- 1 Title: Gargle sample is an effective option in a novel fully automated molecular point-of-care
- 2 test for influenza: a multicenter study
- 3
- 4 Short running head: A novel molecular test for influenza
- 5

6 Authors:

- 7 Norihito Kaku ^{a,b, c}#*, Tomohito Urabe ^d, Tetsuya Iida ^e, Chyuns Yun ^f, Yoshiyuki Nishida ^g,
- 8 Yasunori Onitsuka ^h, Kohji Hashiguchi ⁱ, Kiyoto Hirose ^j, Akimitsu Tomonaga ^k, Koichi
- 9 Izumikawa¹, Hiroshi Mukae^m, Katsunori Yanagihara^{a,b}

10

11 Affiliations:

- ^a Department of Laboratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical
- 13 Sciences, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan
- ^b Department of Laboratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Hospital, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki,

15 Japan

- ^c Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care Medicine, University of Michigan, Michigan, Ann
- 17 Arbor, Michigan, USA
- ^d Urabe Otorhinolaryngology Clinic, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan
- ^e Iida Naika Syounika Clinic, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan
- ²⁰ ^tOhisama Pediatric Clinic, Nagayo-cho, Nagasaki, Japan
- ²¹ ^gNishida Gastrointestinal Internal Medicine Clinic, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan
- ²² ^hOnitsuka Internal Medicine Clinic, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan
- ¹Department of Respiratory Medicine, Japanese Red Cross Nagasaki Genbaku Hospital,

- 24 Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan
- ^jHirose Clinic, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan
- ²⁶ ^kTomonaga Medical Clinic, Omura City, Nagasaki, Japan
- ²⁷ ¹Department of Infectious Diseases, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical
- 28 Sciences, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan
- ²⁹ ^mDepartment of Respiratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical
- 30 Sciences, Nagasaki City, Nagasaki, Japan
- 31
- 32 #Address correspondence to Norihito Kaku, <u>norihitk@gmail.com</u>
- *Address: Department of Laboratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Graduate School of
- 34 Biomedical Sciences, 1-7-1 Sakamoto, Nagasaki 852-8501, Japan
- 35 Tel: +81-85-819-7574
- 36 Fax: +81-95-819-7422
- 37 *Present address:
- 38 Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, University
- of Michigan, 4438 BSRB, 109 Zina Pitcher Pl, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA

41 Abstract

Background: We conducted a multicenter study to evaluate the performance of a novel fully automated molecular point-of-care test using transcription-reverse transcription concerted reaction that can detect influenza A and B within 15 minutes in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples (TRCsatFLU).

Methods: Patients who visited or were hospitalized at eight clinics and hospitals with influenzalike illnesses between December 2019 and March 2020 participated in this study. We collected nasopharyngeal swabs from all patients and gargle samples from patients whom the physician judged fit to perform gargling. The result of TRCsatFLU was compared to a conventional reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR). If the results of TRCsatFLU and conventional RT-PCR were different, the samples were analyzed by sequencing.

52 **Results:** We evaluated 233 nasopharyngeal swabs and 213 gargle samples from 244 patients.

. The average age of the patients was 39.3 ± 21.2 . Of the patients, 68.9% visited a hospital within 53 24 h of symptom onset. The most common symptoms were fever (93.0%), fatigue (79.5%), and 54 55 nasal discharge (64.8%). All patients in whom the gargle sample was not collected were children. Influenza A or B was detected in 98 and 99 patients in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples 56 using TRCsatFLU, respectively. Four and five patients in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle 57 samples, respectively, with different TRCsatFLU and conventional RT-PCR results. Influenza A 58 or B was detected using sequencing in all samples with different results. Based on the combined 59 conventional RT-PCR and sequencing results, the sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive 60 value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) of TRCsatFLU for influenza detection in 61 nasopharyngeal swabs were 0.990, 1.000, 1.000, and 0.993, respectively. In the gargle samples, 62 63 the sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV of the TRCsatFLU for detecting influenza were 0.971,

- 64 1.000, 1.000, and 0.974, respectively.
- 65 Conclusions: The TRCsatFLU showed great sensitivity and specificity for the detection of
- 66 influenza in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples.
- 67 Trial registration: This study was registered in the UMIN Clinical Trials Registry (reference
- number: UMIN000038276) on October 11, 2019. Before sample collection, written informed
- 69 consent for the participation and publication of this study was obtained from all participants.

70

71 Keywords: rapid detection; influenza; TRC method; RT-PCR

72 Background

Influenza is a major infectious disease that spreads during the winter with clinics receiving 73 many influenza patients during the flu season. As antiviral agents for influenza, such as 74 neuraminidase inhibitors are already available, it is essential to accurately test and diagnose 75 influenza. Rapid influenza diagnostic tests (RIDTs) have been widely used in clinics because of 76 their simplicity and speed. However, they often have low sensitivity, especially in the early stage 77 of influenza, compared to nucleic acid tests. [1] Therefore, molecular point-of-care (POC) tests 78 and highly sensitive automated immunochromatographic antigen tests (digital immunoassays, 79 80 DIAs) for influenza have been developed and showed markedly higher sensitivities than traditional rapid influenza diagnostic tests. [2] Recently, applying transcription-reverse 81 transcription concerted reaction (TRC), a novel fully automated molecular POC machine 82 (TRCsat®; Tosoh, Tokyo, Japan) with a dedicated single-use cartridge for influenza 83 (TRCsatFLU; Tosoh, Tokyo, Japan) was developed. TRC is a gene-detecting method that 84 85 involves rapid isothermal RNA amplification using an intercalation-activating fluorescence (INAF) probe, and It has been used to diagnose tuberculosis, nontuberculous mycobacterial 86 infections, mycoplasma pneumonia, chlamydial infections, and gonorrhea. [3,4] TRCsatFLU 87 contains all the elements required for detecting influenza A and B, and it can detect influenza A 88 and B within 15 min. One feature of TRCsatFLU, apart from other POC molecular tests, is that 89 it can detect influenza from gargle samples in addition to nasopharyngeal swabs with simple 90 sample preparation without purification. In a previous single-center study, TRCsatFLU showed 91 comparable performance to the conventional reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction 92 (RT-PCR) method for detecting influenza viruses in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples 93 94 obtained from patients with influenza-like illness (ILI). [5] However, in a previous study, we

