

1
2 **Clinical Performance of Direct RT-PCR Testing of Raw Saliva for Detection of SARS-**
3 **CoV-2 in Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Individuals**

4
5
6 Rosa Castillo-Bravo^{1,*}, Noel Lucca^{1,*}, Linyi Lai¹, Killian Marlborough¹, Galina Brychkova¹,
7 Charlie Lonergan¹, Justin O’Grady², Nabil-Fareed Alikhan², Alexander J. Trotter², Andrew J.
8 Page², Breda Smyth^{3,4}, Peter C. McKeown¹, Jelena D. M. Feenstra^{5,+}, Camilla Ulekleiv⁵, Oceane
9 Sorel⁵, Manoj Gandhi⁵, and Charles Spillane^{1,+}

10
11 Affiliations: ¹Genetics & Biotechnology Lab, Ryan Institute, National University of Ireland
12 Galway, University Road, Galway H91 REW4, Ireland; ²Quadram Institute Bioscience, Norwich
13 Research Park, Norwich, Norfolk, UK; ³College of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences,
14 National University of Ireland Galway, Ireland; ⁴Health Service Executive (HSE) West, Merlin
15 Park University Hospital, Galway, Ireland; ⁵Thermo Fisher Scientific, South San Francisco,
16 USA.

17
18 *These authors contributed equally to this publication

19
20 +Authors for correspondence

21
22
23

24

25 **Abstract**

26 RT-qPCR tests based on RNA extraction from nasopharyngeal swab samples are promoted as
27 the “gold standard” for SARS-CoV-2 detection. However, self-collected saliva samples offer a
28 non-invasive alternative more suited to high-throughput testing. This study evaluated the
29 performance of TaqPath COVID-19 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0 assay for detection of SARS-CoV-
30 2 in raw saliva relative to a lab-developed direct RT-qPCR test (SalivaDirect-based PCR) and a
31 RT-qPCR test based on RNA extraction from NPS samples. Both samples were collected from
32 symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals (N=615). Saliva samples were tested for SARS-
33 CoV-2 using the TaqPath COVID-19 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0 and the SalivaDirect-based PCR,
34 while RNA extracts from NPS samples were tested by RT-qPCR according to the Irish national
35 testing system. The TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast PCR detected SARS-CoV-2 in 52 saliva
36 samples, of which 51 were also positive with the SalivaDirect-based PCR. 49 samples displayed
37 concordant results with the NPS extraction-based method, while three samples were positive on
38 raw saliva. Among the negative samples, 10 discordant cases were found with the TaqPath
39 COVID-19 Fast PCR (PPA=85.7%; NPA=99.5%), when compared to the RNA extraction-based
40 NPS method, performing similarly to the SalivaDirect-based PCR (PPA=87.5%; NPA=99.5%).
41 The direct RT-qPCR testing of saliva samples shows high concordance with NPS extraction-
42 based method for SARS-CoV-2 detection, providing a cost-effective and highly-scalable system
43 for high-throughput COVID-19 rapid-testing.

44 **Introduction**

45 The emergence of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in Wuhan in
46 2019 led to a global pandemic of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). SARS-CoV-2 can lead
47 to both symptomatic and asymptomatic infections, making detection of infected individuals
48 challenging if based solely on symptomatic diagnostic testing. To combat viral spread and ensure
49 public health, countries have implemented different strategies related to diagnostic, screening
50 and surveillance testing. COVID-19 tests should exhibit high sensitivity and quick turn-around-
51 times to adapt treatment, reduce the spread of disease, and adjust public health interventions to
52 the local epidemiology. Establishing COVID-19 testing in high-throughput settings such as
53 schools or workplaces also requires tests that are easy to use, that require minimal resources and
54 have a high acceptance rate by the individuals involved in the testing¹.

55
56 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in RNA extracted from nasopharyngeal swab (NPS) samples using
57 quantitative RT-qPCR is considered to be the gold standard for identification of COVID-19
58 infection, as the virus typically infects the upper respiratory tract. However, reliable collection of
59 NPS requires trained health care professionals, and NPS samples can be difficult to obtain from
60 some individuals due to the discomfort associated with the technique. Using saliva as an
61 alternative sample type to NPS offers several advantages, including non-invasive self-collection,
62 reduced risk of viral transmission and lower sample costs in terms of trained health care
63 personnel, personal protective equipment and costs associated with sample collection².

