1

1	Expansion of a low-cost, saliva-based PCR test for the detection of mpox virus				
2					
3	Russell J Thomas ^{1,2*} , Orchid M. Allicock ^{1*} , Devyn Yolda-Carr ¹ , Katherine Fajardo ¹ , Sydney A. Steel ¹ ,				
4	Chessley B. Blacklock ¹ , Theresa Zepeda ³ , Maurice Brownlee ⁴ , Shyam Saladi ^{2,3} , James Parkin ³ , Anne				
5	L. Wyllie ^{1,2}				
6					
7	¹ Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT,				
8	USA; ² SalivaDirect Inc., New Haven, CT, USA; ³ Neelyx Labs, Wood Dale, IL, USA; ⁴ Wellness Homes				
9	of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA				
10					
11	*These authors contributed equally to the study				
12					
13	Correspondence:				
14	Anne Wyllie				
15	awyllie@gmail.com				
16					
17	Word Count: 3,071 (including references in square brackets)				
18					

19

2

20 ABSTRACT

Background. Current recommendations for the diagnosis of mpox rely on lesion-swabs as the gold-standard specimen type, even though many patients experience symptoms prior to lesion-onset. Alternative sample types, such as saliva, which enable earlier detection could bolster the mpox response by mitigating transmission and facilitating access to antiviral treatments.

26

27 Methods. We evaluated five PCR assays and compared their detection of mpox DNA extracted from 30 saliva specimens collected in Spectrum SDNA-1000 tubes. We sequenced 28 29 seven mpox-positive samples and assessed concordance with the primers and probes of the 30 PCR assays. Following, we incorporated these PCR assays into a simplified, extraction-free protocol to evaluate its feasibility for testing raw (unsupplemented) saliva samples. To further 31 explore the potential of this approach, we investigated the stability of mpox detection in raw 32 saliva diluted 1:10 and 1:100 in mpox-negative saliva, after storage at 4°C, room temperature 33 (~19°C), 30°C, and 40°C for 72 hours and through simulated shipping conditions. 34

35

Results. Despite identifying three nucleotide substitutions in the CDC's Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test's primer sequences, we observed no difference in the mean Ctvalues generated between assays. We successfully incorporated each assay into our salivabased extraction-free PCR protocol. Detection in raw saliva following storage at 4°C, ~19°C, and 30°C remained relatively stable for 24-48 hours and following simulated shipping conditions.

42

Conclusions. This pilot investigation supports a flexible, saliva-based, extraction-free PCR test as a promising approach for diagnosis, outbreak response or ongoing surveillance of mpox. With detection in raw saliva remaining stable for 24-48 hours and through simulated shipping temperatures, saliva-based sampling and simplified testing could reduce diagnostic costs, increase access to testing and address hurdles in low- and middle-income countries.

48

49 **Keywords:** mpox, saliva, qPCR, molecular diagnostics

3

50 BACKGROUND

51 Countries in Western and Central Africa have long dealt with outbreaks of mpox virus, with a 52 likely rodent reservoir contributing to spillover [1]. Few outbreaks of mpox virus have occurred 53 outside of Africa, and when they have, they have been largely self-limiting. However, in 2022, 54 the virus spread globally, particularly in the sexual networks of men who have sex with men 55 [2]. Much like the challenges seen with SARS-CoV-2, public health systems struggled as case 56 counts rapidly grew, with testing bottlenecks and insufficient access to treatment and 57 prophylaxis [2].

58

59 Mpox infection typically presents with a viral prodrome followed by the characteristic "pox" 60 lesions. During the 2022 outbreak, studies highlighted that cases were experiencing oral or 61 mucosal lesions, with some reporting oropharyngeal symptoms first [2,3]. These reports 62 corroborate historical data; a study from the Democratic Republic of Congo found that 29% of 63 cases had mouth/throat lesions, with 78% of cases also reporting a sore throat, with blood 64 and pharyngeal samples confirming infection earlier than lesion swabs [4].

65

66 Through 2022, saliva emerged as a viable diagnostic specimen for mpox, demonstrating high sensitivity [5-9]. Notably, Allen-Blitz et al. found that testing saliva accurately identified 22 67 cases, four of which did not have a rash and one had no symptoms at all [5]. Hernaez et al. 68 found systemic symptoms and lesions associated with higher viral loads in saliva and isolated 69 70 infectious virus from 22/33 saliva samples [8]. When followed over the course of the infection, mpox has been detected in saliva at lower qPCR cycle threshold (Ct) values than from skin 71 lesions [6,7] and oral swab samples [9]. In a systematic review, saliva, anorectal and skin 72 lesion samples had the highest viral loads, all greater than that of pharyngeal samples [10]. 73 74 Moreover, viral loads peaked earliest in saliva, within four days of symptom onset [10], with 75 Brosius et al. detecting DNA and replication-competent mpox virus up to four days before symptom onset [11]. While detection of mpox in saliva typically declines within 14 days of 76 symptoms onset [10], mpox virus has been reported in saliva 76 days after diagnosis [12]. 77 The diagnostic implications for this suggest that mpox virus can circulate systemically prior to 78 79 lesions and in some cases following their resolution, which raises questions surrounding the potential for asymptomatic transmission and opportunities for improved screening measures, 80 81 particularly of close-contacts.

4

83 Together with saliva being a CDC-recognized source of transmission [13], the growing body of literature underscores the potential of saliva as a specimen type for the detection of mpox 84 virus – its advantages including its ease of self-collection and ability to detect infection prior to 85 86 lesion onset. With these benefits supporting serial sample collection from exposed individuals, 87 this could identify cases earlier than lesion development. Early detection facilitates faster access to antivirals, which may lessen the severity of disease and concomitantly, facilitates 88 89 earlier isolation, thus aiding public health workers in halting transmission chains. Therefore, in this study, we evaluated the potential of a simplified PCR test for the detection of mpox virus 90 in saliva, aiming to enhance outbreak response and sustainable surveillance efforts. 91

- 92
- 93

94 METHODS

95 *Ethics statement*

This study was conducted with Institutional Review Board approval from Yale Human Research Protection Program (Protocol ID. 2000033293), which allowed for the use of remnant clinical samples and was considered as non-human subjects research. No personal identifiable information was permitted for use in this study.