95	divided the study period into two and collected gargle samples only from the second period. In
96	addition, because the study was conducted in only a secondary hospital where many adult
97	patients with underlying diseases were seen, it is unclear whether TRCsatFLU could show the
98	same results in patients with ILI, including children, who visit clinics. Therefore, we conducted a
99	multicenter study in several clinical settings, including pediatric clinics, to evaluate the
100	performance of TRCsatFLU for detecting influenza viruses in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle
101	samples.

102

103 Methods

104 *Study design*

This prospective observational study was conducted between December 16, 2019 and March 105 25, 2020. The original plan was to collect samples until May 31, 2022 but the study was 106 suspended early on March 25, 2020 when the spread of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) 107 began in Japan. [6-8] Due to the continued COVID-19 pandemic, the study was not resumed, 108 109 and the analysis was conducted on the samples collected by March 25, 2020. We selected seven internal medicine clinics, pediatrics, and otorhinolaryngology clinics in Nagasaki Prefecture that 110 could participate, the Urabe Otorhinolaryngology Clinic, Iida Naika Syounika Clinic, Ohisama 111 Pediatric Clinic, Nishida Gastrointestinal Intermedicine Clinic, Onitsuka Internal Medicine 112 Clinic, Hirose Clinic, and Tomonaga Medical Clinic. We also included a hospital that 113 participated in the previous study, the Japanese Red Cross Nagasaki Genbaku Hospital. In eight 114 medical facilities, we included patients who visited or were hospitalized with influenza-like 115 illness (ILI), as defined by the World Health Organization's case definition.[9] Patients were 116 117 excluded if they were administered anti-influenza agents within one month before sampling.

118 After obtaining informed consent, nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples were collected. Two nasopharyngeal swabs (1PY1502P; Japan Cotton Swab Industry, Limited, Tokyo, Japan) 119 were collected from all the patients by a healthcare provider. Gargle samples were collected from 120 patients whom the physician judged to be able to perform gargling. In gargle samples, the 121 patients gargled for 5 seconds with 20 mL of water (water for injection; Hikari Pharmaceutical 122 CO., LTD. Tokyo, Japan), which was collected. Gargle samples were stored at -20°C in a 123 container (Multi-purpose container, 70 mL; Sarstedt, K.K., Tokyo, Japan) until further analysis. 124 One of the swabs was used in each medical facility for detecting influenza by DIAs using silver 125 amplification immunochromatography (FUJI DRI-CHEM IMMUNO AG Cartridge FluAB; 126 Fujifilm, Kanagawa, Japan)[10], according to manufacturer's instruction. Another 127 nasopharyngeal swab and gargle samples were stored at -20°C in a sealable tube (PP screw cap 128 test tube; Maruemu Corporation, Osaka, Japan) without media until further analysis. The 129 physicians determined the clinical diagnosis based on medical history, physical findings, and 130 DIAs results, from which they produced a clinical report for each patient. Since TRCsatFLU was 131 not approved in Japan when this study was conducted, and it was necessary to prevent the use of 132 TRCsatFLU results for the diagnosis of influenza at medical facilities, nasopharyngeal swabs 133 and gargle samples were transferred to Tosoh Corporation for performing TRCsatFLU and RT-134 PCR. All information, such as clinical report forms and TRCsatFLU and RT-PCR results, was 135 summarized and analyzed at Nagasaki University Hospital. If the results of TRCsatFLU were 136 137 different from those of RT-PCR, the samples were analyzed by sequencing at Tosoh Corporation. 138

139 *Ethics*

140 This study was approved by the ethics committee of Nagasaki University Hospital (approval

number:19121603) and registered in the UMIN Clinical Trials Registry (reference number:
UMIN000038276). Before sample collection, written informed consent for the participation and
publication of this study was obtained from all participants.

144

145 Data collection

To compile data on patient characteristics, we collected information on sex, age, underlying diseases, history of influenza vaccination, time since onset of symptoms, body temperature at the time of consultation, clinical diagnosis, results of DIAs, treatment for ILI, and the following signs and symptoms: fever (body temperature \geq 37.5 °C), cough, sore throat, nasal discharge, headache, arthralgia and myalgia, fatigue, nausea, and diarrhea.

151

152 *TRC*

For TRCsatFLU, we soaked a new swab in a gargle sample for 5 sec, and the swab containing 153 the gargle solution was mixed with 1 mL extraction buffer containing surfactant, and it was 154 155 infected into a single-use cartridge that contains all the elements required for rapid TRC. Nasopharyngeal swabs were mixed with 1 mL extraction buffer containing surfactant. Of the 156 extraction buffer, 140 µL was aliquoted for RT-PCR, and the remaining 860 µL was injected into 157 the TRCsatFLU cartridge. Next, the cartridge was set in TRCsat®, and nucleic acid 158 amplification, detection, and determination of results were automatically performed in the 159 instrument. The procedure of rapid TRC in TRCsat® is as follows: the samples were incubated 160 at 52 °C for 1 min and then mixed 30 µL of the sample with a dry reagent containing enzymes, 161 substrates, primers, and INAF probes and incubated at 46 °C to monitor fluorescence; it was 162 163 automatically determined as positive when the fluorescence intensity ratio of the reaction

164	solution exceeded 1.2. TRCsatFLU was designed to detect Influenza A(H1N1), A(H1N1)pdm09,
165	A (H3N2), and B (Victoria and Yamagata lineages), but TRCsat® only showed the results with
166	influenza A or B positive or influenza negative.

