

1 **Research note**

2

3 **A combined oro-nasopharyngeal swab is more sensitive than**
4 **mouthwash in detecting SARS-CoV-2 by a high-throughput PCR**
5 **assay**

6

7 Wiebke Michel¹, Jacqueline Färber¹, Milica Dilas¹, Ina Tammer¹, Jannik Baar¹, Achim
8 J. Kaasch¹

9

10 Otto-von-Guericke-university Magdeburg, Medical faculty, Institute of Medical
11 Microbiology and Hospital Hygiene

12

13 Leipziger Str. 44, D-39120 Magdeburg, Germany

14 **Phone** +49-391-67-13392

15 **Fax** +49-391-67-13384

16 Email: achim.kaasch@med.ovgu.de

17

18

19

20 **Abstract**

21
22 **Objectives:** The optimal diagnostic specimen to detect SARS-CoV-2 by PCR in the
23 upper respiratory tract is unclear. Mouthwash fluid has been reported as an alternative
24 to nasopharyngeal and oropharyngeal swabs. We compared mouthwash fluid with a
25 combined oro-nasopharyngeal swab regarding test performance.

26 **Methods:** We tested asymptomatic persons with a previous diagnosis of COVID-19
27 and their household contacts. First, a mouthwash (gargling for at least 5 sec) with
28 sterile water was performed. Then, with a single flocked swab the back of the throat
29 and subsequently the nasopharynx were sampled. Samples were inactivated and
30 analysed on a Roche cobas 6800® system with the Roche SARS-CoV-2 test.

31 **Results:** Of 76 persons, 39 (51%) tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by oro-
32 nasopharyngeal swab. Mouthwash detected 13 (17%) of these infections but did not
33 detect any additional infection. Samples that were positive in both tests, had lower
34 cycle threshold (Ct)-values for oro-nasopharyngeal samples, indicating a higher virus
35 concentration, compared to samples only positive in oro-nasopharyngeal swabs.

36 **Conclusions:** Mouthwash is not as sensitive as combined oro-nasopharyngeal swab
37 in detecting upper respiratory tract infection.

38

39

40

41 **Introduction**

42 In December 2019, a new lung disease called Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
43 first appeared in Wuhan, China, and subsequently spread globally [1]. The causative
44 agent is the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). SARS-
45 CoV-2 is an enveloped, single-stranded positive-sense RNA virus. Together with
46 SARS-1 and MERS coronavirus it is classified in the *Orthocoronaviridae* subfamily,
47 genus *Betacoronavirus* [2].

48 SARS-CoV-2 is efficiently transmitted from person to person by respiratory droplets [3,
49 4]. Rapid and accurate detection of the virus is essential to contain outbreaks. The
50 most suitable diagnostic specimen is still unclear, as the virus is detectable in different
51 respiratory specimens, urine, and stool [5, 6]. One recommended diagnostic specimen
52 for SARS-CoV-2 detection is the nasopharyngeal swab [7], but combined naso-
53 oropharyngeal swabs can increase the sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 detection [4]. A meta-
54 analysis of different SARS-CoV-2 studies showed the highest detection rates in
55 sputum, followed by nasopharyngeal and then oropharyngeal swab samples [8]. In
56 severe cases of COVID-19 or at later stages in the disease, SARS-CoV-2 can be
57 detected in samples from the lower respiratory tract, such as sputum or bronchial
58 aspirate [9].

59 Expected shortages of swabs led us to assess alternative diagnostic specimens. In
60 this study, we compared test performance when using mouthwash or a combined oro-
61 nasopharyngeal swab.

62

63

64 **Methods**

65 Residents (age >6 years) from a refugee facility with a previous diagnosis of COVID-
66 19 and their household contacts were prospectively tested for SARS-CoV-2 with

67 mouthwash and a combined oro-nasopharyngeal swab in controlled conditions on two
68 occasions in May 2020 during an outbreak in the facility. Symptoms of COVID-19 were
69 recorded using a standardized questionnaire. Samples were taken by previously
70 instructed medical personnel. A single flocked swab (eSwab™ Copan) was used to
71 sample the back of the throat and subsequently the deep nasopharynx. For the
72 mouthwash, residents were instructed to gargle the mouth with 10 ml sterile water for
73 at least 5 seconds. Samples were transported at room temperature and stored
74 overnight at 4°C. All samples were mixed 1:1 with ATL buffer and analysed with the
75 cobas® SARS-CoV-2 assay on the Roche cobas 6800 system according to the
76 manufacturer's instructions. Detection of the *E*-(envelope)-gene and *Orf1/a* (open
77 reading frame 1) or only *E*-gene or only *Orf1/a* were interpreted as confirmation of
78 SARS-CoV-2 infection. Cycle threshold (Ct)-values above 40 were considered as
79 negative.