64
65 A number of studies have shown that saliva and NPS RT-PCR-based tests exhibited comparable
66 analytical performance³⁻¹⁰. In addition, several reports indicate that saliva might be more

67 sensitive than nasopharyngeal or nasal swabs for diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection, especially
68 for asymptomatic cases or with the emergence of new SARS-CoV-2 variants that can have a
69 different tropism compared to earlier variants^{7, 11-13}. Indeed, the 2021 guidance on the use of
70 saliva as sample material for COVID-19 testing highlighted the potential of saliva for nucleic
71 acid based (i.e. PCR based) SARS-CoV-2 testing, while cautioning on the use of saliva as a
72 sample for rapid antigen or antibody tests¹⁴.

73
74 The aim of this retrospective study was to evaluate the performance of the TaqPath™ COVID-19
75 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0 and our SalivaDirect-based (SDB) RT-PCR protocol in raw saliva
76 specimens in comparison to the NPS RNA extraction-based TaqPath™ COVID-19 CE-IVD
77 RT-PCR which is considered to be the gold standard for the detection of SARS-CoV-2.

78

79 **Methods**

80 **Clinical specimens**

81 Saliva samples from 615 individuals were collected in the Republic of Ireland (Galway) between
82 February and May 2021 at two locations (Airport Testing Centre and National University of
83 Ireland Galway). All individuals provided a signed informed consent, and the study was
84 approved by the NUI Galway Research Ethics Committee (Approval Number: 2020.08.016;
85 Amend 2102). Of the 615 individuals, 39.7% (N=244) were symptomatic, 35.3% (N=217) were
86 asymptomatic, while the information on the symptomatic status was not available for the
87 remaining part of the cohort (Figure 1A). The Asymptomatic or Symptomatic status of each
88 individual was assigned based on answer given to the question “*Reason why you are being tested*
89 *by the HSE*” in the registration form that was provided to each volunteers. Each individual who

90 indicated that they had a cough and/or high temperature were classified as symptomatic, while
91 others were classified as asymptomatic (such individuals had been referred for testing as they
92 had been contact traced in accordance with the government guidelines of the time). All saliva
93 samples were tested upon collection using the SalivaDirect-based RT-PCR. Concurrent to saliva
94 collection, NPS were collected and tested for SARS-CoV-2 presence using an RNA extraction-
95 based method according to the national COVID-19 testing system in Ireland run by the Health
96 Service Executive (HSE). Following circa 9 months of storage at -20 °C, raw saliva samples
97 were thawed and re-tested using the lab's SDB RT-qPCR as well as the TaqPath™ COVID-19
98 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0. Exclusion criteria included: inconclusive result on the TaqPath™
99 COVID-19 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0 and altered status prior to and following storage on the
100 SDB RT-PCR test.

101

102 **SARS-CoV-2 detection**

103 Raw saliva samples were tested upon collection and following storage using the SDB RT-PCR
104 test. In brief, the samples were treated according to the SalivaDirect protocol; 25 uL of each raw
105 saliva sample was collected on a 2.0 mL Eppendorf tube and treated with Proteinase K at 2.5
106 ug/uL final concentration followed by heat inactivation at 95 °C for 5 minutes. RT-PCR was
107 performed on the Applied Biosystems StepOnePlus™ Real-Time PCR System using the Applied
108 Biosystem TaqMan™ Fast Virus 1-Step Master Mix together with the CDC 2019-Novel
109 Coronavirus Real-time RT-PCR diagnostic panel and results analysed using the StepOne™
110 Software v2.3. In parallel, saliva samples were tested using the TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast PCR
111 Combo Kit 2.0 according to the manufacturer's instructions. The TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast
112 PCR Combo Kit 2.0 is a fast direct PCR, without RNA extraction, which includes 8 targets

113 across 3 SARS-CoV-2 genes (Orf1a, Orf1b and N) to ensure accurate detection of SARS-CoV-2
114 as new mutations continue to arise. RT-qPCR was performed on the QuantStudio™ 5 Real Time
115 PCR Instrument with QuantStudio™ Design and Analysis software v1.5.1, and results were
116 analyzed using the Pathogen Interpretive Software CE-IVD Edition 1.1.0. NPS samples were
117 tested within the national HSE testing program using an RNA extraction-based RT-PCR with the
118 TaqPath™ COVID-19 CE-IVD RT-PCR kit. The study design is shown in Figure 1B.