- 100
- 101 Samples

We received 30 known mpox-positive saliva samples in Spectrum SDNA-1000 collection devices from FlowHealth (Culver City, CA). These collection devices contain patented preservative media to stabilize analytes. Additionally, we received five raw (unsupplemented) mpox-positive saliva samples from Neelyx Labs (Wood Dale, IL) that were collected from patients with positive lesion-swabs.

107

108 PCR assay performance

Using synthetic mpox virus DNA (ATCC VR-3270SD, ATCC Manassas, VA), we assessed the limit of detection (LOD) for five different PCR assays: the Logix Smart[™] Mpox (2-Gene) RUO (Co-Diagnostics, Inc., Salt Lake City, UT), the Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay (Mirimus Labs, Brooklyn, NY), the assay targeting Clade II developed by Yu Li *et al.* [14], and the CDC assays consisting of targets for both mpox virus and non-variola orthopoxvirus [15] (**Table 1**). As the sequences for the primers and probes of the Logix Smart[™] Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay from Co-Diagnostics, Inc. are proprietary, they are not listed. Two target assays had

5

been recommended by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and supported by assay
developers in order to provide two, independent outputs to corroborate each other, and to
make the assay more robust against future variants that could emerge over time.

119

120 Triplicate tests were performed using two-fold dilution series of the synthetic DNA controls in 121 water, ranging from 100 copies/µl to 1 copy/µl. Reaction mixes, including primer and probe 122 concentrations, either followed the manufacturer's instructions (Co-Diagnostics), the CDC 123 guidance for the detection of non-variola orthopoxvirus (CDC and Clade II assays) [15], or as 124 detailed in **Supplementary Table 1** (Mirimus). Assays other than the Logix Smart[™] Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay from Co-Diagnostics were run with the Luna® Universal One-Step RT-125 126 gPCR Kit (New England Biolabs, MA). Thermocycler conditions for each assay are provided 127 in **Supplementary Table 2**. For the Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay, the CDC Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test, and the CDC Non-variola Orthopoxvirus Real-Time PCR 128 Test, samples were considered positive when Ct values <40. For the Logix Smart[™] Mpox (2-129 Gene) RUO assay and the assay targeting Clade II samples were considered positive when 130 Ct values were <42. 131

132

We then validated the five PCR assays on the 30 samples received from FlowHealth. In each
assay, 5 µl of DNA template, extracted using the MagMAX[™] Viral/Pathogen Nucleic Acid
Isolation Kit (ThermoFisher Scientific, MA), was tested in a 20 µl reaction volume.

- 136
- 137

Table 1. Gene targets, primers, and probe sequences of the mpox PCR assays evaluated

Assay	Supplier	Gene Targets	Component	Sequence
Logix Smart™ Mpox (2-Gene)	Co-Diagnostics, Inc. Salt Lake	L6R (T3) F8L (T4)	Forward Primer	Proprietary
KUU	C City, Ci		Reverse Primer	Proprietary
			Probe	Proprietary

Mirimus MPOX	Mirimus Labs,	G2R (Generic)	Forward	5'-GGA AAA TGT AAA GAC AAC
RT-PCR Assay	Brooklyn, NY	E9L	Primers	GAA TAC AG-3'
				5'-TCA ACT GAA AAG GCC ATC TAT GA-3'
			Reverse Primers	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT GGA AGC GTA-3'
				5'-GAG TAT AGA GCA CTA TTT CTA AAT CCC A-3'
			Probes	5'-FAM-AAG CCG TAA TCT A <bhq-1dt>GT TGT CTA TCG TGT CC-Spacer C6-3'</bhq-1dt>
				5'-FAM-CCA TGC AAT A (T– BHQ1) A CGT ACA AGA TAG TAG CCA AC-Phos-3'
Clade II RT-PCR Assay	Yu Li <i>et. Al</i> (11)	G2R (Clade II)	Forward Primer	5'-CAC ACC GTC TCT TCC ACA GA-3'
			Reverse Primer	5'-GAT ACA GGT TAA TTT CCA CAT CG-3'
			Probe	5' FAM-AAC CCG TCG TAA CCA GCA ATA CAT TT-3' BHQ1
CDC Monkeypox virus Generic Real-	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USA	G2R (Generic)	Forward Primer	5'-GGA AAA TGT AAA GAC AAC GAA TAC AG-3'
			Reverse Primer	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT GGA AGC GTA-3'
			Probe	5'-FAM-AAG CCG TAA TCT A <bhq-1dt>G TTG TCT ATC</bhq-1dt>

				GTG TCC-Spacer C6-3'
CDC Non-variola Orthopoxvirus	Centers for Disease Control	E9L	Forward Primer	5'-TCA ACT GAA AAG GCC ATC TAT GA-3'
PCR Test	USA		Reverse Primer	5'-GAG TAT AGA GCA CTA TTT CTA AAT CCC A-3'
			Probe	5'-FAM-CCA TGC AAT A (T– BHQ1) A CGT ACA AGA TAG TAG CCA AC-Phos-3'

140

141 *Extraction-free workflows*

To explore the potential of streamlined, extraction-free PCR testing of saliva for the detection of mpox virus, we validated each of the three SalivaDirect workflows developed for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 [16] on three raw saliva samples from Neelyx Labs. Briefly, workflow one includes the addition of proteinase K followed by heat inactivation at 95°C for 5 minutes, workflow two includes heat treatment at 95°C without addition of proteinase K, and workflow three includes heat pre-treatment at 95°C for 30 minutes, followed by addition of proteinase K, then heat inactivation at 95°C for 5 minutes.

