

1 Comparison of throat swabs and sputum specimens for viral nucleic acid
2 detection in 52 cases of novel coronavirus (SARS-Cov-2) infected
3 pneumonia (COVID-19)

4

5 Chenyao Lin¹, Jie Xiang², Mingzhe Yan², Hongze Li², Shuang Huang¹, and Changxin
6 Shen^{*1}

7

8 ¹Department of Blood Transfusion, ZhongNan hospital of Wuhan University, China

9 ²Department of Clinical laboratory, Wuhan Jinyintan Hospital, Wuhan, China

10

11 Chenyao Lin and Jie Xiang are co-first authors; they contributed equally to the work

12

13 *Corresponding author

14

15 *Correspondence to:* Professor Changxin Shen; Blood Transfusion Department,

16 Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, 169 Donghu Road, Wuhan, Hubei 430071,

17 P.R. China

18 Tel: +86 13871541390 E-mail: shencx1975@sina.com

19

20

21 **Key words:** SARS-Cov-2, COVID-19, throat swabs, sputum specimens

22

23

24

25

26

27

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** In December 2019, a novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) infected
3 pneumonia (COVID-19) occurred in Wuhan, China. Diagnostic test based on
4 real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction assay (qRT-PCR) was the
5 main means of confirmation, and sample collection was mostly throat swabs, which
6 was easy to miss the diagnosis. It is necessary to seek specimen types with higher
7 detection efficiency and accuracy.

8 **Methods:** Paired specimens of throat swabs and sputum were obtained from 54 cases,
9 and RNA was extracted and tested for 2019-nCoV (equated with SARS-CoV-2) by
10 qRT-PCR assay.

11 **Results:** The positive rates of 2019-nCoV from sputum specimens and throat swabs
12 were 76.9% and 44.2%, respectively. Sputum specimens showed a significantly
13 higher positive rate than throat swabs in detecting viral nucleic acid using qRT-PCR
14 assay (P=0.001).

15 **Conclusions:** The detection rates of 2019-nCoV from sputum specimens are
16 significantly higher than throat swabs. We suggest that sputum would benefit for the
17 detection of 2019-nCoV in patients who produce sputum. The results can facilitate the
18 selection of specimens and increase the accuracy of diagnosis.

19

20 **Introduction**

21 In December 2019, a novel coronavirus, since named severe acute respiratory
22 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-Cov-2), emerged in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China^[1],
23 causing an acute febrile illness with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS),
24 which the World Health Organization (WHO) has named 2019 novel coronavirus
25 disease (COVID-19).^[2-4] The type of pneumonia caused by the 2019 novel
26 coronavirus (2019-nCoV, equated with SARS-CoV-2) is a highly infectious disease,
27 and the WHO declared the outbreak a public health emergency of international
28 concern on January 30, 2020.^[5] As of February 20, 2020, a total of 74679 clinically
29 diagnosed and laboratory confirmed cases had been reported in China, including 2122

1 cases of death, and more than one thousand exported cases were reported in 26
2 countries spanning Asia, Europe, Oceania, and North America. The rapid global
3 expansion and rising fatalities raised concerns about global spread.

4 Full-genome sequencing and phylogenetic analysis indicated that 2019-nCoV was
5 a distinct clade from the beta-coronaviruses associated with human severe acute
6 respiratory syndrome (SARS) and Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS).^[2] The
7 2019-nCoV is close similar to bat coronaviruses, with homology of 85-96% to a bat
8 SARS-like coronavirus (bat-SL-CoVZC45) at the whole genome level^[6], and it has
9 been postulated that bats are the primary source. However, the origin of 2019-nCoV is
10 still under investigation, current evidence suggested that animal-to-human
11 transmission via wild animals illegally sold in the Huanan Seafood Wholesale
12 Market.^[7]

13 A study in *The Lancet* by Huang et al^[3] firstly reported 41 cases of COVID-19 in
14 which most patients had a history of exposure to Huanan Seafood Wholesale Market.
15 The clinical manifestations of patients included fever, cough, dyspnea, myalgia,
16 fatigue, normal or decreased leukocyte counts, and radiographic evidence of
17 pneumonia. Organ dysfunction (such as shock, ARDS, acute cardiac injury and acute
18 kidney injury) and death can occur in severe cases.^[3] Signs of infection are highly
19 nonspecific, thus, diagnostic test based on detection of the viral sequence by real-time
20 reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction assay (qRT-PCR) is the main means
21 of confirmation.

