

1 **Wastewater Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 from Acute Care Hospitals Identifies Nosocomial**
2 **Transmission and Outbreaks**

3
4 Nicole Acosta¹, María A. Bautista², Jordan Hollman^{3,4}, Janine McCalder^{1,2}, Alexander Buchner
5 Beaudet², Lawrence Man², Barbara J. Waddell¹, Jianwei Chen², Carmen Li², Darina Kuzma⁵,
6 Srijak Bhatnagar², Jenine Leal^{1,6,7,10}, Jon Meddings⁸, Jia Hu^{7,9,10}, Jason L. Cabaj⁷⁻¹⁰, Norma J.
7 Ruecker¹¹, Christopher Naugler^{7,12}, Dylan R. Pillai^{1,12-14}, Gopal Achari⁴, M. Cathryn Ryan³, John
8 M. Conly^{1,6,8,10,12,13}, Kevin Frankowski⁵, Casey RJ Hubert² and Michael D. Parkins^{1,8,13}

9
10 ¹ Department of Microbiology, Immunology and Infectious Diseases, University of Calgary,
11 Calgary, Canada

12 ² Department of Biological Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

13 ³ Department of Geosciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

14 ⁴ Department of Civil Engineering, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

15 ⁵ Advancing Canadian Wastewater Assets, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

16 ⁶ Infection Prevention and Control, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Canada

17 ⁷ Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

18 ⁸ Department of Medicine, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary,
19 Canada

20 ⁹ Provincial Population & Public Health, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Canada

21 ¹⁰ O'Brien Institute for Public Health, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

22 ¹¹ Water Quality Services, City of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

23 ¹² Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

24 ¹³ Snyder Institute for Chronic Diseases, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

25 ¹⁴ Alberta Precision Laboratories, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Canada

26

27 **Key words:** COVID-19, sewage, wastewater, wastewater-based epidemiology, hospital-acquired

28 **Running Title:** SARS-CoV-2 in Hospital Wastewaters

29 **Abstract word count:** 246

30 **Manuscript word count:** 2998

31 **Figures:** 2

32 **Tables:** 3

33 **Supplemental Material included**

34 **Key-points summary:**

35 SARS-CoV-2 RNA is detectable in hospital wastewater. Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 RNA increases
36 in conjunction with COVID-19-related hospitalizations. Spikes in SARS-CoV-2 wastewater signal
37 correspond to incident hospital-acquired cases and outbreaks, suggesting passive surveillance via
38 wastewater has great promise for COVID-19 monitoring.

39 ***Corresponding author:**

40 Michael D. Parkins, Associate Professor, University of Calgary.

41 Postal address: 3330 Hospital Drive, NW, Calgary, Alberta, T2N 4N1. CANADA.

42 e-mail: mdparkin@ucalgary.ca

43 Phone: 403-220-5951, Fax: 403-270-2772.

44

45 **Alternative corresponding author:**

46 Casey RJ Hubert, Associate Professor, University of Calgary

47 Postal address: 2500 University Gate NW, Calgary, AB T2N 1N4. CANADA

48 e-mail: chubert@ucalgary.ca

49 Phone: 403-220-7794, Fax 403-289-9311

50

51

52 **ABSTRACT**

53 **Background:** SARS-CoV-2 has been detected in wastewater and its abundance correlated with
54 community COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations and deaths. We sought to use wastewater-based
55 detection of SARS-CoV-2 to assess the epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 in hospitals.

56 **Methods:** Between August and December 2020, twice-weekly wastewater samples from three
57 tertiary-care hospitals (totaling >2100 dedicated inpatient beds) were collected. Wastewater
58 samples were concentrated and cleaned using the 4S-silica column method and assessed for SARS-
59 CoV-2 gene-targets (N1, N2 and E) and controls using RT-qPCR. Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 as
60 measured by quantification cycle (Cq), genome copies and genomes normalized to the fecal
61 biomarker PMMoV were compared to the total daily number of patients hospitalized with active
62 COVID-19, confirmed cases of hospital-acquired infection, and the occurrence of unit-specific
63 outbreaks.

64 **Results:** Of 165 wastewater samples collected, 159 (96%) were assayable. The N1-gene from
65 SARS-CoV-2 was detected in 64.1% of samples, N2 in 49.7% and E in 10%. N1 and N2 in
66 wastewater increased over time both in terms of amount of detectable virus and the proportion of
67 samples that were positive, consistent with increasing hospitalizations (Pearson's $r=0.679$,
68 $P<0.0001$, Pearson's $r=0.728$, $P<0.0001$, respectively). Despite increasing hospitalizations through
69 the study period, wastewater analysis was able to identify incident nosocomial-acquired cases of
70 COVID-19 (Pearson's $r=0.389$, $P<0.001$) and unit-specific outbreaks by increases in detectable
71 SARS-CoV-2 N1-RNA (median 112 copies/ml) versus outbreak-free periods (0 copies/ml;
72 $P<0.0001$).

73 **Conclusions:** Wastewater-based monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 represents a promising tool for
74 SARS-CoV-2 passive surveillance and case identification, containment, and mitigation in acute-
75 care medical facilities.

76

77 INTRODUCTION

78 SARS-CoV-2 RNA is present in the feces of infected individuals – appearing just prior or
79 concomitant with symptoms[1]. Accordingly, leaders in the field of wastewater-based
80 epidemiology leveraged their expertise to study this emerging infectious disease[2, 3]. Medema *et*
81 *al* first reported SARS-CoV-2-RNA in Dutch wastewater-treatment plants (WW-TP)[4]. Several
82 groups have since adapted this technology to understand community disease-burden[5-8]. Recent
83 studies suggest that SARS-CoV-2-RNA increases in WW-TP precede clinically diagnosed cases
84 by 0-2 days and associated hospitalizations by 1-4 days[6].

