

Study on the usefulness of Direct Saliva sample Collection (DiSC) by polyester swab

Kotaro Aoki¹⁾, Mami Nagashima²⁾, Katsuhito Kashiwagi³⁾, Takashi Chiba²⁾, Kenji Sadamasu²⁾, Yoshikazu Ishii¹⁾*, Kazuhiro Tateda¹⁾

1) Department of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, Toho University School of Medicine

2) General Medicine and Emergency Center (Internal Medicine), Toho University Omori Medical Center, Tokyo, Japan

3) Department of Microbiology, Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Public Health, Tokyo, Japan

*Correspondence author: Yoshikazu Ishii Ph.D., Department of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, Toho University School of Medicine, 5-21-16 Omori-nishi, Ota-ku, Tokyo 143-8540, Japan. 03-3762-4151. yishii@med.toho-u.ac.jp

Abstract

Saliva sample can be self-collected and used in testing of SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs) test in Japan. However, this may have difficulty collecting a proper specimen when collecting for the first time.

We compared 2 collection methods, conventional methods and Direct Saliva Sample Collection method (DiSC) from 44 asymptomatic or symptomatic individuals who were in quarantine in Toho university hospital. RT-PCR by DiSC method showed about 70 % positive percent agreement compared to RT-PCR by conventional methods. In addition, comparing RT-PCR and TMA by DiSC method, TMA showed about 90 % positive percent agreement compared to RT-PCR. DiSC method is easy to perform by every person, does not have complicated restrictions/instructions and can be used in RT-PCR and TMA. This method allows for ease of saliva collection in certain patient populations.

Keywords

SARS-CoV-2, NAAT, Saliva, Direct collection, Aptima, Panther system.

Accurate pathogen detection by nucleic acid amplification tests (NAATs) begins with effective and consistent specimen collection methods. Especially for SARS-CoV-2 testing, it is important to collect samples safely and consistently for best results and protection of healthcare workers. Currently, nasopharyngeal swab (NP), nasal vestibular swab, and saliva have been used as specimens in SARS-CoV-2 NAATs [1-3]. These three specimen types have advantages and disadvantages in consistency and simplicity of collection. For example, although NP is more consistently collected, it must be collected by a medical worker, who may be exposed to risk of droplet infection by the spray from patients [4]. Saliva can be self-collected and a relatively homogeneous sample can be obtained. However, the person, who is not a medical worker and does not have specimen collection experience, may have difficulty collecting a proper specimen.

In this study, saliva was collected from 44 asymptomatic or symptomatic individuals who were in quarantine in Toho university hospital. Saliva was collected directly from mouth by simply placing an Aptima® Multitest swab between the gums and the inner cheek for approximately 30 seconds (Direct Saliva Sample Collection method; DiSC); paired saliva samples were collected

from the same individuals using conventional methods [5]. The swab was suspended in Aptima® Multitest swab collection tube (MLT; Hologic, U.S.A.). We compared the DiSC with conventional collection method by using N2 RT-PCR (140 µL from MLT was used for extraction for RT-PCR) (5). We also compared a transcription mediated amplification (TMA) NAAT, the Aptima® SARS-CoV-2 run on the Panther system (Hologic, U.S.A.), with the RT-PCR for the sample set collected by DiSC (n=44). The limit of detection for the N2 region RT-PCR used in this study is 50 digital PCR copies / mL in starting sample using SARS-CoV-2 Molecular Q Panel (RANDOX Laboratories, U.K.) and QIAamp Viral RNA mini kit (QIAGEN, Germany), TaqMan Fast Virus 1-Step Master Mix and QuantStudio®5 (ThermoFisher Scientific, U.S.A.) in our laboratory. The study design was approved from the Ethics Committee of Toho University School of Medicine (A20116_A20028_A20020_A20014_19099).

