Method versatility in RNA extraction-free PCR detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva samples

Orchid M. Allicock[†], Devyn Yolda-Carr[†], Rebecca Earnest[†], Mallery I. Breban[†], Noel Vega[†], Isabel M. Ott[†], Chaney Kalinich[†], Tara Alpert[†], Mary E. Petrone[†], Anne L. Wyllie[†]

[†]Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT 06510, USA

[†]Correspondence: Orchid M. Allicock
60 College Street, New Haven, CT 06510
Phone: +1 (201) 401-4573
Fax: +1 (203) 785-7356
E-mail: orchid.allicock@yale.edu

Original Article

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, heat inactivation, testing

21 **Abstract**

22 Early in the pandemic, a simple, open-source, RNA extraction-free RT-qPCR protocol for
23 SARS-CoV-2 detection in saliva was developed and made widely available. This
24 simplified approach (SalivaDirect) requires only sample treatment with proteinase K prior
25 to PCR testing. However, feedback from clinical laboratories highlighted a need for a
26 flexible workflow that can be seamlessly integrated into their current health and safety
27 requirements for the receiving and handling of potentially infectious samples. To address
28 these varying needs, we explored additional pre-PCR workflows. We built upon the
29 original SalivaDirect workflow to include an initial incubation step (95°C for 30 minutes,
30 95°C for 5 minutes or 65°C for 15 minutes) with or without addition of proteinase K. The
31 limit of detection for the workflows tested did not significantly differ from that of the original
32 SalivaDirect workflow. When tested on de-identified saliva samples from confirmed
33 COVID-19 individuals, these workflows also produced comparable virus detection and
34 assay sensitivities, as determined by RT-qPCR analysis. Exclusion of proteinase K did
35 not negatively affect the sensitivity of the assay. The addition of multiple heat
36 pretreatment options to the SalivaDirect protocol increases the accessibility of this cost-
37 effective SARS-CoV-2 test as it gives diagnostic laboratories the flexibility to implement
38 the workflow which best suits their safety protocols.

39 Introduction

40 Almost two years after the emergence of SARS-CoV-2, diagnostic testing remains an
41 important mitigation strategy. As outbreaks and testing policies evolve and as screening
42 testing has emerged as a key feature enabling communities to safely re-open, labs have
43 had to adapt to the changing needs of their local communities. Throughout, this has often
44 required the rapid implementation of alternative or even novel strategies to meet testing
45 demands. However efforts have been hampered with staffing shortages, supply chain
46 disruptions and slow regulatory approval for alternative test protocols or testing
47 instrumentation. Combined, these challenges highlight a great need for alternative testing
48 strategies that a) utilize locally available and inexpensive testing materials, and b) are
49 easy to adopt in either existing or newly created COVID-19 testing laboratories.

50
51 Alternative testing strategies should fit seamlessly into an existing workflow of a
52 laboratory, while adhering to relevant biosafety and biosecurity requirements. Within the
53 limits imposed by the mandatory Laboratory Biosafety Guidelines for Handling and
54 Processing Specimens issued by governing bodies¹, each laboratory has their own
55 protocols when it comes to the intake and processing of infectious agents. As such,
56 adopting additional protocols to help meet mass testing needs, with limited or no flexibility
57 in the reagents, kits or instrumentation permitted for use, can result in delayed test
58 implementation due to the additional investment required or supply chain disruptions.

59
60 In an effort to increase access to COVID-19 testing by minimizing test implementation
61 challenges, we developed a freely available, open-source saliva-based RT-qPCR

diagnostic assay (SalivaDirect) with a simplified and flexible workflow. Key to this approach was obviating the need for sample collection by trained healthcare personnel, removing the requirement for specific collection devices and transport media, while validating reagents and instrumentation from multiple suppliers to enable laboratories to utilize their existing infrastructure, or when needed, to help circumvent supply chain disruptions.

