Daftar Pustaka

1. Han, P.; Ivanovski, S. Saliva-Friend and Foe in the COVID-19 Outbreak. Diagnostic 2020,10,290.

2. Chen, Y.; Liu, Q.; Guo, D. Emerging coronaviruses: Genome structure, replication, and pathogenesis. J. Med. Virol. 2020, 92, jmv.25681.

3. Jaimes, J.A.; Millet, J.K.; Stout, A.E.; André, N.M.; Whittaker, G.R. A Tale of Two Viruses: The Distinct Spike Glycoproteins of Feline Coronaviruses. Viruses 2020, 12, 83.

4. World Health Organization. Laboratory testing for 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in suspected human cases. 2020. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications-detail/laboratory-testing-for-2019-novel-coronavirusin-suspected-human-cases-20200117.

5. Pasomsub E et al., Saliva sample as a non-invasive specimen for the diagnosis of coronavirus disease 2019: a crosssectional study, Clinical Microbiology and Infection 2020.

6. Sri Santosh T, Parmar R, Anand H, et al. A Review of Salivary Diagnostics and Its Potential Implication in Detection of Covid-19. Cureus 2020 12, 4, e7708.

7. Robinson Sabino-Silva, Ana Carolina Gomes Jardim and Walter L. Coronavirus COVID-19 impacts to dentistry and potential salivary diagnosis. Clinical Oral Investigations 2020.

8. Ruoshi Xu, Bomiao Ciu, Xiobo Duan. Saliva: potential diagnostic value and transmission of 2019-nCov. International Journal of Oral Science 2020,12:11.

9. To, K. K. et al. Consistent detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in saliva. Clin. Infect.Dis. 2020

10. To, K. K.-W. et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. Lancet Infect. Dis.2020

11. Yasuhisa Tajima et al. A case report of SARS-CoV-2 confirmed in saliva specimens up to 37 days after onset: Proposal of saliva specimens for COVID-19 diagnosis and virus monitoring. Journal of Infection and Chemotherapy 2020, 26, 1086-1089

12. Lorenzo Azzi et al. Two cases of COVID-19 with positive salivary and negative pharyngeal or respiratory swabs at hospital discharge: A rising concern. Oral Diseases 2020; 00:1-3.

13. Anne L. Wyllie et al. Saliva is more sensitive for SARS-CoV-2 detection in COVID-19 patients than nasopharyngeal swabs. MedRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20067835.

14. Tatsuya Fukumoto, et al. Efficacy of a novel SARS-CoV-2 detection kit without RNA extraction and purification. bioRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.27.120410.

15. Meghan Miller, et al. Validation of a self-administrable, saliva-based RT-qPCR test detecting SARS-CoV-2. medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.05.20122721.

16. Alainna J. Jamal et al. Sensitivity of nasopharyngeal swabs and saliva for the detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.01.20081026.

17. Becker D, et al. Saliva is less sensitive than nasopharyngeal swabs for COVID-19 detection in the community setting. medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.11.20092338.

18. Eloise Williams et al. Saliva as a noninvasive specimen for detection of SARS-CoV-2. Journal of Clinical Microbiology 2020; 58: 8.

19. Nicolas L'Helgouach et al. EasyCOV: LAMP based rapid detection of SARS-CoV-2 in saliva. medRxiv 2020. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.30.20117291.

20. Claire McCormick-Baw et al. Saliva as an Alternate Specimen Source for Detection of SARSCoV-2 in Symptomatic Patients Using Cepheid Xpert Xpress SARS-CoV-2. Journal of Clinical Microbiology 2020; 58:8.

21. Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH, et al.: A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. Lancet. 2020, 395:514-523. 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30154-9

22. Zohaib Khurshid et al. Human Saliva: Non-Invasive Fluid for Detecting Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV). Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2020, 17, 2225; doi:10.3390/ijerph17072225

23. Wang, W.K et al. Detection of SARS-associated coronavirus in throat wash and saliva in early diagnosis. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 2004, 10, 1213–1219.

24. Huang, Cet al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet 2020, 6736, 1–10.

25. To, K.K.-W et al. Consistent detection of 2019 novel coronavirus in saliva. Clin. Infect. Dis. 2020, 4–6.

26. Sabino-Silvaet al. Coronavirus COVID-19 impacts to dentistry and potential salivary diagnosis. Clin. Oral Investig. 2020, 1–3.

27. To KK, et al.: Saliva as a diagnostic specimen for testing respiratory virus by a point-of-care molecular assay: a diagnostic validity study. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2019, 25:372-378.

28. Rutgers launches genetic testing service for new coronavirus. (2020). Accessed: April 13, 2020: https://www.rutgers.edu/news/rutgers-launches-genetic-testing-service newcoronavirus.

29. Kim, Y.-G. et al. Comparison between Saliva and Nasopharyngeal Swab Specimens for Detection of Respiratory Viruses by Multiplex Reverse Transcription-PCR. J. Clin.Microbiol. 2017; 55, 226–233.

30. Wyllie, A. L. et al. Molecular surveillance of nasopharyngeal carriage of Streptococcus pneumoniae in children vaccinated with conjugated polysaccharide pneumococcal vaccines. Sci. Rep. 2016;6, 23809

31. Kojima, N. et al. Self-Collected Oral Fluid and Nasal Swabs Demonstrate Comparable Sensitivity to Clinician Collected Nasopharyngeal Swabs for Covid-19 Detection. medRxiv 2020.04.11.20062372 (2020).

Lampiran 1 *JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist* untuk Studi *Case Report*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR CASE REPORTS

Reviewer_____Date_____

Author_____Year_____ Record Number_____

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were patient's demographic characteristics clearly described?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Was the patient's history clearly described and presented as a timeline?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the current clinical condition of the patient on presentation clearly described?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Were diagnostic tests or assessment methods and the results clearly described?	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Was the intervention(s) or treatment procedure(s) clearly described?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Was the post-intervention clinical condition clearly described?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Were adverse events (harms) or unanticipated events identified and described?	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Does the case report provide takeaway lessons?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐   Exclude ☐   Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

_____
_____
_____

Critical Appraisal Checklist for Case Reports – 3

Lampiran 2 *JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist* untuk Studi *Cohort*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR COHORT STUDIES

Reviewer_____Date_____

Author_____Year_____ Record Number_____

		Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1.	Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.	Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.	Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.	Were confounding factors identified?	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.	Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.	Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.	Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.	Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?	☐	☐	☐	☐
10.	Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?	☐	☐	☐	☐
11.	Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (Including reason for exclusion)

_____

_____

Critical Appraisal Checklist for Cohort Studies - 3

Lampiran 3 *JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist* untuk Studi *Cross Sectional*

JBI CRITICAL APPRAISAL CHECKLIST FOR ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL STUDIES

Reviewer_____Date_____

Author_____Year_____ Record Number_____

	Yes	No	Unclear	Not applicable
1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Were confounding factors identified?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Overall appraisal: Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info ☐

Comments (including reason for exclusion)

_____

_____

_____

Lampiran 4 PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) Checklis

Section/Topic	Item No.	Checklist item
TITLE		
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.
ABSTRACT		
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.
INTRODUCTION		
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).
METHODS		
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.