

# The accuracy of saliva versus nasopharyngeal and/or oropharyngeal samples for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in children – A rapid systematic review and meta-analysis

Sharonjit K. Dhillon<sup>1</sup>, Petra Schelstraete<sup>2</sup>, Laura Cornelissen<sup>1</sup>, Yves Lafort<sup>1</sup>, Jesper Bonde<sup>3</sup>, M. Arbyn<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Sciensano, Brussels, Belgium

<sup>2</sup> UZ Gent, Department of Paediatric Pulmonology and Infectious Diseases

<sup>3</sup> Molecular Pathology Laboratory, Dept. Pathology, Copenhagen University Hospital - Amager and Hvidovre Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark

\* Corresponding author

**Correspondence:** Marc Arbyn, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Sciensano, J. Wytsmanstreet 14, B1050 Brussels, Belgium.

E-mail: [marc.arbyn@sciensano.be](mailto:marc.arbyn@sciensano.be)

## KEYWORDS

SARS-CoV-2; children; diagnostic test accuracy; saliva; COVID-19

## **Abstract**

### **Background**

The comparative performance of saliva and nasopharyngeal samples for the detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection by reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) in children remains unclear. As schools reopen around the world, there is an interest in the use of saliva samples for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in children to circumvent barriers with nasopharyngeal sampling. We systematically reviewed the literature to understand the performance of saliva sampling using RT-PCR on naso- and/or oropharyngeal swabs as the reference standard.

### **Methods**

Articles from PubMed/MEDLINE and Living Evidence were accessed until 28<sup>th</sup> April 2021. A search method without restriction to children population was applied and during the review phase, if a study included patients <18 years old, authors were contacted to provide additional information on the subset of children. Studies were eligible if they reported on matched saliva and naso- and/or oropharyngeal samples, taken from the same patient on the same day. Studies using other respiratory samples such as sputum samples were excluded. Each paired patient sample had to be tested on the same RT-PCR platform.

### **Results**

Ten studies were included, comprising 1486 matched saliva and on naso- and/or oropharyngeal pairs from children aged 0 to 18 years old. The pooled absolute sensitivity and specificity of saliva sampling using RT-PCR on nasopharyngeal samples as the reference standard was 84.5% (95% CI; 78.0%-90.3%) and 99.5% (95% CI; 98.2%-100.0%). Comparable performance of saliva to nasopharyngeal samples was shown in both symptomatic and asymptomatic children. Stratified analyses of various covariates showed no significant differences.

### **Discussion**

Our pooled accuracy estimates of RT-PCR SARS-CoV-2 testing on saliva in children did not seem to be different from meta-analyses of studies that enrolled mainly adults. Saliva could potentially be considered an alternative sampling method for screening in children and to pick up those with high viral load.

## Introduction

The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) was initially reported in Wuhan, China at the end of 2019. Since then, the world has witnessed the devastating impact of this pandemic with over 2.75 million deaths and 123 million cases as of March 2021<sup>1</sup>. In the midst of this pandemic, children and adolescents are seen as a distinct population as they rarely develop severe or critical illness. Compared to adults, children infected with SARS-CoV-2 are less likely to exhibit symptoms or have mild, non-specific symptoms<sup>2,3</sup>. Additionally, despite a majority of children exhibiting mild disease, children can actively transmit SARS-CoV-2 to others. With the reopening of schools worldwide, there is an interest in testing in children for SARS-CoV-2 to identify new clusters of infection early and prevent outbreaks and unnecessary school closures. Hence, the need for easy and repeated sampling is essential to ensure this.

Nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS) for nucleic acid amplification testing (NAAT) are regarded as the gold standard for the identification of SARS-CoV-2. NPS are obtained through the insertion of swabs with the purpose to reach the deepest area of the nasopharynx. This invasive method sometimes is difficult and uncomfortable, especially in children. In general, children are often uncooperative and may be anxious during sampling, increasing the risk of trauma and unwillingness to be tested. On top of that, NPS sampling requires trained healthcare personnel for collection and can increase the risk of nosocomial viral transmission as the procedure often induces cough and sneezing.

