

1 Evaluation of a novel direct capture method for virus concentration n wastewater  
2 from COVID-19 infectious ward and correlation analysis with the number of  
3 inpatients.

4  
5 Manami Inaba <sup>1</sup>, Ryohei Nakao <sup>1</sup>, Fumiko Imamura <sup>2</sup>, Yutaka Nakashima <sup>3</sup>, Seiji  
6 Miyazono <sup>1</sup> and Yoshihisa Akamatsu <sup>1</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup> *Graduate School of Science and Technology for Innovation, Yamaguchi*  
8 *University, 2-16-1, Tokiwadai, Ube, Yamaguchi, 755-8611, Japan*

9 <sup>2</sup> *NIPPON KOEI CO., Research & Development Center Center for Advanced*  
10 *Research, 2304 Inarihara, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 300-1259, Japan*

11 <sup>3</sup> *Yamaguchi Prefectural Grand Medical Center, 77, Osaki, Hofu, Yamaguchi,*  
12 *747-8511, Japan*

13  
14  
15 **Corresponding author:**

16 **Mailing address:** 2-16-1 Tokiwadai, Ube, Yamaguchi, 755-8611, Japan

17 **Tel:**+81-836-85-9342

18 **Fax:**+81-836-85-9301

19 **E-mail:** minaba@yamaguchi-u.ac.jp

20 **Key words:** Virus concentration, Direct capture, PEG precipitation, Wastewater-  
21 based epidemiology, Wastewater, SARS-CoV-2

1 ABSTRACT

2 The global outbreak of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has increased the focus of  
3 Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) studies as a tool for understanding the  
4 epidemic and risk management. A highly sensitive and rapid method for the virus  
5 concentration from wastewater is needed to obtain the accurate information for early  
6 detection of SARS-CoV-2 outbreak and epidemic. In this study, we evaluated the  
7 efficiency of the direct capture method provided from Promega, based on column  
8 adsorption using the wastewater from actual infectious diseases ward. The efficiency  
9 of the nucleic acid extraction-purification process was also evaluated by Maxwell®  
10 RSC instrument (fully automated extraction) and QIAamp Viral RNA mini kit  
11 (manual extraction). The obtained SARS-CoV-2 data from wastewater were analyzed  
12 with the number of inpatients which is the consideration of the severity and the days  
13 of onset. The combination of direct capture and Maxwell's method (DC-MW) was  
14 suggested to be a highly sensitive and simple method with better concentration  
15 efficiency and quantification than other methods. Moreover, the inpatient conditions  
16 (severity and days of after onset) should be considered to accurately understand the  
17 actual status of the correlation between the number of inpatients and SARS-CoV-2  
18 concentration in wastewater. The highly sensitive method of DC-MW was suggested  
19 to assess more actual situation of SARS-CoV-2 shedding into the wastewater.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## INTRODUCTION

1  
2 Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is an effective way to detect and  
3 quantify specific substances (e.g., pathogenic microorganisms, drugs, pesticides, etc.)  
4 in wastewater and to collect information on behavior (e.g., prevalence, consumption,  
5 etc.) in the catchment area of the target substance (Victoria et al., 2016, Salvatore et  
6 al., 2015. Prevost et al., 2015). Previous WBE studies have focused the early  
7 detection of epidemics in enteric viruses such as norovirus and the WHO poliovirus  
8 eradication program (WHO 2015, Yoshida et al., 2000, Kazama et al., 2016). The  
9 WBE is also expected to be utilized in the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19)  
10 caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)  
11 infections, which are still pandemic. SARS-CoV-2 has been identified to be shed in  
12 the feces as well as in the sputum and swabs of patients respiratory (Wolfel et al.,  
13 2020). The detection of SARS-CoV-2 in the wastewater has also been reported in  
14 many countries (Haramoto et al., 2020, Wu et al., 2020a, Randazzo et al., 2020, Bar-  
15 Or et al., 2020). A disturbing characteristic of the coronaviruses is the presence of  
16 many asymptomatic patients, who shed coronaviruses as well as symptomatic  
17 patients (Avanzato et al., 2020, Polo et al., 2020). Furthermore, it has been estimated  
18 that the period of coronavirus shedding from infected individuals begins several days  
19 (3-7 days) before the onset of the infection, peaks around the day of onset, and lasts  
20 until several days (3-7 days) later (He et al., 2020). These indicate that SARS-CoV-2  
21 shed from patient can exist in the environment even before the actual patients are  
22 confirmed. SARS-CoV-2 had been detected in wastewater samples around the world  
23 before the virus was detected in the population of the study area (Ahmed et al., 2020,  
24 LaRosa et al., 2020). Thus, WBE is expected to be an effective tool for the early

1 detection of SARS-CoV-2 and the warning of the epidemic, spread, and infection  
2 risks.

3 The WBE process for virus can be roughly divided into four processes  
4 (wastewater sample collection, virus concentration, extraction and purification of the  
5 viral genome, and genome quantification). The virus concentration is particularly  
6 essential and important process to increase the sensitivity of virus detection because  
7 viruses in public wastewater are often in low concentrations. Various methods such  
8 as polyethylene glycol precipitation (PEG), ultracentrifugation, ultrafiltration (UF),  
9 and negatively charged membrane method have been applied to concentrate the  
10 wastewater effluent (Kazama et al., 2016, Huang et al., 2000, Katayama et al., 2002,  
11 Torii et al., 2020). Among these, the PEG is broadly used in WBE for SARS-CoV-2  
12 because it is representative and inexpensive (Hata et al., 2020, Farkas et al., 2021,  
13 Kocamemi et al, 2020., Graham et al., 2021, D’Aoust et al., 2021). Although the  
14 efficiency of concentration by PEG is not high and stable, it has been known that the  
15 efficiency varies with the sample condition and the operator skill (Salvo et al. 2021,  
16 Ahamed et al., 2020, Hata et al., 2021, Torii et al., 2022). In addition, the addition  
17 PEG and NaCl amounts, incubation time, and centrifugation conditions vary with  
18 study, and no standardized recommended conditions have been determined (Wu et  
19 al., 2020b, Lewis and Metcalf 1988, Kocamemi et al. 2020, Barril et al., 2021). Thus,  
20 it is necessary to establish a highly efficient and simple method for quantifying the  
21 virus concentration from wastewater.

22 The WBE has increased attention due to the COVID-19 epidemic, and various  
23 products for virus concentration in wastewater have been provided. The Viral  
24 RNA/DNA Concentration and Extraction Kits for Wastewater (Direct capture kit,

1 DC) released by Promega is a column-based aspiration method for the direct capture  
2 and concentration of total nucleic acids (TNA) in wastewater. Promega reported that  
3 the concentration of viral nucleic acids is faster than that of the PEG and the stable  
4 recovery rate is achieved (Mondal et al., 2021). In addition, it has the advantage of  
5 reducing the burden on the operator and ensuring safety, because it takes only about  
6 two hours of work, and the initial process includes inactivation process by  
7 isopropanol and protease. The DC method is expected to be a highly efficient,  
8 simple, and stable method for virus concentration in wastewater.

