparison of three nasopharyngeal swab types and the impact of physiochemical properties 2 for optimal SARS-CoV-2 detection

3 Trish R. Kahamba^a# Lara Noble,^a Wendy Stevens,^{a,b} Lesley Scott^a

4 ^aDepartment of Molecular Medicine and Haematology, School of Pathology, Faculty of Health
5 Science, University of the Witwatersrand, 7th Floor, 7 York Road, Parktown, Johannesburg, 2193,
6 South Africa.

7 ^bNational Priority Programme of the National Health Laboratory Service, Room 3n29 3rd Floor Wits
8 Med School, 7 York Road, Parktown, Johannesburg, 2193, South Africa

9 #Address correspondence to Trish R. Kahamba, trish.kahamba@ilead.org.za.

10 Abstract

11 Adequate swab specimen collection, release and detection of nucleic acids by molecular diagnostic
12 assays is largely attributed to the physical and chemical characteristics of different swab types. We
13 investigated properties of three types of commercial nasopharyngeal swabs (nylon flocked: Type 1-
14 Media Merge; Type 2- Kang Jian Medical Apparatus, China and Type 3- Wuxi NEST Biotechnology
15 Co. Ltd, China) used in clinical diagnostics with the aim to establish if different swab designs and
16 configurations had any effect on swab performance. Properties investigated included viral absorption,
17 release, capture, extraction and recovery efficiency from each swab for the detection of Severe Acute
18 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2). All swab types (n=18) were inoculated with
19 different amounts of SARS-CoV-2 live viral cultures (1:10, 1:100 and 1:1000 copies/ml) and eluted in
20 sterile phosphate buffer saline. RNA was extracted from all swab eluates using a fully automated
21 system (BD MAX™ System) and cycle threshold (Ct) values were compared. RNA stability was also
22 investigated after dry storage of swabs at room temperature for 72 hours. Statistically significant
23 differences (p<0.05) were observed in the absorption and release capabilities between Type 1 and 3
24 as well as between Type 2 and 3 swabs, however, no significant difference was observed between
25 Type 1 and 2. Ct values and extraction efficiency amounts of SARS-CoV-2 varied amongst the swab
26 types. We conclude that in order to facilitate accurate SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis, assessment of NP
27 swab characteristics is of importance before implementation for specimen collection in the clinical
28 setting.

29 **Keywords:** nasopharyngeal swabs, nylon flocked swabs, cycle threshold, RNA, Severe Acute
30 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2, and SARS-CoV-2.

31 Introduction

32 Accurate diagnosis of respiratory infections using swabs as the specimen collection device is largely
 33 dependent on the types of fibres and their physical characteristics (1, 2). Moreover, the sampling
 34 techniques i.e. pressure applied, swab rotations, number of strokes and sampling site are paramount
 35 for sufficient organism capture and diagnostic sensitivity (3). As recommended by the World Health
 36 Organization (WHO) and US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the use of the
 37 nasopharyngeal (NP) swab is the main sampling method to detect Severe Acute Respiratory
 38 Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) (4, 5). It is further recommended that sampling of the
 39 secretions from the posterior nasopharynx must be conducted using only synthetic fiber swabs like
 40 rayon or nylon flocked swabs with plastic or wire shafts (4).

41 Both nylon flocked and rayon swabs have been shown to have similar efficiency in preserving
 42 influenza RNA (6). Conversely, a study by Daley *et al.*, have shown better yields of respiratory
 43 epithelial cells by flocked than rayon swabs after NP sampling (7). Hernes *et al.*, also reported that
 44 nylon flocked swabs are more efficient than rayon swabs (8).

45 Studies focusing on SARS-CoV-2 have demonstrated that NP swabs are more sensitive than
 46 oropharyngeal (OP) swabs (9, 10), however, there are other studies that have shown comparable
 47 sensitivities between the two swab types (11). It has been previously reported that the quality of swab
 48 samples contribute to proper disease detection and monitoring of respiratory infections such as avian
 49 influenza (12) and swab composition and structure significantly impact the collection and release
 50 efficiency of a sample (13, 14).