Alternate sampling methods, specifically saliva, have been the subject of recent research. The ease and non-invasive nature of saliva collection and the possibility of self-sampling have the potential to address many of the barriers associated with NPS sampling, especially in paediatric populations. Hence, there is a need to understand the comparative sensitivity of saliva and the NPS for SARS-CoV-2 detection in children. A preliminary search on public bibliographic databases, including peer-reviewed and preprint articles showed that paediatric evidence for the use of saliva specimens by RT-PCR is sparse and suffers from methodological limitations. Therefore, we contacted authors of eligible studies involving children and requested outcome data for paediatric strata. These data allowed us to conduct for the first time a systematic review and meta-analysis on the accuracy of SARS-CoV-2 assays applied on paired saliva and NPS in children.

## Methods

### Search strategy and selection criteria

A search method without restriction to population was applied. During the review phase, if a study included patients <18 years old, authors were contacted to provide additional information on the subset of the children population. We searched the databases PubMed/MEDLINE and Living Evidence (see appendix for the clinical questions and search terms used). Living Evidence is an initiative from the University of Bern which includes live search results using application programming interfaces (API) to collect daily citation data from peer-reviewed medical bibliographic databases (PUBMED, Embase) as well as preprints indexed in *bioRxiv* and *medRxiv* databases. The applied search strings are in the appendix (p 1). Additionally, relevant studies were retrieved by screening the reference lists of searched studies. Studies were eligible for inclusion if the following criteria were fulfilled: a matched saliva and naso- and/or oropharyngeal sample taken from the same patient on the same day. Studies using other respiratory samples such as sputum samples, were excluded. Each paired patient sample had to be tested on the same RT-PCR platform. Where primary data was not included in the article, we contacted authors to provide additional accuracy data whenever possible.

For this systematic review and meta-analysis, we followed the PRISMA guidelines for reporting meta-analyses<sup>4</sup>. Additional details on the Population-Intervention-Comparator-Outcome-Target Condition-Study (PICOTS) and the review question are described in the appendix (p 2).

### Clinical questions, data extraction and quality assessment


We aimed to answer the following research question: what is the absolute sensitivity and specificity of saliva compared to the standard nasopharyngeal samples for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in children? We analysed studies including symptomatic and asymptomatic children who were tested for SARS-CoV-2 infection and children undergoing screening for SARS-CoV-2 infection as part of a screening programme or as close contacts of a confirmed COVID-19 case. Children with confirmed COVID-19 undergoing retesting were also included. Two authors (SKD and MA) independently screened articles and extracted the data using a standardized data sheet, which was completed with information on study country, population and symptom status, age, index specimen collected (self-collected or supervised), the technique used to collect index specimen, comparator specimen, the time between sample collection and testing, device and medium used for index and comparator samples, SARS-CoV-2 assay used and gene targets. Patient-paired data was used to construct 2x2 contingency tables. Risk of bias and applicability concerns were assessed using the adapted Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies 2 (QUADAS-2) tool<sup>5</sup>. The two reviewers assessed the findings for agreement and disagreements were solved through consensus after discussion.

## Statistical analysis

Stata (Stat version 16, StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA) was used to conduct meta-analytical pooling using random effect models of binomial data. Pool proportions were analysed with the command *metaprop*<sup>6</sup>. We produced results of the systematic review in forest plots. A continuity correction was applied when a cell of the contingency table contained zero. Heterogeneity among studies was assessed by Cochran's Q-test (p-value below 0.05 was defined as statistically significant) and by the inconsistency index ( $I^2$ ) which describes the proportion of total heterogeneity due to inter-study variation<sup>7</sup>. To investigate possible factors to heterogeneity, we conducted sub-group meta-analyses. We analysed the following covariates; symptom status, the method used for saliva collection and variation between pre-print and peer-reviewed studies. We considered the heterogeneity in the study findings through visual inspection of forest plots and by the p-value of inter-group heterogeneity. Statistical tests were two-sided and statistical significance was defined as p values of less than 0.05.

