

# Evaluating recovery, cost, and throughput of different concentration methods for SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-based epidemiology

Zachary W. LaTurner<sup>a</sup>, David M. Zong<sup>a</sup>, Prashant Kalvapalle<sup>b</sup>, Kiara Reyes Gamas<sup>b</sup>, Austen Terwilliger<sup>c</sup>, Tessa Crosby<sup>a</sup>, Priyanka Ali<sup>a</sup>, Vasanthi Avadhanula<sup>c</sup>, Haroldo Hernandez Santos<sup>c</sup>, Kyle Weesner<sup>c</sup>, Loren Hopkins<sup>d</sup>, Pedro A. Piedra<sup>c</sup>, Anthony W. Maresso<sup>c</sup>, Lauren B. Stadler<sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Rice University, 6100 Main Street MS 519, Houston, TX 77005, USA

<sup>b</sup> Graduate Program in Systems, Synthetic, and Physical Biology, Rice University, 6100 Main Street MS 519, Houston, TX 77005, USA

<sup>c</sup> Department of Molecular Virology and Microbiology, Baylor College of Medicine, One Baylor Plaza, Houston, TX 77030, USA

<sup>d</sup> Houston Health Department, 8000 N. Stadium Dr., Houston, TX 77054

\* Correspondence to: [lauren.stadler@rice.edu](mailto:lauren.stadler@rice.edu)

## 19 **Highlights**

- 20 ● Five methods for concentrating SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater evaluated
- 21 ● Method performance characterized via recovery, cost, throughput, and variability
- 22 ● HA filtration with bead beating had highest recovery for comparatively low cost
- 23 ● Bovine coronavirus, pepper mild mottle virus assessed as possible recovery controls

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 **Abstract**

36 As the COVID-19 pandemic continues to affect communities across the globe, the need to  
37 contain the spread of the outbreaks is of paramount importance. Wastewater monitoring of the  
38 SARS-CoV-2 virus, the causative agent responsible for COVID-19, has emerged as a promising  
39 tool for health officials to anticipate outbreaks. As interest in wastewater monitoring continues to  
40 grow and municipalities begin to implement this approach, there is a need to further identify and  
41 evaluate methods used to concentrate SARS-CoV-2 virus RNA from wastewater samples. Here  
42 we evaluate the recovery, cost, and throughput of five different concentration methods for  
43 quantifying SARS-CoV-2 virus RNA in wastewater samples. We tested the five methods on six  
44 different wastewater samples. We also evaluated the use of a bovine coronavirus vaccine as a  
45 process control and pepper mild mottle virus as a normalization factor. Of the five methods we  
46 tested head-to-head, we found that HA filtration with bead beating performed the best in terms of  
47 sensitivity and cost. This evaluation can serve as a guide for laboratories establishing a protocol  
48 to perform wastewater monitoring of SARS-CoV-2.

49 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, Wastewater-based epidemiology, Method evaluation, Virus  
50 concentration, Bovine coronavirus, Pepper mild mottle virus

51

52

53

54

## 55        **1. Introduction**

56        As the COVID-19 pandemic impacts millions worldwide, community monitoring and early  
57        detection of disease outbreaks has become of critical importance. While the rate of clinical  
58        testing has seen dramatic global increases since the pandemic onset, difficulties in assessing  
59        community health via this method remain (Tromberg et al., 2020). These difficulties include the  
60        logistics and cost of clinical testing, and a lack of robust contact tracing protocols in most  
61        communities. Moreover, the opt-in nature of clinical testing means asymptomatic and  
62        symptomatic individuals who decide to forego testing are not accounted for in community  
63        prevalence estimates.

64

65        Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is an emerging paradigm for monitoring the community  
66        prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 (Hart and Halden, 2020). WBE has already proven to be a viable  
67        method for community monitoring of other viral pathogens, including poliovirus, rotavirus,  
68        hepatitis A virus, hepatitis E virus, noroviruses, enteroviruses, and adenoviruses, suggesting it  
69        could be appropriate for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance (Hellmér et al., 2014; Kamel et al., 2011;  
70        Katayama et al., 2008; Lago et al., 2003; McCall et al., 2020). This method of monitoring for  
71        SARS-CoV-2 is possible due to fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 virus particles and/or virus RNA  
72        before, during, and after clinical symptoms manifest in infected individuals (Cheung et al., 2020;  
73        Mesoraca et al., 2020; Wölfel et al., 2020). Once feces containing SARS-CoV-2 RNA enters the  
74        sewershed, the viral RNA is transported to wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) where it can be  
75        detected and quantified.

76

77 The detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in untreated domestic wastewater has already been reported  
78 in numerous studies from countries across the globe including Australia, Italy, the United States,  
79 Japan, and more (Ahmed et al., 2020a; La Rosa et al., 2021; Sherchan et al., 2020; Torii et al.,  
80 2020). Moreover, concentrations of viral RNA have been shown to correlate with community  
81 prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 (Stadler et al., 2020). WBE alleviates roadblocks associated with  
82 clinical testing by providing a cheaper, less logistically challenging method for monitoring  
83 communities. Importantly, it does not require individuals to opt-in, thereby capturing both  
84 symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. The potential of WBE to inform public health  
85 measures by offering trend tracking and prevalence estimates is already of growing interest to  
86 local governments and has been put to use by universities to proactively prevent COVID-19  
87 outbreaks in campus housing (Colosi et al., 2020; Stadler et al., 2020).

88  
89 The development of rapid, cost-effective, and sensitive methods for quantifying SARS-CoV-2  
90 RNA in wastewater are essential for widespread, successful implementation of WBE for SARS-  
91 CoV-2. Broadly speaking, the detection and quantification of viral RNA in wastewater is  
92 achieved through four steps: (1) wastewater sampling, (2) wastewater concentration, (3) RNA  
93 extraction, and (4) RNA quantification. There are multiple methods to choose from for each step,  
94 with disparate effects on the performance and practicality of the overall measurement system. As  
95 of now, there are no standard or clearly optimal methods for each step and methods are often  
96 selected based on a review of the literature, author familiarity with the method, and equipment  
97 and/or budget. Therefore, there is a need for the SARS-CoV-2 WBE community to better  
98 characterize and directly compare different methods for quantifying SARS-CoV-2 RNA in  
99 wastewater.

100  
101 In this work we characterized different methods for concentrating SARS-CoV-2 RNA from  
102 wastewater. We focused on the concentration step because wastewater concentration methods  
103 applied for SARS-CoV-2 RNA vary widely from electronegative filtration with bead beating  
104 (Ahmed et al., 2020a), electronegative filtration with elution (Sherchan et al., 2020),  
105 ultrafiltration (Westhaus et al., 2021), precipitation (La Rosa et al., 2021), ultracentrifugation  
106 (Prado et al., 2020), and direct extraction (Crits-Christoph et al., 2020). Moreover, differences in  
107 approach, such as sample volume or whether to separate solids by centrifugation can impact  
108 measurement outcomes. Without standardization, it has been difficult to compare concentration  
109 methods across sites, study their relative strengths and weaknesses, optimize the methods, and  
110 understand the biggest sources of RNA loss. Despite these obstacles, our recent study had  
111 success in applying empirical adjustment factors to account for differences in SARS-CoV-2  
112 RNA measurement methods between two labs (Stadler et al., 2020). The lack of internal  
113 standards presents another caveat, as RNA recovery percentages from wastewater samples vary  
114 between methods and thus non-normalized viral concentrations may impact comparisons across  
115 sites. In order to address this problem, surrogate viruses can be used to estimate the recovery  
116 efficiency and quantification of a target virus. Recent studies have used surrogate viruses to  
117 estimate SARS-CoV-2 RNA recovery percentages across a variety of methods (Ahmed et al.,  
118 2020a; La Rosa et al., 2021; Sherchan et al., 2020; Torii et al., 2020). To our knowledge, only  
119 one study has compared SARS-CoV-2 recovery from wastewater across methods in depth, but  
120 there were significant differences between compared methods that make it difficult to pinpoint  
121 the concentration step or some other factor as the source of differences (Pecson et al., 2020). At  
122 least one review compared concentration methods across studies, but there is again other

123 differences between studies that make it difficult to directly compare the concentration method  
124 (La Rosa et al., 2020)

125

126 In this study, we performed a head-to-head comparison of five different concentration methods  
127 on samples from six wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) in Houston, TX. We evaluated the  
128 methods by comparing the yields of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and sensitivity of detection by each  
129 method. In addition, we compared the recovery of a spiked surrogate virus, bovine coronavirus  
130 (BCoV), and the yield of a fecal indicator virus, pepper mild mottle virus (pMMoV). We provide  
131 a comprehensive practical summary for each concentration method by outlining start-up cost,  
132 consumable cost per sample, throughput time, limit of quantification (LoQ), and the variation in  
133 N1 and N2 detection between replicate samples. Overall, this study involves an extensive  
134 analysis of concentration methods currently in use to quantify SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater,  
135 and an examination of BCoV and pMMoV as potential control factors.

