

1 **Saliva is a promising alternative specimen for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in children and**
2 **adults**

3

4 Rebecca Yee, PhD^{1*}, Thao Truong, PhD^{1*}, Pia S. Pannaraj, MD, MPH^{2, 3}, Natalie Eubanks¹,
5 Emily Gai¹, Jaycee Jumarang, MD², Lauren Turner, MS², Ariana Peralta², Yesun Lee, PhD²,
6 Jennifer Dien Bard, PhD^{1, 3, #}

7 ¹Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Children's Hospital Los Angeles, Los
8 Angeles, CA

9 ²Department of Pediatrics, Division of Infectious Diseases, Children's Hospital Los Angeles, Los
10 Angeles, CA

11 ³Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

12 *Authors contributed equally, order was decided based on seniority

13

14

15 **#Corresponding Author:** Jennifer Dien Bard, PhD, D(ABMM)

16 Email: jdienbard@chla.usc.edu

17 **Running title:** Saliva for detecting SARS-CoV-2

18 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, pediatric, saliva, nasopharyngeal swab

19 **Summary:** Saliva is an acceptable alternative specimen compared to nasopharyngeal swabs for
20 detection of SARS-CoV-2. Specifically, saliva demonstrated comparable performance to
21 nasopharyngeal swabs in symptomatic and asymptomatic pediatric patients and in symptomatic
22 adults.

23

24 **Abstract**

25 Testing efforts for SARS-CoV-2 have been burdened by the scarcity of testing materials and
26 personal protective equipment for healthcare workers. The simple and painless process of saliva
27 collection allows for widespread testing, but enthusiasm is hampered by variable performance
28 compared to nasopharyngeal swab (NPS) samples. We prospectively collected paired NPS and
29 saliva samples from a total of 300 unique adult and pediatric patients. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was
30 detected in 32.2% (97/300) of the individuals using the TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit (Thermo
31 Fisher). Performance of saliva and NPS were compared against the total number of positives
32 regardless of specimen type. The overall concordance for saliva and NPS was 91.0% (273/300)
33 and 94.7% (284/300), respectively. The positive percent agreement (PPA) for saliva and NPS
34 was 81.4% (79/97) and 89.7% (87/97), respectively. Saliva detected 10 positive cases that were
35 negative by NPS. In symptomatic and asymptomatic pediatric patients not previously diagnosed
36 with COVID-19, the performances of saliva and NPS were comparable (PPA: 82.4% vs 85.3%).
37 The overall PPA for adults were 83.3% and 90.7% for saliva and NPS, respectively, with saliva
38 detecting 4 cases less than NPS. However, saliva performance in symptomatic adults was
39 identical to NPS (PPA of 93.8%). With lower cost and self-collection capabilities, saliva can be
40 an appropriate alternative sample choice to NPS for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in children and
41 adults.

42

43

44

45

46

47 **Introduction**

48 Accurate and timely molecular testing for SARS-CoV-2, the causative agent of the
49 ongoing coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, has been crucial for informing patient
50 management, public health decision making, contact tracing, and infection control. The
51 Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) guidelines recommend testing for SARS-CoV-2
52 by reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) on specimen samples which
53 includes nasopharyngeal swabs (NPS), mid-turbinate swabs, or nasal swabs rather than
54 oropharyngeal swabs (OPS) or saliva alone (1). However, testing efforts have been hampered by
55 supply chain shortages due to an unprecedented demand for testing materials such as swabs,
56 universal transport media, and personal protective equipment for healthcare workers (2). The
57 simplicity of saliva collection has certainly increased its interest as an alternative specimen for
58 detection of SARS-CoV-2.

59 Compared to NP specimen collection, saliva is less invasive, circumvents the need for
60 swabs, and requires minimal supervision with the option for self-collection. Previous studies
61 have indicated that saliva is a promising specimen for detection of other respiratory viruses by
62 RT-PCR, including influenza and common non-SARS human coronaviruses (3-5). To-date, the
63 U.S. Food and Drug Administration has issued several emergency use authorizations for
64 laboratory-developed diagnostic tests using saliva. More recent studies have shown use of saliva
65 has moderate-to-high sensitivity and specificity when compared to NP swabs for detection of
66 SARS-CoV-2 (6-12). These studies vary widely in sample collection method and testing
67 platforms, and more data is needed to standardize best collection and processing practices.

