

Direct Detection and Identification of Viruses in Saliva Using a SpecID™ Ionization Modified Mass Spectrometer

Pierre Alusta¹, Angel Parades², Marli Azevedo³, Lisa Mullis³, Dan Buzatu^{1*}

¹ Systems Biology Division, National Center for Toxicological Research (NCTR), U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Jefferson, AR

² NCTR / ORA Nanotechnology Facility, Office of Scientific Coordination, National Center for Toxicological Research (NCTR), U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Jefferson, AR

³ Division of Microbiology, National Center for Toxicological Research (NCTR), U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Jefferson, AR

Running title: Direct Detection and Identification of Viruses in Saliva Using SpecID Mass Spectrometry

***Corresponding author:** Dan Buzatu

Mailing address: Systems Biology Division, National Center for Toxicological Research, 3900 NCTR Rd., Jefferson, AR 72079. Phone: 1-870-543-7287. E-mail: Dan.Buzatu@fda.hhs.gov

Note: The co-authors have all contributed equally to this work.

Keywords: spectra similarity, virus detection, virus identification, atmospheric pressure ionization, mass spectrometry.

Abstract

The COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic has led to a significant number of deaths globally and negative health consequences. Accurate early diagnosis, surveillance, identification of cohorts, and prophylaxis are considered essential measures to reduce the spread of SARS-CoV-2. There is a need for a reliable, fast, high-throughput screening method that can identify sick patients. Since respiratory viruses are typically present in nasal and oral secretions, saliva would be a good target for testing. Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) remains the gold standard for sensitive detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection in biological samples. Although PCR testing for COVID is sensitive (500 virions per ml) and widely used by hospitals, the method has a false-negative rate of 15–20% and is kit based. Saliva testing has slowly gained popularity in the diagnostic market for testing based on biomarkers and other constituents ranging from organic compounds (*e.g.*, food additives), peptides, and even microorganisms. In this paper, we will show how the SpecID Mass Spectrometer can detect the presence of a virus in saliva at very low levels. The main goal of the study consisted of addressing the shortcomings of existing methodologies, by providing a reliable, high-throughput, rapid, modified mass spectrometer to detect viruses in saliva, including but not limited to SARS-CoV-2.

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 (*i.e.*, SARS-CoV-2) pandemic has been the biggest global health challenge since the Second World War [37], with 630,499,846 confirmed cases and over 6,573,283 mortalities worldwide (WHO report October, 2022) [1]. Accurate early diagnosis, monitoring, isolation, and prophylaxis are essential to slowing down the spread of SARS-CoV-2 [1, 11, 49]. In order to achieve this, there is a need for a reliable high-throughput screening method [51]. A number of analytical laboratory-based methods have been investigated for fast, accurate detection of SARS-CoV-2 [1]. With detection and monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 in mind, Rehman *et al.* have explored spectroscopy [36], Connell *et al.* have developed a rapid, unsophisticated, and sturdy IgG-capture enzyme-linked immune-absorbent assay [19], Cabitza *et al.* have used blood test analyses and machine learning as an alternative to rRT-PCR [4], and Chan *et al.* have used TEM (transmission electron microscopy) to identify virus morphology [12]. Genome sequencing was also used to identify a particular virus, and sequence data proved useful in designing PCR probes as well as primers [12]. Attempts using data obtained from smartwatches (*i.e.*, consumer wearable devices) such as a) time spent resting, b) number of daily steps walked and c) heart rate variations were tried for detecting coronavirus disease at a pre-symptomatic stage [22]. Most of these methods are not accurate, helpful, or cost-effective [36]. Even polymerase chain reaction (PCR), the gold standard technique for detecting SARS-CoV-2 infection in biological samples, has a false-negative rate of 15–20% [4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 25, 27, 30, 31, 48]. There is a considerable need for an alternative, accurate, quick, high-throughput screen for SARS-Cov-2 variants that can directly analyze body fluids (*i.e.*, saliva, blood, urine) [5, 15, 28, 30, 39]. Samples can be readily collected from test subjects in different community settings [33, 36, 44]. Saliva is a reliable biofluid for detecting viral loads, particular for respiratory viruses like SARS-CoV-2 [27].

1.1. Benefits of using saliva

Saliva is a biofluid that is regularly secreted by the salivary glands [41]. It fulfills several functions, including providing a protective coating for the buccal cavity with antimicrobial properties and assisting digestion [37]. Respiratory viruses can easily spread through nasal and oral secretions [34], from the buccal cavity by salivary gland infection, with subsequent release of particles in saliva via salivary ducts [40, 41]. Saliva can preserve high-quality DNA and viral material at room temperature for transport and analysis [33]. Swabs used in nasopharyngeal sampling are invasive and can be distressing to some patients [37], as it might cause sneezing [29], and in some cases bleeding [29, 35, 37]. Saliva is a readily accessible, easily sampled [9, 13, 15, 23, 37, 42, 45] diagnostic bodily fluid [42, 46, 47], that can contain infectious agents [6]. It is ideal for investigating viral outbreaks [9, 36], including COVID-19 [28]. The practicality and applicability of using nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva to detect viruses has been studied and is an established method [24, 29, 30, 35, 38]. The importance of using a less invasive [25], quick [24] and safe collection [44] of salivary secretion as a substrate for molecular diagnosis is that it won't require the assistance [33, 35, 38] of trained medical personnel or health care professionals [7, 37]. Supervised saliva collection is advised [10, 37] when blood and/or urine collection [18] cannot be obtained from newborns, infants [10, 32, 39] and patients with hemorrhagic syndromes [5]. Patients can self-collect saliva (> 0.5 mL) without generating aerosols [28], thus greatly minimizing the risk of nosocomial virus transmission to healthcare personnel [31, 40, 41] (excluding participants in dental practice [26]). Saliva as a diagnostic biofluid has a high consistency rate of greater than 90% [37]. Saliva testing may be a suitable alternative first-line screening test in several field environments, including low resource community settings [25] or in remote places where medical facilities are lacking all together [10]. Although it has

been neglected in the past [23], the diagnostic value of saliva, aided by current technological development is expected to increase [45].