## Results

We identified 518 articles (published and preprints) of which 415 were excluded after review of title and abstract (**Figure 1**). 103 papers were retained and assessed for full-text eligibility and 89 papers were excluded as they did not include children (individuals aged <18 years). Out of the 14 papers<sup>8-21</sup> which fulfilled our eligibility criteria, we requested additional accuracy data for 9 papers of which we obtained 5. The final 10<sup>8,10-17,21</sup> studies included in the meta-analysis comprised 5 studies for which data was received from authors and 5 studies where data was available in the original article. Two studies<sup>12,15</sup> included 2 separate datasets each, hence a total number of 12 datasets from 10 studies were included in the final analyses.



**Figure 1.** PRISMA Flow Diagram

## Description of included studies

The 10 included studies comprised of 6 peer-reviewed and 4 pre-print articles. In total, 1486 patients with matched saliva and nasopharyngeal swabs were included. The studies varied by setting and patient population, with four studies from Europe, two from Asia, two from the US and one study each from Canada and Brazil. The age of the included children ranged from 1 to 18 years.

Most studies included outpatient individuals being screened for SARS-CoV-2 infection who were either symptomatic or/and asymptomatic but were close contacts of a SARS-CoV-2 positive case. However, one study included confirmed COVID-19 hospitalised patients<sup>16</sup> undergoing retesting. Three studies had only symptomatic patients and one study only asymptomatic ones. The remaining six studies included both asymptomatic and symptomatic patients, but only one study<sup>17</sup> provided stratified data based on symptom status. All of the studies utilised nasopharyngeal swabs collected by healthcare workers as the comparator test except for two studies<sup>10,14</sup> which included nasopharyngeal and/or oropharyngeal swabs. Different techniques for saliva collection were used: general spitting technique in 5 studies<sup>8,11,12,15,21</sup>, drooling method in one study<sup>13</sup>, posterior oropharyngeal spitting technique (by asking children to clear their throats thoroughly and collect saliva) in one study<sup>17</sup> and 3 studies did not report the saliva collection technique<sup>10,14,16</sup>. In addition to the usual saliva collection, one study collected saliva after oropharyngeal washing<sup>12</sup> (where patients were asked to gargle 2ml of saline solution 1-2 minutes prior to saliva collection). In another study<sup>15</sup>, gargle samples were collected after children were asked to swish 5ml of 0.9% saline solution in their mouths and the contents were emptied into a container (full technique described in **Table 1**).

The volume of saliva collected was less than 2ml in four studies, between 2-4ml in two studies and more than 5ml of saliva in two studies. Four studies did not report the volume of saliva collected for molecular testing.

Although saliva collection is more comfortable than NPS sampling in children, obtaining an appropriate saliva specimen still can be challenging, particularly among infants. Delaney et al<sup>10</sup> reported that 2% of patients were unable to provide sufficient volume (1-2ml) of saliva for testing. The authors recommended the age cut off of five years and older for saliva sampling as many of those younger than five were unable to provide saliva samples for testing. They also observe that children over the age of five years portrayed the developmental maturity to provide a sufficient volume of saliva whereas those younger than five years required more time. Difficulty in obtaining saliva samples was also reported by Fernández-González et al<sup>12</sup> where 54 patients with a median age of 5.8 years old were unable to provide saliva specimens. Transport media for saliva specimens were used in two studies whereas six studies collected saliva specimens without transport medium. Nine studies collected saliva specimens in sterile containers or cups whereas one study used wide plastic tubes. Reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assays were used in all studies, with eight studies utilising commercial assays and two studies utilising in-house


laboratory-developed and validated assays. An overview of all study characteristics is summarised in **Table 1**; characteristics related to sample collection and testing are summarised in **Table 2**. The QUADAS-2 tabular summary and graphical summary is provided in the supplementary material (*p 9*). Additionally, a short summary of each the studies included and the 2x2 contingency tables are provided in supplementary (*p 4*).