136

## 137 **2. Methods**

### 138 ***2.1 Surrogate Preparation***

139 BCoV was chosen as a surrogate and quality control measure to analyze viral RNA recovery  
140 between different concentration methods. Calf Guard (Zoetis) cattle vaccine containing an  
141 attenuated strain of the surrogate was used as the source for BCoV. Freeze-dried virus in 3 mL  
142 vials was rehydrated in sterile conditions with 1.5 mL of TE buffer on the morning of sample  
143 collection. Multiple vials were rehydrated and combined to prepare enough stock solution to

144 spike all samples. A 100  $\mu$ L aliquot of BCoV was immediately stored at -80°C to later determine  
145 the concentration of BCoV in the stock solution.

## 146 **2.2 Wastewater Sampling**

147 Time-weighted composite samples of raw wastewater (influent) were collected every 1 hour for  
148 24 hours. The collection period began the morning of Monday, October 5, 2020 and ended the  
149 morning of Tuesday, October 6, 2020. Wastewater samples from 6 facilities with a range of  
150 compositions, as measured by total suspended solids (TSS), carbonaceous biochemical oxygen  
151 demand (CBOD), and ammonia (NH<sub>4</sub>-N), were collected to test the robustness of the different  
152 concentration methods (**Table 1**).

153 concentration methods (**Table 1**).

154

<b>Wastewater Treatment Plant (Anonymized)</b>	<b>Average Daily Flow Rate (MGD)</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>TSS (mg/L)</b>	<b>CBOD (mg/L)</b>	<b>NH<sub>4</sub>-N (mg-N/L)</b>
<b>A</b>	8.52	167,000	342	126	26.2
<b>B</b>	16.6	304,000	970	120	17.4
<b>C</b>	9.69	330,000	196	155	26.2
<b>D</b>	0.180	13,400	100	155	34.2
<b>E</b>	3.21	86,600	58.7	108	30.5
<b>F</b>	1.53	48,200	106	201	32.0

155

156 **Table 1. Characteristics of the different wastewater treatment systems. Average daily flow rate**

157 *was recorded on the day of October 5. Population data was extracted from the 2019 American*

158 *Community Survey (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). Composition data were reported from samples*



159 *taken between October 5, 2020 to October 6, 2020. All data was provided by the City of*  
160 *Houston (Houston Public Works and Houston Health Department).*

### 161 ***2.3 Wastewater Sample Collection***

162 At the end of the sampling period, all samples were transported on ice to a central processing  
163 facility. Larger sample volumes were aliquoted into 500 mL, Nalgene™ Wide-Mouth HDPE  
164 Packaging Bottles (3121890016, Thermo Scientific) and spiked with 50 µL of BCoV stock  
165 solution. Aliquots were transported on ice to Baylor College of Medicine or Rice University and  
166 then stored at 4°C for further processing.

### 167 ***2.4 Wastewater Sample Concentration***

168 The different concentration methods are depicted in **Figure 1**. Concentration occurred the day  
169 following sample collection (Oct. 7). PEG concentration began the day of sample collection to  
170 allow the samples to sit overnight (Oct. 6). Technical replicates were performed in triplicate for  
171 each concentration method. The direct extraction, HA filtration with bead beating, and  
172 ultrafiltration concentration methods were completed at Rice University. The resulting  
173 concentrates were immediately transported to Baylor College of Medicine on ice for extraction.  
174 HA filtration with elution and PEG methods were completed at Baylor College of Medicine.  
175 Concentration methods were split between labs to reduce processing burden and because each  
176 lab had more experience with their respective methods. Concentrates were stored at 4°C until  
177 extraction.

178 *2.4.1 Direct Extraction*

179 Approximately 1 mL of sample was aliquoted into a 1.5 mL centrifuge tube. The sample was  
180 then centrifuged for 5 minutes at 17,000 g and 4°C. The supernatant was carefully aspirated  
181 without disturbing the pellet and used for extraction.

182 *2.4.2 HA Filtration with Bead Beating*

183 Roughly 50 mL of each sample was aliquoted into 50 mL conical tubes (1184R09, Thomas  
184 Scientific) and then centrifuged for 10 minutes at 4,100 g and 4°C. Prior to sample addition, the  
185 assembled MF 3, 300ml Magnetic Filter Holder with lid kit (200300-01, Sterlitech) was attached  
186 to the Multi-Vac 600-MS Manifold (180600-01, Sterlitech) and Rocker 800 Oil Free Laboratory  
187 Vacuum Pump (167800, Sterlitech) system. Electronegative Microbiological Analysis  
188 Membrane HA Filters (HAWG047S6, Millipore Sigma) were placed into the manifold system  
189 with sterile forceps prior to the filtration process. The filters were then washed with  
190 approximately 50 mL of ultrapure water before sample addition. A graduated cylinder was used  
191 to measure 50 mL of supernatant which was then poured directly into the assembled filter holder.  
192 After sample was added into the manifold system, 1 mL of 1.25 M  $MgCl_2 \cdot 6H_2O$  (M0250-500G,  
193 Sigma Aldrich) was added directly to the sample to achieve a final concentration of 25 mM. The  
194 samples were then gently swirled with a pipette tip to homogenize and allowed to sit for five  
195 minutes. The vacuum pump was subsequently turned on and allowed to pull the sample through  
196 the filter. After the sample passed through the filter, the vacuum pumps were turned off, the  
197 filters were rolled up with sterile forceps, and then placed into a filled bead beating tube (0.1 mm  
198 diameter glass beads, Ca. No.: 11079101, BioSpec. Bead beating tube, Ca. No: 02-682-558,  
199 Fisher Scientific).

### 200 2.4.3 HA Filtration with Elution

201 The beginning of the HA filtration with elution method was similar to HA filtration with bead  
202 beating. However, centrifugation for the elution method was completed for 1 minute at 3,000 g  
203 and 4°C. Furthermore, the use of EZ-Fit™ Filtration Unit (EFHAW100B, Millipore Sigma) is  
204 unique to the elution method. These are sterile, single use filter holders that come with the same  
205 electronegative filters used in HA filtration with bead beating. These units were used to facilitate  
206 the elution aspect of the elution method. The major divergence from HA filtration with bead  
207 beating is how the captured virus was recovered from the filters after filtration. After filtration,  
208 filters were carefully flipped over with sterile forceps and placed back into the filter holder.  
209 Next, 5 mL of 1 mM NaOH (S318-100, Fisher Scientific) eluent was placed on top of the  
210 inverted filter. The back of a EZ-Fit Filtration Unit was then used to push the eluent through the  
211 filter and into a 15 mL conical tube (1184R08, Thomas Scientific) containing 12.5 µL of 100  
212 mM H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> (A300-212, Fisher Scientific) to neutralize the NaOH. Roughly 2.5 mL of eluent was  
213 collected from the setup. For concentration calculation purposes, the virus was treated as eluting  
214 into 2.5 mL.

