

1 An alternative approach for bioanalytical assay development for wastewater- 2 based epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2

3 Boogaerts Tim^{a,*}, Jacobs Lotte^b, De Roeck Naomi^b, Van den Bogaert Siel^b, Aertgeerts Bert^c, Lahousse
4 Lies^d, van Nuijs Alexander L.N.^{a,**}, Delputte Peter^{b,**}

5 ^a Toxicological Centre, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

6 ^b Laboratory for Microbiology, Parasitology and Hygiene, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1,
7 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

8 ^c Academic Centre for General Practice, KU Leuven, Kapucijnenvoer 7, 3000 Leuven, Belgium

9 ^d Department of Bioanalysis, Ghent University, Ottergemsesteenweg 460, 9000 Ghent, Belgium

10 * - Corresponding author: Tim.Boogaerts@uantwerpen.be

11 ** - shared senior author

13 Keywords:

- 14 • Wastewater-based epidemiology
- 15 • SARS-CoV-2
- 16 • Ultracentrifugation
- 17 • Digital polymerase chain reaction
- 18 • In-sample stability

19 Highlights:

- 20 • Development of an analytical procedure for detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater
- 21 • Extraction recovery was evaluated in influent wastewater
- 22 • Precision measured with dPCR used as a proxy for qPCR
- 23 • qPCR of the N2 gene fragment showed high in-sample stability of SARS-CoV-2 on average

24 Abstract

25 Wastewater-based epidemiology could be applied to track down SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks at high spatio-temporal
26 resolution and could potentially be used as an early-warning for emergence of SARS-CoV-2 circulation in the
27 general population. Epidemiological surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 could play a role in monitoring the spread of the
28 virus in the population and controlling possible outbreaks. However, sensitive sample preparation and detection
29 methods are necessary to detect trace levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in influent wastewater (IWW).

30 Unlike predecessors, method development of a SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration and detection procedure was
31 performed with IWW samples with high viral SARS-CoV-2 loads (in combination with seeding IWW with a
32 surrogate coronavirus). This is of importance since the SARS-CoV-2 genome in IWW might have already been
33 subjected to previous degradation and inactivation processes. The high viral loads were confirmed by qPCR and
34 identified by sequencing. The high viral loads were confirmed by qPCR and identified by sequencing. The high viral loads were confirmed by qPCR and identified by sequencing.

34 debris,...). Centricon Plus-70 (100 kDa) centrifugal filter devices resulted in the lowest and most reproducible Ct-
35 values for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Lowering pore sizes did not improve our limit of detection and quantification. Real-
36 time polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) was employed for the amplification of the N1, N2, N3 and E_Sarbeco-
37 gene.

38 This is one of the first studies to apply digital polymerase chain reaction (dPCR) for the detection of SARS-CoV-2
39 RNA in IWW. Interestingly, qPCR results were comparable with dPCR results suggesting that qPCR is a valid
40 method. In this study, dPCR was also used as a proxy to assess the precision of qPCR. In this light, dPCR showed
41 high variability at low concentration levels (10^0 copies/ μ L), indicating that variability in bioanalytical assays for
42 SARS-CoV-2 RNA might be substantial.


43 On average, the N2-gene showed high in-sample stability in IWW for 10 days of storage at 4 °C. Between-sample
44 variability was substantial due to the low native concentrations in IWW. Additionally, the E-gene proved to be
45 less stable compared to the N2-gene and showed higher variability. Freezing the IWW samples resulted in a 10-
46 fold decay of loads of the N2- and E-gene in IWW.

47 Although WBE can already aid in filling some knowledge gaps in the epidemiological surveillance of SARS-CoV-2,
48 future WBE studies should aim to further validate and standardize bioanalytical assays, especially with regards
49 to methodological limitations.

50 1. Introduction

51 The Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is an enveloped non-segmented positive-
52 sense RNA virus, which is associated with the pathogenesis of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in
53 humans [1]. Due to the partly asymptomatic transmission and the high infectivity of this virus [2,3], it is crucial
54 to have timely and accurate figures on the spread of SARS-CoV-2 in defined population groups for controlling
55 possible viral outbreaks. Currently, the extent of SARS-CoV-2 circulation has been monitored by diagnostic testing
56 of primarily symptomatic patients and contact tracing to also isolate asymptomatic patients [4,5]. However, a
57 major limitation with these methods is that they depend on participation of individuals, even when they have no
58 symptoms or only mild aspecific symptoms of COVID-19. Lack of recognition of symptoms or refusal to participate
59 in detection or quarantine measures allows further spread of the virus in the general population. In Belgium,
60 contact-tracing is primarily done manually through regional call centers and through the implementation of a
61 smartphone application. Participation is heavily influenced by personal, social and public trust and requires
62 additional efforts to connect with lower educated and vulnerable population groups [4]. Contact-tracing efforts
63 could potentially be biased by reporting and concealment bias and requires from each individual to keep track
64 of their contact list. Additionally, if contact-tracers fail to track down an individual's contacts swiftly (for example
65 due to the prolonged incubation period or time to perform diagnostic testing), it could have limited effect on the
66 spread of this highly infectious virus [6].

67 Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) employs the analysis of influent wastewater (IWW) on human
68 (metabolic) excretion products and has been used as an alternative approach to investigate the circulation and
69 spread of infectious diseases at the population level (Figure 1) [7,8]. Infectious disease biomarkers (e.g. viral
70 genomes) are released, pooled and transported in the wastewater system. The abundance of pathogens in IWW
71 reflects the pattern and spread of infection at the population level and does not depend on participation at the
72 individual level [9]. For this reason, WBE is an efficient alternative approach for the prevention of infectious
73 disease outbreaks, to track down possible hotspots and to evaluate the effectiveness of large scale anticontagion
74 interventions within different communities [10]. In order for WBE to monitor infectious diseases, the
75 corresponding pathogen should preferentially be causing an enteric infection. Alternatively the pathogen or its
76 genome should be excreted at sufficient levels in the faeces, urine or other excretions that end up in the
77 wastewater [10–12]. In this light, several research papers indicated the potential of WBE in surveilling the
78 transmission of the recently emerged SARS-CoV-2 at the population level [13–15].