119

120 **Whole genome sequencing of SARS-CoV-2**

121 Whole genome sequencing (WGS) of a subset of the SARS-CoV-2 positive saliva samples (N =
122 46) was performed on RNA extracted from saliva samples via a Quick DNA/RNA Viral
123 MagBead kit (Zymo, R2140). RNA samples were sent on dry ice to the Quadram Institute
124 Bioscience, UK for WGS of SARS-CoV-2. Viral RNA was converted in cDNA and then
125 amplified using the ARTIC protocol v3 (LoCost)¹⁵ with sequencing libraries prepared using
126 CoronaHiT¹⁶. WGS was performed using the Illumina NextSeq 500 platform with one positive
127 control and one negative control. The raw reads were demultiplexed using bcl2fastq (v2.20). The
128 reads were used to generate a consensus sequence using the ARTIC bioinformatic pipeline
129 (<https://github.com/connor-lab/ncov2019-artic-nf>). Briefly, the reads had adapters trimmed with
130 TrimGalore¹⁷, and were aligned to the Wuhan Hu-1 reference genome (accession MN908947.3)
131 using BWA-MEM (v0.7.17)¹⁸; the ARTIC amplicons were trimmed and a consensus built using
132 iVar (v.1.3.0)¹⁹. Genomes that contained more than 10% missing data were excluded from
133 further analysis to ensure high quality phylogenetic analysis. PANGO lineages were assigned
134 using Pangolin (v2.3.2) (<https://github.com/cov-lineages/pangolin>) and PangoLEARN model
135 dated 2021-02-21²⁰.

136

137

138 **Results**

139 **RT-qPCR on raw saliva shows concordance with RT-qPCR on NPS-extracted RNA for** 140 **SARS-CoV-2 screening**

141 A total of 615 raw saliva samples obtained from symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals
142 were tested following long-term storage at -20 °C using both the TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast
143 PCR Combo Kit 2.0 and the lab's SDB-PCR test. At the time of saliva sample collection, all
144 individuals also provided NPS samples which were tested using an extraction-based RT-qPCR
145 test in an HSE diagnostic laboratory. For all individuals in the study, the result of the RT-qPCR
146 test from the nasopharyngeal swab sample was available. All raw saliva samples were tested
147 both at the time of collection and again following long-term storage at -20 °C using the SDB RT-
148 qPCR assay without an RNA extraction step. For all samples matching results were obtained at
149 the time of sampling and at the time of repeated testing following long-term storage using the
150 SDB RT-qPCR, indicating that no deterioration of sample had occurred.

151

152 To evaluate the performance of the direct RT-qPCR testing approach of raw saliva for detection
153 of SARS-CoV-2, results obtained by testing with the TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast PCR Combo
154 Kit 2.0 were compared to the results based on the nasopharyngeal swab testing using an
155 extraction-based RT-qPCR method (Table 1). SARS-CoV-2 was detected using the TaqPath™
156 COVID-19 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0 in 52 raw saliva samples from the cohort panel, of which
157 51 were in full agreement with both the SDB-PCR results at the time of collection and re-testing
158 following storage at -20 °C. Interestingly, two samples tested positive only from raw saliva

159 (35<Ct<37). In both cases they tested positive consistently for both the TaqPath™ COVID-19
160 Fast assay and the SDB-PCR, while the RNA extraction-based testing of the NPS in these cases
161 yielded a negative result.

162 The performance of the lab's SDB RT-qPCR in raw saliva samples was also evaluated in
163 comparison to the nasopharyngeal swab testing using an extraction-based RT-qPCR method
164 (Table 2) and performed similarly to the TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast assay.

165

166 **Raw saliva-based PCR testing is consistent and can be more sensitive than NPS**

167 SARS-CoV-2 was detected using the TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0 in 52 raw
168 saliva samples from the cohort panel, from which 51 were in full agreement with both the SDB-
169 PCR at the time of collection and re-testing following storage at -20°C. Interestingly, 2 samples
170 were positive on raw saliva (35<Ct<37) using both the TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast assay and the
171 SDB-PCR, while the RNA extraction-based testing of the NPS in these cases showed a negative
172 result.

173

174 Whole genome sequencing data was obtained for 46 of the SARS-CoV-2 positive samples. As
175 expected based on the variants circulating in the Republic of Ireland during the period of sample
176 collection (between February 8th and May 6th, 2021), the vast majority of the positive samples
177 consisted of the B.1.1.7 lineage (N=45), with one sample identified as the B.1.562 lineage. When
178 the SARS-CoV-2 clade was determined, 91.1% of the positive samples belonged to the 20I
179 (Alpha, V1) clade, while 8.9% of the samples consisted of the 20A clade. WGS data was
180 available for one of the two samples that showed positivity using both saliva-based testing
181 methods while negative on RNA from NPS, and identified the presence of the Alpha VOC in the
182 sample.