68 There is tremendous motivation to pursue saliva collection in children, not only because
69 of the simplicity in specimen collection but to also avoid the unnecessary discomfort during NPS

70 collection. There is also huge interest in saliva as a primary specimen type to detected SARS-
71 CoV-2 during the school year. Hence, it is important to understand the dynamics of viral
72 detection in children, which has implications for their contribution to transmission of SARS-
73 CoV-2. Unfortunately, data on the use of saliva to detect SARS-CoV-2 in pediatric patients is
74 sparse. The few reports available on the performance of saliva specimens in children showed
75 poor detection of SARS-CoV-2 with sensitivities of 53-73% albeit such studies suffer from small
76 sample sizes (13-15). In this study, we evaluated and compared prospectively collected paired
77 saliva and NP swabs from both pediatric and adult patients for detection of SARS-CoV-2. We
78 also compare the differences in viral load in asymptomatic and symptomatic COVID-19 patients.

79 **Methods**

80 **Study Design**

81 A total of 300 unique patients (inpatients, outpatients and household members of
82 diagnosed COVID-19 patients) were enrolled in this study between June 8 to August 28, 2020.
83 Demographic data including age, gender, and symptoms were collected. Participants were asked
84 if they had previously tested positive for COVID-19. Paired samples were collected from
85 individuals with unknown COVID-19 status as well as from patients previously positive for
86 SARS-CoV-2. Both symptomatic and asymptomatic patients were enrolled in the study. Study
87 design conducted at Children's Hospital Los Angeles was approved by the Institutional Review
88 Board under IRB #CHLA-20-00124 and CHLA-18-00098.

89 **Sample collection**

90 At least 3 mL of saliva was self-collected under the observation of a healthcare worker
91 who subsequently collected a NP swab sample for parallel testing. Saliva was collected in a
92 sterile cup and NP swabs were immediately placed in viral transport medium (Becton Dickenson,

93 Franklin Lakes, NJ, USA). Samples were either sent to the clinical laboratory within 1 hour from
94 collection or stored at 4°C and sent to the clinical laboratory within 4 hours from collection.
95 Samples were stored at 4°C and tested within 48 hours from collection or stored at -80°C prior to
96 testing.

97 **qRT-PCR assay for SARS-CoV-2 RNA**

98 Paired nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva were sent to the Clinical Virology Laboratory at
99 Children's Hospital Los Angeles. Total nucleic acid was extracted from 250 µL samples using
100 the Thermo Fisher KingFisher Flex specimen processing system with the Applied Biosystems
101 MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Nucleic Acid Isolation Kit (Thermo Fisher, Waltham, MA) and eluted
102 to 50 µL of total nucleic acid. Real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-
103 PCR) was performed using the TaqPath COVID-19 Combo Kit (Thermo Fisher). A positive
104 result for SARS-CoV-2 detection was determined by amplification of at least one of the three
105 genes targeted (N gene, S gene or ORF1ab gene) using a cut-off of Ct value <40. A valid
106 negative result for SARS-CoV-2 detection was determined by amplification of MS2 internal
107 control using a cut-off of Ct value <32.

108

109 **Data and Statistical analysis**

110 A composite gold standard approach was used to determine a true positive case. Any
111 positive detected from either NPS or saliva was considered a true positive and positive percent
112 agreement (PPA) and negative percent agreement (NPA) was calculated based on this. Statistical
113 analyses comparing different Ct values and days between onset of symptoms and test date were
114 performed using a Mann-Whitney test.

115 **Results**

116 During a 11-week period (June 8 to August 28, 2020), SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected
117 in a total of 97 out of 300 individuals, of which 43 (44.3%) were < 19 years of age. The median
118 age was 37.5 years old (range 19-58) and 12 years old (range 4-18) in our adult and pediatric
119 COVID-19 positive cohorts, respectively. A female predominance was noted (61/97, 62.9%). Of
120 the 97 COVID-19 positive patients, 55 (56.7 %) were symptomatic at the time of collection with
121 a median of 10 days between symptom onset and time of collection. Twenty-seven (27.8%)
122 patients were known to be positive for SARS-CoV-2 prior to enrollment. Since individuals in
123 entire households were enrolled, it was not surprising that an overwhelming proportion of our
124 cohort (73/97, 75.3%) reported exposure to a COVID-19 positive individual.