51 During the period of June 2020, our laboratory at the Department of Molecular Medicine and
 52 Haematology at University of Witwatersrand received NP swabs from three different manufacturers for
 53 use in SARS-CoV-2 research. We noticed very distinct differences of the designs and sizes of the
 54 swab tip as well as the amount of nylon flock material on the swabs. We then aimed to investigate the
 55 efficiency of the three NP swabs in terms of viral capture, absorption, extraction efficiency as well as
 56 to compare the qualitative characteristics i.e. material type, length of shaft, breakpoint, ease of use
 57 and robustness. PCR inhibition was also monitored for all three NP swabs.

58 Materials and Methods

59 Swabs

We investigated three types of NP (nylon flocked) swabs from different manufacturers: Wuxi NEST Biotechnology Co. Ltd, China, Kang Jian Medical Apparatus, China and Media Merge (South African supplier- manufacturer undisclosed). All swabs had plastic shafts and breakpoints and were supplied individually wrapped in sterile plastic pouches. (Figure 1). Swab characteristics such as shaft length, breakpoint, ease of use and robustness were assessed using a 5-point Likert scale.

Figure 1: Nasopharyngeal nylon flocked swabs investigated. Type 1- South African supplier; Type 2- Kang Jian Medical Apparatus, China and Type 3- Wuxi NEST Biotechnology Co. Ltd, China.

Swab volume absorption and release capacity

In order to determine the absorption capacity and volume released of each swab, we adopted methods and formulae for calculations from Zasada *et al.*, and Wanke *et al.*, (14, 15) with some modifications. Briefly, swabs were immersed for 5-10s in pre-weighed 1.5ml eppendorf tubes that contained pre-aliquotted spiked phosphate buffered saline (PBS) (500µl) (Diagnostics Media Products, National Health Laboratory Service, South Africa) spiked with SARS-CoV-2 live viral cultures. The swabs were removed and the eppendorf tubes were weighed again. The weight and volume of liquid absorbed as well as volume released were calculated using the following formulae:

$$\text{Weight of absorbed buffer } (W_A) = W_{BS} - W_{AS}$$

where; W_{BS} = weight (g) of buffer before swab immersion

W_{AS} = weight (g) of buffer after swab immersion

$$91 \quad \text{Volume absorbed } (V_A) \mu\text{l} = W_A / \rho$$

92 where, W_A = weight (g) of absorbed buffer

93 ρ = density (1g/cm³ for PBS)

$$\text{Percentage of Volume released } (V_R\%) = \left(\frac{W_{BS} - W_A}{W_A} \right) \times 100$$

94 where, W_A = weight (g) of absorbed buffer

95 W_{BS} = weight (g) of buffer before swab immersion

$$\text{Actual Volume released } (V_R) \mu\text{l} = \left(\frac{V_A \times V_R}{100} \right)$$

96 where, V_A = volume absorbed (μl)

97 V_R = percentage volume released

98 Swab viral capture, extraction and recovery efficiency analysis

99 Swab capture was calculated using information derived from Moore *et al.*, (16) with some
100 modifications to the formula, i.e. for this study we inferred capture to be the same as removal of viral
101 particles from buffer hence we used the following formula:

$$\text{Viral capture } (V_C) = \left(\frac{Y_{BS} - S_Y}{Y_{BS}} \right) \times 100$$

102 where, Y_{BS} = RNA yield of original dilution (ng/ μl)