79
80 **Figure 1: Schematic overview of sewage surveillance for determining SARS-CoV-2 circulation in the general population.**

81 Thanks to some advantages of this epidemiologic approach, WBE could aid in filling some knowledge gaps.
82 Asymptomatic individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 also shed the virus via their stool in the sewers [11,16]
83 enabling WBE to track down the extent of transmission of the virus in different catchments and to predict future
84 disease outbreaks in communities. Additionally, WBE could potentially be used as an early-warning for
85 emergence of SARS-CoV-2 in the general population [17–19]. WBE is especially useful to invigilate new outbreaks
86 as it is highly inefficient to test thousands of individuals when detection rates are low. In this light, it is crucial to
87 have sensitive and robust bioanalytical methods to quantitatively measure SARS-CoV-2 in IWW.

88 The surveillance of wastewater on viral RNA loads of SARS-CoV-2 proposes some analytical challenges. These
89 primarily include the low detection levels of the virus in IWW and the wastewater matrix potentially harboring a
90 wide array of organic matter, humic acids and heavy metals that could interfere with the molecular methods of
91 assaying viruses. Therefore, it is crucial to have reproducible concentration methods and sensitive instrumental
92 techniques to accurately measure viruses in IWW [9]. At this moment, there has been a broad range of
93 concentration methods for the extraction of viral loads of SARS-CoV-2 in IWW. Pre-existing concentration
94 methods for SARS-CoV-2 RNA primarily include ultracentrifugation, ultrafiltration, charged filter membranes or
95 PEG precipitation [20]. Nevertheless, most of these methods assess efficiency of recovery (RE) by spiking non-
96 enveloped human enteric viruses to IWW [21–23]. Only a limited number of papers on method development and
97 optimization investigate RE through spiking of enveloped viruses (e.g. coronavirus, the murine hepatitis virus and
98 the bacteriophage pseudomonas virus phi6) [24]. However, even with enteric viruses, recoveries with
99 concentrations methods are mostly determined by the virus and the matrix composition. In this light,
100 coronaviruses (CoV) have quite distinctive structural and physical properties compared to other enteric viruses
101 [25]. Furthermore, it is not exactly known in what complex the SARS-CoV-2 RNA is present in faeces (virus
102 particles, cellular fragments...) and viral loads may be broken down in smaller fragments during in-sewer
103 transport. Therefore such spiking experiments with viruses, although useful, are probably not fully representative
104 for evaluation of stability and extraction of real IWW.

105 The aim of this study was to compare different bioanalytical procedures for the concentration of SARS-CoV-2
106 RNA in IWW. This bioanalytical assay was optimized with IWW originating from 8 Belgian wastewater treatment
107 plants (WWTPs) with confirmed native levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA, in combination with spiking with an animal
108 Coronavirus. Additionally, in-sample stability at different storage conditions was further investigated. Finally, this
109 study applied, as one of the first, digital polymerase chain reaction (dPCR) for assaying SARS-CoV-2 RNA in IWW,
110 in a direct comparison with traditional qPCR.

111 **2. Materials and methods**

112 **2.1. Reagents and materials**

113 UltraPure™ DEPC-Treated Water (RNase and DNase free, molecular biology grade) was obtained from
114 ThermoFisher Scientific (Waltham, US). Ethanol was obtained from Aventor (Radnor, US). CELLSTAR® serological
115 pipettes (50 mL) and filter tips were obtained from BioScience and Greiner Bio-One International, respectively.
116 The Eppendorf 5910R Centrifuge (Aarschot, BE) was used for sample centrifugation. Centricon Plus-70 Centrifugal
117 filters (100 kDa and 30 kDa) and Amicon® Ultra Centrifugal filters (50 kDa and 10 kDa), Macrosep Advance
118 Centrifugal devices with Omega Membrane (100 kDa and 30 kDa) and Vivaspin 20 ultrafiltration units (100 kDa
119 and 50 kDa) were purchased from Millipore (Burlington, US), Pall (New York, US) and Sartorius (Göttingen, DE),
120 respectively. PEG 8000 and sodium chloride were acquired from Promega (Madison, US).

121 The QIAamp Viral RNA minikit, the RNeasy plus minikit and the RNeasy Powermicrobiome kit were obtained from
122 QIAGEN (Hilden, DE). Automated RNA extraction was done with the Maxwell® RSC Instrument with the PureFood
123 GMO and Authentication kit, both from Promega (Madison, US). Before the molecular assay, samples were
124 further purified from potential PCR-inhibitors with the 2x SensiFAST™ Probe No-ROX One-Step Kit from Bioline
125 (Cincinnati, US). Real-time polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) was performed with the LightCycler® 96 instrument
126 from Roche (Bazel, CH). SARS-CoV-2 and porcine coronavirus (PRCV) primers were obtained from Integrated DNA
127 Technologies (IDT, Coralville, US) [26,27]. 96-well PCR pre-plates were acquired from Applied Biosystems
128 (Thermo Fischer Scientific, Foster City, US). Table 1 summarizes the sequences for the primers and probes used
129 for qPCR. Digital polymerase chain reaction (dPCR) was done with the QIAcuity One 5-Plex from QIAGEN (Hilden,
130 DE). Samples were purified with the QiAcuity One-Step Viral RT-PCR kit and concentrations were 400 nM for
131 primers and 200 nM for probes.

132 PRCV used as a whole process control was obtained from Ghent University (kind gift of Prof. H. Nauwynck,
133 Merelbeke, Belgium). SARS-CoV-2 RNA used as a positive qPCR control was obtained from the Institute of Tropical
134 Medicine Antwerp (kind gift of Prof. K. Ariën, ITG, BE). The EURM-019 reference standard for the construction of
135 the calibration curve was obtained from the Joint Research Centre (JRC, European Commission). The Laboratory
136 of Microbiology, Parasitology and Hygiene possesses the necessary permits for this research.

