Food for thought: Eating before saliva collection and interference with SARS-CoV-2 detection

Matthew M. Hernandez^{1,#}, Mariawy Riollano-Cruz², Mary C. Boyle², Radhika Banu¹, Paras Shrestha¹, Brandon Gray¹, Liyong Cao¹, Feng Chen¹, Huanzhi Shi¹, Daniel E. Paniz-Perez³, Paul A. Paniz-Perez³, Aryan L. Rishi³, Jacob Dubinsky³, Dylan Dubinsky³, Owen Dubinsky³, Sophie Baine³, Lily Baine³, Suzanne Arinsburg¹, Ian Baine¹, Juan David Ramirez¹, Carlos Cordon-Cardo¹, Emilia Mia Sordillo¹, Alberto E. Paniz-Mondolfi^{1,#}

Affiliations:

¹ Department of Pathology, Molecular, and Cell-Based Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029, USA

² Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029, USA

³ Department of Pathology, Molecular and Cell-Based Medicine, Kids Laboratory and Science Hub, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029, USA

Corresponding authors: matthew.hernandez@mssm.edu, alberto.paniz-mondolfi@mountsinai.org

Brief description: Saliva is a non-invasive, easy-to-collect specimen for virus detection in children. However, children's diets introduce substances which interfere with diagnostics. Healthy children's saliva collected immediately after eating various foods interfered with detection of artificially-added SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acids. Diagnostic interference resolved at 20 minutes after eating.

Running head: Interference of SARS-CoV-2 detection in pediatric saliva

Keywords: RT-PCR; MALDI-TOF; Saliva; Interference; SARS-CoV-2

24 **Abstract**

25 Background: Saliva is an optimal specimen for detection of viruses that cause upper respiratory
26 infections including severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) due to its cost-
27 effectiveness and non-invasive collection. However, together with intrinsic enzymes and oral
28 microbiota, children's unique dietary habits may introduce substances that interfere with diagnostic
29 testing.

30 Methods: To determine whether children's dietary choices impact SARS-CoV-2 detection in saliva, we
31 performed a diagnostic study that simulates testing of real-life specimens provided from healthy children
32 (n=5) who self-collected saliva at home before and at 0, 20, and 60 minutes after eating from 20 foods
33 they selected. Each of seventy-two specimens was split into two volumes and spiked with SARS-CoV-
34 2-negative or -positive standards prior to side-by-side testing by reverse-transcription polymerase chain
35 reaction matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization time-of-flight (RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF) assay.

36 Results: Detection of internal extraction control and SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acids was reduced in
37 replicates of saliva collected at 0 minutes after eating 11 of 20 foods. Interference resolved at 20 and 60
38 minutes after eating all foods except hot dog in one participant. This represented a significant
39 improvement in detection of nucleic acids compared to saliva collected at 0 minutes after eating
40 (P=0.0005).

41 Conclusions: We demonstrate successful detection of viral nucleic acids in saliva self-collected by
42 children before and after eating a variety of foods. Fasting is not required before saliva collection for
43 SARS-CoV-2 testing by RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF, but waiting 20 minutes after eating is sufficient for
44 accurate testing. These findings should be considered for SARS-CoV-2 testing and broader viral
45 diagnostics in saliva specimens.

46 **Introduction**

47 Robust diagnostics are vital for testing of respiratory viral infections including severe acute
48 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in order to prevent transmission from infected
49 children. Although many nucleic acid amplification platforms for SARS-CoV-2 detection have been
50 authorized by the United States Food and Drug Administration (US FDA) for testing nasopharyngeal
51 (NP) specimens, collection involves invasive techniques and close-contact with infected individuals [1].
52 Saliva is an attractive alternative since collection is less invasive, uncomfortable, and saliva can be self-
53 collected.