85 Between 4-8% of individuals with COVID-19 will be hospitalized, with age and co-morbidities
86 being key risk factors[9-11]. Nosocomial-transmission and outbreaks affecting patients and health
87 care workers (HCW) are not uncommon, although drivers remain to be fully understood[12, 13].
88 While hospital-acquisition is rare (0.8-5 cases/10,000 patient-days in communities with high
89 disease burden), public fear of acquiring COVID-19 from hospitals has resulted in reduced health-
90 resource utilization and hospital avoidance, often to the detriment of patients[14, 15]. Accordingly,
91 hospital-based detection tools are needed to understand the epidemiology of COVID-19 and
92 potentially mitigate spread.

93 Hospitals hold great promise in understanding SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-generated data. Owing
94 to their proximity to affected individuals in the municipal sewershed relative to WW-TP (i.e.,
95 shorter transit time for signal degradation[1]), hospitals may aid in understanding SARS-CoV-2
96 wastewater dynamics. Compared to the general community, hospitals are much more likely to
97 comprehensively monitor and identify all cases within their populations. Furthermore, outbreaks
98 in hospitals are rapidly and comprehensively investigated. For these reasons we embarked on this

99 study to determine relationships between hospital SARS-CoV-2 wastewater dynamics and
100 COVID-19 hospitalizations, nosocomial-transmissions and outbreaks.

101 **METHODS**

102 **Acute-care hospitals and hospital information systems**

103 We monitored SARS-CoV-2-RNA in the wastewater from three of Calgary's four adult tertiary-
104 care hospitals, accounting for 89% of staffed-inpatient beds (Supplementary Material). Daily
105 prevalent-hospitalized cases were defined as those with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 within
106 14 days, remaining on contact/droplet precautions. Hospital-acquired cases were defined as
107 patients who were admitted to hospital ≥ 7 days before COVID-19 symptom onset that were then
108 confirmed by a positive RT-qPCR SARS-CoV-2 test; or a patient admitted to hospital for ≤ 7 days
109 confirmed to have hospital-acquired COVID-19 infection based on an epidemiological link.
110 Hospital-acquired cases were separately recorded including the unit where they were acquired and
111 are reported as hospital-wide signals for Hospital-1 and 2. Data for Hospital-3 are presented as 3A,
112 3B, 3C based on wastewater drainage outflows of different units. COVID-19 outbreaks were
113 defined as any unit with ≥ 1 confirmed hospital-acquired case(s) and/or ≥ 2 confirmed COVID-19
114 cases in HCWs linked to a unit. This research was approved by the University of Calgary's
115 Conjoint Health Regional Ethics Board (REB-20-1252).

116 **Wastewater sampling**

117 Wastewater samples were collected from August 5th to December 17th, 2020 at three hospitals.
118 Hospital-wide access through a single sampling point was not possible at Hospital-3 where an
119 initial sampling point (Hospital-3A) captured the units predicted to be most relevant for COVID-
120 19 (including ICUs and dedicated COVID-19 care-units). Beginning October 1st two additional

121 sites were added, Hospital-3B and Hospital-3C, expanding coverage to all inpatient-care buildings.
122 Composite 24-hour samples of wastewater were collected using ISCO-GLS autosamplers
123 (Lincoln, Nebraska) placed inside sewer access points outside of hospitals. Samples were taken
124 from each location twice-weekly.

125 **Sample Processing and RNA Purification**

126 Sample preparation and molecular analysis were performed at separate sites to prevent cross
127 contamination. At ACWA, wastewater samples were processed with a 40 ml aliquot taken to
128 comprise the sample. Each sample was spiked with a positive control - Bovilis® attenuated-
129 Coronavirus Vaccine (BCoV; Merck, #151921). Sample processing and RNA purification was
130 conducted using the 4S-silica column method (i.e., Sewage, Salt, Silica and SARS-CoV-2) with
131 modifications[16]. Purified nucleic acids were transported on dry ice to the Health Sciences Centre
132 for molecular analysis. An extraction blank control was included for every processed sample batch
133 to ensure no contamination occurred.

134 **RT-qPCR analysis**

135 We used RT-qPCR to quantify SARS-CoV-2-RNA and controls in wastewater. Specific primers
136 and probes (Supplementary Table-S1) were used to amplify two regions of the nucleocapsid gene
137 (i.e., N1 and N2) and a region of the envelope gene (i.e., E). Samples were considered positive for
138 the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA-target if amplification passed a detection cycle threshold in
139 <40 cycles for at least one of N1, N2 and/or E [4, 17, 18]. The quantification cycle (C_q) value was
140 used for calculations when this threshold was <40 cycles or reached between 40 and 45 cycles for
141 one target as long as another target reached the threshold in <40 cycles. Amplification of the
142 Pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV) was employed to incorporate a human fecal biomarker control

143 in order to normalize SARS-CoV-2 for the relative bioburden in samples[5]. RT-qPCR was
144 performed using a QuantStudio-5 Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems) with each run
145 including no-template controls (NTCs) in triplicate. For N1, N2 and E-assays three positive
146 controls were included in each run. Samples where minimal signal for BCoV or PMMoV controls
147 were recovered were excluded from the analysis to mitigate false-negative results. Amplified
148 products from wastewater were also Sanger sequenced to confirm amplicons were derived from
149 SARS-CoV-2.