9 The specific objective of this study is to evaluate the differences in concentration  
10 efficiency between the conventional PEG and the DC method by detecting and  
11 quantifying the SARA-CoV-2 in actual wastewater.

12

13

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

14 Sample collection

15 Wastewater samples were collected from four sites. One of the four sites was an  
16 independent septic tank located at the infectious disease ward in the general hospital  
17 in the Yamaguchi Prefecture. A total of seven samples were collected at this medical  
18 wastewater (MedWW) site from May 1 to June 17 in 2021. The other three sites were  
19 in the public wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs: -A, -B and -C), and one sample  
20 per site was collected on June 4 in 2021. The water quality items (water temperature,  
21 pH, electrical conductivity (EC), total dissolved solids (TDS), and salinity) measured  
22 in the each collected water sample are summarized in Table 1. All samples collected  
23 into sterile bottles were transported on ice to the laboratory and stored at -80°C until  
24 the experimental treatment.

1

2 Concentration methods of Virus and Total nucleic acid from wastewater samples

3 The 40 mL subsample of each collected wastewater was conducted for  
4 concentrating the virus and TNA by PEG or DC method, respectively (Fig.1). Each  
5 experimental condition was carried out in triplicate. Bacteriophage  $\phi 6$  (NBRC  
6 105899, NITE) which replicates in *Pseudomonas syringae* (NBRC14084, NITE) as a  
7 host was added to the 40 mL subsample to use it as whole process control (WPC)  
8 (Haramoto et al. 2018) of monitoring for the efficacy of virus concentration -  
9 quantitative reverse-transcription PCR (qRT-PCR) processes. Wastewater  
10 subsamples which spiked  $\phi 6$  were incubated at 4°C for 1 to 2 hr to reach the liquid–  
11 solid partitioning at equilibrium, followed by the virus concentration (Torii et al.,  
12 2021).

13 Polyethylene glycol precipitation method for virus concentration was referred to  
14 Hata et al. (2021) with some modifications. Briefly, before the subsample was  
15 centrifuged at 3000 g for 5min to remove the large substance, the recovered  
16 supernatant was mixed with 4.0 g of PEG8000 and 2.35 g of NaCl at a final  
17 concentration of 10 % (w/v) and 1.0 M, respectively. The mixture was incubated on  
18 the shaker at 4 °C overnight. Then, the mixture was centrifuged at 5350 g for 70 min.  
19 The pellet was resuspended with 600  $\mu$ L phosphate buffer. These virus concentrated  
20 solutions were stored at -80 °C until the molecular process.

21 The direct capture method to concentrate the TNA was performed in accordance  
22 with the manual provided by Promega. The subsample which reached the liquid–  
23 solid partitioning at equilibrium was treated with 500  $\mu$ L of supplied protease  
24 solution under at RT for 30 min. The treated subsample was centrifuged at 3000 g for

1 10 min to remove the large substances. The supernatant which divided to about 20  
2 mL into two tubes added 6 mL of binding buffer 1 and 500  $\mu$ L of binding buffer 2.  
3 Additionally, 24 ml of isopropanol was added, and then mixed well by inversion. The  
4 sample mixture was poured into the PureYield™ Midi Binding Column, and applied  
5 the vacuum to capture the TNA in sample on the column. As pretreatment prior to  
6 elution, 5 mL inhibitor removal wash solution pass through the column, following to  
7 20 mL of RNA wash solution. The column was placed in the Eluator™ device with  
8 set 1.5 mL tube and conducted to the elution process. TNA including virus genome  
9 was eluted from the column with 250  $\mu$ L of pre-heated (60 °C) nuclease-free water,  
10 which was repeated twice. The TNA except for a few samples stored at -80°C until  
11 next molecular process was immediately subjected to RNA extraction-purification.

12

### 13 Viral RNA extraction and purification

14 Samples concentrated by PEG and DC method were subjected to RNA  
15 extraction-purification using a QIAamp Viral RNA mini kit (QVR, Qiagen) and  
16 Maxwell® RSC instrument (MW, Promega), respectively. Before initiating the  
17 molecular process, Murine norovirus (MNV) was spiked to the sample as a  
18 molecular process control (MPC) (Rachmadi et al. 2021, Torii et al. 2021) for the  
19 RNA extraction-purification and qPT-PCR processes. The concentration of spiked  
20 MNV was  $1.2 \times 10^5 - 3.0 \times 10^6$  copies (10  $\mu$ L MNV solution), which was spiked for  
21 concentrated products obtained from each method. In this regard, the MNV spiked  
22 for the concentrated sample subjecting to RNA purification using MW was treated by  
23 0.1x volume of protease K (20mg/mL, Qiagen) at 56 °C for 1 hr, prior to spiked. 140  
24  $\mu$ L of the concentrated product obtained from each method was subjected to RNA

1 extraction-purification using a QVR. 500  $\mu$ L and 140  $\mu$ L of the TNA concentrates  
2 produced by DC method and PEG, respectively, were purified by MW. The process  
3 in accordance with the manufacture protocol yielded 60  $\mu$ L and 80  $\mu$ L of purified  
4 RNA extraction product for QVR and MW, respectively. All RNA products were  
5 immediately applied to qRT-PCR templates for the quantification of SARS-CoV-2,  
6  $\phi$ 6 and MNV, except for a few samples. TNA extracted by DC method which  
7 collected at MedWW and WWTP-A from May 7 to June 17 were once stored at -  
8 80°C until purification process by QVR.

9

#### 10 qRT-PCR

11 The concentration of RNA from SARS-CoV-2,  $\phi$ 6 and MNV were determined with  
12 qRT-PCR using a StepOnePlus™ system (Thermo Fisher Scientific) according to  
13 previous reports (CDC 2020, Haramoto et al. 2018, Kitajima et al. 2008). Briefly, the  
14 reaction mixture for the quantification of target viruses was prepared in a final  
15 volume of 20  $\mu$ L, containing a 5  $\mu$ L of TaqMan™ Fast Virus 1-Step Master Mix  
16 (Thermo Fisher Scientific), forward and reverse primer set and probe in a final  
17 concentration of 0.9  $\mu$ M each and 0.125  $\mu$ M, respectively, nuclease-free water and 5  
18  $\mu$ L of extracted RNA. The primer pairs and probes used previously have been  
19 described in the centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC (2020)), Kitajima  
20 et al. (2008) and Gendron et al. (2010). The amplification profile was conducted with  
21 one-step of RT reaction and inactivation at 50 °C for 5 min and 95 °C for 20 sec,  
22 following with 50 cycles at 95 °C for 15 s and specific annealing/extension  
23 temperature for 1 min. Each of temperature for annealing/extension was 55 °C for  
24 SARS, 60 °C for  $\phi$ 6, and 56 °C for MNV. All reactions were performed in triplicate.



