

1 Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 virus in saliva using a guanidium based transport medium suitable
2 for RT-PCR diagnostic assays.

3 Sukalyani Banik¹, Kaheerman Saibire¹, Shraddha Suryavanshi¹, Glenn Johns², Soumitesh
4 Chakravorty², Robert Kwiatkowski², David Alland^{1§} and Padmapriya Banada^{1§}

5 ¹Public Health Research Institute, 225 Warren Street, Newark, NJ 07103; ²Cepheid, Sunnyvale,
6 CA.

7 [§]Equal contribution corresponding authors: Address correspondence to Padmapriya Banada
8 priya.banada@rutgers.edu and David Alland allandda@njms.rutgers.edu

9

10 Running title: SARS-COV-2 inactivation in transport media

11 Key words: SARS-COV-2, inactivation, eNAT

12

13

14

15 Abstract

16 **Background:** Upper respiratory samples used to test for SARS-CoV-2 virus may be
17 infectious and present a hazard during transport and testing. A buffer with the ability to
18 inactivate SARS-CoV-2 at the time of sample collection could simplify and expand testing for
19 COVID-19 to non-conventional settings. **Methods:** We evaluated a guanidium thiocyanate-
20 based buffer, eNAT™ (Copan) as a possible transport and inactivation medium for downstream
21 RT-PCR testing to detect SARS-CoV-2. Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 USA-WA1/2020 in eNAT
22 and in diluted saliva was studied at different incubation times. The stability of viral RNA in
23 eNAT was also evaluated for up to 7 days at room temperature (28°C), refrigerated conditions
24 (4°C) and at 35°C. **Results:** SARS-COV-2 virus spiked directly in eNAT could be inactivated at
25 $>5.6 \log_{10}$ PFU/ml within a minute of incubation. When saliva was diluted 1:1 in eNAT, no
26 cytopathic effect (CPE) on vero-E6 cell lines was observed, although SARS-CoV-2 RNA could
27 be detected even after 30 min incubation and after two cell culture passages. A 1:2
28 (saliva:eNAT) dilution abrogated both CPE and detectable viral RNA after as little as 5 min
29 incubation in eNAT. SARS-CoV-2 RNA from virus spiked at 5X the limit of detection remained
30 positive up to 7 days of incubation in all tested conditions. **Conclusion:** eNAT and similar
31 guanidinium thiocyanate-based media may be of value for transport, preservation, and
32 processing of clinical samples for RT- PCR based SARS-CoV-2 detection.

33

34

35

36

37 **Introduction**

38 Simple and rapid methods to detect SARS-CoV-2 have the potential to aid in controlling
39 the spread of COVID-19 [1-3]. However, clinical samples obtained for SARS-CoV-2 testing can
40 present a biohazard during transport or after being opened in a testing laboratory [4]. Clinical
41 samples obtained at home or in remote locations can leak during transport to a testing laboratory,
42 presenting a biohazard anywhere along this transport chain. Furthermore, the CDC recommends
43 that tests for SARS-CoV-2 should be performed inside a biosafety cabinet in a BSL-2 laboratory
44 setting (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/lab-biosafety-guidelines.html>) to ensure
45 worker safety. These strict testing requirements limit the locations where SARS-CoV-2 assays
46 can be safely performed. A transport buffer that inactivates SARS-CoV-2 while remaining
47 suitable for RT-PCR detection assays would mitigate these safety threats and simplify
48 widespread COVID-19 testing.

49 Many of the physical (heat, ultraviolet light, gamma irradiation) and chemical
50 (detergents, alcohol) methods used for viral inactivation or RNA extraction are either unsuitable
51 for creating a safe transport media [5-9] or require additional downstream sample processing that
52 would complicate rapid point of care COVID-19 tests [10]. Buffers and reagents containing
53 guanidium hydrochloride and guanidinium thiocyanate have shown to inactivate SARS-CoV-2,
54 and these reagents can be used for RT-PCR applications [5, 9, 11, 12]. The eNAT (Copan
55 Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA) is a guanidium thiocyanate based medium designed to be used for
56 specimen collection and transport as it can stabilize nucleic acids for prolonged periods of time
57 (<https://www.copanusa.com/sample-collection-transport-processing/enat/>) [13]. In this study, we
58 evaluated the effectiveness of this media for inactivating SARS-CoV-2 in cell culture
59 supernatants and virus-spiked saliva matrix and its ability to be used to detect SARS-CoV-2 in

60 the point-of-care Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 assay. We also studied the stability of viral RNA in
61 presence of a clinical matrix added to this medium. The findings of this study can be used to
62 simplify sample collection, transport, and COVID-19 diagnostic workflows, potentially
63 increasing access to testing and reducing the time to testing results.