150 **Statistical analysis**

151 To compare the surrogate BCoV and PMMoV signals between hospitals, pairwise Mann-Whitney
152 tests were performed. Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis tests were performed for multiple
153 comparisons of assay sensitivity and surrogate organism signals between sampling locations.
154 Pearson's correlation analyses were performed to determine the correlation of wastewater RNA-
155 signal measured as *i*). Cq, or *ii*). genome copies/ml of wastewater or *iii*). genome copies/genome
156 of PMMoV, vs daily-hospitalized cases. To assess for correlation of wastewater RNA-signal with
157 incident hospital-acquired cases, and to compensate for gaps owing to the twice-weekly sampling,
158 incident cases occurring +/- 3 days were compared to wastewater signals. To compare the SARS-
159 CoV-2 wastewater N1-signal observed during and between unit-outbreaks, each sample was
160 dichotomized as being collected within 3-days of a declared outbreak or not. Samples after a
161 declared outbreak were excluded until 3-days after the last in-hospital linked case was identified.
162 Statistical tests analyzed Hospital-1 and Hospital-2 together (given their capture of the entire
163 hospital-facility) and separately. Statistical analyses were conducted with GraphPad's Prism-8
164 software (La Jolla, CA).

165 RESULTS

166 Hospital SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater-RNA Kinetics

167 In total, 165 hospital wastewater samples were collected and 159 assessed through 135-days of bi-
168 weekly observation (40 Hospital-1; 39 Hospital-2; 34 Hospital-3A; 23 Hospital-3B; 23 Hospital-
169 3C). Six samples were excluded (Supplementary Figures S1-S2) SARS-CoV-2-RNA in
170 wastewater increased over time in both the amount detectable and the proportion of samples that
171 were positive, consistent with increasing cases and hospitalizations (Table 1, Supplementary
172 Figure S3), coinciding with Calgary's COVID-19 'second wave'. We observed that the N1-assay
173 had the best sensitivity for detecting SARS-CoV-2. Of the 96 samples tested using N1, N2 and E-
174 assays (i.e., those received between August 1st and October 29th), 9 samples were positive for all
175 three targets, 28 were positive only for N1 and N2, and 39 were positive only for N1. After October
176 29th the E-assay was dropped, and 69 samples were analyzed, 51 were positive for both N1 and
177 N2 and 63 were positive just with N1. N1 and N2-signals measured as Cq were positively
178 correlated (Pearson's $r=0.710$ Hospital-1, 0.762 Hospital-2, 0.792 Hospital-3A, 0.417 Hospital-
179 3B and 0.491 Hospital-3C) across all sites (Table 2). No-template and blank controls for sample
180 processing and RNA purification were negative for all assays (i.e., N1, N2, E, BCoV and
181 PMMoV). Standard curves for all RT-qPCR assays were within an acceptable range for
182 efficiencies (75 to 162%) and R^2 (0.7 to 1.0) (Supplementary Table-S2).

183 Hospital-1 had a higher proportion of SARS-COV-2-positive wastewater compared to Hospital-2
184 and Hospital-3, consistent with the higher burden of disease in NE Calgary (Table 1 and Figure
185 1). Following a large outbreak in Hospital-3 involving 45 patients, 43 HCW and 5 visitors
186 (beginning in a ward not monitored via Hospital-3A site and compounded by affected patients

187 being transferred into different units through the hospital) that was declared on September 17th,
188 wastewater sampling was expanded to include additional sites; Hospital-3B and Hospital-3C
189 (Figure 2) to enable complete capture of Hospital-3.

190 **Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 signal correlates with total hospitalized COVID-19 cases**

191 We assessed the correlation between the SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-N1 with active-COVID-19
192 patients on contact/droplet isolation at each hospital. When assessed together, Hospital-1 and
193 Hospital-2, we observed that as prevalent cases increased, the wastewater-signal measured as N1-
194 Cq also increased (Pearson's $r=0.679$, CI: 0.529-0.787, $P<0.0001$). This was also true when
195 Hospital-1 and Hospital-2 were assessed separately (Table 2). The same was observed when
196 SARS-CoV-2-N1 wastewater was normalized against copies of the PMMoV at Hospital-2, but
197 only trended towards significance at Hospital-1 (Table 2). These same correlations are not as
198 reliable at the Hospital-3 as we did not have access to prevalent cases as a function of sampling
199 site. However, we continued to observe a positive correlation (Table 2) between prevalent cases
200 vs N1-wastewater signal was measured as Cq at Hospital-3A (including dedicated COVID-19 care
201 units and ICUs) (Pearson's $r=0.717$) or measured as copies/ml and copies normalized to PMMoV
202 at Hospital-3C (Pearson's $r=0.503$ and 0.479 , respectively).