1.2. What can be detected in saliva ?

Saliva has gradually gained wide-spread acceptance as a veritable solvent of biomarkers and other constituents ranging from organic compounds, peptides, and even microorganisms (*i.e.*, bacteria and viruses) [37]. Viruses such as SARS-CoV-2 [29, 31, 33, 40], other respiratory viruses [24], SARS [30], dengue virus [2, 5, 13], chikungunya virus [2, 3], Epstein-Barr virus [6], HIV [19, 23, 45], arthropod-borne oropouche virus (OROV) [20], Hepatitis A virus (HAV) [9], Hepatitis C virus (HCV) [8], congenital cytomegalovirus [18], feline leukemia virus (from cats) [7], or the Zika virus [10, 14, 16], can all be detected in saliva [15] after the onset of symptoms, suggesting its potential use for monitoring viral clearance [31]. Saliva contains a variety of constituents (*i.e.*, salivary glucose and serum glucose [43]) that can be used for the diagnosis of diabetes mellitus [43]. Other constituents, such as controlled substances, sets of unique peptides [48], secretory immunoglobulin (Ig) [19, 42], proteomic biomarkers [47, 48], and breast / lung cancer-specific organic chemical signatures embedded in saliva metabolites [23], have also been detected in saliva [45].

1.3 Using mass spectrometry to detect viruses

While RT-qPCR is presently the method of choice to detect SARS-CoV-2, due to its high degree of sensitivity, the scope of application of the RT-qPCR assay is restricted [11]. Specifically, RT-qPCR detection of viruses requires operation in a certified lab [4], trained personnel to operate the equipment, costly kit-based reagents, and is time-consuming [17, 36, 48]. Attempts have been made to identify SARS-CoV-2 proteins [51] from gargle solution samples of SARS-CoV-2 patients [50] using mass spectrometry [44]. With medical screening in mind, cancer-specific signatures, embedded in saliva metabolites [46, 51] have been detected using mass spectrometry. The mass spectrometric approach is based on a conventional, not portable, MALDI-TOF MS instrument and requires almost an hour of sample preparation to detect the presence of a virus from nasal or salivary secretions [48, 49]. Hernandez *et al.* have employed a mass spectrometric method to determine the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in human saliva [44]. Tomita *et al.* used capillary electrophoresis time-of-flight mass spectrometry [46]. Gel electrophoresis combined with MS was the platform to carry out salivary proteome separation, quantification, and identification [47]. None of these studies can analyze viruses directly in saliva without sample preparation. Moreover, the methods described in these papers use expensive, lab based, non-portable equipment to carry out these studies [49]. The main goal of our study is to highlight a portable, high-throughput, real-time, mass spectrometric method called SpecID for directly detecting SARS-CoV-2 variants in saliva at PCR detection levels.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Instrumentation

The instrument is a SpecID technology, modified, patented, portable mass spectrometer (CMS) supplied by Advion, Inc. (Ithaca, NY, www.advion.com/products/expression-cms/). The base Advion mass spectrometer is an atmospheric pressure ionization portable mass spectrometer. The SpecID instrument modification has previously been described by Alusta *et al.*

[56]. In brief, with the addition of a built-in – high voltage power supply, the CMS was modified (Fig. 1a) so that it would deliver continuous sparks at around 2.3 keV ($2,335\text{V} \pm 112\text{V}$) using a discharge needle in an argon gas atmosphere, in the ionization chamber of the instrument (Fig. 1b). The SpecID patented system [53, 54, 55] has been shown to ionize organic chemicals, as well as microorganisms such as bacteria and viruses. Sample ionization occurs when noble gas plasma sparks continuously strike analytes (*e.g.*, bodily fluid samples) which are deposited onto ready-made depressions (*i.e.*, indentations) of stainless-steel wire mesh sample holders (Fig. 2), that are electrically grounded. This type of ionization was previously described in detail in a patent [53] and four publications [52, 53, 54, 55]. The SpecID method produces mass spectra with rich spectral information content compared to spectra acquired on an off-the-shelf Advion CMS or any other atmospheric pressure ionization instrument (*i.e.*, AccuTOF by JEOL USA, Inc.) [52].

2.2. General procedure

The screening procedure, also known as the SpecID workflow for virus detection in saliva (Fig. 4), consists of the following steps. Saliva is collected (average is 0.4 to 0.5 ml for most people) under supervision from hospital personnel or similar into a 1.5 mL microcentrifuge tube. Microcentrifuge tubes containing saliva are vigorously vortexed for 10 – 15s to ensure homogeneity (regardless of viral load). As many as four (4) 2- μL samples of saliva can be transferred by pipette to a sample holder. Once the samples are dry, sample holders (Fig. 2) are inserted into the ionization chamber of the CMS using a probe (Fig. 1a) where they are spark ionized. During this process, which lasts approx. 8 - 10 s per sample, mass spectra are collected (ranging from 151 to 500 amu) and stored using the CMS software (vers. 6.4.13.4), supplied by the manufacturer. Several replicate mass spectra of all the samples on the sample holder are acquired to ensure spectra reproducibility. Replicate mass spectra are later extracted using the CMS data processing software (vers. 6.4.13.4, Fig. 11) from their respective total ion chromatogram (TIC). Spectral analysis of the spectra can detect the presence or absence of a virus in the saliva sample. The unique viral spectral silhouette can be analyzed using pattern recognition software such as PCA (Fig. 6) or automated using an artificial neural network (ANN).

2.3. Spectra processing

Extracted raw spectra data files are large in size (*i.e.*, require extensive storage space (ca. 2 MB ea.) on electronic media) and thus, are unsuitable for high-throughput screening. For this reason, the raw spectra files are binned to reduce their file size. (Fig. 5a). When acquired, mass spectra contain a nominal amount of background noise, a natural occurrence during spectra acquisition of biological samples or organic compounds (*e.g.*, imiquimod). This background noise level can negatively impact spectra reproducibility and data analysis. Therefore, the binned spectra are divided by their respective relative standard deviation (RSD) to reduce noise (Fig. 5b). This RSD can be calculated from a set of spectral replicates for a sample on a peak by peak basis. Spectra are then normalized between 0 and 1 (Fig. 5c) to facilitate the use of the spectra for data analysis.