103 S_Y = RNA yield of swab (ng/ μl)

104 Swab extraction efficiency of RNA was determined using modified methods and formula from Bruijns
105 *et al.*, (17) and Zasada *et al.*, (14). Briefly swabs were spiked with viral cultures, followed by elution in
106 1.5ml PBS. RNA was extracted from the swab eluates (750 μl) using the BD SARS-CoV-2 reagents on
107 the BD MAXTM System (Becton, Dickinson and Company, Maryland, USA) according to manufacturer
108 instructions (18). Extracted RNA was quantified using the NanoDropTM 2000 Spectrophotometer
109 (Thermo Fisher ScientificTM Inc., USA) and the extraction efficiency of each swab was calculated
110 using the following formula:

$$\text{Extraction efficiency } (EE)\% = \left(\frac{V_A \times S_Y}{V_E \times Y_{BS}} \right) \times 100$$

111 where; V_A = volume absorbed (μl)

112 S_Y = RNA yield of swab (ng/ μl)

113 V_E = extraction volume (μl)

114 Y_{BS} = RNA yield of original dilution
115 (ng/μl)

116 Recovery efficiency was derived from information from Rose *et al.*, (19) and calculated using the
117 following formula:

$$\text{Recovery Efficiency (RE)}(\%) = \left(\frac{S_Y - Y_{BS}}{n} \right) \times 100$$

118 where, Y_{BS} = RNA yield of original dilution (ng/μl)

119 S_Y = RNA yield of swab (ng/μl)

120 n = sample size

121 **Preparation of viral cultures and inoculation of swabs**

122 SARS-CoV-2 live viral cultures obtained from the Centre of Excellence for Biomedical TB Research at
123 the University of the Witwatersrand were spiked into PBS and then serially diluted to final
124 concentrations of 1:10, 1:100, and 1:1000 copies/ml. All swab types were inserted into each dilution
125 (5-10s with swirling), transferred into fresh 1.5ml PBS followed by a vortex step for 5-10s. Positive
126 and negative controls were included in both assays. We tested the PBS before spiking as the
127 negative control and positive controls were derived from the highest concentrations i.e. 1:10 copies/ml
128 SARS-CoV-2. Eluates were stored at 2-8°C and tested within 1 hour (day 0).

129 **RNA stability on different swabs**

130 Some of the inoculated swabs were transferred into dry 1.5ml eppendorf tubes and stored for 72
131 hours (day 3) in zip-lock bags at room temperature in order to simulate transportation from sampling
132 location to the laboratory after which swabs were resuspended in 1.5ml PBS, vortexed 5-10s and
133 stored at 2-8°C. Testing was performed within 1 hour.

134 **Swab Testing: real-time RT-PCR**

135 Swab eluates from the different dilutions were extracted using real-time RT-PCR assay (BD SARS-
136 CoV-2 reagents) on the BD MAX™ System according to manufacturer instructions (18). Testing was
137 performed at two time points- day 0 and day 3. Cycle threshold (Ct) values of each swab eluate were
138 compared.

139 **Statistical analysis**

140 We performed the ANOVA statistical test using Stata/SE 16.0 (StataCorp LLC, USA) to determine
141 differences among means. When statistical significant differences were indicated ($p < 0.05$), post-hoc

comparison was performed using pairwise methods (sidak, bonferroni and scheffe) to determine the means that were significantly different from each other.

Results

Qualitative assessments

Scores using a 5-point Likert scale were given by the user of the swabs. Swab material was scored based on texture, odor and color of swab tip. Type 1 swab had the softest brush-like texture and was given a score of 5. All swabs were odorless. Type 1 and type 3 swab tips appeared to be the whitest in color (indicating high purity) and were therefore given a score of five. All shafts were made of plastic, hence all swabs scored 5. Shaft properties included flexibility, brittleness and debris production when broken beyond the breakpoint. All swab types were tough and did not produce any debris when broken, however, types 1 and 2 appeared more flexible compared to type 3. Type 1 was the shortest in length and types 2 and 3 were almost the same lengths. All swabs had good breakpoints, but type 2 could not be snapped off and the breakpoint dismantled after a few twists. All swabs were easy to use and did not disintegrate after vortexing/centrifugation (3000rpm, 5mins). Overall swab types 1 and 2 were given the highest scores. (Refer to supplementary table S1 for more information).