The results indicate that while the DiSC method may have somewhat decreased sensitivity as compared to the conventional method, it still detected approximately 70% of positive samples (Table 1). Of the 5 DiSC specimens positive only by TMA, three had paired conventional collection saliva specimens that were positive by RT-PCR (Ct values 30-34) (Supp. Table 1).

Our results also show that TMA detects more positives than the SARS-CoV-2 N2 RT-PCR for saliva collected by DiSC. World Health Organization document stated that it may be desirable to use a nasal swab sample rather than a saliva sample because the definitive diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 requires high sensitivity and specificity, but screening tests to confirm cases with suspicious COVID-19 and its history of infection do not require high sensitivity [6]. DiSC is easy to perform by every person, does not have complicated restrictions/instructions (e.g., eating/drinking, time of day for collection, time to processing, etc), and may allow for ease of saliva collection in certain patient populations, particularly children, the elderly, and patients with collagen disease, while still maintaining acceptable sensitivity.

Funding

A part of this research was supported by the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development under Grant Number JP19fk0108113.

ICMJE Statement

Contributors YI was responsible for the organization and coordination of the trial. KA and KS were the chief investigators and responsible for the data analysis. KA, MN, TC, KS, YI and KT developed the trial design. All authors

contributed to the writing of the final manuscript. All members of the DiSC

Study Team contributed to the management or administration of the trial.

Conflict of Interest

All authors have nothing to declare.

References

- [1] Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, Tan W. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA*. 2020;323(18):1843-1844. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.3786.
- [2] Bwire GM, Majigo MV, Njiro BJ, Mawazo A. Detection profile of SARS-CoV-2 using RT-PCR in different types of clinical specimens: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Med Virol*. 2021;93(2):719-725. doi: 10.1002/jmv.26349.
- [3] Ceron JJ, Lamy E, Martinez-Subiela S, Lopez-Jornet P, Capela E Silva F, Eckersall PD, Tvariionaviciute A. Use of Saliva for Diagnosis and Monitoring the SARS-CoV-2: A General Perspective. *J Clin Med*. 2020;9(5):1491. doi: 10.3390/jcm9051491.
- [4] Griesemer SB, Van Slyke G, Ehrbar D, Strle K, Yildirim T, Centurioni DA, Walsh AC, Chang AK, Waxman MJ, St George K. Evaluation of specimen

types and saliva stabilization solutions for SARS-CoV-2 testing. J Clin

Microbiol. 2021;JCM.01418-20. doi: 10.1128/JCM.01418-20.

[5] National Institute of Infectious, Manual for the Detection of Pathogen

2019-nCoV, [https://www.niid.go.jp/niid/images/lab-manual/SARS-CoV-](https://www.niid.go.jp/niid/images/lab-manual/SARS-CoV-2_gene_detect_and_isolation_manual_Ver1_1.pdf)

2_gene_detect_and_isolation_manual_Ver1_1.pdf

[6] World Health Organization document, COVID-19 Target product profiles

for priority diagnostics to support response to the COVID-19 pandemic

v.1.0, [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-target-product-profiles-for-priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic-v.0.1)

profiles-for-priority-diagnostics-to-support-response-to-the-covid-19-

pandemic-v.0.1

1 **Table 1. Evaluation results of the Direct Saliva Sample Collection method**
2 **(DiSC) and the conventional collection method by RT-PCR**

		Saliva (Conventional)		
		Positive	Negative	Total
Saliva (DiSC)	Positive	20	3	23
	Negative	9	12	21
	Total	29	15	44

DiSC against Conventional

positive percent agreement	69%
negative percent agreement	80%
Overall Agreement	73%

Table 2. Evaluation results of the TMA method and RT-PCR performed using samples collected by Direct Saliva Sample Collection method (DiSC).

		RT-PCR		
		Positive	Negative	Total
TMA	Positive	21	6	27
	Negative	2	15	17
	Total	23	21	44

TMA against RT-PCR

positive percent agreement	91%
negative percent agreement	71%
Overall Agreement	82%