

1 ***Redesigning SARS-CoV-2 clinical RT-qPCR assays for wastewater RT-***

2 ***ddPCR***

3 Raul Gonzalez^{a*}, Allison Larson^a, Hannah Thompson^a, Errin Carter^a, Xavier Fernandez Cassi^b

4 ^aHampton Roads Sanitation District, 1434 Air Rail Avenue, Virginia Beach, VA, 23455, United States

5 ^bÉcole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

6 *Corresponding author, rgonzalez@hrsdc.com, ORCID 0000-0002-8115-7709

7

8 **Keywords**

9 SARS-CoV-2

10 Droplet Digital PCR

11 Wastewater

12 Wastewater-based Epidemiology

13 Wastewater Surveillance

14

15 **Declarations**

16 Funding: no external funding was received

17 Conflicts of interest/competing interests: none

18 Availability of data and material: This manuscript has data included as supplemental

19 information. Additional data will be made available on reasonable request.

20

21

22 **Abstract**

23

24 COVID-19 wastewater surveillance has gained widespread acceptance to monitor community
25 infection trends. Wastewater samples primarily differ from clinical samples by having low viral
26 concentrations due to dilution, and high levels of PCR inhibitors. Therefore, wastewater
27 samples should be processed by appropriately designed and optimized molecular workflows to
28 accurately quantify targets. Digital PCR has shown to be more sensitive and resilient to
29 environmental matrix inhibition. However, most SARS-CoV-2 assays have been designed for
30 clinical use on RT-qPCR instruments, then adopted to digital PCR platforms. But it is unknown
31 whether clinical RT-qPCR assays are adequate to use on digital PCR platforms. Here we
32 designed an N and E gene multiplex (ddCoV_N and ddCoV_E) specifically for RT-ddPCR and
33 benchmarked them against the nCoV_N2 and E_Sarbeco assays. ddCoV_N and ddCoV_E have
34 equivalent limits of detections and wastewater sample concentrations to NCoV_N2 and
35 E_Sarbeco but showed improved signal-to-noise ratios that eased interpretation and ability to
36 multiplex. From GISAID downloaded unique sequences analyzed, 2.12% and 0.83% present a
37 mismatch or would not be detected by the used primer/probe combination for the ddCoV_N
38 and ddCoV_E, respectively.

39 Introduction

40 Globally there have been over 83,000,000 cases and 1,800,000 deaths due to the coronavirus
41 disease-2019 (COVID-19) pandemic in 2020 alone (Dong et al., 2020). Wastewater surveillance
42 of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the virus that causes COVID-
43 19, has been used as an epidemiological tool to better understand the infection extent in
44 sewershed communities (e.g. Gerrity et al., 2021; Gonzalez et al., 2020; Prado et al., 2021;
45 Randazzo et al., 2020; Hata et al. 2021; Carrillo-Reyes et al., 2020).

46
47 Two main differences exist between clinical and environmental samples. First, environmental
48 samples typically have lower viral concentrations compared to clinical (e.g., nasopharyngeal,
49 throat, stool, sputum) samples. This is primarily due to dilution effects and often require
50 environmental samples to be concentrated prior to quantification. Second, environmental
51 matrices can have a wide variety of inhibitory substances that are co-concentrated in
52 environmental workflows. Thus, environmental samples require molecular workflows that have
53 properly designed and optimized assays to maximize sensitivity and accuracy. An appropriate
54 assay design reduces primer dimers that can interfere with accurate quantification, which is
55 especially important at lower concentrations. Additionally, proper assay design and
56 optimization can improve signal-to-noise ratios that can facilitate interpretation of true
57 positives. The signal-to-noise ratio is especially important to certain digital PCR platforms (i.e.,
58 droplet digital PCR).