64 **Materials & Methods.**

65 **Ethical considerations.** The use of saliva from confirmed COVID-19 negative
66 volunteers was approved by Rutgers Institutional Review Board, IRB# 2020001786.

67 **Cell and viral culture.** Vero E6 cells (ATCC CRL-1586) were maintained in the
68 Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM, Gibco, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA)
69 supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum (FBS, Gibco, Thermo Fisher
70 Scientific, Waltham, MA) and 100 units/ml of penicillin/streptomycin (Gibco, Thermo Fisher
71 Scientific, Waltham, MA) at 37°C in the presence of 5% CO₂. SARS-CoV-2 strain USA-
72 WA1/2020 was obtained from the World Reference Collection for Emerging Viruses and
73 Arboviruses (WRECVA) at the University of Texas Medical Branch (UTMB, Galveston, TX)
74 and further propagated in Biosafety level 3 (BSL3) laboratory at the Regional Biocontainment
75 Laboratory (RBL), Rutgers New Jersey Medical School, Newark, NJ. All cell lines and virus
76 cultures were maintained at 37°C in the presence of 5% CO₂ unless otherwise mentioned. All
77 experiments in this study were performed inside a biosafety cabinet within a BSL3 containment
78 facility. To generate working virus stocks, Vero E6 cells were infected with an MOI of 0.01 in
79 DMEM supplemented with 2% FBS. Cells were harvested at 72 hours post-infection,
80 supernatants were collected and centrifuged for 10 min at 1,000Xg, aliquoted and stored at -
81 80°C.

82 **Virus quantitation.** SARS-CoV-2 virus titers were determined using both plaque assays
83 and the 50% tissue culture infectious dose (TCID₅₀) method. Plaque assays were performed
84 following standard procedures [14-16] with some modifications. Briefly, Vero E6 cells were
85 seeded into 6-well plates (5×10^5 cells/well) 24 hours before infection. Ten-fold serial dilutions
86 of virus stock were added onto wells (400 μ l/well) and incubated for 1 hour at 37°C with
87 intermittent shaking every 15 min to prevent the cell monolayers from drying. After 1 hour of
88 virus adsorption, 4ml of 0.8% agarose in DMEM supplemented with 4% FBS was added to each
89 well and incubated for 2-3 days at 37°C/CO₂ incubator. The plaques were developed by fixing
90 the cells with 4% formaldehyde in PBS for 1h at room temperature (RT). The agarose plug was
91 removed before staining with 0.2% crystal violet (in 20% ethanol for 15 min at RT). The wells
92 were washed with tap water, dried and the plaques were counted. TCID₅₀ assays were
93 performed by seeding 96-well plates with Vero E6 cells (2×10^4 cells/well) the day before the
94 assay. Ten-fold serial dilutions of virus stock were added onto wells (100 μ l/well) and incubated
95 for 7-10 days at 37°C/CO₂ incubator. The plates were observed for presence of cytopathic effect
96 (CPE) every day. TCID₅₀ titers were calculated using the Reed and Muench method [17].

97 **Removal of cytotoxicity.** Four different approaches were explored to remove
98 cytotoxicity induced by the transport media in the absence of the virus. Pierce 4ml Detergent
99 Removal Spin Column (DRSC, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA), Amicon Ultra 4ml
100 100KDa centrifugal filter units (Millipore Sigma, St. Louis, MO), PD 10 desalting spin columns
101 (Millipore Sigma, St. Louis, MO) and Slide-A-Lyzer G2 dialysis cassette (Thermo Fisher
102 Scientific, Waltham, MA) were prepared according to each manufacturer's instructions. Two ml
103 of eNAT (Copan Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA) was added to 100 μ l of DMEM without the virus,
104 mixed and then processed using each method. Both PD 10 columns and Slide-A-Lyzer G2