22 Appropriate specimen selection is important for the diagnosis of respiratory viral
23 infections.^[8] We collected paired specimens of throat swabs and sputum for the first
24 time. The objective of this study was to compare the positive rates of 2019-nCoV
25 between throat swabs and sputum specimens in the detection of viral nucleic acid by
26 qRT-PCR. This facilitates the selection of specimens for detection of 2019-nCoV, and
27 improve the efficiency of diagnosis for patients suspected of having COVID-19.

28

29 **Methods**

30 **Study Design and Participants**

1 For this retrospective, single center study, we recruited 52 patients suspected of
2 having COVID-19 from February 7 to February 16, 2020, at Jinyintan Hospital,
3 which located in Wuhan, Hubei Province, the endemic areas of COVID-19. Suspected
4 patients were diagnosed according to World Health Organization interim guidance.^[9]
5 All patients enrolled in this study received detection of viral nucleic acid assays
6 (qRT-PCR) in both throat swabs and sputum specimens at the same time to make a
7 definite diagnosis. Jinyintan Hospital is a hospital for adults (ie, aged ≥ 14 years)
8 specialising in infectious diseases, and as well the first designated hospital for
9 COVID-19 patients in Wuhan. The study was approved by Jinyintan Hospital Ethics
10 Committee and oral consent was obtained from patients involved before enrolment
11 when data were collected retrospectively.

12

13 **qRT-PCR Assay for SARS-CoV-2**

14 Throat swabs and sputum specimens were collected for extracting 2019-nCoV
15 RNA from patients suspected of having 2019-nCoV infection. After collection, the
16 throat swabs were placed into a sterile test tube with 1 ml sterile saline, the sputum
17 specimens were added equal volume of acetylcysteine (10g/L) and shaken at room
18 temperature for 30 min to be fully liquefied, and total RNA was extracted using the
19 nucleic acid extraction kit (QIAamp viral RNA mini kit). In brief, 40 μ L of cell lysates
20 were transferred into a collection tube followed by vortex for 10 seconds. After
21 standing at room temperature for 10 minutes, the collection tube was centrifugated at
22 1000 rpm/min for 5 minutes. The suspension was used for qRT-PCR assay of
23 2019-nCoV RNA. Then, n*19 μ L mixed reagent of fluorescence PCR detection and
24 n*1 μ L RT-PCR enzyme (n was the number of reaction tubes) were mixed and
25 vortexed for a few seconds. The above mixture of 20 μ L was put into the PCR
26 reaction tube respectively, after that the extracted sample by 5 μ L was added.
27 qRT-PCR analysis was conducted using the ABI 7500 Real-Time PCR System. The
28 PCR parameters were 45 °C for 10 min, 95 °C for 3 min, followed by 45 cycles of
29 95 °C for 15 s, 58 °C for 30 s, and a single fluorescence detection point at 58°C. Two
30 target genes, including open reading frame 1ab (ORF1ab) and nucleocapsid protein

1 (N), were simultaneously amplified and tested during the qRT-PCR assay. The
2 qRT-PCR assay was performed using a 2019-nCoV nucleic acid detection kit
3 according to the manufacturer's protocol (Shanghai ZJ Bio-Tech Co Ltd). A cycle
4 threshold value (Ct-value) less than 37 was defined as a positive test result, and a
5 Ct-value of 40 or more was defined as a negative test. These diagnostic criteria were
6 based on the recommendation by the national institute for viral disease control and
7 Prevention (China) (http://ivdc.chinacdc.cn/kyjz/202001/t20200121_211337.html). A
8 medium load, defined as a Ct-value of 37 to less than 40, required confirmation by
9 retesting.