59

60 Reverse transcription-qPCR (RT-qPCR) and RT-digital PCR have been the dominant molecular
61 methods used to quantify SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater (e.g., Pecson et al., 2021; Fores et al.,
62 2021; Oliveira et al., 2020; Cervantes-Aviles et al., 2021; Alygizakis et al., 2021; Torii et al.,
63 2021). Many RT-qPCR SARS-CoV-2 assays have been developed for various genome regions—N
64 gene, E gene, S gene, etc. (Lu et al., 2020; Corman et al., 2020; Chu et al., 2020; China CDC,
65 2020). These assays have been designed based on general RT-qPCR specifications and some
66 have design faults from not strictly following design guidelines. However, these assays can still
67 provide adequate quantification, even without strict adherence to recommended design
68 specifications, because of high titer clinical samples. Digital PCR has been proven to be more
69 sensitive than qPCR (Falzone et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020; Suo et al., 2020), especially in
70 environmental matrices (Graham et al., 2021; Cao et al., 2015; Yang et al., 2014; Racki et al.,
71 2014), with some exceptions (e.g., D’Aoust et al., 2021). The assays used have all been designed
72 for clinical use on RT-qPCR instruments, then adopted to digital PCR platforms. Some digital
73 PCR platforms, like droplet digital PCR (ddPCR), require a stricter adherence to assay design
74 criterion since the technology relies on the clear separation of positive and negative droplets or
75 partitions.

76
77 Early on in the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic the following knowledge gap has been identified: Are
78 clinical RT-qPCR assays adequate to use on digital PCR platforms, especially when analyzing
79 environmental samples that have strong matrix inhibition and are subject to dilution effects?
80 Here we designed and optimized a SARS-CoV-2 RT-ddPCR multiplex for wastewater following
81 strict design criteria to maximize accuracy especially at the lower concentrations in a difficult

82 matrix (wastewater). N and E gene assays were specifically designed for ddPCR and compared
83 to the nCoV_N2 and E_Sarbeco assays (Lu et al., 2020; Corman et al., 2020) designed for RT-
84 qPCR. Knowing the effect of strict adherence to digital PCR design specifications is necessary
85 since wastewater surveillance has seen a shift from trend analysis at the sewershed scale to
86 finer resolution building level screening of individuals. Thus, pushing the need for an
87 appropriately optimized method for environmental samples.

88

89

90 **Methods**

91 *Assay Design.* Many COVID-19 wastewater surveillance researchers have been running multiple
92 assays for the same gene (e.g., Sherchan et al., 2020, Medema et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020).
93 This is highly redundant and not normally done in wastewater studies quantifying pathogens
94 (e.g., Worley-Morse et al. 2019; Sarmila et al., 2020). A better strategy to gain higher
95 confidence of results would be to quantify multiple conserved genes in the virus. We have
96 designed 2 assays targeting N and E genes using Primer3Plus software (Untergasser et al., 2007)
97 and the criteria found in Supplemental Table S1. In short, we strictly followed widely accepted
98 PCR design criteria (and specific manufacturer recommendations) to lower primer dimer scores,
99 and target recommended GC content (40-60%), melting temperatures (T_m ; 60-63°C for primers,
100 4-6°C higher for probes), and lengths. The newly designed primers and probes for RT-ddPCR
101 (ddCoV_N, ddCoV_E) can be seen in Table 1. Optimization and validation of these assays was
102 done alongside the popularly used nCoV_N2 and E_Sarbeco assays. Geneious Prime (Geneious
103 Biologics, Auckland, New Zealand) was used to visualize the newly designed primer and probe

104 positions with respect to the nCoV_N2 and E_Sarbeco assays. Primer3Plus Primer_Check task
105 (with the conditions in Supplementary Table S1) was used to determine the primer and probe
106 T_m, GC content, and affinity for self-complementarity (likelihood that a primer will bind to itself
107 or the other primer).

108

109 *Sample Concentration and RNA Extraction.* Wastewater concentration was done using
110 electronegative filtration according to Gonzalez et al. (2020). In short, MgCl₂ was added to a
111 final concentration of 25 mM to 25 - 50 mL wastewater, then acidified to a pH of 3.5 with 20%
112 HCl. The sample was then filtered through a mixed cellulose ester HA filter (HAWPO4700;
113 Millipore, Billerica, MA, USA). A total of 1.0x10⁶ copies of bovine coronavirus (CALF-GUARD;
114 Zoetis, Parsippany, NJ) was added to all samples prior to filtration to determine total process
115 recovery. Bovine coronavirus recovery using RT-ddPCR (Gonzalez et al., 2020) was the ratio of
116 bovine coronavirus sample concentration to spike concentration.