### 215 2.4.4 PEG precipitation

216 Solids were first removed by centrifuging wastewater in 500 mL centrifuge bottles (47735-696,  
217 VWR) for 15 minutes at 7,140 g and 4°C. The supernatant was then filtered through 0.22 µm  
218 Steritop Threaded Bottle Top Filters (SCGPS05RE, Millipore) into glass bottles. Then, 200 mL  
219 of sample was transferred into a new sterile 500 mL bottle. Next, 16 g of PEG 8000 (8% w/v)  
220 (VWRV0159-1KG, VWR) and 5.844 g of NaCl (0.5 M) (S271-1, Fisher Chemical) were added  
221 to the bottle. The solution was then inverted, gently shaken by hand, and allowed to precipitate  
222 overnight at 4°C. The following day, the sample was centrifuged for 30 minutes at 16,900 g and

223 4°C. The supernatant was then poured off and the pellet was resuspended in 2 mL of 1X PBS  
224 solution (0.01 M). The 1X PBS solution (0.01 M) was prepared with 1.096 g Na<sub>2</sub>HPO<sub>4</sub> (S375-  
225 500, Fisher Chemical), 0.3148 g H<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>Na•H<sub>2</sub>O (S369-500, Fisher Chemical), and 8.5 g NaCl  
226 (BP358-10, Fisher Chemical) per liter in ultrapure water and subsequently passed through a 0.22  
227 µM filter into a sterile container. 1 mL of each suspension was then aliquoted into 1.5mL  
228 microcentrifuge tubes.

#### 229 *2.4.5 Ultrafiltration*

230 Roughly 50 mL of each sample was aliquoted into 50 mL conical tubes. The conical tubes were  
231 then centrifuged for 10 minutes at 4,100 g and 4°C. 50 mL of solids-free supernatant was then  
232 transferred to another 50 mL conical tube and stored on ice until further processing. The  
233 Amicon® Pro Purification System with 100kDa Amicon® Ultra-0.5 Devices (ACS510024,  
234 Millipore Sigma) were filled with 15 mL of ultrapure water and centrifuged for 8 minutes at  
235 1,900 g and 4°C. Flow through and residual concentrate were poured out. Approximately 15 mL  
236 of supernatant was then loaded into each ultrafiltration device. The ultrafiltration devices were  
237 then centrifuged for 10 minutes at 4,100 g and 4°C. Flow through was discarded, and additional  
238 sample added to reach the volume limit of the ultrafiltration devices. The centrifugation and  
239 discarding process was repeated until each sample had completely passed through the  
240 ultrafiltration devices. As the ultrafiltration approached completion, centrifugation intervals of 3  
241 minutes and 5 minutes were used to end with a final concentrate volume of approximately 1.5  
242 mL. Concentrate was pipetted from the ultrafiltration devices into 2 mL microcentrifuge tubes.  
243 Microcentrifuge tubes containing the sample were weighed to calculate total volume of  
244 concentrate.

## 245 **2.5 RNA Extraction**

246 Liquid samples were extracted with the chemagic™ Prime Viral DNA/RNA 300 Kit H96 (CMG-  
247 1433, PerkinElmer) following manufacturer protocol. 300 µL of liquid concentrate was  
248 extracted into 100 µL of sterile, nuclease free water. Extraction occurred the day following  
249 concentration for all liquid samples.

250

251 Bead beating tubes containing filters from the HA Filtration with bead beating concentration  
252 method were extracted by first adding 600 µL of lysis buffer from the chemagic kit. The  
253 samples were then bead beaten on a FastPrep-24™ 5G bead beater (116005500, MP Biomedical)  
254 for 1 minute at 5 m/s, placed on ice for 2 minutes, bead beaten for 1 minute at 5 m/s, and then  
255 placed on ice. Samples were then centrifuged for 3 minutes at 17,000 g and 4°C. 300 µL of  
256 supernatant was then removed and subjected to the same chemagic extraction as used on the  
257 liquid samples. RNA extracts were stored at -80°C for 10 days and then transferred to -20°C for  
258 two days until quantification.

259

## 260 **2.6 Quantification**

### 261 *2.6.1 Reverse Transcription - Droplet Digital Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-ddPCR)*

262 One step RT-ddPCR was conducted with One-Step RT-ddPCR Advanced Kit for Probes  
263 (1864021, Bio-Rad) on the QX200 AutoDG Droplet Digital PCR System (Bio-Rad) to quantify  
264 the concentration of N1 SARS-CoV-2, N2 SARS-CoV-2, and M BCoV gene targets in extracted  
265 samples. Primer and probe information can be found in **Table S1**. Reaction mixes were prepared  
266 on ice according to the composition outlined in **Table S2** for N1 and N2, and **Table S3** for

267 BCoV. RNA template for BCoV was diluted 50x to attain a concentration within the  
268 quantifiable range of the ddPCR equipment. Thermocycling conditions are outlined in **Table S6**.  
269 After thermocycling, samples were held at 4°C for no longer than 12 hours until being read on  
270 the QX200 Droplet Reader (18644003, Bio-Rad). Droplet data was analyzed on the QuantaSoft  
271 v1.7.4 software. Manual thresholding of droplets was only performed when QuantaSoft was  
272 unable to automatically threshold.

### 273 *2.6.2 Reverse Transcription - Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-qPCR)*

274 One step RT-qPCR was conducted with qPCRBIO Probe 1-Step Go Separate-ROX (PB25.44-  
275 12, PCR Biosystems) on the QuantStudio 3 Real Time PCR System (A28567, Applied  
276 Biosystems) to quantify the concentration of VGP pMMoV gene targets in extracted samples.  
277 Primer and probe information can be found in **Table S1**. Reaction mixes were prepared on ice  
278 according to the composition outlined in **Table S4**. RNA template for pMMoV was taken from  
279 the 50x dilutions created for measuring BCoV to conserve undiluted extract. Thermocycling  
280 conditions are outlined in **Table S7**. qPCR data was analyzed on the QuantStudio Design and  
281 Analysis v1.4 software.

282  
283 Standards of linear DNA (IDT), 708 bp in length, were prepared and ran in triplicate in a dilution  
284 series with concentrations at 0.69, 6.9, 69, 690, 6,900, 69,000, to 690,000 gene copies/ $\mu$ L  
285 standard. Herring sperm DNA (D1811, Promega) at a final concentration of 10 ng/ $\mu$ L was used  
286 to dilute the standards as a carrier DNA to preserve pMMoV standard DNA fragments during  
287 freeze-thaws.

### 288 2.6.3 Limit of Quantification (LoQ)

289 The LoQ for ddPCR was defined as 3 positive droplets per 10,000 total droplets generated by the  
290 instrument as recommended by the manufacturer. The volume of an individual droplet (0.86 nL)  
291 was then used to calculate a LoQ of 0.767 gene copies/ $\mu$ L RNA template for a reaction setup  
292 with 10  $\mu$ L of RNA template.

293

294 The LoQ for RT-qPCR was determined to be 0.69 gene copies/ $\mu$ L RNA template for a reaction  
295 setup with 4  $\mu$ L of RNA template. This was the concentration of the lowest standard used in our  
296 calibration curve. pMMoV was the only gene target measured through RT-qPCR, and all values  
297 were significantly above this limit. Concentration factors (**Table S8-S13**), average percent  
298 recovery, and unit conversions were then used to convert this raw LoQ to an effective LoQ  
299 associated with each concentration method (**Eqn. 1**).

$$\text{Equation 1: } LoQ_{eff} = \frac{LoQ_{method}}{\% Recovery BCoV} = \frac{LoQ_{raw}}{\% Recovery BCoV * Concentration Factor}$$

300 Measurements below the LoQ may indicate presence of gene targets but are not reliably accurate  
301 measurements of the concentration.

