

1 **Expansion of a low-cost, saliva-based PCR test for the detection of mpox virus**

2

3 Russell J Thomas^{1,2*}, Orchid M. Allicock^{1*}, Devyn Yolda-Carr¹, Katherine Fajardo¹, Sydney A. Steel¹,
4 Chessley B. Blacklock¹, Theresa Zepeda³, Maurice Brownlee⁴, Shyam Saladi^{2,3}, James Parkin³, Anne
5 L. Wyllie^{1,2}

6

7 ¹Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT,
8 USA; ²SalivaDirect Inc., New Haven, CT, USA; ³Neelyx Labs, Wood Dale, IL, USA; ⁴Wellness Homes
9 of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

10

11 *These authors contributed equally to the study

12

13 **Correspondence:**

14 Anne Wyllie

15 awyllie@gmail.com

16

17 **Word Count:** 3,071 (including references in square brackets)

18

19

20 **ABSTRACT**

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

26
27 **Methods.** We evaluated five PCR assays and compared their detection of mpox DNA
28 extracted from 30 saliva specimens collected in Spectrum SDNA-1000 tubes. We sequenced
29 seven mpox-positive samples and assessed concordance with the primers and probes of the
30 PCR assays. Following, we incorporated these PCR assays into a simplified, extraction-free
31 protocol to evaluate its feasibility for testing raw (unsupplemented) saliva samples. To further
32 explore the potential of this approach, we investigated the stability of mpox detection in raw
33 saliva diluted 1:10 and 1:100 in mpox-negative saliva, after storage at 4°C, room temperature
34 (~19°C), 30°C, and 40°C for 72 hours and through simulated shipping conditions.

35
36 **Results.** Despite identifying three nucleotide substitutions in the CDC's Monkeypox virus
37 Generic Real-Time PCR Test's primer sequences, we observed no difference in the mean Ct-
38 values generated between assays. We successfully incorporated each assay into our saliva-
39 based extraction-free PCR protocol. Detection in raw saliva following storage at 4°C, ~19°C,
40 and 30°C remained relatively stable for 24-48 hours and following simulated shipping
41 conditions.

42
43 **Conclusions.** This pilot investigation supports a flexible, saliva-based, extraction-free PCR
44 test as a promising approach for diagnosis, outbreak response or ongoing surveillance of
45 mpox. With detection in raw saliva remaining stable for 24-48 hours and through simulated
46 shipping temperatures, saliva-based sampling and simplified testing could reduce diagnostic
47 costs, increase access to testing and address hurdles in low- and middle-income countries.

48
49 **Keywords:** mpox, saliva, qPCR, molecular diagnostics

50 **BACKGROUND**

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

58

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

65

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

82

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

92

93

94 **METHODS**

95 *Ethics statement*

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

100

101 *Samples*

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

107

108 *PCR assay performance*

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

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

119

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

132

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

136

137

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

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

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

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

140

141 *Extraction-free workflows*

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

149

150 *Stability of detection of mpox virus in raw, un-supplemented saliva*

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

163

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

169

170 *Amplicon sequencing from saliva samples*

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

179

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

189

190 *Statistical methods*

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

195

196 To evaluate the impact of temperature over time, a linear model was used. An interaction
197 term was used to evaluate the effect of time and temperature by sample (time*temperature).
198 The ΔC_t value represents the change in the C_t value from saliva under each condition
199 (categorical). The reference group for time was zero, and the reference group for temperature
200 was room temperature ($\sim 19^\circ\text{C}$). Samples where no mpox virus DNA was detected were set to
201 $C_t = 45.00$. P values of less than 0.05 were considered significant.

202

203

204 **RESULTS**

205 *PCR assay performance*

206 The limit of detection (LOD), determined using the synthetic mpox virus DNA (ATCC VR-
207 3270SD) was 3 copies/ μl for the Mirimus MPOX RT-PCR assay and 1 copy/ μl for both CDC
208 assays. The Logix Smart™ Mpx (2-Gene) RUO assay did not detect the synthetic DNA used
209 so the LOD could not be determined. When testing DNA extracted from saliva collected in
210 Spectrum SDNA-1000 collection devices, all assays performed comparably at detection
211 ($p > 0.05$). Mean C_t values generated did not differ across the assays ($p = 0.59$).