117

118 Filters were immediately stored in a -80°C freezer until RNA extraction on a NucliSENS easyMag
119 (bioMerieux, Inc., Durham, NC, USA) within 5 days of filtration. Extractions were performed
120 using a modified manufacturer's protocol B 2.0.1. Modifications included a 30-min off board
121 lysis (2 mL of lysis buffer) and 100 µL of magnetic silica beads to minimize matrix inhibition and
122 maximize RNA recovery.

123

124 *Reverse Transcription Droplet Digital PCR.* Digital PCR workflow used the one-step RT-ddPCR
125 advanced kit for probes on the Bio-Rad QX200 (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA, USA). The 20 µL final

126 reaction volume consisted of the following: 5 μ L 1 \times one-step RT-ddPCR Supermix (Bio-Rad), 2
127 μ L reverse transcriptase (Bio-Rad), 1 μ L 300 mM DTT, 3 μ L of forward and reverse primers (900
128 nM final concentration) and probes (250 nM final concentration), 5 μ L RNase-free water, and 4
129 μ L RNA (samples run undiluted). The 20 μ L volume was combined with 70 μ L droplet generation
130 oil in the Droplet Generator (Bio-Rad) and resulting droplets were transferred to a 96-well plate
131 for end-point PCR. PCR cycling conditions were: 60-min reverse transcription at 50°C (1 cycle),
132 10-min enzyme activation at 95°C (1 cycle), 30-s denaturation at 94°C (40 cycles), 1-min
133 annealing/extension cycle at 55°C (40 cycles; ramp rate of \sim 2–3°C/s), 10-min enzyme
134 deactivation at 98°C (1 cycle) and a hold at 4°C until read on the droplet reader. Positive and
135 negative droplet reading occurred on the Bio-Rad Droplet Reader.

136
137 *Thermal Gradient Optimization.* Optimizing the annealing temperature of a PCR assay is critical,
138 especially for target specificity. The C1000 Thermal Cycler (Bio-Rad) was used to test the
139 reaction across a range of temperatures (60 to 50°C). The Twist Synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA
140 Control 4 (part no. 102862; Twist Bioscience, San Francisco, CA, USA) and a SARS-CoV-2 positive
141 wastewater sample was used for the optimization. This optimization also gives the first
142 visualization at the assay efficiency and robustness.

143
144 *Limits of Detection.* Theoretical limits of detection (LOD) were calculated by running serial
145 dilutions of the Twist Synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA Control 4 (Twist Bioscience, San Francisco, CA,
146 USA) standard in 10 replicates over 4 orders of magnitude. The LOD was the concentration
147 (copies/reaction) at which over 60% of the technical replicates were positive (Gonzalez et al.,

148 2020). Coefficient of variations (CV) were calculated for the copies per reaction for the serial
149 dilutions to compare replicates at different positive droplet concentrations.

150
151 *In-silico specificity and primer/probe mismatch analysis.* BLASTn (Altschul et al., 1990) was used
152 to test the in-silico specificity of the ddCoV_N and ddCoV_E primers against viruses (taxid:
153 10239) and bacteria (taxid: 2) in the nr database. There were no BLAST hits presenting good
154 homology and coverage for the primer/probe combinations that suggests assay detection to
155 viruses or bacteria other than SARS-CoV-2.