54 We [2] and others [3–6] have demonstrated the diagnostic utility of saliva for SARS-CoV-2
55 testing, and several have demonstrated comparable sensitivities for SARS-CoV-2 detection in saliva
56 versus NP specimens [5,7]; but few have assessed performance in children [4,5] whose saliva can be
57 impacted by dietary and oral hygiene behaviors distinct from adults. With routine self-collection, robust
58 detection of viruses are vulnerable to inhibitors found in saliva secondary to foods, dental care, or native
59 salivary environment [8–10].

60 To evaluate whether dietary choices can impact SARS-CoV-2 detection in saliva, we performed
61 a diagnostic study to simulate testing of real-life specimens provided from healthy children who self-
62 collected saliva at home before and after eating foods they selected.

63

64 **Methods**

65 *Ethics statement*

66 This study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Icahn School of
67 Medicine at Mount Sinai (HS#21-00670). Consent was obtained from at least one parent of each child
68 participant.

69 *Foods evaluated for interference with target detection*

70 A panel of 20 “favorite” foods was identified by the participants who also collaborated in the
71 study design. Detailed information on these foods are in the **Supplemental Table 1**. Participants’
72 renderings of select foods are depicted in **Figure 1A** and **Supplemental Figures 1-4**.

73 *Saliva collection*

74 Saliva specimens were provided by five healthy children aged between 5 and 9 years. Children
75 self-collected specimens in sterile collection devices that have received emergency use authorization
76 (EUA) by the US FDA for at-home saliva collection for SARS-CoV-2 testing. Participants provided
77 saliva once immediately upon waking up prior to any dental care, and then at 0, 20, and 60 minutes after
78 eating each food. Parents annotated the food, timepoint, and date of specimen collection on each tube
79 with a marker. Specimens were refrigerated in biohazard bags until transfer to the Mount Sinai Health
80 System Clinical Laboratory which is certified under Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of
81 1988, 42 U.S.C. §263a and meets requirements to perform high-complexity tests.

82 *SARS-CoV-2 testing*

83 Upon receipt, specimen volumes were divided in half to undergo artificial spiking with in-house
84 standards prior to diagnostic testing using the Agena MassARRAY® SARS-CoV-2 Panel and
85 MassARRAY® System (Agena, CPM384) platform as previously described [2]. This method has been
86 validated for clinical testing and has received EUA by the US FDA. For each specimen collected, one

volume was spiked with a quantitated standard of pooled SARS-CoV-2-positive NP specimens [2]. This generated 1-3 technical replicates of saliva at 300uL each containing 125,000 copies/mL of SARS-CoV-2. The second volume of saliva specimen was spiked with pooled SARS-CoV-2-negative NP matrix standard which generated 1-3 replicates of saliva at 300uL each containing no SARS-CoV-2. Specimen replicates were processed and run side-by-side.

Data acquired by the MassARRAY[®] Analyzer was processed with the MassARRAY[®] Typer and SARS-CoV-2 Report software. The assay detects five viral targets: three in the *N* gene (N1, N2, N3) and two in the *ORF1ab* gene (ORF1A, ORF1AB). If the internal extraction control (IC) was detected, results were interpreted as positive if ≥ 2 targets were detected or negative if < 2 targets were detected. If no IC and no targets were detected, the result was invalid. If IC was not detected but ≥ 2 SARS-CoV-2 targets were detected, the result was positive; notably, this outcome was not observed for any specimens/replicates in this study. Detailed diagnostic results for all replicates are described in **Supplemental Table 2**. Participants' depictions of methods are portrayed in **Supplemental Figures 5-6**. Mass-spectrometry spectra representative of possible outcomes observed in this study are depicted in **Supplemental Figures 7-11**.

Statistical analyses and display items

To compare detection frequency results at different timepoints of all saliva specimens tested, normality was assessed by D'Agostino and Pearson test and Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed rank test was performed (GraphPad Prism 9.0.2).