149

150 Stability of detection of mpox virus in raw, unsupplemented saliva

151 Having demonstrated the stability of detection of other respiratory pathogens in raw saliva [17–19], we explored the stability of the detection of mpox virus DNA in the raw mpox-positive 152 samples diluted 1:10 and 1:100 into mpox-negative saliva. Saliva lysates prepared from the 153 1:10 dilutions using workflow one of the extraction-free protocol were tested with the Logix 154 Smart[™] Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay and the lysates prepared from the 1:100 dilutions were 155 tested with the Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay. Time zero values were adjusted based on this 156 dilution factor, for which a dilution of 1:10 would yield approximately a +3 increase in Ct value. 157 158 To test stability, we assessed the change in Ct values at 24, 48, and 72 hours of incubation at 4°C, room temperature (~19°C), 30°C, and 40°C. Due to limited volume of raw saliva, we 159 160 further assessed the stability of detection using the DNA extracted from a subset of the saliva samples in Spectrum SDNA-1000 collection devices, spiked into raw mpox-negative saliva at 161 a ratio of 1:100, and incubated at room temperature for up to 72 hours. 162

8

163

Additionally, we assessed the stability of mpox detection following incubation through a modification of the US FDA's summer and winter shipping profile conditions, modeled after International Safe Transit Association (ISTA) 7D shipping standards. Due to limited sample volume, only three samples were run through the simulated shipping profiles, and all three samples were diluted 1:5 into mpox-negative saliva.

169

170 Amplicon sequencing from saliva samples

To assess concordance of the primers and probes of the assays, we followed the sequencing 171 protocol developed by Chen et. al. [20], after performing DNA extraction on the 30 known-172 173 positive samples collected into Spectrum SDNA-1000 tubes using the MagMAX[™] 174 Viral/Pathogen Nucleic Acid Isolation Kit (ThermoFisher Scientific, MA). After selecting specimens with Ct values <31 following PCR testing using the Logix Smart[™] Mpox (2-Gene) 175 176 RUO assay, we proceeded with sequencing seven saliva specimens using the Yale Center 177 for Genomic Analysis' Illumina MiSeg at a depth of 1.5 million reads, then followed the bioinformatics pipeline detailed by Chen et al. [20]. 178

179

Next, we performed a reference-guided whole genome alignment using a reference sequence 180 181 retrieved from the National Center for Biotechnology Information's (NCBI) GenBank. We 182 compared the nucleotide sequences of the primers and probes of the assays used in this 183 study against the aligned sequences for concordance using Geneious Prime® v2023.1.1. We retrieved an additional 1,560 complete genomes from GenBank with collection dates from 184 January 1st, 2022 through April 7th, 2023. The primers and probes of the assays were then 185 compared across the new alignment which included a total of 1,484 sequences after 186 187 sequence quality checks. Lineages were assigned using Nextcalde [21], according to Happi 188 et al. [22].

189

190 Statistical methods

Statistical analyses were performed using R v4.2.2 (2022-10-31) and data visualizations were produced using GraphPad Prism v9.4.1. We used a logistic regression model to see if there was a difference in detection as well as a one-way ANOVA to determine whether there was a difference in mean Ct values across assays.

9

To evaluate the impact of temperature over time, a linear model was used. An interaction term was used to evaluate the effect of time and temperature by sample (time*temperature). The Δ Ct value represents the change in the Ct value from saliva under each condition (categorical). The reference group for time was zero, and the reference group for temperature was room temperature (~19°C). Samples where no mpox virus DNA was detected were set to Ct = 45.00. P values of less than 0.05 were considered significant.

- 202
- 203

204 **RESULTS**

205 PCR assay performance

The limit of detection (LOD), determined using the synthetic mpox virus DNA (ATCC VR-3270SD) was 3 copies/µl for the Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay and 1 copy/µl for both CDC assays. The Logix SmartTM Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay did not detect the synthetic DNA used so the LOD could not be determined. When testing DNA extracted from saliva collected in Spectrum SDNA-1000 collection devices, all assays performed comparably at detection (*p*>0.05). Mean Ct values generated did not differ across the assays (*p*=0.59).

212

213 Extraction-free workflows for testing saliva for the detection of mpox virus

Detection of mpox virus in saliva was comparable across all three extraction-free workflows (**Supplementary Figure 1**). Due to limited sample size, it was not possible to statistically quantify the differences in performance of the workflows.

217

218 Stability of detection of mpox virus in saliva

The detection of mpox virus remained relatively stable in raw saliva for 24-48 hours, with 219 220 degradation notable at 72 hours (Figure 1). As compared to time zero, we observed an 221 increase of 2.14 Ct, 2.55 Ct, and 4.72 Ct, at 24, 48, and 72 hours, respectively for Co-Diagnostic's T3 target and an increase of 2.70 Ct, 3.05 Ct, and 4.99 Ct, respectively for the 222 223 T4 target. When fitting the linear model with the interaction term, we found that at 40°C, temperature makes degradation worse over time. We observed similar results for the samples 224 225 that were diluted 1:100 in negative saliva and tested with the Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay (see **Supplementary Figure 2**). When testing the stability of detection of naked mpox DNA 226 227 spiked directly into raw saliva at room temperature, as compared to time zero, we observed a 228 mean increase of <2 Ct at 24 hours and 4.2 Ct at 72 hours (see Supplementary Table 4 for

10

229 data).



