1 Full title: Saliva molecular testing bypassing RNA extraction is suitable for monitoring

2 and diagnosing SARS-CoV-2 infection in children

3

4	Authors: Marta Alenquer ¹ , Tiago Milheiro Silva ^{2, §} , Onome Akpogheneta ^{3, §} , Filipe							
5	Ferreira ¹ , Sílvia Vale-Costa ¹ , Mónica Medina-Lopes ¹ , Frederico Batista ⁴ , Ana Margarida							
6	Garcia ² , Vasco M. Barreto ⁵ , Cathy Paulino ⁶ , João Costa ⁶ , João Sobral ⁶ , Maria Diniz-da-							
7	Costa ⁶ , Susana Ladeiro ⁶ , José Delgado Alves ^{4,5} , Ricardo B. Leite ⁶ , Jocelyne Demengeot ³ ,							
8	Maria João Rocha Brito ² , and Maria João Amorim ^{1,*}							
9								
10	Affiliations:							
11	¹ Cell Biology of Viral Infection Lab, Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência; Oeiras, Portugal							
12	² Pediatric Infectious Disease Unit, Hospital Dona Estefânia, Centro Hospitalar de Lisboa							
13	Central; Lisboa, Portugal.							
14	³ Lymphocyte Physiology Lab, Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência; Oeiras, Portugal.							
15	⁴ Department of Medicine 4, Hospital Prof Doutor Fernando Fonseca; Amadora, Portugal.							
16	⁵ CEDOC NOVA, Centro de Estudos de Doenças Crónicas, Nova Medical School,							
17	Universidade Nova de Lisboa; Lisboa, Portugal.							
18	⁶ Genomics Unit, Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência; Oeiras, Portugal.							
19								
20	§ These authors contributed equally to this work							
21	*Corresponding author. Email: mjamorim@igc.gulbenkian.pt							

23 Key Points

- 24 Question: Is saliva reverse transcription-quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR)
- testing (with and without RNA extraction) suitable to identify SARS-CoV-2 infected young
- children and can the cycle threshold (CT) be associated with infectivity in a heterogeneous
- 27 population admitted to hospital for COVID-19-related and unrelated reasons?
- ²⁸ Findings: In this cross-sectional study of 85 children aged 10 years and under, RT-qPCR in
- 29 saliva samples subjected or not to RNA extraction accurately detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA
- 30 and infectious viruses could be recovered from CTs below 26.
- 31 Meaning: Saliva sampling coupled to RT-qPCR and specific antibody detection efficiently
- 32 identifies infants and children infected with SARS-CoV-2. This approach is suitable for
- 33 surveillance in kindergarten and school settings.
- 34

35 Structured abstract

36 IMPORTANCE Adults are being vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2 worldwide, but the 37 longitudinal protection of these vaccines is uncertain, given the ongoing appearance of 38 SARS-CoV-2 variants. Children are susceptible to infection, and some studies reported that they actively transmit the virus even when asymptomatic, thus affecting the community. 39 Methods to easily test infected children and track the virus they carry are in demand. 40 41 **OBJECTIVE** To determine if saliva is an effective sample for detecting SARS-CoV-2 RNA 42 and antibodies in children aged 10 years and under, and associate viral RNA levels to infectivity. 43

44 DESIGN, SETTING, AND PARTICIPANTS In this cross-sectional study, saliva SARS-45 CoV-2 RT-qPCR tests, with and without RNA extraction, were validated in 49 hospitalized adults. The test was then applied to 85 children, aged 10 years and under, admitted to the 46 47 hospital regardless of COVID-19 symptomatology. Amongst 85 children, 29 (63.0%) 48 presented at least one COVID-19 symptom, 46 (54.1%) were positive for SARS-CoV-2 49 infection, 28 (32.9%) were under the age of 1 and the mean (SD) age was 3.8 (3.4) years. Saliva samples were collected up to 48 h after a positive test by nasopharyngeal (NP) swab-50 RT-qPCR. 51

EXPOSURE Infection by SARS-COV-2 in adults up to 8 days post-symptom onset. Children
 admitted to hospital for any reason and therefore with unclear onset of SARS-CoV-2
 infection.

55 MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES Saliva RT-qPCR up to CT<37 accurately identifies

56 SARS-CoV-2 infected children, with viral infectivity in tissue culture restricted to CT<26.

57 **RESULTS** In adults, the accuracy of the saliva SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR test was 98.0% (95% 58 confidence intervals [CI]: 89.3%–100%) as compared to NP-RT-qPCR. In children, the 59 sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy of saliva-RT-qPCR tests compared to NP swab-RT-

60	qPCR were, respectively, 84.8% (71.8%-92.4%), 100% (91.0%-100%), and 91.8% (84.0%-
61	96.6%) with RNA extraction and 81.8% (68.0%–90.5%), 100% (91.0%–100%), and 90.4%
62	(82.1%–95.0%) without RNA extraction. The threshold for rescuing infectious particles from
63	saliva was CT<26. There were significant IgM positive responses to the spike protein and its
64	receptor-binding domain (RBD) among children positive for SARS-CoV-2 by NP swab and
65	negative by saliva compared to other groups, indicating late infection onset (>7-10 days).
66	CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE Saliva-molecular testing is suitable in children aged
67	10 years and under, including infants aged <1 year, even bypassing RNA extraction methods.
68	Importantly, the detected viral RNA levels were significantly above the infectivity threshold
69	in several samples. Further investigation is required to understand how SARS-CoV-2 RNA
70	levels correlate with viral transmission.