203 **Wastewater SARS-COV2 signal correlates with hospital-acquired infections and outbreaks**

204 We observed a positive correlation between wastewater N1-signal and hospital-acquired cases at
205 Hospital-1 and Hospital-2 when analyzed together (Pearson's $r=0.389$, CI: 0.177–0.566, $P<0.001$)
206 and individually (Table 2). Hospital-3 data could not be fully analyzed as we did not have complete
207 access to patient/HCW movements. Total SARS-CoV-2 as measured by Cq correlated with
208 incident hospital-acquired cases at Hospital-3A when normalized relative to PMMoV. With

209 respect to whether peaks in SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater associated with outbreaks, we compared
210 SARS-CoV-2 signal from wastewater samples collected within 3 days of an outbreak being
211 declared with samples collected during outbreak-free periods. When Hospital-1 and Hospital-2
212 were analysed together, we observed significant differences in median SARS-CoV-2 N-1 between
213 outbreak-free periods vs outbreak periods when measured as copies/ml (0 [IQR: 0-57] vs 112
214 [IQR: 12-1726], $P < 0.0001$) and normalized for PMMoV (0 [IQR: 0-0.06] vs 0.17 [IQR: 0.06-
215 0.89], $P = 0.0003$). We observed that at each of Hospital-1, Hospital-2 and Hospital-3A there were
216 significant differences in median SARS-CoV-2-N1 measured using copies/ml between outbreak
217 and outbreak-free periods (Table 3). Similarly, the same trend was observed at Hospital-1 and
218 Hospital-3A when wastewater SARS-CoV-2-N1 was normalized for PMMoV (Table 3).

219 **DISCUSSION**

220 Hospital-associated outbreaks of COVID-19 are increasingly being reported. Early data suggests
221 that patients with nosocomial COVID-19 may fare worse than those with community-acquired
222 disease, experiencing longer hospital stays but not increased mortality[13]. This observation
223 balances the opposing impacts of increased co-morbidities and medical acuity in hospitalized-
224 individuals on one-hand, with the potential for earlier detection and more rapid supportive
225 care/treatment on the other.

226 Preventing nosocomial transmission of COVID-19 is challenging for a myriad of reasons[19]. In
227 addition to its highly infectious nature, accurate identification, triage, and effective isolation of
228 cases is exceedingly difficult. While COVID-19 has a typical incubation period of 5-7 days, it can
229 take as long as 14 days to manifest such that identifying evolving symptoms in previously admitted
230 patients is challenging[20, 21]. Furthermore, up to 40% of individuals (including patients and

231 HCW) may be asymptomatic, pauci-symptomatic, or pre-symptomatic– each just as likely to
232 transmit infection as symptomatic individuals[22-24]. Despite rigorous infection control protocols,
233 nosocomial infections continue to occur. Novel strategies to understand the epidemiology of
234 SARS-CoV-2 in hospitals are therefore urgently required. One such strategy may be the
235 monitoring of hospital wastewater[25].

236 To date, most wastewater-based SARS-CoV-2 RNA surveillance has focused on monitoring
237 community burden of disease by sampling WW-TP[5-8]. More recently, moving sampling
238 ‘upstream’ in the wastewater-network, closer to patients, is actively being explored. The most
239 granular data comes from single-facility assessments. Passive wastewater surveillance could hold
240 promise as an early warning strategy, adaptable to both low- and high-risk facilities. Importantly,
241 if an incipient signal is detected in facility-wide wastewater samples, in-building plumbing systems
242 can be strategically sampled in a nested manner in order to confirm an outbreak location.

243 Here we demonstrate that both the frequency of positive samples and the abundance of SARS-
244 CoV-2 RNA in hospital wastewater systems correlated with increasing hospitalised cases –
245 analogous to WW-TP levels correlating with the COVID-19 community-diagnosed cases[5-8].
246 This was most evident using raw SARS-CoV-2 Cq values but was also evident when normalized
247 against PMMoV levels. We observed the N1-region of the nucleocapsid gene to be more sensitive
248 than N-2, and E so low as to be dropped from our protocol. Other groups have reported similar
249 trends in that the N1-target is the most sensitive marker in WW-TP studies[4] and cruise ships[26].

250 Despite nosocomial cases and outbreaks representing a small fraction of the overall population of
251 patients hospitalized with COVID-19, these events were discernable by wastewater testing. The
252 natural history of SARS-CoV-2-RNA presence in the gastrointestinal tract remains incompletely

253 understood[2, 3]. Changes in fecal viral loads over the course of the disease have not been
254 explored. Extrapolating from our hospital-based wastewater data, it appears that peak fecal viral
255 shedding may occur around symptom onset, given the congruence of wastewater RNA-signal and
256 nosocomial cases and outbreaks identified in hospitals. Based on the rapid decline in wastewater
257 signal thereafter, it is likely that fecal SARS-CoV-2-RNA drops significantly after initial
258 presentation. Indeed, early in the pandemic when fewer patients with COVID-19 were
259 hospitalized, wastewater samples routinely tested negative. This critical observation suggests that
260 wastewater-based monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 may be most sensitive for identifying incident
261 cases. Accordingly, wastewater-based monitoring of individual high-risk facilities (i.e., hospitals,
262 nursing homes and industrial meat plants) – providing more granular data - through to WW-TP
263 may have great merit.

264 A key limitation to the identification of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples, relative to clinical
265 samples (e.g., swabs) is the massive volume of water in which samples are diluted. This
266 necessitates sample concentration. While procedures for the efficient recovery of non-enveloped
267 viruses exist, researchers continue to search for satisfactory protocols for enveloped viruses such
268 as SARS-CoV-2[27]. Many groups have explored ways to improve the sensitivity of wastewater
269 SARS-CoV-2 detection. Diagnostic platforms with improved sensitivity and more impervious to
270 impurities in the wastewater matrix (i.e., digital droplet RT-PCR) also show considerable
271 promise[28, 29]. Sampling in the proximal sewershed may lead to day-to-day variance resulting
272 in signal noise. This is particularly true for single-facility studies where potential extremes in
273 individual virus shedding could confound results; limited data suggests significant variations in
274 fecal viral load occur (from $10^{3.4}$ to $10^{7.6}$)[30]. This is a key challenge that remains to be solved if
275 wastewater data is to be used in a meaningful way. Similarly, issues arise with attempts to

276 normalize SARS-CoV-2 based on the contributing population. We chose to use the PMMoV as a
277 fecal biomarker to control for variations in fecal loading – a particular risk when sampling takes
278 place ‘upstream’ in the sewershed. While this marker has been validated in WW-TP samples where
279 large and diverse populations contribute to sewage[31], hospitals are a much smaller collection of
280 individuals and variations in PMMoV excretion owing to differences in diet could have a much
281 larger impact[32].