### **Meta-analysis**

In total, we included 1486 paired saliva and nasopharyngeal samples obtained from children ages 1-18 years old. In the meta-analysis, we obtained a pooled absolute saliva sensitivity of 84.5% (95% CI; 78.0%-90.3%) Heterogeneity  $I^2$  was 23%. The pooled absolute specificity was 99.5% (95% CI; 98.2%-100.0%). Individual study estimates of sensitivity and specificity can be seen in Figure 2. The highest sensitivity of 93.3% (95% CI; 78.7%-98.2%) was observed by Huber et al where saliva was collected by asking asymptomatic and symptomatic children to clear their throat to include sample material from the back of the oropharynx for specimen collection. Stratified comparison of symptom status did not show a significant difference in sensitivity. Table 3 shows results stratified by different study characteristics. Often stratifying information was not reported. None of the stratifying variables had a significant impact on the accuracy estimates.

We also performed a post hoc analysis restricted to peer-reviewed studies (*Supplementary Figure 2, p11*) and found a slightly higher pooled sensitivity of 88.5% (95% CI; 80.9%-94.8%) and a similar specificity of 99.3 (95% CI; 97.7%-100.0%).





**Figure 2. a)** Absolute sensitivity and **b)** absolute specificity of saliva in children (<18 years old) using RT-PCR on nasopharyngeal samples as reference standard stratified by symptomatic status

Note: \* Saliva samples were collected after oropharyngeal washing

\*\* Han et al was excluded in the specificity analysis as there were no negative cases

**Table 3.** Stratified pooled estimates of saliva for SARS-CoV-2 detection using RT-PCR on nasopharyngeal samples as a reference in children by study characteristics

<b>Study Characteristic</b>	<b>Studies, n</b>	<b>Sensitivity (95% CI)</b>	<b>Specificity (95% CI)</b>
<b>Population</b>			
Symptomatic	3	84.2 (52.9-97.8)	100.0 (99.7-100.0)
Asymptomatic	1	87.5 (52.9-97.8)	100.0 (96.8-100.0)
Symptomatic and asymptomatic	6	82.8 (72.7-91.3)	97.6 (95.3-99.3)
Heterogeneity between groups		p=1.0	p=0.1
<b>SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis</b>			
Suspicious	9	85.1 (78.3-91.0)	99.5 (98.2-100.0)
Confirmed	1	72.7 (43.4-90.3)	**
Heterogeneity between groups		p=0.4	-
<b>Peer-reviewed</b>			
Yes	6	85.6 (76.3-93.2)	99.3 (97.4-100.0)
No	4	80.8 (68.0-91.4)	99.3 (97.1-100.0)
Heterogeneity between groups		p=0.7	p=0.2
<b>Index sample*</b>			
Saliva	10	83.6 (76.2-90.2)	99.1 (76.2-100.0)
Oropharyngeal washing	1	75.0 (30.1-95.4)	100.0 (51.0-100.0)
Saline gargle	1	90.0 (59.6-98.2)	98.1(89.9-99.7)
Heterogeneity between groups		p=0.8	p=0.9
<b>Reference sample</b>			
Nasopharyngeal samples	8	86.5 (80.5-91.8)	99.4 (98.0-100.0)
Naso/oropharyngeal sample	2	71.6 (50.9-89.0)	100.0 (99.0-100.0)
Heterogeneity between groups		p=0.2	p=0.01
<b>Saliva transport medium</b>			
Unpreserved	4	88.4 (78.9-95.9)	100.0 (99.9-100.0)
Viral Transport Medium	2	87.4 (81.0-92.8)	97.8 (96.2-99.0)
Unreported	4	73.2 (61.8-83.4)	95.9 (88.9-99.8)
Heterogeneity between groups		p=0.03	p=0.2
*2 studies included 2 datasets each with different saliva sampling technique			
** No specificity estimate since the study was restricted to confirmed SARS-CoV-2 carriers (as defined by presence of viral RNA in nasopharyngeal specimens)			

## Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis on the accuracy of SARS-CoV-2 assays applied on paired saliva and nasopharyngeal swabs in children. We addressed a highly relevant public health concern when it comes to testing for SARS-CoV-2 in children. We identified 10 studies with primary data extracted from original articles as well as data provided directly by authors. In our meta-analysis, we found a pooled sensitivity of 84.5% and a pooled specificity of 99.5% for SARS-CoV-2 detection in saliva with RT-PCR using nasopharyngeal samples as reference. We were unable to demonstrate that the performance of saliva varied by symptom status. However, given the lack of symptom information, we cannot ascertain that symptom status does influence the sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 testing on saliva. We, therefore, plan on contacting authors to provide more information about symptomatic status.