105 dialysis cassettes were equilibrated with PBS before adding samples. For the Slide-A-Lyzer G2
106 dialysis cassette, the 2.1 ml samples were added and the cassette was dialyzed overnight at room
107 temperature in PBS with a total of five buffer changes. For Amicon ultra filters, the 2.1 ml
108 samples were added, centrifuged at 4,000 x g for 10 min and washed three times with 2ml of
109 PBS. For PD 10 columns, the 2.1 ml samples were added and the eluate was collected by
110 centrifugation at 1000 x g for 2 min. For the Pierce DRSC columns, the 2.1 ml samples were
111 split into two 1.05 ml samples that were each added to one of two columns, incubated for 2 min
112 at room temperature and then eluted by centrifugation at 1000 x g for 2 min. Four hundred
113 microliters of the samples processed by each method were then added to Vero E6 cells in 6-well
114 plates, incubated at 37°C/CO₂ incubator and observed daily for cytotoxicity for up to 7 days. We
115 also tested eNAT and AVL buffers directly and by dilution on Vero E6 cell lines without prior
116 purification to confirm cytotoxicity in the absence of any purification steps, which showed
117 cytotoxicity until 1:1000 dilution.

118 **Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 treated with eNAT.** Viral inactivation with eNAT was
119 explored in two different approaches; 1) by spiking the virus directly to the eNAT, simulating a
120 swab sample that is placed into a transport media; and 2) by diluting a clinical sample such as
121 saliva in eNAT, simulating a self-collected sample transport scenario. For the first approach,
122 100µl of the SARS-CoV-2 virus culture (8×10^6 PFU/ml) was added to 2ml of eNAT, mixed and
123 incubated for 0, 1, 2, 5, 10 and 15 min at room temperature. After incubation, the entire sample
124 was processed using Pierce 4ml DRSC to remove cytotoxic components from eNAT. For the
125 second approach, one-ml of confirmed COVID-19 negative saliva was spiked with 100 µl of
126 SARS-CoV-2 (3×10^6 PFU/ml) and then added to eNAT at 1:1 and 1:2 sample to eNAT ratio.
127 The samples were incubated at room temperature for 10, 15 and 30 min for the 1:1 ratio and 5,

128 10, 15 min for the 1:2 ratio. Samples were then processed with the DRSC columns as described
129 above. We performed two negative controls for both approaches. The first negative control
130 consisted of 100 µl of virus free DMEM, which was added to 2 ml of eNAT at both 1:1 and 1:2
131 ratio; the second negative control consisted of 100 µl of the SARS-CoV-2 virus that was spiked
132 into 400 µl of AVL buffer (Qiagen, Germantown, MD) and then heated to 92°C for 15 min to
133 inactivate the virus. As a positive control, 100 µl of SARS-CoV-2 was spiked into 2 ml of
134 DMEM. Positive control samples were also assessed before and after DRSC purification to
135 determine viral loss during this process. All controls were performed in either duplicate or
136 triplicate for each experiment.

137 **Calculating eNAT sterilizing activity.** Viral cytopathic effect (CPE) was determined in
138 all samples by both direct infection in Vero E6 cell lines in 6-well plates and TCID50 assay by
139 serial diluting of the samples on 96-well plates. For TCID50 assay, samples were diluted ten-fold
140 in DMEM+2%FBS and titers were calculated by Reed & Muench method [17]. Viral titer
141 reduction was determined by subtracting the viral titer for the treated samples from the untreated
142 samples. For serial passaging of the samples, each 2 ml replicate of the DRSC column purified
143 sample was added into 4 different wells (500 µl of the sample in each well) in a 6-well plate and
144 incubated at 37°C/5% CO₂ for up to 14 days, with two passages every 5 to 7 days. The plates
145 were checked daily under an inverted microscope for the presence of CPE. All samples were also
146 tested by RT-PCR at days 7 and 14 of serial passaging using the Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 test
147 (Xpert, Cepheid, Sunnyvale, CA). The Xpert test reports amplification of sequences of the
148 envelope (E) and nucleocapsid (N2) genes. Positive results were indicated by the detection of
149 either the N2 target or both E and N2 targets.

