

1 **Combined oropharyngeal/nares and nasopharyngeal swab sampling remain effective for molecular**
2 **detection of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant**

3

4 *Glenn Patriquin^{a,b}, Jason J. LeBlanc^{a,b,c,d}, Holly A. Gillis^e, Gregory R. McCracken^a, Janice J. Pettipas^f, and
5 Todd F. Hatchette^{a,b,c,d}

6

7 ^aDivision of Microbiology, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Nova Scotia Health,
8 Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

9 ^bDepartment of Pathology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

10 ^cDepartment of Medicine, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

11 ^dDepartment of Microbiology and Immunology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

12 ^ePublic Health, Nova Scotia Health, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

13 ^fNova Scotia Provincial Public Health Laboratory Network (PPHLN), Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

14

15 **Key Words:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Omicron, oropharyngeal, nares, nasopharyngeal, PCR, nose, throat

16 **Running title:** NP vs. OPN swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Omicron detection

17 **Word count:** 1069

18 **Abstract:** 189

19 ***Corresponding author:** Glenn Patriquin
20 Division of Microbiology, Department of Pathology and Laboratory
21 Medicine, Nova Scotia Health
22 Room 315, MacKenzie Building
23 5788 University Avenue, Halifax, Nova Scotia, B3H 1V8
24 Tel.: +1 902 473 7493, Fax: +1 902 473 6432
25 Email: glenn.patriquin@nshealth.ca

26

27

28 **Summary**

29 The world has experienced several waves of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern (VoCs) throughout the
30 COVID-19 pandemic since the first cases in December 2019. The Omicron VoC has increased
31 transmission, compared to its predecessors, and can present with sore throat and other cold-like
32 symptoms. Given the predominance of throat symptoms, and previous work demonstrating better
33 sensitivity using antigen-based rapid detection tests when a throat swab is included in the standard
34 nasal sampling, this quality improvement project sought to ensure ongoing suitability of both combined
35 oropharyngeal/nares (OPN) and nasopharyngeal (NP) swab sampling used throughout the pandemic.
36 Consenting participants meeting Public Health testing criteria (mostly symptomatic or a close contact of
37 a known case) were enrolled, and paired NP and OPN swabs collections were subjected to nucleic acid
38 amplification testing (NAAT). Comparing paired specimens from 392 participants sensitivity of NP swabs
39 was 89.1% (95% CI, 78.8-94.9), and that of OPN was 98.4% (95% CI: 90.9->99.9) (p-value 0.052). This
40 project demonstrated that both NP and combined OPN swabs detected the Omicron variant with similar
41 sensitivity by NAAT, supporting the continued use of either swab collection for SARS-CoV-2 molecular
42 detection.

43

NP vs. OPN swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Omicron detection

44 **Short communication**

45 Since COVID-19 was first described in December 2019, several SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern
46 (VoCs) have been detected, each with unique properties, both in terms of symptomatology and
47 transmissibility. Prior to the emergence of VoCs, RT-PCR of testing nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs was the
48 gold standard approach to testing in community and hospitalized patients, with the addition of lower
49 tract specimens to increase sensitivity in those with pulmonary disease¹. Early in the global response,
50 the reduced availability of NP swabs necessitated the validation of several combined
51 oropharyngeal/nares (OPN) swabs as an alternative sampling method, which demonstrated acceptable
52 performance when compared to the NP^{2,3}. Recently the Omicron VoC (lineage B.1.1.529)⁴ has become
53 predominant in many regions in the world and is notable for its increased transmissibility, reduced
54 vaccine effectiveness^{5,6}, and possible differences in tissue tropism⁷⁻⁹. The propensity to cause sore
55 throat and cold-like symptoms¹⁰, along with previous work showing improved sensitivity with inclusion
56 of a throat sample in combination with nasal sampling for use with antigen-based rapid testing devices
57 (Ag-RDTs)^{11,12}, prompted this quality improvement initiative.

58 Community members who met eligibility criteria for molecular diagnostic testing by Public
59 Health (Table S1) were asked to participate in this project. Participants were adults recruited from one
60 of two testing streams during a four-day period in January of 2022, in Nova Scotia, Canada. Enrollment
61 was either facilitated by Public Health through the Public Health Mobile Testing Unit deployed for
62 outbreak investigations in multiple communities, or through urban-based COVID-19 testing centres. In
63 both streams, participants had NP sampling for nucleic acid amplification testing (NAAT), using a
64 standardized sampling technique with a flocked swab (<https://vimeo.com/516853275/c67017fd3a>),
65 which was placed in viral transport media (VTM) (Copan Diagnostics, Inc., (Murrietta, CA), or AccuViral
66 Collection Kit, (AccuGene, San Diego, CA)). Following verbal consent, an additional combined OPN swab

67 was collected as previously described^{2,3,13}, using a CLASSIQSwab fiber-tip swab from Copan Italia
68 (Brescia, Italy), placed into the same type of VTM.