The results from our meta-analysis show that the sensitivity and specificity of saliva sampling in children are similar to adults and the general population. Previous systematic reviews and meta-analysis in adults showed pooled sensitivity ranges of 83.2%-86.9% and specificity of 98.9%<sup>22,23</sup>. This shows that the accuracy of saliva for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in children is similar to adults.

Limitations of our study are the lack of data stratified by symptoms and stage of infection in the included studies. It has been demonstrated that the stage of infection during sample collection can contribute to test sensitivity differences. It would have been valuable to compare the sensitivity of saliva in more detail in symptomatic and asymptomatic children. Many studies in our meta-analysis included both symptomatic and asymptomatic children in their studies without clear stratification. Besides, most of the studies included an outpatient population. Studies that included critically ill and hospitalised children were lacking and hence our findings may not be applicable to this setting. Additionally, we assumed nasopharyngeal samples as the reference standard which is an imperfect diagnostic test. Some studies have shown that SARS-CoV-2 remained detectable in saliva while NPS tested negative<sup>24,25</sup>.

In conclusion, we found that the accuracy of saliva for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR in children was similar to results seen in the adult population.

## Acknowledgements

SKD and MA would like to acknowledge the VALCOR<sup>26</sup> project funded by emergency funding from the Federal Belgian Government.

We thank the following authors for providing us with additional data and information that lead to the success of this meta-analysis;

Dr Didzis Gavars (*E. Gulbja Laboratory, Riga, Latvia*),

Dr David Goldfarb (*Associate Head at the Department of Pathology & Lab Medicine, BC Children's & Women's Hospital*),

Dr Félix Gutiérrez Rodero (*Professor of Medicine at the Infectious Diseases Unit Hospital General Universitat d'Elx & Universidad Miguel Hernández Alicante, Spain*),

Dr Meghan Delaney (*Director, Transfusion Medicine and Division Chief, Pathology & Laboratory Medicine Division from the Children's National Hospital, Washington USA*),

Dr Joseph Campos (*Director of Microbiology Laboratory from the Children's National Hospital, Washington USA*) and

Dr Jennifer Dien Bard

(*Director, Clinical Microbiology and Virology Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Children's Hospital Los Angeles, USA*).

**Table 1.** Study characteristic of included studies

Study	Country	Age range	Population & symptomatic status	Number of paired samples	Saliva collection	Collection of saliva sample	Reference specimen
Felix <sup>†</sup> 2021	Brazil	Mean age 10.24 years	-Outpatients undergoing SARS-CoV-2 testing  -Mild symptomatic patients	n=50	Saliva	Children were asked to spit into a sterile container for collection of about 1ml of saliva	Nasopharyngeal swabs
Fougère <sup>‡</sup> 2021	Switzerland	1-18 years  Mean age 12.7 years	-Outpatients undergoing SARS-CoV-2 testing  -Symptomatic patients	n=397	Saliva	Saliva was collected by drooling method Volume of saliva collected not reported	Nasopharyngeal swabs
Goldfärb 2021	Canada	4-14 years	-Patients presenting at outpatient centre for SARS-CoV-2 testing  -Symptomatic patients	n=7 (Saliva/NPS)  n=14 (Gargle samples/NPS)	1. Saliva (Self-collected)  2. Gargle Samples	1. For saliva, children were asked to pool and spit saliva repeatedly until at least 5 – 10 ml were collected  2. Gargle samples were collected after contents of 5ml of 0.9% saline were squeezed into child's open mouth. Children were asked to swish contents for 5 seconds followed by tilting their heads back and gargling for 5 seconds. Process was repeated 2 more times and saline was emptied into empty container.	Nasopharyngeal swabs
Gonzalez 2021	Spain	4 -14 years	- Outpatients symptomatic & asymptomatic undergoing SARS-CoV-2 testing  - Asymptomatic 42, symptomatic 55 (data not stratified)	n=41 (Saliva/NPS pairs)  n=56 (Oropharyngeal washing/NPS pairs)	1. Saliva (supervised-collection)  2. Oropharyngeal washing	1. Saliva specimen collected by asking patients to repeatedly spit up to a minimum of 1 ml of saliva into the collection pot  2. Oropharyngeal washing with 2 ml of saline solution for 1-2 minutes prior to the collection	Nasopharyngeal swabs
Huber 2021	Switzerland	5-17 years	-Outpatients undergoing SARS-CoV-2 testing  - Symptomatic & asymptomatic (data stratified)	n=170	Saliva* (Self-collected)	Individuals were asked to clear their throat thoroughly and collect saliva one or two times into the same tube (0.5-1ml)  Enhanced saliva collection : individuals were asked to clear their throat three times and collect saliva into the same tube (0.5-1ml)	Nasopharyngeal swabs