156
157 A total of 105,268 SARS-CoV-2 sequences retrieved and downloaded from GISAID on
158 06/02/2021 were evaluated in silico for the primer/probes designed. The inclusion criteria for
159 these sequences to be tested in silico were: 1) uploaded sequences from the United States of
160 America on date 01/01/2020 to 31/12/2020; 2) worldwide uploaded sequences from
161 01/01/2021 to 06/02/2021; 3) only those who have been sequenced from a human host and
162 the collection date is included; 5) only fully completed SARS-CoV-2 genomes from all clades and
163 lineages presenting high coverage were included, low coverage genomes were excluded.
164 Briefly, sequences were imported in Geneious Prime (Geneious Biologics) and duplicated
165 sequences with identical names were removed. Using Geneious software, newly designed
166 primers/probes for the nucleocapsid protein (ddCoV_N) and the envelope gene (ddCoV_E)
167 were mapped using Geneious primer mapper against the retrieved sequences allowing a
168 maximum of 3 mismatches. Sequences with more than three mismatches are summarized in
169 Supplemental Figure S1 and could be considered unlikely to be detected by the tested assay. A

170 list of complete mismatches and the relative position within SARS-CoV-2 genome are presented
171 in Supplemental Table S2.

172
173 *Concentration Comparison.* Concentration comparison of the two new assays, nCoV_N2, and
174 E_Sarbeco assays was done on 3 weeks of wastewater samples from 9 different facilities
175 (N=27). These facilities and the collection scheme are described in Gonzalez et al. (2020).
176 Within gene assays concentrations were compared using percent difference.

177

178

179 **Results and Discussion**

180 *Assays and Performance.* The newly designed primers and probes (ddCoV_N and ddCoV_E) are
181 adjacent to the respective nCoV_N2 and E_Sarbeco assay locations. Figure 1 documents the
182 shift in primers and probes necessary to strictly meet widely accepted PCR design criteria and
183 specific manufacturer recommendations (Supplemental Table S1). The information for the two
184 newly designed RT-ddPCR primers and probes as well as the nCoV-N2 and E_Sarbeco assays are
185 in Table 2. The nCoV_N2 and E_Sarbeco assays have high self-complementarity scores in the
186 forward primers. The newly designed assays reduced this score as well as restricted within
187 assay primer/probe Tm differences and constricted the GC%.

188

189 The annealing temperature thermal gradients give the first look at the efficiencies of the 4
190 assays on the QX200 ddPCR platform (Figure 2). With respect to the N gene assays, ddCoV_N
191 created a superior separation between positive and negative droplets for both the high titer

192 standard and wastewater sample. Positive droplet amplitude was approximately 10000 for both
193 assays, while the negative droplet band was approximately 500 and 6500 for ddCoV_N and
194 nCoV_N2, respectively. Additionally, the baseline for the ddCoV_N assay was significantly
195 tighter. During the annealing temperature optimization, droplets in the ddCoV_N negative
196 amplitude ranged from approximately 0 to 1000. The droplets in the nCoV_N2 ranged from
197 approximately 500 to 7000. In the wastewater samples, ‘raininess’ was diminished with the
198 ddCoV_N assay. During the optimization, the E gene assays did not have as significant
199 difference in band amplitudes. The E_Sarbeco amplitude difference was slightly greater than
200 that of the ddCoV_E. E_Sarbeco ranged from approximately 6500 to 11500, while the ddCoV_E
201 ranged from approximately 1600 to 4600. However, the ddCoV_E gene had a noticeably tighter
202 negative baseline—approximately half of the E_Sarbeco assay.

203
204 The increased droplet band separation of the ddCoV_N assay and the tighter negative bands
205 allows for greater ease in interpretation of results. Manual placement of the threshold is
206 difficult with a small gap between positive and negative bands. This can be exacerbated with
207 the ‘raininess’ caused by partial fluorescence and loose bands. These favorable characteristics
208 are also essential to multiplexing assays. The increased separation and reduction in ‘raininess’
209 are likely in part due to the elimination of the BHQ (LGC Biosearch Technologies, Risskov,
210 Denmark) quencher. While recommended by the manufacturer for the instrument, Bio-Rad has
211 advised against the use of BHQ probes (LGC Biosearch Technologies) with their one-step
212 reverse transcription kits since it contains Dithiothreitol (DTT). DTT is thought to cleave BHQ
213 (LGC Biosearch Technologies) when not intended, causing fluorescence clusters. It is unlikely

214 that the ZEN/Iowa Black FQ (Integrated DNA Technologies, Coralville, Iowa) double quenched
215 probes alone caused the tighter baselines since the BHQ (LGC Biosearch Technologies) probes
216 used for the nCoV-N2 and E_Sarbeco probes were also double quenched BHQnova (LGC
217 Biosearch) probes.