230

231 Figure 1. Stability of mpox virus detection in raw (unsupplemented) saliva after prolonged 232 storage at different temperatures. Mpox-positive saliva samples were diluted 1:10 into raw, mpox-233 negative saliva. Prepared saliva lysates were tested by PCR using the Co-Diagnostics Logix SmartTM 234 Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay. The "T3" target cycle threshold (Ct) values are shown as solid lines, the 235 "T4" target Ct values are shown as dotted lines. Results suggest that the detection of mpox virus 236 remains relatively stable for approximately 24-48 hours across all storage conditions, with reduced 237 stability in raw saliva at 40°C. While the low viral load in sample 5 resulted in its lack of detection at 24 238 and 48 hours of incubation at 40°C, the T4 target was detected at 72 hours, likely due to stochastic 239 fluctuations at such low levels.

240

Detection of mpox virus in raw saliva also remained stable following the 56-hour incubation through temperatures and time periods simulating summer and winter shipping conditions (**Figure 2**), suggesting that saliva samples collected for testing for mpox may be sent through postal systems while maintaining sensitivity.

11



245

Figure 2. Detection of mpox virus in raw (unsupplemented) saliva remained stable after cycling 246 247 through temperatures representing shipping conditions encountered in summer and winter. 248 Three mpox-positive saliva samples were diluted 1:5 into raw mpox-negative saliva and (A) cycled 249 through simulated summer and winter shipping profiles, recommended by the US Food and Drug 250 Administration for the validation of remote sample collection. Following, saliva lysates were prepared 251 following workflow one then tested by PCR using the Co-Diagnostics Logic Smart[™] Mpox (2-Gene) RUO assay, CDC Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR assay, CDC Non-variola Orthopoxvirus 252 253 Generic Real-Time PCR assay, and Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay. (B) Resulting cycle threshold (Ct)

12

values were compared to the initial sample testing (T=0) and demonstrated stable detection of mpox,
following sample incubation. Panel A created with biorender.com.

256

257 Amplicon sequencing from saliva samples

We sequenced whole mpox virus genomes from ten saliva samples according to the amplicon-based sequencing protocol. We were able to sequence over 95% of the genome from seven of the ten samples (see Supplementary Table 3; GenBank Accession Numbers PP977060-PP977067). All of the samples sequenced clustered within clade IIb, falling within lineage B1. Three of the sequences were identified in sub lineages B1.2.1, B.1.4 and B.1.17.

263

After aligning the seven consensus sequences to the reference genome "NC_063383", we visually examined the alignment of the forward primers, reverse primers, and probes across the different assays. We found two different mismatches with the CDC's Monkeypox virus Generic RT-PCR Assay. The sequences had a single nucleotide substitution in the forward and reverse primers.

269

270 Importantly, the reference sequence collected in Nigeria in 2018, only had a mismatch in the 271 forward primer; there were no nucleotide substitutions in the reverse primer or the probe. All 272 primers and probes of the other assays were concordant with the generated sequence as well 273 as the reference sequence. The discordant sequences and the primers/probes can be seen in 274 Table 3. Furthermore, alignment with genomes retrieved from Genbank, confirmed that indeed the primers for the CDC's Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test had several 275 276 mismatches across the 1,484 genomes. Neither the Clade IIa Assay nor the CDC's Non-277 variola Orthopoxvirus Generic Real-Time PCR Test primer and probe sets were affected.

278

These findings mostly agree with the results reported by Wu *et al.* [23]. In our study, 100% of the 1,484 sequences had the A6G substitution in the forward primer, while 99.5% (n=1,476) sequences included in our alignment had the G17A substitution in the reverse primer. Additionally, we observed 3 sequences with a G16A substitution in the reverse primer – all of which were from the United States.

284

Table 3. CDC Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test primer concordance with
1,483 sequences aligned to reference sequence 'NC_063383'

Nucleotide Type	ide Type Nucleotide Sequence		
Mpox Sequence	5'-GGA AA <u>G</u> TGT AAA GAC AAC GAA TAC AG-3'	1,484 (100%)	
Forward Primer	5'-GGA AA <u>A</u> TGT AAA GAC AAC GAA TAC AG-3'		
Mpox Sequence	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT G A A AGC GTA-3'	1,476 (99.5%)	
Reverse Primer	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT G G A AGC GTA-3'		
Mpox Sequence	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT <u>A</u> AA AGC GTA-3'	3 (0 2%)	
Reverse Primer	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT <u>G</u> GA AGC GTA-3'		

*Nucleotides underlined and bolded represent substitutions in the mpox sequence pulled from NCBI's
Nucleotide database and the corresponding mismatch in the PCR primer.

289

290

291 DISCUSSION

292 Numerous studies since the 2022 outbreak of mpox have investigated the detection of mpox virus in saliva [5–9,12,24], reporting its high concordance with lesion swabs [8,24] and higher 293 viral load (as approximated by Ct values) in saliva in comparison to other respiratory samples 294 [9], and sometimes also lesion swabs [6,7]. With a geographically diverse network of clinical 295 296 laboratories connected through the SalivaDirect FDA Emergency Use Authorization PCR test [25], we recognized its potential to greatly bolster the response to the US mpox outbreak. 297 298 Leveraging previously published and commercially available assays to support the rapid adaptation of our streamlined PCR test for SARS-CoV-2 [26], we confirmed the comparable 299 performance of five different PCR assays and incorporated them into our extraction-free 300 301 protocol. Extraction-free workflows further reduce costs by minimizing laboratory overhead for 302 sample processing, requiring less equipment and reagents, while facilitating timely results [9,26–28]. In countries where supply-chain infrastructure for test kit materials, reagents, and 303 304 laboratory equipment may be strained, having a flexible platform may reduce barriers to testing while offering flexibility for fitting into existing laboratory regulations and/or processes. 305