However, as SalivaDirect was made available to laboratories around the US, the diversity in specimen handling processing requirements when working with potentially infectious samples containing this novel coronavirus limited implementation in some sites. Upon receipt of clinical samples, laboratories employ different strategies for viral inactivation before processing including the addition of solvent/detergents, low pH inactivation, irradiation, or heat^{2, 3}. Previous studies have demonstrated that heat alone is capable of effective viral inactivation of SARS⁴ and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome^{5, 6}, and more recently, also for SARS-CoV-2^{2, 7, 8}. Given the affordability and broad availability of heating sources in clinical laboratories (e.g. heating block/water bath), we sought to explore additional workflows which incorporate heat-pretreatment to permit safer sample handling. Using spiked and clinical saliva samples, we evaluated the effect of thermal incubation of samples on the sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 detection prior to testing in the SalivaDirect assay.

Materials and Methods

Ethics statement and sample collection

For the spiking experiments, the use of de-identified specimens from healthy or SARS-CoV-2-positive individuals was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Yale Human Research Protection Program (FWA00002571, Protocol ID. 2000027690)⁹. For the clinical evaluation of the workflows, de-identified saliva samples were collected using previously developed saliva self-collection protocols¹⁰, and was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Yale Human Research Protection Program (Protocol ID. 2000029876). For both studies, participants were informed in writing about the purpose and procedure of the study, and consented to study participation through the act of providing the saliva sample. All samples were transferred at room temperature to the laboratory, and stored within 12 hours at -80°C until further analysis.

Alternate workflows

Saliva samples were thawed on ice and processed using the seven workflows detailed in Figure 1. Each of the six new workflows (**Figures 1B and 1C**) was compared with the original SalivaDirect protocol (**Figure 1A**). Each sample was first incubated at each of the three different heat pretreatment conditions (65°C for 15 minutes, 95°C for 5 minutes and 95°C for 30 minutes) using a heating block or a thermocycler. After incubation the samples were split into 2 aliquots; 10 µL was stored at 4°C until testing in RT-qPCR, and 50 µL was placed in a separate tube with 2.5 µL (50mg/mL) proteinase K (Thermo Fisher). After vortexing for 1 minute, the samples were incubated at 95°C for 5 minutes to inactivate the proteinase K. Following sample processing, 5 µL of the saliva lysates (either stored at 4°C or treated with proteinase K) were tested using the SalivaDirect real-time RT-qPCR assay¹¹. This assay uses primers and probes from the US CDC, targeting the

nucleocapsid gene (N1 2019-nCoV_N1) and the human RNase P (RP) as an extraction control¹². The RT-qPCR was performed using the Luna Universal Probe One-Step RT-qPCR Kit (New England Biolabs) on the BioRad CFX96 Touch (BioRad, CA). A synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA control from Twist Bioscience (San Francisco, CA) was diluted to 100 copies/ μ L and used as the positive control for N1.

Limit of detection

We performed a limit of detection confirmation study to evaluate the sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 detection when testing samples with a heat-pretreatment step. Samples were prepared by spiking SARS-CoV-2-positive saliva from a healthcare worker diagnosed with COVID-19 with a known virus concentration (3.7×10^4 copies/ μ L) into saliva samples from healthy individuals (negative for SARS-CoV-2 RNA). Spiked saliva samples at concentrations of 50, 25 and 12 copies/ μ L were tested in triplicate, and concentrations of 6, 3, and 1.5 copies/ μ L were tested with 20 individual replicates. All samples were tested using the seven workflows depicted in **Figure 1**. The limit of detection for each workflow was determined to be the lowest concentration at which at least 19/20 replicates were positive for SARS-CoV-2 (cycle threshold (Ct) value <40.0).

Workflow validation with SARS-CoV-2 clinical specimens

We validated each of the different workflows using 20 de-identified clinical saliva specimens which previously tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 using the standard SalivaDirect workflow (Figure 1A). Each sample was processed by each of the six

workflows, and resulting Ct values were compared to those obtained when originally tested by the standard SalivaDirect protocol.

Data analysis

The sensitivity of the different workflows were compared using repeated-measures ANOVA on the Ct values of each replicate or isolate for each workflow, followed by a Tukey post-hoc test to compare individual pairs of conditions. The agreement of Ct values between each of the alternate workflows and original SalivaDirect protocol were assessed using Pearson correlation coefficient. To compare the Ct value in the clinical samples a Wilcoxon signed-rank test was performed. The negative RT-qPCR of the target gene was set at the Ct value of 40 for the statistical analysis. A p value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were conducted with GraphPad Prism 9.1.2 (GraphPad Software, Inc., San Diego, CA).