218
219 *Limits of Detection.* The LODs were nearly identical for each pair of gene assays but almost an
220 order of magnitude different across genes. The N gene LODs were 2.16 and 2.14 copies per
221 reaction for the ddCoV_N and nCoV_N2 assays, respectively. The E gene LODs were 16.0 and
222 15.0 copies per reaction for the ddCoV_E and E_Sarbeco assays, respectively. Figure 3 shows
223 ddCoV_N and ddCoV_E number of positive droplets and the copies per reaction for the serial
224 dilutions used to calculate the LODs. Coefficients of variation for the replicates were computed
225 using the copies per reaction data for each dilution. For both assays the CV increased through
226 the dilution series but took a large increase at the LODs. The CV increased faster in the
227 ddCoV_E, than the ddCoV_N assay, reflecting the higher LOD.

228
229 *In-Silico Analyses.* From the total of unique sequences analysed, 869 out of 105,227 (0.83%)
230 present a mismatch or would not be detected by the used primer/probe combination for the E
231 gene (ddCoV_E). For E gene assay, most of the mutations affected the designed probe (55%)
232 and the forward primer (35%).

233
234 For the in-silico testing of ddCoV_N assay, the total number of sequences analysed was reduced
235 as the retrieved GISAID sequences presented ambiguous basecalls at the Nucleocapsid region.

236 This was not observed for the E gene and it is likely that these ambiguities are related to a high
237 mutation rate on this specific genome site or the fact that the N gene is located at the 3' of
238 SARS-CoV-2 genome. These ambiguities produced false positive results on the primer/probe
239 mapping, significantly increasing the percentage of mismatches detected. Therefore, from the
240 initial 105,227 sequences, a trimming on the sequences on the 3' was applied when more than
241 40 continuous ambiguous base call were found. As a result of this, some sequences were
242 significantly shortened and only genomes longer than 28Kbs bases were included in the in-silico
243 test for the ddCoV_N. This reduced the total initial sequences analysed to 89,566. From the
244 total of sequences included, 1901 (2.12%) presented a mismatch or would not be detected by
245 the designed assay (more than 3 mismatches). Most of the identified mismatches (1901)
246 affected the probe (47%) or the primer forward (41.6%) targeting the N-gene.

247
248 *Concentration Comparison.* For three weeks the wastewater of 9 major facilities was analyzed
249 using all 4 assays (Figure 4). Bovine coronavirus recoveries for the samples ranged from 0.38%
250 to 19%, with a mean (SD) of 6.6% (4%). These recoveries are in line with previously reported
251 recoveries for the same virus and workflow used (Gonzalez et al., 2020). The detectable
252 concentrations across all assays ranged from 7.00×10^1 to 2.21×10^4 copies/100 mL. One sample
253 was non-detect for all assays. Specifically, the mean (SD) detections for ddCoV_N and nCoV_N2
254 assays were 4.67×10^3 (3.60×10^3) and 5.46×10^3 (4.42×10^3), respectively. The mean (SD)
255 detections for ddCoV_E and E_Sarbeco assays were 1.94×10^3 (1.46×10^3) and 1.92×10^3 (1.49
256 $\times 10^3$), respectively. The mean (SD) percent difference for detections (N=26) using the N assays
257 was 12 (19). The mean percent difference between the E gene assays was 7 (32). Differences

258 within gene assays was small as expected since the assays were designed around the same
259 genomic locations. The 2-D plot (Figure 5) highlights the assays multiplexing performance for
260 the first 9 samples analyzed. There is clear clustering of the droplet populations—gray = double
261 negative, blue = FAM positive, green = HEX positive, and orange = double positive. The
262 optimized, newly designed assays translate well to multiplexing and easily interpretable results.