10

11 **Statistical Analysis**

12 All analyses were performed using SPSS 22.0. Continuous variables were
13 described using mean (SD) if they are normally distributed or median (IQR) if they
14 are not. Categorical variables were expressed as frequencies (percentages), and
15 performed using the McNemar's test. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

16

17 **Results**

18 **Presenting Characteristics**

19 The study population included 52 hospitalized patients suspected of having
20 COVID-19. The average age was 57.3 years (SD, 12.5; range, 34-84 years), and 27
21 (51.9%) were men. All patients received qRT-PCR assays in both throat swabs and
22 sputum specimens. (Table 1)

23

24 **Comparison of throat swabs and sputum specimens**

25 The viral nucleic acid by qRT-PCR showed that 23 cases (44.2%) of throat swabs
26 were positive while 29 cases (55.8%) were negative, and 40 cases (76.9%) of sputum
27 specimens were positive while 12 cases (23.1%) were negative (Figure 1). The
28 positive rate of sputum specimens was almost 2-fold that of throat swabs.

29 Most of the patients (51.9%) had the same results of qRT-PCR assay on throat
30 swabs and sputum specimens, 36.5% with both positive and 15.4% with both

1 negative. However, quite a few patients (40.4%) showed positive sputum specimens
2 and negative throat swabs, while only a tiny minority of patients (7.7%) showed
3 negative sputum specimens and positive throat swabs. The findings showed that
4 positive rates displayed a significant statistical difference ($P=0.001$) between throat
5 swabs and sputum specimens. (Table 2)

7 **Discussion**

8 Adequate specimen collection is important for the diagnosis of respiratory viral
9 infections.^[8] At present, the sample collection for viral nucleic acid detection of
10 suspected patients with COVID-19 is mostly upper respiratory tract samples (mainly
11 throat swabs).^[10] The collection of throat swabs is not standardized and it is easy to
12 miss the diagnosis. The collection process is extremely risky for medical staff.
13 Sputum is representative of the lower respiratory tract but is rarely used for viral
14 testing. The aim of this study was to compare the detection rates of 2019-nCoV RNA
15 from throat swabs and sputum specimens using the qRT-PCR assay.

16 In our research, most of the patients were middle-aged and elderly men, which
17 was similar to previous studies.^[3,4] Paired specimens of throat swabs and sputum were
18 obtained from 52 subjects. The positive rates of 2019-nCoV from sputum specimens
19 and throat swabs were 76.9% and 44.2%, respectively. The present study found that
20 the overall positive rate from sputum specimens in adults was significantly higher
21 than that from throat swabs using qRT-PCR assay. This finding was consistent with
22 the result of a previous study that sputum showed a significantly higher positive rate
23 than nasopharyngeal swabs in detecting respiratory viruses.^[8] Falsey et al^[11] also
24 proved that sputum samples showed higher diagnostic yields than nose–throat swabs
25 in adults.

26 The detection rate of 2019-nCoV from sputum samples was higher than that
27 from throat swabs, which may be related to novel coronavirus's main invasion and
28 infection of lower respiratory tract cells, resulting in clinical manifestations such as
29 cough and pneumonia. In addition, several studies have shown that respiratory viruses
30 were increasingly recognized as the cause of lower respiratory tract infections.^[8] In

1 these cases, specimens of the lower respiratory tract should be collected for detection
2 of 2019-nCoV. And caution should be taken when using the negative result of viral
3 nucleic acid from throat swabs as the criterion for the exclusion of infection and
4 conformation of cure.