167

168 *RT-PCR and sequencing*

We performed RNA extraction and RT-PCR according to the Influenza Diagnosis Manual 4th 169 edition (National Institute of Infectious Diseases, 2019).[11] In gargle samples, total RNA was 170 isolated from 140 µL of a gargle sample using a QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, 171 172 Germany). For nasopharyngeal swabs, total RNA was isolated from 140 µL of the extraction buffer using a QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). RT-PCR was 173 performed using the primers and probes listed in Table S1, the One-Step PrimeScriptTM RT-PCR 174 Kit (TAKARA BIO, Shiga, Japan), and QuantStudio5 Real-Time PCR System (Thermo Fisher 175 Scientific, Massachusetts, USA). In brief, 2 µL of extracted RNA was added to 10 µL of 2X One 176 Step RT-PCR Buffer III, 0.4 µL each of 10 µM primers (Table S1), 0.25µL of 10.2 µM Taqman 177 Probe, 0.4 µL of 50X ROX Reference Dye II, 0.4 µL of PrimeScript RT enzyme Mix II, 0.4 µL 178 of TaKaRa Ex Taq HS, and 5.75 µL of RNase free water. The conditions consisted of 1 cycle of 179 5 min at 42 °C, 10 sec at 95 °C and followed by 45 cycles of 5 s at 95 °C, 34 s at 55 °C for H1N1 180 or 58 °C for H3N2 and B. The result was analyzed using QuantStudio (Thermo Fisher Scientific, 181 Massachusetts, USA), in which a cycle threshold value (Ct-value) $\Box < \Box 40$ was defined as a 182 183 positive result.

184 If the results of TRCsatFLU were different from those of RT-PCR, the TRC and RT-PCR 185 products were analyzed by sequencing according to the Influenza Diagnosis Manual 4th edition 186 (National Institute of Infectious Diseases, 2019).[11] In brief, positive samples were purified

using QIAquick PCR Purification kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). Sequencing employed the ABI
Big Dye Terminator system (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). It was performed at
a contract sequencing facility (FASMAC Co., Ltd. Kanagawa, Japan). For each sequencing
reaction, 50 ng template and 3.2 pmol primers (Table S1) were used.

- 191
- 192 Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using R (the R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria; version 4.0.3). Fisher's exact test was used to compare categorical variables and the Mann–Whitney U test was used to compare continuous variables. The statistical significance level was set at p <0.05. The sensitivity (Se), specificity (Sp), positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) of the TRCsatFLU against the combined results of RT-PCR and sequencing were calculated with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) as in the previous study. [5]

200

201 **Results**

202 *Patient characteristics*

During the study period, 286 patients with ILI participated. Excluded patients and samples were shown in Fig1: one patient was excluded due to withdrawal of consent; 11 nasopharyngeal swabs were excluded due to testing protocol deviation that mixed nasopharyngeal swabs with 1mL extraction buffer for 10 sec, not 5 sec; 40 patients were excluded due to failure of the freezer at the clinic where the samples were stored. Finally, 233 nasopharyngeal swabs and 213 gargle samples obtained from 244 patients were evaluated. Patient characteristics are shown in Table 1. The average age of the patients was 39.3 ± 21.2 . The proportion of patients with underlying

diseases and a history of influenza vaccination was 33.2% and 50.0%, respectively. Of the patients, 68.9% visited a hospital within 24 h of symptom onset. The most common symptoms were fever (93.0%), fatigue (79.5%), and nasal discharge (64.8%). In the clinical diagnosis based on history, physical findings, and the results of DIAs, 44.3% of the patients were diagnosed with influenza and 43.0% were diagnosed with acute upper respiratory infection. All patients in whom gargle samples were not collected were children. The average age of the patients was 2.9, and most of them (26/31) were under the age of 5.

217

218 Detection of influenza by TRCsatFLU in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples

The results of the TRCsatFLU and RT-PCR are shown in Table 2. Influenza was detected in 219 nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples using TRCsatFLU in 41.6% and 46.5% of patients, 220 respectively. The positive rate for influenza was highest at 24–48 h after the onset of symptoms 221 in both types of specimens (Fig. 2). Compared to DIAs, the positive rate for influenza within 6 h 222 after the onset of symptoms in TRCsatFLU and RT-PCR in nasopharyngeal swabs was two times 223 higher than that in DIAs (Fig. 2A). There were 14 cases with a clinical diagnosis of influenza 224 despite negative DIAs; influenza was detected in 5 of 14 nasopharyngeal swabs and 4 of 13 225 gargle samples by TRCsatFLU (Table S2). Additionally, influenza was detected by TRCsatFLU 226 in 6 nasopharyngeal swabs and 10 gargle samples collected from the patients diagnosed as other 227 than influenza (Table S2). 228

229

230 *Performance of TRCsatFLU on the detection of influenza*

Four nasopharyngeal swabs showed different results in RT-PCR and TRCsatFLU: one tested positive for influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 only with RT-PCR; two and one tested positive for

influenza A and B, respectively, only with TRCsatFLU. In those four samples, influenza B and
influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 were detected by sequencing in one and three samples, respectively.
Based on the combined RT-PCR and sequencing results, the Se, Sp, PPV, and NPV of
TRCsatFLU in nasopharyngeal swabs were 0.990, 1.000, 1.000, and 0.993, respectively (Table
3).