Table 1: Qualitative characteristics of the different swab types

Characteristic	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
Swab Material type-Texture	5	4	4
Swab Material type- Color	5	4	5
Shaft- material	5	5	5
Shaft properties	5	5	4
Shaft length	4	5	5
Breakpoint	4	4	5

Laboratory Ease of use	5	5	5
Robustness	5	5	5
Overall score	38/40	37/40	38/40

The swab characteristics were differentiated using the 5-point Linkert scale of 1-5. Type 1- South African supplier, Type 2- Kang Jian Medical Apparatus, China, Type 3- Wuxi NEST Biotechnology Co. Ltd, China. Key: 1= very bad/difficult, 2= bad/difficult, 3= neutral, 4= good/easy, 5= very good/easy.

Swab volume absorption and release capacity

The buffer absorption capacity of the three swab types ranged from 55.5 to 125.8 μ L. Swab type 3 exhibited the highest absorption capacity compared to the remaining two types. The ability to absorb and release buffer of swab type 3 was statistically greater than types 1 and 2; ($p < 0.05$). Differences in absorption of types 1 and 2 were minimal and not statistically different (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Volume of spiked PBS absorbed and released by the nasopharyngeal swabs. Data are presented as mean $\pm$ SEM. Type 1- South African supplier, Type 2- Kang Jian Medical Apparatus, China, Type 3- Wuxi NEST Biotechnology Co. Ltd, China.

Swab viral capture, extraction and recovery efficiency analysis

Swab viral capture analysis showed an inverse relationship to volume absorbed. Type 3, the most absorbent swab had the least capture capabilities. However, the extraction and recovery efficiencies of each swab for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection was strongly related to the type of swab and showed similar trends with the volume absorbed. We obtained the highest extraction and recovery efficiency

for type 3 (12.4 – 38.9%) and the least extraction and recovery efficiency was obtained for type 1 (3.6 - 24.7%) which shows a large part of the virus remained on the swab (Table 2).

Table 2: viral capture, extraction and recovery efficiency analysis for the three NP swabs

Swab properties	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
Viral capture (%)	29,6	24,4	22,2
Extraction efficiency (EE) (%)day 0	5,2	6,3	13,1
Extraction Efficiency (EE) (%)day 3	3,6	4,4	12,4
Recovery efficiency (RE) (%) day 0	35,2	37,8	38,9
Recovery efficiency (RE) (%) day 3	24,7	26,0	36,9

Swab Testing: real-time RT-PCR

SARS-CoV-2 was detected in 100% of the NP swab types for all the viral culture dilutions and time points investigated. Generally lower Ct values were observed for swab types 2 and 3 at day 0 for the nucleocapsid 1 (N1) and nucleocapsid 2 (N2) genes at the lowest viral culture dilution (1:10 copies/ml). Higher Ct values were observed at day 3 indicating lower viral loads, suggesting some loss of stability of RNA on the swabs at day 3 (72 hours). We observed changes in Ct values for day 0 and day 3 across all swab types and viral dilutions, however, the differences in Ct values were not statistically significant (N1 day 0: $p=0.9970$; N2 day 0: $p=0.9984$; N1 day 3: $p=0.8131$; N2 day 3: $p=0.6867$) (Figure 3). No PCR inhibition or interference was observed for all the swab types and the negative and positive controls were valid.

Figure 3: Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by real-time RT-PCR analysis from nasopharyngeal swabs at day 0 and day 3. All viral culture dilutions were copies/ml. Type 1- South African supplier, Type 2- Kang Jian Medical Apparatus, China, Type 3- Wuxi NEST Biotechnology Co. Ltd, China.