150 **Integrity of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in eNAT.** The stability of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in eNAT
151 was evaluated for a period of 7 days. Negative saliva samples were spiked with SARS-CoV-2
152 virus at 5X the LOD (0.05 PFU/ml) previously established for nasopharyngeal (NP) matrix using
153 the Xpert test [18]. Samples were either swabbed and/or diluted 1:2 in eNAT. All samples were
154 stored at three different temperatures (4°C, 28°C and 35°C) and viral RNA was measured at
155 different time points (0h, 4h, 24h, 48h and 168 h) using the Xpert test.

156 **Statistical analysis.** Standard statistical analyses (average, standard deviation, and
157 ANOVA) were performed using GraphPad Prism 8.4.3 for Windows.

158 **Results**

159 **Removal of basal cytotoxicity.** Both eNAT and AVL buffers are cytotoxic to Vero E6
160 cell lines when used directly. We explored four different methods of purification as listed in
161 Table 1. Microscopic observation of the Vero E6 cell lines in a 6-well plate revealed that the
162 buffers purified through DRSC columns and Slide-A-Lyzer G2 dialysis cassettes did not show
163 any cytotoxic effect to Vero E6 cells for up to 7 days. However, the filtrates from PD 10 and
164 Amicon ultra columns were cytotoxic within 24 hours (Table 1).

165 **Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 with eNAT.** eNAT, a guanidine-thiocyanate based sample
166 transport medium is claimed to maintain the integrity of nucleic acids for long periods
167 (<https://www.copanusa.com/sample-collection-transport-processing/enat/>). We evaluated the
168 ability of eNAT as a transport media to inactivate SARS-CoV-2 directly (simulating swab
169 samples) or when diluted with saliva. The virus was added directly to eNAT at the final
170 concentration of 8×10^5 PFU/ml, incubated for 0, 1, 2, 5, 10 and 15 min and filtered using DRSC
171 columns. Vero E6 cell lines were infected with the flow through from these samples and

172 observed for cytopathic effect for up to 14 days with two passages. All test samples and controls
173 were processed and tested on Vero E6 cells in the same manner. We found that the negative
174 controls did not cause any CPE while a 100 μ l positive control containing 8×10^6 PFU/ml of
175 SARS-CoV-2 resulted in high CPEs within 48-72 hours of infection in Vero E6 cells. After 14
176 days of incubation and two passages, both replicates of the test samples incubated in eNAT for 0
177 min produced CPEs and were positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR with an average N2 cycle
178 threshold (Ct) 37.4 ± 1.6 (Table 2). We did not observe any visible CPE after 1 min of incubation
179 in eNAT; however, the RT-PCR assay was positive in 1 out of 2 replicates (Ct 37.4). Extending
180 eNAT incubation to 2 min through 15 mins eliminated both CPE and any RT-PCR positivity,
181 demonstrating a $>5.6 \log_{10}$ PFU/ml reduction in the viral load (Table 2).

182 We further explored the ability of eNAT to inactivate SARS-CoV-2 when diluted in a
183 sample such as saliva. We spiked SARS-CoV-2 (3×10^6 PFU/ml) into SARS-CoV-2 negative
184 saliva and then incubated the samples with eNAT at 1:1 and 1:2 (sample to eNAT) ratios for
185 different time points at room temperature. After 14 days of incubation and 2 passages, eNAT
186 alone and AVL buffer negative controls, maintained cell integrity without any visible CPEs and
187 positive control showed CPEs within 48 hours (N2-Ct=13.8; Table 3). Although we did not
188 observe any CPEs under any test conditions, the 1:1 saliva/eNAT mixtures were found to be
189 SARS-CoV-2 positive by RT-PCR with N2-Ct >40 in all replicates (3/3) after 10 and 15 min of
190 incubation. Even after 30 min of incubation in eNAT, 2/3 samples were positive for SARS-CoV-
191 2 by RT-PCR. However, the spiked saliva samples that were mixed with 1:2 ratios of eNAT
192 appeared to be completely inactivated (calculated SARS-CoV-2 inactivation efficacy $>5.6 \log_{10}$
193 PFU/ml) after as little as 5 min incubation with the eNAT.