72 Introduction

73 The COVID-19 pandemic caused by SARS-CoV-2 has resulted in excess morbidity and mortality worldwide, especially in elderly populations and people with associated specific 74 comorbidities.¹⁻³ Adults and children above 12 years of age are being vaccinated at different 75 paces worldwide,⁴ but younger children will remain more susceptible to infection. How new 76 77 variants will be transmitted amongst children and affect the community remains unclear. In fact, thus far, the role of children in SARS-CoV-2 transmission remains poorly understood, 78 mostly because the majority of children with SARS-CoV-2 display mild to no symptoms;⁵ it 79 has been estimated that 93% of infected children are not identified by symptom screening.⁶ 80 However, it is now well established that children are susceptible to infection,⁷⁻⁹ and a small 81 percentage may develop serious complications,¹⁰ including pneumonia, myocarditis, central 82 nervous system disorders, and multisystem inflammatory syndrome.^{11,12} It is critical in the 83 84 next phase of the pandemic, to have readily available strategies for minimally-invasive approaches to monitor school settings; these strategies could help establish whether children 85 86 are prone to evolve new variants and how variants impact viral transmission by children to the community by combining diagnosis with genotyping and epidemiological analyses. 87 Saliva molecular testing has emerged as a suitable alternative to nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs 88 for sampling and identification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in children and adults, and for 89 genotyping SARS-CoV-2 variants.¹³⁻¹⁵ Compared to NP swabs, saliva testing is less invasive 90 and may be implemented in self-collected or parent-assisted contexts more easily, including 91 the sampling of children up to 1-year-old, by low-pressure aspiration. Saliva RT-qPCR 92 testing is also more sensitive than antigen testing.¹⁶ However, there is still some resistance to 93 using saliva molecular testing partly because it is not a fast test, and it is unclear if the 94 95 detected viral loads are substantially lower than those detected in fast lateral-flow tests using 96 NP swab samples. In this cross-sectional study, we focused on children aged 10 years and

97 under, admitted to hospital with COVID-19 related symptoms or with unrelated medical 98 pathologies or surgeries, and investigated the potential of saliva for being coupled to RT-PCR testing, with saliva collected up to 48 h from a positive (or control) NP swab. Interestingly, 99 100 we found non-significant differences between methods using and bypassing RNA extraction. 101 In addition, we associated RNA levels detected in saliva with infectivity and quantified 102 specific SARS-CoV-2 spike and receptor-binding-domain (RBD) antibodies in this type of 103 sample. Interestingly, we only found statistically significant differences in IgM levels in 104 samples positive in swab-molecular testing that were negative by saliva-molecular testing, 105 suggesting that discrepancies between saliva and NP molecular tests are more frequent in 106 children infected for more than 7-10 days, which correlates to loss of infectivity and hence 107 transmission. Our study shows that saliva molecular testing bypassing RNA extraction is an 108 efficient method for monitoring SARS-CoV-2 infected children in age groups up to 10 years-109 old.

110

112 Methods

113 <u>Study design</u>

114 A total of 49 adults and 85 children (aged 10 years and under) inpatients were enrolled in this 115 study between 25 August 2020 and 20 June 2021. NP swab samples were collected and 116 processed at the hospital. Saliva samples were collected from adults or children, within 24 or 117 48 h from NP swab collection, respectively. Both SARS-CoV-2 positive and negative 118 individuals (by NP swab) were enrolled in this study. In adults, only symptomatic patients 119 were enrolled, whereas, for children, patients were enrolled after admission to the hospital for 120 COVID-19 symptoms or causes non-related to COVID-19 (other medical pathologies or 121 surgeries).

This study was approved by the Ethics committees of Centro Hospitalar Universitário de Lisboa Central and Hospital Professor Doutor Fernando Fonseca, in compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and follows international and national guidelines for health data protection. All participants, or their guardians, provided informed written consent to take part in the study.

127

128 Saliva collection

At least 1 mL of saliva was collected with the help of a health care worker, after abstinence from food or water for at least 30 min. Participants were asked to pool saliva in the mouth and gently spit it into a sterile container without coughing or clearing their throats. For children under the age of 1 year, saliva was gently aspirated from the mouth with a suction tube. Samples were stored at 4°C, sent to Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência, and processed within 72 h from collection.

135

136 <u>SARS-CoV-2 detection</u>

137 Saliva was treated with Proteinase K (645 µg/mL in 160 nM SDS) for 30 min at 50°C, followed by heat inactivation for 10 min at 98°C. Saliva specimens with high viscosity were 138 diluted 1:2 in TBE 2x prior to Proteinase K treatment.¹⁷ Samples were then used directly in 139 140 the RT-qPCR reaction or after RNA extraction with the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini kit (Qiagen, 52906), according to the manufacturer's instructions; 200 µL saliva were extracted 141 142 and eluted in 50 µL RNase-free water; 1 µL extracted RNA or unextracted saliva were used for RT-qPCR. A one-step assay (cDNA synthesis and amplification) was performed using 143 iTaq Universal Probes One-Step Kit (BioRad, #12013250). A master mix was prepared for 144 145 each set of primer-probe CDC N1, CDC N2 and Hs RPP30 using: 0.5 nM of each primer 146 pair, 125 nM of probe, 1x iTaq Universal Probes reaction mix, 2.5% (V/V) iScript Reverse 147 Transcriptase and 10% (V/V) RNA or unextracted saliva sample. Two positive controls were 148 performed separately per experiment (SARS-CoV-2 and Human) for N1, N2, and RP primer-149 probe set using 2,000 synthetic copies of nucleocapsid region of the virus or 2,000 synthetic 150 copies of the Human single copy RPP30 gene. One negative control was performed without 151 template for the same three conditions (N1, N2 and RP). All the primers and probes (2019-152 nCoV RUO Kit, 500 rxn, #10006713) were purchased from Integrated DNA Technologies, as 153 well as the positive virus detection control (2019-nCoV_N_Positive Control, #10006625) and 154 positive human sample control (Hs_RPP30 Positive Control, #10006626). Reactions were 155 performed in 384 wells plates (ThermoFisher, #TF-0384) in a QuantStudio 7 Flex system (Applied Biosciences), using the fast mode, consisting of a hold stage at 50°C for 10 min, and 156 157 95°C for 3 min, followed by 45 cycles of a PCR stage at 95°C for 10 sec then 60°C for 30 sec (FAM signal acquisition step). Positive cases were considered when the two probes were 158 159 amplified with a CT below 37. Negative detection was established as having no amplification 160 or amplification of one probe above 37. Inconclusive results were considered, with only one probe being amplified with a CT less than 37. The limit of detection (LOD) of the saliva 161

