## **Short Communication** 1

Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 viral copy number in saliva mouthwash samples using digital 2 3 droplet PCR

4

5	Lisa Ol	perding <sup>1</sup> , Jia Hu <sup>2</sup> , Byron Berenger <sup>3,4</sup> , Abu Naser Mohon <sup>1</sup> , Dylan R. Pillai <sup>1,3,4,5</sup>
6 7	1.	Department of Microbiology, Immunology, and Infectious Diseases, University of Calgary, AB, Canada
8	2.	Medical Officer of Health Office, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Alberta
9 10 11 12 13	3. 4. 5.	Clinical Section of Microbiology, Alberta Precision Laboratories, Calgary, AB, Canada Department Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada Department of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada
14		
15	Keywords: COVID 19, SARS-CoV-2, digital droplet PCR, viral load	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27 28	Corres	ponding author: Dylan Pillai MD, PhD, 9-3535 Research Road NW, 1W-416

- 28
- Calgary, AB, Canada, T2L2K8, drpillai@ucalgary.ca, T: 403-770-3338, F: 403-770-3347 29
- 30

## Abstract:

- Saliva samples were collected through a simple mouth wash procedure and viral load quantified
- using a technology called digital droplet PCR. Data suggest ddPCR allows for precise
- quantification of viral load in clinical samples infected with SARS-CoV-2.

The shortage of nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs as sample collection devices has prompted clinical 58 59 laboratories to explore other sample types. We conducted a community survey of patients previously diagnosed with COVID-19. Individuals were requested to gargle, swish, and spit 3 mL 60 of normal saline (NS) into a standard sterile container from 12 individuals (REB 20-0444 and 20-61 62 0402, University of Calgary). Participants ranged from days 3 to 16 post symptom-onset. Four hundred µL of saliva in NS was subjected to RNA extraction using the Promega SV total RNA 63 64 (Promega Corp., Madison, WI) following the manufacturer's instructions; the initial lysis step 65 was modified to add 400  $\mu$ L of lysis buffer, wait 10 minutes, then add 400  $\mu$ L 95% EtOH and proceed as normal. Two extracts were performed per sample. Extracted material was amplified 66 using real-time PCR targeting the E gene with modification including the addition of GC clamps 67 at the 3' end of the primers and the shortening and addition of a minor groove binding (MGB) 68 molety to the hydrolysis probe (1). The sample extract was also evaluated by digital droplet 69 70 PCR (QX200<sup>™</sup> Droplet Digital<sup>™</sup> (dd) PCR system, Bio-Rad laboratories, Hercules, CA) using the same primer set as used in the RT-PCR. Briefly, a master mix was made containing (per sample) 71 72 6.252µL of One-Step RT–ddPCR Supermix, 2.52µL of One-Step RT–ddPCR reverse transcriptase, 12μL of 3002mmol/L DTT, 12μL of both forward and reverse E gene primers and 0.5 μL E gene 73 74 probe ( $202\mu$ M primers and  $102\mu$ M probe),  $52\mu$ L of RNA extract, and  $7.52\mu$ L of RNase-free 75 water. Twenty microliters of each template mastermix was added to the sample well of the droplet generation cartridge, along with 70 µL of droplet generation oil for probes. Samples 76 were cycled before measurement and analysis with the QX200<sup>™</sup>. The thermal cycling conditions 77 were 50°C for 12 hour (reverse transcription) and 95°C for 102 min, followed by 40 cycles of 95°C 78 79 for 30<sup>2</sup>/<sub>1</sub>sec and 60°C for 60<sup>2</sup>/<sub>2</sub>sec before a final step at 98°C for 10 min. Ramp rates were set to

80 2°C per sec.

Our data shows that the SARS-CoV-2 E gene is detectable in saliva obtained with a simple 81 mouth wash approach using NS. The RT-PCR was able to detect the SARS-CoV-2 E gene in 9 of 82 83 the 12 (75%) patient samples; however, ddPCR was able to detect copies of the E gene in 12/12 84 (100%) samples well above the no template control (NTC, n=14). The ddPCR data suggests that the majority of patients in this study had detectable viral gene copies in their saliva but the RT-85 PCR is only able to detect a subset of them. This is consistent with the exquisite analytical 86 sensitivity obtained by ddPCR through partitioning the sample into 10-20,000 droplets from 87 which PCR amplification of the template molecules occurs in each individual droplet. 88 Furthermore, ddPCR enables the quantification of target nucleic acids at the single-molecule 89 90 level. Depending on primer sets, the ddPCR system used in this study has a theoretical lower 91 limit of detection between 2-4 copies per reaction (2). A recent study suggests that above a Ct 92 value of 34 using the E gene RT-PCR assay sample are not infectious in vitro (3). Based on this 93 information, 6/12 (50%) of saliva samples collected in this way are potentially infectious. Interestingly, patient 9 had a viral load estimated at 16,522 copies per 5  $\mu$ L of extracted sample 94 and E gene Ct value of 23.17 indicating high infectivity by all measures. These types of 95

96 individuals may pose a risk in communal settings without isolation. We conclude that a simple

- 97 mouth wash approach can be used to identify SARS-CoV-2 in saliva and that ddPCR may be
- 98 useful in quantifying viral load with greater precision than reference RT-PCR.

## 99 Figure 1. Correlation of E gene copy number and E gene RT-qPCR Ct value for saliva samples from patients infected with SARS-CoV-2.

- 100 Graph shows ddPCR quantification (copies per 5 mL sample) with positive E gene RT-qPCR samples indicated in green. Copies are
- average of duplicate measurements with error bars showing SEM. Fourteen no template controls (NTC) were run. The ddPCR
- positive control contains 5 copies of template added per reaction. Ct values are shown below for E gene RT-qPCR for each
- 103 corresponding sample. \* Sample is either below or above the linear range of the QX200.

- \_ ...

- 4.0.0

- ....

## 120 **References:**

121 1. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW, Bleicker T, Brünink S,

122 Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DGJC, Haagmans BL, van der Veer B, van den Brink S,

123 Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette J-L, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C,

124 Koopmans MPG, Drosten C. 2020. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-

125 time RT-PCR. Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull 25.

126 2. Taylor SC, Carbonneau J, Shelton DN, Boivin G. 2015. Optimization of Droplet Digital PCR

127 from RNA and DNA extracts with direct comparison to RT-qPCR: Clinical implications for

128 quantification of Oseltamivir-resistant subpopulations. J Virol Methods 224:58–66.

129 3. La Scola B, Le Bideau M, Andreani J, Hoang VT, Grimaldier C, Colson P, Gautret P, Raoult

D. 2020. Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge of

131 SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis Off Publ Eur

132 Soc Clin Microbiol 39:1059–1061.

133