125 The overall concordance of saliva and NPS was 91.0% (273/300) and 94.7% (284/300),
126 respectively. When analyzing all 97 positive patients, SARS-CoV-2 RNA were detected from
127 both NPS and saliva in 69 patients, from saliva only in 10 patients and NPS only in 18 patients.
128 The overall PPA for saliva and NPS was 81.4% (79/97) and 89.7% (87/97), respectively, when
129 compared to a total number of positive cases identified by RT-PCR (Table 1). The NPA was
130 100% for both specimen types.

131 Focusing on pediatric patients only, the overall PPA were 79.1% for saliva and 88.4% for
132 NPS collected. Performance of saliva (PPA: 82.4%) and NPS (PPA: 85.3%) were comparable
133 when only first time positive pediatric patients were analyzed for both symptomatic and
134 asymptomatic patients. Specifically, testing using saliva detected the same number of COVID-19
135 cases as NPS (both at 78.6%) in the asymptomatic pediatric cohort and only missed one positive
136 case (85% vs 90%) in the symptomatic cohort (Table 2). The performance of saliva remained
137 high in both young and older children. In children ages 4-10 years, saliva and NPS achieved PPA

138 of 83.3%. Additionally, saliva was able to capture all 6/6 (100%) symptomatic patients in this
139 age group as opposed to the 5/6 (83.3%) for NPS. In older patients between 11-18 years old, one
140 positive case was missed by saliva (PPA: 81.8% vs 86.4%) but the performance was superior
141 when testing only asymptomatic patients (PPA: 87.5% vs 75.0%) with detection of an additional
142 case (Table 2).

143 In adult patients, the overall PPA were 83.3% and 90.7% for saliva and NPS,
144 respectively. In contrast to the pediatric data, saliva performed better in symptomatic patients
145 with identical PPA to NPS at 93.8% but poorly in asymptomatic adults (PPA: 68.2% vs 86.4%).
146 Findings were comparable even when only first time positive patients were analyzed. (Table 1-
147 2).

148 The average differences in Ct values between saliva and NPS samples were not
149 statistically different (Ct: 28.7 versus 29.1) (Figure 1A-B). Based on linear regression analysis
150 where Ct values of saliva (Y-axis) are plotted against the Ct values of NPS (X-axis) from the
151 paired sample, the equation of $y=0.9994x$ suggests that Ct values from both sample types are
152 approximately equivalent to one another (Figure 1C). In addition, the Ct values of both saliva
153 and NPS samples remain comparable regardless of age and disease status (symptomatic vs
154 asymptomatic) (Figure 2).

155 Importantly, SARS-CoV-2 RNA were detected in 28 (28.9%) patients in only one sample
156 type (10 saliva; 18 NPS). Most of these patients were older than 10 years (25/28, 89.3%)
157 (Supplementary Table 1). Saliva-only positive patients were tested ranging from 3 to 43 days
158 post-symptom onset compared to the 7 to 31 day post-symptom onset in NPS-only positive
159 patients. The overall Ct values between saliva-only and NPS-only positives were comparable (Ct

160 of 32.4 vs 32.5) with 88.8% (NPS-positive only) and 80% (saliva-positive only) of the samples
161 having a Ct of over 30 (Figure 3).

162 The average Ct values derived from cases detected by both saliva and NPS was lower
163 than when only one sample type was positive (Ct 28.9 vs Ct 32.4, $p < 0.001$). Symptomatic
164 patients were more likely to have SARS-CoV-2 RNA detected from both sample types
165 (OR=3.37, $p = 0.01$).