183

184 **Saliva-based testing offers good performance for different SARS-CoV-2 detection,**
185 **including at low viral burden**

186 Of the 52 samples in which SARS-CoV-2 presence was detected using the TaqPath™ COVID-
187 19 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0, 42.3% (N=22) of the samples showed a Ct<25, 44.2% (N=23)
188 samples were between $25 \leq \text{Ct} < 30$ and 13.4% (N=7) of the samples were of low viral load – with
189 $\text{Ct} \geq 30$ (Figure 2A). Similar sample distribution across the 3 Ct ranges could be observed using
190 the lab's SDB RT-qPCR (Figure 2A). The comparison of median Ct values in SARS-CoV-2
191 positive individuals revealed no significant difference between the symptomatic and the
192 asymptomatic patient cohort using both of the RT-qPCR assays used directly on raw saliva
193 samples (Figure 2B-C).

194

195

196 **Discussion**

197 From the outset of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, both nucleic acid and antigen-based tests were
198 developed and deployed, with a major focus on nasopharyngeal swabs as the biological sample
199 of choice to be tested. However, saliva samples are the direct agents of transmission of SARS-
200 CoV-2, through droplets and aerosols, thereby allowing for direct testing for presence of the
201 biological agent within its transmission vehicle. While RT-PCR-based testing of RNA extracted
202 from NPS samples has been considered as the “gold-standard” for SARS-CoV-2 detection, saliva
203 has emerged during the pandemic as a valuable sampling method to improve SARS-CoV-2
204 detection and workflows²¹. Besides the obvious advantage of self-collection associated with
205 lower costs and reduced risks for viral transmission,^{8, 10} raw saliva samples can be processed
206 directly through RT-qPCR assays which reduces time and removes costs associated with RNA
207 extraction. In addition, saliva (through droplets and aerosols) constitutes a transmission route for
208 SARS-CoV-2 infection and can contain high viral loads of infectious virus as reported by recent
209 studies^{7, 11, 12, 22}. Thus, direct testing for SARS-CoV-2 in saliva can help monitor viral loads
210 across variant surges and assess risk of transmission.

211
212 Depending on variants, individual factors (genotype, age, health etc) and immunological status
213 (vaccination, prior exposure), SARS-CoV-2 infections can range from asymptomatic to severe
214 symptoms. In the current study we demonstrate that direct RT-qPCR from raw saliva samples
215 using either our in-house developed SDB-PCR assay or a commercially available CE-IVD
216 marked TaqPath Fast kit enables accurate detection of SARS-CoV-2 in both symptomatic and
217 asymptomatic individuals with PPA of >83% and NPA of >99% when compared to the “gold-
218 standard” RNA extraction-based RT-qPCR from nasopharyngeal swabs (Figure 2). Despite the

219 long-term storage (~ 9 months) of raw saliva samples included in the study, the accuracy
220 between saliva and NPS testing was high. This demonstrates that raw saliva samples can be
221 easily stored for long periods without the need for expensive additives or preservatives.

222

223 A number of studies have investigated the use of saliva as a sample method for SARS-CoV-2
224 detection in comparison to nasopharyngeal swab testing. Although most studies compared RNA
225 extraction-based protocols, the findings of such studies were consistent with our results which
226 used direct RT-qPCR on raw saliva. For saliva samples vs NPS, Pasomsub *et al.* reported a
227 diagnostic sensitivity of 84.3% and specificity of 98.9%²³, while Yokota *et al.* reported a
228 sensitivity of 92% and specificity of 99.96% for saliva sample versus NPS²⁴. Other studies
229 investigating direct PCR saliva based testing obtained comparable results with Moreno-Contreras
230 *et al.* reporting sensitivity of 86.2%²⁵ and Vogels *et al.* a positive agreement of 94.1% and a
231 negative agreement of 90.9% for direct PCR from saliva compared to extraction-based NPS
232 testing²⁶. Procop *et al.*, reported 100% positive agreement (38/38 positive specimens) and 99.4%
233 negative agreement (177/178 negative specimens) by using saliva as specimens from
234 symptomatic patients suspected of having COVID-19²⁷. Saliva specimens from Covid-19
235 confirmed patients even provide greater detection sensitivity and consistency due to an
236 approximately 5X higher viral load compared to nasopharyngeal swabs¹⁰. Indeed, saliva can
237 offer higher sensitivity and lower variability of saliva testing when compared to the NPS
238 specimens^{2, 11}. Our results also demonstrated that two saliva samples gave a positive result using
239 both of the saliva-based direct PCR methods, one of which was confirmed by WGS, while these
240 same samples tested negative on the extraction-based RT-PCR testing of matched

241 nasopharyngeal swabs. This finding suggests that saliva samples may result in greater accuracy
242 from PCR-based testing than nasopharyngeal swabs.

