

1 **Feasibility and Sensitivity of Saliva GeneXpert MTB/RIF Ultra for Tuberculosis Diagnosis**
2 **in Adults in Uganda**

3
4 Patrick Byanyima¹, Sylvia Kaswabuli¹, Emmanuel Musisi², Catherine Nabakiibi¹, Josephine
5 Zawedde¹, Ingvar Sanyu¹, Abdul Sessolo¹, Alfred Andama^{1,5}, William Worodria^{1,5}, Laurence
6 Huang^{3,4}, J. Lucian Davis^{6,7}

- 7
8 1. Infectious Diseases Research Collaboration, Kampala, Uganda
9 2. Division of Infection and Global Health, School of Medicine, University of St. Andrews, UK
10 3. Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, University of California San Francisco,
11 San Francisco, California, USA
12 4. Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine, University of California San
13 Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA
14 5. Department of Internal Medicine, Makerere University College of Health Sciences, Uganda
15 6. Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, New
16 Haven, Connecticut, USA
17 7. Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine Section, Yale School of Medicine, New
18 Haven, Connecticut, USA

19
20 Running Head: Saliva TB NAAT in Uganda

21 Word Count (Main Text): 2533 words

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 The objective of this prospective, observational study carried out at China-Uganda Friendship
3 Hospital-Naguru in Kampala, Uganda, was to determine the performance of GeneXpert
4 MTB/RIF Ultra (Xpert) testing on saliva for active tuberculosis (TB) disease among consecutive
5 adults undergoing diagnostic evaluation. We calculated sensitivity to determine the diagnostic
6 performance in comparison to that of the composite reference standard of *Mycobacterium*
7 *tuberculosis* liquid and solid cultures on two spot sputum specimens. GeneXpert Ultra on saliva
8 had a sensitivity of 90% (95% confidence interval [CI], 81-96%); this was similar to that of
9 sputum fluorescence smear microscopy (FM) of 87% (95% CI, 77-94%). Sensitivity was 24%
10 lower (95% CI for difference 2-48%, p=0.003) among persons living with HIV (71%, 95% CI 44-
11 90%) than among persons living without HIV (95%, 95% CI 86-99%) and 46% lower (95% CI
12 for difference 14-77%, p<0.0001) among sputum microscopy positive (96%, 95% CI 87-99%)
13 than among sputum microscopy negative patients (50%, 95% CI 19-81%). Semi-quantitative
14 Xpert grade was higher in sputum than in paired saliva samples from the same patient. In
15 conclusion, saliva specimens appear to be feasible and similarly sensitive to sputum for active
16 TB diagnosis using molecular testing, suggesting promise as a non-sputum diagnostic test for
17 active TB in high-burden settings.

18

19 Word Count (Abstract): 202 words (Limit 250)

1 INTRODUCTION

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
Over the last quarter century, improvements in diagnosis and treatment of people with tuberculosis (TB) have gradually reduced mortality, but large gaps in detection and treatment persist that contribute to substantial ongoing morbidity and mortality [1]. Among several available strategies to facilitate rapid, same-day diagnosis of TB, testing sputum with the GeneXpert MTB/RIF Ultra molecular assay [2, 3] is the most sensitive and most readily available approach. Unfortunately, there are several operational challenges associated with collecting sputum for diagnosis of pulmonary TB. First, coughing during sputum expectoration or sputum induction generates aerosols that may facilitate TB transmission [4]. Second, some individuals are unable to produce sputum, including young children, those with dry cough, and the severely ill/severely debilitated. Given these limitations of sputum for TB diagnosis, in 2014 the World Health Organization (WHO) issued guidelines for developers of a future non-sputum test for active TB diagnosis, including a target product profile suggesting that it should have a minimum diagnostic accuracy similar to sputum GeneXpert MTB/RIF on sputum smear-negative individuals (*i.e.*, sensitivity $\geq 68\%$, specificity $\geq 98\%$) [5].