- assay was performed by serial dilution of IDT synthetic copies (20,000 to 20) of SARS-CoV-
- 163 2 in fresh saliva samples (non-positives) (eFigure 1).
- 164

165 Infectious SARS-CoV-2 growth from saliva

Saliva samples were diluted 1:4 in virus growth medium (Dulbecco's Modified Eagle 166 167 Medium [DMEM, Gibco, #21969035] supplemented with 2% fetal bovine serum [FBS, L-glutamine 168 Gibco, #10500064], 2 mМ [ThermoFisher, #25030024], 1% 169 penicillin/streptomycin solution [Biowest, #L0022] and 2.5 µg/mL Amphotericin B [Gibco, 170 #15290018]), vortexed, briefly centrifuged to collect debris and passed through a 40 µm 171 filter. Two hundred μ L of each sample were added in triplicate to Vero E6 cells (a kind gift 172 from Rupert Beale, The Francis Crick Institute, UK) pre-seeded in 24 well plates with coverslips and centrifuged for 15 min at 3,500 g, 37°C. After centrifugation, the inoculum 173 174 was removed and 250 μ L of fresh virus growth media were added to the cells (protocol adapted from ¹⁸). As a positive control, cells were infected with SARS-CoV-2 viral stock 175 (strain human/DEU/HH-1/2020 from the European Virus Archive Global) at a multiplicity of 176 177 infection (MOI) of 0.01. Cells were inspected daily for cytopathic effect (CPE) and 178 considered negative if no CPE was visible for 7 days. At 1- and 4-days post-infection, a 179 replicate was fixed with 4% formaldehyde and processed for immunofluorescence, as described in ¹⁹. Cells were stained with a rabbit polyclonal SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid 180 181 antibody (1:1,000; ThermoFisher, #MA536270) and an anti-rabbit IgG Alexa-Fluor 488 182 secondary antibody (1:1,000; Invitrogen, #A-21206). Cell nuclei were stained with Hoechst 183 33342 (1 µg/mL, Invitrogen, #H3570). Single optical sections were imaged with a Leica SP5 184 confocal microscope.

185

186 <u>ELISA</u>

187 The ELISA assay used to quantify saliva IgG, IgA, and IgM anti-full-length SARS-CoV-2 spike and its receptor-binding domain (RBD) was adapted from 20 as described in 21,22 , with 188 few modifications described here. Briefly, high binding 96 well plates (Maxisorb) were 189 190 coated with either RBD or spike as capture antigen at $0.5 \square \mu g/mL$ stored overnight at 4°C. 191 Plates were blocked with PBS supplemented with 2% BSA (PBS-BSA) for 1-4 hours at 192 room temperature. Saliva samples were tested at 1 in 25 dilutions in PBS with 2% BSA and 193 0.1% Tween (PBS-BSA-T), in duplicate. For each isotype test plate, an IgG, IgM (GenScript 194 [clone 2001]) or IgA (Absolute Antibody [clone 3022]) SARS-CoV-2 reactive monoclonal 195 antibody was used to generate a concentration curve upon serial dilution and validate each 196 plate assayed. Duplicate measurements of reference positive and negative sera samples were 197 used at 1 in 50 dilutions in PBS-BSA-T to validate each plate assayed; negative sera were 198 used to determine cutoff values.

Samples and monoclonal antibodies were incubated for 2 hours at 37°C, then plates were washed 3x in PBS-T. Secondary antibody goat anti□Human Fc□HRP IgG, IgA or IgM (Abcam) diluted 1 in 25,000 in PBS-BSA-T was added to respective isotype plates and incubated for 1 hour at 37°C to reveal bound IgG, IgA or IgM. Plates were then washed 3x in PBS-T and incubated with 3,3',5,5'□tetramethylbenzidine (BD OptEIATM, BD Biosciences) for 20 to 30 minutes at 37°C. The reaction was stopped with sulphuric acid, and the colorimetric assay was read to provide optical density (OD) at 450□nm.

Reference negative sera were collected at least 3 years before the COVID \Box 19 pandemic and used as pooled serum from 50 samples. Isotype-specific positive and negative thresholds were determined for each assay plate from the mean negative serum value plus two standard deviations (SD). Negative sera were obtained upon informed consent in the frame of the projects "Genetic susceptibility factors and immunologic protection in COVID \Box 19" and

211	"Genetic variance in Portuguese population: candidate genes in COVID 19", both approved
212	by the IGC Ethics Committee (reference H004.2020 and H002.2020, respectively).
213	

214 <u>Statistical analysis</u>

The values of sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy were estimated using the results of the NP 215 216 swab as the reference standard. 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated using the Wilson method, recommended for small sample sizes.²³ The analytical sensitivity of SARS-217 CoV-2 RNA detection between saliva and nasopharyngeal swabs from SARS-CoV-2 positive 218 219 adults and children was compared using a Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank test, in 220 GraphPad Prism 9.1.2. 221 ELISA data were cleaned, and categorical variables were created where needed. Thresholds 2.2.2. for antibody-positive responses were defined by the negative pool (mean + 2 SD). The 223 correlation between antibody OD values and age was assessed using Pearson's Pairwise coefficients. Descriptive statistics were assessed as frequencies and percentages (n [%]) for 224 225 categorical variables; crude associations were tested with Pearson's Chi2 tests. Significance level was set at <0.05. STATA (StataCorp LLC, USA, V16) was used for all analyses. 226

228 **Results**

229 <u>Method validation in adults</u>

We first validated our method with adult patients admitted to Hospital Fernando Fonseca 230 231 with COVID-19, or without SARS-CoV-2 infection, as negative controls. Once SARS-CoV-232 2 infection was assessed by RT-qPCR on RNA extracted from a nasopharyngeal (NP) swab, 233 a saliva sample was collected within the following 48 hours. Saliva specimens were pre-234 treated with proteinase K, RNA was extracted and subjected to RT-qPCR using the primer and probe sequences from the Center for Disease Control and Prevention.²⁴ Alternatively, 235 saliva samples treated with proteinase K were used directly for the RT-qPCR reaction, 236 237 without RNA extraction. 238 The overall concordances of saliva and NP swab were 98.0% (48/49) and 97.8% (46/47), 239 with and without RNA extraction from saliva, respectively (Table 1). Of the patients with a 240 positive NP swab, 100% were also positive in saliva, either with (36/36) or without (34/34) 241 RNA extraction. The differences in CT values between saliva (with or without RNA 242 extraction) and NP swab were not statistically significant (Figure 1A), but CT values in saliva with vs. without RNA extraction are statistically different, with extraction of RNA 243

consistently decreasing the CT values obtained.

