It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 2	Integration of Group A Streptococcus Rapid Tests with the Open Fluidic CandyCollect Device
- 3 4 5 6	J. Carlos Sanchez <sup>*1</sup> , Ingrid H. Robertson <sup>*1</sup> , Victoria A. M. Shinkawa <sup>*1</sup> , Xiaojing Su <sup>1</sup> , Wan-chen Tu <sup>1</sup> , Timothy R. Robinson <sup>2</sup> , Megan M. Chang <sup>3</sup> , Andrea Blom <sup>4</sup> , Elena Alfaro <sup>4</sup> , Daniel B. Hatchett <sup>1</sup> , Ayokunle O. Olanrewaju <sup>2,3</sup> , Ellen R. Wald <sup>4</sup> , Gregory P. DeMuri <sup>4</sup> , Erwin Berthier <sup>1</sup> , Sanitta Thongpang <sup>§1,5</sup> , Ashleigh B. Theberge <sup>§1,6</sup>
7	
8	Affiliations:
9	<sup>1</sup> Department of Chemistry, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
10	<sup>2</sup> Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle WA, USA
11	<sup>3</sup> Department of Bioengineering, University of Washington, Seattle WA, USA
12 13	<sup>4</sup> Department of Pediatrics, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI, USA
14 15	<sup>5</sup> Department of Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Mahidol University, Nakorn Pathom, Thailand
16	<sup>6</sup> Department of Urology, School of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
17	
18	
19	*These authors contributed equally to this work
20	<sup>§</sup> Co-corresponding authors
21	
22	Address correspondence to: Ashleigh B. Theberge, Department of Chemistry, University
23	of Washington, Box 351700, Seattle, WA 98195-1700, [abt1@uw.edu], 206-685-2330. Sanitta
24	Thongpang, Department of Chemistry, University of Washington, Box 351700, Seattle, WA 98195-1700,
25	[sanitta@uw.edu], 206-685-2330.
20 27	Konwords, Discussion Onen Missoffuidias, Daint of Care, Destarial Detection, David Anticon
21 28	Detection Test (PADT). Computer assisted Analysis
20 29	Detection Test (RADT), Computer-assisted Anarysis
30	
31	Abstract
32	
33	The CandyCollect device is a lollipop-inspired open fluidic oral sampling device designed to provide a
34	comfortable user sampling experience. We demonstrate that the CandyCollect device can be coupled with
35	a rapid antigen detection test (RADT) kit designed for Group A Streptococcus (GAS). Through in vitro
36	experiments with pooled saliva spiked with Streptococcus pyogenes we tested various reagents and
37	elution volumes to optimize the RADT readout from CandyCollect device samples. The resulting
38	optimized protocol uses the kit-provided reagents and lateral flow assay (LFA) while replacing the kit's
39	pharyngeal swab with the CandyCollect device, reducing the elution solution volume, and substituting the
40	tube used for elution to accommodate the CandyCollect device. Positive test results were detected by eye
41	with bacterial concentrations as low as the manufacturer's "minimal detection limit" - 1.5x10 <sup>5</sup> CFU/mL.
42 42	LFA strips were also scanned and quantified with image analysis software to determine the signal-to-
43 11	baseline ratio (SBR) and categorize positive test results without human bias. We tested our optimized
44	protocol for integrating CandyCollect and KAD1 using CandyCollect clinical samples from pediatric

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

45 patients (n=6) who were previously diagnosed with GAS pharyngitis via pharyngeal swabs tested with

46 RADT as part of their clinical care. The LFA results of these CandyCollect devices and interspersed

47 negative controls were determined by independent observers, with positive results obtained in four of the

48 six participants on at least one LFA replicate. Taken together, our results show that CandyCollect devices

49 from children with GAS pharyngitis can be tested using LFA rapid tests.

50

# 51 Introduction

52

*Streptococcus pyogenes* is responsible for over 600 million cases of bacterial pharyngitis globally each
 year.<sup>1</sup> Demographically, this affects 15% of school-aged children and 4-10% of adults; in developing

54 year. Demographically, this affects 15% of school-aged clinicitien and 4-10% of adults, in developing
 55 nations, the burden is much greater with rates 5-10 times higher.<sup>1</sup> Streptococcal pharyngitis most

56 commonly presents as a fever and sore throat an inflamed pharynx and tonsils (often with patchy white

57 exudates). Most symptoms of strep throat resolve after 3 to 4 days, however treatment in the form of

58 antibiotics is recommended to shorten the course of the infection, lessen spread, and prevent more serious

59 outcomes.<sup>1</sup> Untreated incidents of GAS infections may trigger several disorders including acute rheumatic

60 fever, acute poststreptococcal glomerulonephritis, and pediatric autoimmune neuropsychiatric disorders

61 associated with streptococcal infections. Acute rheumatic fever can lead to long term heart damage

62 known as rheumatic heart disease in children 5-14, resulting in 282,000 new cases each year.<sup>1</sup>

63

64 GAS pharyngitis is typically diagnosed by rapid antigen detection test (RADT) which requires a posterior

65 pharyngeal swab sample and provides a positive or negative result usually within 10 minutes. If the

66 RADT is negative, a throat culture is commonly performed requiring laboratory analysis, taking

67 additional time.<sup>2</sup> Wide-spread usage of RADT has been a valuable tool in detecting strep throat, and has

68 simultaneously reduced the overprescription of antibiotics.<sup>3</sup> Most importantly, RADTs are inexpensive,

69 offer reasonable sensitivity and specificity, and have short turnaround times.<sup>4,5</sup> Molecular testing, such as

70 the cobas® liat system (polymerase chain reaction, PCR), is also available requiring a posterior

71 pharyngeal swab and instrumentation.<sup>6</sup> PCR technology is valuable due to its increased sensitivity at

72 detecting GAS.<sup>7</sup> Pharyngeal swabs are uncomfortable, sometimes acting as a deterrent for children and

73 adults but it is important to confidently diagnose bacterial pharyngitis not only for the long-term health of