302

## 303 3. Results & Discussion

### 304 3.1 Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater with Different Concentration Methods

305 We first evaluated the effectiveness of five concentration methods at detecting and quantifying  
306 the SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater samples. We obtained 24 hour composite wastewater  
307 samples from six different WWTPs in Houston covering a range of influent flow rates,

308 population sizes, and wastewater compositions (**Table 1**). We also created a negative control  
309 sample that contains only DI water that had been spiked with the BCoV surrogate. We applied  
310 each of the five different concentration methods to each sample in triplicate, extracted the RNA  
311 of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, and quantified the concentration of CDC target N1 and N2 using  
312 digital droplet PCR (ddPCR). We then back calculated the concentration of the virus in terms of  
313 copies of the virus per liter of wastewater (**Figure 2A, B**).

314 The concentration methods use different mechanisms to concentrate SARS-CoV-2. HA filtration  
315 concentrates via manipulation of charge interactions between virus particles and filter media  
316 (Cashdollar and Wymer, 2013). The addition of salts effectively replaces the repulsive  
317 interactions between the negatively charged virus surface and the negatively charged surface of  
318 the filter with positive-ion bridges. The bead beating method then desorbs and ruptures virus  
319 particles absorbed to the filter membrane surface. In the HA filtration with elution method, an  
320 eluent is added that desorbs the virus particles from the filter membrane surface into a smaller  
321 volume by altering the pH. The PEG method concentrates by precipitation of virus particles upon  
322 addition of polyethylene glycol and sodium chloride. Although there is uncertainty in the exact  
323 mechanism, virus precipitation is believed to occur similarly to precipitation of proteins by PEG,  
324 where water molecules are drawn from the solution to hydrate PEG molecules, thereby  
325 increasing the effective protein concentration, making it insoluble, enabling the proteins to  
326 precipitate after reaching saturation (Ingham, 1990; Yamamoto et al., 1970). Ultrafiltration  
327 concentrates via size exclusion, allowing water and other small particles to pass through a filter,  
328 but blocking larger sized particles like SARS-CoV-2 virus (Cashdollar and Wymer, 2013). The  
329 different mechanisms involved in these concentration methods lead to different degrees of  
330 recovery of SARS-CoV-2, BCoV, and pMMoV.



331 All five of the tested concentration methods were able to detect the presence of SARS-CoV-2  
332 RNA, but varied significantly in viral RNA titer. Direct extraction yielded the highest apparent  
333 concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA across all wastewater samples. In contrast, PEG had  
334 consistently lower signal for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Both methods involving HA filtration (with  
335 bead beating and with elution) yielded similar concentrations that were about a half log lower  
336 than direct extraction. In all cases, the resulting concentration of N1 and N2 per liter of  
337 wastewater was highly dependent on the concentration method used, more so than from which  
338 WWTP the sample came from. This suggests that the true concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
339 from all six WWTPs was roughly the same. It is worth noting that these measurement systems  
340 may be detecting free SARS-CoV-2 RNA along with intact SARS-CoV-2 virus particles, and  
341 that each concentration method may have a different ability to measure that free SARS-CoV-2  
342 RNA.

343 Direct extraction yielded the highest concentrations of genome copies per L of wastewater due to  
344 the fewest losses associated with concentration and the largest concentration factor applied.  
345 When the results are shown in terms of the raw data, copies of N1 or N2 per  $\mu\text{L}$  of RNA  
346 template, direct extraction had the lowest raw concentrations of viral RNA and many data points  
347 were below the LoQ (as shown by the line in **(Figure 2C, D)**). Furthermore, the only method that  
348 yielded results that were consistently above the LoQ for all WWTPs and both targets was HA  
349 filtration with bead beating. Because the LoQ is constant in terms of copies of RNA per  $\mu\text{L}$  of  
350 RNA template, the method that yields the highest raw concentration of RNA per  $\mu\text{L}$  of template  
351 is the one that produces quantifiable signal. Therefore, when evaluating concentration methods, a  
352 key metric for consideration is not the genome copies per liter wastewater, but the copies per  $\mu\text{L}$   
353 of RNA template. In the set of methods we evaluated, we found that HA filtration with bead

354 beating performed the best in terms of having the highest raw genome copies per microliter of  
355 RNA template and was thus consistently able to quantify SARS-CoV-2 RNA in all wastewater  
356 samples tested.

357 One important decision in SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration that may impact sensitivity,  
358 reproducibility, and variability is the volume of input wastewater. As input volume increases you  
359 are left with a higher concentration of virus RNA in a concentrate of the same volume.

360 However, this does not come without sacrifice. In all three filtration-based methods, there is a  
361 nearly exponential relationship between input volume and processing time (data not shown),  
362 which can be an issue for the logistics of WBE for SARS-CoV-2. There is also an upper limit on  
363 filterable volume, as pores in the filter membrane become completely blocked. In the case of  
364 PEG, larger input volume means larger volumes need to be placed in centrifuges which have  
365 maximum volumetric capacities and increases in startup price associated with increasing that  
366 capacity by purchasing higher-powered centrifuges. Additionally, the fraction of recovered virus  
367 may not stay constant for all methods with a higher volume. In the case of HA filtration  
368 methods, for example, absorption sites on the filter surface may be increasingly occupied as  
369 additional volume is filtered, reducing the amount of virus particles and virus RNA that can  
370 absorb to the surface. All concentration methods in this study, except for direct extraction and  
371 HA filtration with elution, used 50 mL of input volume. Direct extraction used 300  $\mu$ L due to  
372 volume limits of the extraction kit that we used, and HA filtration with elution used 25 mL due  
373 to rate of filtration limits in the operating lab. An in-depth investigation into volume  
374 optimization was out of the scope of this study but could be performed to improve the sensitivity  
375 and reduce the variability of each of the concentration methods.

376 3.2 Practical considerations of different concentration methods

<b>Method</b>	<b>Startup cost (\$)</b>	<b>Consumables cost (\$/ sample)</b>	<b>Throughput (hr/6 samples)</b>	<b>LoQ (gc/L WW)</b>	<b>Effective LoQ (gc/L WW)</b>	<b>BCoV %CV</b>	<b>pMMoV %CV</b>
<b>Direct extraction</b>	\$5,650	\$0.14	0.1	2.56E+05	8.39E+06	14.6	29.9
<b>HA Filtration + Bead Beating</b>	\$15,368	\$1.50	0.7	3.07E+03	2.76E+05	27.3	25.9
<b>HA Filtration + Elution</b>	\$11,160	\$5.80	0.5	2.56E+04	3.89E+06	20.9	31.8
<b>PEG</b>	\$20,288	\$11.02	4.6	2.56E+03	2.70E+06	39.0	49.8
<b>Ultrafiltration</b>	\$9,000	\$12.10	1.5	7.67E+03	2.63E+06	24.4	49.5

377 *Table 2: Summary of key metrics of each concentration method. A detailed breakdown of costs*  
378 *and list of equipment used can be found in S14-23.*

379

380 Next, we compared characteristics related to the practicality of the different concentration  
381 methods. We did this comparison to help relevant parties decide which SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
382 concentration method is best suited for their situation. Laboratories might have differences in  
383 availability of resources (equipment, labor) and in the number of samples requiring analysis, and  
384 thus can use these results to optimize workflow.