263

264 **Conclusion**

265 SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance has been practiced widely to examine community level
266 infection trends and even to screen for infected individuals at the building level. Wastewater
267 SARS-CoV-2 concentrations can be significantly lower than clinical samples due to dilution and
268 environmental RNA degradation. Because of this well designed and optimized molecular assays
269 should be used in environmental sample workflows. The ddCoV_N and ddCoV_E assays have
270 been designed to lower dimer scores and strictly follow PCR design guidelines, specifically those
271 recommended for ddPCR. While the RT-ddPCR assays have equivalent LOD and concentrations,
272 they have improved signal-to-noise ratios that ease interpretation and decrease the likelihood
273 of false positives due to misinterpretation. This is especially important for novice users and
274 ultimately this improved efficiency is translated to an easier ability to multiplex. *In-silico*
275 analysis of the designed primers and probes should be periodically conducted to ensure
276 continued assay appropriateness in SARS-CoV-2 environmental monitoring. New variants are
277 constantly emerging with mutations affecting the targeted genes which ultimately can decrease
278 the sensitivity of currently used assays.

279

280 **References**

281 Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J.W., Choi, P.M., Kitajima, M.,
282 Simpson, S.L., Li, J. and Tschärke, B., 2020. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated
283 wastewater in Australia: a proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the
284 community. *Science of the Total Environment*, 728, p.138764.

285

286 Altschul, S.F., Gish, W., Miller, W., Myers, E.W. and Lipman, D.J., 1990. Basic local alignment
287 search tool. *Journal of molecular biology*, 215(3), pp.403-410.

288

289 Alygizakis, N., Markou, A.N., Rousis, N.I., Galani, A., Avgeris, M., Adamopoulos, P.G., Scorilas, A.,
290 Lianidou, E.S., Paraskevis, D., Tsiodras, S. and Tsakris, A., 2020. Analytical methodologies for the
291 detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: Protocols and future perspectives. *TrAC Trends in*
292 *Analytical Chemistry*, p.116125.

293

294 Cao, Y., Raith, M.R. and Griffith, J.F., 2015. Droplet digital PCR for simultaneous quantification
295 of general and human-associated fecal indicators for water quality assessment. *water research*,
296 70, pp.337-349.

297

298 Carrillo-Reyes, J., Barragán-Trinidad, M. and Buitrón, G., 2020. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in
299 sewage and wastewater treatment plants in Mexico. *Journal of Water Process Engineering*,
300 p.101815.

301

302 Cervantes-Avilés, P., Moreno-Andrade, I. and Carrillo-Reyes, J., 2021. Approaches applied to
303 detect SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and perspectives post-COVID-19. *Journal of Water Process*
304 *Engineering*, p.101947.

305
306 Chu, D.K., Pan, Y., Cheng, S.M., Hui, K.P., Krishnan, P., Liu, Y., Ng, D.Y., Wan, C.K., Yang, P.,
307 Wang, Q. and Peiris, M., 2020. Molecular diagnosis of a novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) causing
308 an outbreak of pneumonia. *Clinical chemistry*, 66(4), pp.549-555.

309
310 Corman, V.M., Landt, O., Kaiser, M., Molenkamp, R., Meijer, A., Chu, D.K., Bleicker, T., Brünink,
311 S., Schneider, J., Schmidt, M.L. and Mulders, D.G., 2020. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus
312 (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Eurosurveillance*, 25(3), p.2000045.

313
314 D'Aoust, P.M., Mercier, E., Montpetit, D., Jia, J.J., Alexandrov, I., Neault, N., Baig, A.T., Mayne, J.,
315 Zhang, X., Alain, T. and Langlois, M.A., 2021. Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from
316 wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence. *Water*
317 *research*, 188, p.116560.

318
319 Dong, E., Du, H. and Gardner, L., 2020. An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19
320 in real time. *The Lancet infectious diseases*, 20(5), pp.533-534.