- 74 the patient but also to avoid over-prescription of antibiotics.<sup>1</sup>
- 75

76 Saliva sampling holds significant promise; saliva is an accessible diagnostic biospecimen for point-of-

77 care devices as it is easy to collect, handle, and test.<sup>8,9</sup> Here, we present an alternative sample collection

78 device called CandyCollect developed in our lab, <sup>10,11,12</sup> and we show for the first time that the

79 CandyCollect device can be used in conjunction with an 'on the market' GAS RADT. Inspired by a

80 lollipop, the CandyCollect device is a polystyrene sampling tool that has open fluidic channels on one

81 side and a strawberry-flavored isomalt candy coating on the back and sides. While the user enjoys the

82 candy, pathogens in saliva are collected in the open fluidic channels.<sup>10,11,12</sup> There are multiple sampling

83 devices currently available that resemble a lollipop but lack some of the built-in features that make the

84 CandyCollect device unique. For instance, Self-LolliSponge<sup>TM</sup>, V-check COVID-19, and Whistling

85 COVID-19 are saliva collection devices that allow the user to self-collect saliva with a minimally

86 invasive protocol, but while these devices resemble a lollipop form they do not contain candy and do not

87 look like a lollipop.<sup>13,14</sup>

88

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

89 Our prior research determined that the open fluidic channel in the CandyCollect device prevents the

- 90 tongue from removing bacteria, effectively collecting and accumulating the sample for future analysis.<sup>10</sup>
- 91 We have previously demonstrated the functionality of the CandyCollect device with an at-home human
- 92 subjects study that focused on the collection of commensal bacteria for the detection of *Staphylococcus*
- 93 *aureus* and *Streptococcus mutans* using qPCR.<sup>11</sup> We found that the CandyCollect device can successfully
- 94 capture commensal bacteria in an at-home setting, is stable through standard shipping without
- 95 refrigeration or other cooling mechanisms, and bacteria can be eluted and quantified using qPCR.<sup>11</sup> The
- study also asked users to compare the CandyCollect device to two other commercial methods of
- 97 collection—a spit tube and ESwab<sup>TM</sup>; users ranked the CandyCollect device as their preferred method of
- oral sampling. Lastly, it was determined that the CandyCollect device is functional after storage for up to
   one year.<sup>11</sup> Subsequently, we tested the CandyCollect device in a clinical setting, enrolling 30 pediatric
- one year.<sup>11</sup> Subsequently, we tested the CandyCollect device in a clinical setting, enrolling 30 pediatric
   patients, aged 5-14 years who had positive results from pharyngeal swabs processed with RADT as part
- 101 of their clinical care.<sup>12</sup> Results from the CandyCollect device (qPCR analysis) had 100% concordance
- 102 with the positive results from their clinical care. Further, most children preferred the CandyCollect device
- 103 over pharyngeal swabs and mouth swabs.<sup>12</sup>
- 104

105 Our prior work used qPCR to detect bacteria (S. pyogenes, S. mutans, S. aureus) collected on the

106 CandyCollect devices, which is more sensitive than RADTs but requires specific equipment and is not

107 accessible to a home setting or some clinics. Here, we demonstrate that the CandyCollect device can be

- 108 integrated with a commercially available RADT as an alternative sample collection tool to the posterior
- 109 pharyngeal swab commonly packaged with RADT kits. To the best of our knowledge, our work presents
- the first example of integrating a saliva collection method (the CandyCollect device) with a GAS RADT
- 111 . In addition, we demonstrate that our integrated protocol can achieve a positive signal on previously
- frozen clinically sampled CandyCollect devices collected from pediatric patients.<sup>12</sup>
   113
- 114 Material & Methods
- 115

# 116 Fabrication of CandyCollect devices

117

119

118 Device fabrication was described in our prior work.<sup>10,11,12</sup> See SI for full description.

- 120 Capture, elution, and detection of S. Pyogenes
- 121

# 122 *Capture of* S. pyogenes *on the CandyCollect device*

123 CandyCollect devices were incubated with 50 µL of *S. pyogenes* suspended in saliva for 10 min with the

124 following concentrations:  $1.0x10^9$ ,  $1.0x10^7$ ,  $1.0x10^6$ ,  $5.0x10^5$ ,  $1.5x10^5$  CFU/mL.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, we

125 incorporated, S. pyogenes at  $1 \times 10^9$  CFU/mL suspended in THY liquid media as a positive control and

- 126 filtered pooled saliva as a negative control.
- 127
- 128 *Elution of* S. pyogenes *from the CandyCollect device*

129 Upon completion of the 10 min incubation time, the CandyCollect devices were placed in 14 mL round-

- bottom polypropylene test tubes (Falcon CAT# 352059) that contained elution reagents, shaken for 15 s,
- and eluted for another 45 s.
- 132