Study	Country	Age range	Population & symptomatic status	Number of paired samples	Saliva collection	Collection of saliva sample	Reference specimen
Suwaidi 2021	UAE	3-18 years	-Community based screening centres for closed contacts with confirmed COVID-19 patients, presence of presumptive symptoms or testing for return to school.  -Symptomatic & asymptomatic (data not stratified)	n=485	Saliva (Self-collected)	Participants were asked to close their mouths and allow saliva to pool in mouth for 1-2 minutes and gently spit 1-3 ml of saliva in the container	Nasopharyngeal swabs
Delaney <sup>†</sup> 2020	USA	9-20 years	-Individuals tested for COVID-19 in emergency department and peri-operative testing program  -41 asymptomatic, 5 symptomatic (data not stratified)	n=46	Saliva	1-2 ml saliva collected. Collection technique not reported.	Nasopharyngeal & oropharyngeal swabs
Gavars <sup>†</sup> 2020	Latvia	5-17 years	-Individuals who were contact persons of confirmed COVID-19 persons.  -All asymptomatic	n=125	Saliva (Self-collected)	NR	Nasopharyngeal & oropharyngeal swabs
Han 2020	South Korea	<18 years	-In patient confirmed COVID-19 patients  -Symptomatic & asymptomatic	n=11	Saliva	NR	Nasopharyngeal swabs
Yee 2020	USA	4-17 years	-In-patient, out-patient and household members of previously diagnosed COVID-19 positive individuals  -Symptomatic & asymptomatic	n=93	Saliva (Self-collected)	3 ml of saliva was self-collected under observation of HCW, patients were asked to work up saliva by gently rubbing the outside of their cheeks and gently spitting without coughing or clearing their throats	Nasopharyngeal swabs

**Abbreviations:**

NR= not reported, HCW = healthcare workers

**Notes**

\*Saliva was collected by asking patients to clear throat and included sampling material from posterior oropharynx

<sup>†</sup> Pre-print studies

**Table 2.** Characteristics related to collection and testing of included studies

Study	Time between sample collection & testing	Collection devices and transport media		SARS-CoV-2 assay & gene targets	Sample laboratory handling issues
		Saliva	Nasopharyngeal specimen		
Felix <sup>†</sup> 2021	Samples were immediately stored at 4°C until being taken to laboratory (<48 hours)	Sterile container  Without transport medium	NR	Altona RealStar® SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR Kit 1.0 (Altona Diagnostics GmbH, Hamburg, Germany)	NR
Fougère <sup>†</sup> 2021	Samples were sent the same day or the next day to the laboratory for molecular testing.	Plastic tube  Viral transport medium	NR  Viral transport medium	Laboratory developed and validated test  E - gene	NR
Goldfärb 2021	Samples were immediately brought to the laboratory and processed within 12 hours of collection	Leakbuster™ 90 ml container, Starplex Scientific, Etobicoke, Ontario, Canada  Wide mouth sterile empty polypropylene container (for both gargle and saliva samples)	Nasopharyngeal Flocked Swabs  3 ml universal viral transport medium	Lab Developed Test (QiaSymphony extraction followed by RT-PCR on ABI 7500) and Xpert SARS-CoV-2 (Cepheid) - Matched sample were performed on the same RT-PCR assay  E and RdRp gene	Nucleic acid extraction performed
Gonzalez 2021	NSP and Saliva samples were transported to the lab within 2 hours of samples collection 1. NPS analysed immediately 2. Saliva specimen frozen at -20 C and analysed within 2 weeks of collection	100 ml sterile empty container  Without transport medium	Mini-tip swab  Sterile transport medium containing Guanidine salt (MoleBioScience, SUNGO Europe B.V. Amsterdam Netherlands)	LightMix Modular SARS-CoV-2 (COVID19), TIB MOLBIOL, Berlin, Germany, Roche  E-gene	Nucleic acid extraction performed