137 **Table 1 Real-time PCR primers and probes for the target virus and the whole process control**

Target gene	Primer/Probe	Concentration (nM)	5'	Sequence	3'
SARS-CoV-2					
Nucleocapsid (N1)	2019-nCoV_N1-F	200	None	GACCCCAAATCAGCGAAAT	None
	2019-nCoV_N1-R	200	None	TCTGGTTACTGCCAGTTGAATCTG	None
	2019-nCoV_N1-P	200	FAM	ACCCCGCATTACGTTTGGTGGACC	/ZEN//3laBkFQ/
Nucleocapsid (N2)	2019-nCoV_N2-F	200	None	TTACAAACATTGGCCGCAAA	None
	2019-nCoV_N2-R	200	None	GCGCGACATTCCGAAGAA	None
	2019-nCoV_N2-P	200	FAM	ACAATTTGCCCCAGCGCTTCAG	/ZEN//3laBkFQ/
Nucleocapsid (N3)	2019-nCoV_N3-F	200	None	GGGAGCCTTGAATACACCAAAA	None
	2019-nCoV_N3-R	200	None	TGTAGCACGATTGCAGCATTG	None
	2019-nCoV_N3-P	200	FAM	AYCACATTGGCACCCGCAATCCTG	/ZEN//3laBkFQ/
Envelope (E)	E_Sarbeco_F	400	None	ACAGGTACGTTAATAGTTAATAGCGT	None
	E_Sarbeco_R	400	None	ATATTGCAGCAGTACGCACACA	None
	E_Sarbeco_P1	200	FAM	ACACTAGCCATCCTTACTGCGCTTCG	/ZEN//3laBkFQ/
PRCV					
	PRCV_1_F	200	None	AGCTATTGGACTTCAAAGGAAGATG	None
	PRCV_1_R	200	None	CATAGGCATTAATCTGCTGAAGGAA	None
	PRCV_1_P	100	HEX	TCACGTTACACACAAATACCACTTGCC A	/ZEN//3laBkFQ/

138

139 2.2. Sampling

140 Method development was done with IWW samples acquired from eight different Belgian WWTPs with
 141 population equivalents ranging between 25,000 to 200,000 inhabitants and sanitary wastewater (SAW) from a
 142 company that had a high number of positive COVID-19 cases (approximately 17% of the employers) [28]. Daily
 143 IWW samples were collected in the preamble (2nd of August), peak (20th of November) and tail (20th of January)
 144 of the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. Locations are not further specified due to anonymity constraints,
 145 however, matrix compositions differ substantially between the locations of interest to demonstrate the
 146 robustness of the methodology. It should be noted that in-sewer degradation in the SAW is most likely less
 147 substantial compared to the IWW samples because of minor average residence times.

148 Daily 24-h composite IWW samples were collected time- or flow proportionally in order to obtain samples that
 149 were representative for an entire day. For time-proportional sampling, 10-minute intervals were applied to
 150 compile daily samples to accurately capture viral RNA loads over the 24-h period [29]. Average residence time
 151 was less than 12 hours in all locations. After sample collection, samples were transported immediately at 4 °C to
 152 the laboratory and analyzed within 24 hours.

153 2.3. Sample concentration

154 Virus concentration is necessary because of the low levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater. The analytical
 155 procedure needs to be sensitive enough to detect viral loads in the beginning or at the tail of the COVID-19 peak
 156 when only a limited number of SARS-CoV-2 infections are present in the catchment area. Several ultrafiltration
 157 methods (for protocols, see figures S1-S3) with different centrifugal devices with varying molecular weight cut-
 158 offs (MWCO) and loading volumes were tested for the concentration of viral RNA loads in IWW in order to obtain
 159 high extraction efficiencies. Additionally, PEG precipitation was also tested as an alternative for sample
 160 concentration. It should be noted that co-concentration of PCR inhibitors could also occur when using these
 161 concentration methods which could affect the assay's sensitivity [23]. The composition of the IWW matrix is
 162 highly variable and contains a range of heavy metals, RNases and polysaccharides that could interfere with qPCR
 163 amplification.

164 It should be noted that RE was not determined by spiking the IWW samples pre- and post-extraction with an
 165 enveloped enteric control virus. In this study, an alternative approach was proposed in which IWW with
 166 substantial loads of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was tested with different sample concentration methods. The protocol with
 167 the lowest and most reproducible cycle threshold (Ct) levels for the amplification of the different SARS-CoV-2
 168 genes was chosen for sample concentration. This approach was chosen since spiking IWW with enteric enveloped

169 viruses may not be representative for RE of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in IWW due to different structural properties of
170 these surrogate viruses or the in-sewer degradation of viral SARS-CoV-2 genome. Additionally, SARS-CoV-2
171 genome could also be present in a different form (e.g. cell debris) in the sewer system. However, during method
172 development, IWW samples were spiked in parallel with PRCV to investigate whether the Ct-values for the
173 amplification of the PRCV_1-gene were in line with the SARS-CoV-2 results when optimizing the different
174 extraction protocols. Table 2 summarizes the design of experiment with the varying extraction protocols in order
175 to obtain the most suitable sample concentration method of viral RNA loads in the wastewater matrix.

176 **Table 2 Optimizing a suitable sample concentration method**

Condition	Amicon	Centricon	Macrosep	Vivaspin	PEG 8000
Loading volume (mL)	15, 30	50, 100	20, 40	20, 40	90
Molecular weight cut-off (MWCO) (kDa)	10, 50	30, 100	30, 100	50, 100	8

177
178 In the final protocol, samples were firstly centrifuged at 4625g for 30 minutes at 4 °C to remove solids and debris.
179 The supernatans was transferred to a Centricon Plus-70 centrifugal filter for sample concentration. The sample
180 was centrifuged for 15 minutes at 2500g at 4 °C in these centrifugal devices. Subsequently, the filter cup was
181 centrifuged for an additional 2 minutes at 1000g at 4 °C to collect the sample concentrate. Finally, the sample
182 concentrate was extracted and standardized at a volume of 1.5 mL.

183 **2.4. RNA extraction**

184 Similar to the sample concentration protocols, different commercially available manual RNA extraction kits were
185 compared in order to obtain the lowest and most reproducible Ct-values for both SARS-CoV-2 and PRCV. Initially,
186 a selection of IWW samples was processed with three manual RNA extraction kits (i.e. Viral RNA, RNeasy and
187 Powermicrobiome). These RNA extraction kits need to be capable of isolating trace levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
188 from IWW. The RE depends heavily on the composition of the RNA extraction kit. The number of washing steps
189 to remove PCR inhibitors may vary between the kits and different elution solvents are used for the extraction of
190 SARS-CoV-2 RNA from the concentrate. These commercialized kits have been proposed in other WBE applications
191 for the extraction of SARS-CoV-2 in IWW [21].