3. Results

3.1. Proof of concept

In order to perform a proof of concept experiment for detecting a virus in a complex matrix such as human saliva using SpecID, a preliminary experiment was designed and commenced. Human saliva – obtained from a consenting volunteer subject – was spiked *in vivo* with a cucumber leaf spot virus (CLSV, Fig. 3a, provided by Dr. Sherman, Dept. of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology, Univ. of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, TX) at a concentration which corresponds to that of a virus-infected patient, approximately 10^6 viral particles / mL of saliva. Replicate spectra of 1) CLSV only, 2) saliva only, and 3) CLSV-treated saliva were acquired and plotted as respective spheres within a hypothetical 3D principal component analysis (PCA) plot (Fig. 6). The clustering of spheres within each group clearly demonstrates that replicate samples obtained from CLSV-treated saliva (Fig. 7) can be reliably identified and distinguished from the replicate samples (Fig. 7a) obtained from human saliva of a healthy individual (Fig. 6).

3.2. Limit of detection (LOD)

In order to determine the lower limit of detection, CLSV suspensions were diluted ranging from 0 to 2 M viral particles / mL. Mass spectra of human saliva spiked with CLSV at various concentrations (Fig. 7), ranging from 0 to 2.0×10^6 viral particles / mL were acquired on a modified CMS and processed as described above. The LOD resides at around 0.5×10^6 virions / mL of saliva. Later experiments showed that the LOD was even lower (*i.e.*, 10^4 virions / mL, data not shown). Concentrations below 10^4 / mL will yield mass spectra that become indistinguishable from spectra acquired from saliva only samples.

3.3. Distinction of coronaviruses

At the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic, we were able to acquire mass spectra of various heat-inactivated coronaviruses, namely 1) a canine COV viral suspension in HEPES (1.5 mM $\text{Na}_2\text{HPO}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ aqueous solution) buffer, 2) a HCOV OC43 (Fig. 3c) viral suspension in buffer, 3) a HCOV NL63 viral suspension in buffer, as well as a BCOV sample (Fig. 3b), (courtesy of Dr. Azevedo). The HEPES buffer solution served as a control. A side-by-side visual comparison of the mass spectra acquired from canine COV (Fig. 8a), HCOV OC43 (Fig. 8b), HCOV NL63 (Fig. 8c) and HEPES buffer solution (Fig. 8d) allowed identification of distinctive spectral features. Through ArrayTrack™ PCA software, we were able to show distinctive clustering of replicate spectra (data not shown). This demonstrated the SpecID platform was suitable for distinguishing various coronaviruses.

3.4. Distinction of SARS-CoV-2 variants

The next logical step consisted of distinguishing SARS-CoV-2 variants of clinical importance. The heat inactivated viruses used in this experiment were obtained from *bei RESOURCES* (www.beiresources.org). These included NR-56128, SARS-CoV-2 hCoV-19, B.1.617.2, delta variant, and NR-56495, SARS-CoV-2 hCoV-19, B.1.1.529, omicron variant. A comparison of the spectra of human saliva only and human saliva spiked with delta / omicron SARS-CoV-2 variants is shown in (Fig. 9a-e). Reproducible prominent peaks of break down products from the spark ionization (arrows) aid in visually distinguishing the samples. Furthermore, 3D PCA (software used: ArrayTrack™ accessible at www.fda.gov) of mass spectra acquired from human saliva, compared to processed mass spectra acquired of human saliva spiked with a SARS-CoV-2 variant (*i.e.*, delta and omicron variants) clearly demonstrates that the two variants – delta and omicron – could be distinguished (Fig. 10). The spatial clustering of each group of replicate spectra (*i.e.*, saliva only, saliva treated

with coronavirus / delta variant, and saliva treated with coronavirus / omicron variant), demonstrated that spectra produced by SpecID are reproducible and unique enough to distinguish SARS-Cov-2 variants. This was possible using the RSD processing algorithm developed ‘in-house’. For comparison, the CMS manufacturer spectrum library tool cannot perform this distinction.

4. Discussion

The SpecID technology was discovered serendipitously while working with bacteria. The ensuing work on bacterial pathogens with SpecID showed the argon plasma spark ionization produced reproducible patterns of different strains of bacteria, specifically *Salmonella* serovars (Supplemental materials S1). Spectra that could be databased and catalogued, and easily identified with pattern recognition [54]. Our lab used the platform to perform chemical analysis and identify adulterated drugs, including creams and gel medications, with no sample preparation [56]. As part of a collaboration with Western Kentucky University, we used SpecID to identify antibiotics in porcine waste (Supplemental materials S2), with minimal sample handling (data not shown). Since the technology could directly be used for all these applications, our lab considered using the platform to detect Covid-19 once the pandemic was in full swing. Since Covid-19 is a respiratory virus, and saliva is a route of transmission, saliva was a logical matrix for analysis using SpecID. The initial SpecID work using CLSV virus in saliva, as a surrogate for Covid, showed: 1) the saliva spectra are reproducible, 2) saliva containing virus could easily be distinguished from saliva only samples, and 3) viral load in the saliva could easily be tracked. We performed limit of detection experiments that showed the SpecID sensitivity for detection of viruses in saliva outperforms PCR, both in terms of sensitivity and time to result (SpecID – 8s, PCR – hours). For the initial work, artificial saliva (Pickering Laboratories, Mountain View, CA) was tested as a surrogate to human saliva. Artificial saliva is a mixture of chemicals that approximate the viscosity and some of the physical characteristics of saliva. It did not work as a saliva surrogate for SpecID since it produces significant spectral variability between replicate spectra (data not shown). Having obtained FDA IRB approval, the saliva used in this study was collected from consenting healthy human volunteers and used to prepare the various viral suspensions analyzed. Volunteers at our facility, who agreed to participate in our study, provided saliva in 1.5 mL microcentrifuge tubes at least 60 min after the most recently ingested meal, in some instances, after teeth brushing. Volunteers were made aware that consumed products can affect saliva quality, including recent consumption of food, drinking soft/alcoholic beverages, smoking, vaping, smokeless tobacco products, chewing bubble gum, and presence of controlled substances (Schedules I-V) in trace amounts. The SpecID technology is so sensitive that it can “see” all these adulterants in saliva. Similarly, several health conditions will affect saliva. Similarly, several health conditions will have an effect on saliva. These include dehydration, reflux disease, poor hygiene, and other medical conditions such as decaying teeth, tonsillitis, bronchitis, benign lymphoepithelial lesions [60], and diabetes. This suggests the platform could be used to diagnose different diseases in saliva and other body fluids. It also suggests that food, drugs, other chemicals, disease states, and other adulterants can be identified and entered in a database as part of normal, virus free saliva. Enabling viruses to easily be identified on top of these conditions. Identifying a particular virus in saliva during high-throughput screening of the general population can be challenging, as people will most likely exhibit some variability in their saliva. However, the SpecID system is so sensitive that it can deconvolute the background noise and isolate the virus. Saliva is generally accepted as a source for biological indicators ranging from alterations in nucleic acids, proteins, and microflora biochemicals [59], and for this reason it has a good potential, compared to other biological fluids, for use in the detection of respiratory viruses