Results

Limit of detection

The limit of detection (LOD) for the original SalivaDirect protocol (reagents and PCR instrument, depending) is as few as 1.5 copies/ μ L¹³, with the formal LOD recorded at 12 copies/ μ L, reflecting the least sensitive combination of recommended reagents and instruments¹¹. To determine the LOD of the alternate workflows, we tested spiked saliva samples at 50, 25 and 12 virus RNA copies/ μ L in triplicate, all of which were detected by RT-qPCR (**Table S1**). We confirmed the LOD for each workflow by testing 20 replicates of spiked saliva samples at lower viral copies (6, 3 and 1.5 virus RNA copies/ μ L). While

all 20 of the individual replicates of the spiked samples at 6 virus RNA copies/ μ L tested positive for each workflow (**Figure 2, Table 1**), some workflows were more sensitive, with workflows including a heat incubation step of 65°C for 15 minutes without proteinase K, and 95°C for 5 minutes with or without proteinase K having a limit of detection of 3 virus RNA copies/ μ L.

Clinical evaluation of heat treatment workflows

To investigate the agreement between each of the different workflows and the original SalivaDirect protocol, 20 saliva samples which previously tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by SalivaDirect (Ct value range 22.16 - 38.71) were processed using each of the different workflows. There was a median Ct difference in workflows of 0.92 to 6.08 across each of the clinical samples (**Figure 3A**). Ct values from the N1 gene obtained from the original saliva direct workflow correlated with each of the alternate workflows (Pearson $r > 0.9$, $p < 0.0001$) (**Figure S1, Table S2**). The workflow that was significantly less efficient at detecting N1 gene than the original was 95°C for 30 minutes with the added proteinase K step (Δ Ct = 1.46, $p < 0.001$).

We also investigated the impact of proteinase K on the sensitivity of each workflow (**Figure 3B**). While the addition of proteinase K made no difference when the samples were first incubated at 95°C for 5 minutes, the addition of proteinase K following incubation at 65°C for 15 minutes resulted in an increase in sensitivity (median difference in Ct value = -0.53, $p = 0.027$). When the proteinase K was added following incubation at

95°C for 30 minutes however, there was a decrease in sensitivity (median difference in Ct value = 0.79, $p = 0.009$).

The use of the human *RNase P* (RP) control gene in the dualplex PCR helps to monitor for any major degradation or inhibitors in samples. Ct values for RP were significantly higher (indicating reduced detection) for all workflows except when the samples were processed with incubation steps of 65°C for 15 minutes with PK, and 95°C for 5 minutes with PK. None of the saliva samples had Ct values for RP over 35, the threshold for an invalid sample (**Table S2**), demonstrating that none of the workflows negatively affected the quality of the clinical samples.

Discussion

Saliva as a specimen type is underutilized in molecular diagnostics. Prior to 2020, almost all molecular-based diagnostic tests for respiratory infections required nasopharyngeal specimens (e.g aspirate or swabs) with only one test using saliva swabs for the detection of cytomegalovirus ¹⁴. So following the first reports outlining the potential of saliva as a reliable sample type for SARS-CoV-2 detection ^{9, 15, 16} and a means to overcome the numerous challenges that labs were facing with nasopharyngeal swabs, diagnostic and research laboratories alike scrambled to devise guidelines and protocols for the safe handling, processing and storage of potentially infectious saliva specimens. Heating samples on arrival for virus inactivation presents a straightforward approach which can be easily adapted in a range of laboratory settings. As an additional benefit, heating of samples decreases the viscosity of saliva samples ¹⁷, making sample pipetting easier.