Next, we analyzed the stability of saliva samples for stored 3 days at 4°C or 7 days at -20°C prior to processing (Figure 1B). We detected viral RNA in all saliva samples kept at 4°C and -20°C, regardless of RNA extraction, demonstrating they are stable under the conditions studied.

249

250 Performance of the method in pediatric patients

251 Eighty-five patients aged 10 years and under admitted to Hospital Dona Estefânia between

August 2020 and June 2021 were included in our analysis. The clinical characteristics of the

participants are shown in Table 2. Forty-six (54.1%) were positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection
and, within these, 29 (63.0%) presented at least one COVID-19 symptom, the most common
being fever (50.0%), cough (28.0%), and coryza (28.0%). The remaining 17 children (37.0%)
were diagnosed on routine tests prior to hospital admission for causes non-related to COVID19. Twenty-eight (32.9%) participants were under the age of 1 and the mean (SD) age was
3.8 (3.4) years.

Upon hospital admission, SARS-CoV-2 infection was assessed by RT-qPCR quantification 259 260 of RNA load in NP swab samples. Saliva samples were collected within the following 48 hours and processed as described above. The overall concordances of saliva and NP swab 261 262 were 91.8% (78/85) with RNA extraction and 90.4% (75/83) without RNA extraction from 263 saliva (Table 1). Of the children with a positive NP swab, 84.8% were positive in saliva after 264 RNA extraction (39/46) and 81.1% (36/44) were positive in saliva without RNA extraction. 265 The specificity of the method was 100%, with the 39 patients negative by NP swab, also 266 negative in saliva, with and without RNA extraction. When restricting the analysis to children 267 younger than 1-year-old, the sensitivity of the method increases to 87.0% (25/28) with RNA extraction and 86.4% (19/27) without RNA extraction from saliva (Table 1). 268

The CT values in the saliva of children were significantly different from those in NP swab (Figure 2A), with a mean CT (SD) of 22.9 (6.2) in NP swab versus 26.1 (5.1) in saliva with RNA extraction and 27.9 (4.7) without extraction. It is important to notice that there was a time interval between NP swab and saliva collection that could go up to 48 h and, therefore, these differences may not reflect a lower sensitivity of our method but rather a decrease in the

274 patient viral load. Importantly, there was no correlation between detection of SARS-CoV-2 in

saliva and the CT value of the NP swab, or the age of the patient (Figure 2B).

We also analyzed the stability of saliva samples from children when stored for 3 days at 4°C

or 7 days at -20°C prior to processing (Figure 2C). As for adults, saliva samples from children

278 were stable under the conditions tested, since viral RNA was detectable in all samples,

279 irrespective of whether RNA extraction was performed. Finally, we tested saliva samples on a commercial lateral-flow test (COVID19 antigen rapid 280 281 test, ALL TEST, #ICOV-502). Saliva samples that tested positive in our molecular assay with 282 CT<26 also tested positive in the chosen lateral-flow assay (eFigure 2). Of note, two other 283 commercial lateral-flow tests performed poorly in our hands. These data are consistent with what was observed for NP swabs¹⁶ and may have direct implications for monitoring schools. 284 285

Viral growth from saliva samples 286

287 To address if we could detect infectious SARS-CoV-2 viruses in children saliva and correlate 288 viral replication with their CT value, saliva samples were cultured in Vero cells, inspected 289 daily for CPE, and analyzed by immunofluorescence using an antibody against SARS-CoV-2 290 nucleoprotein (Figure 2D). Importantly, we recovered infectious viruses from all saliva 291 samples with CT values \leq 25.6, whereas in saliva samples with higher CT values or negative, 292 no viral replication was detected. These results suggest that children with CT values in saliva 293 equal or higher than 26 may not be able to shed infectious viruses.

294

295 Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in saliva

296 To address the levels of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG, IgA and IgM antibodies in the saliva of 297 adults and children, we performed ELISA assays against full-length spike and spike's RBD 298 (Figure 2F and Table 3). In adults, all saliva samples (n=21) tested negative for IgG 299 reactivities. In contrast, reactive IgA was detected in 16 (76.2%) adults, regardless of NP 300 swab and saliva results, suggesting that the detection of IgA antibodies does not correlate 301 with infection. This discrepancy could, however, be explained by the presence of secreted

302 IgAs (sIgAs) that recognize glycosylation patterns existent in spike.^{25,26} Only one (4.8%)

- 303 participant was positive for reactive IgM.
- 304 Of the 73 saliva samples from children tested by ELISA, 3 (3.1%) were positive for specific
- 305 IgG. Reactive IgA and IgM were detected in 44 (60.3%) and 5 (11.1%) participants,
- 306 respectively. Four participants with discrepant NP vs. saliva RT-qPCR data (NP positive,
- 307 saliva negative, n=12) presented IgM, suggesting that the corresponding samples were
- 308 collected after the first immune response, estimated to be 7-10 days post-infection, and
- 309 therefore after the peak of viral loads.
- 310 For children up to 10 years, IgG OD responses increased significantly (p<0.05) with age for
- spike, while IgA OD responses to spike and RBD presented a marginally significant (p<0.1)
- 312 increase with age (Figure 2F).
- 313
- 314

