

## **Is nasopharyngeal swab comparable with nasopharyngeal aspirate to detect SARS-CoV-2 in children?**

Ester Capecchi, MD<sup>1</sup>, Giada Maria Di Pietro, MD<sup>1</sup>, Ester Luconi, MSc<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>University of Milan, Milan, Italy

<sup>2</sup> Foundation IRCCS Ca' Granda, Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy

On behalf of **Testing Pediatric Covid-19 (TPC-19)**:

Paola Marchisio, MD<sup>12</sup>, Silvana Castaldi, MD<sup>12</sup>, Elia Biganzoli, PhD<sup>23</sup>, Patrizia Boracchi<sup>3</sup>,

Samantha Bosis, MD<sup>2</sup>, Giovanna Lunghi, MD<sup>2</sup>, Ferruccio Ceriotti, MD<sup>2</sup>, Giuseppe Bertolozzi,

MD<sup>2</sup>, Carlo Agostoni, MD<sup>12</sup>, Andrea Gori, MD<sup>12</sup>.

### **Affiliations**

<sup>1</sup> Foundation IRCCS Ca' Granda, Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy

<sup>2</sup> University of Milan, Milan, Italy

<sup>3</sup> Department of Clinical Sciences and Community Health & DSRC, University of Milan, Italy

### **Abstract**

The tests currently used for the direct identification of SARS-CoV-2 include specimens taken from the upper and the lower respiratory tract.

In our paediatric department all children undergo both nasopharyngeal swab and nasopharyngeal aspirate, performed from both nostrils, on admission and after 24 hours.

We decided to compare these two methods of detection of SARS-CoV-2. Considering nasopharyngeal aspirate as the gold standard, we calculated sensitivities and specificities of nasopharyngeal swab.

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice. Based on our results, we suggest to prefer the collection of aspirates whenever possible.

**Corresponding author:**

Ester Capecchi, MD

University of Milan, Milan, Italy

Via della Commenda 9, 20122, Milan, Italy

Ph: 39 02 5503 2469

email: [ester.capecchi@unimi.it](mailto:ester.capecchi@unimi.it)

**Other authors:**

Giada Maria Di Pietro, MD

University of Milan, Milan, Italy

Via della Commenda 9, 20122, Milan, Italy

Ph: 39 02 5503 2469

email: [giada.dipietro@unimi.it](mailto:giada.dipietro@unimi.it)

Ester Luconi, MSc

Foundation IRCCS Ca' Granda, Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico,

Via della Commenda 9, 20122, Milan, Italy

Ph: 39 02 5503 2469

email: [ester.luconi91@gmail.com](mailto:ester.luconi91@gmail.com)

**Funding Source:** No funding was secured for this study.

**Financial Disclosure:** The authors have no financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose.

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors have no conflicts of interest relevant to this article to disclose.

## **To the Editor,**

In December 2019 appeared in China a novel coronavirus, designated as SARS-CoV-2, responsible for a pandemic respiratory disease, known as coronavirus Disease (COVID-19), with the Italian outbreak from February 2020. Children appear to have milder symptoms and less severe disease<sup>1</sup>. The tests currently used for the direct identification of SARS-CoV-2 include specimens taken from the upper and the lower respiratory tract<sup>2,3</sup>. Since the use of nasopharyngeal aspirate (NPA) seemed to be better than nasopharyngeal swab (NS) to identify respiratory virus in paediatrics<sup>4,5</sup> we decided to compare these methods in detecting SARS-CoV-2 in children.

Children hospitalized in our paediatric department underwent NS (Copan-503CS01 nasopharyngeal flocked swab) and NPA (Medicoplast mucus extractor 440-ch08), performed from both nostrils, on admission and after 24 hours. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was extracted from the paired samples through nucleic acid amplification, using the RT-PCR.

From March 13th to May 22nd, 300 paired specimens (NS/NPA) collected from 136 patients (134 hospitalized and 2 outpatients) were tested for SARS-CoV-2.