198

199 In the current study we investigated the addition of thermal incubation prior to testing
200 saliva samples with the simplified RT-qPCR assay, SalivaDirect, and evaluated the effect
201 of heat pre-treatment on the sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 detection. Although 56°C is
202 commonly used for inactivation of enveloped viruses ¹⁸, higher temperatures have been
203 used for other coronaviruses ⁶. More recently, it has been shown that SARS-CoV-2 viral
204 particles can be inactivated by incubating a sample at 65°C for 15 minutes and 95°C for
205 5 minutes before processing^{7, 8, 19}, without loss of sensitivity in nasopharyngeal swabs
206 and sera ^{2, 7}. While in the current study, we did not confirm the inactivation of SARS-CoV-
207 2 following heat pretreatment, the conditions selected were based on the literature
208 demonstrating the total inactivation of SARS-CoV-2, or, in the case of 95°C for 30 minutes
209 (workflow C), at the request of testing laboratories who were already utilizing this step
210 prior to testing by alternative methods.

211

212 For all workflows investigated, we found a limit of detection of 3 to 6 copies/μL. The
213 robustness of the detection of the N1 gene in saliva has been demonstrated previously,
214 with no significant decrease in sensitivity when exposed to moderate heat ^{10, 20}.
215 Additionally, proteinase K also did not significantly affect the overall sensitivity of detection
216 of the N1 gene (paired t test, $p = 0.247$). Rather, at the lower incubation temperature
217 (65°C for 15 minutes), addition of proteinase K marginally increased the sensitivity of
218 detection as compared to samples processed without proteinase K. It is possible that,
219 while 65°C alone can effectively inactivate SARS CoV-2, this is not as effective at
220 “extracting” all of the virus RNA for RT-qPCR detection. Conversely, the addition of the

proteinase K step to samples incubated at 95°C for 30 minutes significantly decreased the sensitivity of both N1 and RNase P detection when compared to the original SalivaDirect protocol. However, while RP is used as an internal control, the minor differences observed would not affect the outcome of the assay. Proteinase K degrades RNases and assists in preserving RNA integrity, hence it is commonly used in the processing of samples for molecular assays, especially in various extraction-free workflows^{21, 22}. Extraction-free workflows with saliva is no exception, and has been incorporated into many saliva-based extraction-free molecular assays²³⁻²⁶, including SalivaDirect.

The addition of alternate workflows to an already flexible testing framework further support the rapid implementation of the SalivaDirect RT-qPCR assay in diagnostic and research laboratories looking to improve access to SARS-CoV-2 testing in their local communities. Importantly, with the addition of pre-treatment heat steps, these expanded workflows help to prevent the exposure of laboratory personnel directly or indirectly handling potentially SARS-CoV-2-infected samples, while providing flexibility of adaptation into their existing standard operating procedures. One of the unique attributes of SalivaDirect is it is validated with materials from multiple vendors, to minimize the risk of supply chain issues. The option of omitting proteinase K treatment makes this flexible framework even less vulnerable to supply shortages, and more affordable for laboratories - and thus importantly, to their patients. This is especially important for the implementation of mass testing strategies in resource-poor areas, or in low-to-middle income countries

which continue to suffer the brunt of the reagent and laboratory consumables shortages during the pandemic.

Data Availability

All of the data generated from this study is in the Supplementary information.

Author contributions

A.L.W. conceived the study. O.M.A. and R.E. assisted with the coordination and execution of the study. R.E., M.E.P., C.K. and T.A. coordinated sample collection. M.I.B., I.M.O, D.Y-C., O.M.A. and N.V. performed the diagnostic tests. O.M.A. and N.V. analyzed the data. O.M.A. assisted with the design of the statistical analysis. O.M.A., N.V., and A.L.W. wrote and edited the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank the study participants for their time and cooperation. This work was funded by Tempus Labs, Inc (A.L.W), Yale Center for Clinical Investigation TL1 TR001864 (M.E.P.) and Fast Grant from Emergent Ventures at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University (A.L.W).