315 Discussion

316 The infection of SARS-CoV-2 in children remains under-diagnosed and poorly understood. In particular, the role of children in viral transmission remains unclear, especially with the 317 318 emerging variants that increase viral transmission, such as the delta variant. In our work, we corroborate findings that saliva molecular testing by methods similar to those described 319 previously¹⁵ efficiently detects infected children, even in children unable to donate saliva 320 321 (Figure 2A), for whom saliva was gently aspirated. Importantly, in children, the sensitivity, 322 specificity, and accuracy of saliva-RT-qPCR tests compared to NP swab-RT-qPCR were respectively 84.8% (71.8%–92.4%), 100% (91.0%–100%), and 91.8% (84.0%–96.6%) with 323 324 RNA extraction and 81.8% (68.0%-90.5%), 100% (91.0%-100%), and 90.4% (82.1%-325 95.0%) without RNA extraction. Hence, we show that methods bypassing RNA extraction 326 have a sensitivity of 97.3% (36/37) compared with assays extracting RNA, and 100% (36/36) 327 sensitivity considering CTs up to 36 with RNA extraction. We observed that discrepancies 328 between saliva and NP swab-based molecular tests were found in children with specific IgM 329 responses, which could suggest lower viral loads and prolonged infection. Interestingly, our study detected a high proportion of uninfected children with IgA antibodies in saliva. 330 Antibodies in saliva may be acquired from the blood via the gingival crevicular fluid.²⁷ 331 332 However, there is a portion of IgAs that are produced locally in mucosal tissues, such as salivary glands, including secretory IgA (sIgA).²⁵ While some sIgA antibodies undergo 333 affinity maturation, others recognize specific glycosylation patterns²⁶ and could justify the 334 335 high levels detected in negative patients. This cross-reactive response has been reported by others in the mucosal tissue ^{28,29} and is considered an important property of sIgAs for 336 protecting the mucosal tissue against infections. 337

In addition, our study shows that SARS-CoV-2 infectious viruses may be rescued from saliva
samples with CTs lower than 26 (Figure 2D, E). Data suggest that high viral loads are prone

to result in viral transmission.¹⁸ In our study, SARS-CoV-2 viral growth was not associated 340 with symptoms in children, but the sample size used was too low to draw conclusions 341 regarding how symptoms relate to viral loads. In fact, it has been shown that asymptomatic 342 children have significantly lower viral loads than symptomatic children.⁷ Overall, it is well-343 established that infected children are more likely to remain asymptomatic or have milder 344 disease than adults; children are rarely hospitalized and rarely have fatal outcomes.^{1,6,9,10,30} 345 However, data accumulated from 22 centers throughout South Korea has shown that 58% of 346 symptomatic infected children experienced symptoms 3 days (median, in a range of 1-28 347 days) before SARS-CoV-2-positive diagnostic and that, despite having a detectable virus 348 349 load, pre-symptomatic children remained symptom-free for 2.5 days (median, in a range of 1-25 days).⁶ For these reasons, the vast majority of SARS-CoV-2 infected children will 350 continue to be missed by a symptom-based testing approach.⁶ With the unprecedented effort 351 352 of vaccinating the world population above 12-years-old, it is critical to understand how children below 12-years-old contribute to viral circulation within their community. To this 353 need, it is essential to implement efficient, easy, non-invasive, cheap methods for accurately 354 identifying and tracking infected children, for which our method offers a solution. It is also 355 356 critical to establish if children are a potential source for emerging novel SARS-CoV-2 variants, and saliva is suitable for collecting SARS-CoV-2 for genotyping¹³⁻¹⁵ and detecting 357 358 antibodies specific to spike and RBD as we show here (Figure 2F and Table 3). How infection in children will impact breakthrough infections upon vaccination, which has been 359 360 demonstrated as possible,³¹ remains to be elucidated and is of the utmost importance. Overall, 361 our study provides a method highly suitable to identify children positive for SARS-CoV-2. It 362 could be used for the surveillance of kindergartens and schools, and also as the first step in 363 genotyping efforts to monitor known variants and spot novel ones when coupled to CRISPRbased methodologies.³² 364

366 Limitations

367 This cross-sectional study has one key limitation. There was an interval of up to 48 hours between SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnostic in children by NP swab and the collection of a 368 369 saliva sample. Given this time interval, it remains unclear whether the saliva molecular testing has a lower sensitivity than the NP test, or whether there was a real decrease in the 370 371 patient viral load between the two samples collection. In support of the former scenario, other studies conducted in adults reported a small detection decrease in saliva relative to NP 372 swabs.^{15,33-37} Despite the temporal limitation, our saliva testing in children up to 10-years-old 373 374 indicates a high sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy with and without RNA extraction, 375 showing that the method is suitable for detecting infected children. An important note is that 376 children were admitted to hospital for many reasons other than COVID-19 related symptoms 377 and hence this study is suitable to draw conclusions for children regardless of their 378 symptoms. A second limitation of this study is that the number of samples from which we 379 rescued infective viral particles in cultured cells does not allow a suitable statistical analysis 380 to relate viral loads with symptoms and is not a formal demonstration of transmission from children. A third caveat is that the ELISA assay, despite being specific for sera and collected 381 from infected people,²¹ was not established for saliva. In fact, we did not calibrate the ELISA 382 383 with pre-pandemic saliva, and as children were not re-analyzed posteriorly for antibody 384 development, there is a lack of saliva positive and negative controls, which also limits the 385 conclusions we may draw from the data.