166 **Discussion**

167 Testing saliva specimens can circumvent the shortage of collection supplies and may be a
168 sufficient noninvasive and more cost-effective alternative for SARS-CoV-2 testing (4). The
169 sensitivity of saliva for detection of SARS-CoV-2 has been shown to be less than NPS in other
170 studies, ranging from 72% to 86% (16, 17). We demonstrated an overall PPA of 81.4% in saliva
171 versus 89.7% in NPS in our entire cohort. Comparable performance of saliva to NPS was shown
172 in children who were previously unknown positive patients (both symptomatic and
173 asymptomatic patients) and also in symptomatic adults only. To our knowledge, this is the first
174 and largest study demonstrating support for utilization of saliva in the pediatric age group and
175 comparison of performance of saliva between pediatric and adult cohorts.

176 It is important to note that testing of saliva caught 10 additional COVID-19 cases that
177 were negative by NPS. Our findings are consistent with results from other studies demonstrating
178 how saliva specimens can identify otherwise missed cases of not only COVID-19, but also
179 influenza and RSV (4, 6, 17). In this study, of the 18 samples that were detected by NPS only, 7
180 (38.9%) were from asymptomatic adults, a subpopulation that performed poorly with detection
181 of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva. Additionally, over 80% of NPS-positive only patients exhibited Ct
182 values past 30.0, suggesting that false negatives are attributed to lower viral loads. Additionally,

183 our study showed that the performance of saliva is not dependent on age which is corroborated
184 by recent studies which also reported that age had no impact on viral load and detection of
185 SARS-CoV-2 (15, 18), including in pediatric populations.

186 While some studies argue that viral load is highest in saliva within the first week of
187 symptom onset, others have shown that saliva can be more sensitive than NPS throughout the
188 course of infection or sometimes produce intermittent positive results over the course of a few
189 weeks (19). A small, longitudinal pediatric study from South Korea found SARS-CoV-2 RNA
190 was more readily detected from saliva within the first few days of symptom onset followed by a
191 drastic decline in viral load compared to NPS (14). In contrast, we report the detection of SARS-
192 CoV-2 in saliva for up to 43 days compared to 32 days for NP swabs.

193 While several studies have shown that NPS yield lower Ct values than saliva in
194 symptomatic adult patients (8, 10, 11), we report no significant difference in Ct values between
195 saliva and NPS in either our adult or pediatric patients. Our findings corroborates with a recent
196 study of 19 adults that reported no significant differences (7). Interestingly, a recent study
197 demonstrated that in adult populations, performance of saliva was better than NPS in detecting
198 SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic individuals, but our results suggest that saliva was a poor
199 alternative to NPS in asymptomatic adults, missing 4 cases that were NPS positive (20).
200 However, it must be noted that in our older children cohort (11-18 years old), saliva's
201 performance was superior than NPS for detection in first-time positive asymptomatic individuals.
202 The conflicting findings between studies may be due to differences in saliva collection protocol,
203 collection device, age of patient, and also the inherent difficulties in working with a more
204 viscous sample that may be more prone to more sampling variabilities (9, 10). Such differences
205 in methodology may account for the variability in the performance of saliva reported in other

206 studies. A more thorough comparison and standardization of saliva collection and processing
207 needs to be evaluated.

208 Limitations of this study include the small sample size of both children, particularly
209 younger children, and adults from a single medical institution. Second, this study consisted of
210 only outpatients, patients admitted to the emergency department, and family members who
211 volunteered to enroll in the study which can bias our findings regarding the role of COVID-19
212 exposure to specimen performance. Since viral load may or may not be correlated with clinical
213 manifestations, further studies should be conducted in inpatient or ICU settings as the spectrum
214 of disease ranges from asymptomatic to severely ill patients (21-23). Finally, despite a
215 standardized protocol utilized during the collection of the saliva samples, it can be challenging
216 for children to properly salivate into a collection device. The volume of saliva obtained may also
217 vary among patients due to excessive bubbles and other factors despite the same amount of
218 saliva being processed for testing.

219 **Conclusions**

220 Our study reveals that saliva is a reliable diagnostic specimen for the detection of SARS-
221 CoV-2 RNA by RT-PCR, particularly in both symptomatic and asymptomatic children and
222 symptomatic adults. Moreover, saliva was able to identify additional COVID-19 cases that were
223 otherwise missed by NPS. With saliva collection being a more cost-effective and non-invasive
224 approach, it offers a feasible approach for widespread testing of SARS-CoV-2 in the inpatient
225 settings and in the community.

