

## SOFT-AAFS ORAL FLUID COMMITTEE

### FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQ)

#### 1. What are the benefits of testing oral fluid for identifying drugs in driving under the influence of drugs (DUID) cases?

- Rapid, simple, non-invasive collection with no gender-specific requirements
- Specimens can be collected proximate to the time of driving following a traffic stop or crash
- No requirement for a medical professional to draw blood, eliminating transport time, costs, and collection delays
- Presence of parent drug and/or metabolites likely reflects recent drug use
- Difficult to adulterate the specimen
- Basic drugs concentrate in oral fluid from the blood
- On-site screening devices are available for use at the time of a traffic stop or crash

#### 2. What are the limitations of testing oral fluid for identifying drugs in DUID cases?

- Salivation decreases after stimulant, opioid, and marijuana use, potentially extending the time required for obtaining adequate specimen volume
- Neutral, amphoteric, acidic drugs, and highly protein-bound drugs do not partition well into oral fluid, creating challenges for detection even with supra-therapeutic use (e.g. benzodiazepines and opiates)
- Total oral fluid elution buffer volume is typically low (~2 - 4mL) and may restrict the number of confirmatory tests or independent analyses that can be performed
- Roadside devices do not typically allow confirmation testing using the same specimen that has been screened, although device technology is continually evolving
- Oral fluid testing is not currently common to most forensic laboratories, requiring method development and validation along with the use of more sensitive and expensive instrumentation due to low drug detection limits

#### 3. Is oral fluid testing reliable and valid?

- Yes, there are multiple published studies regarding the utility, and reliability (sensitivity, specificity, and efficiency) of point of care (POC) oral fluid drug on-site screening devices and laboratory-based confirmatory methods for drugs in oral fluid for DUID, drug treatment, pain management, criminal justice, and workplace drug testing applications
- Yes, validated and accepted analytical techniques are utilized for oral fluid testing
- Yes, field-based rapid screening devices need to be used according to the manufacturers' instructions, and operators must be fully trained

#### 4. How long does it take until drugs appear in oral fluid?

- The onset of drug detection in oral fluid is dependent on the route of administration:
  - Drugs which are smoked, inhaled, snorted, or taken as edibles initially appear rapidly in oral fluid because of oral mucosa deposition (a waiting period is needed prior to specimen collection)
  - Drugs that are administered orally in capsules (e.g., dronabinol) generally do not coat the oral mucosa and tend to appear in oral fluid from blood; if they are acidic, neutral, or lipophilic, they may not be readily detectable in oral fluid
  - Drugs administered intravenously (e.g., heroin) are detected in oral fluid within minutes of injection

#### 5. What is the window of detection?

- The window of detection is dependent on the route of administration, drug dose, drug formulation, history of use, sensitivity of the analytical test method, and cut-off concentrations
  - These factors are also considered for detection windows in other matrices
- Typical windows of detection of drugs in oral fluid mirror blood, and are on the order of a few hours

**6. What concentration of drug in oral fluid is indicative of impairment?**

- At this time, it is not possible to correlate a quantitative drug concentration in oral fluid, blood, or urine directly to the degree of impairment

**7. Are oral fluid and blood drug concentrations equivalent?**

- THC is highly lipophilic and does not partition well from blood to oral fluid, but is often detectable soon after smoked administration because of oral cavity deposition
- Oral fluid and blood drug concentrations are not directly correlated immediately after intake; drugs require time to equilibrate within the body; initial oral fluid concentrations are elevated because of oral mucosal deposition, depending upon the route of administration
- For many drugs, particularly when smoked, vaped, or snorted, oral fluid drug concentrations do not predict concurrent blood drug concentrations
- At this time, it is not recommended to estimate drug concentrations in whole blood from oral fluid drug concentrations or vice versa

**8. Is passive exposure to cannabis an issue with oral fluid drug testing?**

- Possibly, several studies showed THC to be present in the oral fluid of individuals passively exposed to environments with high levels of cannabis smoke