385

386 The startup costs reflect equipment that was unique to each concentration method. Standard lab  
387 equipment required by all concentration methods, such as pipettes and PPE, were not included in

388 these calculations. Additionally, RNA extraction costs were not included, except in the case for  
389 the price of a bead beater, which is necessary to quantify RNA when using the HA filtration with  
390 bead beating method. The largest factor contributing to startup costs in all cases was centrifuges.  
391 The differences in startup costs was generally due to differences in cost of the specific centrifuge  
392 required. A centrifuge is not necessary to perform the HA filtration with bead beating method,  
393 but centrifuging samples prior to concentration to remove solids drastically decreased filtering  
394 time and thus greatly increased throughput efficiency (data not shown). Pecson et al. also found  
395 that a solids removal step did not show a clear impact on the quantification results of SARS-  
396 CoV-2 (Pecson et al., 2020). A detailed breakdown of startup costs can be found in **Table S14-**  
397 **S18.**

398  
399 By far the most expensive method in terms of consumables cost per sample is ultrafiltration. The  
400 Amicon® filters required by this process are expensive and not reusable. The PEG method is  
401 also relatively high in cost for a similar reason; the unique bottom top filters are costly and  
402 cannot be reused. It may be possible to lower costs for PEG by purchasing individual 0.22 µm  
403 filters to use in a filter manifold setup, however, this would further sacrifice throughput, as time  
404 would be required to rinse the manifold setup to prevent cross contamination. HA filtration with  
405 bead beating and elution methods had comparable consumables costs, although the elution  
406 method is more expensive due to the use of an EZ-Fit™ Filtration Unit. We do not suggest  
407 reusing or replacing the EZ-Fit units to lower cost, since contact with the flipped filter and  
408 underlying surface poses a large cross contamination risk if done in a repeatedly used filter  
409 manifold. Direct extraction was the least expensive method since specialized consumables were  
410 not required. A detailed breakdown of consumable costs can be found in **Table S19-S23.**

411  
412 Throughput time was also assessed as different groups conducting WBE for SARS-CoV-2 have  
413 varying numbers of samples and unique requirements for turnaround times needed to report data.  
414 All concentration methods included a centrifugation step to remove solids in their throughput  
415 time. The PEG method had the lowest throughput, largely because of the precipitation step,  
416 taking at least 3 hours longer to process a batch of samples than the other methods evaluated. In  
417 our study, PEG was precipitated overnight to lower the burden on lab workers, but our  
418 experience with PEG concentration suggests that this time could be lowered to 4 hours without  
419 lowering recovery. Other literature concentrating viruses using PEG have reduced precipitation  
420 time further, but investigation of the effect of this on recovery was out of the scope of this study.  
421 Ultrafiltration had the second lowest throughput due to non-filterable matter accumulation during  
422 centrifugation. In centrifugation steps that allow fluid to pass directly through a filter, clogging  
423 and precipitation is probable, thus increasing processing time. Direct extraction had the highest  
424 throughput efficiency, since it only required a five minute solids removal step. HA filtration with  
425 bead beating and HA filtration with elution had high and comparable throughputs. A detailed  
426 breakdown of throughput can be found in **Table S24**.

427  
428 We then determined the LoQ for all of the concentration methods. Here we defined the LoQ by  
429 translating the minimum droplet counts required to reliably quantify gene targets (an approach  
430 recommended by Bio-Rad). The minimum droplet count, 3 positive droplets per 10,000 total  
431 droplets, translates to 0.767 gene copies/ $\mu$ L ddPCR reaction. The amount of RNA template and  
432 different concentration factors between methods were then used to calculate the LoQ in **Table 2**.  
433 PEG had the highest concentration factor of 300, leading to the lowest LoQ, while direct

434 extraction has the highest LoQ because there was no concentration occurring. It is important to  
435 note that this LoQ does not take into account losses incurred by the different concentration  
436 methods. The optimal method will balance a low LoQ with a high recovery leading to raw  
437 concentrations of gene targets being significantly above the raw LoQ. We accounted for recovery  
438 by averaging percent recovery of BCoV for the different methods and incorporating that average  
439 into an effective LoQ. It should be noted that BCoV has yet to be identified as an optimal  
440 surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 but can still provide valuable information in this context. The  
441 recovery of BCoV through PEG, averaging 0.09%, was low enough to increase the effective  
442 LoQ to higher than that of HA filtration with bead beating. When incorporating percent recovery  
443 of the different methods, HA filtration with bead beating had the lowest effective LoQ at  $2.76e5$   
444 gene copies/L wastewater, and was almost an order of magnitude lower (more sensitive) than the  
445 other concentration methods [**Table 2**]. The effective LoQ is directly related to the sensitivity of  
446 the concentration method, which is a critical factor in being able to reliably quantify SARS-CoV-  
447 2 in wastewater samples, especially when there is relatively low community prevalence.  
448 Lowering the effective LoQ relative to direct extraction is the essential reason why we include a  
449 concentration step, because it makes lower concentrations of virus more reliably quantifiable.  
450  
451 In a study that investigated different overall processing methods for measurement of SARS-  
452 CoV-2, no systematic impact by the concentration method was found for results corrected with a  
453 process control (Pecson et al., 2020). As mentioned previously however, there were  
454 confounding factors, such as differences in extraction and quantification steps, between the  
455 different processing methods that could have skewed the comparison of the concentration step.  
456 Another study investigated the recovery of murine hepatitis virus (MHV), a proposed process

457 control for SARS-CoV-2, between multiple concentration methods with the same extraction and  
458 quantification steps (Ahmed et al., 2020b). The general ranking of the recovery results for the  
459 concentration methods they tested generally agree with ours in the order of best to worst: HA  
460 filtration with bead beating, ultrafiltration, and PEG. A third study compared concentration of  
461 MHV via PEG, ultracentrifugation, and ultrafiltration and found that ultrafiltration was the  
462 preferable concentration method for enveloped viruses of those three methods, but this study  
463 based its results on the quantification of live virus and not virus RNA (Ye et al., 2016). They  
464 suggest that PEG is a preferred method only for non-enveloped viruses. Overall, our study our  
465 study controlled for different confounding factors and directly measured SARS-CoV-2 RNA,  
466 unlike these previous two studies.

### 467 *3.3 Recovery of corrective surrogates*

468 In addition to SARS-CoV-2 RNA, we compared the concentrations of BCoV and pMMoV RNA  
469 in the WWTP samples processed via the different concentration methods. Each wastewater  
470 sample was immediately spiked with a known concentration of BCoV upon reception at the  
471 collection site. Samples that had passed through concentration and extraction protocols were then  
472 analyzed through ddPCR (BCoV) and qPCR (pMMoV) to determine their concentrations in the  
473 wastewater samples.

### 474 *3.4 Bovine Coronavirus (BCoV) Process Control*

475 A process control is necessary when exact RNA recovery efficiency of the target component  
476 across different processing steps is unknown, or when determining these recoveries may be  
477 impractical. By spiking in a known concentration of the process control at the beginning of the  
478 process or at different stages throughout the process and comparing the measured concentration

479 to the expected concentration, it is possible to determine the overall recovery of the process  
480 control and loss of the process control during sample processing. If the process control has been  
481 validated, and is known to behave in a way similar to the target component, then these losses can  
482 be incorporated into the measured concentration of the target component to estimate a “true”  
483 measure of the target component in the sample. Process controls can also be used simply as  
484 positive controls to ensure that nothing went awry during sample processing and analysis.

485

486 Recent SARS-CoV-2 WBE studies have used a variety of process controls, including MHV  
487 (Ahmed et al., 2020b), transmissible gastroenteritis virus (TGEV) (Mlejnkova et al., 2020),  
488 human coronavirus (HCoV 229E) (La Rosa et al., 2021), Phi 6 (Sherchan et al., 2020), bovine  
489 respiratory syncytial virus (BRSV) (Gonzalez et al., 2020), and BCoV (Gonzalez et al., 2020).  
490 However, no single process control has proven, as of yet, to be significantly more indicative of  
491 SARS-CoV-2 recovery than other process controls. In this work we sought to assess BCoV as a  
492 process control by comparing its recovery across different methods and wastewater samples  
493 against the yields of SARS-CoV-2 RNA.