243 In addition to structural differences between variants at the nucleic or polypeptide levels, the
244 viral load and clearance across tissues and disease stages can potentially differ between variants
245 which in turn could have an impact on what biological specimens are most suitable for detecting
246 different variants. Indeed, the omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant poses a significant challenge for
247 nasal swab based testing as there are indications that saliva based samples may be more effective
248 for diagnostic detection of the omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant relative to NSPs^{12,22}. Marais *et al.*
249 have showed that saliva was a preferred sample for the detection of Omicron variant¹¹, which is
250 shown to have an altered tropism for the upper respiratory tract compared to the previous SARS-
251 CoV-2 variants¹³.

252
253 The use of a direct-PCR workflows offers an advantage in terms of time-to-result, which in case
254 of both the TaqPath Fast kit and the lab-based SDB assay is under 2 hours. Rapid PCR-based
255 SARS-CoV-2 detection is particularly important in high-frequency testing settings which is often
256 associated with asymptomatic routine testing at workplaces or schools. Our data demonstrate no
257 difference in viral loads between the asymptomatic and symptomatic individuals (Figure 2B-C),
258 in line with previous studies²⁸. Several studies have also evaluated the use of RT loop-mediated
259 isothermal amplification (RT-LAMP) in saliva samples for fast detection of SARS-CoV-2. For
260 instance, one study tested different RT-LAMP testing methods using saliva or NPS as sample,
261 and found similar results when using purified/precipitated RNA from each sample type but with
262 significantly reduced sensitivity when the sample is used directly (a reduction from 93% to

263 65%)²⁹. Similar results for direct RT-LAMP were obtained by other groups, indicating
264 significantly lower sensitivity of such approach compared to direct RT-PCR²⁹⁻³¹.

265

266 A desirable feature of any diagnostic kit is the ability to detect different variants, particularly for
267 the case of RNA viruses such as SARS-CoV-2 that are prone to mutation and recombination.

268 While genome sequencing is ideal for characterisation of individual samples, large-scale testing

269 based on genome sequencing has not to date been scaled for everyday practice. All diagnostic

270 tests for SARS-CoV-2 face the challenge of a constantly mutating viral population with periodic

271 emergence of viral variants that display fitness advantages that promote their transmission³². For

272 nucleic acid based tests, such challenges to detect new variants arise for homology-based

273 molecular tests (e.g. PCR, LAMP) where the mutations (indels) arise in regions that are detected

274 by sequence homology of the diagnostic test (e.g. the primers)³³. The emergence of contagious

275 SARS-CoV-2 variants that have undergone significant mutational changes, and display fitness

276 advantages for enhanced transmission in human populations (vaccinated or unvaccinated), can

277 cause surges in COVID-19 cases, as recently exemplified by the Omicron variant. Therefore,

278 there is a high demand for accurate, mutation-resilient, high-throughput testing solutions for both

279 symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. The development of multiplex assays with several

280 targets across the more conserved regions of the SARS-CoV-2 genome, as for example, the 8

281 targets in the TaqPath Fast 2.0 assay (targeting Orf1a, Orf1b and N gene) is crucial to enable

282 accurate detection of the virus and avoid false negative testing caused by viral mutations,

283 especially during high surges of cases.

284

285 **Conclusions**

286 The current COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the need for diagnostic testing, screening and
287 surveillance methods that are high-throughput and cost-effective. While point-of-care antigen
288 testing has been deployed at scale globally, the reality is that the detection limit of antigen tests
289 remains poorer than PCR-based methods. However, increasing the throughput of PCR-based
290 testing for more accurate detection of SARS-CoV-2 has been constrained by the use of NPS
291 which are costly and cumbersome to collect. In this study, we demonstrated that highly accurate
292 PCR-based testing can be conducted directly on saliva samples, using a Saliva-Direct based test
293 and a novel CE-IVD marked TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0. Saliva-based
294 testing for SARS-CoV-2 provides a highly scalable and accurate approach for rapid detection of
295 SARS-CoV-2 especially during surges of COVID-19 cases, for large-scale mass-testing which
296 includes screening and surveillance programs.

297

298 **Acknowledgements**

299 This study was funded by Science Foundation Ireland grant no. 20/COV/0198 and 21/COV/3753 to
300 CS. We are very grateful to Anne Wyllie (Yale University) and Michael Crone (Imperial
301 College) for support and advice on this work. We are also grateful to the Health Service
302 Executive of Ireland for assistance in sampling.