14

307 To further support access to testing, we considered it essential to evaluate the stability of 308 mpox detection in raw (unsupplemented) saliva to facilitate cold-chain-free options for both 309 low-cost and remote and/or discrete sample collection, which holds potential as a means for 310 frequent, follow-up testing in exposed individuals, before the appearance of lesions. 311 Expanding upon the findings of Yinda et al., demonstrating stability of mpox virus spiked into 312 saliva over the course of 20 days [29], our study demonstrates the stable detection of mpox virus DNA in raw saliva for 24-48 hours and under simulated seasonal shipping conditions. 313 This suggests that, similar to recommendations made for variola virus in 1957 [30], samples 314 transported in this window may not require stabilizing media, minimizing test-kit costs as only 315 316 a collection tube is necessary; cold-chain transport of specimens is only necessary in settings where temperatures near 40°C. It is important to note that as the samples were diluted into 317 318 mpox-negative saliva, the composition of the pooled negative saliva may have disrupted the 319 integrity of the original sample, thereby negatively-impacting the stability of mpox virus DNA. 320 Despite this, these findings support a possible low-cost solution for at-home sample collection 321 which can provide a more discrete option for groups facing stigma.

322

306

Genomic sequencing of pathogens contributes to the understanding and monitoring of 323 324 outbreaks and transmission chains. The ability to sequence from saliva further negates the requirement of swab-based samples which are typically considered necessary for this. 325 326 Importantly, the multiple substitutions that we observed in the primers of the CDC's assay 327 highlight the ongoing need for routine genomic surveillance of emerging pathogens to ensure adequate diagnostic performance in the face of virus evolution. The mismatches identified by 328 329 us and different mismatches reported by others [23,31] reaffirms the necessity of multiplexed 330 assays and mpox-specific targets for reliable diagnosis.

331

We recognize that the small sample size remains a limitation of our preliminary investigation and that it emphasizes the need for prospective collection of multiple sample types during outbreaks of emerging pathogens to identify best diagnostic practices. While ≤5 clinical samples have been tested in this work, diluting these in negative saliva increased the number

15

of contrived samples that we could validate across potential storage conditions and across different workflows and PCR assays. Consistent results across these settings is promising and as such, despite these limitations, the results of this study contribute to the expanding body of evidence that supports both extraction-free [9,27] and saliva-based methods for the detection of mpox virus.

341

342 Saliva is increasingly being accepted as a clinical sample type across the globe [32,33] and 343 should be considered as a potential tool to aid in the ongoing global need for the timely diagnosis and surveillance of pathogens such as mpox virus. Our open-source PCR test 344 345 demonstrates how low-cost options could be utilized to support this, particularly when 346 implemented within a testing framework that can support a rapid and flexible outbreak 347 response. However, further research is needed to assess the temporal dynamics of mpox virus in saliva, which will elucidate the window at which we can expect patients to become 348 349 positive and/or infectious through saliva. As such, guestions pertaining to asymptomatic 350 transmission/prolonged viral shedding also remain and identifying these cases is important for 351 halting ongoing human-to-human transmission. Combined, this understanding can aid us in prediction of when disease may be at its worst based on viral load. Therefore, we echo 352 353 Coppens et al. for studies that prospectively screen close-contacts of confirmed cases to 354 answer these questions [24]. The ongoing need for diagnostics development and sustainable surveillance methods is accentuated by case reports of reinfection, break-through infection 355 following vaccination, and infection of those who have both prior infection and full vaccination 356 [34-36]. 357

- 358
- 359

360 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the Grubaugh Laboratory at the Yale School of Public Health for providing guidance on the amplicon-sequencing protocol they developed – in particular Dr. Nathan D. Grubaugh, Nicholas F.G. Chen, and Dr. Chrispin Chaguza. We also would like to thank Mirimus Labs, Co-Diagnostics Inc., and Dr. Delphine Dean at Clemson University for providing us with the PCR assays used in this study. Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under

16

Award Number 1S10OD030363-01A1. We also thank Yale University's Fund for Lesbian and
 Gay Studies for financially supporting this research.

369

370 ROLE OF THE FUNDER

This work was supported by Yale University's Fund for Lesbian and Gay Studies (FLAGS) and SalivaDirect, Inc..

373

374 AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS.

- 375 ALW conceived and designed the study. OMA, DY-C and ALW managed the study. TZ, MB,
- 376 SS and JP managed sample collection. RJT, OMA, DY-C and KF were responsible for and

377 performed the assays. RJT, OMA and ALW performed the analyses and interpreted the data.

RJT, CB, SAS, OMA and ALW drafted the manuscript. All authors amended and commentedon the final manuscript.

380

381 DISCLOSURES

- ALW has received consulting and/or advisory board fees from Pfizer, Merck, Diasorin, PPS Health, Primary Health, Co-Diagnostics, and Global Diagnostic Systems for work unrelated to this project, and is Principal Investigator on research grants from Pfizer, Merck, and NIH RADx UP to Yale University and from NIH RADx, Balvi.io and Shield T3 to SalivaDirect, Inc.. All other co-authors declare no potential conflict of interest.
- 387
- 388

389 **REFERENCES**

- R. Pebody, Human Monkeypox in Kasai Oriental, Democratic Republic of Congo,
 February 1996 October 1997: preliminary report, Weekly Releases (1997–2007) 1
 (1997) 1015.
- 393 [2] Thornhill John P., Barkati Sapha, Walmsley Sharon, Rockstroh Juergen, Antinori Andrea, Harrison Luke B., Palich Romain, Nori Achyuta, Reeves Iain, Habibi Maximillian S., Apea 394 395 Vanessa, Boesecke Christoph, Vandekerckhove Linos, Yakubovsky Michal, Sendagorta Elena, Blanco Jose L., Florence Eric, Moschese Davide, Maltez Fernando M., Goorhuis 396 397 Abraham, Pourcher Valerie, Migaud Pascal, Noe Sebastian, Pintado Claire, Maggi Fabrizio, Hansen Ann-Brit E., Hoffmann Christian, Lezama Jezer I., Mussini Cristina, 398 399 Cattelan AnnaMaria, Makofane Keletso, Tan Darrell, Nozza Silvia, Nemeth Johannes, 400 Klein Marina B., Orkin Chloe M., Monkeypox Virus Infection in Humans across 16 401 Countries — April–June 2022, N. Engl. J. Med. 387 (2022) 679–691.
- 402 [3] N. Girometti, R. Byrne, M. Bracchi, J. Heskin, A. McOwan, V. Tittle, K. Gedela, C. Scott,