References

1. CDC: Interim Laboratory Biosafety Guidelines for Handling and Processing Specimens Associated with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/lab-biosafety-guidelines.html>. Last Accessed 2021/11/30.
2. Patterson EI, Prince T, Anderson ER, Casas-Sanchez A, Smith SL, Cansado-Utrilla C, Solomon T, Griffiths MJ, Acosta-Serrano Á, Turtle L, Hughes GL: Methods of Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 for Downstream Biological Assays. J Infect Dis 2020, 222:1462-1467.
3. Darnell MER, Subbarao K, Feinstone SM, Taylor DR: Inactivation of the coronavirus that induces severe acute respiratory syndrome, SARS-CoV. J Virol Methods 2004, 121:85-91.
4. Pagat A-M, Seux-Goepfert R, Lutsch C, Lecouturier V, Saluzzo J-F, Kusters IC: Evaluation of SARS-Coronavirus Decontamination Procedures. Appl Biosaf 2007, 12:100-108.
5. Kampf G, Voss A, Scheithauer S: Inactivation of coronaviruses by heat. J Hosp Infect 2020, 105:348-349.
6. Leclercq I, Batéjat C, Burguière AM, Manuguerra J-C: Heat inactivation of the Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus. Influenza Other Respi Viruses 2014, 8:585-586.
7. Batéjat C, Grassin Q, Manuguerra J-C, Leclercq I: Heat inactivation of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2. J Biosaf Biosecur 2021, 3:1-3.

- 283 8. Smyrlaki I, Ekman M, Lentini A, Rufino de Sousa N, Papanicolaou N, Vondracek
284 M, Aarum J, Safari H, Muradrasoli S, Rothfuchs AG, Albert J, Högberg B, Reinius
285 B: Massive and rapid COVID-19 testing is feasible by extraction-free SARS-CoV-
286 2 RT-PCR. Nat Commun 2020, 11:4812.
- 287 9. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M,
288 Vijayakumar P, Warren JL, Geng B, Muenker MC, Moore AJ, Vogels CBF, Petrone
289 ME, Ott IM, Lu P, Venkataraman A, Lu-Culligan A, Klein J, Earnest R, Simonov M,
290 Datta R, Handoko R, Naushad N, Sewanan LR, Valdez J, White EB, Lapidus S,
291 Kalinich CC, Jiang X, Kim DJ, Kudo E, Linehan M, Mao T, Moriyama M, Oh JE,
292 Park A, Silva J, Song E, Takahashi T, Taura M, Weizman O-E, Wong P, Yang Y,
293 Bermejo S, Odio CD, Omer SB, Dela Cruz CS, Farhadian S, Martinello RA, Iwasaki
294 A, Grubaugh ND, Ko AI: Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection
295 of SARS-CoV-2. N Engl J Med 2020, 383:1283-1286.
- 296 10. Allicock OM, Petrone ME, Yolda-Carr D, Breban M, Walsh H, Watkins AE,
297 Rothman JE, Farhadian SF, Grubaugh ND, Wyllie AL: Usability of saliva collection
298 devices for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics. medRxiv 2021.
- 299 11. Vogels CBF, Watkins AE, Harden CA, Brackney DE, Shafer J, Wang J, Caraballo
300 C, Kalinich CC, Ott IM, Fauver JR, Kudo E, Lu P, Venkataraman A, Tokuyama M,
301 Moore AJ, Muenker MC, Casanovas-Massana A, Fournier J, Bermejo S, Campbell
302 M, Datta R, Nelson A, Yale IRT, Dela Cruz CS, Ko AI, Iwasaki A, Krumholz HM,
303 Matheus JD, Hui P, Liu C, Farhadian SF, Sikka R, Wyllie AL, Grubaugh ND:
304 SalivaDirect: A simplified and flexible platform to enhance SARS-CoV-2 testing
305 capacity. Med (N Y) 2021, 2:263-280.e266.