Study	Time between sample collection & testing	Collection devices and transport media		SARS-CoV-2 assay & gene targets	Sample laboratory handling issues
		Saliva	Nasopharyngeal specimen		
Huber 2021	Both specimens were immediately sent for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing. All testing for NPS and saliva was done in parallel on the same day.	Wide plastic tube for saliva collection (Sarsted)  3 mL Viral Transport Medium VTM (Axonlab)	Regular swabs  Different transport mediums; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cobas PCR Medium (Roche, Basel, Switzerland)</li> <li>Liquid Amies preservation medium (Copan, Bettlach, Switzerland)</li> <li>Virus Preservative Medium (Improviral, Singapore)</li> <li>In-house VTM (HEPES (4-(2-hydroxyethyl)-1-piperazineethanesulfonic acid), Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium (DMEM), foetal calf serum (FCS), antibiotics and anti-mycotics)</li> </ul>	Cobas SARS-CoV-2 IVD test (Roche)  E and ORF1ab gene	NR
Suwaidi 2021	NR	Sterile container  Without transport medium	NP swabs  Greiner Bio-One universal transport system (Greiner Bio-One, Kremsmünster, Austria)	Allplex™ 2019-nCoV Assay (Seegene, Seoul, South Korea)  N, E and RdRp genes	Samples were processed using validated RNA extraction and SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR protocol used in the Dubai Health Authority virology laboratory
Delaney <sup>†</sup> 2020	NR	Urine cup (1-2ml) & SpectrumDNA saliva collection kit tube with standard collection volume (3ml)  Without transport medium	NP Swabs  Viral transport medium	Allplex™ 2019-nCoV Assay (Seegene, Seoul, South Korea)  N, E and RdRp genes	NR
Gavars <sup>†</sup> 2020	NPS and Saliva samples were transported to laboratory within 24 hours and tested immediately upon arrival	Specimen container  Without transport medium	NR	Laboratory developed and validated test  S & N genes	Samples were pre-treated by adding 1 ml of phosphate-buffered-saline (PBS)  Extraction of RNA identical for both swab and saliva



Study	Time between sample collection & testing	Collection devices and transport media		SARS-CoV-2 assay & gene targets	Sample laboratory handling issues
		Saliva	Nasopharyngeal specimen		
Han 2020	NR	NR	NR	Allplex 2019-nCoV Assay kit  N gene, S gene or ORF1ab gene	NR
Yee 2020	Samples were either sent to the clinical laboratory within 1 hour from collection or stored at 4°C and sent to the clinical laboratory within 4 hours from collection. Samples were stored at 4°C and tested within 48 hours from collection or stored at -80°C prior to testing.	Sterile cup  Without transport medium	NPS-swabs  Viral transport medium	TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit (Thermo Fisher)  S & N genes	Nucleic acid extraction performed