303

304 References

- 305 1. Mina MJ, Andersen KG: COVID-19 testing: One size does not fit all. *Science* 2021,
306 371:126-127.
- 307 2. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar
308 P, Warren JL, Geng B, Muenker MC, Moore AJ: Saliva or nasopharyngeal swab
309 specimens for detection of SARS-CoV-2. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020,
310 383:1283-1286.
- 311 3. Bastos ML, Perlman-Arrow S, Menzies D, Campbell JR: The Sensitivity and Costs of
312 Testing for SARS-CoV-2 Infection With Saliva Versus Nasopharyngeal Swabs : A
313 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2021, 174:501-510.
- 314 4. Butler-Laporte G, Lawandi A, Schiller I, Yao M, Dendukuri N, McDonald EG, Lee TC:
315 Comparison of Saliva and Nasopharyngeal Swab Nucleic Acid Amplification Testing for
316 Detection of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern Med*
317 2021, 181:353-360.
- 318 5. Connor MC, Copeland M, Curran T: Investigation of saliva, tongue swabs and buccal
319 swabs as alternative specimen types to nasopharyngeal swabs for SARS-CoV-2 testing. *J*
320 *Clin Virol* 2022, 146:105053.
- 321 6. de Paula Eduardo F, Bezinelli LM, de Araujo CAR, Moraes JVV, Birbrair A, Pinho JRR,
322 Hamerschlak N, Al-Hashimi I, Heller D: Self-collected unstimulated saliva, oral swab,
323 and nasopharyngeal swab specimens in the detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Clin Oral Investig*
324 2022, 26:1561-1567.
- 325 7. Williams E, Bond K, Zhang B, Putland M, Williamson DA: Saliva as a Noninvasive
326 Specimen for Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020, 58.
- 327 8. Fernandes LL, Pacheco VB, Borges L, Athwal HK, de Paula Eduardo F, Bezinelli L,
328 Correa L, Jimenez M, Dame-Teixeira N, Lombaert IMA, Heller D: Saliva in the
329 Diagnosis of COVID-19: A Review and New Research Directions. *J Dent Res* 2020,
330 99:1435-1443.
- 331 9. Alqutaibi AY, Saeed MH, Aboalrejal AN: Saliva May Be Considered as Reliable Tool
332 for Diagnosis of COVID-19 When Compared With Nasopharynx or Throat Swabs. *J*
333 *Evid Based Dent Pract* 2021, 21:101530.
- 334 10. Wyllie AL, Fournier J, Casanovas-Massana A, Campbell M, Tokuyama M, Vijayakumar
335 P, Geng B, Muenker MC, Moore AJ, Vogels CBF, Petrone ME, Ott IM, Lu P,
336 Venkataraman A, Lu-Culligan A, Klein J, Earnest R, Simonov M, Datta R, Handoko R,
337 Naushad N, Sewanan LR, Valdez J, White EB, Lapidus S, Kalinich CC, Jiang X, Kim
338 DJ, Kudo E, Linehan M, Mao T, Moriyama M, Oh JE, Park A, Silva J, Song E,
339 Takahashi T, Taura M, Weizman O-E, Wong P, Yang Y, Bermejo S, Odio C, Omer SB,
340 Dela Cruz CS, Farhadian S, Martinello RA, Iwasaki A, Grubaugh ND, Ko AI: Saliva is
341 more sensitive for SARS-CoV-2 detection in COVID-19 patients than nasopharyngeal
342 swabs. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.2004.2016.20067835.
- 343 11. Marais Gert, Hsiao Nei-yuan, Iranzadeh Arash, Doolabh Deelan, Enoch Annabel, Chun-
344 yat Chu, Williamson Carolyn, Brink Adrian, Diana H: Saliva swabs are the preferred
345 sample for Omicron detection. *medRxiv* 2021.
- 346 12. Adamson B, Sikka R, Wyllie AL, Premsrirut P: Discordant SARS-CoV-2 PCR and Rapid
347 Antigen Test Results When Infectious: A December 2021 Occupational Case Series.
348 *medRxiv* 2022.