using SpecID. In addition to detecting and identifying a particular virus of interest in human saliva, the spectral data can be used to isolate the spectral fingerprint of a virus from the spectrum acquired from virus-infected human saliva. This is a way to avoid confusion with ingested or consumed substances and medical conditions. This can be achieved using an “in house” developed software which automatically extracts spectra from the total ion chromatogram, then processes the spectra for convenient spectra comparison. The method appears to work well to determine if one’s saliva contains viruses of any type.

5. Conclusions

Compared to other bodily fluids (*e.g.*, blood), collection and testing of saliva is painless and enables rapid screening of infected individuals. Compared to sampling of other bodily fluids such as blood and urine, the SpecID workflow for saliva is easy to perform. There is no sample preparation and saliva samples can be introduced by a trained hospital worker directly into the mass spectrometer’s ionization chamber using a sample holder. Replicate spectra are acquired in less than a minute and with software automation, the spectra could be extracted, RSD-processed, and analyzed in seconds. Virus identification, down to the variant-level, can be completed using automated software, which will sift through a large spectral library containing viruses of clinical importance, including SARS-CoV-2. In this study, we were first able to detect and identify cucumber leaf spot virus (CLSV) in saliva vs. saliva only, with a LOD of 10^4 virions / mL, distinguish various coronaviruses in saliva vs. control, and most importantly distinguish and identify SARS-CoV-2 variants (delta and omicron) in human saliva samples. The SpecID “in house” RSD processing and analysis software was necessary to produce the results. The commercial CMS Spectrum Library software provided by the mass spectrometer manufacturer did not yield reliable results. The use of SpecID platform as discussed in this manuscript implies 1) the instrument modifications that produces argon plasma spark ionization, and 2) the complementary replicate-based RSD processing software. This system could be extended to the rapid and reliable detection and identification of other clinically significant viruses such as Zika, dengue, influenza, hepatitis B and C [10, 57, 58], human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), and many others including newly emerging viruses. For this reason, the SpecID platform could be extremely useful in clinical settings. In addition to clinical testing of saliva and other body fluids for viruses, the platform can be used for environmental testing for viruses in public places including airports, subway train stations, product testing labs in regulatory environments, quality control departments in industrial production facilities, to name a few. Numerous sampling methods can be used with SpecID. Since the SpecID system is robust, it can analyze samples ‘as is’, meaning no sample prep. This includes solids, gels, creams, liquids, biofluids, and many other matrices. The SpecID platform has many other uses, and our plan is to highlight those applications in future publications.

6. Funding

This research was supported in its entirety by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

7. Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this study.

8. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank volunteer subjects for providing saliva samples, Dr. Michael Sherman for providing the CLSV sample, Drs. Kellie Woodling and Lisa Pence for critically reviewing the manuscript, and Anna Williams for literature search.

The following reagents were obtained through BEI Resources, NIAID, NIH: SARS-Related Coronavirus 2, Isolate hCoV-19/USA/MD-HP05285/2021 (Lineage B.1.617.2; Delta Variant), Heat Inactivated, NR-56128, and SARS-Related Coronavirus 2, Isolate hCoV-19/USA/GA-EHC-2811C/2021 (Lineage B.1.1.529; Omicron Variant), Heat Inactivated, NR-56495.

9. Disclaimer

The views presented in this article do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The mention of tradenames or specific manufacturer products are solely for clarification and should not be construed as endorsements.

10. References

1. Khan MS, Asif MI, Altaf R, Naeem A, Ullah H. Coronavirus (COVID-19): a systematic review of transmission, diagnosis, and vaccination, *Bulletin of Environment, Pharmacology and Life Sciences Bull. Env. Pharmacol. Life Sci.*, 01 9 [6] May 2020, pp. 80-84, 2020 Academy for Environment and Life Sciences, India, Online ISSN 2277-1808
2. Gonçalves de Castro M, Nogueira RMR, Schatzmayr HG, Miagostovich MP, Lourenço-de-Oliveira R. Dengue virus detection by using reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction in saliva and progeny of experimentally infected aedes albopictus from Brazil, *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro*, Vol. 99(8): pp. 809-814, Dec. 2004
3. Musso D, Teissier A, Rouault E, Teururai S, Pina JJ and Nhan TX. Detection of chikungunya virus in saliva and urine, *Virology Journal* (2016) 13:102, DOI 10.1186/s12985-016-0556-9
4. Brinati D, Campagner A, Ferrari D, Locatelli M, Banfi G, Cabitza F. Detection of COVID-19 infection from routine blood exams with machine learning: a feasibility study, *Journal of Medical Systems* (2020) 44: 135, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-020-01597-4>
5. Poloni TR, Oliveira AS, Alfonso HL, Galvão LR, Amarilla AA, Poloni DF et al. Detection of dengue virus in saliva and urine by real time RT-PCR, *Virology Journal* 2010, 7:22, www.virologyj.com/content/7/1/22