**9. After an oral fluid roadside or on-site test, does a second evidential specimen need to be collected?**

- Yes. Roadside POC testing devices are usually immunoassay-based, and consequently, for forensic purposes, require an independent confirmatory test as recommended with any laboratory-based immunoassay screening procedure
- Oral fluid roadside drug screening devices can help establish probable cause in DUID cases, but the collection of a second evidentiary specimen is required whenever any adverse consequences for the donor may occur
- Preferably, oral fluid will be collected as the evidential specimen proximate to the time of driving or suspected impairment, because the rapid decline in drug blood concentrations (particularly THC) and the time required to collect a blood specimen can inhibit the ability to obtain a confirmation sample collected later in the process
- Confirmation specimens should be collected in appropriate tubes/devices with volume indicators and/or a mechanism for demonstrating when adequate volume has been collected (e.g. color change)
- Specimens should not be left at extreme temperatures (e.g. outdoors, vehicle trunks) for an extended period
- It is best practice to collect a secondary oral fluid specimen by “passive” means as opposed to a stimulated and/or expectorated collection (stimulated and expectorant collection may dilute the drug concentration in oral fluid)

**10. Which is the better evidential specimen for DUID: blood, urine or oral fluid?**

- Urine is the least preferred specimen for DUID cases because its window of drug detection may greatly exceed the window of drug impairment and generally the parent drug is not detected
- Oral fluid is preferable to blood for ease of collection, although both offer the possibility of documenting drug intake proximal to the incident
- Oral fluid offers non-invasive, rapid, observed sampling at the time of the traffic stop or crash

### **11. Can oral fluid be used for workplace or clinical testing?**

- Yes, oral fluid is acceptable as a specimen in Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs
- Oral fluid testing in workplace and clinical cases offers the same benefits compared to blood as described above for DUID cases: observed collection, shorter detection times more proximal to intake, and parent drug predominance
- Urine is often used for clinical prescription drug monitoring for its longer window of detection. Oral fluid is reflective of blood contents, as described above
- For marijuana specifically, oral fluid methods typically target the parent drug (delta-9 THC) and are well suited to respond to some recent legislation by some states to require active metabolite reporting only for workplace testing, given the increased window of detection of inactive metabolites in urine

### **12. Is there a recommended deprivation period before I collect the oral fluid specimen?**

- Yes, a 10-minute deprivation period without any food or drink is recommended to reduce the risk of interference from potentially inhibiting substances

### **13. What is the stability of drugs in oral fluid?**

- Stability depends upon the drug, collection device, elution buffer, and storage conditions
- Oral fluid collection device manufacturers should provide specific storage instructions and stability data
- Consumables for oral fluid devices must be stored in accordance with the manufacturers' recommended conditions, and collected samples require timely analysis due to the instability of certain target drugs

### **14. Should laboratories develop qualitative or quantitative oral fluid confirmation methods?**

- Laboratories may elect to develop qualitative methods since there is not a direct correlation between concentrations in oral fluid and blood in most cases due to a variety of factors (e.g. oral cavity deposition from recent use, unknown exact volume of confirmation oral fluid specimen, individual variability in pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics)
- Quantitative measurement of drug concentrations for research purposes is essential to developing a better understanding of typical oral fluid drug concentrations in various populations, which in turn helps with the development of screening devices with the appropriate sensitivity

### **15. Can oral fluid point of care testing replace the DRE program?**

- No, oral fluid drug testing is a test of drug use, not impairment; the result can be used to support the DRE officer's opinion about which drug(s) is/are responsible for the observed impairment
- Oral fluid drug testing is a tool that assists with DRE investigation, providing real time chemical test information that the officer can use in questioning the subject about their drug use
- When a DRE officer is not available, officers should perform a standardized field sobriety test battery, followed by the oral fluid POC test; a DRE or toxicologist can later give an opinion about whether the observations in the SFSTs are consistent with the drugs detected in the field
- Current oral fluid POC tests do not test for all impairing drug classes, including inhalants, some anticonvulsants, muscle relaxants, antidepressants, antipsychotics, and other potentially impairing drugs
- When a field oral fluid test result is negative and there is objective evidence of impairment, a toxicological sample (blood, oral fluid or urine) should be collected and sent to the laboratory for comprehensive analysis