386

388 **References**

- 389 1. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in
- 390 China. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(18):1708-1720.
- Yang J, Zheng Y, Gou X, et al. Prevalence of comorbidities and its effects in patients
 infected with SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020:94:91-95.
- 394 3. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With
- 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. JAMA.
 2020:323(11):1061-1069.
- 4. Ledford H. Should children get COVID vaccines? What the science says. *Nature*.
 2021;595:638-639
- Jones TC, Biele G, Muhlemann B, et al. Estimating infectiousness throughout SARSCoV-2 infection course. *Science*. 2021;373(6551).
- 401 6. Han MS, Choi EH, Chang SH, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Viral RNA Detection in
 402 Children With Coronavirus Disease 2019 in the Republic of Korea. *JAMA Pediatr*.
 403 2021:175(1):73-80.
- Kam KQ, Thoon KC, Maiwald M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA load dynamics in the
 nasopharynx of infected children. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2021;149:e18.
- 406 8. Jones TC, Mühlemann B, Hofmann J, et al. An analysis of SARS-CoV-2 viral load by
 407 patient age. 2020.
- 408 9. Lu X, Zhang L, Du H, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Children. N Engl J Med.
 409 2020;382(17):1663-1665.
- 410 10. Chao JY, Derespina KR, Herold BC, et al. Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes of
- 411 Hospitalized and Critically Ill Children and Adolescents with Coronavirus Disease 2019
- 412 at a Tertiary Care Medical Center in New York City. *J Pediatr.* 2020;223:14-19 e12.

- 413 11. Mardi P, Esmaeili M, Iravani P, Abdar ME, Pourrostami K, Qorbani M. Characteristics
- 414 of Children With Kawasaki Disease-Like Signs in COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic
- 415 Review. Front Pediatr. 2021;9:625377.
- 416 12. Ebina-Shibuya R, Namkoong H, Shibuya Y, Horita N. Multisystem Inflammatory
- 417 Syndrome in Children (MIS-C) with COVID-19: Insights from simultaneous familial
- 418 Kawasaki Disease cases. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;97:371-373.
- 419 13. Carmagnola D, Pellegrini G, Canciani E, et al. Saliva Molecular Testing for SARS-CoV-
- 420 2 Surveillance in Two Italian Primary Schools. *Children (Basel)*. 2021;8(7).
- 421 14. Jayamohan H, Lambert CJ, Sant HJ, et al. SARS-CoV-2 pandemic: a review of
 422 molecular diagnostic tools including sample collection and commercial response with
 423 associated advantages and limitations. *Anal Bioanal Chem.* 2021;413(1):49-71.
- 424 15. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, et al. Saliva is more sensitive for SARS-
- 425 CoV-2 detection in COVID-19 patients than nasopharyngeal swabs. *medRxiv*.
 426 2020;https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067835
- 427 16. Schildgen V, Demuth S, Lusebrink J, Schildgen O. Limits and Opportunities of SARS-
- 428 CoV-2 Antigen Rapid Tests: An Experienced-Based Perspective. *Pathogens*. 2021;10(1).
- 429 17. Ranoa DRE, Holland RL, Alnaji FG, et al. Saliva-Based Molecular Testing for SARS-
- 430
 CoV-2
 that
 Bypasses
 RNA
 Extraction.
 bioRxiv.

 431
 2020;https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.18.159434
 .
- 432 18. van Kampen JJA, van de Vijver D, Fraaij PLA, et al. Duration and key determinants of
 433 infectious virus shedding in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-2019
 434 (COVID-19). *Nat Commun.* 2021;12(1):267.
- 435 19. Vale-Costa S, Alenquer M, Sousa AL, et al. Influenza A virus ribonucleoproteins
 436 modulate host recycling by competing with Rab11 effectors. *J Cell Sci.*437 2016;129(8):1697-1710.

- 438 20. Stadlbauer D, Amanat F, Chromikova V, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion in Humans:
- 439 A Detailed Protocol for a Serological Assay, Antigen Production, and Test Setup. Curr
- 440 *Protoc Microbiol.* 2020;57(1):e100-e100.
- 441 21. Alenquer M, Ferreira F, Lousa D, et al. Amino acids 484 and 494 of SARS-CoV-2 spike
- 442 are hotspots of immune evasion affecting antibody but not ACE2 binding. *bioRxiv*.
- 443 2021:2021.2004.2022.441007.
- Viana JF, Bergman M-L, Gonçalves LA, et al. Population homogeneity for the antibody
 response to COVID-19 BNT162b2 / Comirnaty vaccine is only reached after the second
- 446 dose, across all adult age ranges. *MedRxiv*. 2021;2021.03.19.21253680.
- 23. Newcombe RG. Improved confidence intervals for the difference between binomial
 proportions based on paired data. *Stat Med.* 1998;17(22):2635-2650.
- 449 24. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention USDoHaHS. Research Use Only 2019450 Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-time RT-PCR Primers and Probes. 2020.
- 451 25. Stadtmueller BM, Huey-Tubman KE, Lopez CJ, Yang Z, Hubbell WL, Bjorkman PJ.
- The structure and dynamics of secretory component and its interactions with polymericimmunoglobulins. *Elife*. 2016;5.
- 454 26. Gonçalves J, Juliano AM, Charepe N, et al. Non-neutralizing secretory IgA and T cells
- 455 targeting SARS-CoV-2 spike protein are transferred to the breastmilk upon BNT162b2
 456 vaccination. *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.2005.2003.21256416.
- 457 27. Ebersole JL. Humoral immune responses in gingival crevice fluid: local and systemic
 458 implications. *Periodontol 2000*. 2003;31:135-166.
- 459 28. Woof JM, Mestecky J. Mucosal immunoglobulins. *Immunological Reviews*.
 460 2005;206(1):64-82.
- 461 29. Brandtzaeg P. Induction of secretory immunity and memory at mucosal surfaces.
 462 *Vaccine*. 2007;25(30):5467-5484.