6. Idesawa M, Sugano N, Ikeda K, Oshikawa M, Takane M, Seki K et al. Detection of Epstein–Barr virus in saliva by real-time PCR, *Oral Microbiol Immunol* 2004; 19: 230–232.
7. Gomes-Keller MA, Gönczi E, Tandon R, Riondato F, Hofmann-Lehmann R, Meli ML et al. Detection of feline leukemia virus RNA in saliva from naturally infected cats and correlation of PCR results with those of current diagnostic methods, *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, Mar. 2006, p. 916–922, Vol. 44, 0095-1137/06/\$08.00+0 doi:10.1128/JCM.44.3.916–922.2006
8. Hermida M, Ferreiro MC, Barral S, Laredo R, Castro A, Diz Dios P. Detection of HCV RNA in saliva of patients with hepatitis C virus infection by using a highly sensitive test, *Journal of Virological Methods* 101 (2002) 29–35, 0166-0934/02/\$, PII: S0166-0934(01)00417-7
9. Mackiewicz V, Dussaix E, Le Petitcorps MF, Roque-Afonso AM. Detection of hepatitis A virus RNA in saliva, *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, Sept. 2004, p. 4329–4331 Vol. 42, No. 9, 0095-1137/04/\$08.00+0 DOI: 10.1128/JCM.42.9.4329–4331.2004
10. Musso D, Roche C, Nhan TX, Robin E, Teissier A, Cao-Lormeau VM. Detection of Zika virus in saliva, *Journal of Clinical Virology* 68 (2015) 53–55, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2015.04.021> 1386-6532/© 2015 Elsevier B.V.
11. Rai P, Kumar BK, Deekshit VK, Karunasagar I, Karunasagar I. Detection technologies and recent developments in the diagnosis of COVID-19 infection, *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology* (2021) 105:441–455, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-020-11061-5>
12. Udugama B, Kadhiresan P, Kozlowski HN, Malekjahani A, Osborne M, Li VYC, et al. Diagnosing COVID-19: the disease and tools for detection, *ACS Nano* 2020, 14, 3822–3835, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acsnano.0c02624>
13. Balmaseda A, Guzmán MG, Hammond S, Robleto G, Flores C, Téllez Y, et al. Diagnosis of dengue virus infection by detection of specific immunoglobulin M (IgM) and IgA antibodies in serum and saliva, *Clinical and Diagnostic Laboratory Immunology*, Mar. 2003, p. 317–322 Vol. 10, No. 2, 1071-412X/03/\$08.00+0 DOI: 10.1128/CDLI.10.2.317–322.2003
14. Khurshid Z, Zafar M, Khan E, Mali M, Latif M. Human saliva can be a diagnostic tool for Zika virus detection, *Journal of Infection and Public Health* 12 (2019) 601–604, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2019.05.004>, 1876-0341/© 2019
15. Khurshid Z, Asiri FYI, and Al Wadaani H. Human saliva: non-invasive fluid for detecting novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV), *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 2020, 17, 2225; doi:10.3390/ijerph17072225

16. Bonaldo M, Ribeiro IP, Lima NS, dos Santos AAC, Menezes LSR, da Cruz SOD, et al. Isolation of infective Zika virus from urine and saliva of patients in Brazil, *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* | DOI:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004816 June 24, 2016
17. Scohy A, Anantharajah A, Bodéus M, Kabamba-Mukadi B, Verroken A, Rodriguez-Villalobos H. Low performance of rapid antigen detection test as frontline testing for COVID-19 diagnosis, *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 129 (2020) 104455, 21386-6532/ © 2020 Published by Elsevier B.V., <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104455>
18. Balcarek KB, Warren W, Smith RJ, Lyon MD, Pass RF. Neonatal screening for congenital cytomegalovirus infection by detection of virus in saliva, *Journal of Infectious Diseases* 1993;167:1433-6, 0022-1899/93/6706-0028\$01.00
19. Connell JA, Parry JV, Mortimer PP, Duncan J. Novel assay for the detection of immunoglobulin G antihuman immunodeficiency virus in untreated saliva and urine, *Journal of Medical Virology* 41:159-164 (1993), © 1993 Wiley-Liss, Inc.
20. Alves do Nascimento V, Abdalla Santos JH, da Silva Monteiro DC, Pinheiro Pessoa K, Leão Cardoso AJ, Costa de Souza V, et al. Oropouche virus detection in saliva and urine, *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro*, Vol. 115: e190338, 2020, doi: 10.1590/0074-02760190338, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2888-1060>
21. Ekrami E, Pouresmaeli M, Barati F, Asghari S, Ziarani FR, Shariati P, et al., Potential diagnostic systems for coronavirus detection: a critical review, *Biological Procedures Online* (2020) 22:21, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12575-020-00134-4>
22. Mishra T, Wang M, Metwally AA, Bogu GK, Brooks AW, Bahmani A, et al. Pre-symptomatic detection of COVID-19 from smartwatch data, *Nature Biomedical Engineering*, Vol. 4, Dec. 2020, pp. 1208–1220, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-020-00640-6>
23. Pink R, Simek J, Vondrakova J, Faber E, Michl P, Pazdera J, et al. Saliva as a diagnostic medium”, *Biomed Pap Med Fac Univ Palacky Olomouc Czech Repub.* 2009, 153(2):103–110,
24. To KKW, Yip CCY, Lai CYW, Wong CKH, Ho DTY, Pang PKP, et al. Saliva as a diagnostic specimen for testing respiratory virus by a point-of-care molecular assay: a diagnostic validity study, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2018.06.009>, 1198-743X, *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* 25 (2019) 372-378
25. Williams E, Bond K, Zhang B, Putland M, Williamson DA. Saliva as a non-invasive specimen for detection of SARS-CoV-2, *JCM Accepted Manuscript Posted Online 21 April 2020*, *J. Clin. Microbiol.* doi:10.1128/JCM.00776-20