194 **Stability of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in eNAT.** We evaluated the stability of the SARS-COV-
195 2 RNA in saliva treated with eNAT over a range of storage times and temperatures. SARS-COV-
196 2 virus was spiked into saliva samples at 5X the established NP LOD (0.05 PFU/ml) of the Xpert
197 test, and the samples were added to eNAT either as swab samples or saliva/eNAT mixed at 1:2
198 ratio. The samples were stored at 4°C, 28°C and 35°C and were periodically tested for the
199 presence of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR after 0, 4, 24, 48 and 168 h (7 days) of storage. As shown
200 in Fig. 1A, the RNA was stable for the swab samples stored in eNAT under all conditions as
201 indicated by N2 gene cycle threshold (Ct) ($P>0.05$). In saliva samples diluted 1:2 in eNAT, the
202 RNA was stable until 168 h at 4°C and for 48 h at 28°C ($P>0.05$, Fig. 1B). However, average
203 N2-Ct increased by 3 Ct values at 28°C after 7 days ($P=0.004$), as well as a significant decrease
204 in RNA in as little as 24 hours in samples incubated at 35°C ($P=0.01$). The RNA detection rate
205 remained at 100% positive rate for all samples with very low viral load, through all tested
206 conditions despite the increase in assay Ct values over time and increased temperature.

207 **Discussion**

208 We have demonstrated that eNAT can rapidly inactivate SARS-CoV-2 present in saliva
209 samples when used at a ratio of 1:2 (sample to eNAT) or higher. Furthermore, SARS-CoV-2
210 RNA is stable in eNAT for at least 48 hours at room temperature or below. These results strongly
211 suggest that eNAT can be used to ensure safe handling, collection, transport, storage, and
212 processing of specimens intended to be tested for SARS-CoV-2 using the Xpert test. The safety
213 provided using a viral inactivating buffer may simplify testing in several settings, including
214 home sample collection and rapid assay testing outside of conventional laboratories. Recent
215 studies have shown that buffers containing guanidinium thiocyanate can inactivate SARS-CoV-2
216 [5, 7, 9, 12]. In this study, we conclusively demonstrated that eNAT, a guanidinium thiocyanate-

217 based buffer can be used as a viral inactivation and preservation media for SARS-CoV-2
218 specimens.

219 Saliva is increasing in popularity as an alternative specimen for COVID testing because
220 of its ease of self-collection. However, samples transported by mail can leak due to improper
221 packaging or handling, raising safety concerns [4]. Our studies demonstrate that eNAT can
222 inactivate SARS-CoV-2 spiked saliva samples within 5 minutes when used in 2 volumes of
223 eNAT to 1 volume of the sample. These results can help guide practices for safe specimen
224 handling, transport, and processing, and may permit safe SARS-CoV-2 testing in locations
225 without strict BSL2 practices and/or decontamination procedures.

226 To accurately evaluate the efficacy of viral inactivation, we established rapid methods to
227 remove any background cytotoxicity caused by the buffer in the absence of the virus. We
228 explored several methods involving dilution, dialysis, and column filtration [7, 19-21]. Both
229 dialysis and filtration using Pierce DRSC spin columns resulted in complete removal of basal
230 cytotoxicity from eNAT and did not result in any viral loss. However, our preference was to use
231 DRSC spin columns because this method detoxified samples within minutes compared to the
232 many hours required by a dialysis process. The more rapid processing also ensured that we were
233 able to make accurate determinations of buffer inactivation time. Dilution methods might have
234 been an alternate way to remove cytotoxic components; however, we have observed that eNAT
235 remained cytotoxic even after a 1000-fold dilution (data not shown) and such high dilutions can
236 produce misleading estimates of log titer virus inactivation unless very high titer viral stocks can
237 be tested [7, 13].

238 We suggest that eNAT can be used as part of SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing programs in
239 schools, workplaces, prisons, skilled nursing facilities, homeless shelters, and other high-risk

240 locations, perhaps in combination with sample pooling strategies to decrease total testing costs.
241 The use of eNAT is further supported by our determination that eNAT can help increase the
242 clinical sensitivity of the Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 test when used with variety of upper
243 respiratory specimens (Banada et al., submitted for publication). While the use of a sterilizing
244 buffer is only one component of a successful worldwide testing program, the utility of this type
245 of reagent and its potential contributions to designing improved testing strategies should be
246 explored.