17

S. Patel, J. Gohil, D. Nugent, T. Suchak, M. Dickinson, M. Feeney, B. Mora-Peris, K.
Stegmann, K. Plaha, G. Davies, L.S.P. Moore, N. Mughal, D. Asboe, M. Boffito, R.
Jones, G. Whitlock, Demographic and clinical characteristics of confirmed human
monkeypox virus cases in individuals attending a sexual health centre in London, UK: an
observational analysis, Lancet Infect. Dis. 22 (2022) 1321–1328.

- [4] P.R. Pittman, J.W. Martin, P.M. Kingebeni, J.-J.M. Tamfum, G. Mwema, Q. Wan, P.
 Ewala, J. Alonga, G. Bilulu, M.G. Reynolds, X. Quinn, S. Norris, M.B. Townsend, P.S.
 Satheshkumar, J. Wadding, B. Soltis, A. Honko, F.B. Güereña, L. Korman, K. Patterson,
 D.A. Schwartz, J.W. Huggins, Kole Human Mpox Infection Study Group, Clinical
 characterization and placental pathology of mpox infection in hospitalized patients in the
 Democratic Republic of the Congo, PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis. 17 (2023) e0010384.
- L.-T. Allan-Blitz, K. Carragher, A. Sukhija-Cohen, P. Ritchie, H. Scott, H. Li, J.D.
 Klausner, Laboratory validation and clinical performance of a saliva-based test for
 monkeypox virus, J. Med. Virol. 95 (2023) e28191.
- 417 [6] A. Peiró-Mestres, I. Fuertes, D. Camprubí-Ferrer, M.Á. Marcos, A. Vilella, M. Navarro, L.
 418 Rodriguez-Elena, J. Riera, A. Català, M.J. Martínez, J.L. Blanco, Hospital Clinic de
 419 Barcelona Monkeypox Study Group, Frequent detection of monkeypox virus DNA in
 420 saliva, semen, and other clinical samples from 12 patients, Barcelona, Spain, May to
 421 June 2022, Euro Surveill. 27 (2022). https://doi.org/10.2807/1560422 7917.ES.2022.27.28.2200503.
- [7] A. Antinori, V. Mazzotta, S. Vita, F. Carletti, D. Tacconi, L.E. Lapini, A. D'Abramo, S.
 Cicalini, D. Lapa, S. Pittalis, V. Puro, M. Rivano Capparuccia, E. Giombini, C.E.M.
 Gruber, A.R. Garbuglia, A. Marani, F. Vairo, E. Girardi, F. Vaia, E. Nicastri, INMI
 Monkeypox Group, Epidemiological, clinical and virological characteristics of four cases
 of monkeypox support transmission through sexual contact, Italy, May 2022, Euro
 Surveill. 27 (2022). https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.22.2200421.
- [8] B. Hernaez, A. Muñoz-Gómez, A. Sanchiz, E. Orviz, A. Valls-Carbo, I. Sagastagoitia, O.
 Ayerdi, R. Martín, T. Puerta, M. Vera, N. Cabello, J. Vergas, C. Prieto, M. PardoFiguerez, A. Negredo, J.M. Lagarón, J. Del Romero, V. Estrada, A. Alcamí, Monitoring
 monkeypox virus in saliva and air samples in Spain: a cross-sectional study, Lancet
 Microbe 4 (2023) e21–e28.
- Y. Wang, H. Chen, K. Lin, Y. Han, Z. Gu, H. Wei, K. Mu, D. Wang, L. Liu, R. Jin, R.
 Song, Z. Rong, S. Wang, Ultrasensitive single-step CRISPR detection of monkeypox virus in minutes with a vest-pocket diagnostic device, Nat. Commun. 15 (2024) 3279.
- [10] H. Kim, R. Kwon, H. Lee, S.W. Lee, M. Rahmati, A. Koyanagi, L. Smith, M.S. Kim, G.F.
 López Sánchez, D. Elena, S.G. Yeo, J.I. Shin, W. Cho, D.K. Yon, Viral load dynamics
 and shedding kinetics of mpox infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis, J. Travel
 Med. 30 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taad111.
- [11] I. Brosius, C. Van Dijck, J. Coppens, L. Vandenhove, E. Bangwen, F. Vanroye, J.
 Verschueren, ITM MPOX Study Group, S. Zange, J. Bugert, J. Michiels, E. Bottieau, P.
 Soentjens, J. van Griensven, C. Kenyon, K.K. Ariën, M. Van Esbroeck, K. Vercauteren,
 L. Liesenborghs, Presymptomatic viral shedding in high-risk mpox contacts: A
 prospective cohort study, J. Med. Virol. 95 (2023) e28769.
- [12] A. Pettke, F. Filén, K. Widgren, A. Jacks, H. Glańs, S. Andreasson, S. Muradrasoli, S.
 Helgesson, E. Hauzenberger, M.L. Karlberg, N. Walai, A. Bjerkner, H. Gourlé, S.
 Gredmark-Russ, O.K. Lindsjö, K. Sondén, H. Asgeirsson, Ten-Week Follow-Up of
- 449 Monkeypox Case-Patient, Sweden, 2022, Emerg. Infect. Dis. 28 (2022) 2074–2077.
- 450 [13] CDC Monkeypox Response: Transmission, CDC (2022).
- 451 https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2022/0509-monkeypox-transmission.html (accessed