## References

- a. Langel K, Gjerde H, Favretto D, et al. Comparison of drug concentrations between whole blood and oral fluid. *Drug Test Anal.* 2014;6(5):461-71.
- b. Moore C, Coulter C, Uges D, et al. Cannabinoids in oral fluid following passive exposure to marijuana smoke. *Forens Sci Int.* 2011;212(1-3):227-30.
- c. Cone EJ, Bigelow GE, Herrmann ES, et al. Nonsmoker exposure to secondhand cannabis smoke. III. Oral fluid and blood drug concentrations and corresponding subjective effects. *J Anal Toxicol.* 2015;39(7):497-509.
- d. D'Orazio AL, Mohr ALA, Chan-Hosokawa, A, et al. Recommendations for toxicological investigation of drug- impaired driving and motor vehicle fatalities – 2025 update. *J Anal Toxicol.* 2025; doi: 10.1093/jat/bkaf085. Epub 16 September 2025.
- e. Newmeyer MN, Swortwood MJ, Andersson M, et al. Cannabis Edibles: Blood and oral fluid cannabinoid pharmacokinetics and evaluation of oral fluid screening devices for predicting  $\Delta^9$ -tetrahydrocannabinol in blood and oral fluid following cannabis brownie administration. *Clin Chem.* 2017;63(3):647-62.
- f. Swortwood MJ, Newmeyer MN, Abulseoud OA, et al. On-site oral fluid  $\Delta^9$ - tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) screening after controlled smoked, vaporized, and oral cannabis administration. *Forens Toxicol.* 2016 doi;10.1007/s11419-016-0348-3
- g. Swortwood MJ, Newmeyer MN, Abulseoud OA, et al. Cannabinoid disposition in oral fluid after controlled smoked, vaporized and oral cannabis administration. *Drug Test Anal.* 2017;9(6):905-15
- h. Hartman RL, Brown TL, Milavetz G, et al. Controlled vaporized cannabis, with and without alcohol: Subjective effects and oral fluid-blood cannabinoid relationships. *Drug Test Anal.* 2016;8(7):690-701.
- i. Krotulski AJ, Mohr ALA, Friscia M, Logan BK. Field detection of drugs of abuse in oral fluid using the Alere™ DDS®2 mobile test system with confirmation by liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS). *J Anal Toxicol.* 2017 Dec 28. doi: 10.1093/jat/bkx105.
- j. Rohrig TP, Moore CM, Stephens K, et al. Roadside drug testing: An evaluation of the Alere DDS2 mobile test system. *Drug Test Anal.* 2017 Sep 6. doi: 10.1002/dta.2297.
- k. Edwards LD, Smith KL, Savage T. Drugged Driving in Wisconsin: Oral Fluid Versus Blood. *J Anal Toxicol.* 2017;41(6):523-29. doi: 10.1093/jat/bkx051.
- l. Veitenheimer AM, Wagner JR. Evaluation of oral fluid as a specimen for DUID. *J Anal Toxicol.* 2017;41(6):517-22. doi: 10.1093/jat/bkx036.
- m. Scherer JN, Fiorentin TR, Borille BT, et al. Reliability of point-of-collection testing devices for drugs of abuse in oral fluid: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Pharm Biomed Anal.* 2017;143:77-85. doi: 10.1016/j.jpba.2017.05.021. Epub 2017 May 13.
- n. Harper CE, Hudson JS, Tidwell K, et al. Implementation of the first comprehensive state oral fluid drug testing program for roadside screening and laboratory testing in DUID cases – a 5-year review. *J Anal Toxicol* 2023;44:694-702. doi: [10.1093/jat/bkad051](https://doi.org/10.1093/jat/bkad051)
- o. Sarris GG, Abbott DL, Moreno TM, et al. Development and validation of a simple chromatographic method to screen oral fluid samples for drugs in DUID investigations. *J Anal Toxicol* 2024;48:528-34. doi: 10.1093/jat/bkae068
- p. Buzby D, Mohr ALA, Logan BK, et al. Evaluation of on-site oral fluid drug screening technology. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (*Report No. DOT HS 812854*)
- q. Desrosiers NA, Huestis MA. Oral fluid drug testing: analytical approaches, issues and interpretation of results. *J Anal Toxicol* 2019;43:415-43. doi: [10.1093/jat/bkz048](https://doi.org/10.1093/jat/bkz048)