Discussion

Although several specimen types are listed as acceptable for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis by the CDC and WHO, the NP swabs are still the gold standard method of sampling (4, 5, 20). These swabs are minimally invasive but discomfort during sampling has been highlighted in some studies inciting bleeding, nausea and vomiting in patients probably caused by the swab surface properties (9, 21, 22). In order to achieve maximal sample collection, the design and mechanical properties of the NP swabs is crucial. The recommended shaft length is ~15cm and diameter of tip is ~1- 3.2mm. Other important properties include smoothness/softness, flexibility, ability to withstand torsion force, breakpoints, durability, collection sufficiency and PCR compatibility (21, 23). In this study we performed a qualitative analysis of the properties of three commercially available NP swabs. We observed some variations in the length of swab tip, shaft and breakpoints which ranged from 16-27mm, 150-152mm and 70-80mm respectively. All swabs had soft tips, which according to Copan Diagnostics facilitate efficient sample release (24). The colour of the swab tip has also been highlighted to be an important feature where generally a white swab tip indicates the absence of impurities/chemical coating/treatment of the swab, hence will aid in pure sample collection (25, 26). In the current study, this was observed for swab types 1 and 3.

The swab composition and structure have a significant impact on the main properties of the swab i.e. absorption, capture, extraction and recovery efficiency of collected sample (13, 14, 27). In our study, the three NP swabs revealed significant differences in volume absorption (the amount of fluid sample absorbed) and volume released (volume of fluid sample released into buffer). These parameters were inversely related to swab viral capture capacity (the amount of organisms removed from solution by the swab) but strongly related to extraction efficiency (the effectiveness of sample transfer from the swab tip to the extraction buffer) and recovery efficiency (the overall transfer effectiveness of swab from the sampling site to the extraction buffer). Type 3 NP swabs had the highest absorbing and releasing capacity compared to types 1 and 2 suggesting a direct relationship between the swab tip length (i.e. high amount of nylon flock material on the tip (refer to supplementary table 2)) and these properties. Less than 25%, 30% and 55% SARS-CoV-2 RNA was recoverable from swab types 1, 2 and 3 respectively, indicating that most of the viral particles either were left in buffer or were entrapped by the swab material.

The quality of swab samples and other factors such as sampling procedures, time of sampling and sample storage temperature contribute to adequate disease detection and monitoring of respiratory infections (12, 28, 29). We investigated storage of swabs over two time points (day 0 and day 3) at room temperature. RNA was detected from all swabs at both time points without PCR inhibition/interference but an increase in Ct values was observed at day 3 for all swab types, indicating lower viral loads detected. RNA stability was comparable for all swab types.

Although there is a vast amount of NP swab validation studies (2, 6, 14, 27, 30-34), this is, to our knowledge the first head-to-head comparison of the NP swab types from different manufacturers for SARS-CoV-2 testing. The limitations of this study include the unavailability of clinical specimens for comparison, broader storage times to investigate RNA stability on the swabs as well as inclusion of swabs from well-known manufacturer i.e. Copan and Puritan, which we could not acquire at the time of the study due to high-demand. Future focus would be to validate swabs in clinical settings on a larger population.

Conclusion

We conclude that different nasopharyngeal swabs have different absorption, capture capabilities and extraction efficiencies. We recommend critical assessment of the swab features and properties before implementation for use at clinical settings in order to facilitate accurate diagnosis.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Asiashu Singh-Moodley for assisting with critical reviews and staff at the Centre of Excellence for Biomedical TB Research at the University of the Witwatersrand (Bavesh Kana, Bhavna Gordhan, Edith Machowski, Wolfgang Preiser and Taejon Suliman) for assisting with viral cultures and mimetics. We also thank the Bill Melinda Gates Foundation for providing research funding support (grant no.OPP1171455).The funders had no role in study design, data collection and interpretation, or the decision to submit the work for publication.

References

1. Harry KH, Turner JC, Madhusudhan KT. 2013. Comparison of physical characteristics and collection and elution performance of clinical swabs. African Journal of Microbiology Research 7:4039-4048.
2. Abu-Diab A, Azzeh M, Ghneim R, Ghneim R, Zoughbi M, Turkuman S, Rishmawi N, Siriani I, Dauodi R, Kattan R. 2008. Comparison between pernasal flocked swabs and nasopharyngeal

272 aspirates for detection of common respiratory viruses in samples from children. Journal of
273 Clinical Microbiology 46:2414-2417.