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- 133 For the majority of experiments, the primary elution reagents used were 2.0 M Sodium Nitrite (Reagent
- A) and 0.4 M Acetic Acid (Reagent B), obtained from the Areta Strep A Swab Test Kit<sup>TM</sup> (Easy@Home,
- 135 CAT# ARST-100S). Elution solutions of 100  $\mu$ L of Reagents A and B were prepared for each rapid test,
- 136 resulting in 200  $\mu$ L total volume. This volume was increased to 200  $\mu$ L of each reagent for a total of 400
- 137  $\mu$ L of elution solution for our experiment that directly compared our integrated workflow with the kit's
- 138 established workflow (per manufacturer's instructions). The solution was then aliquoted into 14 mL tubes
- 139 for the CandyCollect device or the kit-provided tubes for the swabs.
- 140
- 141 Other reagents tested as elution solutions included (1) ESwab<sup>TM</sup> buffer (Becton, Dickinson and Company,
- 142 Cat # R723482) with 1% Mineral Oil (Thermo Scientific<sup>™</sup>, CAT#AC415080010), (2) ESwab<sup>™</sup> buffer
- 143 with 5% ethanol (3) ESwab<sup>™</sup> buffer with 2% SDS, and (4) phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) (Fisher
- 144 Scientific, Cat# BP2944100) with 1% Proteinase K (Thermo Scientific<sup>™</sup>, Cat# EO0491).<sup>10,11</sup>
- 145
- 146 *Clinical sample integration*
- 147 One of the CandyCollect devices from each replicate set was eluted and analyzed via qPCR following the
- 148 protocol established in our prior work.<sup>11,12</sup> The second device was used to test the integrated
- 149 CandyCollect-Areta<sup>TM</sup> protocol. Six CandyCollect devices were chosen to test with a requirement that
- 150 both the replicate CandyCollect and the ESwab<sup>TM</sup> have low Ct values scores (a CandyCollect was not
- 151 chosen if the replicate had a low Ct but the ESwab<sup>TM</sup> did not). It should be noted that we tested the
- replicate CandyCollect device, not the device that was eluted for qPCR. To prevent inconsistencies with
- 153 the test strips, all test strips used during a given experiment came from the same box and lot number. For
- 154 quality assurance, the box was validated per Areta<sup>TM</sup> new package protocol using the provided negative
- and positive controls before any tests were started. They were also secondarily checked by the researchers
- using pooled saliva as a negative control before testing the clinical samples. Clinical sample
- 157 CandyCollect devices were removed from a -80 °C freezer and thawed on ice for 10 min before testing.
- 158 Independent observers, away from the testing area, were given verbal instructions to not discuss results
- and were given an insert from the Areta<sup>TM</sup> box that instructs what is considered a negative or positive test
- 160 result (Figure S1). Negative control devices were inoculated using pooled saliva and were included
- arbitrarily among the clinical devices. Two strips were tested for each device. At the 18 min mark, the
- 162 strips were placed inside a sterile OmniTray<sup>TM</sup> (ThermoScientific<sup>TM</sup> Nunc<sup>TM</sup>, CAT# 140156) with a clear
- 163 lid. With the strips inside the tray, independent observers were asked to record whether they thought the
- 164 test to be negative or positive.
- 165

#### 166 Analysis of lateral flow immunoassay strips

- 167
- 168 Interpretation of lateral flow immunoassay strip readout by eye
- 169 Once the CandyCollect devices were eluted for 1 min, a lateral flow immunoassay strip was immersed
- 170 into the eluted solution. The immunoassay strip was held in the solution until the solution wicked up the
- testing area on the immunoassay strip. Upon wicking, a timer was set for 18 min at which point the
- 172 immunoassay strip was viewed by two researchers and scanned (Hewlett-Packard, HP OfficeJet Pro6978,
- 173 SN# TH0AK4N0YT). All readouts conducted in the lab were determined by eye from each of the two
- 174 researchers after 18 min per the manufacturer's instructions which indicate that results are valid from 10
- to 20 min after the test strip is removed from the elution solution. As noted in the Results section, for

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

176 clinical samples, test strips were viewed by two researchers and three independent observers who are not 177 authors of this publication.

178

179 Quantification of signal on Areta lateral flow immunoassay strip via optical analysis

The scanned LFA strips were analyzed using a custom image analysis Python script, drawing on 180

algorithms similar to previously published work.<sup>15</sup> Images of each strip were digitally cropped from an 181

182 original full-color image obtained by the HP scanner, yielding multiple 25 x 100 pixel images. These

183 cropped images were then converted to monochrome and subsequently inverted. Profiles of digital

184 numbers against pixel location were obtained by averaging the rows for each strip. The script pinpoints

185 the test line peak signal values and locations from the profiles. For each profile, two regions of interest

- (ROIs) spanning between 5 to 10 pixels were manually selected, approximately 30 pixels from both sides 186
- 187 of the peak. These two ROIs, selected from the non-reactive part of the membrane, establish the baseline.
- 188 The baseline is computed as the average digital number from these two ROIs. The signal-to-baseline
- 189 ratio (SBR) is calculated as the ratio of the peak signal of the test line from the profile divided by the
- 190 baseline.

191 The positivity threshold is a predetermined value of the SBR above which the test results are deemed

192 positive. It is derived from image analysis of the three negative controls collected for each experiment and

- 193 is calculated from the following equation:
- 194

Positivity Threshold =  $\mu SBR + 3\sigma SBR$ 

195 where  $\mu SBR$  and  $\sigma SBR$  are the average signal-to-baseline and the standard deviation signal-to-baseline of 196 the three negative controls, respectively. The python script determines the negative signal by analyzing a

197 segment of the profile located at a specific distance from the negative control line peak, a distance that is

198 informed by the test line peak locations in positive test strips. This approach ensures that the segment

199 location accurately reflects the expected position of a negative control test line.

#### 200 **Results and Discussion**

201 Integration of the CandyCollect device with a commercially available lateral flow immunoassay for GAS 202 detection

203 The CandyCollect device (Figure 1a.) is a lollipop-inspired oral sampling device that uses plasma-treated 204

open fluidic channels to capture pathogens in saliva as the user consumes the strawberry-flavored isomalt

candy.<sup>10,11,12</sup> We integrated the CandyCollect device into the Areta Strep A Swab Test<sup>TM</sup> protocol by 205

- 206 substituting the kit-provided swab with our novel oral sampling device in order to provide a more
- 207 comfortable testing experience. There are several commercially available LFA for GAS detection. We
- 208 explored three commercially available tests, Areta Strep A Swab Test TM, Abbot BinaxNow Strep A Card
- 209 <sup>TM</sup>, and Quidel QuickVue Dipstick Strep A Test <sup>TM</sup>, and compared them based on limit of detection and
- 210 overall user workflow. The Areta Strep A Swab Test<sup>™</sup> kit was selected as the rapid strep throat test to
- 211 integrate with the CandyCollect device as it had the lowest limit of detection (1.5 x  $10^5$  CFU/mL S.
- 212 pyogenes) and the workflow of the test allowed for the most direct substitution of the throat swab
- 213 sampling method.
- 214

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .





Figure 1. (a) Schematic of the CandyCollect Device. The open fluidic channels milled into the head of the plasma-treated 217 polystyrene stick allow pathogens to adhere over sampling time as the user consumes the isomalt candy. (b) Workflow to 218 incorporate sampling with the CandyCollect device with the Areta Strep A Swab Test<sup>TM</sup> protocol. (i) Elution solution is prepared 219 before sampling in the kit-provided tube by combining 100 µL (2 drops) of Reagent A (2.0 M sodium nitrite) and 100 µL (2 220 drops) of Reagent B (0.4 M acetic acid) for a total elution solution volume of 200 µL. (ii) To sample, the participant places the 221 CandyCollect device in their mouth and consumes the isomalt candy on the CandyCollect device until the candy is completely 222 dissolved. S. pyogenes collects on the plasma-treated open-fluidic channels within the CandyCollect device over time. (iii) After 223 sampling, the CandyCollect device is added to the tube of elution solution, and the tube is capped and shaken for 15 s to ensure 224 that the elution solution reaches the channels. (iv) The tube is then set aside for 1 minute. (v) The tube is then uncapped, and the 225 kit-provided test strip is dipped into the elution solution for 10 s or until the fluid visibly starts to wick on the testing section of 226 the lateral flow strip. Test results are valid for 10 to 20 min after complete wicking. (vi) The presence of a test and control line 227 indicates a positive result; a control line only indicates a negative result. 228

229 Our optimized integrated workflow is outlined in Figure 1b. Rather than taking a sample directly from the 230 throat with the kit-provided swab, the user's saliva sample is gathered using the channels of the 231 CandyCollect device. From there, the device is added to a reduced volume of 200 µL of the kit-provided 232 elution reagents [Reagent A (2.0 M sodium nitrite) and Reagent B (0.4 M acetic acid)]. The CandyCollect 233 device is larger than the kit-provided swab, so our protocol includes a larger round-bottom tube to 234 accommodate the device and ensure effective coverage of the CandyCollect channels when immersed in elution solution. The user directly tests the elution solution by dipping the LFA strip following the 235 236 manufacturer's instructions. As is common with LFAs, there is a control line and a test line, the presence 237 of both lines indicates a positive result, while the presence of only the control line indicates a negative 238 result. It is important to note that the sample tested in this workflow is saliva rather than a direct 239 collection of bacteria from the user's throat, like in a throat swab.

240

241 Optimization of sample preparation and lateral flow assay workflow

242 We first evaluated the optimal reagents to elute S. pyogenes or S. pyogenes antigens from the

243 CandyCollect device. We compared the strength of the test line signal when using the kit-provided

reagents [Reagent A (2.0 M sodium nitrite) and Reagent B (0.4 M acetic acid)] to the signal strength

245 when using other methods our lab previously developed for eluting *S. pyogenes* prior to qPCR detection

246 (Figure 2).<sup>10</sup> The elution methods used in the evaluation were ESwab<sup>™</sup> buffer with 5% ethanol,

ESwab<sup>™</sup> buffer with 2% sodium dodecyl sulfate, ESwab<sup>™</sup> buffer with 1% mineral oil and PBS with 1%

248 Proteinase K.<sup>10,11</sup> Test strips were imaged 18 minutes after elution. Quantification of the test line and

control line intensity are shown in Figure 2a. Further, results were determined by eye per the

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

250 manufacturer's instructions also at 18 minutes after elution and are reported below the corresponding

scanned test strip. The scanned images are for visual aid and may not align with the reported results by eve due to quality of imaging.

253





255 Figure 2. Optimization of elution solution. (a) Image analysis of the LFA strips from the elution comparison test shows that the 256 Areta<sup>TM</sup> kit-provided reagents [Reagent A (2.0 M sodium nitrite) and Reagent B (0.4 M acetic acid)] result in the strongest signal 257 intensity when compared with previous successful elution solutions developed for the CandyCollect device with qPCR 258 analysis.<sup>10,11</sup> (b) Representative images of LFA strips quantified in A (Figure S2 shows images from three independent 259 experiments). S. pvogenes at 1.0x106 CFU/mL suspended in filtered pooled saliva was used for all samples. Reagents tested from 260 left to right are: the kit-provided Reagent A (2.0 M sodium nitrite) and Reagent B (0.4 M acetic acid), ESwab™ buffer with 5% 261 ethanol (EtOH), ESwab<sup>TM</sup> buffer with 2% sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS), ESwab<sup>TM</sup> buffer with 1% mineral oil (M. Oil), and 262 phosphate buffered saline (PBS) with 1% Proteinase K (ProK).

263

The kit-provided reagents resulted in the strongest test line signal across all three experiments (Figure 2 and S2) and were selected as the optimal elution solution for the integrated workflow. ESwab<sup>™</sup> buffer with 5% ethanol and PBS with 1% Proteinase K resulted in negative or markedly fainter positive results than the kit-provided reagents. ESwab<sup>™</sup> buffer with 2% sodium dodecyl sulfate and ESwab<sup>™</sup> buffer with 1% mineral oil consistently resulted in a negative test line, making them unfit as an elution solution for the rapid test kit.

270

271 Although the manufacturer's instructions specify that the strength of the test line signal is not indicative 272 of the concentration of S. pvogenes, to aid the user's ability to read test results easily and accurately, we 273 investigated possible alterations to the rapid test workflow to increase test line signal strength. To increase 274 the concentration of S. pvogenes antigens in solution for testing, we reduced the elution solution volume 275 from 400  $\mu$ L to 200  $\mu$ L. We investigated the effects of the alteration by directly comparing the rapid test 276 results across a range of S. pyogenes concentration samples 1.5x10<sup>5</sup> to 1.0x10<sup>7</sup> CFU/mL, with 1.5x10<sup>5</sup> 277 CFU/mL advertised as the kit's limit of detection (Figure 3). In order to achieve a non-biased readout, an 278 algorithm was written in Python to evaluate the intensities of the lines, relative to the positivity threshold 279 (Figure S3, S4, S5, & S6). Our intention was to eliminate user discrepancies when interpreting the strips

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

results by eye. The quantified results from three independent experiments are plotted in Figure 3a. Results
were also determined by eye per the manufacturer's instructions 18 minutes after testing the elution

solution and are reported below the corresponding scanned test strip (Figure 3b). The scanned images are

for visual aid and may not align with the reported results due to quality of imaging.