1 Plasmid or oligo DNA of target sequence for standard curve was prepared at  $10^1$  to  
2  $10^5$  copies/well. The standard control was reacted on same plate together with the  
3 samples to obtain the standard curve. The each qRT-PCR assay showed the  
4 efficiencies of 99.9-107.3 % for SARS-CoV-2, 106.1-119.3 % for  $\phi 6$ , and 100.3-  
5 111.2 % for MNV by the standard curve. The correlation coefficients ( $r^2$ ) of the  
6 standard curves ranged from 0.992 to 0.998 in all target viruses.

7

## 8 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 9 Efficacy of virus detection process

10 The recovery efficiency of  $\phi 6$  as a WPC is shown in Table 2. The  $\phi 6$  was added to  
11 all 10 sewage samples as an evaluation tool for the whole process from concentration  
12 to quantification by qRT-PCR to compare the efficiency of the four methods. The  
13 recovery rates of  $\phi 6$  in each method, i.e., the recovery rates of virus in WPC, were  
14 DC-MW (101.4%), PEG-MW (82.7%), PEG-QVR (50.3%), and DC-QVR (21.5%),  
15 in descending order in terms of the geometric mean (GM). In DC-MW, PEG-MW,  
16 and PEG-QVR methods, the recovery rates of samples except for the MedWW  
17 sample on May 27 processed by PEG-QVR were more than 10%. Seven samples in  
18 DC-QVR method were preserved under  $-80^\circ\text{C}$  after the concentration-recovery of  
19 RNA with DC. The recovery rates of these seven samples were 5.07~23.4% (GM  
20 =11.9%). In addition, the recovery rates of the two samples (May 13 and 20,  
21 MedWW) were less than 10%. On the other hand, the GM of the recovery rate of  $\phi 6$   
22 on the other three samples was 89.3%. Under the DC-QVR method, comparing the  
23 group which was once subjected to the freeze and thaw process (seven samples  
24 collected at MedWW and WWTP-A from May 7 to June 17) and the other group

1 which w/o freeze and thaw process, the recovery rate between the groups were  
2 significantly different (t-test,  $p < 0.05$ ). It suggests that the freeze and thaw process  
3 could damage the recovered nucleic acid.

4 The efficiencies of DC and PEG in the RNA extraction-purification and qPT-PCR  
5 processes measured by spiked MNV for MPC with MW were 128.1% and 168.5% in  
6 terms of geometric mean, and their geometric standard deviation were 1.4 and 1.3,  
7 respectively. The efficiencies of DC and PEG for MPC with QVR were 94.1% and  
8 110.1% in terms of geometric mean, and their geometric standard deviation were 4.6  
9 and 2.0, respectively. Except for one sample (MedWW May 20, DC-QVR), the  
10 efficiency of the molecular process exceeded 10%. In the report of virus  
11 quantification from water environments, if the recovery rate of MPC is less than  
12 10%, the quantification is evaluated to be inhibited by the present of foreign  
13 substances in the sample (Hata et al., 2021, Hata et al., 2017). Since the MPC of the  
14 same sample treated by the other three methods was above 10%, it is not considered  
15 to be affected by inhibition. On the sample of which efficiency was less than 10%  
16 processed with DC-QVR (May 20, MedWW), WPC was also low, suggesting that  
17 the actual processes of concentration and recovery were not successfully operated.

18 The efficiency of virus concentration has been evaluated by adding  $\phi 6$  as WPC.  
19 The PEG concentration efficiencies in this study were 82.7% and 50.3% with  
20 geometric standard deviations 1.7 and 2.1 for PEG-DC and PEG-QVR, respectively,  
21 showing relatively stable and high performances. Previous studies have shown that  
22 the virus concentration rates from wastewater treated with PEG were as low as less  
23 than 10% in some cases (Salvo et al. 2021, Philo et al., 2021, Barril et al. 2021). In  
24 addition, there is no unified or standardized method for the concentration of the

1 additive PEG, pretreatment, and centrifugation time and g (Flood et al., 2021,  
2 Sharma et al., 2021, Barril et al., 2021, Torii et al., 2022). It had been also suggested  
3 in previous reports that there are differences in the recovery efficiency depending on  
4 the target virus (Haramoto et al., 2018, Torii et al., 2021, Pérez-Cataluña et al., 2021).  
5 The concentration efficiency was thought to vary significantly with the reported  
6 cases and workers. Therefore, although virus concentration by the PEG was a  
7 relatively low-cost method and has been applied in many studies (Salvo et al., 2021,  
8 LaTurner et al., 2021), in practice, it was necessary to select the optimized conditions  
9 depending on the target virus and the condition of the wastewater sample.  
10 Furthermore, the virus concentrates recovered by PEG method remain infectious,  
11 although this is one of advantages on this method. The virus concentration by the  
12 PEG method possessed an infection risk to the workers who handle it, and there were  
13 restrictions on the facilities. In contrast, the process of virus concentration from the  
14 wastewater by DC was conducted for the degradation at the initial step by protease,  
15 and could minimize the risk of infection to the workers. The process following the  
16 enzymatic treatment was simple (i.e., involving centrifugation, mixing of reagent  
17 buffers, and passing through a column) and were not likely to cause efficiency biases  
18 by the operators. The operation time of DC method according to the recommended  
19 protocol was about 1 hr for 40 mL of wastewater (see.  
20 [https://www.promega.com/products/nucleic-acid-extraction/viral-rna-extraction-](https://www.promega.com/products/nucleic-acid-extraction/viral-rna-extraction-viral-dna-extraction/wastewater-viral-rna-dna-extraction/?catNum=A2991#protocols)  
21 [viral-dna-extraction/wastewater-viral-rna-dna-](https://www.promega.com/products/nucleic-acid-extraction/viral-rna-extraction-viral-dna-extraction/wastewater-viral-rna-dna-extraction/?catNum=A2991#protocols)  
22 [extraction/?catNum=A2991#protocols](https://www.promega.com/products/nucleic-acid-extraction/viral-rna-extraction-viral-dna-extraction/wastewater-viral-rna-dna-extraction/?catNum=A2991#protocols)). In the DC method, the adsorbed TNA on  
23 column had been washed with the attached buffer before the elution and recovery  
24 process. This process was thought to be effective in the molecular process because it