192 For each RNA extraction kit, each sample concentration method was considered. The Ct-values obtained with
193 the automated Maxwell PureFood GMO and Authentication RNA extraction kit were compared with the results
194 from the manual RNA extraction kits to investigate whether it was possible to increase the throughput of the
195 bioanalytical assay.

196 In the final method, extraction was performed with the automated Maxwell PureFood GMO and Authentication
197 RNA extraction kit. 200 µL of the concentrate was added to 200 µL cetyltrimethylammonium bromide buffer and
198 40 µL proteinase K and the total volume was incubated for 10 minutes at 56 °C. This mixture was transferred to
199 the sample well together with 300 µL lysis buffer. The final elution volume with this RNA extraction kit was 50
200 µL.

201 **2.5. Molecular methods for assaying SARS-CoV-2: qPCR and dPCR**


202 All qPCR amplifications were performed in 20 µL reaction mixtures using a 2x SensiFAST™ Probe No-ROX One-
203 Step kit for further purification from PCR-inhibitors after RNA extraction. Each reaction mixture contained 20%
204 v/v of the extracted RNA. The final concentration of the primer and probes in the different qPCR mixtures was
205 given in Table 1. A six-point calibration curve with a concentration between 10⁵ and 10⁰ copies/µL was
206 constructed in ultrapure DEPC-treated water for quantification of the different genes of interest (Table 1) in
207 IWW. The lower limit of quantification (LLOQ) was defined as the concentration in the lowest point of the
208 calibration curve and was 10⁰ copies/µL for all genes. All qPCR reactions were performed in duplicate. For each
209 qPCR run, two negative controls and a positive control were included. qPCR settings were as follows: 10 minutes

210 for reverse transcription, 2 minutes for polymerase activation followed by 45 cycles of 5 seconds at 95 °C for
211 denaturation and 30 seconds for annealing and extension.

212 In low-concentration IWW samples, qPCR could potentially be affected by sample inhibitors, poor amplification
213 efficiency, less precision and the need for relative quantification, which might lead to the occurrence of false
214 negative results. Therefore, dPCR was tested for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in IWW because of the higher
215 precision, tolerance to PCR inhibitors and reproducibility compared to qPCR. dPCR could potentially be useful
216 because of the low sensitivity to PCR inhibitors that are highly present in IWW and possibly co-concentrated
217 during sample preparation. For this reason, this molecular assay could potentially be more sensitive for the
218 detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in IWW. Another advantage of dPCR is that absolute quantification is performed
219 (through Poisson calculations). The same standard curve was injected with dPCR for all genes of interest to
220 investigate precision with dPCR at different concentration levels as a proxy for validation of the quantitative
221 results. For each dPCR run a non-template control was included to determine the signal to noise (S/N) threshold.

222 2.6. Stability experiments

223 During transport in the sewer system, it is possible that the SARS-CoV-2 genome is broken down in smaller RNA
224 fragments containing the SARS-CoV-2 genes. Therefore, in-sample stability was not investigated through
225 standard addition with SARS-CoV-2 since stability of the corresponding gene fragments might not be comparable
226 with the fragments found in IWW. This study only considered in-sample stability and in-sewer stability should be
227 further investigated as medium to low stability could substantially influence the concentrations of SARS-CoV-2
228 RNA in the sewer system.



229
230 **Figure 2 Schematic overview of the stability experiment**
231 IWW samples from the eight different locations with substantial viral RNA loads were divided in multiple aliquots
232 of 50 mL and stored at different temperatures (4 °C and -20 °C). These aliquots were subsequently analyzed at
233 different time points for all genes of interest, as illustrated by Figure 2. Important to note is that all aliquots
234 stored at -20 °C were only thawed once at the moment of analysis. The effect of multiple freeze-thaw cycles was
235 not considered in this study. However, it has to be mentioned that multiple freeze-thaw cycles could lead to
236 extensive breakdown of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by RNases present in IWW.


237 For each IWW sample, viral loads for each gene were quantified at each time point and expressed as a relative
238 percentage of the native concentration present in the corresponding IWW samples at the starting point of this
239 stability study. The mean and relative standard deviation (%RSD) of all IWW samples were considered for each
240 gene of interest.

241 3. Results & discussion

242 3.1. Sample concentration


243 Figures S1 summarizes the results of the different sample concentration methods for each RNA extraction kit.
 244 For this initial comparison, a fresh IWW sample (stored at 4 °C) from location 2 from the 2nd of August 2020 was
 245 divided in different aliquots which were analyzed with different sample concentration methods for SARS-CoV-2
 246 and seeded PRCV. At this time, the number of confirmed cases of COVID-19 was on the rise in this specific
 247 location, but was still considerably lower compared to the second wave of the pandemic. The Centricon Plus-70
 248 centrifugal filters resulted in the highest yields of PRCV and SARS-CoV-2 for all genes of interest. While PEG
 249 precipitation resulted in detection levels of SARS-CoV-2 above the LLOQ for the E-gene, yields for the N1 and N2
 250 gene were generally low or these genes remained undetected. This was in line with previous studies that
 251 reported poor recoveries of SARS-CoV-2 with PEG precipitation, possibly due to the co-concentration of PCR-
 252 inhibitors because of the small MWCO with this concentration method [21]. Ct-values measured with the other
 253 centrifugal methods were also low, as presented in Figure S4. However, yields of PRCV were considerably higher
 254 with the ultracentrifugation methods compared to the PEG precipitation. For this reason, PEG precipitation was
 255 excluded from further method optimization. The N3-gene resulted in poor detection levels with both RNA
 256 extraction kits and across all sample concentration methods. For this reason, further amplification of SARS-CoV-
 257 2 genes in IWW mainly focused on the N1-, N2- and E-gene.