5 It should be noted that the high viscosity of sputum can make it difficult to
6 extract nucleic acid. Therefore, pre-treatment of sputum samples is required, but
7 currently no standardized pre-treatment procedure is available for virus detection. In
8 our study, acetylcysteine was used for the digestion of sputum, which may cause
9 substantial loss of RNA due to the washing and pipetting steps in the procedures.
10 Therefore, thoroughly mixing and homogenization of sputum samples might be
11 important factors to obtain reliable test results.^[8]

12 This study has several limitations. First, only 52 patients with suspected
13 COVID-19 were included, and further studies were needed to investigate the
14 observation in a larger group of patients. Second, our study only involved throat
15 swabs and sputum samples, and expand discussions of bronchoalveolar lavage fluid
16 and blood samples are necessary in the future. Although sputum is more sensitive than
17 throat swabs for 2019-nCoV detection, the use of sputum may be limited because not
18 all patients with COVID-19 produce sputum, especially elderly patients. Therefore, if
19 a sputum sample is available, it might be a rather reliable specimen for nucleic acid
20 detection of 2019-nCoV.

21 In conclusion, the detection rates of 2019-nCoV from sputum specimens are
22 significantly higher than those from throat swabs using the qRT-PCR assay. We
23 suggest that sputum would benefit for the detection of novel coronavirus in patients
24 who produce sputum. The results can facilitate the selection of specimens and
25 increase the accuracy of diagnosis of COVID-19.

26

27 **Acknowledgements**

28 This work was supported by the Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University
29 Science, Technology and Innovation Seed Fund under Grant znp2017022.

30

1 **Disclosure statement**

2 The authors have no conflict of interest.

3

4 **References:**

- 5 1. Wuhan Municipal Health Commission. Wuhan Municipal Health Commission briefing on the
6 pneumonia epidemic situation 31 Dec 2019 [in Chinese]. 2020 [cited 2020 Feb 20].
7 <http://wjw.wuhan.gov.cn/front/web/showDetail/2019123108989>. Accessed.
- 8 2. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China,
9 2019 [J]. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(8):727-733.
- 10 3. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus
11 in Wuhan, China [J]. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):497-506.
- 12 4. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019
13 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China [J]. *Jama*. 2020.
- 14 5. World Health Organization. Statement on the second meeting of the International Health
15 Regulations (2005) Emergency Committee regarding the outbreak of novel coronavirus
16 (2019-nCoV). Geneva: the Organization; 2020 [cited 2020 Feb 20].
17 [https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-\(2005\)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-\(2019-ncov\)](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/30-01-2020-statement-on-the-second-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-outbreak-of-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)). Accessed.
- 18 6. Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of
19 probable bat origin [J]. *Nature*. 2020.
- 20 7. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019
21 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study [J]. *Lancet*.
22 2020;395(10223):507-513.
- 23 8. Jeong JH, Kim KH, Jeong SH, et al. Comparison of sputum and nasopharyngeal swabs for
24 detection of respiratory viruses [J]. *J Med Virol*. 2014;86(12):2122-2127.
- 25 9. World Health Organization. Clinical management of severe acute respiratory infection when
26 novel coronavirus (nCoV) infection is suspected: interim guidance. 2020 [cited 2020 Feb 20].
27 [https://www.who.int/publications-detail/clinical-management-of-severe-acute-respiratory-infection-when-novel-coronavirus-\(ncov\)-infection-is-suspected](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/clinical-management-of-severe-acute-respiratory-infection-when-novel-coronavirus-(ncov)-infection-is-suspected). Accessed.
- 28 10. Xie X, Zhong Z, Zhao W, et al. Chest CT for Typical 2019-nCoV Pneumonia: Relationship to
29 Negative RT-PCR Testing [J]. *Radiology*. 2020:200343.
- 30 11. Falsey AR, Formica MA, Walsh EE. Yield of sputum for viral detection by reverse transcriptase
31 PCR in adults hospitalized with respiratory illness [J]. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2012;50(1):21-24.
- 32
- 33
- 34

Table 1. The clinical data and nucleic acid detection results (qRT-PCR) of 52 patients