Five gargle samples showed different results in RT-PCR and TRCsatFLU: three tested positives for influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 only with RT-PCR, and two tested positive for influenza A only with TRCsatFLU. Influenza A(H3N2) was detected by sequencing in one of the samples that tested positive only with TRCsatFLU, and influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 was detected in all other samples. Based on the combined RT-PCR and sequencing results, the Se, Sp, PPV, and NPV of TRCsatFLU in nasopharyngeal swabs were 0.971, 1.000, 1.000, and 0.974, respectively (Table 3).

245

246 Comparison of TRCsatFLU results between nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples

We evaluated TRCsatFLU results in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples collected from the same patients. Of 202 patients, 86 were positive for influenza in both specimens. However, 14 had different results between nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples: seven tested positive for influenza A only in nasopharyngeal swabs, one tested positive for influenza B only in nasopharyngeal swabs, and six patients tested positive for influenza A only in gargle samples.

In the patients who tested positive for influenza only in nasopharyngeal swabs, the percentage of fever and headache, the percentage of diagnosing influenza, the influenza-positive rate by DIAs and RT-PCR in nasopharyngeal swabs, and the influenza-positive rate by RT-PCR in gargle samples were significantly lower than the patients who tested positive for influenza in both

256 samples (Table 4). In the patients who tested positive for influenza only in gargle samples, the percentage of patients who visited the medical facilities within 6 h since the onset of symptoms 257 was significantly higher than those who tested positive for influenza in both samples (Table 4). 258 Additionally, the percentage of diagnosing influenza, the influenza-positive rate by DIAs and 259 RT-PCR in nasopharyngeal swabs were significantly lower in the patients who tested positive for 260 261 influenza only in gargle samples than those in the patients who tested positive for influenza in both samples (Table 4). However, there was no difference between the patients who tested 262 positive for influenza only in nasopharyngeal swabs and only in gargle samples. 263

264

265 **Discussion**

TRCsatFLU showed greater sensitivity and specificity in both nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle 266 samples compared to the combined RT-PCR and sequencing. The sensitivity/specificity of the 267 TRCsatFLU in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples were 0.990/1.000 and 0.971/1.000, 268 respectively, which are similar to those of the previous single-center study (1.000/1.000) and 269 270 0.946/1.000, respectively). [5] We conducted this study by adding seven clinics to the hospital that participated in the previous study. Therefore, there were differences in patient backgrounds 271 272 between this study and the previous study. The average age in this study was ten years younger than that in the previous study because only this study included children. In addition, the 273 percentages of patients with symptoms such as fever, fatigue, nasal discharge, headache, sore 274 throat, arthralgia, and myalgia in this study were higher than those in the previous study. Fewer 275 patients visited clinics and hospitals 72 hours after symptom onset compared to those in the 276 previous study (2.9% versus 13.8%), which might have influenced the difference. The proportion 277 278 of influenza variants was also different between the two studies. In the previous study, the most

detected variant was influenza B, and the most detected influenza A variant was. In contrast, in this study, the most detected variant was influenza A(H1N1)pdm09, and influenza B and A(H3N2)weres detected from only one patient each. Thus, despite differences in patient backgrounds and influenza variants, the TRCsatFLU showed the same test performance in both studies.

TRCsatFLU can detect influenza A and B within 15 min. The most common RIDTs are antigen 284 tests using immunochromatography in nasopharyngeal swabs. However, since conventional 285 antigen tests have very low sensitivity in the early stages of influenza, [1] in this study, 286 commercially available high-sensitivity DIAs using silver amplification immunochromatography 287 [10] were used at clinics and hospitals for clinical diagnosis. However, the positive rate for 288 influenza in DIAs was obviously lower than that of TRCsatFLU in this study. Notably, in 289 patients who visited clinics or hospitals within 6 hours from the onset of symptoms, the positive 290 rate for influenza in DIAs was half of that for TRCsatFLU. In addition, there were 14 cases with 291 a clinical diagnosis of influenza despite negative DIAs. Among them, influenza was detected in 5 292 of 14 nasopharyngeal swabs and 4 of 13 gargle samples by TRCsatFLU. Those results are 293 similar to the results of a multicenter study that we conducted at the same time as this study. In 294 the study, we compared cobas®Liat® PCR System (Liat) and DIAs, and Liat showed a higher 295 positive rate than DIAs (51.6% versus 40.7%), and the difference was evident within 18h from 296 the onset of symptoms. [12] Since other previous studies also reported a higher sensitivity of 297 298 molecular POC tests compared to DIAs, [2,13,14] molecular POC tests, including TRCsatFLU, can contribute to the accurate diagnosis of influenza. 299

There are several rapid RT-PCR technologies for the detection of influenza, such as Liat, ID NOW (formerly AlereTM i), and GeneXpert Xpress (Xpert). Some multicenter studies have