226

227

228 **Acknowledgments**

229 We would like to acknowledge the staff members of the Clinical Virology laboratory at
230 Children’s Hospital Los Angeles for dedication towards SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing. We
231 would like to acknowledge Dr. Javier Mestas and Irvin Ibarra Flores for assisting with the saliva
232 testing.

233

234 **Funding**

235 This work was funded in part by the National Institutes of Health [U01 AI144616-02S1 to
236 P.S.P.].

237 **Conflict of Interest**

238 All authors declare no conflict of interest.

239

240 References

- 241 1. Hanson KE, Caliendo AM, Arias CA, Englund JA, Lee MJ, Loeb M, Patel R, El Alayli A, Kalot
242 MA, Falck-Ytter Y, Lavergne V, Morgan RL, Murad MH, Sultan S, Bhimraj A, Mustafa RA.
243 2020. Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Diagnosis of COVID-19.
244 Clin Infect Dis doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa760.
- 245 2. Ranney ML, Griffeth V, Jha AK. 2020. Critical Supply Shortages - The Need for Ventilators
246 and Personal Protective Equipment during the Covid-19 Pandemic. N Engl J Med
247 382:e41.
- 248 3. Sueki A, Matsuda K, Yamaguchi A, Uehara M, Sugano M, Uehara T, Honda T. 2016.
249 Evaluation of saliva as diagnostic materials for influenza virus infection by PCR-based
250 assays. Clin Chim Acta 453:71-4.
- 251 4. To KKW, Yip CCY, Lai CYW, Wong CKH, Ho DTY, Pang PKP, Ng ACK, Leung KH, Poon RWS,
252 Chan KH, Cheng VCC, Hung IFN, Yuen KY. 2019. Saliva as a diagnostic specimen for
253 testing respiratory virus by a point-of-care molecular assay: a diagnostic validity study.
254 Clin Microbiol Infect 25:372-378.
- 255 5. Kim YG, Yun SG, Kim MY, Park K, Cho CH, Yoon SY, Nam MH, Lee CK, Cho YJ, Lim CS.
256 2017. Comparison between Saliva and Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of
257 Respiratory Viruses by Multiplex Reverse Transcription-PCR. J Clin Microbiol 55:226-233.
- 258 6. Azzi L, Carcano G, Gianfagna F, Grossi P, Gasperina DD, Genoni A, Fasano M, Sessa F,
259 Tettamanti L, Carinci F, Maurino V, Rossi A, Tagliabue A, Baj A. 2020. Saliva is a reliable
260 tool to detect SARS-CoV-2. J Infect 81:e45-e50.
- 261 7. Pasomsub E, Watcharananan SP, Boonyawat K, Janchompoo P, Wongtabtim G, Sukswan
262 W, Sungkanuparph S, Phuphuakrat A. 2020. Saliva sample as a non-invasive specimen
263 for the diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019: a cross-sectional study. Clin Microbiol
264 Infect doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.05.001.
- 265 8. Williams E, Bond K, Zhang B, Putland M, Williamson DA. 2020. Saliva as a Noninvasive
266 Specimen for Detection of SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Microbiol 58.
- 267 9. Hanson KE, Barker AP, Hillyard DR, Gilmore N, Barrett JW, Orlandi RR, Shakir SM. 2020.
268 Self-Collected Anterior Nasal and Saliva Specimens versus Healthcare Worker-Collected
269 Nasopharyngeal Swabs for the Molecular Detection of SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Microbiol
270 doi:10.1128/jcm.01824-20.
- 271 10. Landry ML, Criscuolo J, Peaper DR. 2020. Challenges in use of saliva for detection of
272 SARS CoV-2 RNA in symptomatic outpatients. J Clin Virol 130:104567.
- 273 11. Iwasaki S, Fujisawa S, Nakakubo S, Kamada K, Yamashita Y, Fukumoto T, Sato K, Oguri S,
274 Taki K, Senjo H, Sugita J, Hayasaka K, Konno S, Nishida M, Teshima T. 2020. Comparison
275 of SARS-CoV-2 detection in nasopharyngeal swab and saliva. J Infect 81:e145-e147.
- 276 12. Altawalrah H, AlHuraish F, Alkandari WA, Ezzikouri S. 2020. Saliva specimens for
277 detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 in Kuwait: A cross-
278 sectional study. J Clin Virol 132:104652.
- 279 13. Han MS, Seong MW, Heo EY, Park JH, Kim N, Shin S, Cho SI, Park SS, Choi EH. 2020.
280 Sequential analysis of viral load in a neonate and her mother infected with SARS-CoV-2.
281 Clin Infect Dis doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa447.