One alternative sample type with great promise for diagnosis of pulmonary TB is saliva, which is easy to collect, with minimal risk of generating aerosols. Although Stop TB Partnership guidelines discourage collection of salivary sputum samples because they have lower diagnostic yield for acid-fast bacilli (AFB) by microscopy or culture, the diagnostic yield of TB molecular testing appears to be more promising. In a previous study of 1782 smear-negative adults undergoing evaluation for active TB, for example, we found that salivary sputum provided a substantially higher diagnostic yield and sensitivity for culture-positive TB than other sputum

24 types, implying incremental value to using oral samples at least as a supplement to sputum [6].
25 Using a different sampling technique, oral swabs, Wood and colleagues showed that oral nylon
26 swabs repeatedly tested positive for TB via IS6110 polymerase chain reaction testing in 90% of
27 South African patients with TB confirmed by sputum GeneXpert MTB/RIF testing, suggesting
28 that TB is present in the oral cavity [7]. A subsequent study of 50 adults with possible TB in
29 Uganda found similar sensitivity of 88%, albeit with lower specificity. Saliva is also now widely
30 used for molecular diagnosis of COVID-19, where it has high sensitivity, even among patients
31 without symptoms [8]. Using saliva as a diagnostic specimen in the COVID-19 context has been
32 shown to reduce aerosol exposure for health workers and eliminate the need for personal
33 protective equipment because it is self-collected [9]. This raises the possibility that saliva alone
34 could be used as a TB diagnostic when paired with next generation and ultra-sensitive molecular
35 tests (GeneXpert MTB/RIF Ultra). Thus, the aim of this study was to evaluate the feasibility and
36 sensitivity of GeneXpert MTB/RIF on saliva among symptomatic adult TB confirmed patients.

37

38 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

39 *Study design & Population.* Between June 2018 and May 2019, we carried out a prospective,
40 observational study to determine the performance of GeneXpert MTB/RIF Ultra (Xpert) testing
41 on saliva for diagnosis of active TB. This was a sub-study nested within the Mulago Inpatient
42 Non-invasive Diagnosis of Pneumonia–Inflammation Aging, Microbes, and Obstructive Lung
43 Disease (I AM OLD) study. We enrolled consecutive adults (age ≥ 18 years) with cough of any
44 duration but < 6 months who were also undergoing TB evaluation (including HIV testing, chest
45 radiography, and sputum examination) as inpatients or outpatients at China-Uganda Friendship
46 Hospital-Naguru in Kampala, Uganda; patients with a prior history of TB within the past two

47 years and those receiving treatment for active TB at the time of presentation were excluded. In
48 this sub-study, we included consecutive patients with positive sputum Xpert results at any semi-
49 quantitative threshold.

50

51 ***Measurements and Study Procedures:*** After obtaining written informed consent from
52 participants, a study nurse collected demographic and clinical information using a structured
53 questionnaire, and then provided standardized instructions to expectorate sputum into three
54 separate cups “on the spot” [10]. Trained study staff examined the first sample using direct
55 auramine-O fluorescence microscopy (FM) [11, 12] and sent the remaining sample for
56 mycobacterial culture and speciaion on Lowenstein-Jensen (LJ) solid media and in
57 Mycobacterial Growth Indicator Tube (MGIT) liquid media, the accepted microbiologic
58 reference standard assays for TB. Staff examined the second sample using direct FM and
59 performed GeneXpert MTB/RIF testing on the remainder [13]. Finally, staff sent a third sputum
60 sample for mycobacterial culture on solid media and liquid culture.. All cultures were performed
61 at the Makerere University Mycobacteriology Laboratory, and staff performing the cultures were
62 not provided with clinical information about the study participants. At least two hours after
63 sputum collection, the patients were asked to submit at least 1 mL of saliva placed into a sterile
64 specimen cup for GeneXpert MTB/RIF testing; all participants were instructed not to cough prior
65 to saliva collection. Saliva specimens were processed for GeneXpert MTB/RIF using a sample
66 reagent to saliva volume ratio of 1:1, and all other steps followed the manufacturer’s
67 recommendations for extra-pulmonary body fluid specimens [13]. Sputum was collected prior to
68 TB treatment initiation, and saliva was collected prior to or within two hours of TB treatment
69 initiation. Finally, all participants without a prior known HIV diagnosis were offered HIV testing

70 and counseling, and for those found to be living with HIV, a CD4+ T-cell count was performed
71 at the Makerere University–Johns Hopkins University Research Collaboration (MU-JHU)
72 laboratory.