1 removes substances that inhibit the subsequent process, such as proteins. In our  
2 study, nucleic acid recovery and purification efficiencies were high for both MW and  
3 QVR; however, MW was found to be more efficient and stable. The sample volume  
4 that could be tested for MW was 500  $\mu$ L, while that for QRV was 140  $\mu$ L. The  
5 extracted nucleic acids recovered by each method were 80  $\mu$ L and 60  $\mu$ L, and the  
6 concentration ratio was 6.3-fold and 2.3-fold, respectively, with a higher ratio for  
7 MW. With regarded to the PEG-concentrated samples, in this study, 140  $\mu$ L of PEG-  
8 concentrated samples were subjected to the extraction and purification processes of  
9 MW and QVR. These results showed that higher efficiency was obtained under the  
10 MW purification and recovery method (Table 2). In MW, TNA in the liquid phase  
11 was adsorbed on magnetic beads, and then the purification process such as washing  
12 was performed in another liquid phase. Therefore, more purified TNA was thought to  
13 had been obtained with less inhibitors carried in. In addition, the MW is a fully  
14 automated system, and no differences were in the skill of the operators. The  
15 conditions of stable purification by full automation and less introduction of inhibitors  
16 could have been contributed to the high efficiency and stable recovery and  
17 purification rate.

18

#### 19 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater

20 In this study, qRT-PCR was performed using the CDC\_N2 assay which region  
21 encoding the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein gene (CDC 2020). Table 3 and Fig. 2 show  
22 the results detected and quantified by each concentration and molecular method. The  
23 results in Table 3 are the quantitative data of SARS-CoV-2 per reaction well.  
24 Quantitative values were shown only for those with a concentration of higher than

1  $1 \times 10^1$  copies / reaction. The concentrations smaller than  $10^1$  copies / reaction were  
2 marked with “+”, and those that were negative were shown as “-”. The DC-MW  
3 method could be obtained the highest number of quantitative data, 5 out of 10  
4 samples. The number of samples quantified by the other three methods were 3 out of  
5 10. In the same sample, the concentration quantified per reaction was highest in the  
6 DC-MW method (except for MedWW May 27, DC-QVR). Furthermore, the two  
7 samples (MedWW May 20, June 17) were quantified only by DC-MW, which could  
8 not be quantified or detected by other methods. Comparing the quantitative values, it  
9 was confirmed that SARS-CoV-2 concentration of DC-MW was 1.9 to 5.2 times  
10 higher than those of the other three methods. In addition, the number of samples  
11 detected, also included below the limit of quantification (LOQ), was highest in the  
12 DC-MW method (9/10). The number of samples detected by the other three methods  
13 was 6/10 to 7/10. Quantitative values of copies per L in the wastewater are shown in  
14 Fig.2. When converted to the unit of copies per L, the quantitative value of PEG-MW  
15 tended to be higher than those of other methods. The magnification when converting  
16 the quantitative value of each method to copies/L was 400 times for DC-MW, 1080  
17 times for DC-QVR, 1720 times for PEG-MW, and 1290 times for PEG-QVR,  
18 respectively. This magnification depended on the amount of wastewater contained in  
19 the template used per reaction. The high magnification was caused by small amount  
20 of wastewater used for qRT-PCR per reaction. The calculated amount of raw  
21 wastewater added per reaction of DC-MW was 2.5 mL, and it was higher than other  
22 methods (other methods were 0.58 to 0.93 mL per reaction). Thus, DC-MW is  
23 considered to have the highest quantification per reaction. Furthermore, the LOQ per  
24 L was also lowest. These indicate that the concentration-quantification by the DC-

1 MW method is most accurate and the detection sensitivity is highest among the  
2 methods in this study.  
3  
4 Relationship between the SARS-CoV-2 concentration in wastewater and inpatient  
5 number.  
6 The cross-correlations among the methods are shown in Table 4. The cross-  
7 correlations among the three conditions (DC-MW, PEG-MW and PEG-QVR), which  
8 showed a positive correlation with the number of inpatients, were high. The  
9 consistency among the three conditions applied to the actual samples suggests the  
10 reliability of the obtained concentration. Fig.3 shows the correlation between the  
11 SARS-CoV-2 concentration obtained by each concentration/extraction-purification  
12 method and the number of inpatients in the infectious disease ward from which  
13 MedWW was collected. The results of Fig. 3 show that the concentrations of virus  
14 detected in the wastewater from the infectious disease ward tended to increase as the  
15 number of inpatients increased. The concentrations obtained from the three  
16 conditions other than DC-QRV showed a positive correlation with the number of  
17 inpatients. On the other hand, the concentration obtained from DC-QRV showed a  
18 negative correlation. In addition, DC-MW gave relatively higher concentration and  
19 the highest number of quantifiable samples. These suggest that DC-MW was the  
20 most reliable method for the data analysis among the methods in this study. As  
21 already discussed in “Efficacy of virus detection process” section, the results from  
22 DC-QRV imply that the extracted RNA sample were degraded by the freezing and  
23 thawing processes and the accuracy of the data is doubtful. Therefore, it was  
24 excluded in the following discussion.

1 The concentrations in the samples taken on May 20, May 27, and June 3 of 2021,  
2 were LOQ or were not detected on three methods. The number of inpatients were  
3 large in these three days. The phenomenon indicates an inconsistency in the  
4 relationship between the concentrations and the number of inpatients. In order to  
5 interpret this inconsistency, the viral shedding period of the patients and the severity  
6 of the symptom need to be considered. It has been reported that the viral shedding  
7 period in feces from SARS-CoV-2 patients is up to 5 weeks, with an average of 20  
8 days to 1 month (Wolfel et al., 2020, Xing et al., 2020, Wu et al., 2020, Xiao et al.,  
9 2020). According to Hu et al. (2020), most patients begin shedding from 3 days  
10 before to 3 days after the onset date, and it is estimated that the viral shedding begins  
11 on the day of onset in most cases. The peak value of viral shedding in feces often  
12 appears around 9 days after the onset (Wolfel et al., 2020). That means that the  
13 amount of virus released into feces from long-term inpatients is considered to be  
14 small, and it is necessary to extract patients who contribute to the amount of virus  
15 released into feces (i.e., the amount of virus in wastewater). In addition, in the  
16 severity determination of coronavirus infection patients in Japan by symptom, the  
17 severe and moderate patients thought to have difficult to walk independently and  
18 could not use the ward toilet. Thus, severe and moderate ill patients were excluded  
19 from the subjects, and only mild and asymptomatic patients were extracted as  
20 patients possibly contributing to the concentration in wastewater. The relationship  
21 between the number of inpatients and the SARS-CoV-2 concentration in wastewater  
22 is analyzed considering the number of days after onset and symptoms. Among mild  
23 ill and asymptomatic patients, the period of the virus shedding in the feces after the  
24 onset was assumed as some days, and only inpatients included in the number of days

1 were extracted. In this study, the average number of days from onset to  
2 hospitalization was 4.5 days, and the average length of hospitalization until discharge  
3 was 17 days. Therefore, the extraction period was assumed to be from 5 to 20 days  
4 after onset and analyzed in order with 1-day increments. Furthermore, the below  
5 LOQ data in the virus concentration gives information that the concentration was  
6 low, although it was not quantitative. These obtained data were used as the assumed  
7 value for LOQ data in analyzing the relationship between the virus concentration and  
8 the number of patients considered with severity and days of after onset.