247 **Acknowledgments**

248
249 We thank the World Reference Center for Emerging Viruses and Arboviruses, the
250 University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, for providing the SARS-CoV-2 USA-
251 WA1/2020 strain. This study was funded by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
252 Diseases of the National Institutes of Health under award number R01 AI131617.

253 R.K. G.J, and S.C. are employees of Cepheid Inc., which sells the Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2
254 test. D.A. receives research support and royalty payments from Cepheid.

255

256 References

- 257 1. Wu, F., et al., *A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China.*
258 Nature, 2020. **579**(7798): p. 265-269.
- 259 2. Zhou, P., et al., *A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable*
260 *bat origin.* Nature, 2020. **579**(7798): p. 270-273.
- 261 3. Sohrabi, C., et al., "World Health Organization declares Global Emergency: A review of
262 *the 2019 Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19)*" (vol 76, pg 71, 2020). International Journal of
263 Surgery, 2020. **77**: p. 217-217.
- 264 4. Dewar, R., et al., *Viral Transportation in COVID-19 Pandemic: Inactivated Virus*
265 *Transportation Should Be Implemented for Safe Transportation and Handling at*
266 *Diagnostics Laboratories.* Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 2020. **144**(8):
267 p. 916-917.
- 268 5. Pastorino, B., et al., *Evaluation of Chemical Protocols for Inactivating SARS-CoV-2*
269 *Infectious Samples.* Viruses, 2020. **12**(6).
- 270 6. Heilingloh, C.S., et al., *Susceptibility of SARS-CoV-2 to UV irradiation.* Am J Infect
271 Control, 2020. **48**(10): p. 1273-1275.
- 272 7. Welch, S.R., et al., *Analysis of Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 by Specimen Transport*
273 *Media, Nucleic Acid Extraction Reagents, Detergents, and Fixatives.* J Clin Microbiol,
274 2020. **58**(11).
- 275 8. Patterson, E.I., et al., *Methods of Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 for Downstream Biological*
276 *Assays.* J Infect Dis, 2020. **222**(9): p. 1462-1467.
- 277 9. Chan, K.H., et al., *Factors affecting stability and infectivity of SARS-CoV-2.* J Hosp
278 Infect, 2020. **106**(2): p. 226-231.
- 279 10. Pastorino, B., et al., *Heat Inactivation of Different Types of SARS-CoV-2 Samples: What*
280 *Protocols for Biosafety, Molecular Detection and Serological Diagnostics?* Viruses,
281 2020. **12**(7).
- 282 11. Grant, P.R., et al., *Extraction-free COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) diagnosis by RT-PCR to*
283 *increase capacity for national testing programmes during a pandemic.* bioRxiv, 2020: p.
284 2020.04.06.028316.
- 285 12. Scallan, M.F., et al., *Validation of a Lysis Buffer Containing 4 M Guanidinium*
286 *Thiocyanate (GITC)/ Triton X-100 for Extraction of SARS-CoV-2 RNA for COVID-19*
287 *Testing: Comparison of Formulated Lysis Buffers Containing 4 to 6 M GITC, Roche*
288 *External Lysis Buffer and Qiagen RTL Lysis Buffer.* bioRxiv, 2020: p.
289 2020.04.05.026435.
- 290 13. van Bockel, D., et al., *Evaluation of Commercially Available Viral Transport Medium*
291 *(VTM) for SARS-CoV-2 Inactivation and Use in Point-of-Care (POC) Testing.* Viruses,
292 2020. **12**(11).
- 293 14. Baer, A. and K. Kehn-Hall, *Viral concentration determination through plaque assays:*
294 *using traditional and novel overlay systems.* J Vis Exp, 2014(93): p. e52065.
- 295 15. Harcourt, J., et al., *Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 from Patient with*
296 *Coronavirus Disease, United States.* Emerg Infect Dis, 2020. **26**(6): p. 1266-1273.
- 297 16. Herzog, P., C. Drosten, and M.A. Müller, *Plaque assay for human coronavirus NL63*
298 *using human colon carcinoma cells.* Virology Journal, 2008. **5**(1): p. 138.
- 299 17. Reed, L.J. and H. Muench, *A simple method of estimating fifty per cent endpoints.*
300 American journal of epidemiology, 1938. **27**(3): p. 493-497.