274 3. Whyte W, Carson W, Hambraeus A. 1989. Methods for calculating the efficiency of bacterial
275 surface sampling techniques. Journal of Hospital Infection 13:33-41.

276 4. Prevention UCfDCa. 2020. Interim Guidelines for Collecting, Handling, and Testing Clinical
277 Specimens from Persons for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19).
278 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/guidelines-clinical-specimens.html> Accessed: 8
279 July 2020.

280 5. Organization WH. 2020. Laboratory testing for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in
281 suspected human cases: interim guidance, 2 March 2020. World Health Organization,

282 6. Esposito S, Molteni CG, Daleno C, Valzano A, Cesati L, Gualtieri L, Tagliabue C, Bosis S,
283 Principi N. 2010. Comparison of nasopharyngeal nylon flocked swabs with universal transport
284 medium and rayon-bud swabs with a sponge reservoir of viral transport medium in the
285 diagnosis of paediatric influenza. Journal of medical microbiology 59:96-99.

286 7. Daley P, Castriciano S, Chernesky M, Smieja M. 2006. Comparison of flocked and rayon
287 swabs for collection of respiratory epithelial cells from uninfected volunteers and symptomatic
288 patients. Journal of clinical microbiology 44:2265-2267.

289 8. Hernes S, Quarsten H, Hagen E, Lyngroth AL, Pripp AH, Bjorvatn B, Bakke P. 2011.
290 Swabbing for respiratory viral infections in older patients: a comparison of rayon and nylon
291 flocked swabs. European journal of clinical microbiology & infectious diseases 30:159-165.

292 9. Wang H, Liu Q, Hu J, Zhou M, Yu MQ, Li KY, Xu D, Xiao Y, Yang JY, Lu YJ, Wang F, Yin P,
293 Xu SY. 2020. Nasopharyngeal Swabs Are More Sensitive Than Oropharyngeal Swabs for
294 COVID-19 Diagnosis and Monitoring the SARS-CoV-2 Load. Front Med (Lausanne) 7:334.

295 10. Yang Y, Yang M, Shen C. Evaluating the accuracy of different respiratory specimens in the
296 laboratory diagnosis and monitoring the viral shedding of 2019-nCoV infections. Posted
297 February 17, 2020. Available at: doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.11.200211>.

298 11. Woelfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Mueller MA, Niemeyer D,
299 Vollmar P, Rothe C, Hoelscher M. 2020. Clinical presentation and virological assessment of
300 hospitalized cases of coronavirus disease 2019 in a travel-associated transmission cluster.
301 MedRxiv.