73

74 **Statistical Analysis:** We examined baseline characteristics using proportions for categorical
75 variables, and medians for continuous variables. We calculated sensitivity for GeneXpert
76 MTB/RIF results on saliva and on sputum in reference to a composite reference standard
77 described as follows: those with ≥ 1 sputum sample culture-positive were defined as
78 *Mycobacterium tuberculosis (Mtb)* positive, those with two negative cultures were defined as
79 negative, and all others were defined as indeterminate. We estimated precision using exact
80 binomial 95% confidence intervals. We explored comparisons of diagnostic accuracy results
81 (sensitivity differences with 95% CI) and semi-quantitative results (Fisher’s exact test) for saliva
82 GeneXpert by sputum smear microscopy and HIV status. We estimated that a sample size of 84
83 patients would enable us to determine if the sensitivity of saliva GeneXpert MTB/RIF was 75%
84 or higher with a precision of $\pm 10\%$, allowing for up to 10% indeterminate results due to missing or
85 contaminated sputum culture results. We used STATA 14.0 (Stata Corporation, College Station,
86 TX) for all statistical analyses.

87

88 **Human subjects protection.** The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Yale
89 University and the University of California San Francisco Institutional Review Boards, the
90 Makerere University School of Medicine Research Ethics Committee, the Mulago Hospital
91 Institutional Review Board, and the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology.

92

93 **Data sharing.** A comprehensive, de-identified dataset containing individual-level data will be
94 made available prior to publication.

95 **RESULTS**

96 **Study Population.** Among 153 participants enrolled into the parent study between June 2018 and
97 June 2019, 40 were GeneXpert MTB/RIF negative; 15 did not have sputum GeneXpert
98 MTB/RIF performed; 16 did not provide a saliva specimen; and one participant had an
99 indeterminate culture result, (Figure 1) leaving 81 participants for inclusion in the analysis.
100 There were no adverse events during specimen collection. Median age of participants was 30
101 years (interquartile range 24-38), 50 (62%) were men. 18 (22%) were persons living with HIV,
102 with median CD4 cell count 90 cells/uL (interquartile range 49-234), and only seven of the 18
103 (39%) were taking antiretroviral therapy at enrolment. 17 (21%) had ever smoked ≥ 100
104 cigarettes in their entire life and 60 (74%) had a history of alcohol use. 17 (21%) had a cough
105 greater than two weeks, while 71 (88%) reported subjective fever within the past seven days. 75
106 (93%) reported weight loss, including 46 (57%) with weight loss ≥ 5 kg. 14 (17%) reported no
107 ambulatory limitation; 47 (58%) were mildly limited with ambulation, and 20 (25%) were
108 severely affected but not bedbound. 67 patients (83%) were AFB smear-positive, including 30
109 (37%) with an AFB microscopy smear grade of 3+, 18 (22%) with a grade of 2+, nine (11%) 1+,
110 and 10 (12%) had 1-9 AFB seen per 100 high-powered fields. 13 (16%) were AFB smear-
111 negative and one (1%) was missing an AFB smear microscopy result (Table 1).

112

113 **Diagnostic Performance.** Seventy-eight patients were confirmed *Mtb* culture-positive on liquid
114 and/or solid media, while three were *Mtb* culture-negative. Seventy-three of the 78 patients with
115 culture-confirmed TB were salivary GeneXpert MTB/RIF positive, giving an overall sensitivity

116 of GeneXpert MTB/RIF on saliva of 90% (95% Confidence Interval (CI) 81-96%). This
117 sensitivity was similar to that of sputum smear microscopy, which had a sensitivity of 87% (95%
118 CI 77-94%) in reference to the combined culture reference standard. Among the three *Mtb*
119 culture-negative patients, two were salivary GeneXpert positive. Sensitivity was 24% lower
120 (95% CI for difference 2-48%, $p=0.003$) among persons living with HIV (71%, 95% CI 44-90%)
121 than among persons living without HIV (95%, 95% CI 86-99%), and 46% lower (95% CI for
122 difference 14-77%, $p<0.0001$) among sputum microscopy positive (96%, 95% CI 87-99%) than
123 among sputum microscopy negative patients (50%, 95% CI 19-81%).

124
125 We also compared the semi-quantitative results of bacilli by GeneXpert for both saliva and
126 sputum, as shown in Table 2. Overall, the semi-quantitative GeneXpert grade was higher in
127 sputum samples than in paired saliva samples collected from the same patient: 56 of 72 (78%) of
128 the sputum samples of either medium ($n=22$) or high ($n=34$) semi-quantitative grade, whereas
129 only 14 of 72 (19%) of the saliva samples were of either medium ($n=10$) or high ($n=4$) grade,
130 indicating that the mycobacterial load in the saliva specimens was low overall. There was no
131 difference in semi-quantitative results by smear microscopy result ($p=0.52$) or by HIV status
132 ($p=0.39$).