258 The effect of different pore sizes and different loading volumes was tested with the different ultracentrifugation
 259 methods in order to obtain the highest and most reproducible RE for SARS-CoV-2. SAW from a company with
 260 high prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infections was used for the optimization of the method, as illustrated by Figure
 261 3A. Overall, increasing the sample volume resulted in the lowest Ct-values for the genes of interest with the
 262 different sample concentration methods. However, higher loading volumes (i.e. two times the maximum capacity
 263 of the filter) often resulted in blockage of the centrifugal filter membrane and, therefore, the IWW sample was
 264 only loaded once to prevent this. Blockage of the filter could also potentially lead to higher concentrations of
 265 PCR-inhibitors which could negatively influence the sensitivity with qPCR. The use of lower sample volumes also
 266 increases the throughput of the bioanalytical assay, since higher loading volumes require multiple centrifugation
 267 steps. Lower pore sizes did also not result in more sensitive detection of SARS-CoV-2; only the Amicon centrifugal
 268 filters with a MWCO of 10 kDa showed minor improvements. While sample concentration might be better with
 269 smaller pore sizes, decreasing the MWCO could also potentially lead to co-concentration of PCR-inhibitors. For
 270 this reason, MWCO ranging between 50 and 100 kDa were used for sample concentration. Concentration with
 271 the Centricon Plus-70 centrifugal filters resulted in the lowest Ct-values; the other centrifugal filters were
 272 comparable. Other studies also found acceptable RE of surrogate viruses or seeded SARS-CoV-2 in IWW with
 273 some of these ultracentrifugation methods. Loading volumes ranged between 50 and 500 mL in these studies.
 274 However, the variation of the RE with these sample concentration methods was quite substantial [21,23].



275
 276 **Figure 3 Optimization of pore sizes and loading volumes with the different sample concentration methods in SAW using**
 277 **(A) the Viral RNA extraction kit and (B) the Maxwell PureFood GMO and Authentication kit.** The colour of each cell
 278 represents the Ct-value. Cells indicated with a red asterisk have higher Ct-values than the lowest point of the calibration curve
 279 and could therefore not be quantified. However, in these cells a positive signal was still detected. No signal was detected in cells
 280 with a black cross. Side-by-side cells for each location represent duplicate Ct-values.

281 Structural properties of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA found in the SAW might differ from the viral loads measured in
 282 IWW due to in-sewer degradation of viral RNA during sewage transport. Therefore, IWW samples (50 mL)
 283 collected from eight different Belgian WWTPs were processed with the Centricon (100 kDa) and the Macrosep
 284 (100 kDa) centrifugal filters to confirm the results. The effect of direct extraction was also considered because of
 285 the high incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections at the time of sample collection. Figure 4 illustrates the Ct-values for
 286 the different SARS-CoV-2 genes under investigation for the different sample concentration methods. The use of
 287 no concentration step resulted in poor yields of SARS-CoV-2 RNA with Ct-values above the LLOQ only detected
 288 in a few locations, mainly for the N2-gene. This verifies the need for a concentration step to detect the low
 289 concentration levels of SARS-CoV-2 in IWW. The use of the Centricon centrifugal filters resulted in the lowest Ct-
 290 values for the N1- and E-gene. Results for the N2-gene were comparable between the Centricon and Macrosep
 291 centrifugal devices. In the final protocol, ultracentrifugation with Centricon filters was chosen for sample
 292 concentration.



293
 294 **Figure 4 Comparison of sample concentration methods in IWW from 8 Belgian WWTPs.** The colour of each cell represents
 295 the Ct-value. Cells indicated with a red asterisk have higher Ct-values than the lowest point of the calibration curve and could
 296 therefore not be quantified. However, in these cells a positive signal was still detected. No signal was detected in cells with a black
 297 cross. Side-by-side cells for each location represent duplicate Ct-values. The Maxwell PureFood GMO and Authentication kit was
 298 used for RNA extraction.

299 3.2. RNA extraction

300 Figure S4 compares the different RNA extraction protocols for both SARS-CoV-2 and PRCV. The use of the
 301 Powermicrobiome kit resulted in low detection levels of the different SARS-CoV-2 genes in IWW. Therefore, this
 302 RNA extraction method was excluded at an early stage. The Viral RNA and RNeasy extraction kit showed
 303 comparable results, with slightly higher detection levels observed with the Viral RNA extraction kit for both SARS-
 304 CoV-2 and PRCV. The Viral RNA extraction kit also recovered higher viral RNA loads in frozen IWW compared to
 305 the RNeasy extraction kit. However, in frozen IWW viral loads were almost always lower than the LLOQ, as further
 306 discussed in section 3.4.

307 Figure 3 provides a comparison between the manual Viral RNA extraction kit and the automated Maxwell
 308 PureFood GMO and Authentication kit. The use of both RNA extraction kits was comparable with slightly lower

309 and more reproducible Ct-values among duplicates observed with the manual RNA extraction kit. However,
310 automatization of the RNA extraction also significantly increases the throughput of the bioanalytical assay. For
311 this reason, the Maxwell PureFood GMO and Authentication kit was used for RNA extraction in the final protocol.

312 3.3. Molecular methods for assaying SARS-CoV-2

313 3.3.1. qPCR

314 A surrogate coronavirus (i.e. PRCV) was used as a whole process control. There was an expected repetitive drop
315 in the Ct-value for the SARS-CoV-2 genes and PRCV_1-gene when amplifying a 10-fold dilution series proving the
316 applicability of qPCR for the detection of the genes of interest. SARS-CoV-2 genes were not detected in the
317 negative controls and the positive control tested always positive.

318 3.3.2. dPCR

319 At this moment, investigation of SARS-CoV-2 genes with dPCR remains underexplored [30,31]. IWW samples
320 from the tail of the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic were analyzed with both qPCR and dPCR. dPCR could
321 potentially be more sensitive in measuring viral RNA loads in IWW because of the higher tolerance to PCR
322 inhibitors. Due to the high number of partitions (approximately 25,000), chances are low that PCR inhibitors and
323 SARS-CoV-2 RNA are partitioned in the same reaction well. The positive partition rate was generally low in the
324 IWW samples (<0.05%). At the low concentration levels observed in these samples, the 95% confidence interval
325 (CI) with dPCR was also quite broad, as illustrated in Table 3. Concentrations measured with qPCR were the same
326 order of magnitude as those with dPCR, with the exception of sample 3 and 4 for the E-gene (i.e. 10-fold higher
327 with qPCR). Overall this indicates that sensitivity of both molecular assays is comparable. D'Aoust et al. also
328 reported that dPCR did not result in superior detection of SARS-CoV-2 compared to qPCR [31]. In their study
329 sensitivity was even lower compared to qPCR.