321

322 Falzone, L., Musso, N., Gattuso, G., Bongiorno, D., Palermo, C.I., Scalia, G., Libra, M. and Stefani,
323 S., 2020. Sensitivity assessment of droplet digital PCR for SARS-CoV-2 detection. International
324 journal of molecular medicine, 46(3), pp.957-964.

325
326 Forés, E., Bofill-Mas, S., Itarte, M., Martínez-Puchol, S., Hundesa, A., Calvo, M., Borrego, C.M.,
327 Corominas, L.L., Girones, R. and Rusiñol, M., 2021. Evaluation of two rapid ultrafiltration-based
328 methods for SARS-CoV-2 concentration from wastewater. Science of The Total Environment,
329 768, p.144786.

330
331 Gerrity, D., Papp, K., Stoker, M., Sims, A. and Frehner, W., 2021. Early-pandemic wastewater
332 surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Nevada: Methodology, occurrence, and
333 incidence/prevalence considerations. Water research X, 10, p.100086.

334
335 Gonzalez, R., Curtis, K., Bivins, A., Bibby, K., Weir, M.H., Yetka, K., Thompson, H., Keeling, D.,
336 Mitchell, J. and Gonzalez, D., 2020. COVID-19 surveillance in Southeastern Virginia using
337 wastewater-based epidemiology. Water research, 186, p.116296.

338
339 Graham, K.E., Loeb, S.K., Wolfe, M.K., Catoe, D., Sinnott-Armstrong, N., Kim, S., Yamahara, K.M.,
340 Sassoubre, L.M., Mendoza Grijalva, L.M., Roldan-Hernandez, L. and Langenfeld, K., 2020. SARS-
341 CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with COVID-19 Cases in a Large Urban
342 Sewershed. Environmental science & technology.

343

344 Hata, A., Hara-Yamamura, H., Meuchi, Y., Imai, S. and Honda, R., 2021. Detection of SARS-CoV-2
345 in wastewater in Japan during a COVID-19 outbreak. *Science of The Total Environment*, 758,
346 p.143578.

347
348 Liu, X., Feng, J., Zhang, Q., Guo, D., Zhang, L., Suo, T., Hu, W., Guo, M., Wang, X., Huang, Z. and
349 Xiong, Y., 2020. Analytical comparisons of SARS-COV-2 detection by qRT-PCR and ddPCR with
350 multiple primer/probe sets. *Emerging microbes & infections*, 9(1), pp.1175-1179.

351
352 Lu, X., Wang, L., Sakthivel, S.K., Whitaker, B., Murray, J., Kamili, S., Lynch, B., Malapati, L., Burke,
353 S.A., Harcourt, J. and Tamin, A., 2020. US CDC real-time reverse transcription PCR panel for
354 detection of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2. *Emerging infectious diseases*,
355 26(8), p.1654.

356
357 Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R. and Brouwer, A., 2020. Presence of SARS-
358 Coronavirus-2 RNA in sewage and correlation with reported COVID-19 prevalence in the early
359 stage of the epidemic in the Netherlands. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 7(7),
360 pp.511-516.

361
362 National Institute for Viral Disease Control and Prevention. Specific primers and probes for
363 detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2020);
364 http://ivdc.chinacdc.cn/kyjz/202001/t20200121_211337.html

365

366 Oliveira, M.D.L.A., Campos, A., Matos, A.R., Rigotto, C., Martins, A.S., Teixeira, P.F. and Siqueira,
367 M.M., 2020. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology (WBE) and Viral Detection in Polluted Surface
368 Water: A Valuable Tool for COVID-19 Surveillance—A Brief Review.

369

370 Pecson, B.M., Darby, E., Haas, C., Amha, Y., Bartolo, M., Danielson, R., Dearborn, Y., Di Giovanni,
371 G., Ferguson, C., Fevig, S. and Gaddis, E., 2021. Reproducibility and sensitivity of 36 methods to
372 quantify the SARS-CoV-2 genetic signal in raw wastewater: findings from an interlaboratory
373 methods evaluation in the US. *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology*.