302 reported their performance for detecting influenza: the sensitivity/specificity of Liat, ID NOW, and Xpert for influenza A and B was reported as 0.996/0.975 and 0.993/0.997, 0.978-303 0.993/0.966-0.981 and 0.929-0.976/0.983-1.000, and 0.953-1.000/0.948-1.000 and 0.938-304 1.000/0.995-1.000. [15-20] Compared to the results of these previous studies, TRCsatFLU 305 showed comparable sensitivity and specificity in nasopharyngeal swabs. TRCsatFLU has a 306 unique feature: it can detect influenza in gargle samples with simple sample preparation without 307 purification. In this study and previous single-center studies, TRCsatFLU showed great 308 sensitivity and specificity in gargle samples.[5] Some studies have reported the performance of 309 310 molecular POC tests on gargle samples, and the sensitivity of Xpert and Liat for influenza detection in gargle samples is 0.917 (11/12 samples) and 1.000 (15/15 samples), respectively, 311 compared to in-house RT-PCR.[21,22] In addition to gargle samples, several non-312 nasopharyngeal swab specimens, such as nasal aspirate-wash, nasopharyngeal aspirate, throat 313 swabs, and saliva have been evaluated using molecular POC tests. The sensitivity of molecular 314 POC tests in the nasal aspirate wash, nasopharyngeal aspirate, throat swabs, and saliva was 315 316 0.900-1.000, 0.980-1.000, 0.75-0.83, and 0.750-0.918, respectively.[19,23,24] Among these samples, only nasopharyngeal aspirate showed high sensitivity comparable to gargle samples in 317 this study.[23] The results in previous studies [5,19,21–24] and this study indicate that the gargle 318 sample is an excellent specimen for detecting influenza by molecular POC tests. However, the 319 sample preparation method was not described in the previous studies that evaluated the gargle 320 321 samples using Xpert and Liat. [21,22] In addition, molecular POC tests other than TRCsatFLU do not officially designate gargle samples as specimens. Therefore, further studies are needed to 322 determine whether gargle samples can be used as specimens in molecular POC tests other than 323 324 TRCsatFlu.

325 In this study, the positive rate for influenza in TRCsatFLU was higher in the gargle samples (46.5%) than in nasopharyngeal swabs (41.6%). However, in the 202 patients for whom both 326 samples were taken, the positive rate was slightly lower in gargle samples (45.5%) than in 327 nasopharyngeal swabs (46.5%). Among the 202 patients, 8 were positive for influenza only in 328 nasopharyngeal swabs, and 6 were positive for influenza only in gargle samples, but there were 329 no significant differences in patient background between them. Therefore, it is not clear which 330 cases of gargle samples should be used in preference to nasopharyngeal swabs. When compared 331 to patients who tested positive for influenza in both samples, the influenza-positive rate by DIAs 332 333 and RT-PCR and the percentage of diagnosing influenza were significantly lower in patients who tested positive for influenza only in either of the samples. These results suggest that the viral 334 load in the sample was low in the patients who tested positive for influenza only in either of the 335 samples. 336

This study had some limitations. We could only collect samples for one season because of the 337 COVID-19 pandemic, as described in the Materials and Methods section. Therefore, we 338 analyzed the data collected from fewer patients than initially planned. In addition, only one 339 patient with an influenza B infection was included in this study. In a previous study, the 340 TRCsatFLU showed high sensitivity and specificity for influenza B in nasopharyngeal swabs [5] 341 but its performance in gargle samples remains unknown. In this study, TRCsatFLU has not been 342 compared with other molecular POC tests. Thus, a comparative study is needed to determine if 343 344 TRCsatFLU performs as well as other molecular POC tests.

345

346 Conclusions

347 The novel molecular POC test, TRCsatFLU, showed great sensitivity and specificity for the

348	detection of influenza. Since TRCsatFLU detects influenza in gargle samples collected by the
349	patient, it can contribute to reducing the exposure risk to pathogens during sample collection by
350	healthcare professionals.

351

352 **Declarations**

Ethics approval: This study was approved by the ethics committee of Nagasaki University
Hospital (approval number:19121603). : Before sample collection, written informed consent for
the participation of this study was obtained from all participants.

Consent for publication: Before sample collection, written informed consent for the publication

357 of this study was obtained from all participants.

Availability of data and materials: The derived data supporting the findings of this study are presented in this paper, supplementary Table1 and 2, and metadata file.

360 Competing interests: The authors declare no conflicts of interest directly relevant to the content361 of this article.

Funding: Tosoh Corporation funded the study. The sponsor performed RT-PCR, TRC, and sequencing for influenza, but had no control over the interpretation, writing, or publication of this work.

Authors' contributions: All the authors were involved in the study design. TU, TI, CY, YN, YO, KH, KH, and AT acquired the samples and data. NK, KI, HK, and KY were involved in data interpretation and analysis. NK wrote the original manuscript, and all authors revised and approved the manuscript for publication.

369 Acknowledgements: none

373 **References**

374

Chartrand C, Leeflang MMG, Minion J, Brewer T, Pai M. Accuracy of rapid influenza
 diagnostic tests: A meta-analysis. Ann Intern Med. American College of Physicians;
 2012;156:500–11.

2. Merckx J, Wali R, Schiller I, Caya C, Gore GC, Chartrand C, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of
novel and traditional rapid tests for influenza infection compared with reverse transcriptase
polymerase chain reaction. Ann Intern Med. Ann Intern Med; 2017;167:395–409.

381 3. Drouillon V, Delogu G, Dettori G, Lagrange PH, Benecchi M, Houriez F, et al. Multicenter
382 Evaluation of a Transcription-Reverse Transcription Concerted Assay for Rapid Detection of
383 Mycobacterium tuberculosis Complex in Clinical Specimens. J Clin Microbiol. American
384 Society for Microbiology Journals; 2009;47:3461–5.

4. Mazzarelli A, Cannas A, Venditti C, D'Arezzo S, De Giuli C, Truffa S, et al. Clinical
evaluation of TRCReady M.TB for rapid automated detection of M. tuberculosis complex in
respiratory samples. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis. Int J Tuberc Lung Dis; 2019;23:260–4.

5. Kaku N, Hashiguchi K, Akamatsu N, Wakigawa F, Matsuda J, Komaru K, et al. Evaluation of
a novel rapid TRC assay for the detection of influenza using nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle
samples. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis; 2021;40:1743–8.