26. Li Y, Ren B, Peng X, Hu T, Li J, Gong T, et al. Saliva is a non-negligible factor in the spread of COVID-19”, *Mol Oral Microbiol.* 2020;35:141–145, <https://doi.org/10.1111/omi.12289>
27. Azzi L, Carcano G, Gianfagna F, Grossi P, Dalla Gasperina D, Genoni A, et al. Saliva is a reliable tool to detect SARS-CoV-2, *Journal of Infection* 81 (2020) e45–e50, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.005>
28. Pasomsub E, Watcharananan SP, Boonyawat K, Janchompoo P, Wongtabtim G, Suksuwan W, et al. Saliva sample as a non-invasive specimen for the diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019: a cross-sectional study, *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, Vol. 26, Issue 12, Dec. 2020, pp. 1711-1713, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.05.001>
29. Alizargar J, Aghamohammadi M, Etemadi Sh M, Hatefi S. Saliva samples as an alternative for novel coronavirus (COVID-19) diagnosis, *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association* (2020) 119, 1234e1235, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfma.2020.04.030>
30. Altawalah H, Alhuraish F, Alkandari WA, Ezzikouri S. Saliva specimens for detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 in Kuwait: a cross-sectional study, *Journal of Clinical Virology* 132 (2020) 104652, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104652>
31. Sapkota D, Thapa SB, Hasséus B, Jensen JL. Saliva testing for COVID-19?, *British Dental Journal*, Vol. 228, No. 9, May 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-020-1594-7>
32. Chong CY, Kam KQ, Li JH, Maiwald M, Loo LH, Donceras Nadua K, et al. Saliva is not a useful diagnostic specimen in children with Coronavirus Disease 2019, Oxford University Press for the Infectious Diseases Society of America, <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1376/5905581>
33. Caulley L, Corsten M, Eapen L, Angel JB, Bastien N, Poliquin G, Johnson-Obaseki S. Salivary detection of COVID-19, *Annals of Internal Medicine*, Vol. 174, No. 1, Jan. 2021, doi:10.7326/M20-4738
34. Vinayachandran D, Balasubramanian S. Salivary diagnostics in COVID-19: future research implications, *Journal of Dental Sciences* (2020) 15, 364-366, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jds.2020.04.006>
35. Jamal AJ, Mozafarihashjin M, Coomes E, Powis J, Li AX, Paterson A, et al. Sensitivity of nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva for the detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, *Clinical Infectious Diseases*® 2021;72(6):1064–6, DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciaa848
36. Khan RS, Ur Rehman I. Spectroscopy as a tool for detection and monitoring of Coronavirus (COVID-19), *Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics*, 2020, Vol. 20, No. 7, pp 647–649, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14737159.2020.1766968>

37. Sri Santosh T, Parmar R, Anand H, Srikanth K, Saritha M. A review of salivary diagnostics and its potential implication in detection of Covid-19, *Cureus* 12(4): e7708. DOI 10.7759/cureus.7708
38. Rao M, Rashid FA, Sabri FSAH, Jamil NN, Zain R, Hashim R, et al. Comparing nasopharyngeal swab and early morning saliva for the identification of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), *Clinical Infectious Diseases*® 2021;72(9):e352–6, DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1156
39. Warren WP, Balcarek K, Smith R, Pass RF. Comparison of rapid methods of detection of cytomegalovirus in saliva with virus isolation in tissue culture, *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, Apr. 1992, Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 786-789
40. To KKW, Tsang OTY, Yip CCY, Chan KH, Wu TC, Chan JMC, et al. Consistent detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in saliva, *Clinical Infectious Diseases*® 2020;71(15):841–3, DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciaa149
41. Sabino-Silva R, Gomes Jardim AC, Siqueira WL. Coronavirus COVID-19 impacts to dentistry and potential salivary diagnosis, *Clinical Oral Investigations* (2020) 24:1619–1621, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00784-020-03248-x>
42. Corstjens PLAM, Abrams WR, Malamud D. Detecting viruses by using salivary diagnostics, *J Am Dent Assoc.* 2012 October ; 143(10 0): 12S–18S.
43. Viswanath B, Choi CS, Lee K, Kim S. Recent trends in the development of diagnostic tools for diabetes mellitus using patient saliva, *Trends in Analytical Chemistry* 89 (2017) 60e67, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2017.01.011>
44. Hernandez MM, Banu R, Shrestha P, Patel A, Chen F, Cao L, et al. RT-PCR/MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry-based detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva specimens, *J Med Virol.* 2021;93:5481–5486, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.27069>
45. Pink R, Simek J, Vondrakova J, Faber E, Michl P, Pazdera J, et al. Saliva as a diagnostic medium, *Biomed Pap Med Fac Univ Palacky Olomouc Czech Repub.* 2009, 153(2):103–110.
46. Sugimoto M, Wong DT, Hirayama A, Soga T, Tomita M. Capillary electrophoresis mass spectrometry-based saliva metabolomics identified oral, breast and pancreatic cancer-specific profiles, *Metabolomics* (2010) 6:78–95, DOI 10.1007/s11306-009-0178-y
47. Xiao H, Zhang L, Zhou H, Lee JM, Garon EB, Wong DTW. Proteomic analysis of human saliva from lung cancer patients using two-dimensional difference gel electrophoresis and mass spectrometry, *Molecular & Cellular Proteomics* 11.2, 10.1074/mcp.M111.012112–11

48. Nikolaev EN, Indeykina MI, Brzhozovskiy AG, Bugrova AE, Kononikhin AS, Starodubtseva NL, et al. Mass-spectrometric detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus in scrapings of the epithelium of the nasopharynx of infected patients via nucleocapsid N protein, *J. Proteome Res.* 2020, 19, 4393–4397, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.jproteome.0c00412>
49. Singh P, Chakraborty R, Marwal R, Radhakrishnan VS, Bhaskar AK, Vashisht H, et al. A rapid and sensitive method to detect SARS-CoV-2 virus using targeted-mass spectrometry, *Journal of Proteins and Proteomics* (2020) 11:159–165, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42485-020-00044-9>
50. Ihling C, Tänzler D, Hagemann S, Kehlen A, Hüttelmaier S, Arlt C, et al. Mass Spectrometric identification of SARS-CoV-2 proteins from gargle solution samples of COVID-19 patients, *J. Proteome Res.* 2020, 19, 4389–4392, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.jproteome.0c00280>
51. Iles RK, Zmuidinaite R, Iles JK, Carnell G, Heeney ASJL. “Development of a clinical MALDI-ToF mass spectrometry assay for SARS-CoV-2: rational design and multi-disciplinary team work”, *Diagnostics* 2020, 10, 746; doi:10.3390/diagnostics10100746
52. Alusta. Rapid identification of bacteria using mass spectrometry and spectral pattern recognition”, University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) Ph.D. dissertation, 2012.
53. Alusta P, Dorey C, Parker WR, Wilkes JG, Buzatu DA. Direct impact ionization (DII) mass spectrometry”, U.S. Pat. 8704169 B2 / US20130087700, 2011.
54. Alusta P, Buzatu DA, Williams A, Cooper WM, Tarasenko O, Dorey RC, et al. Instrumental improvements and sample preparations that enable reproducible, reliable acquisition of mass spectra from whole bacterial cells. *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry*, Volume 29, Issue 21, 15 November 2015, Pages 1961–1968.
55. Alusta P, Buzatu DA, Tarasenko O, Wilkes JG, Darsey J. Direct impact corona ionization of bacteria for rapid, reproducible identification via spectral pattern recognition, *AIP Conference Proceedings* 1326, 128 (2011); <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3587468>.
56. Alusta P, Willet D, Rodriguez J, Williams A, Buzatu DA. Reliable and rapid distinction of substandard / counterfeit medications from reference medications using a modified compact mass spectrometer, (in review).
57. van der Eijk AA, Niesters HGM, Hansen BE, Pas SD, Richardus JH, Mostert M, et al. Paired, quantitative measurements of hepatitis B virus DNA in saliva, urine and serum of chronic hepatitis B patients, *European Journal of Gastroenterology & Hepatology*: November 2005 - Volume 17 - Issue 11 - p 1173-1179.

