Journal of
Clinical Medicine

MDPI

Reply

Reply to Fabbris et al. A Viable Alternative. Comment on "Kohmer et al. Self-Collected Samples to Detect SARS-CoV-2: Direct Comparison of Saliva, Tongue Swab, Nasal Swab, Chewed Cotton Pads and Gargle Lavage. *J. Clin. Med.* 2021, *10*, 5751"

Sebastian Hoehl [1,*], Niko Kohmer [1], Lisa Eckermann [1], Rene Gottschalk [1,2] and Sandra Ciesek [1,3,4]

[1] Institute for Medical Virology, University Hospital, Goethe University Frankfurt, 60596 Frankfurt, Germany
[2] Health Protection Authority, City of Frankfurt, 60313 Frankfurt, Germany
[3] German Centre for Infection Research, External Partner Site, 60323 Frankfurt, Germany
[4] Fraunhofer Institute for Molecular Biology and Applied Ecology (IME), Branch Translational Medicine and Pharmacology, 60596 Frankfurt, Germany
* Correspondence: sebastian.hoehl@kgu.de; Tel.: +49-69-6301-0

Citation: Hoehl, S.; Kohmer, N.; Eckermann, L.; Gottschalk, R.; Ciesek, S. Reply to Fabbris et al. A Viable Alternative. Comment on "Kohmer et al. Self-Collected Samples to Detect SARS-CoV-2: Direct Comparison of Saliva, Tongue Swab, Nasal Swab, Chewed Cotton Pads and Gargle Lavage. *J. Clin. Med.* 2021, *10*, 5751". *J. Clin. Med.* **2022**, *11*, 4920. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm11164920

Academic Editors: Natália Cruz-Martins and Célia F. Rodrigues

Received: 6 July 2022
Accepted: 18 August 2022
Published: 22 August 2022

We thank Fabbris et al. for their remarks [1] on our publication "Self-Collected Samples to Detect SARS-CoV-2: Direct Comparison of Saliva, Tongue Swab, Nasal Swab, Chewed Cotton Pads and Gargle Lavage" [2].

We agree that nasal wash or nasopharyngeal aspirate, which has previously been demonstrated to be useful when testing for different viruses, Ref. [3] may also be an interesting candidate to test for SARS-CoV-2 in a self-collected environment.

In our study, we limited the number of different collection techniques to avoid overwhelming the study participants with a multitude of samples collected without supervision by a medical professional, and due to potential interference between different specimens.

Our study was designed to assess the diagnostic sensitivity of self-collected specimens. Therefore, we recruited patients who were known to be infected with SARS-CoV-2. This prohibited us from determining the specificity of the materials examined in our study.

Funding: Data from the original work of this reply was based on research funded in part by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research through project NaFoUniMedCovid19 [B-FAST]—COVIDready (grant 02WRS1621C).

Conflicts of Interest: S.C. and S.H.: Research support from Roche diagnostics; S.C.: Speaker's fee from Roche diagnostics. All other authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

References

1. Fabbris, C.; Camerotto, R.; Battistuzzi, V.; Spinato, G. A Viable Alternative. Comment on Kohmer et al. Self-Collected Samples to Detect SARS-CoV-2: Direct Comparison of Saliva, Tongue Swab, Nasal Swab, Chewed Cotton Pads and Gargle Lavage. *J. Clin. Med.* 2021, *10*, 5751. *J. Clin. Med.* **2022**, *11*, 4501. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
2. Kohmer, N.; Eckermann, L.; Böddinghaus, B.; Götsch, U.; Berger, A.; Herrmann, E.; Kortenbusch, M.; Tinnemann, P.; Gottschalk, R.; Hoehl, S.; et al. Self-Collected Samples to Detect SARS-CoV-2: Direct Comparison of Saliva, Tongue Swab, Nasal Swab, Chewed Cotton Pads and Gargle Lavage. *J. Clin. Med.* **2021**, *10*, 5751. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
3. Flynn, M.F.; Kelly, M.; Dooley, J.S.G. Nasopharyngeal Swabs vs. Nasal Aspirates for Respiratory Virus Detection: A Systematic Review. *Pathogens* **2021**, *10*, 1515. [CrossRef] [PubMed]