- 349 13. Hui KPY, Ho JCW, Cheung MC, Ng KC, Ching RHH, Lai KL, Kam TT, Gu H, Sit KY,
350 Hsin MKY, Au TWK, Poon LLM, Peiris M, Nicholls JM, Chan MCW: SARS-CoV-2
351 Omicron variant replication in human bronchus and lung ex vivo. *Nature* 2022.
- 352 14. Control ECfDPa: Considerations for the use of saliva as sample material for COVID-19
353 testing. Stockholm: ECDC, 2021.
- 354 15. Quick J: NCoV-2019 Sequencing Protocol v3 (LoCost). Protocolsio 2020.
- 355 16. Baker DJ, Aydin A, Le-Viet T, Kay GL, Rudder S, de Oliveira Martins L, Tedim AP,
356 Kolyva A, Diaz M, Alikhan NF, Meadows L, Bell A, Gutierrez AV, Trotter AJ, Thomson
357 NM, Gilroy R, Griffith L, Adriaenssens EM, Stanley R, Charles IG, Elumogo N, Wain J,
358 Prakash R, Meader E, Mather AE, Webber MA, Dervisevic S, Page AJ, O'Grady J:
359 CoronaHiT: high-throughput sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 genomes. *Genome Med* 2021,
360 13:21.
- 361 17. Krueger F: 2020. FelixKrueger/TrimGalore. Perl. 2016.
- 362 18. Heng L: Aligning Sequence Reads, Clone Sequences and Assembly Contigs with BWA-
363 MEM. ArXiv 2013:1303.3997 [q-Bio].
- 364 19. Grubaugh ND, Gangavarapu K, Quick J, Matteson NL, De Jesus JG, Main BJ, Tan AL,
365 Paul LM, Brackney DE, Grewal S, Gurfield N, Van Rompay KKA, Isern S, Michael SF,
366 Coffey LL, Loman NJ, Andersen KG: An amplicon-based sequencing framework for
367 accurately measuring intrahost virus diversity using PrimalSeq and iVar. *Genome Biol*
368 2019, 20:8.
- 369 20. Rambaut A, Holmes EC, O'Toole Á, Hill V, McCrone JT, Ruis C, du Plessis L, Pybus
370 OG: A dynamic nomenclature proposal for SARS-CoV-2 lineages to assist genomic
371 epidemiology. *Nat Microbiol* 2020, 5:1403-1407.
- 372 21. Tan SH, Allicock O, Armstrong-Hough M, Wyllie AL: Saliva as a gold-standard sample
373 for SARS-CoV-2 detection. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021, 9:562-564.
- 374 22. Lai J, German J, Hong F, Tai S-HS, McPhaul KM, Milton DK, Group ftUoMSR:
375 Comparison of Saliva and Mid-Turbinate Swabs for Detection of COVID-19. *medRxiv*
376 2022:2021.2012.2001.21267147.
- 377 23. Pasomsub E, Watcharananan SP, Boonyawat K, Janchompoo P, Wongtabtim G,
378 Sukswan W, Sungkanuparph S, Phuphuakrat A: Saliva sample as a non-invasive
379 specimen for the diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019: a cross-sectional study. *Clin*
380 *Microbiol Infect* 2021, 27:285.e281-285.e284.
- 381 24. Yokota I, Shane PY, Okada K, Unoki Y, Yang Y, Inao T, Sakamaki K, Iwasaki S,
382 Hayasaka K, Sugita J, Nishida M, Fujisawa S, Teshima T: Mass Screening of
383 Asymptomatic Persons for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Using
384 Saliva. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021, 73:e559-e565.
- 385 25. Moreno-Contreras J, Espinoza MA, Sandoval-Jaime C, Cantú-Cuevas MA, Barón-
386 Olivares H, Ortiz-Orozco OD, Muñoz-Rangel AV, Hernández-de la Cruz M, Eroza-
387 Osorio CM, Arias CF, López S: Saliva Sampling and Its Direct Lysis, an Excellent
388 Option To Increase the Number of SARS-CoV-2 Diagnostic Tests in Settings with
389 Supply Shortages. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020, 58.
- 390 26. Vogels CBF, Watkins AE, Harden CA, Brackney DE, Shafer J, Wang J, Caraballo C,
391 Kalinich CC, Ott IM, Fauver JR, Kudo E, Lu P, Venkataraman A, Tokuyama M, Moore
392 AJ, Muenker MC, Casanovas-Massana A, Fournier J, Bermejo S, Campbell M, Datta R,
393 Nelson A, Yale IRT, Dela Cruz CS, Ko AI, Iwasaki A, Krumholz HM, Matheus JD, Hui
394 P, Liu C, Farhadian SF, Sikka R, Wyllie AL, Grubaugh ND: SalivaDirect: A simplified