106 Results

107 Pediatric participants independently selected 20 of their favorite foods and provided saliva for
108 RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF detection of artificially-added viral and control nucleic acids (**Figure 1**).
109 Altogether, 72 different saliva specimens were collected before and after eating. All specimens were
110 divided into two volumes to undergo side-by-side testing after spiking with in-house SARS-CoV-2-
111 negative or -positive standards. In total, 404 replicates were tested.

112 We assessed the successful extraction and detection of internal extraction controls (IC) in
113 specimens that were spiked with SARS-CoV-2-negative standard (**Table 1**). First, morning saliva
114 collected immediately upon waking was collected from each participant. Morning saliva from four
115 participants yielded successful detection of IC and a negative result for SARS-CoV-2 in 100% of
116 replicates. In contrast, IC was detected in 0/3 replicates (0%) of participant #1 morning saliva suggesting
117 the presence of substances that inhibit extraction or detection of IC. Morning saliva from a second
118 independent collection for this participant yielded IC detection in 2/3 replicates (67%) highlighting
119 consistent interference.

120 When we assessed interference in saliva collected after eating, we found the greatest interference
121 with IC detection occurred in specimens collected immediately after eating (0 minutes) (**Table 1**). In
122 saliva collected immediately after eating 12 foods, IC was detected in 0-67% of replicates. However, for
123 11 of the 12 foods, IC was detected in 100% of replicates at 20 and 60 minutes after eating representing
124 a significant improvement from the 0 minute timepoint ($P=0.0005$). Interestingly, saliva collected after
125 eating hot dog were the exception and interfered with IC detection up to 60 minutes after consumption
126 in participant #1. Notably, participant #3 also consumed hot dog, but IC was detected in all replicates
127 from 0 to 60 minutes after eating.

128 We next assessed the effect of eating before saliva collection on SARS-CoV-2 detection in
129 spiked samples. To do this, we spiked specimens with SARS-CoV-2-positive standard to generate
130 replicates of specimens each containing 125,000 virus copies/mL, a concentration that is ~100-fold
131 greater than the overall limit of detection for this saliva assay [2].

132 SARS-CoV-2 detection was uniformly successful in SARS-CoV-2-spiked morning saliva
133 specimens from four participants; but, SARS-CoV-2 was not detected in spiked saliva from participant
134 #1 (**Table 2**). Together with the failure to detect IC in morning saliva from the same participant, these
135 findings suggest that morning saliva may have substances that inhibit extraction, amplification, and/or
136 detection of nucleic acids. In fact, when participant #1 morning saliva collected at a second independent
137 collection was spiked with SARS-CoV-2, viral nucleic acids were detected in 0/3 replicates
138 (**Supplemental Table 2**).

139 Similar to saliva spiked with SARS-CoV-2-negative standard, the greatest interference with
140 detection occurred in specimens collected immediately after eating (**Table 2**). Specifically, SARS-CoV-
141 2 was detected in 0-50% of all replicates from SARS-CoV-2-spiked saliva collected immediately after
142 eating 11 foods. These same foods were all associated with inhibition of detection of IC nucleic acids in
143 paired specimens spiked with SARS-CoV-2-negative standard. Interestingly, for participant #3, contrary
144 to detection of IC in SARS-CoV-2-negative saliva collected immediately after eating hot dog, viral
145 nucleic acids were detected in 0/3 replicates (0%) of paired saliva spiked with SARS-CoV-2. Successful
146 detection of SARS-CoV-2 was achieved in saliva collected at 20 to 60 minutes after eating almost all
147 (19/20) foods which represents a significant improvement in detection compared to the 0 minute
148 timepoint (P=0.0010). Once again, the exception was for participant #1 saliva collected after eating hot
149 dog which interfered with SARS-CoV-2 detection up to one hour later.