282 By capturing longitudinal data from three tertiary-care hospitals (>2100 inpatient beds) we have
283 demonstrated that passive wastewater monitoring is indeed possible at a range of hospital-
284 facilities. Whereas Hospital-1 and Hospital-2 had a single municipal access point enabling
285 surveillance of the entire facility – Hospital-3 required three locations to capture fully. As patients
286 were frequently moved from one unit/building to another, either based on attending services
287 geographic location, COVID-positive patient cohorting or need for ICU support, attributing
288 SARS-CoV-2 signal in the wastewater of this facility was more complicated but nonetheless
289 correlations were evident. Furthermore, while nursing staff is often assigned to individual units,
290 many allied health workers and physicians work or consult throughout the entire facility. If passive
291 wastewater monitoring is to be adapted for other aspects of nosocomial surveillance (i.e., antibiotic
292 consumption, emergence of antimicrobial resistant organisms, etc.) – a keen insight into the
293 collection network is required.

294 There are limitations of our work that merit discussion. Given the complexity involved in sample
295 collection, we were limited to twice-weekly sampling. Knowing how quickly SARS-CoV-2 can
296 spread and outbreaks can occur, a daily monitoring strategy would have much greater capacity to
297 identify and mitigate secondary cases of COVID-19. Incident cases are likely to be clinically
298 diagnosed in hospital far faster than in other high-risk facilities owing to greater resources and

299 heightened suspicion – potentially leading to an even greater lead-time associated with a positive
300 wastewater-signal of outbreaks than observed herein. Hospitals pose unique challenges in
301 wastewater monitoring owing to these facilities’ high use of chemical disinfectants and
302 detergents[33] that could interfere with molecular assays; this may explain why 3.6% of our
303 samples spiked controls and PMMoV were not detected by RT-qPCR. To minimize the risk of
304 false negatives, rigorous protocols that use internal controls (such as our BCoV spike) are
305 necessary. The role of PCR-inhibitors in the wastewater matrix within the proximal sewershed is
306 an area that deserves considerable study if this field is to expand.

307 Wastewater-based monitoring can only effectively monitor those individuals that contribute fecal
308 matter to the sewershed. Importantly, hospitalized patients – those most vulnerable to COVID-19
309 adverse events – are often unable to self-toilet. Rather, these sick and often elderly individuals are
310 dependent on continence aids, adult diapers, sanitary pads and nursing cleanup; this results in fecal
311 matter from these individuals being disposed into biohazard solid waste. Accordingly, wastewater-
312 based sampling could miss between 10-20% of patients in general hospital patients[34, 35]. This
313 proportion is expected to be even higher in ICU where immobilization necessitated through
314 ventilatory support further heightens toileting assistance requirements. Adapting wastewater
315 surveillance technology to other high-risk settings like long-term care will encounter this same
316 limitation. Finally, – tracking workers through passive wastewater monitoring poses inherent
317 challenges. There is data that suggests that 52-56% of employees are uncomfortable defecating at
318 work[36, 37].

319 **Conclusion**

320 In a five-month observational study we were able to detect SARS-CoV-2 from the wastewater of
321 Calgary's three largest tertiary-care hospitals. The rate of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater test-positivity
322 and RNA-abundance increased over time, concomitant with the increasing proportion of patients
323 hospitalized with COVID-19. Despite persistent low levels of SARS-CoV-2-RNA in wastewater
324 resulting from patients being treated for and recovering from COVID-19, we detected spikes
325 attributable to hospital-acquired infections and outbreaks. This study reveals that wastewater-
326 based monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA holds promise for early detection, monitoring and
327 containment of incident infections.

328

329 **FUNDING**

330 This work was supported by grants from the Canadian Institute of Health Research [448242 to
331 M.D.P.]; and Canadian Foundation for Innovation [41054 to C.R.J.H], as well as discretionary
332 start-up funding from the Cumming School of Medicine Infectious Disease Section-Chief Fund
333 (M.D.P.) and Campus Alberta Innovates Program Chair (C.R.J.H).

334

335 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

336 The authors gratefully acknowledge the staff of the City of Calgary and in particular members of
337 Water Quality Services for their continued efforts for sample site planning, maintenance, and
338 collection. The authors are grateful to staff from Alberta Health Services and AHS Infection
339 Prevention and Control for assistance in data collection on patient disposition in the Calgary Zone.
340 The authors also thanks Cameron Semper for providing the pMCSG53 vector and T7/T7
341 terminator primers, and for providing support with Gibson assembly cloning. We would like to
342 acknowledge the tremendous efforts of Dr Rhonda Clark for program administration and
343 management.

344 All authors report no potential conflicts. All authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for
345 Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest.