**Abbreviations:**

NR= not reported, NPS = nasopharyngeal swab

**Notes**

† Pre-print studies

## References

1. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. COVID-19 Situation Update Worldwide, as of week 13, updated 8 April 2021. <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/geographical-distribution-2019-ncov-cases> (accessed 12 April 2021).
2. Ludvigsson JF. Systematic review of COVID-19 in children shows milder cases and a better prognosis than adults. *Acta Paediatrica* 2020; **109**(6): 1088-95.
3. Ruggiero A, Sanguinetti M, Gatto A, Attinà G, Chiaretti A. Diagnosis of COVID-19 infection in children: Less nasopharyngeal swabs, more saliva. *Acta Paediatr* 2020; **109**(9): 1913-4.
4. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev* 2015; **4**: 1.
5. Whiting PF, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, et al. QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. *Ann Intern Med* 2011; **155**(8): 529-36.
6. Nyaga VN, Arbyn M, Aerts M. Metaprop: a Stata command to perform meta-analysis of binomial data. *Arch Public Health* 2014; **72**(1): 39.
7. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2003; **327**(7414): 557-60.
8. Al Suwaidi H, Senok A, Varghese R, et al. Saliva for molecular detection of SARS-CoV-2 in school-age children. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*.
9. Chong CY, Kam K-Q, Li J, et al. Saliva is not a useful diagnostic specimen in children with Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 2020: c1aa1376.
10. Delaney M, Simpson J, Thomas B, et al. The Use of Saliva as a Diagnostic Specimen for SARS CoV-2 Molecular Diagnostic Testing for Pediatric Patients. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.11.11.20223800.
11. Felix AC, de Paula AV, Ribeiro AC, et al. Saliva as a Reliable Sample for COVID-19 Diagnosis in Paediatric Patients. *medRxiv* 2021: 2021.03.29.21254566.
12. Fernández-González M, Agulló V, de la Rica A, et al. Performance of Saliva Specimens for the Molecular Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in the Community Setting: Does Sample Collection Method Matter? *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2021; **59**(4): e03033-20.
13. Fougère Y, Schwob JM, Miauton A, et al. Performance of RT-PCR on saliva specimens compared to nasopharyngeal swabs for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in children: A prospective comparative clinical trial. *medRxiv* 2021: 2021.02.27.21252571.
14. Gavars D, Gavars M, Perminovs D, et al. Saliva as testing sample for SARS-CoV-2 detection by RT-PCR in low prevalence community setting. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.10.20.20216127.
15. Goldfarb DM, Tilley P, Al-Rawahi GN, et al. Self-Collected Saline Gargle Samples as an Alternative to Health Care Worker-Collected Nasopharyngeal Swabs for COVID-19 Diagnosis in Outpatients. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2021; **59**(4): e02427-20.
16. Han MS, Seong M-W, Kim N, et al. Viral RNA Load in Mildly Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Children with COVID-19, Seoul, South Korea. *Emerging infectious diseases* 2020; **26**(10): 2497-9.
17. Huber M, Schreiber PW, Scheier T, et al. High Efficacy of Saliva in Detecting SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR in Adults and Children. *Microorganisms* 2021; **9**(3): 642.

18. Kam K-Q, Yung CF, Maiwald M, et al. Clinical Utility of Buccal Swabs for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Detection in Coronavirus Disease 2019-Infected Children. *Journal of the Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society* 2020; **9**(3): 370-2.
19. Kandel C, Zheng J, McCready J, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 from Saliva as Compared to Nasopharyngeal Swabs in Outpatients. *Viruses* 2020; **12**(11).
20. Skolimowska K, Rayment M, Jones R, Madona P, Moore LSP, Randell P. Non-invasive saliva specimens for the diagnosis of COVID-19: caution in mild outpatient cohorts with low prevalence. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2020; **26**(12): 1711-3.
21. Yee R, Truong TT, Pannaraj PS, et al. Saliva Is a Promising Alternative Specimen for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Children and Adults. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2021; **59**(2): e02686-20.
22. Bastos ML, Perlman-Arrow S, Menzies D, Campbell JR. The Sensitivity and Costs of Testing for SARS-CoV-2 Infection With Saliva Versus Nasopharyngeal Swabs : A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2021.
23. Butler-Laporte G, Lawandi A, Schiller I, et al. 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; **181**(3): 353-60.
24. Azzi L, Carcano G, Dalla Gasperina D, Sessa F, Maurino V, Baj A. Two cases of COVID-19 with positive salivary and negative pharyngeal or respiratory swabs at hospital discharge: A rising concern. *Oral Dis* 2020.
25. Zhang W, Du RH, Li B, et al. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2020; **9**(1): 386-9.
26. Sciensano. VALCOR - VALidation of SARS-CORona Virus-2 assays. <https://www.sciensano.be/en/projects/validation-sars-corona-virus-2-assays> [Date accessed; 14th May 2021].