133
134 **DISCUSSION**

135 In a prospective, observational study of consecutive sputum GeneXpert-positive TB patients in a
136 high-burden setting, we showed that diagnosis of TB using GeneXpert Ultra on saliva is feasible
137 and had a high sensitivity relative to a rigorously defined reference standard. This finding has
138 significant implications for the diagnosis of TB and potentially also for TB infection control.

139 Using sputum specimens for TB diagnosis poses a number of challenges, since some individuals
140 such as those with non-productive cough and young children find expectoration challenging, and
141 the associated generation of sputum aerosols poses an infection control risk for health care
142 workers and nearby patients [14]. The development of novel testing strategies that employ non-
143 sputum samples for TB has been identified as a priority by the WHO, and the sensitivity
144 measured in our study is consistent with WHO's minimum target-product profile for a non-
145 sputum-based test, with similar sensitivity to sputum GeneXpert among a population of
146 predominantly sputum microscopy-positive and HIV-negative individuals. Although our
147 alternative strategy of salivary GeneXpert exceeds WHO's optimal targets for cost (\$4) and turn-
148 around time (20 minutes) for a non-sputum-based test, if GeneXpert on saliva were shown to
149 perform well in populations for whom sputum collection is less feasible for the reasons described
150 above, the willingness to pay for and wait for results might be higher.

151
152 The use of saliva for molecular diagnosis of TB was first described in a convenience sample of
153 52 adult TB patients in Japan who were evaluated using a lab-developed, nested PCR assay that
154 was shown to have a sensitivity of 98% [15]. A more recent study of 44 sputum smear- and
155 culture-positive TB patients, including 35 in South Africa and 9 in South Korea, reported on
156 saliva as having a very low sensitivity of 39% for TB testing [16]. Sputum mycobacterial load
157 was similarly high (100% smear-positive in the South Africa/South Korea study vs. 87% in our
158 study), so these differences in diagnostic performance might be attributable to differences in
159 either sample collection or specimen processing. For example, participants were instructed to
160 rinse their mouths prior to specimen collection in the South Africa/South Korea study but not in
161 our study. Second, the South Africa/South Korea study diluted one part of the sample in two

162 parts of sample reagent as recommended by the manufacturer for sputum, while we used a 1:1
163 dilution ratio as recommended for cerebrospinal fluid, another extra-pulmonary specimen
164 without a mucoid matrix [17]. Finally, we used the GeneXpert MTB/RIF Ultra cartridge, which
165 has ten-fold better analytic sensitivity than the earlier generation GeneXpert MTB/RIF cartridge.
166 To our knowledge, we are among the first to report the performance of GeneXpert MTB/RIF
167 Ultra on saliva.

168
169 Previous studies have examined the sensitivity of a variety of oral specimens for diagnosis of
170 TB. We previously showed that oropharyngeal wash specimens paired with a lab-developed PCR
171 assay had a high sensitivity for TB diagnosis in reference to sputum mycobacterial culture on
172 previously frozen and thawed sputum, but a subsequent study failed to confirm these results [18,
173 19]. A study of *Mtb* PCR on buccal swabs of South African TB patients and US controls showed
174 high sensitivity (90%) and specificity (100%), although the case-control design may have
175 inflated diagnostic accuracy [7]. A recent study from the US was among the first to show that
176 saliva is a viable and accurate specimen for diagnosis of SARS-CoV2, and more sensitive and
177 less variable than nasopharyngeal swab specimens [20]. Another study carried out in Thailand
178 using saliva for diagnosis of SARS-CoV2 showed similar results, with saliva providing a
179 sensitivity of 84% and a specificity of 99% [21]. Collectively, these studies suggest that saliva is
180 a very promising novel specimen for diagnosis of respiratory tract infections.