150 Discussion

151 As children return to in-person schooling, large-scale SARS-CoV-2 screening and surveillance
152 efforts have utilized saliva for its cost-effective, non-invasive, and safe characteristics in testing children
153 and adults [11]. However, to effectively execute these initiatives and to exploit saliva for testing of other
154 viruses, a better assessment of diagnostic performance of saliva in children is required. In particular, the
155 requirement to fast or avoid eating may be difficult for parents and children because of constraints on
156 mealtime scheduling and unpredictability of children's dietary habits.

157 To address this, the children who participated in our study collected saliva upon waking, and
158 then, at set intervals, after eating their favorite foods. Although the number of participants in this study
159 was small, a consistent finding was that, by 20 minutes after eating most foods, there was minimal or no
160 interference with extraction, amplification, and detection of IC and SARS-CoV-2. Importantly, specific
161 foods (e.g., hot dog) and saliva collected upon waking up may interfere with diagnostics, which warrants
162 further study on other RT-PCR-based and novel (e.g., RT loop-mediated isothermal amplification,
163 CRISPR/Cas-based) diagnostic platforms.

164 Despite its advantages, saliva, like other biological samples, is prone to matrix-specific factors
165 that influence diagnostics including intrinsic degrading enzymes, changes in salivary flow over time
166 (e.g., circadian rhythms), or oral microbiome composition [8–10,12]. Moreover, various PCR inhibitors
167 have been described in milk, vegetables, and foods high in protein and fat which interfere with robust
168 diagnostic detection of pathogen nucleic acids [8,9]. Together with unique dietary habits of children,
169 these factors pose challenges to molecular microbiology diagnostics and are essential to consider as we
170 learn to exploit saliva for capturing infections with upper respiratory pathogens.

171 **Acknowledgments**

172 We would like to thank all of the children and their parents for their participation in this study
173 and for ultimately advancing the viral diagnostics. We are also grateful for the continuous expert
174 guidance provided by the ISMMS Program for the Protection of Human Subjects.