212

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


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

217

218 *Stability of detection of mpox virus in saliva*

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

229 data).




230

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

240

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



245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

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

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

256

257 *Amplicon sequencing from saliva samples*

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

263

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

269

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

278

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

284

285 **Table 3. CDC Monkeypox virus Generic Real-Time PCR Test primer concordance with**
286 **1,483 sequences aligned to reference sequence ‘NC_063383’**

Nucleotide Type	Nucleotide Sequence	Number Observed
Mpox Sequence	5'-GGA <u>AAG</u> TGT AAA GAC AAC GAA TAC AG-3'	1,484 (100%)
Forward Primer	5'-GGA <u>AA</u>A TGT AAA GAC AAC GAA TAC AG-3'	
Mpox Sequence	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT <u>GAA</u> AGC GTA-3'	1,476 (99.5%)
Reverse Primer	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT <u>GG</u>A AGC GTA-3'	
Mpox Sequence	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT <u>AAA</u> AGC GTA-3'	3 (0.2%)
Reverse Primer	5'-GCT ATC ACA TAA TCT <u>G</u>G A AGC GTA-3'	

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

289

290

291 **DISCUSSION**

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

306

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

322

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

331

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

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

341

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

358

359

360 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

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

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

369

370 **ROLE OF THE FUNDER**

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

373

374 **AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS.**

375 ALW conceived and designed the study. OMA, DY-C and ALW managed the study. TZ, MB,
376 SS and JP managed sample collection. RJT, OMA, DY-C and KF were responsible for and
377 performed the assays. RJT, OMA and ALW performed the analyses and interpreted the data.
378 RJT, CB, SAS, OMA and ALW drafted the manuscript. All authors amended and commented
379 on the final manuscript.

380

381 **DISCLOSURES**

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

387

388

389 **REFERENCES**

- 390 [1] R. Pebody, Human Monkeypox in Kasai Oriental, Democratic Republic of Congo,
391 February 1996 – October 1997: preliminary report, *Weekly Releases (1997–2007)* 1
392 (1997) 1015.
- 393 [2] Thornhill John P., Barkati Sapha, Walmsley Sharon, Rockstroh Juergen, Antinori Andrea,
394 Harrison Luke B., Palich Romain, Nori Achyuta, Reeves Iain, Habibi Maximillian S., Apea
395 Vanessa, Boesecke Christoph, Vandekerckhove Linos, Yakubovsky Michal, Sendagorta
396 Elena, Blanco Jose L., Florence Eric, Moschese Davide, Maltez Fernando M., Goorhuis
397 Abraham, Pourcher Valerie, Migaud Pascal, Noe Sebastian, Pintado Claire, Maggi
398 Fabrizio, Hansen Ann-Brit E., Hoffmann Christian, Lezama Jezer I., Mussini Cristina,
399 Cattelan AnnaMaria, Makofane Keletso, Tan Darrell, Nozza Silvia, Nemeth Johannes,
400 Klein Marina B., Orkin Chloe M., *Monkeypox Virus Infection in Humans across 16*
401 *Countries — April–June 2022*, *N. Engl. J. Med.* 387 (2022) 679–691.
- 402 [3] N. Girometti, R. Byrne, M. Bracchi, J. Heskin, A. McOwan, V. Tittle, K. Gedela, C. Scott,