346

347 REFERENCES

- 348 1. Foladori P, Cutrupi F, Segata N, et al. SARS-CoV-2 from faeces to wastewater treatment:
349 What do we know? A review. *Sci Total Environ* **2020**; 743: 140444.
- 350 2. Ling Y, Xu SB, Lin YX, et al. Persistence and clearance of viral RNA in 2019 novel
351 coronavirus disease rehabilitation patients. *Chin Med J (Engl)* **2020**; 133(9): 1039-43.
- 352 3. Gupta S, Parker J, Smits S, Underwood J, Dolwani S. Persistent viral shedding of SARS-
353 CoV-2 in faeces - a rapid review. *Colorectal Dis* **2020**; 22(6): 611-20.
- 354 4. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-
355 Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in
356 the Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environ Sci Technol Lett* **2020**; 7:
357 511-6.
- 358 5. D'Aoust PM, Mercier E, Montpetit D, et al. Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
359 from wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence.
360 *Water Res* **2021**; 188: 116560.
- 361 6. Peccia J, Zulli A, Brackney DE, et al. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater
362 tracks community infection dynamics. *Nat Biotechnol* **2020**; 38(10): 1164-7.
- 363 7. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, et al. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
364 untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of
365 COVID-19 in the community. *Sci Total Environ* **2020**; 728: 138764.
- 366 8. Wurtzer S, Marechal V, Mouchel J, et al. Evaluation of lockdown effect on SARS-CoV-2
367 dynamics through viral genome quantification in waste water, Greater Paris, France, 5
368 March to 23 April 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **2020**; 25(50): 2000776.

- 369 9. Ioannou GN, Locke E, Green P, et al. Risk Factors for Hospitalization, Mechanical
370 Ventilation, or Death Among 10131 US Veterans With SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *JAMA*
371 *Netw Open* **2020**; 3(9): e2022310.
- 372 10. Carrillo-Vega MF, Salinas-Escudero G, Garcia-Pena C, Gutierrez-Robledo LM, Parra-
373 Rodriguez L. Early estimation of the risk factors for hospitalization and mortality by
374 COVID-19 in Mexico. *PLoS One* **2020**; 15(9): e0238905.
- 375 11. Ko JY, Danielson ML, Town M, et al. Risk Factors for COVID-19-associated
376 hospitalization: COVID-19-Associated Hospitalization Surveillance Network and
377 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**.
- 378 12. Long DR, O'Reilly-Shah V, Rustagi AS, et al. Incidence of Health Care-Associated
379 COVID-19 During Universal Testing of Medical and Surgical Admissions in a Large US
380 Health System. *Open Forum Infect Dis* **2020**; 7(10): ofaa435.
- 381 13. Carter B, Collins JT, Barlow-Pay F, et al. Nosocomial COVID-19 infection: examining
382 the risk of mortality. The COPE-Nosocomial Study (COVID in Older PEople). *J Hosp*
383 *Infect* **2020**; 106(2): 376-84.
- 384 14. Hartnett KP, Kite-Powell A, DeVies J, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on
385 Emergency Department Visits - United States, January 1, 2019-May 30, 2020. *MMWR*
386 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2020**; 69(23): 699-704.
- 387 15. Czeisler ME, Marynak K, Clarke KEN, et al. Delay or Avoidance of Medical Care
388 Because of COVID-19-Related Concerns - United States, June 2020. *MMWR Morb*
389 *Mortal Wkly Rep* **2020**; 69(36): 1250-7.

- 390 16. Whitney ON, Al-Shayeb B, Crits-Cristoph A, et al. V.4 -Direct wastewater RNA capture
391 and purification via the "Sewage, Salt, Silica and SARS-CoV-2 (4S). Available at:
392 <https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bpdfmi3n>. Accessed 1 June 2020.
- 393 17. Randazzo W, Truchado P, Cuevas-Ferrando E, Simón P, Allende A, Sánchez G. SARS-
394 CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area.
395 *Water research* **2020**; 181: 115942.
- 396 18. Wu F, Zhang J, Xiao A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than
397 Expected from Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems* **2020**; 5(4): e00614-20.
- 398 19. Harada S, Uno S, Ando T, et al. Control of a Nosocomial Outbreak of COVID-19 in a
399 University Hospital. *Open Forum Infect Dis* **2020**; 7(12): ofaa512.
- 400 20. Wang X, Zhou Q, He Y, et al. Nosocomial outbreak of COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan,
401 China. *Eur Respir J* **2020**; 55(6).
- 402 21. Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus
403 (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. *Euro*
404 *Surveill* **2020**; 25(5).
- 405 22. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and
406 Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382(22): 2081-90.
- 407 23. Yanes-Lane M, Winters N, Fregonese F, et al. Proportion of asymptomatic infection
408 among COVID-19 positive persons and their transmission potential: A systematic review
409 and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* **2020**; 15(11): e0241536.
- 410 24. Johansson MA, Quandelacy TM, Kada S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission From People
411 Without COVID-19 Symptoms. *JAMA Netw Open* **2021**; 4(1): e2035057.