494

495 We chose BCoV because of its similarity to SARS-CoV-2, as both viruses are part of the genus  
496 *Betacoronaviridae*. SARS-CoV-2 is an enveloped virus, generally spherical in shape with mild  
497 pleomorphism (60-140 nm diameter) and a 29.9 kb length genome (Zhu et al., 2020). BCoV is a  
498 pleomorphic (65-210 nm diameter), enveloped RNA virus with a 27 - 32 kb length genome (Saif,  
499 2010). Both BCoV and SARS-CoV-2 carry a spike (S) glycoprotein on their envelope surface,  
500 while only BCoV carries an additional, large protein on its envelope surface known as  
501 hemagglutinin-esterase (HE) glycoprotein (Saif, 2010). Apart from structural similarity, BCoV is



502 also easily obtainable in an attenuated form from a common cattle vaccine and poses a low  
503 health risk to humans.

504

505 The magnitude of recovery of BCoV reflected the magnitude of recovery of N1 and N2 across  
506 concentration methods. Like N1 and N2, the highest to lowest recovery of BCoV from the  
507 different concentration methods occurred in the order of direct extraction, HA filtration with  
508 bead beating, HA filtration with elution, ultrafiltration, and finally PEG. Overall, this suggests  
509 that BCoV could be a good surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 as relative recovery of BCoV across  
510 concentration methods mirrors the relative recoveries of SARS-CoV-2. However, there is some  
511 difficulty in directly comparing recovery of N1 and N2 to BCoV due to the number of N1 and  
512 N2 measurements that were below the LoQ for ddPCR. Additionally, it is not clear what the  
513 dominant forms (intact viral particle vs free RNA) of BCoV and SARS-CoV-2 are when they  
514 reach the concentration step of the measurement process and how this affects concentration.  
515 More research is needed to characterize the form of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and understand  
516 how the form impacts concentration to inform the choice of an appropriate surrogate.

517

518 Interestingly, DI water controls spiked with BCoV showed significantly different levels of  
519 recoveries compared to wastewater samples concentrated via the same method. One potential  
520 explanation for this could be rupture of the viral particles due to a large difference in osmotic  
521 pressures across viral capsid/envelope in DI water. Rupture may not occur in wastewater  
522 samples due to a significant amount of dissolved compounds reducing differences in osmotic  
523 pressure inside and outside of the viral particle. Thus, the disparate concentration methods may  
524 have different effects on ruptured versus unruptured virus.

### 525 3.5 Pepper Mild Mottle Virus (pMMoV) Normalization Factor

526 There are many factors that affect wastewater concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA between  
527 excretion in feces and quantification in the lab that potentially confound translation of  
528 concentration to community prevalence. While a process control, like BCoV, can be used to  
529 account for factors during the measurement process (i.e. between sampling and quantification), a  
530 normalization factor attempts to account for factors during the measurement process and  
531 additional upstream factors, like dilution in the sewer system.

532

533 pMMoV has been suggested as a promising normalization factor for SARS-CoV-2 (Wu et al.,  
534 2020). It is the most abundant RNA virus found in human feces due to its origin in peppers and  
535 pepper containing products and has previously been proposed as a water quality and fecal  
536 pollution indicator (Kitajima et al., 2018; Rosario et al., 2009). In theory, it is excreted in  
537 relatively consistent amounts in humans across a population and will travel alongside SARS-  
538 CoV-2 viral particles and viral RNA in the conveyance system, experiencing the same  
539 conditions. pMMoV is a rod-shaped (~312 nm length), non-enveloped RNA virus with a 6.4 kb  
540 length genome in the *Tobamovirus* family (Kitajima et al., 2018). Due to a number of structural  
541 differences between pMMoV and SARS-CoV-2, pMMoV is better used as a fecal indicator than  
542 as a corrective process control.

543

544 Direct extraction showed the highest recovery of pMMoV in all the wastewater samples (**Figure**  
545 **3**). Three other methods, HA filtration with bead beating, HA filtration with elution, and  
546 ultrafiltration showed roughly equivalent recoveries of pMMoV. The PEG method had the

547 lowest recoveries of pMMoV of all the concentration methods. All of the resulting pMMoV  
548 measurements, with the exception of two, were well above the LoQ.  
549 The relative effectiveness of direct extraction and the PEG method compared to the other  
550 concentration methods was about the same between measurement of pMMoV and measurement  
551 of N1 and N2. However, while HA filtration with bead beating, HA filtration with elution, and  
552 ultrafiltration were roughly equivalent for pMMoV, HA filtration with bead beating recovered  
553 the most N1 and N2 of the three respective concentration methods.

554

555 A number of differences between pMMoV and SARS-CoV-2 may be the cause of these  
556 differences. For example, it may be that the protein capsid and envelope of SARS-CoV-2 are  
557 easier to rupture via bead beating than the sole protein capsid of pMMoV. Alternatively, it is  
558 possible that the forms of the virus are different after conveyance in the sewers system. One of  
559 the viruses may primarily exist in the form of free RNA due to decay of their envelope and/or  
560 protein capsid, while the other virus may be largely intact. It is currently not clear what form  
561 either pMMoV or SARS-CoV-2 are in when they reach the concentration step, how these forms  
562 impact concentration, or how different characteristics of the two viruses impact concentration,  
563 but they are areas that should be explored further.

### 564 *3.6 Variability of measurement between concentration methods with BCoV and pMMoV*

565 The variability of measurements between each concentration method was determined using the  
566 coefficient of variance (CV) for BCoV and pMMoV (**Table 2**). The lower the CV, the lower the  
567 variability and the higher confidence one can have in a measured value. Further, if CV is low  
568 enough, it may be reasonable to reduce replicates (i.e. from triplicates to duplicates) to save on  
569 cost and throughput. The CV was measured for each WWTP for a particular method and then

570 averaged for all WWTPs in the method to get the CV of the whole method. The PEG method  
571 showed the highest average CV, while the HA filtration with bead beating method had a  
572 generally low CV for both BCoV and pMMoV. As of now, it is not clear what causes the  
573 difference in variability between each concentration method. We chose not to directly  
574 incorporate CV of N1 and N2 gene targets because a large proportion of measurements were  
575 below the LoQ. Therefore variability in N1 and N2 would be more attributed to the  
576 quantification procedure that was used to establish the LoQ as opposed to variability caused by  
577 the particular concentration method. Between BCoV and pMMoV, the BCoV CV is likely a  
578 better indicator of a potential SARS-CoV-2 CV due to BCoVs higher structural similarity to  
579 SARS-CoV-2 than pMMoV.

580

#### 581 **4. Conclusion**

582 By directly measuring N1, N2, BCoV, and pMMoV, we assessed the recovery and practicality of  
583 different concentration methods required for SARS-CoV-2 WBE. HA filtration with bead  
584 beating showed high recovery of all gene targets at a significant distance above the LoQ, leading  
585 to low variability across measurements. The same method also demonstrated relatively moderate  
586 startup costs, low cost per sample, and high throughput. HA filtration with bead beating is  
587 therefore a preferred concentration method in many situations from the perspective of recovery  
588 and practicality. Additional attention should be paid optimizing the sensitivity and recovery of all  
589 concentration methods. Future work should also identify the form of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and  
590 establish how this affects measurements via the different concentration methods. Additionally,  
591 more work needs to be done to determine the best process controls and normalization factors for  
592 SARS-CoV-2. The WBE for SARS-CoV-2 community needs to identify process controls and

593 surrogates that behave similarly to SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and Overall, this work further  
594 demonstrates that methods to concentrate SARS-CoV-2 RNA for WBE are low cost and reliable.

595

## 596 **Acknowledgements**

597 We thank Kathy Ensor for her invaluable contributions to the implementation of a wastewater  
598 monitoring system in Houston. We thank Paul Zappi, Rae Mills, Carol LaBreche, Walid  
599 Samarneh, and Aisha Niang from Houston Water for their assistance in collecting wastewater  
600 samples. We thank Lilian Mojica, Braulio Garcia, Courtney Hundley, Jeremy Rangel, Kelsey  
601 Caton, Rebeca Schneider, Daniel Bahrt, Kaavya Damakonda, Patrick Key, and Naomi Macias  
602 from the Houston Health Department for their assistance in sample collection and data analysis.  
603 We thank Kristina Cibor, Esther Lou, Basmah Maiga, Camille McCall, and Pavan Raja, and for  
604 their assistance in sample collection, processing, analysis, and project management. We thank  
605 Jeseth Delgado Vela, Adam Smith, Nadine Kotlarz, Francis de los Reyes, and Angela Harris for  
606 their discussions on wastewater-based epidemiology.