286 Figure 3. Reduction of elution volume results in a stronger test line signal. Areta Strep A Swab Test<sup>TM</sup> results using different 287 elution reagent volumes, 200 µL (our optimized reduced volume) and the 400 µL (the volume specified in the Areta test kit 288 instructions). (a) Quantification of three independent experiments with the mean and standard error of the mean (SEM). The 289 positivity threshold (green dashed line) is calculated as the mean + three standard deviations of the signal-to-baseline ratio (SBR) 290 taken from the negative controls (Figure S5 & S6). (b) Representative images of LFA strips quantified in A (Figure S3 shows 291 images from three independent experiments). Elution reagents used were Reagent A (2.0 M sodium nitrite) and Reagent B (0.4 M 292 acetic acid) provided in the rapid test kit. The different elution volumes were tested using samples across a range of 293 concentrations from  $1.5 \times 10^5$  to  $1.0 \times 10^7$  S. pyogenes CFU/mL.

294

285

When testing samples at 1.5 x  $10^5$  CFU/mL, the 400 µL elution solution volume resulted in very faintly 295 296 positive to negative results by eye, however, the reduced 200 µL elution solution volume resulted in 297 positive results across three independent experiments (Figure 3b). Image quantification revealed that for 298  $1.5 \times 10^5$  CFU/mL, the 200 µL elution solution volume resulted in a signal that was above or at the 299 positivity threshold, whereas using the 400  $\mu$ L elution solution volume resulted in a signal that was below 300 the positivity threshold (Figure 3a). This trend was further confirmed with the 5.0x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/mL samples, 301 as the strength of the test line signal by eye from the samples using the 200  $\mu$ L elution solution volume was consistently greater than the test line signal of the samples using the 400  $\mu$ L elution solution volume; 302 303 quantification of the test line signal intensity of the 5.0x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/mL samples showed that using the 200 304  $\mu$ L elution solution volume resulted in a signal that was above the positivity threshold whereas using the

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

 $400 \ \mu L$  elution solution volume resulted in a signal that was below the positivity threshold (Figure 3a).

For  $1.0 \times 10^6$  and  $1.0 \times 10^7$  CFU/mL samples, both conditions resulted in strong positive results and the difference in strength of signal was less prominent based on image quantification and by eye (Figure 3a

308 and b). Taken together, the results showed the benefit of reducing the elution solution volume to 200 µL.

309 and this change was implemented into our integrated workflow (Figure 1b).

310

# CandyCollect sampling method gives comparable results to the kit-provided swab based on in vitro experiments in spiked saliva

- 313 To compare the efficacy of the CandyCollect device as an alternative sampling method to the kit-provided
- 314 swab, we evaluated the strength of the test lines across three different sampling methods and the two

different elution solution volumes (Figure 4). For our experiments, we used a 50  $\mu$ L sample of S.

- 316 *pyogenes* in saliva to inoculate the channels of the CandyCollect device for 10 minutes as an *in vitro*
- 317 simulation of bacterial collection from saliva. To compare to the CandyCollect device, we deposited
- samples onto the kit-provided swab in two ways: (i) 50 μL of the sample directly pipetted onto the swab
- 319 (to directly compare the same sample volume that was pipetted on the CandyCollect device) and (ii)
- 320 dipping the swab directly into the saliva sample. An important limitation of the comparisons between
- 321 swabs and the CandyCollect device is that the swab data from the manufacturer is completed at the back
- 322 of the throat whereas in this work we used bacteria suspended saliva; however, we decided to compare the 323 sampling methods this way due to practicality of the experimental setup.
- 324
- 325

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



N - Negative P - Postive

\*P- Faint Positive

326 327 Figure 4. The CandyCollect device gives comparable results to kit-provided swabs. (a) Areta Strep A Swab Test<sup>TM</sup> results using 328 three different sampling methods with the optimized (reduced elution solution volume) workflow (CandyCollect  $-50 \ \mu L$ 329 pipetted; kit-provided swab – 50  $\mu$ L pipetted; and kit-provided swab – dipped into sample all eluted in 200  $\mu$ L) as well as the 330 original Areta workflow (kit-provided swab – dipped into sample eluted in 400  $\mu$ L). All four methods were tested across a range 331 of concentrations from 1.5x10<sup>5</sup> to 1.0x10<sup>7</sup> CFU/mL S. pyogenes in pooled human saliva. The images were taken at 18-20 min, 332 and the result indicated (positive or negative) was determined by eve according to the test instructions at 18 min. Images shown 333 are representative of three independent experiments. (b) Quantification of three independent experiments with the mean and 334 standard error of the mean (SEM). The positivity threshold (green dashed line) is calculated as the mean + three standard 335 deviations of the signal to baseline ratio (SBR) taken from the negative controls (see SI for further details). 336

337 All four methods were tested across a range of concentrations from  $1.5 \times 10^5$  to  $1.0 \times 10^7$  CFU/mL S.