58. Liuzzi G, Nicastrì E, Puro V, Zumla A, Ippolito G. Zika virus in saliva—new challenges for prevention of human to human transmission, *European Journal of Internal Medicine*, Volume 33, e20-e21, Sept. 1, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejim.2016.04.022>

59. Fini MB. Oral saliva and COVID-19. *Oral Oncology*, Volume 108, September 2020, 104821, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oraloncology.2020.104821>

60. Metwaly H, Cheng J, Ida-Yonemochi H, Ohshiro K, Jen KY, Liu AR, Saku T. Vascular endothelial cell participation in formation of lymphoepithelial lesions (epi-myoeptithelial islands) in lymphoepithelial sialadenitis (benign lymphoepithelial lesion). *European Journal of Pathology*, *Virchows Archive* 443, 17–27 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00428-003-0824-0>

11. Figures

Figure 1a: The SpecID modified ionization chamber of the Advion CMS mass spectrometer. The sample holder (dark gray rod and yellow aggregate) is depicted being inserted in the chamber. All CAD drawings reproduced in this study were made by the authors using SketchUp vers. 14.

Figure 1b: Cut-through view of the modified ionization chamber of the CMS. The tip of the discharge needle (D) is located right above the ion inlet orifice (I) – top of the cone.

Figure 2: Low-magnification SEM micrograph of the stainless-steel wire mesh “sample holder”. The up-side-down indentation which can hold up to 5 μ L of saliva ready to be ionized.

Figure 3a: TEM micrograph (magnification: 40,000 \times) of cucumber leaf spot virus (CLSV) virions. The average diameter of a CLSV virion is \sim 30 nm.

Figure 3b: TEM micrograph (magnification: 25,000 \times) of bovine coronavirus (BCOV). The average diameter of BCOV virus is \sim 90 nm.

Figure 3c: TEM micrograph (magnification: 25,000 \times) of HCOV OC43 virions. The average diameter of a HCOV OC43 virus is \sim 95 nm.

Figure 4: SpecID workflow (general procedure): *i*) supervised collection of saliva from a human volunteer into a 1.5 mL microcentrifuge tube, *ii*) deposition of two or more 2- μ L drops of saliva on stainless-steel sample holders, *iii*) loading sample holder into the ionization chamber of the CMS, *iv*) acquisition and storage of several replicate mass spectra, *v*) extraction

of replicate mass spectra from chromatogram, *vi*) analysis of presence or absence of a particular virus using spectra analysis software.

Figure 5a: Spectral binning: Illustration of binning mass spectra stored as Cartesian coordinates arranged in a spreadsheet. Individual spectra data points are binned at a resolution of 1 amu. Only the maximum value (red dotted line) found within each bin is adopted for each bin (red arrows). Analysis of binned spectra is much quicker due to the file size, when compared to raw data.

Figure 5b: Noise reduction: Division by Relative Standard Deviation (RSD) to reduce background noise. Each spectral data point is divided by the relative standard deviation spectrum (calculated from the respective sample replicates).

Figure 5c: Spectral normalization: To facilitate spectral analysis, the amplitudes of each spectrum are shifted between 0.000 and 1.000, as calculated by their minima and maxima (see bottom of table shown in Fig. 5c).

Figure 6 3D PCA Plot: Software used: ArrayTrack™ (www.fda.gov/science-research/bioinformatics-tools/arraytracktm-hca-pca-standalone-package-powerful-data-exploring-tools). Notice the clusters of each replicate spectra group (saline solution, saliva only, CLSV only, and saliva treated with CLSV). This demonstrates that spectra processing with RSD can easily distinguish the samples.

Figure 7: Spectra comparison of human saliva spiked with CLSV at various concentrations. From top to bottom: saliva only (Fig. 7a), saliva only (Fig. 7b), 0.5 M viral particles per mL of saliva (Fig. 7c), 1.0 M viral particles per mL of saliva (Fig. 7d), 2.0 M viral particles per mL of saliva, and finally CLSV only (Fig. 7e).

Figure 8: Comparison of mass spectra acquired of canine COV (Fig. 8a), HCOV NL63 (Fig. 8b), HCOV OC43 (Fig 8c), and HEPES buffer solution (Fig. 8d). Distinctive spectral features can be easily identified by means of visual inspection.

Figure 9: Spectra of human saliva spiked with the SARS-CoV-2 variants delta and omicron. From top to bottom: human saliva only (Fig. 9a); NR-56128, heat-inactivated SARS-CoV-2, hCoV-19, B.1.617.2, delta variant, 10^4 virions suspended in 1 mL of PBS (Fig. 9b); NR-56128, heat-inactivated SARS-CoV-2, hCoV-19, B.1.617.2, delta variant, 10^4 viral particles suspended in 1 mL of human saliva (Fig. 9c); NR-56495, heat-inactivated SARS-CoV-2, hCoV-19, B.1.1.529, omicron variant, 10^4 viral particles suspended in 1 mL of PBS (Fig. 9d); NR-56495, heat-inactivated SARS-CoV-2, hCoV-19, B.1.1.529, omicron variant, 10^4 viral particles suspended in 1 mL of human saliva (Fig. 9e). The arrows point to peaks of metabolites that aid visual confirmation.