69 NP and OPN samples were immediately transported to a central laboratory and refrigerated at
70 4° Celsius, where NAAT was performed within 12h according to manufacturer instructions. Initially,
71 both NP and OPN samples were tested using the Aptima SARS-CoV-2 Assay on the Panther System
72 (Hologic Inc., San Diego, CA). NP and OPN swabs with negative Panther results were confirmed as
73 negative with the SARS-CoV-2 Test on the Cobas 6800 instrument (Roche Diagnostics, Rotkreuz,
74 Switzerland). NP or OPN swabs with positive results, as well as the paired specimen regardless of its
75 result, were subsequently tested using both the Roche 6800 assay and the Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2 test
76 (Cepheid, Sunnyvale, CA). Swab result was compared to a consensus reference standard derived from all
77 NAAT test results. For each swab, a positive result was defined as SARS-CoV-2 detection in at least two
78 NAATs (Table S2). To categorize swab results as true positive, true negative, false positive, and false
79 negative results (to determine sensitivity and specificity), each swab was compared to the case result,
80 established at the level of the individual. McNemar's test with Yate's correction
81 (<https://www.omnicalculator.com/>) was used to determine statistical significance between NP and OPN
82 swab collections. This project was deemed a quality improvement initiative and was exempt from
83 Research Ethics Board review (file number 1027644).

84 Overall, 392 participants with paired NP and OPN samples were analyzed, with concurrent
85 results between swab types seen for the majority of individuals (Table). The overall positivity rate was
86 16.3%, with 328 individuals negative by both swab types, and 56 with positive results from both swab
87 types. Eight people had conflicting results, with one SARS-COV-2 detection identified by NP alone, and
88 seven detected by OPN alone. Sensitivity and specificity were 89.1% (95% confidence interval (CI): 78.8-
89 94.9%) and 100% (95% CI: 92.5-100), and 98.4% (95% CI: 90.9->99.9%) and 100% (95% CI: 93.1-100), for
90 NP and OPN swabs, respectively. However, this difference between the swab types was not statistically

NP vs. OPN swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Omicron detection

91 significant (p-value, 0.052). All OPN samples with Ct values <32 were submitted for next-generation
92 sequencing at the National Microbiology Laboratory (NML) (Winnipeg, Manitoba). Of 59 samples
93 submitted, four sequencing reactions failed, and the remaining 55 samples were characterized as the
94 VoC, Omicron (50 of the BA.1 lineage, and five of the BA.1.1 lineage).

95 The COVID-19 pandemic has been fraught with various challenges; each wave uniquely testing
96 our ability to detect, contain, and prevent infection. With Omicron, questions have been raised
97 regarding altered tissue tropism, which caused people to question the optimal anatomical location for
98 SARS-CoV-2 detection. In this quality project, there was no significant difference between NP or OPN
99 specimens for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 when using NAAT methods.

100 This conclusion differs from our recent study in which the sensitivity of Ag-RDTs for detecting
101 SARS-CoV-2 was higher when sampling the throat and nose (versus nasal sampling alone). However, the
102 results of that study are not directly comparable to this population because the current project
103 compared the nasopharynx and the oropharynx/nares, whereas the Ag-RDT study compared bilateral
104 nares swabbing with an OPN swab. It may be that the anatomical proximity of the nasopharynx to the
105 oropharynx rendered a difference between sampling these sites insignificant. In addition, perhaps NAAT
106 testing, being more sensitive than Ag-RDT testing was not subject to noticeable differences between the
107 sites. In this project, although not significant, there were some cases detected by OPN that were missed
108 by NP sampling. It is possible that some of these results reflect the difficulty in performing an NP swab
109 consistently, as compared to the relative ease of performing an OPN swab; however, given a lack of a
110 reliable molecular host target for sample quality, the possibility of discrepant results based on
111 differences in anatomical sites is also possible⁷⁻⁹.