- 282 14. Han MS, Seong MW, Kim N, Shin S, Cho SI, Park H, Kim TS, Park SS, Choi EH. 2020. Viral
283 RNA Load in Mildly Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Children with COVID-19, Seoul,
284 South Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis* 26:2497-2499.
- 285 15. Chong CY, Kam KQ, Li J, Maiwald M, Loo LH, Nadua KD, Tan NWH, Yung CF, Thoon KC.
286 2020. Saliva is not a useful diagnostic specimen in children with Coronavirus Disease
287 2019. *Clin Infect Dis* doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1376.
- 288 16. Zhu J, Guo J, Xu Y, Chen X. 2020. Viral dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva from infected
289 patients. *J Infect* 81:e48-e50.
- 290 17. Jamal AJ, Mozafarihashjin M, Coomes E, Powis J, Li AX, Paterson A, Anceva-Sami S,
291 Barati S, Crowl G, Faheem A, Farooqi L, Khan S, Prost K, Poutanen S, Taylor M, Yip L,
292 Zhong XZ, McGeer AJ, Mubareka S. 2020. Sensitivity of nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva
293 for the detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Clin*
294 *Infect Dis* doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa848.
- 295 18. Yonker LM, Neilan AM, Bartsch Y, Patel AB, Regan J, Arya P, Gootkind E, Park G,
296 Hardcastle M, John AS, Appleman L, Chiu ML, Fialkowski A, Flor DDI, Lima R, Bordt EA,
297 Yockey LJ, D'Avino P, Fischinger S, Shui JE, Lerou PH, Bonventre JV, Yu XG, Ryan ET,
298 Bassett IV, Irimia D, Edlow AG, Alter G, Li JZ, Fasano A. 2020. Pediatric SARS-CoV-2:
299 Clinical Presentation, Infectivity, and Immune Responses. *The Journal of Pediatrics* 0.
- 300 19. Cheuk S, Wong Y, Tse H, Siu HK, Kwong TS, Chu MY, Yau FYS, Cheung IYY, Tse CWS, Poon
301 KC, Cheung KC, Wu TC, Chan JWM, Cheuk W, Lung DC. 2020. Posterior oropharyngeal
302 saliva for the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Clin Infect Dis* doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa797.
- 303 20. Yokota I, Shane PY, Okada K, Unoki Y, Yang Y, Inao T, Sakamaki K, Iwasaki S, Hayasaka K,
304 Sugita J, Nishida M, Fujisawa S, Teshima T. 2020. Mass screening of asymptomatic
305 persons for SARS-CoV-2 using saliva. *Clin Infect Dis* doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1388.
- 306 21. Pujadas E, Chaudhry F, McBride R, Richter F, Zhao S, Wajnberg A, Nadkarni G, Glicksberg
307 BS, Houldsworth J, Cordon-Cardo C. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 viral load predicts COVID-19
308 mortality. *Lancet Respir Med* 8:e70.
- 309 22. Argyropoulos KV, Serrano A, Hu J, Black M, Feng X, Shen G, Call M, Kim MJ, Lytle A,
310 Belovarac B, Vougiouklakis T, Lin LH, Moran U, Heguy A, Troxel A, Snuderl M, Osman I,
311 Cotzia P, Jour G. 2020. Association of Initial Viral Load in Severe Acute Respiratory
312 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Patients with Outcome and Symptoms. *Am J*
313 *Pathol* 190:1881-1887.
- 314 23. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, Lau YC, Wong JY, Guan Y, Tan X, Mo X,
315 Chen Y, Liao B, Chen W, Hu F, Zhang Q, Zhong M, Wu Y, Zhao L, Zhang F, Cowling BJ, Li F,
316 Leung GM. 2020. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19.
317 *Nat Med* 26:672-675.