NO.	Unique traceability number	Gender	age (years)	throat swabs collection date	throat swabs results	sputum specimens collection date	sputum specimens results
1	233492	Female	49	2020/2/14	positive	2020/2/13	positive
2	233502	Female	47	2020/2/12	negative	2020/2/13	positive
3	233428	Male	80	2020/2/13	positive	2020/2/13	positive
4	233389	Female	73	2020/2/12	negative	2020/2/13	positive
5	233445	Female	54	2020/2/13	negative	2020/2/13	positive
6	233512	Female	63	2020/2/12	negative	2020/2/13	positive
7	232932	Male	67	2020/2/14	positive	2020/2/13	positive
8	231688	Male	47	2020/2/13	positive	2020/2/13	positive
9	232712	Female	72	2020/2/7	negative	2020/2/13	positive
10	233473	Male	49	2020/2/12	negative	2020/2/13	positive
11	232360	Male	69	2020/2/11	negative	2020/2/13	positive
12	233495	Female	57	2020/2/12	negative	2020/2/13	positive
13	233386	Male	79	2020/2/13	negative	2020/2/13	positive
14	233501	Female	34	2020/2/13	negative	2020/2/13	positive
15	233429	Female	67	2020/2/13	positive	2020/2/13	positive
16	233127	Male	54	2020/2/9	negative	2020/2/14	positive
17	233557	Female	64	2020/2/14	positive	2020/2/14	positive
18	233491	Female	35	2020/2/14	negative	2020/2/14	positive
19	233552	Female	47	2020/2/14	positive	2020/2/14	positive

20	233559	Female	66	2020/2/14	positive	2020/2/14	positive
21	233159	Male	57	2020/2/9	positive	2020/2/14	positive
22	233077	Female	66	2020/2/13	positive	2020/2/14	positive
23	233548	Female	39	2020/2/15	negative	2020/2/14	negative
24	233185	Male	59	2020/2/14	negative	2020/2/14	positive
25	233514	Male	52	2020/2/12	negative	2020/2/14	positive
26	233352	Male	64	2020/2/13	negative	2020/2/14	positive
27	233259	Male	62	2020/2/14	negative	2020/2/14	positive
28	233554	Male	55	2020/2/14	positive	2020/2/14	positive
29	233553	Female	63	2020/2/14	positive	2020/2/14	positive
30	233540	Female	71	2020/2/13	positive	2020/2/14	negative
31	233558	Male	58	2020/2/14	negative	2020/2/14	positive
32	233467	Male	51	2020/2/16	positive	2020/2/14	negative
33	233566	Female	44	2020/2/14	positive	2020/2/14	positive
34	233555	Male	55	2020/2/14	negative	2020/2/14	negative
35	232525	Male	40	2020/2/13	negative	2020/2/14	negative
36	233549	Male	49	2020/2/13	positive	2020/2/14	negative
37	232342	Male	36	2020/2/12	negative	2020/2/14	negative
38	233494	Female	59	2020/2/12	negative	2020/2/14	negative
39	232697	Female	46	2020/2/13	negative	2020/2/14	positive
40	232825	Female	59	2020/2/13	negative	2020/2/14	negative
41	233489	Female	72	2020/2/13	positive	2020/2/14	positive

42	233546	Female	56	2020/2/15	negative	2020/2/14	positive
43	233425	Female	51	2020/2/13	negative	2020/2/14	negative
44	233340	Male	75	2020/2/13	positive	2020/2/14	positive
45	233470	Male	47	2020/2/16	positive	2020/2/15	positive
46	233155	Male	76	2020/2/10	positive	2020/2/15	positive
47	233098	Male	38	2020/2/13	positive	2020/2/15	negative
48	233561	Female	84	2020/2/14	positive	2020/2/15	positive
49	233550	Male	60	2020/2/15	negative	2020/2/15	positive
50	233214	Male	47	2020/2/14	positive	2020/2/15	positive
51	233568	Male	72	2020/2/15	negative	2020/2/15	positive
52	232512	Male	41	2020/2/13	negative	2020/2/15	negative




Figure 1. Distribution of qRT-PCR results on throat swabs and sputum specimens in patients with suspected COVID-19.

Table 2. Comparison of qRT-PCR results between throat swabs and sputum specimens

	No. (%) of sputum specimens result	
	Positive	Negative
No. (%) of throat swabs result		
Positive	19 (36.5%)	4 (7.7%)
Negative	21 (40.4%)	8 (15.4%)

P value = 0.001 by McNemar test.