338 pyogenes suspended in filtered pooled human saliva, as well as a negative control of only saliva. For this

- 339 experiment, we followed our optimized integrated workflow with a 200 µL elution volume for the three
- 340 different methods. We also tested a condition using the kit directed workflow with a 400 µL elution
- volume with the swab dipped into the saliva sample. Both the 50  $\mu$ L 1.5x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/mL sample on the 341
- 342 CandyCollect device and the dipped samples on the swab gave positive results, however, the 50 µL
- 343 sample pipetted on the swab produced a negative result by eye (Figure 4a). Image quantification revealed
- 344 that pipetting 50 µL of 1.5x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml S. *pyogenes* and following up with 200 µL of elution solution
- 345 onto the CandyCollect device, resulted in a signal below that positivity threshold. Image quantification
- 346 for the Areta kit swab, using the same conditions, demonstrated a similar result, being at or just below the
- positivity threshold (Figure 4b). At 5x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/mL S. pyogenes all four methods resulted in positive tests 347

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- that were visible by eye (Figure 4a). As the image quantification shows, two out of the three methods in
- this experiment, which used a 200 µL elution volume, resulted in a signal above the positivity threshold
- 350 line. In contrast, the Areta kit swab, following Areta's recommended elution volume (400 µL), resulted in
- a signal at the positivity threshold line (Figure 4b). At  $1.0 \times 10^6$  and  $1.0 \times 10^7$  CFU/mL *S. pyogenes* all four
- 352 conditions resulted in positive tests. The results were consistent across all three experiments, specifically
- that the CandyCollect device sample at  $1.5 \times 10^5$  CFU/mL *S. pyogenes* was read as positive by eye, further
- supporting it as a possible alternative sampling method (Figure 4a). Lastly, at  $1.0 \times 10^{6}$  and  $1.0 \times 10^{7}$  mean
- 355 values for all conditions were above or at the positivity threshold (Figure 4b).
- 356
- 357 Of note, there were minor differences between the results in Figures 3a (left plot) and 4b (top left plot)
- 358 using the same experimental conditions (50 µL of *S. pyogenes* in saliva pipetted onto the CandyCollect
- device and eluted in 200 μL). The difference across these two sets of experiments is likely due to
- 360 manufacturing inconsistencies across LFA strips and varying amounts of leaching dye that results in a
- 361 higher background and therefore higher positivity threshold in Figure 4b than in Figure 3a.
- 362

# 363 Clinical sample results

	Analysis Day 1			Analysis Day 2				Analysis Day 3			
	Negative Control	Participant 1	Participant 2	Negative Control	Negative Control	Participant 3	Participant 4	Negative Control	Negative Control	Participant 5	Participant 6
Control Line		-	-	-	-		_		-		
_Test Line								-	- 6-6-		
Observer 1	ΝΝ	РР	ΡР	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	PP	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	NN	ΝΡ
Observer 2	ΝΝ	ΡР	ΡР	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	PP	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	PP	ΝP
Observer 3	ΝΝ	ΡР	ΡР	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	ΡР	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	ΝN	NP	ΝΡ
Researcher 1	ΝΝ	ΡР	ΡР	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	ΡР	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	NN	РР	ΝΡ
Researcher 2	ΝΝ	ΡР	ΡР	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	ΡΡ	ΝΝ	ΝΝ	NN	РР	ΝΡ
-			N = N	egative dete	ection by eye	e. P = Po	ostive detect	ion by eye.			

N = Negative detection by eye. P = Postive detection by eye.
 Figure 5. Rapid test results from the CandyCollect device samples obtained from children with GAS pharyngitis. Testing was
 completed over the course of three days. Participants 1-3 had positive test results on two replicate LFA strips eluted from the
 sample CandyCollect device. For Participant 6, one LFA strip was positive and the duplicate LFA strip was negative. The LFA
 strips for participant 5 did not have universal agreement among independent observers and researchers. Independent observers
 were shown LFA strips in an arbitrary order. The scanned images are for visual aid and may not align with the reported results
 due to quality of imaging.

371

Subsequently, we tested the CandyCollect device in a clinical setting, enrolling 30 pediatric patients, aged 5-14 years who had positive results from pharyngeal swabs processed with RADT as part of their clinical care.<sup>12</sup> We performed the optimized protocol (shown in Figure 1) on six CandyCollect devices from six participants. We performed the LFA in duplicate for each of the CandyCollect device (the 200 μL elution volume allowed for two LFA strips). We asked three independent observers who are not co-authors on this manuscript to evaluate LFA strips from negative controls and human subject samples shown to them in an arbitrary order. Two researchers, who are co-authors on this manuscript, also viewed the test strips,

- and all results are reported in Figure 5. The human subject samples were tested over the course of three
- days, with fresh negative controls interspersed each day. Independent observers were shown the Areta<sup>TM</sup>
- 381 protocol and were told that a line, even a faint line, is positive and no line is negative, as instructed by the

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Areta<sup>TM</sup> protocol (see Figure S8). We requested that the independent observers not discuss or share their
 answers with each other.

384

385 Additional red pigment due to leftover candy was common on the devices from the clinical samples, 386 resulting in background pinkish/red color along the length of the test strip, particularly in Participants 1, 387 2, 3, and 5. In the future we plan to test other candy colors, such as yellow, to avoid this background 388 signal. Further, due to the high background, we did not quantify these images as the human eye is able to discern a positive signal despite the background and the Areta<sup>TM</sup> protocol instructions call for reading the 389 390 strips by eve. Twenty out of 22 test strips had unanimous agreement as being either positive or negative: 391 the two that did not have agreement among the independent observers came from the same CandyCollect 392 device (from Participant 5) on analysis day 3; this CandyCollect device, still had candy on the device 393 which caused the testing area to be pinkish/red. The combination of the added pigment and the possibility 394 of the concentration of S. pyogenes being near the minimal detection limit for this sample may have led to 395 the mixed observations. Participants 1-3 had positive test results on two replicate LFA strips eluted from 396 the sample CandyCollect device. For Participant 6, one LFA strip was positive and the duplicate LFA 397 strip was negative. Taken together, our results show that the CandyCollect devices from children with 398 GAS pharyngitis can be tested using LFA rapid tests. Further work is needed to reduce the red 399 background (by changing the candy color), to expand the sample size, and to improve detection in 400 samples with less abundant bacteria. We note that the Areta Strep A Swab Test TM was designed to be 401 integrated with a pharyngeal swab, which will likely have different levels of bacteria compared to a saliva 402 sample; further development of the CandyCollect device surface properties to be specific to capturing 403 GAS may improve the levels of bacteria collected and is a subject of future work.