18

452 July 24, 2024).

- [14] Y. Li, H. Zhao, K. Wilkins, C. Hughes, I.K. Damon, Real-time PCR assays for the specific
 detection of monkeypox virus West African and Congo Basin strain DNA, J. Virol.
 Methods 169 (2010) 223–227.
- [15] CDC, PCR Test Procedures, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2023).
 https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/mpox/collections/pages/pcr-test-procedures.html (accessed July 24, 2024).
- [16] O.M. Allicock, D. Yolda-Carr, R. Earnest, M.I. Breban, N. Vega, I.M. Ott, C. Kalinich, T.
 Alpert, M.E. Petrone, A.L. Wyllie, Method versatility in RNA extraction-free PCR detection
 of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva samples, bioRxiv (2021).
- 462 https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.27.21268334.
- I.M. Ott, M.S. Strine, A.E. Watkins, M. Boot, C.C. Kalinich, C.A. Harden, C.B.F. Vogels,
 A. Casanovas-Massana, A.J. Moore, M.C. Muenker, M. Nakahata, M. Tokuyama, A.
 Nelson, J. Fournier, S. Bermejo, M. Campbell, R. Datta, C.S. Dela Cruz, S.F. Farhadian,
 A.I. Ko, A. Iwasaki, N.D. Grubaugh, C.B. Wilen, A.L. Wyllie, Yale IMPACT Research
 team3, Stability of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Nonsupplemented Saliva, Emerg. Infect. Dis. 27
- 468 (2021) 1146–1150.
- [18] O.M. Allicock, T.-Y. Lin, K.T. Fajardo, D. Yolda-Carr, M. Hislop, D. Zuniga, W. Platt, B.
 Tuhoy, J. Wang, A.L. Wyllie, Exploring the potential of a saliva-based, RNA-extractionfree PCR test for the multiplexed detection of key respiratory pathogens, bioRxiv (2023).
 https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.04.23296240.
- 473 [19] O.M. Allicock, A. York, P. Waghela, D. Yolda-Carr, D.M. Weinberger, A.L. Wyllie, Impact
 474 of Temporary Storage Conditions on the Viability of Streptococcus pneumoniae in Saliva,
 475 mSphere 7 (2022) e0033122.
- [20] N.F.G. Chen, C. Chaguza, L. Gagne, M. Doucette, S. Smole, E. Buzby, J. Hall, S. Ash,
 R. Harrington, S. Cofsky, S. Clancy, C.J. Kapsak, J. Sevinsky, K. Libuit, D.J. Park, P.
 Hemarajata, J.M. Garrigues, N.M. Green, S. Sierra-Patev, K. Carpenter-Azevedo, R.C.
- 479 Huard, C. Pearson, K. Incekara, C. Nishimura, J.P. Huang, E. Gagnon, E. Reever, J.
- 480 Razeq, A. Muyombwe, V. Borges, R. Ferreira, D. Sobral, S. Duarte, D. Santos, L. Vieira,
 481 J.P. Gomes, C. Aquino, I.M. Savino, K. Felton, M. Bajwa, N. Hayward, H. Miller, A.
- 482 Naumann, R. Allman, N. Greer, A. Fall, H.H. Mostafa, M.P. McHugh, D.M. Maloney, R.
- Dewar, J. Kenicer, A. Parker, K. Mathers, J. Wild, S. Cotton, K.E. Templeton, G.
 Churchwell, P.A. Lee, M. Pedrosa, B. McGruder, S. Schmedes, M.R. Plumb, X. Wang,
- 404 Gruteriweii, F.A. Lee, M. Pedrosa, B. McGruder, S. Schmedes, M.R. Plumb, X. War 485 R.B. Barcellos, F.M.S. Godinho, R.S. Salvato, A. Ceniseros, M.I. Breban, N.D.
- 486 Grubaugh, G.R. Gallagher, C.B.F. Vogels, Development of an amplicon-based
- 487 sequencing approach in response to the global emergence of mpox, PLoS Biol. 21
 488 (2023) e3002151.
- [21] I. Aksamentov, C. Roemer, E. Hodcroft, R. Neher, Nextclade: clade assignment,
 mutation calling and quality control for viral genomes, J. Open Source Softw. 6 (2021)
 3773.
- 492 [22] C. Happi, I. Adetifa, P. Mbala, R. Njouom, E. Nakoune, A. Happi, N. Ndodo, O. Ayansola,
 493 G. Mboowa, T. Bedford, R.A. Neher, C. Roemer, E. Hodcroft, H. Tegally, Á. O'Toole, A.
 494 Rambaut, O. Pybus, M.U.G. Kraemer, E. Wilkinson, J. Isidro, V. Borges, M. Pinto, J.P.
- 495 Gomes, L. Freitas, P.C. Resende, R.T.C. Lee, S. Maurer-Stroh, C. Baxter, R. Lessells,
- 496 A.E. Ogwell, Y. Kebede, S.K. Tessema, T. de Oliveira, Urgent need for a non-
- discriminatory and non-stigmatizing nomenclature for monkeypox virus, PLoS Biol. 20
 (2022) e3001769.
- [23] F. Wu, J. Oghuan, A. Gitter, K.D. Mena, E.L. Brown, Wide mismatches in the sequences
 of primers and probes for monkeypox virus diagnostic assays, J. Med. Virol. 95 (2023)

19

501 e28395.