For clinical aims, we considered positive, to SARS-CoV-2 every patient whose NPA or NS or NPA/NS resulted positive or weak positive.

Out of the 134 patients hospitalized, 18 children tested positive (prevalence 13.4%, 95% CI: 8.2%-20.4%); among the latter, 13 of them and 2 outpatient children were followed collecting their paired specimens until both resulted negative 24 hours apart.

Of the 300 paired specimens evaluated: 276 were concordant, 24 were discordant, so the naïve concordance was 92.0% (95% CI: 88.3%-94.6%) with Cohen's kappa (K) 0.63. Among the paired specimens whose NPA resulted positive, 41.9% (95% CI: 28.2%-56.9%) had NS negative; while among the paired specimens whose NPA resulted negative, 2.3% (95% CI: 1.1%-5.1%) had NS positive.

Considering NPA as the gold standard for detection of SARS-CoV-2, we calculated sensitivities and specificities of NS. The overall sensitivity of NS was 58.1% (95% CI: 43.1%-71.8%) and the specificity was 97.7% (95% CI: 94.9-98.9%). Since the different practice in specimen collection, we divided our cohort according to the children's age (<6 or ≥ 6 years, Table 1). Among children under 6 years, the concordance was K=0.67. Regarding children of 6 years or older, the concordance was K=0.60.

The NS has in any case a low sensitivity in detecting SARS-CoV-2 in children when referred to NPA. Our results, the first we know are available, suggest to prefer the collection of NPA whenever possible for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in children.

<b>Table 1. NS and NPA results</b>					
<b>All children's specimens</b>					
	NPA negative	CI 95%	NPA positive	CI 95%	Total
NS negative	251 (97.7%)	94.9% - 98.9%	18 (41.9%)	28.2% - 56.9%	269 (89.7%)
NS positive	6 (2.3%)	1.1% - 5.1%	25 (58.1%)	43.1% - 71.8%	31 (10.3%)
Total	257 (100.0%)		43 (100.0%)		300 (100.0%)
<b>Children &lt; 6 years of age</b>					
	NPA negative	CI 95%	NPA positive	CI 95%	Total
NS negative	134 (97.8%)	93.4% - 99.3%	4 (33.3%)	12.5% - 63.6%	138 (92.6%)
NS positive	3 (2.2%)	0.7% - 6.6%	8 (66.7%)	36.4% - 87.5%	11 (7.4%)
Total	137 (100.0%)		12 (100.0%)		149 (100.0%)
<b>Children ≥ 6 years of age</b>					
	NPA negative	CI 95%	NPA positive	CI 95%	Total
NS negative	117 (97.5%)	92.5% - 99.2%	14 (45.2%)	28.9% - 62.6%	131 (86.8%)
NS positive	3 (2.5%)	0.8% - 7.5%	17 (54.8%)	37.4% - 71.1%	20 (13.2%)
Total	120 (100.0%)		31 (100.0%)		151 (100.0%)

## References

1. Ludvigsson JF. Systematic Review of COVID-19 in Children Shows Milder Cases and a Better Prognosis Than Adults. *Acta Paediatr* 2020;109:1088-1095.
2. Mawaddah A, Gendeh HS, Lum SG, Marina MB. Upper Respiratory Tract Sampling in COVID-19. *Malays J Pathol* 2020;42:23-35.
3. Loeffelholz MJ, Tang YW. Laboratory Diagnosis of Emerging Human Coronavirus Infections - The State of the Art. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2020;9:747-756.
4. Lambert SB, Whiley DM, O'Neill NT, et al. Comparing Nose-Throat Swabs and Nasopharyngeal Aspirates Collected From Children With Symptoms for Respiratory Virus Identification Using Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction. *Pediatrics* 2008;122:e615-20.
5. Macfarlane P, Denham J, Assous J, Hughes C. RSV Testing in Bronchiolitis: Which Nasal Sampling Method Is Best? *Arch Dis Child* 2005;90:634-5.