- 403 S. Patel, J. Gohil, D. Nugent, T. Suchak, M. Dickinson, M. Feeney, B. Mora-Peris, K.
404 Stegmann, K. Plaha, G. Davies, L.S.P. Moore, N. Mughal, D. Asboe, M. Boffito, R.
405 Jones, G. Whitlock, Demographic and clinical characteristics of confirmed human
406 monkeypox virus cases in individuals attending a sexual health centre in London, UK: an
407 observational analysis, *Lancet Infect. Dis.* 22 (2022) 1321–1328.
- 408 [4] P.R. Pittman, J.W. Martin, P.M. Kingebeni, J.-J.M. Tamfum, G. Mwema, Q. Wan, P.
409 Ewala, J. Alonga, G. Bilulu, M.G. Reynolds, X. Quinn, S. Norris, M.B. Townsend, P.S.
410 Satheshkumar, J. Wadding, B. Soltis, A. Honko, F.B. Güereña, L. Korman, K. Patterson,
411 D.A. Schwartz, J.W. Huggins, Kole Human Mpox Infection Study Group, Clinical
412 characterization and placental pathology of mpox infection in hospitalized patients in the
413 Democratic Republic of the Congo, *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* 17 (2023) e0010384.
- 414 [5] L.-T. Allan-Blitz, K. Carragher, A. Sukhija-Cohen, P. Ritchie, H. Scott, H. Li, J.D.
415 Klausner, Laboratory validation and clinical performance of a saliva-based test for
416 monkeypox virus, *J. Med. Virol.* 95 (2023) e28191.
- 417 [6] A. Peiró-Mestres, I. Fuertes, D. Camprubí-Ferrer, M.Á. Marcos, A. Vilella, M. Navarro, L.
418 Rodríguez-Elena, J. Riera, A. Català, M.J. Martínez, J.L. Blanco, Hospital Clinic de
419 Barcelona Monkeypox Study Group, Frequent detection of monkeypox virus DNA in
420 saliva, semen, and other clinical samples from 12 patients, Barcelona, Spain, May to
421 June 2022, *Euro Surveill.* 27 (2022). [https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.28.2200503)
422 [7917.ES.2022.27.28.2200503](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.28.2200503).
- 423 [7] A. Antinori, V. Mazzotta, S. Vita, F. Carletti, D. Tacconi, L.E. Lapini, A. D’Abramo, S.
424 Cicalini, D. Lapa, S. Pittalis, V. Puro, M. Rivano Capparuccia, E. Giombini, C.E.M.
425 Gruber, A.R. Garbuglia, A. Marani, F. Vairo, E. Girardi, F. Vaia, E. Nicastri, INMI
426 Monkeypox Group, Epidemiological, clinical and virological characteristics of four cases
427 of monkeypox support transmission through sexual contact, Italy, May 2022, *Euro*
428 *Surveill.* 27 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.22.2200421>.
- 429 [8] B. Hernaez, A. Muñoz-Gómez, A. Sanchiz, E. Orviz, A. Valls-Carbo, I. Sagastagoitia, O.
430 Ayerdi, R. Martín, T. Puerta, M. Vera, N. Cabello, J. Vergas, C. Prieto, M. Pardo-
431 Figueres, A. Negredo, J.M. Lagarón, J. Del Romero, V. Estrada, A. Alcamí, Monitoring
432 monkeypox virus in saliva and air samples in Spain: a cross-sectional study, *Lancet*
433 *Microbe* 4 (2023) e21–e28.
- 434 [9] Y. Wang, H. Chen, K. Lin, Y. Han, Z. Gu, H. Wei, K. Mu, D. Wang, L. Liu, R. Jin, R.
435 Song, Z. Rong, S. Wang, Ultrasensitive single-step CRISPR detection of monkeypox
436 virus in minutes with a vest-pocket diagnostic device, *Nat. Commun.* 15 (2024) 3279.
- 437 [10] H. Kim, R. Kwon, H. Lee, S.W. Lee, M. Rahmati, A. Koyanagi, L. Smith, M.S. Kim, G.F.
438 López Sánchez, D. Elena, S.G. Yeo, J.I. Shin, W. Cho, D.K. Yon, Viral load dynamics
439 and shedding kinetics of mpox infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis, *J. Travel*
440 *Med.* 30 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taad111>.
- 441 [11] I. Brosius, C. Van Dijck, J. Coppens, L. Vandenhove, E. Bangwen, F. Vanroye, J.
442 Verschueren, ITM MPOX Study Group, S. Zange, J. Bugert, J. Michiels, E. Bottieau, P.
443 Soentjens, J. van Griensven, C. Kenyon, K.K. Ariën, M. Van Esbroeck, K. Vercauteren,
444 L. Liesenborghs, Presymptomatic viral shedding in high-risk mpox contacts: A
445 prospective cohort study, *J. Med. Virol.* 95 (2023) e28769.
- 446 [12] A. Pettke, F. Filén, K. Widgren, A. Jacks, H. Glans, S. Andreasson, S. Muradrasoli, S.
447 Helgesson, E. Hauzenberger, M.L. Karlberg, N. Walai, A. Bjerker, H. Gourelé, S.
448 Gredmark-Russ, O.K. Lindsjö, K. Sondén, H. Asgeirsson, Ten-Week Follow-Up of
449 Monkeypox Case-Patient, Sweden, 2022, *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 28 (2022) 2074–2077.
- 450 [13] CDC Monkeypox Response: Transmission, CDC (2022).
451 <https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2022/0509-monkeypox-transmission.html> (accessed