319

320 **Table 1. Performance of Saliva and NP specimens**

		First-time Positives	All Positives
All samples		N=70	N=97
No. (%)	Saliva	57 (81.4)	79 (81.4)
No. (%)	NP	62 (88.6)	87 (89.7)
Pediatric (all ages)		N=34	N=43
No. (%)	Saliva	28 (82.4)	34 (79.1%)
No. (%)	NP	29 (85.3)	38 (88.4)
< 10 years old		N=12	N=15
No. (%)	Saliva	10 (83.3)	12 (80.0)
No. (%)	NP	10 (83.3)	13 (86.7)
11-18 years old		N=22	N=28
No. (%)	Saliva	18 (81.8)	22 (78.6)
No. (%)	NP	19 (86.4)	25 (89.3)
Adult		N=36	N=54
No. (%)	Saliva	29 (80.6)	45 (83.3)
No. (%)	NP	33 (91.7)	49 (90.7)

321

322 **Table 2. Performance of Saliva and NP specimens in Symptomatic Patients**

		Symptomatic (%)		Asymptomatic (%)	
		First-time Positives	All Positives	First-time Positives	All Positives
All samples		N=38	N=55	N=32	N=42
No. (%)	Saliva	34 (89.5)	49 (89.1)	23 (71.9)	30 (71.4)
No. (%)	NP	36 (94.7)	51 (92.7)	26 (81.3)	36 (85.7)
All Pediatric (0-18 y)		N=20	N=23	N=14	N=20
No. (%)	Saliva	17 (85.0)	19 (82.6)	11 (78.6)	15 (75.0)
No. (%)	NP	18 (90.0)	21 (91.3)	11 (78.6)	17 (85.0)
< 10 y		N=6	N=8	N=6	N=7
No. (%)	Saliva	6 (100)	7 (87.5)	4 (66.7)	5 (71.4)
No. (%)	NP	5 (83.3)	7 (87.5)	5 (83.3)	6 (85.7)
11-18 y		N=14	N=15	N=8	N=13
No. (%)	Saliva	11 (78.6)	12 (80.0)	7 (87.5)	10 (76.9)
No. (%)	NP	13 (92.9)	14 (93.3)	6 (75.0)	11 (84.6)
Adult (>18 y)		N=18	N=32	N=18	N=22
No. (%)	Saliva	17 (94.4)	30 (93.8)	12 (66.7)	15 (68.2)
No. (%)	NP	18 (100)	30 (93.8)	15 (83.3)	19 (86.4)

323

324 **Figure Legends**

325 **Figure 1. Concordance of Ct values from Saliva and NP swabs.** Comparison of Ct values
326 from paired saliva and nasopharyngeal swab specimens in (A) adult and (B) pediatric patients
327 that were positive for SARS-CoV-2. Each line represents the corresponding paired specimen. (C)
328 Regression curve plotting Ct values from paired saliva and nasopharyngeal swab specimens that
329 were positive for SARS-CoV-2 reveal a linear association between the Ct values obtained from
330 the two specimen types.

331


332 **Figure 2. Comparison of Ct values from asymptomatic and symptomatic populations.** The
333 Ct values from saliva and nasopharyngeal swab specimens collected from our SARS-CoV-2
334 positive asymptomatic (open circle) and symptomatic (filled circle) patients in our (A) adult
335 populations and (B) pediatric cohort.

336

337 **Figure 3. Ct values of saliva and NP swab samples in relation to days between time of**
338 **symptom onset to time of collection for testing.** The Ct values of (A) adult and (B) pediatric
339 patients tested positive by both nasopharyngeal swab (black solid circle) and saliva (black open
340 circle), nasopharyngeal swab only (blue filled circle), and saliva only (blue open circle) are
341 depicted in reference to when they were tested since symptom onset (days).

342


343 **Figure 1.**



344

345

346 **Figure 2.**




347

348

349

350 **Figure 3.**



351

352