181
182 There were a few limitations to our study. First, because the primary study objective was to
183 evaluate feasibility and preliminary sensitivity, we did not include patients with non-productive
184 cough or children, two ideal target populations for salivary testing. If, as seems plausible, these

185 populations have more paucibacillary disease, diagnostic sensitivity could be lower in these
186 populations, as suggested by the lower sensitivity observed among sputum smear-negative
187 individuals and persons living with HIV. However, in the current study, we found that even
188 though saliva is more paucibacillary than sputum as assessed by GeneXpert's semi-quantitative
189 measurement of mycobacterial load, diagnostic sensitivity was similar between the two specimen
190 types, likely because of the extremely low threshold of analytic sensitivity of the GeneXpert
191 Ultra assay [22]. Secondly, to conserve costs in this preliminary study, we did not enroll non-TB
192 patients to serve as controls, a choice that prevented us from estimating diagnostic specificity.
193 However, a recent systematic review found that both GeneXpert MTB/RIF assays have a high
194 specificity on a variety of body fluid types [23]. Thirdly, our sample size was small, especially
195 for persons living with HIV and for sputum smear-negative patients, which limited our ability to
196 develop precise accuracy estimates for these and other subgroups.

197
198 In conclusion, saliva appears to be a feasible specimen for TB diagnosis using GeneXpert Ultra,
199 with a similar diagnostic sensitivity to sputum GeneXpert Ultra, at least among HIV-negative
200 and sputum smear-positive individuals. and thus appear to be a very promising alternative non-
201 sputum diagnostic test for active TB in high-burden settings. Future studies should examine
202 sensitivity in populations who are most likely to benefit from this test, including individuals who
203 are unable to expectorate sputum, children, and individuals from populations with a broad
204 spectrum of mycobacterial load and disease severity, and symptomatic individuals without TB,
205 including persons living with HIV. Direct comparisons of saliva to other oral sampling methods,
206 including swabs, would also be useful. Finally, studies evaluating the relative impacts of salivary
207 versus sputum testing on infection control proxies and/or on outcomes would also be valuable.

208 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

209 The authors would like to acknowledge the patients who participated in the study and the
210 administration and TB clinic staff of the China-Uganda Friendship Hospital where the study took
211 place.

212

213 **FUNDING**

214 This work was supported in part by NIH D43 TW009607 (JLD), the Pulmonary Complications
215 of AIDS Research Training (PART) program; and by NIH K24 HL087713 (LH) and R01
216 HL128156 (LH).

REFERENCES

1. WHO, *Global tuberculosis report 2018*. 2018: Geneva.
2. Horne, D.J., et al., *Xpert MTB/RIF and Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra for pulmonary tuberculosis and rifampicin resistance in adults*. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2019(6).
3. Di Tanna, G.L., et al., *Effect of Xpert MTB/RIF on clinical outcomes in routine care settings: individual patient data meta-analysis*. The Lancet Global Health, 2019. **7**(2): p. e191-e199.
4. Jones-López, E.C., et al., *Cough aerosols of Mycobacterium tuberculosis predict new infection. A household contact study*. American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine, 2013. **187**(9): p. 1007-1015.
5. Profiles, W.H.-P.T.P., *for New Tuberculosis Diagnostics: Report of a Consensus Meeting*. Geneva: World Health Organisation, 2014.
6. Meyer, A.J., et al., *Sputum quality and diagnostic performance of GeneXpert MTB/RIF among smear-negative adults with presumed tuberculosis in Uganda*. PLoS One, 2017. **12**(7).
7. Wood, R.C., et al., *Detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis DNA on the oral mucosa of tuberculosis patients*. Scientific reports, 2015. **5**: p. 8668-8668.
8. Wyllie, A.L., et al., *Saliva or nasopharyngeal swab specimens for detection of SARS-CoV-2*. New England Journal of Medicine, 2020. **383**(13): p. 1283-1286.
9. Johnson, A.J., et al., *Saliva Testing Is Accurate for Early-Stage and Presymptomatic COVID-19*. 2021. **9**(1): p. e0008621.
10. Khan, M.S., et al., *Improvement of tuberculosis case detection and reduction of discrepancies between men and women by simple sputum-submission instructions: a pragmatic randomised controlled trial*. The Lancet, 2007. **369**(9577): p. 1955-1960.
11. Kent, P.T., *Public health mycobacteriology: a guide for the level III laboratory*. 1985: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Centers
12. McCarter, Y.S. and A. Robinson, *Detection of acid-fast bacilli in concentrated primary specimen smears stained with rhodamine-auramine at room temperature and at 37 degrees C*. Journal of clinical microbiology, 1994. **32**(10): p. 2487-2489.