- 452 July 24, 2024).
- 453 [14] Y. Li, H. Zhao, K. Wilkins, C. Hughes, I.K. Damon, Real-time PCR assays for the specific
454 detection of monkeypox virus West African and Congo Basin strain DNA, *J. Virol.*
455 *Methods* 169 (2010) 223–227.
- 456 [15] CDC, PCR Test Procedures, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2023).
457 <https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/mpox/collections/pages/pcr-test-procedures.html> (accessed
458 July 24, 2024).
- 459 [16] O.M. Allicock, D. Yolda-Carr, R. Earnest, M.I. Breban, N. Vega, I.M. Ott, C. Kalinich, T.
460 Alpert, M.E. Petrone, A.L. Wyllie, Method versatility in RNA extraction-free PCR detection
461 of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva samples, *bioRxiv* (2021).
462 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.27.21268334>.
- 463 [17] I.M. Ott, M.S. Strine, A.E. Watkins, M. Boot, C.C. Kalinich, C.A. Harden, C.B.F. Vogels,
464 A. Casanovas-Massana, A.J. Moore, M.C. Muenker, M. Nakahata, M. Tokuyama, A.
465 Nelson, J. Fournier, S. Bermejo, M. Campbell, R. Datta, C.S. Dela Cruz, S.F. Farhadian,
466 A.I. Ko, A. Iwasaki, N.D. Grubaugh, C.B. Wilen, A.L. Wyllie, Yale IMPACT Research
467 team3, Stability of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Nonsupplemented Saliva, *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 27
468 (2021) 1146–1150.
- 469 [18] O.M. Allicock, T.-Y. Lin, K.T. Fajardo, D. Yolda-Carr, M. Hislop, D. Zuniga, W. Platt, B.
470 Tuhoy, J. Wang, A.L. Wyllie, Exploring the potential of a saliva-based, RNA-extraction-
471 free PCR test for the multiplexed detection of key respiratory pathogens, *bioRxiv* (2023).
472 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.04.23296240>.
- 473 [19] O.M. Allicock, A. York, P. Waghela, D. Yolda-Carr, D.M. Weinberger, A.L. Wyllie, Impact
474 of Temporary Storage Conditions on the Viability of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* in Saliva,
475 *mSphere* 7 (2022) e0033122.
- 476 [20] N.F.G. Chen, C. Chaguza, L. Gagne, M. Doucette, S. Smole, E. Buzby, J. Hall, S. Ash,
477 R. Harrington, S. Cofsky, S. Clancy, C.J. Kapsak, J. Sevinsky, K. Libuit, D.J. Park, P.
478 Hemarajata, J.M. Garrigues, N.M. Green, S. Sierra-Patev, K. Carpenter-Azevedo, R.C.
479 Huard, C. Pearson, K. Incekara, C. Nishimura, J.P. Huang, E. Gagnon, E. Reeve, J.
480 Razeq, A. Muyombwe, V. Borges, R. Ferreira, D. Sobral, S. Duarte, D. Santos, L. Vieira,
481 J.P. Gomes, C. Aquino, I.M. Savino, K. Felton, M. Bajwa, N. Hayward, H. Miller, A.
482 Naumann, R. Allman, N. Greer, A. Fall, H.H. Mostafa, M.P. McHugh, D.M. Maloney, R.
483 Dewar, J. Kenicer, A. Parker, K. Mathers, J. Wild, S. Cotton, K.E. Templeton, G.
484 Churchwell, P.A. Lee, M. Pedrosa, B. McGruder, S. Schmedes, M.R. Plumb, X. Wang,
485 R.B. Barcellos, F.M.S. Godinho, R.S. Salvato, A. Ceniseros, M.I. Breban, N.D.
486 Grubaugh, G.R. Gallagher, C.B.F. Vogels, Development of an amplicon-based
487 sequencing approach in response to the global emergence of mpox, *PLoS Biol.* 21
488 (2023) e3002151.
- 489 [21] I. Aksamentov, C. Roemer, E. Hodcroft, R. Neher, Nextclade: clade assignment,
490 mutation calling and quality control for viral genomes, *J. Open Source Softw.* 6 (2021)
491 3773.
- 492 [22] C. Happi, I. Adetifa, P. Mbala, R. Njouom, E. Nakoune, A. Happi, N. Ndodo, O. Ayansola,
493 G. Mboowa, T. Bedford, R.A. Neher, C. Roemer, E. Hodcroft, H. Tegally, Á. O’Toole, A.
494 Rambaut, O. Pybus, M.U.G. Kraemer, E. Wilkinson, J. Isidro, V. Borges, M. Pinto, J.P.
495 Gomes, L. Freitas, P.C. Resende, R.T.C. Lee, S. Maurer-Stroh, C. Baxter, R. Lessells,
496 A.E. Ogwell, Y. Kebede, S.K. Tessema, T. de Oliveira, Urgent need for a non-
497 discriminatory and non-stigmatizing nomenclature for monkeypox virus, *PLoS Biol.* 20
498 (2022) e3001769.
- 499 [23] F. Wu, J. Oghuan, A. Gitter, K.D. Mena, E.L. Brown, Wide mismatches in the sequences
500 of primers and probes for monkeypox virus diagnostic assays, *J. Med. Virol.* 95 (2023)