9 Fig. 4 shows the correlation between the virus concentration and the number of  
10 patients within the assumed period of the virus shedding after the onset. The  
11 correlation was highest in DC-MW, PEG-MW and PEG QVR when 7 days is  
12 assumed as the period of the virus shedding after the onset. Considering the existing  
13 report that the peak value of viral shedding in feces often appears around 9 days after  
14 the onset (Wolfel et al., 2020), it is reasonable that the highest correlation was  
15 observed when extracting the patients within 7 days after the onset. The results of  
16 this analysis suggest that when evaluating the correlation between viral  
17 concentrations in wastewater and the number of patients, it is necessary to consider  
18 the patient's situation, i.e., the severity of symptoms and the number of days since  
19 onset. It was also expected that similar considerations should be applied to the risk  
20 management, such as estimating the number of patients, which is an important data  
21 use in WBE. The correlation between the patient's contribution value to SARS-CoV-  
22 2 load in feces and the SARS-CoV-2 concentration in wastewater from infectious  
23 diseases ward is shown in Fig. 5. The patient's contribution value to virus load, which  
24 means the given additional weight to value of shedding more virus in the feces, was



1 determined. A quadratic approximation curve was calculated for the fecal viral  
2 concentration data from patient for each day post-onset (Wolfel et al., 2020), and a  
3 contribution value was fitted to each patient. Compared to the relationship between  
4 the concentrations and the total inpatients (Fig.3), higher correlation was obtained.  
5 Therefore, if the severity of the patient's symptoms and the number of days with  
6 virus shedding after the onset of the disease were taken into consideration, it is  
7 interpretable that the obtained values were smaller than the LOQ despite the large  
8 number of total inpatients.

9 According to the previous studies, the virus can be released into feces for a long  
10 period of time (Wolfel et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2000, Xiao et al., 2020, Xing et al.,  
11 2020). Because the amount of virus shedding is expected to decrease, the correlation  
12 with the virus concentration in the wastewater will be low when long-term inpatients  
13 are included; however, it is considered that a certain extent of correlation remains.  
14 Thus, the strength of the correlation will be gradually weakened as the assumed  
15 period of the virus shedding after the onset increases. Among the three conditions,  
16 only DC-MW showed the above-mentioned trend while the other two conditions  
17 showed a rapid drop of the correlation coefficient (around 9 days after onset). These  
18 suggest that the result of DC-MW is more realistic, and DC-MW has the high  
19 sensitivity and quantitatively in the actual field. Therefore, DC-MW is considered to  
20 be superior to the other two methods in monitoring the actual situation.

21

## 22 Conclusion

23 In this study, we compared the methods of concentration and extraction-purification  
24 of the viruses in wastewater. By comparing the efficiency of the methods with the

1 addition of process control, DC-MW was confirmed to be the most sensitive and  
2 efficient method. The result of quantification and detection of the actual SARS-CoV-  
3 2 in the wastewater, the positive result was confirmed even in the sample which  
4 could not be detected by other methods, and was shown also highly sensitive. In  
5 addition, regarding the correlation between the number of patients and the virus  
6 concentration in the wastewater, the DC-MW was found to be highly sensitive and  
7 efficient, and was likely to be advantageous in reflecting the actual situation. Because  
8 this method targets the genome, the infectious viruses cannot be evaluated. For  
9 enteric viruses such as rotavirus, to recover the infectious viruses is necessary and  
10 important for assessment of the infection risk in environment and the accumulation  
11 in marine products at the discharged area. In such cases, this method may not be  
12 suitable. On the other hand, for the case of SARS-CoV-2, the main target on WBE is  
13 to detect earlier the patients exist and the epidemic in the collection area or the  
14 building of interest, indicating that the genome detection meets the requirements.

15 From another point of view, the risk of infection from wastewater is very low for  
16 the case of SARS-CoV-2, but it is not negligible for the case of norovirus. Because  
17 the virus inactivation process is included in the first stage of DC, the safety of  
18 workers is high. In particular, when the effluent standards for viruses in wastewater  
19 are established in the future, workers who are not accustomed to handling viruses  
20 will be able to conduct the sampling and quantification. The high safety is an  
21 advantage in such cases. This method is highly safe and simple method that can  
22 reduce the influence of the operator's technique. The highly sensitive, rapid and  
23 simple method of DC-MW is also considered to be effective for the stable data  
24 accumulation.

1

2

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

3

4 This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 20H00632.

5

6

## REFERENCES

7

8 Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J. W., Choi, P. M.,

9 Kitajima, M., Simpson, S. L., Li, J., Tschärke, B., Verhagen, R., Smith, W. J. M.,

10 Zaugg, J., Dierens, L., Hugenholtz, P., Thomas, K. V., Mueller, J. F., 2020. First

11 confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: a proof of

12 concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Sci. Total*

13 *Environ.* 728, 138764. [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764)

14

15 Avanzato, V. C., Matson, M. J., Seifert, S. N., Pryce, R., Williamson, B. N., Anzick,

16 S. L., Barbian, K. Judson, S. D., Fischer, E. R., Martens, C., Bowden, T. A., Wit, E.,

17 Riedo, F. X., Munster, V. J., 2020. Case Study: Prolonged infectious SARS-CoV-2

18 shedding from an asymptomatic immunocompromised individual with cancer. *Cell.*

19 183(7), 1901-1912. e9.