- 6. Kaku N, Ota K, Sasaki D, Akamatsu N, Uno N, Sakamoto K, et al. Had COVID-19 spread in
 the community before the first confirmed case in Nagasaki, Japan? Microbes Infect. Microbes
 Infect; 2021;23:104812.
- 7. Kaku N, Nishimura F, Shigeishi Y, Tachiki R, Sakai H, Sasaki D, et al. Performance of antiSARS-CoV-2 antibody testing in asymptomatic or mild COVID-19 patients: A retrospective
- study in outbreak on a cruise ship. PLoS One. Public Library of Science; 2021;16:e0257452.

397	8. Ota K, Yanag	gihara K, S	Sasaki D, Kaku N	I, Uno N, Sakamo	oto K, et al. D	etection of SAR	S-CoV-
398	2 using qRT-	PCR in	saliva obtained	from asympton	natic or mil	d COVID-19	patients,
399	comparative ar	nalysis wi	th matched nase	opharyngeal sam	ples. PLoS	One. Public Lil	brary of
400	Science; 2021;1	6:e02529	64.				
401	9. World Health	h Organiza	ation. World Hea	lth Organization	Global Epide	emiological Surv	veillance
402	Standards	for	Influenza	[Internet].	2013.	Available	from:

https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241506601 403

397

10. Mitamura K, Shimizu H, Yamazaki M, Ichikawa M, Nagai K, Katada J, et al. Clinical 404 evaluation of highly sensitive silver amplification immunochromatography systems for rapid 405 diagnosis of influenza. J Virol Methods. 2013;194:123-8. 406

11. National Institute of Infectious Diseases. Manual for diagnosis of influenza [Internet]. 4th ed. 407

Tokyo: 2019. 24 - 57. Available from: https://www.niid.go.jp/niid/images/lab-408 p. manual/influenza20190116.pdf 409

12. Kaku N, Kodama H, Akamatsu N, Ota K, Kosai K, Morinaga Y, et al. Multicenter evaluation 410 of molecular point-of-care testing and digital immunoassays for influenza virus A/B and 411 respiratory syncytial virus in patients with influenza-like illness. J Infect Chemother. Elsevier; 412 2021;27:820-5. 413

13. Kanwar N, Michael J, Doran K, Montgomery E, Selvarangan R. Comparison of the ID Now 414 Influenza A & B 2, Cobas Influenza A/B, and Xpert Xpress Flu Point-of-Care Nucleic Acid 415 416 Amplification Tests for Influenza A/B Virus Detection in Children. J Clin Microbiol. J Clin Microbiol; 2020;58. 417

14. Sato Y, Nirasawa S, Saeki M, Yakuwa Y, Ono M, Kobayashi R, et al. Comparative study of 418 419 rapid antigen testing and two nucleic acid amplification tests for influenza virus detection. J

- 420 Infect Chemother; 2022;28:1033–6.
- 421 15. Gibson J, Schechter-Perkins EM, Mitchell P, Mace S, Tian Y, Williams K, et al. Multi-center
- 422 evaluation of the cobas® Liat® Influenza A/B & amp; RSV assay for rapid point of care
- 423 diagnosis. J Clin Virol. J Clin Virol; 2017;95:5–9.
- 424 16. Hassan F, Crawford J, Bonner AB, Ledeboer NA, Selvarangan R. Multicenter evaluation of
- 425 the AlereTM i influenza A&B assay using respiratory specimens collected in viral transport media.
- 426 Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis; 2018;92:294–8.
- 427 17. Bell J, Bonner A, Cohen DM, Birkhahn R, Yogev R, Triner W, et al. Multicenter clinical
- 428 evaluation of the novel AlereTM i Influenza A&B isothermal nucleic acid amplification test. J
- 429 Clin Virol. J Clin Virol; 2014;61:81–6.
- 430 18. Wolters F, Grünberg M, Huber M, Kessler HH, Prüller F, Saleh L, et al. European
 431 multicenter evaluation of Xpert® Xpress SARS-CoV-2/Flu/RSV test. J Med Virol. J Med Virol;
 432 2021;93:5798–804.
- 19. Novak-Weekley S, Marlowe EM, Poulter M, Dwyer D, Speers D, Rawlinson W, et al.
 Evaluation of the Cepheid Xpert Flu Assay for rapid identification and differentiation of
 influenza A, influenza A 2009 H1N1, and influenza B viruses. J Clin Microbiol. J Clin
 Microbiol; 2012;50:1704–10.
- 20. Cohen DM, Kline J, May LS, Harnett GE, Gibson J, Liang SY, et al. Accurate pcr detection
 of influenza a/b and respiratory syncytial viruses by use of cepheid xpert flu+rsv xpress assay in
 point-of-care settings: Comparison to prodesse proflu+. J Clin Microbiol. J Clin Microbiol;
 2018;56.
- 21. Bennett S, MacLean A, Gunson R. Verification of Cepheid Xpert Xpress Flu/RSV assay for
 use with gargle samples, sputa and endotracheal secretions. 2019;101:114–5.

22. Goldstein EJ, Gunson RN. In-house validation of the cobas Liat influenza A/B and RSV
assay for use with gargles, sputa and endotracheal secretions. J Hosp Infect. J Hosp Infect;
2019;101:289–91.