- 412 25. Gonçalves J, Koritnik T, Mioč V, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in hospital
413 wastewater from a low COVID-19 disease prevalence area. *Science of The Total*
414 *Environment* **2021**; 755: 143226.
- 415 26. Ahmed W, Bertsch PM, Angel N, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in commercial
416 passenger aircraft and cruise ship wastewater: a surveillance tool for assessing the
417 presence of COVID-19 infected travellers. *J Travel Med* **2020**; 27(5).
- 418 27. Alygizakis N, Markou AN, Rousis NI, et al. Analytical methodologies for the detection
419 of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: Protocols and future perspectives. *Trends Analyt Chem*
420 **2021**; 134: 116125.
- 421 28. Gonzalez R, Curtis K, Bivins A, et al. COVID-19 surveillance in Southeastern Virginia
422 using wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Res* **2020**; 186: 116296.
- 423 29. Falzone L, Musso N, Gattuso G, et al. Sensitivity assessment of droplet digital PCR for
424 SARS-CoV-2 detection. *Int J Mol Med* **2020**; 46(3): 957-64.
- 425 30. Cheung KS, Hung IFN, Chan PPY, et al. Gastrointestinal Manifestations of SARS-CoV-
426 2 Infection and Virus Load in Fecal Samples From a Hong Kong Cohort: Systematic
427 Review and Meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology* **2020**; 159(1): 81-95.
- 428 31. Kitajima M, Sassi HP, Torrey JR. Pepper mild mottle virus as a water quality indicator.
429 *npj Clean Water* **2018**; 1(1): 19.
- 430 32. Colson P, Richet H, Desnues C, et al. Pepper mild mottle virus, a plant virus associated
431 with specific immune responses, Fever, abdominal pains, and pruritus in humans. *PLoS*
432 *One* **2010**; 5(4): e10041.
- 433 33. Zotesso JP, Cossich ES, Janeiro V, Tavares CRG. Treatment of hospital laundry
434 wastewater by UV/H₂O₂ process. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* **2017**; 24(7): 6278-87.

- 435 34. Condon M, Mannion E, Molloy DW, O'Caomh R. Urinary and Faecal Incontinence:
436 Point Prevalence and Predictors in a University Hospital. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*
437 **2019**; 16(2): 194.
- 438 35. Toba K, Ouchi Y, Orimo H, et al. Urinary incontinence in elderly inpatients in Japan: a
439 comparison between general and geriatric hospitals. *Aging (Milano)* **1996**; 8(1): 47-54.
- 440 36. Bennet J, McCall A. Women Poop. Sometime at work. Get over it. Available at:
441 <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/17/style/women-poop-at-work.html>. Accessed 1
442 December 2020.
- 443 37. MacKenzie M. This is how many people refuse to poop at work-Are you one of them?
444 *Womens Health*. Available at:
445 <https://www.womenshealthmag.com/health/a19998266/pooping-at-work/>. Accessed 1
446 December 2020.

447 TABLES

448 **Table 1.** Descriptive statistics of SARS-CoV-2 RNA monitoring among wastewater hospital samples.

Hospital	Collection period	No. of tested samples	N1			N2			E ^β		
			% of (+) SARS-CoV-2*	Cq median (IQR)	Cq range [†]	% of (+) SARS-CoV-2*	Cq median (IQR)	Cq range [†]	% of (+) SARS-CoV-2*	Cq median (IQR)	Cq range [†]
1	August 5 th to December 17 th	40	62.5	32.5 (30.6-36.4)	12.5	50	35.3 (33.5-37.7)	13.5	7.5	35.5 (31.3-37.3)	12.1
2	August 5 th to December 17 th	40	45	31.8-35.9	8.6	35	35.9 (34.5-37.8)	9.04	0	-	-
3A	August 5 th to December 17 th	39	51.3	32.8 (30.7-35.6)	11.9	48.7	36.2 (33.2-41.2)	16.3	12.8	30.6 (28.5-30.7)	5.7
3B	October 1 st to December 17 th	23	91.3	34.6 (33.8-36.5)	8.3	73.9	39.6 (38.1-41.7)	9.7	0	-	-

	October 1 st			36.4			41.1				
3C	to	23	78.3	(34.7-	11.07	52.2	(39.7-	13.08	4.3	34.9	-
	December			37.1)			41.7)				
	17 th										

449 * Percentage of samples positive for SARS-CoV2 (no. of positive samples/no. of tested samples).

450 † Range is the difference between the max and min value for Cq, cycle of quantification.

451 ^βE assay was performed for samples collected from August 5th to October 29th.

452

453 **Table 2.** Correlation analyses between SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in wastewater from Calgary Hospitals with daily-prevalent cases of
 454 patients hospitalized with COVID-19 and those incident hospital-acquired cases.

455

Hospital	Comparison	Cq			Copies/ml			Copies/Copies PMMoV [†]		
		r	P-value	95% CI	r	P-value	95% CI	r	P-value	95% CI
1	N1 vs N2	0.710	<0.0001	0.511 – 0.836	-	-	-	-	-	-
	N1 vs prevalent	0.486	0.0027	0.187 – 0.702	0.290	0.0858	-0.0422 – 0.565	0.187	0.2737	-0.150 – 0.486
	N1 vs incident*	0.537	0.0005	0.263 – 0.731	0.279	0.0896	-0.0445 – 0.550	0.277	0.0920	-0.0466 – 0.548
2	N1 vs N2	0.762	<0.0001	0.587 – 0.868	-	-	-	-	-	-
	N1 vs prevalent	0.862	<0.0001	0.742 – 0.929	0.542	0.0008	0.255 – 0.741	0.534	0.0009	0.245 – 0.736
	N1 vs incident*	0.474	0.0030	0.177 – 0.692	0.25 5	0.1273	-0.0750 – 0.535	0.283	0.0900	-0.0455 – 0.556
3A	N1 vs N2	0.792	<0.0001	0.620 – 0.892	-	-	-	-	-	-