- 306 12. CDC: Research Use Only 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-time RT-
307 PCR Primers and Probes. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-pcr-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.html)
308 [panel-primer-probes.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.html). Last Accessed 2021/08/09.
- 309 13. FDA: SalivaDirect - EUA Summary. <https://www.fda.gov/media/141192/>. Last
310 Accessed 2021/12/21.
- 311 14. FDA: FDA authorizes first test to aid in detecting a type of herpes virus in newborns
312 called cytomegalovirus. [https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-authorizes-first-test-aid-detecting-type-herpes-virus-newborns-called-cytomegalovirus)
313 [announcements/fda-authorizes-first-test-aid-detecting-type-herpes-virus-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-authorizes-first-test-aid-detecting-type-herpes-virus-newborns-called-cytomegalovirus)
314 [newborns-called-cytomegalovirus](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-authorizes-first-test-aid-detecting-type-herpes-virus-newborns-called-cytomegalovirus). Last Accessed 2021/12/21.
- 315 15. Hanson KE, Barker AP, Hillyard DR, Gilmore N, Barrett JW, Orlandi RR, Shakir
316 SM: Self-Collected Anterior Nasal and Saliva Specimens versus Health Care
317 Worker-Collected Nasopharyngeal Swabs for the Molecular Detection of SARS-
318 CoV-2. J Clin Microbiol 2020, 58.
- 319 16. Byrne RL, Kay GA, Kontogianni K, Aljayyousi G, Brown L, Collins AM, Cuevas
320 LE, Ferreira DM, Fraser AJ, Garrod G, Hill H, Hughes GL, Menzies S, Mitsi E,
321 Owen SI, Patterson EI, Williams CT, Hyder-Wright A, Adams ER, Cubas-Atienzar
322 AI: Saliva Alternative to Upper Respiratory Swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Diagnosis.
323 Emerg Infect Dis 2020, 26:2770-2771.
- 324 17. Sahajpal NS, Mondal AK, Ananth S, Njau A, Ahluwalia P, Newnam G, Lozoya-
325 Colinas A, Hud NV, Kota V, Ross TM, Reid MD, Fulzele S, Chaubey A, Hegde M,
326 Rojiani AM, Kolhe R: SalivaSTAT: Direct-PCR and Pooling of Saliva Samples
327 Collected in Healthcare and Community Setting for SARS-CoV-2 Mass
328 Surveillance. Diagnostics (Basel) 2021, 11.

- 329 18. Gröner A, Broumis C, Fang R, Nowak T, Popp B, Schäfer W, Roth NJ: Effective
330 inactivation of a wide range of viruses by pasteurization. *Transfusion* 2018, 58:41-
331 51.
- 332 19. Burton J, Love H, Richards K, Burton C, Summers S, Pitman J, Easterbrook L,
333 Davies K, Spencer P, Killip M, Cane P, Bruce C, Roberts ADG: The effect of heat-
334 treatment on SARS-CoV-2 viability and detection. *J Virol Methods* 2021,
335 290:114087.
- 336 20. Ott IM, Strine MS, Watkins AE, Boot M, Kalinich CC, Harden CA, Vogels CBF,
337 Casanovas-Massana A, Moore AJ, Muenker MC, Nakahata M, Tokuyama M,
338 Nelson A, Fournier J, Bermejo S, Campbell M, Datta R, Dela Cruz CS, Farhadian
339 SF, Ko AI, Iwasaki A, Grubaugh ND, Wilen CB, Wyllie AL, Yale IRT: Stability of
340 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Nonsupplemented Saliva. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021, 27:1146-
341 1150.
- 342 21. Espy MJ, Patel R, Paya CV, Smith TF: Comparison of three methods for extraction
343 of viral nucleic acids from blood cultures. *J Clin Microbiol* 1995, 33:41-44.
- 344 22. Sung H, Yong D, Ki C-S, Kim J-S, Seong M-W, Lee H, Kim M-N: Comparative
345 evaluation of three homogenization methods for isolating Middle East respiratory
346 syndrome coronavirus nucleic acids from sputum samples for real-time reverse
347 transcription PCR. *Ann Lab Med* 2016, 36:457-462.
- 348 23. Azmi I, Faizan MI, Kumar R, Raj Yadav S, Chaudhary N, Kumar Singh D, Butola
349 R, Ganotra A, Datt Joshi G, Deep Jhingan G, Iqbal J, Joshi MC, Ahmad T: A Saliva-
350 Based RNA Extraction-Free Workflow Integrated With Cas13a for SARS-CoV-2
351 Detection. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2021, 11:632646.