330 **Table 3 Comparison of qPCR and dPCR results for all genes of interest for seven IWW samples collected in the tail of**
331 **the second wave.** CI = 95% confidence interval. Matrix composition (i.e. number of PCR inhibitors) was different between the
332 different samples.


Sample	Real-time qPCR			Digital PCR					
	N1 (copies/ μ L)	N2 (copies/ μ L)	E (copies/ μ L)	N1 (copies/ μ L)	CI (%)	N2 (copies/ μ L)	CI (%)	E (copies/ μ L)	CI (%)
1	0.17	1.16	n.d.	0.70	95.7	0.54	109.1	0.27	168.6
2	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	0.13	274.4	n.d.	-	0.26	168.6
3	0.46	1.15	10.17	1.33	64.9	1.00	79.0	0.13	274.4
4	n.d.	0.10	13.57	n.d.	-	n.d.	-	0.13	274.4
5	0.08	0.50	n.d.	n.d.	-	n.d.	-	n.d.	-
6	0.20	n.d.	n.d.	0.14	274.4	n.d.	-	n.d.	-
7	0.17	0.74	1.27	1.77	56.3	0.53	109.1	0.40	274.4

333
334 The same calibration curve was processed with both qPCR and dPCR. A major advantage of dPCR is that it allows
335 absolute quantification and, thus, no standard curve is needed. The different calibration points were amplified
336 with dPCR as a proxy to validate variability at different concentration levels and Ct-levels with qPCR. This is of
337 importance because native concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in IWW are in the low copies/ μ L range. Important
338 to note is that precision is generally higher with dPCR compared to qPCR because of the higher tolerance to PCR
339 inhibitors and the use of absolute quantification. Therefore, precision observed with dPCR is used as a proxy for
340 qPCR, but most likely the actual variability with qPCR will be higher due to methodological differences.

341 Figure 5 combines the result for the standard curve observed with qPCR with the results of dPCR. At low
342 concentration levels (10^{-1} to 10^0 copies/ μ L), the width of the CI tends to be rather broad. For the E-gene, no
343 positive partitions were measured in the reaction well containing the 10^0 copies/ μ L calibration point. The width
344 of the CI for the N1- and N2-gene at this concentration level was 79.0% and 95.7% respectively (see also Table
345 S1). This further evidences the high variability observed at Ct-values around the LLOQ with qPCR and could
346 potentially explain why only one single well out of the side-by-side duplicates tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. Of
347 course, the high variability observed in WBE applications for SARS-CoV-2 has further implications for the analysis


348 of temporal trends in SARS-CoV-2 infections, especially in catchment areas with low prevalence of COVID-19.
349 This uncertainty is further explored in section 4.

350



351
352 **Figure 5 Evaluation of the precision of the standard curve with dPCR as a means to validate qPCR results.** *CI = confidence*
353 *interval; Ct = cycle threshold. The left y-axis represents the precision of the 95% confidence interval after running the standard*
354 *curve with dPCR. The right y-axis represents the Ct-values measured at the different concentration levels with qPCR.*

355 3.4. Stability



356
357 **Figure 6 In-sample stability of the different SARS-CoV-2 genes at (A) 4 °C and (B) -20 °C.** *The horizontal lines represent*
358 *the mean residual percentage for the eight samples. Detection of the N1-gene was generally low in the IWW samples (i.e. 10-1*
359 *copies/ μ L) with Ct-values below the LLOQ in most samples. Therefore, it was not possible to assess in-sample stability for the*
360 *N1-gene.*

361 In traditional WBE applications, stability is evaluated according to McCall et al. [32]. Generally, WBE biomarkers
362 are classified as either high (<20% transformation), medium (20-60%), low (60-100%) or variable (i.e. different
363 results found in WBE studies) stability over a pre-defined time period. However, the variability observed with
364 native concentrations measured at the LLOQ levels (see section 3.3.2.) complicates this assessment.

365 The N2-gene and E-gene were detected in concentrations above the LLOQ in 100% and 87.5% of the IWW
366 samples, respectively. The relative standard deviation (%RSD) was relatively high for both SARS-CoV-2 genes, as
367 illustrated by Figure 6. Additionally, it appears that the variability for the E-gene tends to increase towards the
368 end of the time period, with the highest %RSD values observed at day 10. On average, the N2-gene shows high
369 in-sample stability for the entire sampling period, which is in line with the findings of others [17,33,34]. The E-
370 gene showed medium to low in-sample stability during the time period, while others reported relatively high in-
371 sample stability for this gene [33].

372 Most of the stability studies use surrogate viruses to investigate the stability of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater or
373 often do not include all genes of interest [17,35,36]. Additionally, most of the available stability studies assess
374 in-sample stability by seeding SARS-CoV-2 or another virus in IWW [33,34]. However, the genome of SARS-CoV-
375 2 could potentially be degraded to smaller fragments during in-sewer transport. To our knowledge, only
376 Hokajärvi et al. and Medema et al. investigated decay of native SARS-CoV-2 RNA loads in IWW [17,33] and
377 variability reported by Hokajärvi was also substantial.

378 Freezing the samples drastically influences the in-stability of viral RNA loads of all genes of interest, with a 10-
379 fold decrease in SARS-CoV-2 gene copies. This was also observed during method development (Figure S4) where
380 detection levels were considerably higher in fresh IWW samples (kept at 4 °C) compared to frozen IWW samples.

381 During sample transport and storage, IWW samples should be kept at 4 °C to minimize in-sample degradation of
382 viral RNA loads and IWW samples should be analyzed within three days after sample collection.

383 **4. Uncertainties**

384 At this moment, an ideal external control standard with the same properties as SARS-CoV-2 for quantification is
385 missing [21]. In this study PRCV was used as a whole process control, but this surrogate might not entirely reflect
386 the structural properties of the SARS-CoV-2 genome in IWW. In traditional WBE, isotope-labelled analogues are
387 used for the quantification of chemical biomarkers. However, for biological applications, such controls are
388 unavailable which could potentially lead to high variability with the current bioanalytical assays. Therefore,
389 further methodological and molecular assay validation for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in IWW is required to enhance the
390 accuracy and precision of WBE for SARS-CoV-2. This also further emphasizes the need for surrogate coronaviruses
391 (e.g. PRCV) as whole process control to ensure overall quality of these bioanalytical assays. The presence of a
392 whole process control is especially of importance because of the high variability in the composition of the matrix.
393 The fraction of PCR inhibitors could vary within a single WWTP over time and is potentially very different between
394 WWTPs. In this study, the %RSD at the low detection levels was still considerable, as indicated with dPCR. The
395 high variability observed in the LLOQ range also addresses the need for replicates.