175

176 **Financial support**

177 The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, or publication of this
178 article.

179

180 **Potential conflicts of interest**

181 The authors have no reported conflicts of interest to disclose for this study.

References

- [1] O. Vandenberg, D. Martiny, O. Rochas, A. van Belkum, Z. Kozlakidis, Considerations for diagnostic COVID-19 tests, *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 19 (2021) 171–183.
- [2] M.M. Hernandez, R. Banu, P. Shrestha, A. Patel, F. Chen, L. Cao, S. Fabre, J. Tan, H. Lopez, N. Chiu, B. Shifrin, I. Zapolskaya, V. Flores, P.Y. Lee, S. Castañeda, J.D. Ramírez, J. Jhang, G. Osorio, M.R. Gitman, M.D. Nowak, D.L. Reich, C. Cordon-Cardo, E.M. Sordillo, A.E. Paniz-Mondolfi, RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry-based detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva specimens, *J. Med. Virol.* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.27069>.
- [3] A.L. Wyllie, J. Fournier, A. Casanovas-Massana, M. Campbell, M. Tokuyama, P. Vijayakumar, J.L. Warren, B. Geng, M.C. Muenker, A.J. Moore, C.B.F. Vogels, M.E. Petrone, I.M. Ott, P. Lu, A. Venkataraman, A. Lu-Culligan, J. Klein, R. Earnest, M. Simonov, R. Datta, R. Handoko, N. Naushad, L.R. Sewanan, J. Valdez, E.B. White, S. Lapidus, C.C. Kalinich, X. Jiang, D.J. Kim, E. Kudo, M. Linehan, T. Mao, M. Moriyama, J.E. Oh, A. Park, J. Silva, E. Song, T. Takahashi, M. Taura, O.-E. Weizman, P. Wong, Y. Yang, S. Bermejo, C.D. Odio, S.B. Omer, C.S. Dela Cruz, S. Farhadian, R.A. Martinello, A. Iwasaki, N.D. Grubaugh, A.I. Ko, Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2, *N. Engl. J. Med.* 383 (2020) 1283–1286.
- [4] R. Yee, T.T. Truong, P.S. Pannaraj, N. Eubanks, E. Gai, J. Jumarang, L. Turner, A. Peralta, Y. Lee, J. Dien Bard, Saliva Is a Promising Alternative Specimen for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Children and Adults, *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 59 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02686-20>.
- [5] G. Butler-Laporte, A. Lawandi, I. Schiller, M.C. Yao, N. Dendukuri, E.G. McDonald, T.C. Lee, Comparison of Saliva and Nasopharyngeal Swab Nucleic Acid Amplification Testing for Detection of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis, *JAMA Intern. Med.* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.8876>.
- [6] D. Banerjee, A. Sasidharan, A. Abdulhamid, E.M. Orosco, J.L. Watts, J.E. Schuster, A.L. Myers, G. Weddle, R. Selvarangan, Diagnostic Yield of Saliva for SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Testing in Children, *J. Pediatric Infect. Dis. Soc.* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpids/piab058>.
- [7] R.A. Lee, J.C. Herigon, A. Benedetti, N.R. Pollock, C.M. Denking, Performance of Saliva, Oropharyngeal Swabs, and Nasal Swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Detection: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis, *J. Clin. Microbiol.* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02881-20>.
- [8] C. Schrader, A. Schielke, L. Ellerbroek, R. Johne, PCR inhibitors - occurrence, properties and removal, *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 113 (2012) 1014–1026.
- [9] C. Suther, M.D. Moore, Quantification and discovery of PCR inhibitors found in food matrices commonly associated with foodborne viruses, *Food Science and Human Wellness.* 8 (2019) 351–355.
- [10] L. Rossen, P. Nørskov, K. Holmstrøm, O.F. Rasmussen, Inhibition of PCR by components of food samples, microbial diagnostic assays and DNA-extraction solutions, *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 17 (1992) 37–45.
- [11] J. Crowe, A.T. Schnaubelt, S. SchmidtBonne, K. Angell, J. Bai, T. Eske, M. Nicklin, C. Pratt, B. White, B. Crotts-Hannibal, N. Staffend, V. Herrera, J. Cobb, J. Conner, J. Carstens, J. Tempero, L. Bouda, M. Ray, J.V. Lawler, W.S. Campbell, J.-M. Lowe, J. Santarpia, S. Bartelt-Hunt, M. Wiley, D. Brett-Major, C. Logan, M.J. Broadhurst, Assessment of a Program for SARS-CoV-2 Screening and Environmental Monitoring in an Urban Public School District, *JAMA Netw. Open.* 4 (2021) e2126447.
- [12] S.P. Humphrey, R.T. Williamson, A review of saliva: normal composition, flow, and function, *J. Prosthet. Dent.* 85 (2001) 162–169.

227 **Author contributions**

228 M.C.B. and M.R.C. recruited and consented parents and subjects to provide specimens for this study.

229 D.E.P.P, P.A.P.P, A.L.R, J.D, D.D, S.B, and L.B participated in the design and implementation of the

230 research. M.M.H., R.B., P.S., L.C., F.C., and A.E.PM. accessioned subjects' specimens and performed

231 diagnostic assays. M.M.H., R.B., H.S., E.M.S., and A.E.PM analyzed, interpreted, or discussed data.

232 S.A., I.B., M.R.G., M.D.N., and C.C.C contributed to the interpretation of the results. M.M.H., E.M.S.,

233 and A.E.PM. wrote the manuscript. M.M.H. and A.E.PM. conceived the study. E.M.S. and A.E.PM.

234 supervised the study. All authors discussed the results and commented on the manuscript.