446 23. To KKW, Yip CCY, Lai CYW, Wong CKH, Ho DTY, Pang PKP, et al. Saliva as a

- 447 diagnostic specimen for testing respiratory virus by a point-of-care molecular assay: a diagnostic
- 448 validity study. Clin Microbiol Infect. Clin Microbiol Infect; 2019;25:372–8.
- 449 24. Davis S, Allen AJ, O'Leary R, Power M, Price DA, Simpson AJ, et al. Diagnostic accuracy
- 450 and cost analysis of the AlereTM i Influenza A&B near-patient test using throat swabs. J Hosp
- 451 Infect. J Hosp Infect; 2017;97:301–9.
- 452 25. Frazee BW, Rodríguez-Hoces de la Guardia A, Alter H, Chen CG, Fuentes EL, Holzer AK,
- 453 et al. Accuracy and Discomfort of Different Types of Intranasal Specimen Collection Methods
- 454 for Molecular Influenza Testing in Emergency Department Patients. Ann Emerg Med. Ann
- 455 Emerg Med; 2018;71:509-517.e1.
- 456 26. Malecki M, Lüsebrink J, Teves S, Wendel AF. Pharynx gargle samples are suitable for
- 457 SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic use and save personal protective equipment and swabs. Infect. Control
- 458 Hosp. Epidemiol. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol; 2021. p. 248–9.

460 Tables

Table 1. Patient characteristics

	Nasopharyngeal									
	All		swabs and ga	rgle	Nasopharyngeal		Gargle samples			
			complex	e	swabs only		(only		
Characteristic			samples							
	N	=244	N=202		N=	31	N=11			
	Ν	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	Ν	(%)		
Age (average ±	39.3	± 21.2	44.6	± 16.6	2.9	± 2.9	43.5	± 24.0		
S.D.)										
Under 16 years	37	(15.2%)	4	(2.0%)	31	(100%)	2	(18.2%)		
old										
Gender, female	138	(56.6%)	119	(58.9%) 14	(45.2%)	5	(45.5%)		
Underlying	81	(33.2%)	75	(37.1%) 3	(9.7%)	3	(27.3%)		
diseases										
History of										
Influenza	122	(50.0%)	102	(50.5%) 14	(45.2%)	6	(54.5%)		
vaccination										
Time since onset of	f sympt	oms								
0 - 6 h	33	(13.5%)	26	(12.9%) 5	(16.1%)	2	(18.2%)		
6 - 12 h	31	(12.7%)	21	(10.4%) 9	(29.0%)	1	(9.1%)		
12 - 24 h	104	(42.6%)	86	(42.6%) 13	(41.9%)	5	(45.5%)		
24 - 48 h	45	(18.4%)	41	(20.3%) 3	(9.7%)	1	(9.1%)		
48 - 72 h	21	(8.6%)	20	(9.9%)	1	(9.7%)	0	(0.0%)		

72 h -	7	(2.9%)	6	(3.0%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(9.1%)
Unknown	3	(1.2%)	2	(1.0%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(9.1%)
Symptoms								
Fever	227	(93.0%)	186	(92.1%)	31	(100%)	10	(90.9%)
Fatigue	194	(79.5%)	177	(87.6%)	1	(3.2%)	8	(72.7%)
Nasal discharge	158	(64.8%)	128	(63.4%)	20	(64.5%)	10	(90.9%)
Cough	157	(64.3%)	137	(67.8%)	18	(58.1%)	2	(18.2%)
Headache	152	(62.3%)	144	(71.3%)	1	(3.2%)	7	(63.6%)
Sore throat	150	(61.5%)	141	(69.8%)	2	(6.5%)	7	(63.6%)
Arthralgia	129	(52.9%)	124	(61.4%)	0	(0.0%)	5	(45.5%)
Myalgia	97	(39.8%)	92	(45.5%)	9	(29.0%)	4	(36.4%)
Diarrhea	15	(6.1%)	14	(6.9%)	1	(3.2%)	1	(9.1%)
Nausea	13	(5.3%)	11	(5.4%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(9.1%)
Results of influen	za antige	en test using	silver amplif	ication im	munoc	hromatogr	aphy	
Influenza A	93	(38.1%)	84	(41.6%)	5	(16.1%)	4	(36.4%)
Influenza B	1	(0.4%)	1	(0.5%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
Negative	150	(61.5%)	117	(57.9%)	26	(83.9%)	7	(63.6%)
Clinical Diagnosis	S							
Influenza	108	(44.3%)	98	(48.5%)	6	(19.4%)	4	(36.4%)
Acute upper	105	(43.0%)	77	(38.1%)	21	(67.7%)	7	(63.6%)
respiratory								
infection								

Acute bronchitis	17 (7.0%)	14 (6.9%)	3	(9.7%)	0	(0.0%)
Others	14 (5.7%)	13 (6.4%)	1	(3.2%)	0	(0.0%)

S.D., standard deviation

461

462

463 Table 2. Results of TRCsatFLU

	Nasophary	ngeal swabs	Gargle samples		
	(N=	233)	(N=213)		
	Ν	(%)	Ν	(%)	
TRCsatFLU					
Influenza A	97	(41.6%)	99	(46.5%)	
Influenza B	1	(0.4%)	0	(0.0%)	
Negative	135	(57.9%)	114	(53.5%)	
RT-PCR					
Influenza A(H1N1)pdm09	96	(41.2%)	100	(46.9%)	
Influenza B	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	
Negative	137	(58.8%)	113	(53.1%)	

464

465

Table 3. Performance of TRCsatFLU in nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples

	Nasopharyngeal swabs	Gargle samples	
	(N=233)	(N=213)	
True-positive	98	99	
True-negative	134	111	
False-positive	0	0	

False-negative	1	3
Se (95% CI)	0.990 (0.945-1.000)	0.971 (0.916-0.994)
Sp (95% CI)	1.000 (0.959-1.000)	1.000 (0.951-1.000)
PPV (95% CI)	1.000 (0.945-1.000)	1.000 (0.951-1.000)
NPV (95% CI)	0.993 (0.959-1.000)	1.000 (0.925-0.995)