396 To our knowledge, no information is available on the in-sewer degradation of the SARS-CoV-2 genome.
397 Fragmentation of the genome during in-sewer transport could potentially affect RE with the different
398 concentration methods found in literature and lead to high variation between WWTPs due to different sewer
399 structures. In the future, sequencing of the SARS-CoV-2 genome in IWW is required to identify the different SARS-
400 CoV-2 strains in IWW.

401 In the final protocol, solids were removed during the pre-centrifugation of the IWW samples. However,
402 adsorption of the SARS-CoV-2 genome to the pallet could affect RE. In this study, SARS-CoV-2 was detected to
403 some extent in solids (data not shown), but the overall importance needs to be further explored.

404 **5. Conclusions**

405 The present study proposes an alternative approach to assess RE of SARS-CoV-2 genes in IWW with different
406 ultracentrifugation protocols. Native concentration levels of the different SARS-CoV-2 genes measured in IWW
407 from different Belgian WWTPs with the different sample concentration methods were used to optimize RE of
408 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in IWW. The bioanalytical assay proved to be capable of measuring low concentrations of SARS-
409 CoV-2 RNA present in the samples from different IWW sources. The present study is among the first to apply
410 dPCR for the quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in IWW and dPCR results were comparable with the qPCR results.

411 The variability observed with the sample concentration methods for SARS-CoV-2 remains substantial due to the
412 lack of an 'ideal' external control standard with similar properties to SARS-CoV-2. At this moment, there is also a
413 lot of uncertainty regarding the state of SARS-CoV-2 genome (fragments) in IWW due to potential in-sewer
414 degradation. More research on variability of SARS-CoV-2 in IWW and potential transformation of SARS-CoV-2
415 RNA in the IWW is necessary to further investigate the applicability of WBE.

416 Although WBE can already aid in filling some critical knowledge gaps in the epidemiological surveillance of SARS-
417 CoV-2, future research should aim to further validate and standardize bioanalytical assays, especially with
418 regards to methodological uncertainties. This is especially of importance when the number of WBE applications
419 on data triangulation with other epidemiological information sources outpace the number of WBE studies that
420 investigate intrinsic methodological uncertainties.

421 **Author contributions:**

422 **Tim Boogaerts** – Conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, visualization,
423 roles/writing – original draft, writing -review and editing

424 **Naomi De Roeck** – Conceptualization, Data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, writing -
425 review and editing

426 **Lotte Jacobs** - Data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, writing -review and editing

427 **Siel Van Den Bogaert** – Data curation, writing – review and editing

428 **Bert Aertgeerts** – Writing – review and editing

429 **Lies Lahousse** – Writing – review and editing

430 **Alexander van Nuijs** – Conceptualization, Data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, writing -
431 review and editing, supervision, funding acquisition

432 **Peter Delputte** – Conceptualization, Data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, writing -review
433 and editing, supervision, funding acquisition

434 **Conflicts of interest**

435 None to declare.

436 **Acknowledgements**

437 The funding of this project was obtained from the Research Council (BOF) of the University of Antwerp [project
438 number: FFB200184] and the Agency of Care and Health [project number: GEO-1GPFZJA-WT]. Additionally, we
439 thank the personnel of Aquafin for their support in collection of the IWW samples.

440 **References**

- 441 1. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus
442 in Wuhan, China. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):497-506. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5)
443 6736(20)30183-5
- 444 2. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019
445 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet*.
446 2020;395(10223):507-513. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30211-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30211-7)
- 447 3. Gao QY, Chen YX, Fang JY. 2019 Novel coronavirus infection and gastrointestinal tract. *J Dig*
448 *Dis*. 2020;21(3):125-126. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-2980.12851>
- 449 4. Vandamme A-M, Nguyen T. Belgium - concerns about coronavirus contact-tracing apps.
450 *Nature*. 2020;581(7809):384. doi:10.1038/d41586-020-01552-w
- 451 5. Peccia J, Zulli A, Brackney DE, et al. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks
452 community infection dynamics. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2020;38(10):1164-1167. doi:10.1038/s41587-
453 020-0684-z
- 454 6. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-
455 19. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(5):672-675. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5
- 456 7. Mao K, Zhang K, Du W, Ali W, Feng X, Zhang H. The potential of wastewater-based
457 epidemiology as surveillance and early warning of infectious disease outbreaks. *Curr Opin*
458 *Environ Sci Heal*. 2020;17:1-7. doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.04.006
- 459 8. Sims N, Kasprzyk-Hordern B. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology:
460 Monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level. *Environ Int*.
461 2020;139:105689. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2020.105689
- 462 9. Corpuz MVA, Buonerba A, Vigliotta G, et al. Viruses in wastewater: occurrence, abundance
463 and detection methods. *Sci Total Environ*. 2020;745:140910.
464 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140910>
- 465 10. Hamouda M, Mustafa F, Maraqa M, Rizvi T, Aly Hassan A. Wastewater surveillance for SARS-
466 CoV-2: Lessons learnt from recent studies to define future applications. *Sci Total Environ*.
467 2021;759:143493. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143493
- 468 11. Zhang J, Wang S, Xue Y. Fecal specimen diagnosis 2019 novel coronavirus-infected
469 pneumonia. *J Med Virol*. 2020;92(6):680-682. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25742>
- 470 12. Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical samples.
471 *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(4):411-412. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30113-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30113-4)
- 472 13. Wu F, Zhang J, Xiao A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than Expected from
473 Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems*. 2020;5(4). doi:10.1128/mSystems.00614-20
- 474 14. La Rosa G, Iaconelli M, Mancini P, et al. First detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated
475 wastewaters in Italy. *Sci Total Environ*. 2020;736:139652.
476 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139652
- 477 15. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, et al. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated
478 wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in
479 the community. *Sci Total Environ*. 2020;728:138764. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764
- 480 16. Lescure F-X, Bouadma L, Nguyen D, et al. Clinical and virological data of the first cases of
481 COVID-19 in Europe: a case series. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20(6):697-706.