112 This project was limited in several ways. As it was a quality initiative, clinical information for
113 participants was not available, therefore symptomatology, timing of swab collection from recent

114 exposures, and the impact of co-morbid conditions or immunization status could not be established.
115 Also, despite policies and training in the standardization of performing NP swabs, the quality of the
116 technique could not be directly assessed.

117 Ultimately, despite evidence indicating that combined sampling of the throat and nares can
118 significantly increase SARS-CoV-2 detection by Ag-RDTs compared to nasals swabs, the performance
119 characteristics of OPN swabs did not differ from the reference NP sampling method for NAAT detection
120 of SARS-CoV-2. Importantly, this work demonstrates the ongoing suitability of either NP or OPN swab
121 for molecular detection of SARS-CoV-2, even if Omicron potentially has altered tissue tropism.

NP vs. OPN swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Omicron detection

122 **Acknowledgements**

123 The authors thank the constant efforts of those working in the COVID-19 Testing Centres and the Public
124 Health Mobile Units for their support in this project. Your dedication and enthusiasm for projects such
125 as these are instrumental for the ongoing care of the community. The authors would also like to thank
126 front line staff in the Division of Microbiology, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Nova
127 Scotia Health, for their support for this project and unwavering efforts throughout the pandemic.
128 Thank you to the National Microbiology Laboratory for providing surveillance sequencing data.

129 **Table.** SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid amplification test results of paired nasopharyngeal and
130 oropharyngeal/nares swabs.

	Number of participants
Positive by NP and OPN	56
Positive by NP only	1
Positive by OPN only	7
Negative by NP and OPN	328
<i>p-value</i> (NP vs. OPN)*	0.052

131

132 *McNemar's test with Yate's correction; NP, nasopharyngeal; OPN, oropharyngeal/nares.

NP vs. OPN swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Omicron detection

133 **References**

134

- 135 1. Bwire GM, Majigo MV, Njiro BJ, Mawazo A. Detection profile of SARS-CoV-2 using
136 RT-PCR in different types of clinical specimens: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
137 *J Med Virol.* 2021;93(2):719-725. doi:10.1002/jmv.26349
- 138 2. LeBlanc JJ, Heinsteinst C, MacDonald J, Pettipas J, Hatchette TF, Patriquin G. A combined
139 oropharyngeal/nares swab is a suitable alternative to nasopharyngeal swabs for the
140 detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of Clinical Virology.* 2020;128:104442.
141 doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104442
- 142 3. Patriquin G, Davis I, Heinsteinst C, MacDonald J, Hatchette TF, LeBlanc JJ. Exploring
143 alternative swabs for use in SARS-CoV-2 detection from the oropharynx and anterior
144 nares. *Journal of Virological Methods.* 2020;285:113948.
145 doi:10.1016/j.jviromet.2020.113948
- 146 4. World Health Organization. Tracking SARS-CoV-2 variants. Accessed January 16, 2022.
147 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/what-we-do/tracking-SARS-CoV-2-variants>
- 148 5. Collie S, Champion J, Moultrie H, Bekker LG, Gray G. Effectiveness of BNT162b2 Vaccine
149 against Omicron Variant in South Africa. *N Engl J Med.* Published online December 29,
150 2021;NEJMc2119270. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2119270
- 151 6. Araf Y, Akter F, Tang Y dong, Fatemi R, Parvez MdSA, Hossain MdG. Omicron variant of
152 SARS-CoV-2: Genomics, transmissibility, and responses to current COVID-19 vaccines.
153 *Journal of Medical Virology.* 2022;Epub ahead of print. doi:10.1002/jmv.27588

- 154 7. CDC COVID-19 Response Team. SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.529 (Omicron) Variant — United
155 States, December 1–8, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(50):1731-1734.
156 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7050e1
- 157 8. Huang N, Pérez P, Kato T, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection of the oral cavity and saliva. *Nat*
158 *Med.* 2021;27(5):892-903. doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01296-8
- 159 9. Marais G, Hsiao N yuan, Iranzadeh A, et al. Saliva Swabs Are the Preferred Sample for
160 Omicron Detection. *MedRxiv Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2021.
161 doi:10.1101/2021.12.22.21268246
- 162 10. Iacobucci G. Covid-19: Runny nose, headache, and fatigue are commonest symptoms of
163 omicron, early data show. *BMJ.* Published online December 16, 2021:n3103.
164 doi:10.1136/bmj.n3103
- 165 11. Adamson B, Sikka R, Wyllie AL, Premssirut P. *Discordant SARS-CoV-2 PCR and Rapid*
166 *Antigen Test Results When Infectious: A December 2021 Occupational Case Series.*
167 *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2022. doi:10.1101/2022.01.04.22268770
- 168 12. Goodall BL, LeBlanc JJ, Hatchette TF, Barrett L, Patriquin G. Investigating Sensitivity of
169 Nasal or Throat (ISNOT): A Combination of Both Swabs Increases Sensitivity of SARS-
170 CoV-2 Rapid Antigen Tests. *MedRxiv Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2022.
171 doi:10.1101/2022.01.18.22269426
- 172 13. LeBlanc JJ, Pettipas J, Di Quinzio M, Hatchette TF, Patriquin G. Reliable detection of
173 SARS-CoV-2 with patient-collected swabs and saline gargles: A three-headed comparison
174 on multiple molecular platforms. *Journal of Virological Methods.* 2021;295:114184.
175 doi:10.1016/j.jviromet.2021.114184