404

### 405 Conclusion

406

407 In this work, we combined a previously reported novel saliva sampling device with an available GAS 408 RADT. This was achieved by altering the Areta<sup>TM</sup> kit protocol: (1) replacing the pharyngeal swab with 409 the CandyCollect device, (2) substituting the kit test tube for a larger round-bottom tube (to accommodate 410 the larger CandyCollect device), and (3) adjusting the elution volume. Other elution solutions were 411 considered but results showed that elution reagents provided by the manufacturer performed best. In vitro 412 experiments showed we can consistently achieve a positive test strip signal with the "minimal detection 413 limit" indicated by the manufacturer. Furthermore, previously frozen CandyCollect clinical samples from 414 pediatric patients diagnosed as positive for GAS via RADT performed on pharyngeal swabs as part of 415 their clinical care also yielded a positive signal while following our optimized protocol. Future research 416 will be conducted remotely with children and their parents to continue to test usability and practicality of 417 performing our CandyCollect-rapid test protocol in a home setting. Future studies will also be done to 418 examine other bacterial and viral pathogens found in saliva that can be captured by the CandyCollect 419 device and integrated with rapid tests, such as SARS-CoV-2. We will also continue our ongoing 420 collaborative studies in clinical settings to build our sample size with patients and to further integrate their 421 feedback.

422

# 423 Conflict of Interest Disclosures

- 424 Ashleigh B. Theberge, Xiaojing Su, Erwin Berthier, and Sanitta Thongpang filed patent 63/152,103
- 425 (International Publication Number: WO 2022/178291 Al) through the University of Washington on the

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

426 CandyCollect oral sampling device. J. Carlos Sanchez, Timothy R. Robinson, Ayokunle O. Olanrewaju,

- 427 Erwin Berthier, and Ashleigh B. Theberge filed patent 63/683,571 through the University of Washington
- 428 on a related platform. Ashleigh B. Theberge reports filing multiple patents through the University of
- 429 Washington and receiving a gift to support research outside the submitted work from Ionis
- 430 Pharmaceuticals. Erwin Berthier is an inventor on multiple patents filed by Tasso, Inc., the University of
- 431 Washington, and the University of Wisconsin. Sanitta Thongpang has ownership in Salus Discovery,
- 432 LLC, and Tasso, Inc. Erwin Berthier has ownership in Salus Discovery, LLC, and Tasso, Inc. and is
- 433 employed by Tasso, Inc. However, this research is not related to these companies. Sanitta Thongpang,
- 434 Erwin Berthier, and Ashleigh B. Theberge have ownership in Seabright, LLC, which will advance new
- tools for diagnostics and clinical research, potentially including the CandyCollect device. The terms of
- this arrangement have been reviewed and approved by the University of Washington in accordance with
- 437 its policies governing outside work and financial conflicts of interest in research. The other authors have438 no conflicts of interest to disclose.
- 439

### 440 Author Contributions

- J.C.S., I.R., and V.A.M.S., contributed equally to this work. J.C.S., I.R., V.A.M.S., X.S., E.B., S.T., and
- A.B.T conceptualized the research integrating the CandyCollect with RADTs. A.B. E.A., E.R.W., G.P.D.,
  E.B., S.T., and A.B.T. conceptualized the pediatric clinical study, and E.R.W. and G.P.D. oversaw study
- 444 execution. J.C.S. and I.R. milled the CandyCollect devices. J.C.S., I.R., V.A.M.S., and D.B.H fabricated
- 445 candy devices and prepared devices for the human subjects research, including designing experimental
- 446 protocols/engineering designs. J.C.S., I.R., and V.A.M.S. X.S., W.-C.T., reviewed the literature that
- informed the study, designed the biological experiments, conducted biological experiments and data
- 448 collection. A.B. advised on study design and execution, enrolled and interacted with the participants,
- collected the samples and user surveys, and accessioned and shipped the samples. E.A. advised on studydesign and execution, advised on all regulatory aspects, drafted the study protocol and survey
- 451 instruments, and obtained Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. J.C.S., T.R.R., M.M.C., A.O.O.,
- 452 E.B., and A.B.T. developed and refined data analysis methods for quantifying RADT results. All authors
- 453 analyzed and interpreted the data. J.C.S., I.R., V.A.M.S., X.S., T.R.R., M.M.C., S.T., and A.B.T., wrote
- 454 sections of the manuscript. All authors revised and approved the manuscript.
- 455

# 456 Acknowledgement

- 457 All phases of this study were supported by National Institutes of Health grants (R21AI166120,
- 458 R35GM128648 (the latter specifically supported some of the in-lab developments and procedure
- 459 developments)), the Washington Research Foundation, a STEP grant from UW CoMotion, the Camille
- and Henry Dreyfus Foundation, and an Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellowship. The content is solely the
- 461 responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes
- 462 of Health or other funding sources. We would like to thank the participants in the clinical study and the
- 463 independent observers.
- 464

# 465 References

 Walker, M. J.; Barnett, T. C.; McArthur, J. D.; Cole, J. N.; Gillen, C. M.; Henningham, A.;
 Sriprakash, K. S.; Sanderson-Smith, M. L.; Nizet, V. Disease Manifestations and Pathogenic Mechanisms of Group A Streptococcus. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2014, 27 (2), 264–301. https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00101-13.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