- 501 e28395.
- 502 [24] J. Coppens, F. Vanroye, I. Brosius, L. Liesenborghs, S. van Henten, T. Vanbaelen, S.
503 Bracke, N. Berens-Riha, I. De Baetselier, C. Kenyon, P. Soentjens, E. Florence, J. Van
504 Griensven, K.K. Ariën, B.K.M. Jacobs, D. Van den Bossche, M. Van Esbroeck, K.
505 Vercauteren, ITM MPX study group, Alternative sampling specimens for the molecular
506 detection of mpox (formerly monkeypox) virus, *J. Clin. Virol.* 159 (2023) 105372.
- 507 [25] SalivaDirect - EUA Summary, (n.d.). <https://www.fda.gov/media/141192/> (accessed
508 February 21, 2021).
- 509 [26] C.B.F. Vogels, A.E. Watkins, C.A. Harden, D.E. Brackney, J. Shafer, J. Wang, C.
510 Caraballo, C.C. Kalinich, I.M. Ott, J.R. Fauver, E. Kudo, P. Lu, A. Venkataraman, M.
511 Tokuyama, A.J. Moore, M.C. Muenker, A. Casanovas-Massana, J. Fournier, S. Bermejo,
512 M. Campbell, R. Datta, A. Nelson, K. Anastasio, M.H. Askenase, M. Batsu, S. Bickerton,
513 K. Brower, M.L. Bucklin, S. Cahill, Y. Cao, E. Courchaine, G. Deluliis, R. Earnest, B.
514 Geng, B. Goldman-Israelow, R. Handoko, W. Khoury-Hanold, D. Kim, L. Knaggs, M.
515 Kuang, S. Lapidus, J. Lim, M. Linehan, A. Lu-Culligan, A. Martin, I. Matos, D. McDonald,
516 M. Minasyan, M. Nakahata, N. Naushad, J. Nouws, A. Obaid, C. Odio, J.E. Oh, S. Omer,
517 A. Park, H.-J. Park, X. Peng, M. Petrone, S. Prophet, T. Rice, K.-A. Rose, L. Sewanan, L.
518 Sharma, A.C. Shaw, D. Shepard, M. Smolgovsky, N. Sonnert, Y. Strong, C. Todeasa, J.
519 Valdez, S. Velazquez, P. Vijayakumar, E.B. White, Y. Yang, C.S. Dela Cruz, A.I. Ko, A.
520 Iwasaki, H.M. Krumholz, J.D. Matheus, P. Hui, C. Liu, S.F. Farhadian, R. Sikka, A.L.
521 Wyllie, N.D. Grubaugh, SalivaDirect: A Simplified and Flexible Platform to Enhance
522 SARS-CoV-2 Testing Capacity, *Med* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medj.2020.12.010>.
- 523 [27] Z. Li, A. Sinha, Y. Zhang, N. Tanner, H.-T. Cheng, P. Premrurit, C.K.S. Carlow,
524 Extraction-free LAMP assays for generic detection of Old World Orthopoxviruses and
525 specific detection of Mpox virus, *Sci. Rep.* 13 (2023) 21093.
- 526 [28] C. Peno, T.-Y. Lin, M.S. Hislop, D. Yolda-Carr, K. Farjado, A. York, V.E. Pitzer, D.M.
527 Weinberger, A.K. Bei, O.M. Allicock, A.L. Wyllie, A low-cost culture- and DNA extraction-
528 free method for the molecular detection of pneumococcal carriage in saliva, *Microbiol*