80 The study was performed according to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.
81 Approval was obtained from the ethics committee of the Medical Faculty of the Otto-
82 von-Guericke University Magdeburg. Written informed consent was obtained by all
83 participants or their guardians.

84

85

86 **Results**

87 Overall, 64 asymptomatic persons with a previous diagnosis of COVID-19 and their
88 household contacts were tested on two occasions. Age ranged from 7 to 59 years, with
89 an average age of 29 years. At the time of testing, no person showed symptoms of
90 COVID-19. Fifteen persons recollected symptoms compatible with COVID-19 in the
91 past three weeks: cough (6 persons), headache (4 persons), rhinitis (4 persons), loss

92 of taste (2 persons), fatigue (2 persons), fever, sneezing, aching limbs, diarrhoea, and
93 mild shortness of breath (one person each). No person was hospitalised.

94
95 In 39 of the 76 participants (51%), PCR of the combined oro-nasopharyngeal swab
96 confirmed SARS-CoV2 infection. In contrast, SARS-CoV-2 was detected in 13
97 mouthwashes (17 %) of which all were positive by the oro-nasopharyngeal swab (table
98 1). When considering the oro-nasopharyngeal swab as gold standard, the sensitivity
99 of mouthwash was 33%.

100
101 The cycle threshold (Ct)-value is a measure for the abundance of the transcript in the
102 sample and correlates with viral load. When comparing Ct-values of oro-
103 nasopharyngeal swabs, specimens that were positive by mouthwash had lower Ct-
104 values than specimens negative by mouthwash, indicating a lower viral load in
105 mouthwash (Figure 1a). Samples that were positive by both methods showed higher
106 Ct-values in the mouthwash (Figure 1b). All results are consistent with a lower
107 sensitivity of detection in mouthwash.

108
109

110 **Discussion**

111 The shortage of swabs that are suitable for PCR diagnostics led us to explore the utility
112 of mouthwash in a controlled study. We found a very low sensitivity of mouthwash
113 (33%), when using oro-nasopharyngeal swabs as comparator. We speculate that this
114 striking difference in sensitivity is partly due to the dilution of the mouthwash sample.
115 Thus, mouthwash is not suitable for the reliable detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

116

117 The only published study reported that the rate of positivity for SARS-CoV-2 was higher
118 in self-collected throat washings with sterile normal saline than in nasopharyngeal
119 swabs [10]. However, the small sample size of eleven patients does not allow firm
120 conclusions.

121
122 Our study has several strengths: We conducted the study in a controlled setting with
123 specifically trained personnel. This allows for a more rigorously sampling than in an
124 observational study conducted in the clinical setting. As gold standard, we chose
125 combined oro-nasopharyngeal swabs. A systematic review that assessed the positivity
126 rate of different specimens found that nasopharyngeal swabs had a slightly higher
127 positivity rate than oropharyngeal swabs, with larger differences when sampling was
128 performed more than 14 days after symptom onset [8].

129
130 Our study population were asymptomatic persons, with a median time after diagnosis
131 of 14 days, and their household contact. Since the viral load decreases over time, this
132 population is expected to have a low viral load and thus high Ct-values. Indeed, 34 of
133 38 (89%) samples had Ct-values above 30 for the *E*-gene, a value currently discussed
134 as a cut-off for infection. Thus, this study was designed to rigorously assess differences
135 in sensitivity.

136
137 Our study has also limitations. Mouthwash with gargling was performed as a self-
138 administered procedure and we observed some variation in adherence to the protocol
139 regarding the duration and intensity of gargling, which may have influenced the results.
140 Furthermore, we did not compare different RNA extraction methods, which may show
141 a better performance with mouthwash specimens.

142

143 There is a high likelihood of aerosol formation during gargling. Thus, mouthwash
144 should be performed alone in a well-ventilated area. This may limit its use in patients
145 to minimize exposure of health-care personnel. In conclusion, SARS-CoV2 detection
146 with mouthwash showed a low sensitivity compared to oro-nasopharyngeal swabs.
147 Thus, we do not recommend mouthwash performing combined oro-nasopharyngeal
148 swabs, especially in patients with no or mild symptoms.

149

150 **Transparency declaration**

151 JF reports personal fees from Biomérieux and the Medical Association of Saxony-
152 Anhalt, outside the submitted work; WM, MD, IT, JB and AJK report no conflicts of
153 interest. There was no specific funding for this study.

154

155 **Contribution**

156 AJK and IT designed the study; DM, JB, IT and AJK conducted the investigation; MW,
157 BJ, and AJK edited, reviewed and interpreted the data; WM and AJK wrote the original
158 draft and all authors approved the manuscript.

159

160 **Acknowledgement**

161 We thank the technical personnel of the Institute of Medical Microbiology and Hospital
162 Hygiene and the Institute of Transfusion Medicine, Medical Faculty, Otto-von-Guericke
163 University, for technical support.