- 395 and flexible platform to enhance SARS-CoV-2 testing capacity. *Med (N Y)* 2021, 2:263-
396 280 e266.
- 397 27. Procop GW, Shrestha NK, Vogel S, Van Sickle K, Harrington S, Rhoads DD, Rubin BP,
398 Terpeluk P: A Direct Comparison of Enhanced Saliva to Nasopharyngeal Swab for the
399 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Symptomatic Patients. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020, 58.
- 400 28. Zuin M, Gentili V, Cervellati C, Rizzo R, Zuliani G: Viral Load Difference between
401 Symptomatic and Asymptomatic COVID-19 Patients: Systematic Review and Meta-
402 Analysis. *Infect Dis Rep* 2021, 13:645-653.
- 403 29. Uribe-Alvarez C, Lam Q, Baldwin DA, Chernoff J: Low saliva pH can yield false
404 positives results in simple RT-LAMP-based SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic tests. *PLoS One*
405 2021, 16:e0250202.
- 406 30. Nagura-Ikeda M, Imai K, Tabata S, Miyoshi K, Murahara N, Mizuno T, Horiuchi M,
407 Kato K, Imoto Y, Iwata M, Mimura S, Ito T, Tamura K, Kato Y: Clinical Evaluation of
408 Self-Collected Saliva by Quantitative Reverse Transcription-PCR (RT-qPCR), Direct
409 RT-qPCR, Reverse Transcription-Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification, and a Rapid
410 Antigen Test To Diagnose COVID-19. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020, 58:e01438-01420.
- 411 31. Taki K, Yokota I, Fukumoto T, Iwasaki S, Fujisawa S, Takahashi M, Negishi S,
412 Hayasaka K, Sato K, Oguri S, Nishida M, Sugita J, Konno S, Saito T, Teshima T: SARS-
413 CoV-2 detection by fluorescence loop-mediated isothermal amplification with and
414 without RNA extraction. *J Infect Chemother* 2021, 27:410-412.
- 415 32. Markov PV, Katzourakis A, Stilianakis NI: Antigenic evolution will lead to new SARS-
416 CoV-2 variants with unpredictable severity. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2022:1-2.
- 417 33. Rajib SA, Ogi Y, Hossain MB, Ikeda T, Tanaka E, Kawaguchi T, Satou Y: A SARS-
418 CoV-2 Delta variant containing mutation in the probe binding region used for RT-qPCR
419 test in Japan exhibited atypical PCR amplification and might induce false negative result.
420 *J Infect Chemother* 2022, 28:669-677.

421

422


423 Figure 1



424


425

426 Figure 2




B

TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0



C

In-house RT-PCR



427

428

		Extraction based RT-PCR from nasopharyngeal swab samples		
		Positive	Negative	Total
TaqPath™ COVID-19 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0	Positive	49	3	52
	Negative	10	534	544
Total		59	537	596
Positive Percent Agreement (PPA)		83.05% [71.54% to 90.52%]		
Negative Percent Agreement (NPA)		99.44% [98.37% to 99.81%]		

429

430 **Table 1. Positive and negative percent agreement of the raw saliva-based testing using the TaqPath™**
431 **COVID-19 Fast PCR Combo Kit 2.0 and the nasopharyngeal swab-based testing using an RNA-extraction RT-**
432 **PCR diagnostic assay.** Each individual provided one saliva and one nasopharyngeal swab sample on the same day.
433 The nasopharyngeal swabs were processed on the same or following day, while the saliva testing was performed on
434 samples following storage at -20 °C for several months.

435

436

		Extraction based RT-PCR from nasopharyngeal swab samples		
		Positive	Negative	Total
SDB RT-PCR assay	Positive	50	2	52
	Negative	9	535	544
	Total	59	537	596
Positive Percent Agreement (PPA)		84.75% [73.48% to 91.76%]		
Negative Percent Agreement (NPA)		99.63% [98.65% to 99.90%]		

437

438 **Table 2. Positive and negative percent agreement of the raw saliva-based testing using the SDB RT-PCR**
439 **assay and the nasopharyngeal swab-based testing using an RNA-extraction RT-PCR diagnostic assay.** Each
440 individual provided one saliva and one nasopharyngeal swab sample on the same day. The nasopharyngeal swabs
441 were processed on the same or following day, while the saliva testing was performed on samples following storage at
442 -20 °C for several months.

443

444 **Figure 1. Study design.**

445 **A)** Cohort description based on the symptomatic status. **B)** A total of 615 individuals provided
446 saliva and nasopharyngeal swab samples on the same day. Samples were processed according to
447 the algorithm shown.

448

449 **Figure 2. Saliva based SARS-CoV-2 testing Ct values.**

450 **A)** Distribution of samples across high, medium and low viral loads grouped by Ct value
451 detected with TaqPath Fast 2.0 kit or SDB RT-PCR. **B-C)** Comparison of the median Ct values
452 between the symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals positive for SARS-CoV-2 using either
453 the TaqPath COVID-19 Fast 2.0 kit (**B**) or the SDB RT-PCR test (**C**). The box plots show the
454 median (bold horizontal line), interquartile range (box), and total range (whiskers) of detected Ct
455 values.

456

457