20

21 Bar-Or, I., Yaniv, K., Shagan, M., Ozer, E., Erster, O., Mendelson, E., Mannasse, B.,

22 Shirazi, R., Kramarsky-Winter, E., Nir, O., Abu-Ali, H., Ronen, Z., Rinott, E., Lewis,

23 Y. E., Friedler, E., Bitkover, E., Paitan, Y., Berchenko, Y., Kushmaro, A., 2020.

24 Regressing SARS-CoV-2 sewage measurements onto COVID-19 burden in the

1 population: a proof-of-concept for quantitative environmental surveillance. medRxiv  
2 10.1101/2020.04.26.20073569  
3  
4 Barril P. A., Pianciola L. A., Mazzeo, M., Ousset, M. J., Jaureguiberry M. V.,  
5 Alessandrello, M., Sánchez, G., Oteiza J. M., 2021. Evaluation of viral concentration  
6 methods for SARS-CoV-2 recovery from wastewaters. *Sci. Total Environ.* 756(20),  
7 144105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144105>  
8  
9 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Respiratory Viruses Branch, Division of  
10 Viral Diseases Instructions. 2020. Real-Time RT-PCR Panel for Detection 2019-  
11 Novel Coronavirus Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Respiratory Viruses  
12 Branch, Division of Viral Diseases.  
13  
14 D'Aoust P. M., Mercier M., Montpetit D., Jia JJ., Alexandrov, I., Neault, N., Baig A.  
15 T., JMayne, M., Zhang, X., Alain, T., Langlois, MA., Servos, M.R., MacKenzie, M.,  
16 Figeys, D., MacKenzie A. E, Graber T. E., Delatolla, R., 2021. Quantitative analysis  
17 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19  
18 incidence and prevalence. *Water Res.* 188(1), 116560.  
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116560>  
20  
21 Farkas, K., Hillary, L., S., Thorpe, J., Walker, D. I., Lowther, J. A., McDonald, J. E.,  
22 Malham, S. K., Jones, D., 2021. Concentration and quantification of SARS-CoV-2  
23 RNA in wastewater using polyethylene glycol-based concentration and qRT-PCR.  
24 *Methods Protoc.* 4(1), 17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/mps4010017>

1  
2 Flood, M. T., D’Souza, N., Rose, J. B., Aw, T. G., 2021. Methods Evaluation for  
3 Rapid Concentration and Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 in Raw Wastewater Using  
4 Droplet Digital and Quantitative RT-PCR. Food Environ. Virol. 13, 303-315.  
5  
6 Gendron, L., Verreault, D., Veillette, M., Moineau, S., Duchaine, C., 2010.  
7 Evaluation of filters for the sampling and quantification of RNA phage aerosols.  
8 Aerosol Sci. Technol. 44, 893-901. [10.1080/02786826.2010.501351](https://doi.org/10.1080/02786826.2010.501351)  
9  
10 Graham, K.E., Loeb, S. K., Wolfe, M. K., Catoe, D., Sinnott-Armstrong, N., Kim, S.,  
11 Yamahara, K. M., Sassoubre, L. M., Mendoza Grijalva, L. M., Roldan-Hernandez,  
12 L., Langenfeld, K., Wigginton, K. R., Boehm, A.B., 2021. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in  
13 wastewater settled solids is associated with COVID-19 cases in a large urban  
14 sewershed. Environ. Sci. Technol. 55,488-498.  
15  
16 Haramoto, E., Kitajima, M., Hata, A., Torrey, J. R., Masago, Y., Sano, S., Katayama,  
17 H., 2018. A review on recent progress in the detection methods and prevalence of  
18 human enteric viruses in water. Water Res. 135, 168-186.  
19 [10.1016/j.watres.2018.02.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.02.004)  
20  
21 Haramoto, E., Malla, B., Thakali, O., Kitajima, M., 2020. First environmental  
22 surveillance for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and river water in  
23 Japan. Sci. Total Environ. 737, 140405.  
24

- 1 Hata, A., Hara-Yamamura, H., Meuchi, Y., Imai, S., Honda. R., 2021. Detection of  
2 SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater in Japan during a COVID-19 outbreak. *Sci. Total*  
3 *Environ.* 758, 143578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143578>  
4  
5 Hata, A., Inaba, M., Katayama, H., Furumai, H., 2017. Characterization of natural  
6 organic substances potentially hindering RT-PCR-based virus detection in large  
7 volumes of environmental water. *Environ Sci. Technol.* 51(23), 13568-13579.  
8  
9 He, X., Lau, E. H. Y., Wu, P., Deng, X., Wang, J., Hao, X., Lau, U. C., Wong, J. Y.,  
10 Guan, Y., Tan, X., Mo, X., Chen, Y., Liao, B., Chen, W., Hu, F., Zhang, Q., Zhong,  
11 M., Wu, Y., Zhao, L., Zhang, F., Cowling, B. J., Li, F., Leung, G. M., 2020. Temporal  
12 dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine.* 26,  
13 672-675.  
14  
15 Huang, P. W., Laborde, D., Land, V. R., Matson D. O., Smith, A. W., Jiang, X., 2000.  
16 Concentration and Detection of Caliciviruses in Water Samples by Reverse  
17 Transcription-PCR. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 66(10), 4383-4388.  
18  
19 Katayama, H., Shimasaki, A., Ohgaki, S., 2002. Development of a Virus  
20 Concentration Method and Its Application to Detection of Enterovirus and Norwalk  
21 Virus from Coastal Seawater. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 68(3), 1033-1039.  
22  
23 Kazama, S., Masago, Y., Tohma, K., Souma, N., Imagawa, T., Suzuki, A., Liu, X.,  
24 Saito, M., Oshitani, H., Omura, T., 2016. Temporal dynamics of norovirus

- 1 determined through monitoring of municipal wastewater by pyrosequencing and  
2 virological surveillance of gastroenteritis cases. *Water Res.* 92, 244-253.  
3 [10.1016/j.watres.2015.10.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2015.10.024)  
4  
5 Kocamemi, B. A., Kurt, H., Sait, A., Sarac, F., Saatci, A. M., Pakdemirli, B., 2020.  
6 SARS-CoV-2 Detection in Istanbul wastewater treatment plant sludges. medRxiv.  
7 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.12.20099358>  
8  
9 La Rosa, G., Iaconelli, M., Mancini, P., Bonanno Ferraro G., Veneri, C., Bonadonna,  
10 L., Lucentini, L., Suffredini, E., 2020. First detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated  
11 wastewaters in Italy. *Sci. Total Environ.* 736, 139652.  
12 [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139652](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139652)  
13  
14 LaTurner Z. W., Zong D. M., Kalvapalle, P., Gamas, K. R., Terwilliger, A., Crosby,  
15 T., Ali, P., Avadhanula, V., Santos, H. H., Weesner, K., Hopkins, L, Piedra, P. A.,  
16 Maresso, A. W., Stadlera, L. B., 2021. Evaluating recovery, cost, and throughput of  
17 different concentration methods for SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-based epidemiology.  
18 *Water Res.* 197, 117043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117043>  
19  
20 Lewis, G. D., Metcalf, T.G., 1988. Polyethylene glycol precipitation for recovery of  
21 pathogenic viruses, including hepatitis A virus and human rotavirus, from oyster,  
22 water, and sediment samples. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 54 (8), 1983-1988.  
23  
24 Mondal, S., Feirer, N., Brockman, M., Preston, M, S., Teter, S. J., Ma, M., Goueli, S.