- 352 24. Mahmoud SA, Ganesan S, Ibrahim E, Thakre B, Teddy JG, Raheja P, Abbas WZ:
353 Evaluation of RNA Extraction-Free Method for Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
354 Salivary Samples for Mass Screening for COVID-19. Biomed Res Int 2021, 2021.
- 355 25. de Oliveira CM, Brochi L, Scarpelli LC, Lopes ACW, Levi JE: SARS-CoV-2 saliva
356 testing is a useful tool for Covid-19 diagnosis. J Virol Methods 2021:114241.
- 357 26. Genoud V, Stortz M, Waisman A, Berardino BG, Verner P, Dansey V, Salvatori M,
358 Remes Lenicov F, Levi V: Extraction-free protocol combining proteinase K and
359 heat inactivation for detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-qPCR. PLoS One 2021,
360 16:e0247792.
- 361

Tables

Table 1. The number of replicates of spiked saliva samples which were considered positive following testing in the alternative workflows including heat pre-treatment with or without treatment with proteinase K (PK).

Concentration of spiked saliva (virus RNA copies/ μ L)	65°C for 15 minutes		95°C for 5 minutes		95°C for 30 minutes	
	With PK	Without PK	With PK	Without PK	With PK	Without PK
6 copies/ μ L	20/20*	20/20	20/20	20/20	20/20	20/20
3 copies/ μ L	17/20	20/20	19/20	19/20	12/20	15/20
1.5 copies/ μ L	15/20	17/20	10/20	15/20	8/20	14/20

*Concentrations where at least 19/20 replicates tested positive (indicating the assay limit of detection) are shown in bold.

Figures

Figure 1. Alternative SalivaDirect workflows including heat-pretreatment prior to sample processing. In the original SalivaDirect protocol, (A) raw saliva is combined with proteinase K then followed by heat-inactivation of the proteinase K and testing in RT-qPCR. The alternate workflows include an initial heat treatment step (65°C for 15 minutes, 95°C for 5 minutes or 95°C for 30 minutes), followed by either (B) testing by RT-qPCR directly or (C) the addition and inactivation of proteinase K prior to testing by RT-qPCR. (Figure created with BioRender.com)

Figure 2. Comparison of the sensitivity of the 6 alternate workflows of the SalivaDirect RT-qPCR saliva-based assay for SARS-CoV-2 detection. Each alternative workflow was evaluated by processing spiked positive saliva at (A) 6, (B) 3,

and (C) 1.5 copies/ μ L in 20 replicates, and comparing the CT values as a proxy for workflow sensitivity. Solid lines indicate the median Ct values targeting the N1 gene. The dashed line indicates the detection limit at 40 Ct with samples falling below the dashed line considered negative for SARS-CoV-2. The differences between each of the workflows and the original SalivaDirect protocol were compared by a Wilcoxon test ($p < 0.05$, * = 0.03, ** = 0.001). Data used to make this figure can be found in **Table S1**.
Abbreviations: Ct, cycle threshold; ND, not detected; PK, proteinase K.

Figure 3. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in positive clinical saliva samples across the 7 different workflows. Clinical saliva samples positive for SARS-CoV-2 were used to compare the sensitivities in detection across the 7 workflows. (A) Ct values for each of the 20 clinical samples processed with the different workflows. The solid lines indicate the median Ct values and 95% CI for each sample across the different workflows. Each dot represents an individual replicate of each of the 20 clinical samples as indicated by the dash on the x-axis. (B) We evaluated the effect of proteinase K on the sensitivity of detection between each of 3 different heat treatment conditions by a Wilcoxon test ($p < 0.05$). Matched clinical samples are represented by the solid black line between those processed without proteinase K (blue dots), and those with proteinase K (green dots). The area below the dotted line indicates the detection threshold for the N1 gene. Data used to make this figure can be found in Table S2. (*, $p = 0.027$; **, $p = 0.009$)
Abbreviations: Ct, cycle threshold; ND, not detected; PK, proteinase K.

- 65°C, 15 mins
- 65°C, 15 mins + PK
- 95°C, 5 mins
- 95°C for 5 minutes, PK
- 95°C, 30 mins
- 95°C for 30 minutes, PK
- SalivaDirect

A **B**