470	2.	Shulman, S. T.; Bisno, A. L.; Clegg, H. W.; Gerber, M. A.; Kaplan, E. L.; Lee, G.; Martin, J. M.;
471		Van Beneden, C.; Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clinical Practice Guideline for the
472		Diagnosis and Management of Group A Streptococcal Pharyngitis: 2012 Update by the Infectious
473		Diseases Society of America. Clin Infect Dis 2012, 55 (10), e86-102.
474		https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cis629.
475	3.	Worrall, G.; Hutchinson, J.; Sherman, G.; Griffiths, J. Diagnosing Streptococcal Sore Throat in
476		Adults. Can Fam Physician 2007, 53 (4), 666–671.
477	4.	De Schuyter, K.; Boelens, J.; Messiaen, AS.; Schelstraete, P.; Verhasselt, B.; Huis In't Veld, D.;
478		Callens, S.; Sermijn, E.; Vande Weygaerde, Y.; Vandendriesche, S. Rapid Detection of S.
479		Pyogenes and S. Pneumoniae in Pleural Fluid for Diagnosis of Parapneumonic Empyema. Eur J
480		<i>Clin Microbiol Infect Dis</i> <b>2024</b> , <i>43</i> (1), 195–201. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-023-04710-w.
481	5.	Korenkov, M.; Poopalasingam, N.; Madler, M.; Vanshylla, K.; Eggeling, R.; Wirtz, M.; Fish, I.;
482		Dewald, F.; Gieselmann, L.; Lehmann, C.; Fätkenheuer, G.; Gruell, H.; Pfeifer, N.; Heger, E.;
483		Klein, F. Evaluation of a Rapid Antigen Test To Detect SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Identify
484		Potentially Infectious Individuals. Journal of Clinical Microbiology 2021, 59 (9),
485		10.1128/jcm.00896-21. https://doi.org/10.1128/jcm.00896-21.
486	6.	Jaggi, P.; Leber, A. Molecular Testing for Group A Streptococcal Pharyngitis: To Test or Not To
487		Test, That Is the Question. Journal of the Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society <b>2021</b> , 10 (2), 65–
488		67. https://doi.org/10.1093/jpids/pix106.
489	7.	Baneriee, D.: Crawford, J.: Harrison, C. J.: Rha, B.: Lively, J. Y.: Selvarangan, R. 2185, Group A
490		Streptococcus (GAS) Detection by PCR in Children with Viral Acute Respiratory Illness and
491		Healthy Children, Open Forum Infectious Diseases 2019, 6 (Supplement 2), S742–S743.
492		https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofz360.1865.
493	8.	Henson, B. S.; Wong, D. T. Collection, Storage, and Processing of Saliva Samples for
494		Downstream Molecular Applications. Oral Biology: Molecular Techniques and Applications
495		<b>2010</b> , 21–30, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-60761-820-1 2.
496	9.	Nonaka, T.: Wong, D. T. W. Saliva Diagnostics. Annu Rev Anal Chem (Palo Alto Calif) 2022, 15
497		(1), 107–121, https://doi.org/10.1146/annurey-anchem-061020-123959.
498	10.	Lee, U. N.: Su, X.: Hieber, D. L.: Tu, W.: McManamen, A. M.: Takezawa, M. G.: Hassan, G. W.:
499		Chan, T. C.; Adams, K. N.; Wald, E. R.; DeMuri, G. P.; Berthier, E.; Theberge, A. B.; Thongpang,
500		S. CandyCollect: At-Home Saliva Sampling for Capture of Respiratory Pathogens. Lab Chip
501		<b>2022</b> , 22 (18), 3555–3564, https://doi.org/10.1039/D1LC01132D.
502	11.	Tu, WC.: McManamen, A. M.: Su, X.: Jeacopello, I.: Takezawa, M. G.: Hieber, D. L.: Hassan,
503		G. W.: Lee, U. N.: Anana, E. V.: Locknane, M. P.: Stephenson, M. W.: Shinkawa, V. A. M.: Wald.
504		E. R.: DeMuri, G. P.: Adams, K.: Berthier, E.: Thongpang, S.: Theberge, A. B. At-Home Saliva
505		Sampling in Healthy Adults Using CandyCollect, a Lollipop-Inspired Device. <i>bioRxiv</i> 2023.
506		2023.01.14.524039. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.14.524039.
507	12.	Tu, WC.: Robertson, I. H.: Blom, A.: Alfaro, E.: Shinkawa, V. A. M.: Hatchett, D. B.: Sanchez,
508		J. C.: McManamen, A. M.: Su, X.: Berthier, E.: Thongpang, S.: Wald, E. R.: DeMuri, G. P.:
509		Theberge, A. B. Capture of Group A Streptococcus by Open-Microfluidic CandyCollect Device
510		in Pediatric Patients. <i>medRxiv</i> <b>2024</b> , 2023.12.14.23299923.
511		https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.14.23299923.
512	13.	Ottaviano, E.: Parodi, C.: Borghi, E.: Massa, V.: Gervasini, C.: Centanni, S.: Zuccotti, G.:
513	-	LollipopStudy Group: Bianchi, S. Saliva Detection of SARS-CoV-2 for Mitigating Company
514		Outbreaks: A Surveillance Experience. Milan. Italy. March 2021. Enidemiol Infect <b>2021</b> , 149.
515		e171. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268821001473.
516	14.	De Mever, J.: Goris, H.: Mortelé, O.: Spiessens, A.: Hans, G.: Jansens, H.: Goossens, H.:
517		Matheeussen, V.: Vandamme, S. Evaluation of Saliva as a Matrix for RT-PCR Analysis and Two
518		Rapid Antigen Tests for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2. Viruses 2022. 14 (9), 1931.
519		https://doi.org/10.3390/v14091931.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

520 15. Smith, C. A.; Chang, M. M.; Kundrod, K. A.; Novak, E. N.; Parra, S. G.; López, L.; Mavume, C.; 521 Lorenzoni, C.; Maza, M.; Salcedo, M. P.; Carns, J. L.; Baker, E.; Montealegre, J.; Scheurer, M.; 522 Castle, P. E.; Schmeler, K. M.; Richards-Kortum, R. R. A Low-Cost, Paper-Based Hybrid Capture Assay to Detect High-Risk HPV DNA for Cervical Cancer Screening in Low-Resource Settings. 523 Lab Chip 2023, 23 (3), 451–465. https://doi.org/10.1039/D2LC00885H. 524 525 526

# **Table of Contents/Abstract Figure**



527 528