- 482 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30200-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30200-0)
- 483 17. Medema G, Been F, Heijnen L, Petterson S. Implementation of environmental surveillance for
484 SARS-CoV-2 virus to support public health decisions: Opportunities and challenges. *Curr Opin*
485 *Environ Sci Heal*. 2020;17:49-71. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.006>
- 486 18. Orive G, Lertxundi U, Barcelo D. Early SARS-CoV-2 outbreak detection by sewage-based
487 epidemiology. *Sci Total Environ*. 2020;732:139298. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139298
- 488 19. Ahmed W, Tschärke B, Bertsch PM, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA monitoring in wastewater as a
489 potential early warning system for COVID-19 transmission in the community: A temporal case
490 study. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021;761:144216. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144216
- 491 20. Kitajima M, Ahmed W, Bibby K, et al. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and
492 research needs. *Sci Total Environ*. 2020;739:139076.
493 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076>
- 494 21. Alygizakis N, Markou AN, Rousis NI, et al. Analytical methodologies for the detection of SARS-
495 CoV-2 in wastewater: Protocols and future perspectives. *Trends Analyt Chem*.
496 2021;134:116125. doi:10.1016/j.trac.2020.116125
- 497 22. Jafferali MH, Khatami K, Atasoy M, Birgersson M, Williams C, Cetecioglu Z. Benchmarking virus
498 concentration methods for quantification of SARS-CoV-2 in raw wastewater. *Sci Total Environ*.
499 2021;755(Pt 1):142939. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142939
- 500 23. Ahmed W, Bivins A, Bertsch PM, et al. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater:
501 Methods optimisation and quality control are crucial for generating reliable public health
502 information. *Curr Opin Environ Sci Heal*. Published online September 2020.
503 doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.003
- 504 24. Ye Y, Ellenberg RM, Graham KE, Wigginton KR. Survivability, Partitioning, and Recovery of
505 Enveloped Viruses in Untreated Municipal Wastewater. *Environ Sci Technol*.
506 2016;50(10):5077-5085. doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b00876
- 507 25. Haramoto E, Kitajima M, Hata A, et al. A review on recent progress in the detection methods
508 and prevalence of human enteric viruses in water. *Water Res*. 2018;135:168-186.
509 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.02.004>
- 510 26. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Research Use Only 2019-Novel Coronavirus
511 (2019-nCoV) Real-time RT-PCR Primers and Probes. Published 2020.
512 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.html>
- 513 27. Corman V, Bleicker T, Brünick S, Drosten C. *Diagnostic Detection of 2019-NCoV by Real-Time*
514 *RT-PCR.*; 2020. <https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/protocol-v2-1.pdf>
- 515 28. Outters A. All employers of Westvlees tested: a total of 94 infections. *Vrt News*.
516 [https://www.vrt.be/vrtnws/nl/2020/08/14/alle-werknemers-van-westvlees-getest-in-totaal-](https://www.vrt.be/vrtnws/nl/2020/08/14/alle-werknemers-van-westvlees-getest-in-totaal-94-mensen-besmet/)
517 [94-mensen-besmet/](https://www.vrt.be/vrtnws/nl/2020/08/14/alle-werknemers-van-westvlees-getest-in-totaal-94-mensen-besmet/). Published 2020.
- 518 29. Ort C, Lawrence MG, Reungoat J, Mueller JF. Sampling for PPCPs in Wastewater Systems:
519 Comparison of Different Sampling Modes and Optimization Strategies. *Environ Sci Technol*.
520 2010;44(16):6289-6296. doi:10.1021/es100778d
- 521 30. Pecson BM, Darby E, Haas CN, et al. Reproducibility and sensitivity of 36 methods to quantify
522 the SARS-CoV-2 genetic signal in raw wastewater: findings from an interlaboratory methods
523 evaluation in the U.S. *Environ Sci Water Res Technol*. Published online 2021.
524 doi:10.1039/D0EW00946F

- 525 31. D'Aoust PM, Mercier É, Montpetit D, et al. Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from
526 wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence. *medRxiv*.
527 Published online January 1, 2020:2020.08.11.20173062. doi:10.1101/2020.08.11.20173062
- 528 32. McCall A-K, Bade R, Kinyua J, et al. Critical review on the stability of illicit drugs in sewers and
529 wastewater samples. *Water Res.* 2016;88:933-947. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2015.10.040
- 530 33. Hokajärvi A-M, Rytönen A, Tiwari A, et al. The detection and stability of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA
531 biomarkers in wastewater influent in Helsinki, Finland. *Sci Total Environ.* 2021;770:145274.
532 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145274
- 533 34. Ahmed W, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, et al. Decay of SARS-CoV-2 and surrogate murine hepatitis
534 virus RNA in untreated wastewater to inform application in wastewater-based epidemiology.
535 *Environ Res.* 2020;191:110092. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110092
- 536 35. Casanova L, Rutala WA, Weber DJ, Sobsey MD. Survival of surrogate coronaviruses in water.
537 *Water Res.* 2009;43(7):1893-1898. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2009.02.002
- 538 36. Gundy PM, Gerba CP, Pepper IL. Survival of Coronaviruses in Water and Wastewater. *Food*
539 *Environ Virol.* 2009;1(1):10. doi:10.1007/s12560-008-9001-6
- 540


SARS-COV-2 genome in the faeces of infected individuals



Asymptomatic transmitters



Severly ill individuals



Release and transport in the sewage system




Sampling in the wastewater treatment plant




Analysis of influent wastewater on Sars-Cov-2

Spatio-temporal trends






IWW samples from 8 different locations




(A)


The effect of different pore sizes and different loading volumes for sample concentration in SAW with **Viral RNA kit**

**(B)**


The effect of different pore sizes and different loading volumes for sample concentration in SAW with **Maxwell PureFood GMO and Authentication kit**




N1 gene



N2 gene




E gene



- Confidence interval (95%)
- Ct

(A) 4°C



(B) -20°C