CI, confidence

466

Table 4. Characteristics of patients with different results between nasopharyngeal swabs and	
gargle sample	

	Positive in both samples		Positive only in nasopharyngeal swabs		P value compared to	Positive only in gargle samples		P value compared to	P value compared positive only in	
	1)	N=86)	(N=8)		positive	(N=6)	positive	swabs and only	
	Ν	(%)	Ν	(%)	in both samples	Ν	(%)	in both samples	in gargle samples	
Age (average \pm S.D)	44.9	± 22.9	50.9	± 22.9	NS	41.3	± 10.9	NS	NS	
Under 16 years old	3	(3.5%)	1	(12.5%)	NS	0	(0.0%)	NS	NS	
Gender, female	53	(61.6%)	5	(62.5%)	NS	1	(16.7%)	0.078	0.138	
Underlying diseases	29	(33.7%)	4	(50.0%)	NS	2	(33.3%)	NS	NS	
History of Influenza vaccination	33	(38.4%)	4	(50.0%)	NS	2	(33.3%)	NS	NS	
Time since onset	of sym	otoms								
0–6 h	6	(7.0%)	2	(25.0%)	0.137	3	(50.0%)	0.011	NS	
6-12 h	6	(7.0%)	1	(12.5%)	NS	0	(0.0%)	NS	NS	
12–24 h	43	(50.0%)	1	(12.5%)	0.063	3	(50.0%)	NS	1	
24–48 h	21	(24.4%)	3	(37.5%)	NS	0	(0.0%)	NS	0.245	
48–72 h	7	(8.1%)	1	(12.5%)	NS	0	(0.0%)	NS	0.209	
72+ h	2	(2.3%)	0	(0.0%)	NS	0	(0.0%)	NS	NS	
Unknown	1	(1.2%)	0	(0.0%)	NS	0	(0.0%)	NS	NS	
Symptoms										
Fever	82	(95.3%)	5	(62.5%)	0.012	6	(100%)	NS	0.209	
Fatigue	77	(89.5%)	8	(100%)	NS	5	(83.3%)	NS	NS	
Nasal discharge	54	(62.8%)	5	(62.5%)	NS	3	(50.0%)	NS	NS	

Cough	70	(81.4%)	8	(100%)	NS	5	(83.3%)	NS	NS
Headache	70	(81.4%)	4	(50.0%)	0.060	5	(83.3%)	NS	NS
Sore throat	59	(68.6%)	7	(87.5%)	NS	5	(83.3%)	NS	NS
Arthralgia	58	(67.4%)	5	(62.5%)	NS	4	(66.7%)	NS	NS
Myalgia	48	(55.8%)	4	(50.0%)	NS	1	(16.7%)	0.093	NS
Diarrhea	5	(5.8%)	0	(0.0%)	NS	1	(16.7%)	NS	NS
Nausea	4	(4.7%)	0	(0.0%)	NS	0	(0.0%)	NS	NS
Results of DIAs									
Influenza A	80	(93.0%)	3	(37.5%)	< 0.001	1	(16.7%)	<0.001	NS
Negative	6	(7.0%)	5	(62.5%)		5	(83.3%)		
Clinical Diagnosis									
Influenza	83	(96.5%)	5	(62.5%)	0.007	2	(33.3%)	< 0.001	0.138
Acute upper respiratory infection	3	(3.5%)	1	(12.5%)	NS	3	(50.0%)	0.003	0.245
Acute bronchitis	0	(0.0%)	2	(25.0%)	0.006	1	(16.7%)	0.065	NS
Results of RT-PCR	in na	sopharynge	al swa	ıbs					
Influenza A(H1N1)pdm09	85	(98.8%)	6	(75.0%)	0.018	1	(16.7%)	<0.001	0.103
Negative	1	(1.1%)	2	(25.0%)		5	(83.3%)		
Results of RT-PCR	in ga	rgle sample	s						
Influenza A(H1N1)pdm09	85	(98.8%)	2	(25.0%)	<0.001	5	(83.3%)	0.127	0.103
Negative	1	(1.1%)	6	(75.0%)		1	(16.7%)		

NS, not significant (P > 0.2)

469 **Figure legends**

470 Figure 1. Participant flow diagram

471 Participant flow diagram showing progression through phases of prospective observational study.

472

473 Figure 2. Positive rate of influenza in each test by time since onset of symptoms

Nasopharyngeal swabs were collected from all patients using two swabs (A). Gargle samples 474 475 were collected from patients whom the physician judged fit to perform gargling (B). A highly sensitive automated antigen test was performed using silver amplification 476 immunochromatography for influenza (FUJI DRI-CHEM IMMUNO AG Cartridge FluAB; 477 Fujifilm, Kanagawa, Japan) at clinics and hospitals. Nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples 478 for TRCsatFLU and RT-PCR were stored at -20 °C until further analysis. The samples were 479 480 transferred to Tosoh Corporation to perform TRCsatFLU and RT-PCR.



Figure 1. Participant flow diagram

Participant flow diagram showing progression through phases of prospective observational study.



B)



Figure 2. Positive rate of influenza in each test by time since onset of symptoms Nasopharyngeal swabs were collected from all patients using two swabs (A). Gargle samples were collected from patients whom the physician judged fit to perform gargling (B). A highly sensitive automated antigen test was performed using silver amplification immunochromatography for influenza (FUJI DRI-CHEM IMMUNO AG Cartridge FluAB; Fujifilm, Kanagawa, Japan) at clinics and hospitals. Nasopharyngeal swabs and gargle samples for TRC and RT-PCR were stored at –20°C until further analysis. The samples were transferred to Tosoh Corporation to perform TRCsatFLU and RT-PCR.

A)