235 M.M.H. and A.E.PM are the guarantors of this work and, as such, had full access to all of the data in the

236 study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

237

238

239 **Figure and Table Legends**

240

241 **Figure 1. Foods selected by participants to test for interference of SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic testing**
242 **in saliva. (A)** Participants' rendering of select categories of foods tested for impact on SARS-CoV-2
243 detection in saliva. **(B)** Participants' rendition of process of collecting saliva, artificially spiking with (or
244 without) SARS-CoV-2, RNA extraction, and RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF diagnostic testing.

245

246 **Table 1. Detection of extraction control in children's saliva before and after eating.**

247

248 **Table 2. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in children's saliva before and after eating.**

249

Figure 1

A

B

Table 1. Detection of internal extraction control in children's saliva before and after eating.

Participant	Morning ^b	After eating ^a			
		Food	0 minutes	20 minutes	60 minutes
1	0/3 (0%)	---	---	---	---
	---	Hot Dog	0/3 (0%)	2/3 (66.7%)	2/3 (66.7%)
	---	Ice Cream	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Cookies	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Pizza	0/2 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Pretzels	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
2	3/3 (100%)	---	---	---	---
	---	Apple	2/2 (100%)	2/2 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Banana	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Chocolate	2/3 (66.7%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Clementine	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Hamburger	3/3 (100%)	2/2 (100%)	2/2 (100%)
	---	Chicken Nuggets	0/2 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Pasta	1/2 (50.0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Popcorn	2/2 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	2/2 (100%)
3	3/3 (100%)	---	---	---	---
	---	Eggs & Bacon	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Macaroni & Cheese	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Peanut Butter & Jelly	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Potato Chips	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Hot Dog	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
4	1/1 (100%)	---	---	---	---
	---	French Fries	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Pancake	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
5	3/3 (100%)	---	---	---	---
	---	French Fries	2/2 (100%)	2/2 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
Overall	10/13 (76.9%)	---	30/60 (50.0%)	62/63 (98.4%)	62/63 (98.4%)

a Fraction of saliva replicates collected after eating that are spiked with SARS-CoV-2-negative NP matrix and yield detectable internal extraction control. Fraction also depicted as percentage.

b Fraction of saliva replicates collected in the morning that are spiked with SARS-CoV-2-negative NP matrix and yield detectable internal extraction control. Fraction also depicted as percentage.

Table 2. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in children's saliva before and after eating

Participant	Morning ^b	After eating ^a			
		Food	0 minutes	20 minutes	60 minutes
1	0/3 (0%)	---	---	---	---
	---	Hot Dog	0/3 (0%)	2/3 (66.7%)	2/3 (66.7%)
	---	Ice Cream	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Cookies	1/3 (33.3%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Pizza	1/2 (50.0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Pretzels	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
2	3/3 (100%)	---	---	---	---
	---	Apple	2/2 (100%)	2/2 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Banana	1/3 (33.3%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Chocolate	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Clementine	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Hamburger	3/3 (100%)	2/2 (100%)	2/2 (100%)
	---	Chicken Nuggets	1/2 (50.0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Pasta	1/2 (50.0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Popcorn	2/2 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	2/2 (100%)
	---	Waffle	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	2/2 (100%)
3	3/3 (100%)	---	---	---	---
	---	Eggs & Bacon	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Macaroni & Cheese	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Peanut Butter & Jelly	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Potato Chips	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Hot Dog	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
4	1/1 (100%)	---	---	---	---
	---	French Fries	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
	---	Pancake	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
5	3/3 (100%)	---	---	---	---
	---	French Fries	2/2 (100%)	2/2 (100%)	3/3 (100%)
Overall	10/13 (76.9%)	---	32/60 (53.3%)	62/63 (98.4%)	62/63 (98.4%)

a Fraction of saliva replicates collected after eating that are spiked with SARS-CoV-2-positive NP matrix and yield detectable SARS-CoV-2. Fraction also depicted as percentage.

b Fraction of saliva replicates collected in the morning that are spiked with SARS-CoV-2-positive NP matrix and yield detectable SARS-CoV-2. Fraction also depicted as percentage.