- 1 A., Moorji, S., Saul, B., Cali, J. J., 2021. A direct capture method for purification and  
2 detection of viral nucleic acid enables epidemiological surveillance of SARS-CoV-2.  
3 Sci. Total Environ. 795, 148834. [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.148834](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.148834)  
4
- 5 Philo, S. E., Keim E. K., Swanstrom, R., Ong A. Q. W., Burnor, E. A., Kossik, A. L.,  
6 Harrison, J. C., Demeke, B. A., Zhou, A. A., Beck N. K., Shirai, J. H., Meschke, J. S.,  
7 2021. A comparison of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentration methods for  
8 environmental surveillance. Sci. Total Environ. 760, 144215.  
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144215>  
10
- 11 Polo, D., Quintela-Baluja, M., Corbishley, A., Jones, D. L., Singer, A. C., Graham, D.  
12 W., Romalde, J. L., 2020. Making waves: wastewater-based epidemiology for  
13 COVID-19 - approaches and challenges for surveillance and prediction. Water Res.  
14 186, 116404.
- 15 Prevost, B., Lucas, F. S., Goncalves, A., Richard, F., Moulin, L., Wurtzer, S., 2015.  
16 Large scale survey of enteric viruses in river and wastewater underlines the health  
17 status of the local population. Environ. Int. 79, 42-50. ISSN 0160-4120  
18
- 19 Pérez-Cataluña, A., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Randazzo, W., Falcó, I., Allende, A.,  
20 Sánchez, G., 2021. Comparing analytical methods to detect SARS-CoV-2 in  
21 wastewater. Sci. Total Environ. 758, 143870.  
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143870>  
23
- 24 Rachmadi A. T., Azizkhan, Z. M., Hong, P.Y., 2021. Enteric virus in reclaimed water



1 from treatment plants with different multi-barrier strategies: Trade-off assessment in  
2 treatment extent and risks. *Sci. Total Environ.* 776(1), 146039.

3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146039>

4

5 Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Simón, P., Allende, A., Sánchez,  
6 G., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a  
7 Low prevalence area. *Water Res.* 181, 115942.

8

9 Salvatore, S., Bramness J. G., Reid. M. J., Thomas, K. V., Harman, C., Roislien, J.,  
10 2015. Wastewater-based epidemiology of stimulant drugs: Functional data analysis  
11 compared to traditional statistical methods. *PLOS ONE*.

12 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138669>

13

14 Salvo, M., Moller, A., Alvareda, E., Gamazo, P., Colina, R., Victoria, M., 2021.  
15 Evaluation of low-cost viral concentration methods in wastewaters: Implications for  
16 SARS-CoV-2 pandemic surveillances. *J. Virol. Methods.* 297, 114249.

17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2021.114249>

18

19 Sharma, D. K., Nalavade, U. P., Kalgutkar, K., Gupta, N., Deshpande, J. M., 2021.  
20 SARS-CoV-2 detection in sewage samples: Standardization of method & preliminary  
21 observations. *Indian J. Med. Res.* 153(1-2), 159-165. [10.4103/ijmr.IJMR\\_3541\\_20](https://doi.org/10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_3541_20)


22

23 Torii, S., Furumai, H., Katayama, H., 2021. Applicability of polyethylene glycol  
24 precipitation followed by acid guanidinium thiocyanate-phenol-chloroform

1 extraction for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from municipal wastewater. *Sci.*  
2 *Total Environ.* 756, 143067.  
3  
4 Torii, S., Oishi, W., Zhu, Y., Thakali, O., Malla, B., Yu, Z., Zhao, B., Arakawa, C.,  
5 Kitajima, M., Hata, A., Ihara, M., Kyuwa, S., Sano, D., Haramoto, E., Katayama, H.,  
6 2022. based recovery of murine hepatitis virus, bacteriophage phi6, and pepper mild  
7 mottle virus as a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater. *Sci. Total Environ.*  
8 807(2), 150722. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150722>  
9  
10 Victoria, M., Tort, L.F.L., Lizasoain, A., García, M., Castells, M., Berois, M.,  
11 Divizia, M., Leite, J.P.G., Miagostovich, M.P., Cristina, J., Colina, R., 2016.  
12 Norovirus molecular detection in Uruguayan sewage samples reveals a high genetic  
13 diversity and GII.4 variant replacement along time. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 120 (5),  
14 1427–1435. <https://sfamjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jam.13058>  
15  
16 WHO, 2015. Global Polio Eradication Initiative: Guidelines on environmental  
17 surveillance for detection of polioviruses. [https://polioeradication.org/wp-](https://polioeradication.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/GPLN_GuidelinesES_April2015.pdf)  
18 [content/uploads/2016/07/GPLN\\_GuidelinesES\\_April2015.pdf](https://polioeradication.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/GPLN_GuidelinesES_April2015.pdf)  
19  
20 Wu, F., Zhang, J., Xiao, A., Gu, X., Lee, W. L., Armas, F., Kauffman, K., Hanage,  
21 W., Matus, M., Ghaeli, N., Endo, N., Duvallet, C., Poyet. M., Moniz, K., Washburne,  
22 A. D., Erickson, T. B., Chai, P. R., Thompson, J., Alm, E. J., (b) 2020. SARS-CoV-2  
23 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from clinically confirmed cases.  
24 *mSystems.* 5(4), e00614–20.

1  
2 Wu, Y., Guo, C., Tang, L., Hong, Z., Zhou, J., Dong, X., Yin, H., Xiao, Q., Tang, Y.,  
3 Qu, X., Kuang, L., Fang, X., Mishra, N., Lu, J., Shan, H., Jiang, G., Huang X., (a)  
4 2020. Prolonged presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in faecal samples. *Lancet*  
5 *Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* 5, 434-435.  
6  
7 Wölfel, R., Corman, V. M., Guggemos, W., Seilmaier, M., Zange, S., Müller, M. A.,  
8 Niemeyer, D., Jones, T. C., Vollmar, P., Rothe, C., Hoelscher, M., Bleicker, T.,  
9 Brünink, S., Schneider, J., Ehmann, R., Zwirgmaier, K., Drosten, C., Wendtner C.,  
10 2020. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*,  
11 581, 465-469.  
12  
13 Xiao, F., Sun, J., Xu, Y., Li, F., Huang, X., Li, H., Zhao, J., Huang, J., Zhao, J., 2020.  
14 Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in feces of patient with severe COVID-19. *Emerg. Infect.*  
15 *Dis.*26(8), 1920-1922.  
16  
17 Xing, YH., Ni, Wei., Wu, Qin., Li, WJ., Li, GJ., Wang, WD., Tong, JN., Song XF., G  
18 Wong, G, WK., Xing, QS., 2020. Prolonged viral shedding in feces of pediatric  
19 patients with coronavirus disease 2019. *J. Microbiol. Immunol. Infect.* 53(3), 473-  
20 480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmii.2020.03.021>  
21  
22 Yoshida, H., Horie. H., Matsuura. K., Miyamura. T., 2000. Characterisation of  
23 vaccine-derived polioviruses isolated from sewage and river water in Japan. *Lancet.*  
24 356, 1461-1463. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(00\)02868-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02868-3)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10