13. Hillemann, D., et al., *Rapid Molecular Detection of Extrapulmonary Tuberculosis by the Automated GeneXpert MTB/RIF System*. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 2011. **49**(4): p. 1202.
14. Namuganga, A.R., et al., *Suitability of saliva for Tuberculosis diagnosis: comparing with serum*. BMC infectious diseases, 2017. **17**(1): p. 600-600.
15. Eguchi, J., et al., *PCR method is essential for detecting Mycobacterium tuberculosis in oral cavity samples*. Oral microbiology and immunology, 2003. **18**(3): p. 156-159.
16. Shenai, S., et al., *Exploring Alternative Biomaterials for Diagnosis of Pulmonary Tuberculosis in HIV-Negative Patients by Use of the GeneXpert MTB/RIF Assay*. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 2013. **51**(12): p. 4161-4166.
17. Organization, W.H., *Xpert MTB/RIF implementation manual: technical and operational 'how-to'; practical considerations*. 2014, World Health Organization.
18. Davis, J.L., et al., *Polymerase chain reaction of secA1 on sputum or oral wash samples for the diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis*. Clinical infectious diseases, 2009. **48**(6): p. 725-732.
19. Davis, J.L., et al., *Nucleic acid amplification tests for diagnosis of smear-negative TB in a high HIV-prevalence setting: a prospective cohort study*. PLoS One, 2011. **6**(1): p. e16321.
20. Wyllie, A.L., et al., *Saliva or Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of SARS-CoV-2*. New England Journal of Medicine, 2020. **383**(13): p. 1283-1286.
21. Pasomsub, E., et al., *Saliva sample as a non-invasive specimen for the diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019: a cross-sectional study*. Clinical Microbiology and Infection, 2021. **27**(2): p. 285.e1-285.e4.
22. Chakravorty, S., et al., *The New Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra: Improving Detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis and Resistance to Rifampin in an Assay Suitable for Point-of-Care Testing*. MBio, 2017. **8**(4).
23. Kohli, M., et al., *Xpert MTB/RIF Ultra and Xpert MTB/RIF assays for extrapulmonary tuberculosis and rifampicin resistance in adults*. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2021. **1**(1): p. Cd012768.

FIGURES AND TABLES

FIGURE 1. Flow diagram showing study enrollment and TB testing results.

Legend: Patients missing index test results due to a missing saliva sample and patients with missing reference standard results due indeterminate culture results were excluded from analysis.

TABLE 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics.

Characteristic (n=81)	n (%)*
Age, median years (Q1-Q3)	30(24-38)
Men	50 (62)
Inpatients	8 (9)
Persons living with HIV	18(22)
CD4+ T-cell count, median cells/mL (Q1-Q3)	90 (49-234)
Taking antiretroviral therapy at enrollment	7 (39)
Smoking history	17 (21)
Alcohol use	60 (74)
Cough of any duration	81 (100)
Cough for \geq 14 days	17 (21)
Fever within the past 7 days	71 (88)
Weight loss	75 (93)
Difficulty in breathing within the past 7 days	46 (47)
Clinical status	
Ambulatory, unaffected	14 (17)
Ambulatory, mildly affected	47 (58)
Bedbound, moderately affected	12(15)
Bedbound, severely affected	8 (10)
Sputum AFB microscopy grade [†]	
3+	30 (37)
2+	18(22)
1+	9 (11)
1-9 per 100 hpf	10 (12)
Negative	13 (16)

Abbreviations: AFB, acid-fast bacilli; hpf, high-powered fields; Q1, 25% quartile; Q3, 75% quartile. TB, tuberculosis.

Legend: *Unless otherwise specified; [†]1 result missing

TABLE 2. Within-individual comparisons of semi-quantitative GeneXpert MTB/RIF Ultra results between sputum and saliva, among those with positive test results on both sample types (n=72).

		Saliva Xpert Results				
Sputum Xpert Results		Trace	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High
Trace		0	0	0	0	0
Very Low		0	0	1	0	0
Low		2	5	6	0	2
Moderate		0	4	15	2	1
High		2	3	20	8	1

Legend: Shading intensity is proportional to the frequency of paired results by semi-quantitative grade across the two sample types.

153 patients enrolled in parent study

40 sputum GeneXpert negative
15 sputum GeneXpert not done

98 patients eligible

16 did not provide saliva

82 GeneXpert-positive patients with
sputum mycobacterial culture results

1 sputum culture indeterminate

81 patients analyzed

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272031>; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).