Figure 10: 3D PCA of spectra of human saliva only, and spectra of saliva spiked with 500 virions of delta and omicron variants. Notice the spatial clustering of each group, demonstrating that spectral distinction of these variants can be achieved with SpecID at this low level of virus in saliva.

Figure 11: Screenshot of the Advion CMS analysis software.

WITHDRAWN
see manuscript DOI for details




Figure 1a




Figure 1b




Figure 2

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.28.22284023>; this version posted December 30, 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. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.




Figure 3a

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.28.22284023>; this version posted December 30, 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. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.




Figure 3b

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.28.22284023>; this version posted December 30, 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. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.




Figure 3c

SpecID workflow (SOP)



Figure 4

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.28.22284023>; this version posted December 30, 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. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

1st bin

x	y
152.00	677205.03
152.05	706199.22
152.10	998567.40
152.15	1939245.42
152.20	3812318.08
152.25	702118.38
152.30	9880317.36
152.35	12678972.50
152.40	15657628.21
152.45	18197062.20
152.50	20095639.94
152.55	21015288.88
152.60	20109565.96
152.65	17563054.05
152.70	14224854.93
152.75	10102697.64
152.80	7147639.27
152.85	5917136.29
152.90	5502497.42
152.95	6152438.98
153.00	8337514.63
153.05	11180612.34
153.10	15010379.22
153.15	19677399.21
153.20	24115906.82
153.25	29167574.88
153.30	33234932.60
153.35	34495068.54
153.40	33558679.69
153.45	31889586.86
153.50	30062132.55
153.55	29165172.52
153.60	28485391.46
153.65	27098129.24
153.70	24135646.96
153.75	20630885.88
153.80	16906261.86
153.85	12044334.84
153.90	7652737.37
153.95	5135498.64
154.00	3822482.21
154.05	3976097.37
154.10	5881245.63

2nd bin

x	y
152	21015288.88
153	34495068.54
154	24909758.20
155	71597106.31
156	13898028.66
157	53210586.60
158	21165926.87
159	48300990.21
160	11700994.59
161	42068188.26
162	10492625.52
163	22204949.83
164	6462969.10
165	42944454.93
166	17670416.55
167	31944885.92
168	15003705.56
169	36641380.44
170	13112536.66

Figure 5a

average data points
of replicate spectra

relative
standard
deviation*

standard deviation of replicate spectra

x	Raw	Raw	Raw	Saliva sample		
	Saliva spectrum-1	Saliva spectrum-2	Saliva spectrum-3	STD	AVRG	RSD
152	677205.0313	726426.3438	724666.66	27923.82481	709432.68	3.936078
153	706199.2227	795378.8477	1211351.66	269618.1725	904309.91	29.81485
154	998567.4023	1015933.3398	1860548.21	492728.2523	1291682.99	38.14622
155	1939245.4160	1493441.5410	3389832.79	991568.1688	2274173.25	43.60126
156	3862218.0820	2307360.5820	6791694.08	2277010.409	4320424.25	52.7034
157	6782528.3750	3236536.6250	11694239.38	4247189.232	7237768.13	58.68092
158	9880317.3594	4245860.8594	15707760.36	5731220.523	9944646.19	57.63122
159	12678972.4961	5759183.9961	19001863.50	6623581.406	12480006.66	53.07354
160	15657628.2129	7709188.2129	23047990.21	7671092.879	15471602.21	49.58176
161	18197062.1992	9374623.1992	25911308.20	8274528.91	17827664.53	46.41398
162	20095639.9551	10474290.9551	27460515.96	8518055.283	19343482.29	44.03579
163	21015288.8848	11206091.8848	27698446.88	8295407.566	19973275.88	41.53253
164	20109565.9551	11311917.9551	25618523.96	7216026.19	19013335.96	37.95245
165	17563054.0459	10740390.0459	22565872.05	5936033.419	16956438.71	35.00755
166	14224854.9316	9827555.9316	18807184.93	4490132.212	14286531.93	31.42913
167	10102697.6406	8276750.1406	14281307.64	3078137.331	10886918.47	28.27372
168	7147639.2676	6210654.2676	10640927			29.1865
169	5917136.2891	4499336.2891				
170	5502497.4160	3203728.6660				
171	6152438.9805	2711776.7305				
	8337514.6299	3617451				

* $RSD = 100 \times (STD/AVRG)$

Figure 5b

	Normalized	Normalized	Normalized
x	Saliva spectrum-1	Saliva spectrum-2	Saliva spectrum-3
152	0.0140	0.0170	0.0146
153	0.0000	0.0017	0.0010
154	0.0002	0.0017	0.0018
155	0.0020	0.0025	0.0045
156	0.0047	0.0034	0.0093
157	0.0087	0.0045	0.0160
158	0.0118	0.0063	0.0229
159	0.0203	0.0096	0.0310
160	0.0276		0.0410
161	0.0348		
162	0.0409		
163	0.0470		
		0.0165	0.0146
		0.0261	0.0206
495	0.0508	0.0421	0.0320
496	0.0845	0.0752	0.0584
497	0.1546	0.1444	0.1206
498	0.2296	0.2217	0.1891
499	0.2832	0.2720	0.2350
Min	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Max	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.28.22284023>; this version posted December 30, 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. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

WITHDRAWN
see manuscript DOI for details

Figure 5c




Figure 6






Figure 7a,b,c





Figure 7d,e

Spectrum RT 0:15 - 0:23 {56 scans} - Background Subtracted 0 - 0:13
Canine COV viral suspension-2.datx;
APCI + Sparging at 2.5 keV Max: 2.2E8




Fig. 8a

Spectrum RT 0:45 - 0:49 {27 scans} - Background Subtracted 0 - 0:20
HCOV NL63 viral suspension-1.datx;
APCI + Sparging at 2.5 keV Max: 2.7E8





Fig. 8b

Figure 8a,b

Spectrum RT 0:32 - 0:44 (84 scans) - Background Subtracted 0:03 - 0:31

HCOV DC43 viral suspension-1.dabx

APCI + Sparking at 2.5 keV Max: 2.9E8



Spectrum RT 0:13 - 0:22 (62 scans) - Background Subtracted 1 - 0:13

Hepes buffer-5.dabx

APCI + Sparking at 2.5 keV Max: 3.4E8




Figure 8c,d





Figure 9a,b




Figure 9c,d



Figure 9e




Figure 10




Figure 11