NP vs. OPN swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Omicron detection

176

177

178 **Table S1.** Provincial Public Health eligibility criteria for COVID-19 testing by polymerase chain reaction,
179 at the time of data collection.

People who have symptoms or have been identified as close contacts AND are one of the following:

- 50 years and over
- Unvaccinated (less than full vaccine series) and age 12 or older
- Live or work in the following congregate settings:
 - Long-term care home
 - Residential care facilities
 - Corrections
 - Shelters and transition houses
 - Acute care settings
- Adult First Nations and African Nova Scotians
- Front line Health Care Workers with direct patient care (eg family physicians, nurse practitioners, dentist) and First Responders
- Adults 18-49 year with one or more risk factors for severe disease:
 - Obesity (BMI >30 kg/m²)
 - Type 1 or 2 diabetes mellitus
 - Chronic lung disease, including poorly controlled asthma (e.g. on medication or hospitalization within the past 12 months)
 - Chronic kidney disease, including those on dialysis
 - Down Syndrome
 - Motor Neuron Disease, Multiple Sclerosis, Myasthenia Gravis, Huntington's Disease
 - Immunocompromised or receiving immunosuppressive therapy
- Children and youth under age 18 with any of the following conditions:
 - history of prematurity < 29 weeks
 - Chronic lung disease including chronic lung disease of prematurity, cystic fibrosis, and severe asthma
 - Down Syndrome
 - Motor Neuron Disease, Multiple Sclerosis, Myasthenia Gravis
 - Obesity (BMI >30kg/m²)
- Pregnant

2. Testing required for medical procedure

3. Partially or unvaccinated travelers who need 2 negative PCR tests to stop isolating after at least 7 days

180

181

182

NP vs. OPN swabs for SARS-CoV-2 Omicron detection

183 **Table S2.** Discrepant results between NP and OPN swab collections.

Sample	NP swab									OPN swab								
	Panther		6800			Xpert			Overall Result	Panther		6800			Xpert			Overall Result
	RLU	Result	Ct Orf1a/b	Ct E gene	Result	Ct E gene	Ct N2 gene	Result		RLU	Result	Ct Orf1a/b	Ct E gene	Result	Ct E gene	Ct N2 gene	Result	
1	906	POS	41.6	42.7	POS	0	0	NEG	POS	NEG	NEG	0	0	NEG	0	0	NEG	NEG
2	NEG	NEG	0	0	NEG	0	37.87	POS	NEG	812	POS	0	41.7	POS	0	37.25	POS	POS
3	NEG	NEG	39	41.8	POS	0	0	NEG	NEG	1265	POS	35.1	38.3	POS	35.76	37.1	POS	POS
4	NEG	NEG	0	0	NEG	0	0	NEG	NEG	1227	POS	38.6	40.7	POS	0	35.48	POS	POS
5	NEG	NEG	0	0	NEG	0	0	NEG	NEG	1264	POS	33.3	35.7	POS	31.15	32.62	POS	POS
6	NEG	NEG	0	0	NEG	0	0	NEG	NEG	1300	POS	25.4	27.6	POS	27.31	27.55	POS	POS
7	NEG	NEG	0	0	NEG	0	0	NEG	NEG	1305	POS	23.8	26.2	POS	23.52	23.9	POS	POS
8	NEG	NEG	0	0	NEG	0	0	NEG	NEG	1306	POS	24.5	26.7	POS	24.83	25.09	POS	POS

184

185 Abbreviations: cycle threshold (Ct); relative light unit (RLU); nasopharyngeal (NP);
 186 oropharyngeal/bilateral nares (OPN).

187