- [24] J. Coppens, F. Vanroye, I. Brosius, L. Liesenborghs, S. van Henten, T. Vanbaelen, S.
 Bracke, N. Berens-Riha, I. De Baetselier, C. Kenyon, P. Soentjens, E. Florence, J. Van
 Griensven, K.K. Ariën, B.K.M. Jacobs, D. Van den Bossche, M. Van Esbroeck, K.
 Vercauteren, ITM MPX study group, Alternative sampling specimens for the molecular
 detection of mpox (formerly monkeypox) virus, J. Clin. Virol. 159 (2023) 105372.
- 507 [25] SalivaDirect EUA Summary, (n.d.). https://www.fda.gov/media/141192/ (accessed 508 February 21, 2021).
- [26] C.B.F. Vogels, A.E. Watkins, C.A. Harden, D.E. Brackney, J. Shafer, J. Wang, C.
 Caraballo, C.C. Kalinich, I.M. Ott, J.R. Fauver, E. Kudo, P. Lu, A. Venkataraman, M.
 Tokuyama, A.J. Moore, M.C. Muenker, A. Casanovas-Massana, J. Fournier, S. Bermejo,
- 512 M. Campbell, R. Datta, A. Nelson, K. Anastasio, M.H. Askenase, M. Batsu, S. Bickerton,
- 513 K. Brower, M.L. Bucklin, S. Cahill, Y. Cao, E. Courchaine, G. Deluliis, R. Earnest, B.
- 514 Geng, B. Goldman-Israelow, R. Handoko, W. Khoury-Hanold, D. Kim, L. Knaggs, M.
- 515 Kuang, S. Lapidus, J. Lim, M. Linehan, A. Lu-Culligan, A. Martin, I. Matos, D. McDonald,
- 516 M. Minasyan, M. Nakahata, N. Naushad, J. Nouws, A. Obaid, C. Odio, J.E. Oh, S. Omer,
- 517 A. Park, H.-J. Park, X. Peng, M. Petrone, S. Prophet, T. Rice, K.-A. Rose, L. Sewanan, L.
- Sharma, A.C. Shaw, D. Shepard, M. Smolgovsky, N. Sonnert, Y. Strong, C. Todeasa, J.
 Valdez, S. Velazquez, P. Vijayakumar, E.B. White, Y. Yang, C.S. Dela Cruz, A.I. Ko, A.
 Iwasaki, H.M. Krumholz, J.D. Matheus, P. Hui, C. Liu, S.F. Farhadian, R. Sikka, A.L.
- Wyllie, N.D. Grubaugh, SalivaDirect: A Simplified and Flexible Platform to Enhance
 SARS-CoV-2 Testing Capacity, Med (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medj.2020.12.010.
- [27] Z. Li, A. Sinha, Y. Zhang, N. Tanner, H.-T. Cheng, P. Premsrirut, C.K.S. Carlow,
 Extraction-free LAMP assays for generic detection of Old World Orthopoxviruses and
 specific detection of Mpox virus, Sci. Rep. 13 (2023) 21093.
- [28] C. Peno, T.-Y. Lin, M.S. Hislop, D. Yolda-Carr, K. Farjado, A. York, V.E. Pitzer, D.M.
 Weinberger, A.K. Bei, O.M. Allicock, A.L. Wyllie, A low-cost culture- and DNA extractionfree method for the molecular detection of pneumococcal carriage in saliva, Microbiol
 Spectr (2024) e0059124.
- [29] C.K. Yinda, D.H. Morris, R.J. Fischer, S. Gallogly, Z.A. Weishampel, J.R. Port, T.
 Bushmaker, J.E. Schulz, K. Bibby, N. van Doremalen, J.O. Lloyd-Smith, V.J. Munster,
 Stability of Monkeypox Virus in Body Fluids and Wastewater, Emerg. Infect. Dis. 29
 (2023) 2065–2072.
- [30] F.O. Maccallum, J.R. Mcdonald, Effect of temperatures of up to 45 degrees C on survival
 of variola virus in human material in relation to laboratory diagnosis, Bull. World Health
 Organ. 16 (1957) 441–443.
- [31] C. for Disease Control, Prevention, Others, Lab alert: MPXV TNF receptor gene deletion
 may lead to false negative results with some MPXV specific LDTs, (2023).
- [32] E.R. Tobik, L.B. Kitfield-Vernon, R.J. Thomas, S.A. Steel, S.H. Tan, O.M. Allicock, B.L.
 Choate, S. Akbarzada, A.L. Wyllie, Saliva as a sample type for SARS-CoV-2 detection:
 implementation successes and opportunities around the globe, Expert Rev. Mol. Diagn.
 22 (2022) 519–535.
- [33] S.H. Tan, O.M. Allicock, A. Katamba, C.V.F. Carrington, A.L. Wyllie, M. ArmstrongHough, Saliva-based methods for SARS-CoV-2 testing in low-and middle-income
 countries, (2022). https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/bulletin/onlinefirst/blt.22.288526.pdf?sfvrsn=30da2b19_1 (accessed October 7, 2022).
- 547 [34] S. Accordini, M. Cordioli, E. Pomari, E. Tacconelli, C. Castilletti, People with
 548 asymptomatic or unrecognised infection potentially contribute to monkeypox virus
 549 transmission, Lancet Microbe 4 (2023) e209.

- [35] N. Low, L.H. Bachmann, D. Ogoina, R. McDonald, A.M. Ipekci, L.A.S. Quilter, M. Cevik,
 Mpox virus and transmission through sexual contact: Defining the research agenda,
 PLoS Med. 20 (2023) e1004163.
- 553 [36] S. Musumeci, I. Najjar, E.B.E. Amari, M. Schibler, F. Jacquerioz, S. Yerly, A. Renzoni, A. 554 Calmy, L. Kaiser, A Case of Mpox Reinfection, Clin. Infect. Dis. 77 (2023) 135–137.