607

## 608 **Funding**

609 This work was supported by the Houston Health Department, grants from the National Science  
610 Foundation (CBET 2029025), and Rice University. P.K. was funded by a Johnson & Johnson  
611 WiSTEM2D award. Z.W.L. was funded by an Environmental Research & Education Foundation  
612 scholarship and Rice University. P.A. was funded by a National Science Foundation award  
613 (CBET 1932000). T.C. was funded by the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and  
614 Medicine Gulf Research Early Career Research Fellowship.

615 **Bibliography**

- 616 Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J.W., Choi, P.M., Kitajima,  
617 M., Simpson, S.L., Li, J., Tschärke, B., Verhagen, R., Smith, W.J.M., Zaugg, J., Dierens,  
618 L., Hugenholtz, P., Thomas, K.V., Mueller, J.F., 2020a. First confirmed detection of  
619 SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater  
620 surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Sci. Total Environ.* 138764.  
621 <https://doi.org/10/ggs449>
- 622 Ahmed, W., Bertsch, P.M., Bivins, A., Bibby, K., Farkas, K., Gathercole, A., Haramoto, E.,  
623 Gyawali, P., Korajkic, A., McMinn, B.R., Mueller, J.F., Simpson, S.L., Smith, W.J.M.,  
624 Symonds, E.M., Thomas, K.V., Verhagen, R., Kitajima, M., 2020b. Comparison of virus  
625 concentration methods for the RT-qPCR-based recovery of murine hepatitis virus, a  
626 surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 from untreated wastewater. *Sci. Total Environ.* 739, 139960.  
627 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139960>
- 628 Cashdollar, J.L., Wymer, L., 2013. Methods for primary concentration of viruses from water  
629 samples: a review and meta-analysis of recent studies. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 115, 1–11.  
630 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.12143>
- 631 Cheung, K.S., Hung, I.F.N., Chan, P.P.Y., Lung, K.C., Tso, E., Liu, R., Ng, Y.Y., Chu, M.Y.,  
632 Chung, T.W.H., Tam, A.R., Yip, C.C.Y., Leung, K.-H., Fung, A.Y.-F., Zhang, R.R., Lin,  
633 Y., Cheng, H.M., Zhang, A.J.X., To, K.K.W., Chan, K.-H., Yuen, K.-Y., Leung, W.K.,  
634 2020. Gastrointestinal Manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Virus Load in Fecal  
635 Samples From a Hong Kong Cohort: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.  
636 *Gastroenterology* 159, 81–95. <https://doi.org/10/ggrqjr>

- 637 Colosi, L.M., Barry, K.E., Kotay, S.M., Porter, M.D., Poulter, M.D., Ratliff, C., Simmons, W.,  
638 Steinberg, L.I., Wilson, D.D., Morse, R., Zmick, P., Mathers, A.J., 2020. Development of  
639 wastewater pooled surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 from congregate living settings.  
640 medRxiv 2020.10.10.20210484. <https://doi.org/10/ghjmm8>
- 641 Crits-Christoph, A., Kantor, R.S., Olm, M.R., Whitney, O.N., Al-Shayeb, B., Lou, Y.C.,  
642 Flamholz, A., Kennedy, L.C., Greenwald, H., Hinkle, A., Hetzel, J., Spitzer, S., Koble, J.,  
643 Tan, A., Hyde, F., Schroth, G., Kuersten, S., Banfield, J.F., Nelson, K.L., 2020. Genome  
644 sequencing of sewage detects regionally prevalent SARS-CoV-2 variants. medRxiv  
645 2020.09.13.20193805. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.13.20193805>
- 646 Gonzalez, R., Curtis, K., Bivins, A., Bibby, K., Weir, M.H., Yetka, K., Thompson, H., Keeling,  
647 D., Mitchell, J., Gonzalez, D., 2020. COVID-19 surveillance in Southeastern Virginia  
648 using wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Res.* 186, 116296.  
649 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116296>
- 650 Hart, O.E., Halden, R.U., 2020. Computational analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19  
651 surveillance by wastewater-based epidemiology locally and globally: Feasibility,  
652 economy, opportunities and challenges. *Sci. Total Environ.* 730, 138875.  
653 <https://doi.org/10/ds22>
- 654 Hellmér, M., Paxéus, N., Magnius, L., Enache, L., Arnholm, B., Johansson, A., Bergström, T.,  
655 Norder, H., 2014. Detection of Pathogenic Viruses in Sewage Provided Early Warnings  
656 of Hepatitis A Virus and Norovirus Outbreaks. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 80, 6771–6781.  
657 <https://doi.org/10/f245jt>

- 658 Ingham, K.C., 1990. [23] Precipitation of proteins with polyethylene glycol, in: Deutscher, M.P.  
659 (Ed.), *Methods in Enzymology, Guide to Protein Purification*. Academic Press, pp. 301–  
660 306. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0076-6879\(90\)82025-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0076-6879(90)82025-W)
- 661 Kamel, A.H., Ali, M.A., El-Nady, H.G., Deraz, A., Aho, S., Pothier, P., Belliot, G., 2011.  
662 Presence of enteric hepatitis viruses in the sewage and population of Greater Cairo. *Clin.*  
663 *Microbiol. Infect.* 17, 1182–1185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03461.x>
- 664 Katayama, H., Haramoto, E., Oguma, K., Yamashita, H., Tajima, A., Nakajima, H., Ohgaki, S.,  
665 2008. One-year monthly quantitative survey of noroviruses, enteroviruses, and  
666 adenoviruses in wastewater collected from six plants in Japan. *Water Res.* 42, 1441–  
667 1448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2007.10.029>
- 668 Kitajima, M., Sassi, H.P., Torrey, J.R., 2018. Pepper mild mottle virus as a water quality  
669 indicator. *Npj Clean Water* 1, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10/ghdbbx>
- 670 La Rosa, G., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L., Kenmoe, S., Suffredini, E., 2020. Coronavirus in  
671 water environments: Occurrence, persistence and concentration methods - A scoping  
672 review. *Water Res.* 179, 115899. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.115899>
- 673 La Rosa, G., Mancini, P., Bonanno Ferraro, G., Veneri, C., Iaconelli, M., Bonadonna, L.,  
674 Lucentini, L., Suffredini, E., 2021. SARS-CoV-2 has been circulating in northern Italy  
675 since December 2019: Evidence from environmental monitoring. *Sci. Total Environ.* 750,  
676 141711. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141711>
- 677 Lago, P.M., Gary, H.E., Pérez, L.S., Cáceres, V., Olivera, J.B., Puentes, R.P., Corredor, M.B.,  
678 Jiménez, P., Pallansch, M.A., Cruz, R.G., 2003. Poliovirus detection in wastewater and  
679 stools following an immunization campaign in Havana, Cuba. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 32, 772–  
680 777. <https://doi.org/10/dfkdb3>