- 463 30. Hoang A, Chorath K, Moreira A, et al. COVID-19 in 7780 pediatric patients: A
 464 systematic review. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020.
- 465 31. Hacisuleyman E, Hale C, Saito Y, et al. Vaccine Breakthrough Infections with SARS466 CoV-2 Variants. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;384(23):2212-2218.
- 467 32. de Puig H, Lee RA, Najjar D, et al. Minimally instrumented SHERLOCK 468 (miSHERLOCK) for CRISPR-based point-of-care diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 and
- 469 emerging variants. *Science Advances*. 2021;7(32):eabh2944.
- 470 33. Chua GT, Wong JSC, To KKW, et al. Saliva viral load better correlates with clinical and
- 471 immunological profiles in children with coronavirus disease 2019. *Emerg Microbes*472 *Infect.* 2021;10(1):235-241.
- 473 34. Khurshid Z, Zohaib S, Joshi C, Moin SF, Zafar MS, Speicher DJ. Saliva as a non-
- 474 invasive sample for the detection of SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review. 2020.
- 475 35. Moreno-Contreras J, Espinoza MA, Sandoval-Jaime C, et al. Saliva sampling is an
- excellent option to increase the number of SARS CoV2 diagnostic tests in settings with
- 477 supply shortages. *bioRxiv*. 2020;<u>https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.24.170324</u>
- 478 36. Xu R, Cui B, Duan X, Zhang P, Zhou X, Yuan Q. Saliva: potential diagnostic value and
 479 transmission of 2019-nCoV. *Int J Oral Sci.* 2020;12(1):11.
- 480 37. Yee R, Truong TT, Pannaraj PS, et al. Saliva Is a Promising Alternative Specimen for
- 481 the Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Children and Adults. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*.
- 482 2021;59(2):e02686-02620.
- 483
- 484
- 485

486 Acknowledgements

487	This publication was supported by the European Virus Archive Global (EVA-GLOBAL)
488	project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and
489	innovation program under grant agreement No 871029. It was funded by the Fundação para a
490	Ciência and Tecnologia (FCT, Portugal) under RESEARCH4COVID 19 call with reference
491	283_596885654 and co-funded by ANI under INOV4COVID (Funding to V.M.B.). M.J.A. is
492	funded by the FCT (CEECIND/02373/2020). M.A. is funded by a Junior Researcher working
493	contract from FCT and Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência (IGC, Portugal). This work benefited
494	from COVID19 emergency funds 2020 from Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation and from
495	Oeiras city council.





Figure 1. SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in NP swab and saliva samples from adult patients infected with SARS-CoV-2. (A) Comparison of CT values from paired saliva (with and without RNA extraction) and NP swab specimens. Each line corresponds to a paired specimen. n.d., not detected. ns, not significant; ***p<0.001, by Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank test. (B) Saliva stability at 4°C and -20°C: comparison of CT values from paired saliva samples (with and without RNA extraction) processed immediately, after 3 days at 4°C or 7 days at -20°C.



Figure 2. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection in NP swab and saliva samples from children. (A) Comparison of CT values from paired saliva (with and without RNA extraction) and NP swab specimens from children aged 10 years and under, positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection. Each line corresponds to a paired specimen. n.d., not detected. Each line corresponds to a paired specimen. n.d., not detected; **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, by

512 Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank test. (B) Graphical representation of CT values in NP 513 swabs from infected children vs. age. Positive in saliva, green dots; negative in saliva, red dots. (C) Saliva stability at 4°C and -20°C: comparison of CT values from paired saliva 514 515 samples (with and without RNA extraction) processed immediately, after 3 days at 4°C or 7 516 days at -20°C. (D, E) Infectious SARS-CoV-2 growth from saliva samples. Vero E6 cells 517 were inoculated with saliva samples from children and inspected daily for the presence of a cytopathic effect. As a positive control, cells were infected with SARS-CoV-2 viral stock at 518 519 an MOI of 0.01. (D) Graphical representation of CT values in saliva vs. NP swab result, with dots representing symptomatic children, triangles asymptomatic patients, green color 520 521 indicating samples where viral replication was detected, and red color samples without viral 522 growth. n.d., non-detected. (E) At 24h post-infection, cells were fixed with 4% formaldehyde, 523 permeabilized with 0.2% Triton X100, and stained with SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid antibody 524 (green). Cell nuclei were stained with Hoechst (blue). White bar=10µm. Images were acquired with a Leica SP5 confocal microscope. Representative images from Vero cells 525 526 infected with SARS-CoV-2 viral stock or inoculated with saliva specimens with CT values of 17, 22, 25, and 30, or saliva with non-detected SARS-CoV-2 (n.d.). (F) Levels of IgG, IgA, 527 and IgM against full-length spike and spike's RBD measured in the saliva of children aged 10 528 529 years and under, measured by ELISA.

531 Tables

532 **Table 1.** Performance of saliva in adults and children. Summary of results obtained from

533 parallel testing of swab and saliva with and without extraction of RNA.

	Saliva No.							
	with RNA extraction			without RNA extraction				
NP swab No.	Positive Negative		Total	Positive	Positive Negative			
Adults > 18y								
Positive	36	0	36	34	0	34		
Negative	1	12	13	1	12	13		
Total	37	12	49	35	12	47		
Sensitivity (95%CI)	100% (90.4	4%-100%)		100% (89.8%–100%)				
Specificity (95%CI)	92.3% (66.7%-98.6%)			92.3% (66.7%–98.6%)				
Accuracy (95%CI)	98.0% (89.3%-99.6%)			97.9% (88.9%-99.6%)				
Children < 10y	•			·				
Positive	39	7	46	36	8	44		
Negative	0	39	39	0	39	39		
Total	39	46	85	36	47	83		
Sensitivity (95%CI)	84.8% (71.	84.8% (71.8%-92.4%)			81.8% (68.0%–90.5%)			
Specificity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI) 100% (91.0%–100			100% (91.0%–100%)				
Accuracy (95%CI)	91.8% (84.0%-96.6%)			90.4% (82.1%-95.0%)				
Children < 1y								
Positive	20	3	23	19	3	22		
Negative	0	5	5	0	5	5		
Total	20	8	28	19	8	27		
Sensitivity (95%CI)	87.0% (67.9%–95.5%)			86.4% (66.7%–95.3%)				
Specificity (95%CI)	100% (56.6%-100%)			100% (56.6%-100%)				
Accuracy (95%CI)	89.3% (72.8%–96.3%)			88.9% (71.9%–96.1%)				

534

537 Table 2. Characteristics and reported signs and symptoms of SARS-CoV-2-positive and

538 negative children included in this study.