11 Fig.1


12

13

1  
2  
3  
4  
5



6 Fig.2



1 Fig.3.

2

3

4

5

6


7

8

9

10

11



1 Fig.4.

2

3

4

5

6

7


8

9

10

11

12



1 Fig.5.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11



## FIGURE LEGENDS

- 1
- 2 Fig.1. Workflow of wastewater concentration and extraction-purification processes in  
3 each comparison experiment method. Values in the squares indicate the recovered  
4 products volume. Values without a square indicate amount of specimen. <sup>a</sup> WPC:  
5 Whole process control. <sup>b</sup> MPC: Molecular process control.
- 6
- 7 Fig.2. Concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater treated by four difference types  
8 of concentration and extraction-purification methods. LOQ: Limit of Quantification.  
9 Symbols below the LOQ line indicate that virus genome were detectable, but the  
10 concentrations were smaller than  $1 \times 10^1$  copies/reaction.
- 11
- 12 Fig.3. Relationship between the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater from  
13 infectious diseases ward and the inpatient number. Gray circles indicate the  
14 relationship between the total number of inpatients and the SARS-CoV-2  
15 concentrations for which a quantitative value ( $10^1$  copies/reaction) was obtained.  
16 White circles surrounded with a dashed line indicate the relationship between the  
17 total number of inpatients and SARS-CoV-2 concentration including samples with  
18 concentrations below the limit of quantification (LOQ). Solid and dashed line  
19 indicate the regression line of the quantitative values and the including with below  
20 LOQ, respectively.
- 21
- 22 Fig.4. Correlation coefficient between SARS-CoV-2 concentration in wastewater  
23 form infectious diseases ward and patient number of days after onset of symptoms.
- 24

1 Fig.5. The correlation between the patient's contribution values to SARS-CoV-2 load  
2 in feces and SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater from the infectious diseases  
3 ward.

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 Table 1. Water quality data of the collected wastewater samples.

Site	Date	Temperature (°C)	pH	EC (µS)	TDS (ppm)	Salinity (ppt)
MedWW	May 1	18.8	7.42	371	264	0.18
	May 7	19.6	6.16	760	522	0.37
	May 13	20.9	6.23	788	560	0.39
	May 20	23.1	9.44	222	158	0.11
	May 27	19.6	7.04	650	461	0.33
	June 3	22.3	7.09	805	568	0.40
	June17	25.8	7.25	380	261	0.19
WWTP-A	June 4	21.5	7.33	359	253	0.18
WWTP-B	June 4	22.7	7.12	301	215	0.15
WWTP-C	June 4	21.9	7.25	516	369	0.26

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1 Table 2. Efficiency of each process in four methods based on WPC and MPC  
2 quantitative analyses.

Date	Type	Efficiency of the process (%)							
		Whole process ( $\phi 6$ )				Molecular process (MNV)			
		DC- MW <sup>c</sup>	DC- QVR <sup>d</sup>	PEG- MW <sup>c</sup>	PEG- QVR <sup>f</sup>	DC- MW	DC- QVR	PEG- MW	PEG- QVR
May 1	MedWW	94.3	94.8	169.7	96.2	154.1	85.6	117.5	74.2
May 7	MedWW <sup>g</sup>	149.7	12.0	53.0	16.9	143.9	89.1	121.7	69.2
May 13	MedWW <sup>g</sup>	43.1	5.07	148.1	63.8	134.1	25.8	141.4	64.5
May 20	MedWW <sup>g</sup>	118.4	6.7	167.6	77.6	208.5	3.87	150.7	<sup>10</sup> 0.3
May 27	MedWW <sup>g</sup>	35.0	11.7	84.0	9.5	119.1	520.2	183.0	57.3
June 3	MedWW <sup>g</sup>	18.4	19.6	44.0	57.5	85.0	550.8	203.0	697.3
June 17	MedWW <sup>g</sup>	501.1	23.4	79.1	77.7	175.4	263.1	197.4	134.9
June 4	WWTP-A <sup>g</sup>	206.6	15.43	94.7	85.2	74.1	281.0	159.5	134.0
June 4	WWTP-B	405.7	55.13	67.0	63.9	93.2	40.6	246.0	101.3
June 4	WWTP-C	59.4	119.2	36.4	56.8	156.2	83.0	211.0	107.6
	GM <sup>a</sup>	101.4	21.5	82.7	50.3	128.1	94.1	168.5	110.1
	$\pm$ SD <sup>b</sup>	2.9	2.9	1.7	2.1	1.4	4.6	1.3	2.0

3 <sup>a</sup> GM: Geometric mean.

4 <sup>b</sup>  $\pm$ SD: Geometric standard deviation.

5 <sup>c-f</sup>: Combination of virus concentration and extraction or purification method. CD: Direct capture, PEG: Polyethylene glycol,

6 MW: Maxwell, QVR: QIAamp Viral RNA mini kit.

7 <sup>g</sup>: The freeze and thaw process was subjected once under the DC-QVR method.

8

9

1 Table 3. Detection and quantification results of SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater by  
 2 each virus concentration and extraction-purification method.

Sample	Detection and quantification (copies/reaction) <sup>a</sup>			
	DC- MW	DC- QVR	PEG- MW	PEG- QVR
MedWW May 1	46.2	23.9	19.8	18.5
MedWW May 7	45.0	30.0	17.1	12.5
MedWW May 13	125.3	+	24.3	34.9
MedWW May 20	60.0	+	+	+
MedWW May 27	+	10.1	+	+
MedWW June 3	+	-	+	+
MedWW June 17	10.0	+	-	-
WWTP-A	-	-	-	-
WWTP-B	+	-	-	-
WWTP-C	+	-	-	+
Positive quantification	5 (50.0 %)	3 (30.0 %)	3 (30.0 %)	3 (30.0 %)
Positive detection	9 (90.0 %)	7 (70.0 %)	6 (60.0%)	7 (70.0%)

3 <sup>a</sup>: Quantification data was shown only for those that had a more than  $1.0 \times 10^0$  copies/reaction of the concentration. +: Positive  
 4 detection. The concentration was smaller than  $1.0 \times 10^0$  copies/reaction. -: Negative.

5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10

1 Table 4. Cross-correlation in four difference types of the concentration and  
2 extraction-purification methods.

	DC-MW	DC-QVR	PEG-MW	PEG-QVR
DC-MW	1	0.24	0.76	0.87
DC-QVR		1	0.70	0.43
PEG-MW			1	0.43
PEG-QVR				1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11