164

165

166 References

- 167 [1] Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with
168 Pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(8):727-733.
169 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2001017
- 170 [2] Ludwig S, Zarbock A. Coronaviruses and SARS-CoV-2: A Brief Overview.
171 *Anesth Analg*. 2020;131(1):93-96. doi:10.1213/ANE.0000000000004845
- 172 [3] WHO. Scientific Brief: Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: implications for infection
173 prevention precautions. URL: [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/transmission-of-sars-cov-2-implications-for-infection-prevention-precautions)
174 [room/commentaries/detail/transmission-of-sars-cov-2-implications-for-](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/transmission-of-sars-cov-2-implications-for-infection-prevention-precautions)
175 [infection-prevention-precautions](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/transmission-of-sars-cov-2-implications-for-infection-prevention-precautions)
- 176 [4] Yan Y, Chang L, Wang L. Laboratory testing of SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV, and
177 SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCoV): Current status, challenges, and countermeasures.
178 *Rev Med Virol*. 2020;30(3):e2106. doi:10.1002/rmv.2106
- 179 [5] Sun J, Zhu A, Li H, et al. Isolation of infectious SARS-CoV-2 from urine of a
180 COVID-19 patient. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2020;9(1):991-993.
181 doi:10.1080/22221751.2020.1760144
- 182 [6] Wu Y, Guo C, Tang L, et al. Prolonged presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in
183 faecal samples. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2020;5(5):434-435.
184 doi:10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30083-2
- 185 [7] Department of Communications, WHO Global. Laboratory testing for 2019
186 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in suspected human cases. **WHO Reference**
187 **Number:** WHO/COVID-19/laboratory/2020.5, URL:
188 [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117)
189 [coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirus-in-suspected-human-cases-20200117)
- 190 [8] Mohammadi A, Esmaeilzadeh E, Li Y, Bosch RJ, Li J. SARS-CoV-2 Detection
191 in Different Respiratory Sites: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.

- 192 EBioMedicine, 2020, 102903, ISSN 2352-3964,
193 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2020.102903>
- 194 [9] Wang K, Zhang X, Sun J, et al. Differences of Severe Acute Respiratory
195 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Shedding Duration in Sputum and Nasopharyngeal
196 Swab Specimens Among Adult Inpatients With Coronavirus Disease 2019
197 [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jun 20]. Chest. 2020;S0012-
198 3692(20)31718-9. doi:10.1016/j.chest.2020.06.015
- 199 [10] Guo WL, Jiang Q, Ye F, et al. Effect of throat washings on detection of
200 2019 novel coronavirus [published online ahead of print, 2020 Apr 9]. Clin
201 Infect Dis. 2020;ciaa416. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa416
- 202 [11] Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different
203 Types of Clinical Specimens. JAMA. 2020;323(18):1843-1844.
204 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3786
- 205 [12] Ek P, Böttiger B, Dahlman D, Hansen KB, Nyman M, Nilsson AC. A
206 combination of naso- and oropharyngeal swabs improves the diagnostic yield
207 of respiratory viruses in adult emergency department patients. Infect Dis
208 (Lond). 2019;51(4):241-248. doi:10.1080/23744235.2018.1546055
- 209 [13] Mawaddah A, Gendeh HS, Lum SG, Marina MB. Upper respiratory tract
210 sampling in COVID-19. Malays J Pathol. 2020;42(1):23-35
211

212

213

214 **Table 1:** Comparison of mouthwash and combined oro-nasopharyngeal swab in
215 detecting SARS-CoV-2. The sensitivity of mouthwash is 33%, the specificity 100%
216 when using the combined oro-nasopharyngeal swab as gold standard (McNemar test
217 p -value <0.001).

218


	oro-nasopharyngeal swab positive	oro-nasopharyngeal swab negative	total
mouthwash positive	13	0	13
mouthwash negative	26	37	63
total	39	37	76

219

220

221

222



223

224

225

226 **Figure 1: The combined oro-nasopharyngeal swab has a higher sensitivity than**

227 **mouthwash.** a) Cycle threshold (CT) values for *Orf1/a*- and *E*-gene for oro-

228 nasopharyngeal swabs in samples positive and negative in mouthwash. A lower CT-

229 value indicates a higher viral load. (Mann-Whitney U-Test *E*-gene: p-value<0.001,

230 *Orf1/a*-gene: p-value=0.036) b) Ct-values for samples positive in both specimen types.

231 Ct-values for the mouthwash were higher than for the combined oro-nasopharyngeal

232 swabs, indicating a lower viral load in mouthwash. Only 12 paired samples were

233 shown, since one sample was positive in the *E*-gene and another in the *Orf1/a*-gene,

234 only (Wilcoxon signed rank test *E*-gene: p-value=0.007, *Orf1/a*-gene: p-value=0.037).

235

236