Characteristic		No. (%)					
		Total sample	Negative	Positive			
Т	otal	85	39 (45.9)	46 (54.1)			
Se	ex (
	Female	39 (45.9)	20 (51.3)	19 (41.3)			
	Male	46 (54.1)	19 (48.7)	27 (58.7)			
A	ge (y)						
	<1	28 (32.9)	5 (12.8)	23 (50)			
	1–5	25 (29.4)	15 (38.5)	10 (21.7)			
	6–10	32 (37.7)	19 (48.7)	13 (28.3)			
C	OVID-19 sign or symptom						
	None	17 (37.0)	NA	17 (37.0)			
	Fever	23 (50.0)	NA	23 (50.0)			
	Cough	13 (28.3)	NA	13 (28.3)			
	Dyspnea	5 (10.9)	NA	5 (10.9)			
	Coryza	13 (28.3)	NA	13 (28.3)			
	Odynophagia	4 (8.7)	NA	4 (8.7)			
	Headache	1 (2.2)	NA	1 (2.2)			
	Abdominal pain	1 (2.2)	NA	1 (2.2)			
	Nausea/Vomit	3 (6.5)	NA	3 (6.5)			
	Diarrhea	3 (6.5)	NA	3 (6.5)			
С	oncurrent conditions						
	0	11 (12.9)	1	10			
	1	69 (81.2)	35	34			
	>1	5 (5.9)	3	2			
	Another Infection	12 (14.1)	1	11			
	Cardiovascular disease	5 (5.9)	0	5 (10.9)			
	Urinary tract disease	13 (15.3)	6	7			
	Digestive tract disease	10 (11.8)	5	5			
	Another respiratory disease	5 (5.9)	0	5			
	Oral surgery	4 (4.7)	4	0			
	Facial congenital anomalies	3 (3.5)	3	0			

539

540

542 **Table 3.** Patients with antibodies in saliva against full-length spike or RBD, divided by age

		Positive N	Io. (%)				
	Total sample No.	Spike			RBD		
Group		IgG	IgA	IgM	IgG	IgA	IgM
Adults > 18y	21	0	15 (71.4)	1 (4.8)	0	16 (76.2)	1 (4.8)
Swab-/saliva-	5	0	3 (60.0)	0	0	3 (60.0)	0
Swab-/saliva+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swab+/saliva-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swab+/saliva+	16	0	12 (75.0)	1(6.3)	0	13 (81.3)	1 (6.2)
Children≤10y	73	3 (4.1)	44 (60.3)	5 (11.1)	1 (1.37)	39 (53.4)	4 (5.5)
Swab-/saliva-	37	2 (5.4)	21 (56.8)	1(2.70)	0	20 (54.0)	0
Swab-/saliva+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swab+/saliva-	12	1 (8.3)	9(75.0)	4 (33.3)**	0	7 (58.3)	3(25.0)*
Swab+/saliva+	24	0	14 (58.3)	0	1 (4.17)	12 (50.0)	1 (4.17)
Total (Adults+Children)	94	3 (3.2)	59 (62.8)	6 (6.4)	1 (1.06)	55 (58.6)	5 (5.3)
Swab-/saliva-	42	2 (4.8)	24 (57.1)	1 (2.4)	0	23 (54.8)	0
Swab-/saliva+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swab+/saliva-	12	1 (8.3)*	9 (75.0)	4 (33.3)**	0	7 (58.3)	3 (25.0)**
Swab+/saliva+	40	0	26 (65.0)	1 (2.50)	1 (2.50)	25 (62.5)	2(5.00)

543 category and by RT-qPCR result on swab and saliva.

544 +, positive; -, negative; *p<0.1, **p<0.05 by Pearson's Chi2 test.

545

547	Supplementary Materials for
548	
549	
550	Saliva molecular testing bypassing RNA extraction is suitable for monitoring and
551	diagnosing SARS-CoV-2 infection in children
552	
553	Authors: Marta Alenquer ¹ , Tiago Milheiro Silva ^{2, §} , Onome Akpogheneta ^{3, §} , Filipe
554	Ferreira ¹ , Sílvia Vale-Costa ¹ , Mónica Medina-Lopes ¹ , Frederico Batista ⁴ , Ana Margarida
555	Garcia ³ , Vasco M. Barreto ⁵ , Cathy Paulino ⁶ , João Costa ⁶ , João Sobral ⁶ , Maria Diniz-da-
556	Costa ⁶ , Susana Ladeiro ⁶ , José Delgado Alves ^{4,5} , Ricardo B. Leite ⁶ , Jocelyne Demengeot ³ ,
557	Maria João Rocha Brito ² , and Maria João Amorim ^{1,*}
558	
559	This file includes:
560	eFigure 1. Standard curves obtained by RT-qPCR amplification of dilution series of synthetic
561	copies of SARS-CoV-2 (20000 to 20) in fresh negative saliva samples, using the
562	N1 and the N2 primer-probe sets.
563	eFigure 2. COVID-19 rapid antigen test detects SARS-CoV-2 in saliva samples positive and
564	with CT values up to 26.
565	
566	

567



568

eFigure 1. Standard curves obtained by RT-qPCR amplification of dilution series of synthetic copies of SARS-CoV-2 (20000 to 20) in fresh negative saliva samples, using the N1 and the N2 primer-probe sets. The obtained cycle threshold (CT) values were plotted vs. the copy number on a logarithmic scale. Each sample was run in quadruplicate. Error bars indicate the standard deviation.



575



eFigure 2. COVID-19 rapid antigen test detects SARS-CoV-2 in saliva samples positive and with CT values up to 26. Graphical representation of CT values in saliva after RNA extraction vs. rapid antigen test result, with dots representing symptomatic children, triangles asymptomatic patients. n.d., not-detected. The COVID-19 antigen rapid test from ALL TEST (ref. ICOV-502) was used accordingly to the manufacturer's instructions, with the exception that instead of NP swab, saliva samples diluted 1:2 in extraction buffer were used.

585

586