- 302 12. Fereidouni SR, Globig A, Starick E, Harder TC. 2012. Effect of swab matrix, storage time, and
303 temperature on detection of avian influenza virus RNA in swab samples. Avian diseases
304 56:955-958.
- 305 13. Watson J, Whiting PF, Brush JE. 2020. Interpreting a covid-19 test result. BMJ 369:m1808.
- 306 14. Zasada AA, Zacharczuk K, Woźnica K, Głowska M, Ziolkowski R, Malinowska E. 2020. The
307 influence of a swab type on the results of point-of-care tests. AMB Express 10:1-6.
- 308 15. Warnke P, Warning L, Podbielski A. 2014. Some are more equal-a comparative study on
309 swab uptake and release of bacterial suspensions. PLoS One 9:e102215.
- 310 16. Moore G, Griffith C. 2002. Factors influencing recovery of microorganisms from surfaces by
311 use of traditional hygiene swabbing. Dairy Food and Environmental Sanitation 22:410-421.
- 312 17. Bruijns BB, Tiggelaar RM, Gardeniers H. 2018. The extraction and recovery efficiency of pure
313 DNA for different types of swabs. Journal of forensic sciences 63:1492-1499.
- 314 18. Becton DaC. 2020. BD SARS-CoV-2 Reagents for BD MAX™ System.
315 <https://www.fda.gov/media/136816/download> Accessed: 20 July 2020.
- 316 19. Rose L, Jensen B, Peterson A, Banerjee SN, Arduino MJ. 2004. Swab materials and Bacillus
317 anthracis spore recovery from nonporous surfaces. Emerging infectious diseases 10:1023.
- 318 20. Qian Y, Zeng T, Wang H, Xu M, Chen J, Hu N, Chen D, Liu Y. 2020. Safety management of
319 nasopharyngeal specimen collection from suspected cases of coronavirus disease 2019. Int J
320 Nurs Sci doi:10.1016/j.ijnss.2020.03.012.
- 321 21. Callahan CJ, Lee R, Zulauf KE, Tamburello L, Smith KP, Previtera J, Cheng A, Green A,
322 Azim AA, Yano A. 2020. Open Development and Clinical Validation Of Multiple 3D-Printed
323 Nasopharyngeal Collection Swabs: Rapid Resolution of a Critical COVID-19 Testing
324 Bottleneck. Journal of Clinical Microbiology.
- 325 22. Tu Y-P, Jennings R, Hart B, Cangelosi G, Wood R, Wehber K, Verma P, Vojta D, Berke EM.
326 2020. Patient-collected tongue, nasal, and mid-turbinate swabs for SARS-CoV-2 yield
327 equivalent sensitivity to health care worker collected nasopharyngeal swabs. medRxiv.
- 328 23. Saito T, Miller Jr JJ, Leach CW. 1942. The nasopharyngeal swab in the diagnosis of
329 pertussis. American Journal of Public Health and the Nations Health 32:471-474.

330 24. Diagnostics C. 2020. FLOQSwabs® Patented Original Technology for Optimal Sample
331 Collection and Diagnostics. [https://www.copanusacom/sample-collection-transport-](https://www.copanusacom/sample-collection-transport-processing/floqswabs/)
332 [processing/floqswabs/](https://www.copanusacom/sample-collection-transport-processing/floqswabs/) Accessed: 26 July 2020.

333 25. Harry K, Madhusudhan K. 2014. Effect of protein coating of flocked swabs on the collection
334 and release of clinically important bacteria. Indian journal of medical microbiology 32:301.

335 26. Indevuyst C, Beuselinck K, Lagrou K. 2012. eSwab flocked swabs unfit for viral culture.
336 Journal of Clinical Virology 55:282-3.

337 27. Panpradist N, Toley BJ, Zhang X, Byrnes S, Buser JR, Englund JA, Lutz BR. 2014. Swab
338 sample transfer for point-of-care diagnostics: characterization of swab types and manual
339 agitation methods. PloS one 9:e105786.

340 28. Van Wesenbeeck L, Meeuws H, D'Haese D, Ispas G, Houspie L, Van Ranst M, Stuyver LJ.
341 2014. Sampling variability between two mid-turbinate swabs of the same patient has
342 implications for influenza viral load monitoring. Virology journal 11:1-5.

343 29. Basso D, Aita A, Navaglia F, Franchin E, Fioretto P, Moz S, Bozzato D, Zambon C-F, Martin
344 B, Dal Prà C. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 RNA identification in nasopharyngeal swabs: issues in pre-
345 analytics. Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM) 1.

346 30. Iwasaki S, Fujisawa S, Nakakubo S, Kamada K, Yamashita Y, Fukumoto T, Sato K, Oguri S,
347 Taki K, Senjo H, Sugita J, Hayasaka K, Konno S, Nishida M, Teshima T. 2020. Comparison
348 of SARS-CoV-2 detection in nasopharyngeal swab and saliva. J Infect
349 doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.05.071.