- 681 McCall, C., Wu, H., Miyani, B., Xagorarakis, I., 2020. Identification of multiple potential viral  
682 diseases in a large urban center using wastewater surveillance. *Water Res.* 184, 116160.  
683 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116160>
- 684 Mesoraca, A., Margiotti, K., Viola, A., Cima, A., Sparacino, D., Giorlandino, C., 2020.  
685 Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in fecal samples. *Viol. J.* 17, 86.  
686 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12985-020-01359-1>
- 687 Mlejnkova, H., Sovova, K., Vasickova, P., Ocenaskova, V., Jasikova, L., Juranova, E., 2020.  
688 Preliminary Study of Sars-Cov-2 Occurrence in Wastewater in the Czech Republic. *Int. J.*  
689 *Environ. Res. Public. Health* 17, 5508. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155508>
- 690 Pecson, B.M., Darby, E., Haas, C.N., Amha, Y., Bartolo, M., Danielson, R., Dearborn, Y.,  
691 Giovanni, G.D., Ferguson, C., Fevig, S., Gaddis, E., Gray, D., Lukasik, G., Mull, B.,  
692 Olivas, L., Olivieri, A., Qu, Y., Consortium, S.-C.-2 I., 2020. Reproducibility and  
693 sensitivity of 36 methods to quantify the SARS-CoV-2 genetic signal in raw wastewater:  
694 findings from an interlaboratory methods evaluation in the U.S. medRxiv  
695 2020.11.02.20221622. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20221622>
- 696 Prado, T., Fumian, T.M., Mannarino, C.F., Maranhão, A.G., Siqueira, M.M., Miagostovich,  
697 M.P., 2020. Preliminary results of SARS-CoV-2 detection in sewerage system in Niterói  
698 municipality, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Mem. Inst. Oswaldo Cruz* 115.  
699 <https://doi.org/10.1590/0074-02760200196>
- 700 Rosario, K., Symonds, E.M., Sinigalliano, C., Stewart, J., Breitbart, M., 2009. Pepper Mild  
701 Mottle Virus as an Indicator of Fecal Pollution. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 75, 7261–  
702 7267. <https://doi.org/10/cvdh3j>


- 703 Saif, L.J., 2010. Bovine Respiratory Coronavirus. *Vet. Clin. North Am. Food Anim. Pract.* 26,  
704 349–364. <https://doi.org/10/drj9>
- 705 Sherchan, S.P., Shahin, S., Ward, L.M., Tandukar, S., Aw, T.G., Schmitz, B., Ahmed, W.,  
706 Kitajima, M., 2020. First detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in North  
707 America: A study in Louisiana, USA. *Sci. Total Environ.* 743, 140621.  
708 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140621>
- 709 Stadler, L.B., Ensor, K.B., Clark, J.R., Kalvapalle, P., LaTurner, Z.W., Mojica, L., Terwilliger,  
710 A., Zhuo, Y., Ali, P., Avadhanula, V., Bertolusso, R., Crosby, T., Hernandez, H.,  
711 Hollstein, M., Weesner, K., Zong, D.M., Persse, D., Piedra, P.A., Maresso, A.W.,  
712 Hopkins, L., 2020. Wastewater Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 as a Predictive Metric of  
713 Positivity Rate for a Major Metropolis. *medRxiv* 2020.11.04.20226191.  
714 <https://doi.org/10/ghjmm9>
- 715 Torii, S., Furumai, H., Katayama, H., 2020. Applicability of polyethylene glycol precipitation  
716 followed by acid guanidinium thiocyanate-phenol-chloroform extraction for the detection  
717 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from municipal wastewater. *Sci. Total Environ.* 143067.  
718 <https://doi.org/10/ghg84r>
- 719 Tromberg, B.J., Schwetz, T.A., Pérez-Stable, E.J., Hodes, R.J., Woychik, R.P., Bright, R.A.,  
720 Fleurence, R.L., Collins, F.S., 2020. Rapid Scaling Up of Covid-19 Diagnostic Testing in  
721 the United States — The NIH RADx Initiative. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 383, 1071–1077.  
722 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMSr2022263>
- 723 U.S. Census Bureau, 2019. 2019 American Community Survey.
- 724 Westhaus, S., Weber, F.-A., Schiwy, S., Linnemann, V., Brinkmann, M., Widera, M., Greve, C.,  
725 Janke, A., Hollert, H., Wintgens, T., Ciesek, S., 2021. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in raw

- 726 and treated wastewater in Germany – Suitability for COVID-19 surveillance and  
727 potential transmission risks. *Sci. Total Environ.* 751, 141750.  
728 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141750>
- 729 Wölfel, R., Corman, V.M., Guggemos, W., Seilmaier, M., Zange, S., Müller, M.A., Niemeyer,  
730 D., Jones, T.C., Vollmar, P., Rothe, C., Hoelscher, M., Bleicker, T., Brünink, S.,  
731 Schneider, J., Ehmann, R., Zwirgmaier, K., Drosten, C., Wendtner, C., 2020. Virological  
732 assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 581, 465–469.  
733 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x>
- 734 Wu, F., Zhang, J., Xiao, A., Gu, X., Lee, W.L., Armas, F., Kauffman, K., Hanage, W., Matus,  
735 M., Ghaeli, N., Endo, N., Duvallat, C., Poyet, M., Moniz, K., Washburne, A.D.,  
736 Erickson, T.B., Chai, P.R., Thompson, J., Alm, E.J., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in  
737 Wastewater Are Higher than Expected from Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems* 5.  
738 <https://doi.org/10/gg5tgt>
- 739 Yamamoto, K.R., Alberts, B.M., Benzinger, R., Lawhorne, L., Treiber, G., 1970. Rapid  
740 bacteriophage sedimentation in the presence of polyethylene glycol and its application to  
741 large-scale virus purification. *Virology* 40, 734–744. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-6822(70)90218-7)  
742 [6822\(70\)90218-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0042-6822(70)90218-7)
- 743 Ye, Y., Ellenberg, R.M., Graham, K.E., Wigginton, K.R., 2016. Survivability, Partitioning, and  
744 Recovery of Enveloped Viruses in Untreated Municipal Wastewater. *Environ. Sci.*  
745 *Technol.* 50, 5077–5085. <https://doi.org/10/ggt7br>
- 746 Zhu, N., Zhang, D., Wang, W., Li, X., Yang, B., Song, J., Zhao, X., Huang, B., Shi, W., Lu, R.,  
747 Niu, P., Zhan, F., Ma, X., Wang, D., Xu, W., Wu, G., Gao, G.F., Tan, W., 2020. A Novel

748            Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. N. Engl. J. Med. 382, 727–  
749            733. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001017>  
750

	Direct Extraction	HA Filtration + Bead Beating	HA Filtration + Elution	PEG	Ultracentrifugation
					
Limit of Quantification	--	++	-	+	+
Recovery	++	+	-	--	-
Variability	++	+	+	--	-
Practicality	++	+	+	--	--


*Estimates of the relative relationship of the five concentration methods to each other based on different performance characteristics.*



**Figure 1: Overview of the evaluated concentration methods.** Wastewater samples were collected from several wastewater treatment plants across Houston in sample collection bottles and immediately spiked with BCoV (top). a-e): The samples were then concentrated through several methods: a) direct extraction, b) HA filtration with bead beating, c) HA filtration with elution, d) PEG precipitation, and e) ultrafiltration. All concentrated samples subsequently underwent RNA extraction. Samples undergoing direct extraction were not concentrated and instead were directly extracted from the liquid phase of the wastewater samples.


A

## SARS-CoV-2 N1




B

## SARS-CoV-2 N2




C

## SARS-CoV-2 N1



D

## SARS-CoV-2 N2




**Figure 2. SARS-CoV-2 RNA Concentrations.** *N1 (a) and N2 (b) gene target concentrations determined using different concentration methods for six wastewater samples reported in gene copies/L wastewater. N1 (c) and N2 (d) gene target concentrations determined using different concentration methods for six wastewater samples reported in gene copies/uL RNA template. Black horizontal lines indicate LoQs. WWTP are A-E, DI is deionized water, and NTC is no template control.*




A

## Surrogate virus (BCoV)




B

## Pepper Mild Mottle Virus (PMMoV)




C

## Surrogate virus (BCoV)



D

## Pepper Mild Mottle Virus (PMMoV)



**Figure 3. BCoV and pMMoV concentrations.** Recovery of BCoV (a) and pMMoV (b) between different concentration methods and different WWTP reported in gene copies/L wastewater. Recovery of BCoV (c) and pMMoV (d) between different concentration methods and different WWTP reported in gene copies/ $\mu$ L RNA template. WWTP are A-E, DI is deionized water, and NTC is no template control.