- 301 18. Loeffelholz, M.J., et al., *Multicenter Evaluation of the Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-*
302 *2 Test*. J Clin Microbiol, 2020. **58**(8).
- 303 19. Patterson, E.I., et al., *Methods of Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 for Downstream Biological*
304 *Assays*. The Journal of Infectious Diseases, 2020. **222**(9): p. 1462-1467.
- 305 20. Kumar, M.P., et al., *Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) and the liver: a comprehensive*
306 *systematic review and meta-analysis*. Hepatol Int, 2020. **14**(5): p. 711-722.
- 307 21. Haddock, E., F. Feldmann, and H. Feldmann, *Effective Chemical Inactivation of Ebola*
308 *Virus*. Emerg Infect Dis, 2016. **22**(7): p. 1292-4.
- 309
- 310

311 Figure legends

312

313 Fig. 1. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in a swab of saliva mixed with eNAT (A) or saliva diluted
314 1:2 with eNAT (B). Saliva samples were spiked with SARS-CoV-2 virus at 5X the LOD (0.005
315 PFU/ml) and maintained at 4°C, 28°C (room temperature) and 35°C. The samples were tested
316 for SARS-CoV-2 RNA by RT-PCR at 0, 4, 24, 48 and 168 hours. N2 gene cycle threshold (Ct)
317 values are shown. Four replicates were performed for each condition and results are expressed as
318 mean±SD. ns-not statistically significant. P<0.05 is considered statistically significant.

319

320

321

322 Table 1: Removal of basal cytotoxicity from eNAT transport media

Reagent	Methods	Total processing time	Cytotoxicity in VeroE6 cell line
eNAT	Slide-A-Lyzer G2 dialysis cassette	Overnight (16-18h)	No
	Pierce 4ml DRSC	12 min	No
	Amicon Ultra 4ml	40 min	Yes
	PD10 desalting column	15 min	Yes

323

324

325 Table 2: Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 treated directly with eNAT transport media.

Reagents	Sample matrix	Incubation time (minutes)	Presence of CPE ^a (replicates)	Presence of viral RNA ^b (replicates; Ct±SD)
eNAT	Virus in Tissue culture media	0	Yes (2/2)	Yes (2/2; 37.4±1.6)
		1	No (0/2)	Yes (1/2; 37.4±0)
		2	No (0/2)	No (0/2)
		5	No (0/2)	No (0/2)
		10	No (0/3)	No (0/3)
		15	No (0/3)	No (0/3)
	Tissue culture media without the virus	None	No (0/2)	No (0/2)
AVL buffer + heating at 92°C (Negative control)	Virus in Tissue culture media	15	No (0/2)	No (0/2)
None (Positive control)	Virus in Tissue culture media	None	Yes	Yes (13.6)

326 ^aTested by both culture and TCID50; ^bTested by Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 test

327

328 Table 3: Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva samples diluted with eNAT

Reagent	Sample matrix	Sample to eNAT ratio	Incubation time (min)	Presence of CPE ^a (replicates)	Presence of viral RNA ^b (replicates; Ct±SD)
eNAT	Saliva with virus	1:1	10	No (0/3)	Yes (3/3; 41.2±1.1)
			15	No (0/3)	Yes (3/3; 41.1±1.0)
			30	No (0/3)	Yes (2/3; 42.3±1.9)
		1:2	5	No (0/3)	No (0/3)
			10	No (0/3)	No (0/3)
			15	No (0/3)	No (0/3)
	Tissue culture media without the virus	1:1	None	No (0/2)	No (0/2)
		1:2	None	No (0/2)	No (0/2)
AVL buffer + heating at 92°C (Negative control)	Virus in tissue culture media	None	15	No (0/2)	No (0/2)
None (Positive control)	Virus in Tissue culture media	None	None	Yes	Yes (13.8)

329 ^aTested by both culture and TCID50; ^bTested by Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 test

330

331

332