350 31. Kim C, Ahmed JA, Eidex RB, Nyoka R, Waiboci LW, Erdman D, Tepo A, Mahamud AS,
351 Kabura W, Nguhi M, Muthoka P, Burton W, Breiman RF, Njenga MK, Katz MA. 2011.
352 Comparison of nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs for the diagnosis of eight
353 respiratory viruses by real-time reverse transcription-PCR assays. PLoS One 6:e21610.

354 32. Wang X, Tan L, Wang X, Liu W, Lu Y, Cheng L, Sun Z. 2020. Comparison of nasopharyngeal
355 and oropharyngeal swabs for SARS-CoV-2 detection in 353 patients received tests with both
356 specimens simultaneously. Int J Infect Dis 94:107-109.

357 33. Ng P, Ng, J and Mazzulli. 2019. COMPARISON OF NASOPHARYNGEAL (NP) SWABS
358 COLLECTED WITH PERNASAL FLOCKED SWABS VERSUS NP SWABS COLLECTED
359 WITH TRADITIONAL TWISTED WIRE FIBER MINITIP FOR THE DETECTION OF

360 RESPIRATORY VIRUSES USING SIMULFLUOR DFA. [https://www.copanusacom/wp-](https://www.copanusacom/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/131425317870_CopanFlockedSwabDaytona_CVS080426pdf)
361 [content/uploads/2019/04/131425317870_CopanFlockedSwabDaytona_CVS080426pdf](https://www.copanusacom/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/131425317870_CopanFlockedSwabDaytona_CVS080426pdf)
362 Accessed: 27 July 2020.

363 34. Irving SA, Vandermause MF, Shay DK, Belongia EA. 2012. Comparison of nasal and
364 nasopharyngeal swabs for influenza detection in adults. Clin Med Res 10:215-8.

365 35. Medical KJ. 2020. Collection Swab & Virus Sampling Tube IFU. [http://enchina-](http://enchina-kangjiancom/Collection-Swab-Virus-Sampling-Tube-pd6496148html)
366 [kangjiancom/Collection-Swab-Virus-Sampling-Tube-pd6496148html](http://enchina-kangjiancom/Collection-Swab-Virus-Sampling-Tube-pd6496148html) Accessed: 5 August
367 2020.

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

Supplementary Table S1: Characteristics of swabs and acceptance criteria

Characteristic	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Acceptable criteria	References
Swab sterility	Sterile	Sterile- no DNA/RNA enzymes	Sterile	Sterile	(4)
Total swab length	150mm	152mm	152mm	150-160mm	(21)
Swab tip length	16mm	21mm	27mm	15-35mm	(21)
Swab tip diameter	3mm	2mm	3mm	1-4mm	(21)
Texture of swab tip	Velvet brush-like	Velvet	Soft	Sufficient smoothness	(21)
Lint production from swab tip	None	None	None	Lint-free	(24)
Swab tip pH	Undisclosed	Undisclosed	7.2-7.8	Not specified	(35)
Robustness: Ability to withstand vortexing or centrifugation	Good- no shearing or disintegration	Good- no shearing or disintegration	Good- no shearing or disintegration	Ability to tolerate torsion	(21)
Shaft- material	Acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (ABS)	Acrylonitrile butadiene styrene (ABS)	Plastic	No wood or calcium alginate- interference	(4)

Shaft- flexibility	Very flexible	Flexible	Flexible	Flexible for insertion with PCR into the posterior nasopharynx	(4)
Breakpoint	80mm	80mm	70mm	70-100mm	(21)
Breakpoint properties	No debris generation during breaking	No debris generation during breaking	No debris generation during breaking	Must be easy break without scissors	(21)
Appearance of swab tip and shaft after freezing - 80°C	No cracking/deformation	No cracking/deformation	No cracking/deformation	Must maintain original shape after freezing	(4)
Laboratory ease of use	Easy to use	Easy to use	Easy to use	Swabs must be easy to use	(33)