529 *Spectr* (2024) e0059124.
- 530 [29] C.K. Yinda, D.H. Morris, R.J. Fischer, S. Gallogly, Z.A. Weishampel, J.R. Port, T.
531 Bushmaker, J.E. Schulz, K. Bibby, N. van Doremalen, J.O. Lloyd-Smith, V.J. Munster,
532 Stability of Monkeypox Virus in Body Fluids and Wastewater, *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 29
533 (2023) 2065–2072.
- 534 [30] F.O. Maccallum, J.R. Mcdonald, Effect of temperatures of up to 45 degrees C on survival
535 of variola virus in human material in relation to laboratory diagnosis, *Bull. World Health*
536 *Organ.* 16 (1957) 441–443.
- 537 [31] C. for Disease Control, Prevention, Others, Lab alert: MPXV TNF receptor gene deletion
538 may lead to false negative results with some MPXV specific LDTs, (2023).
- 539 [32] E.R. Tobik, L.B. Kitfield-Vernon, R.J. Thomas, S.A. Steel, S.H. Tan, O.M. Allicock, B.L.
540 Choate, S. Akbarzada, A.L. Wyllie, Saliva as a sample type for SARS-CoV-2 detection:
541 implementation successes and opportunities around the globe, *Expert Rev. Mol. Diagn.*
542 22 (2022) 519–535.
- 543 [33] S.H. Tan, O.M. Allicock, A. Katamba, C.V.F. Carrington, A.L. Wyllie, M. Armstrong-
544 Hough, Saliva-based methods for SARS-CoV-2 testing in low-and middle-income
545 countries, (2022). [https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/bulletin/online-](https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/bulletin/online-first/blt.22.288526.pdf?sfvrsn=30da2b19_1)
546 [first/blt.22.288526.pdf?sfvrsn=30da2b19_1](https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/bulletin/online-first/blt.22.288526.pdf?sfvrsn=30da2b19_1) (accessed October 7, 2022).
- 547 [34] S. Accordini, M. Cordioli, E. Pomari, E. Tacconelli, C. Castilietti, People with
548 asymptomatic or unrecognised infection potentially contribute to monkeypox virus
549 transmission, *Lancet Microbe* 4 (2023) e209.

- 550 [35] N. Low, L.H. Bachmann, D. Ogoina, R. McDonald, A.M. Ipekci, L.A.S. Quilter, M. Cevik,
551 Mpox virus and transmission through sexual contact: Defining the research agenda,
552 PLoS Med. 20 (2023) e1004163.
- 553 [36] S. Musumeci, I. Najjar, E.B.E. Amari, M. Schibler, F. Jacquerioz, S. Yerly, A. Renzoni, A.
554 Calmy, L. Kaiser, A Case of Mpox Reinfection, Clin. Infect. Dis. 77 (2023) 135–137.

555