	N1 vs prevalent#	0.717	<0.0001	0.481 – 0.856	0.20 2	0.2840	-0.171 – 0.524	0.147	0.4382	-0.225 – 0.482
	N1 vs incident*	0.350	0.0492	0.00201 – 0.623	0.46 3	0.0077	0.136 – 0.699	0.444	0.0109	0.113 – 0.686
	N1 vs N2	0.417	0.0478	0.00565 – 0.708	-	-	-	-	-	-
3B	N1 vs prevalent#	0.139	0.5709	-0.337 – 0.558	0.13 5	0.5821	-0.340 – 0.555	- 0.139	0.5707	-0.558 – 0.337
	N1 vs incident*	0.0654	0.7783	-0.377 – 0.483	- 0.03 96	0.8645	-0.463 – 0.399	0.187	0.4179	-0.267 – 0.572
	N1 vs N2	0.491	0.0174	0.0987 – 0.751	-	-	-	-	-	-
3C	N1 vs prevalent#	- 0.0929	0.7052	-0.525 – 0.377	0.50 3	0.0282	0.0632 – 0.779	0.479	0.0379	0.0318 – 0.767
	N1 vs incident*	0.266	0.2433	-0.187 – 0.626	- 0.04 81	0.8361	-0.470 – 0.392	0.006 04	0.9793	-0.427 – 0.437

456 * Average of incident hospital acquired cases (-/+3 days from sample collection).

457 † Relative SARS-CoV2 genomic copies compared to genomic copies of PMMoV.

458 # Prevalent cases at Hospital-3 are reported for the entire facility – as opposed to those cases directly housed in 3A, 3B, 3C.

459 Cq, quantification cycle.

460 **Table 3.** SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in hospital-wastewater samples as a function of proximity
 461 to a declared outbreak.

Hospital	Measurement	Outbreak-free periods vs	P-value
		outbreaks (Median (IQR))	
1	Copies/ml	0 (0-7.9) vs 280 (35-1768)	<0.0001
	Copies/Copies PMMoV	0 (0-0.07) vs 0.18 (0.09-1.8)	0.0001
2	Copies/ml	0 (0-0) vs 8 (1.1-17)	0.022
	Copies/Copies PMMoV	0 (0-0) vs 0.035 (0-0.21)	0.453
3A	Copies/ml	0 (0-12) vs 122 (5.9-408)	0.031
	Copies/Copies PMMoV	0 (0-0.11) vs 0.5 (0.01-10)	0.026
3C	Copies/ml	2.4 (0-8.8) vs 26 (1.1-3179)	0.212
	Copies/Copies PMMoV	0.013 (0-0.08) vs 0.1 (0.0003-6.9)	0.253

462

463

464 FIGURES LEGENDS

465 **Figure 1. Determination of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater samples from Hospital-1 and**
466 **Hospital-2.** Relative SARS-CoV-2 genomic copies compared to genomic copies of PMMoV from
467 A) Hospital 1 (August 5th to December 17th) and B) Hospital 2 (August 5th to December 17th).
468 Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in samples was determined by the N1 (black) and N2 (red)
469 assays. Green line denotes the total daily number of active prevalent cases in the hospital. Orange
470 bars denotes the number of daily hospital-acquired cases. Plots show the average of three technical
471 replicates and error bars represent the standard deviation. Vertical dash lines correspond to days
472 where outbreaks were declared (Table S3), where the number of patients and health care workers
473 involved are indicated at the top each dotted dash line. Asterisk denotes that for a specific outbreak
474 more than one unit was involved. Gray zones denote duration of the outbreak. HA: hospital
475 acquired. Bottom individual boxed areas represent individual samples as Positives (+) = samples
476 where SARS-CoV-2 signal identified with a $Cq < 40$, and negatives (-) had values ≥ 40 . Please note
477 that the scale is different in Figure A and B.

478 **Figure 2. Determination of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater samples from Hospital-3.**
479 Relative SARS-CoV-2 genomic copies compared to genomic copies of PMMoV from A) Hospital
480 3A (Trauma, Medical & Surgical ICUs, orthopedics surgery and designated COVID-care units)
481 August 5th to December 17th), B) Hospital 3B (i.e., Main Building, North wing, October 1st to
482 December 17th) and C) Hospital3C (i.e., Main Building South Wing, cancer care building, complex
483 medical care building and hostel/administration building), October 1st to December 17th).
484 Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in samples was determined by the N1 (black) and N2 (red)
485 assays. Green line denotes the number of prevalent cases in the hospital. Orange bars denotes the
486 number of daily hospital-acquired cases. Plots show the average of three technical replicates and


487 error bars represent the standard deviation. Vertical dash lines correspond to days where outbreaks
488 were declared (Table S3), where the number of patients and health care workers involved are
489 indicated at the top each dotted dash line. Asterisk (*) denotes the largest outbreak which occurred
490 initially at Hospital_3C prior to instituted monitoring at that site – and reflects the SARS-CoV-2
491 infected patients who were relocated to the designated COVID-19 wards in Hospital_3A where it
492 was detected by wastewater monitoring. The last case associated with the large outbreak was
493 identified October 19th. Gray zones denote duration of the outbreak. HA: hospital acquired. Bottom
494 individual boxed areas represent individual samples as Positives (+) = samples where SARS-CoV-
495 2 signal identified with a Cq<40, and negatives (-) had values ≥ 40 . Please note that the scale is
496 different from A, B and C figures.

497


498 **FIGURES**

499 **Figure 1**

A



B



500

501