374

375 Prado, T., Fumian, T.M., Mannarino, C.F., Resende, P.C., Motta, F.C., Eppinghaus, A.L.F., do Vale,
376 V.H.C., Braz, R.M.S., de Andrade, J.D.S.R., Maranhão, A.G. and Miagostovich, M.P., 2021.
377 Wastewater-based epidemiology as a useful tool to track SARS-CoV-2 and support public health
378 policies at municipal level in Brazil. *Water research*, 191, p.116810.

379

380 Rački, N., Morisset, D., Gutierrez-Aguirre, I. and Ravnikar, M., 2014. One-step RT-droplet digital
381 PCR: a breakthrough in the quantification of waterborne RNA viruses. *Analytical and*
382 *bioanalytical chemistry*, 406(3), pp.661-667.

383

384 Randazzo, W., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Sanjuán, R., Domingo-Calap, P. and Sánchez, G., 2020.
385 Metropolitan wastewater analysis for COVID-19 epidemiological surveillance. *International*
386 *Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*, 230, p.113621.

387

388 Sarmila, T., Sherchan, S.P. and Eiji, H., 2020. Applicability of crAssphage, pepper mild mottle
389 virus, and tobacco mosaic virus as indicators of reduction of enteric viruses during wastewater
390 treatment. *Scientific Reports (Nature Publisher Group)*, 10(1).
391

392 Sherchan, S.P., Shahin, S., Ward, L.M., Tandukar, S., Aw, T.G., Schmitz, B., Ahmed, W. and
393 Kitajima, M., 2020. First detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in North America: a study
394 in Louisiana, USA. *Science of The Total Environment*, 743, p.140621.
395

396 Suo, T., Liu, X., Feng, J., Guo, M., Hu, W., Guo, D., Ullah, H., Yang, Y., Zhang, Q., Wang, X. and
397 Sajid, M., 2020. ddPCR: a more accurate tool for SARS-CoV-2 detection in low viral load
398 specimens. *Emerging microbes & infections*, 9(1), pp.1259-1268.
399

400 Torii, S., Furumai, H. and Katayama, H., 2021. Applicability of polyethylene glycol precipitation
401 followed by acid guanidinium thiocyanate-phenol-chloroform extraction for the detection of
402 SARS-CoV-2 RNA from municipal wastewater. *Science of The Total Environment*, 756, p.143067.
403

404 Worley-Morse, T., Mann, M., Khunjar, W., Olabode, L. and Gonzalez, R., 2019. Evaluating the
405 fate of bacterial indicators, viral indicators, and viruses in water resource recovery facilities.
406 *Water Environment Research*, 91(9), pp.830-842.
407

408 Yang, R., Paparini, A., Monis, P. and Ryan, U., 2014. Comparison of next-generation droplet
409 digital PCR (ddPCR) with quantitative PCR (qPCR) for enumeration of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts
410 in faecal samples. *International journal for parasitology*, 44(14), pp.1105-1113.

411

412


413 **Figures/Tables**

414

415 Figure 1. Locations of RT-ddPCR and RT-qPCR designed assays with respect to the SARS-CoV-2

416 genome (GenBank accession no. MN908947). ddCoV_N and nCoV_N2 assays are located on the

417 N gene (top panel). ddCoV_E and E_Sarbeco are located on the E gene (bottom panel).







418

419


420 Figure 2. Annealing temperature thermal gradient optimizations for the 2 RT-ddPCR designed
421 assays (ddCoV_N, ddCoV_E) and the 2 RT-qPCR designed assays (nCoV_N2, E_Sarbeco). Thicker
422 portion of the positive band (first 8 wells) used RNA oligo standard, while the thinner portion
423 (next 8 wells) used a SARS-CoV-2 positive wastewater sample. The last 8 wells are negatives
424 (NTC).

425




426

427 Figure 3. ddCoV_N and ddCoV_E positive droplets and copies per reaction for the limits of
428 detection serial dilutions. Coefficients of variation (CV) for the copies per reaction are shown.
429




430

431 Figure 4. Assay comparisons for three weeks of wastewater SARS-CoV-2 concentrations at 9
432 facilities in southeast Virginia. Only the detectable concentrations are shown (N=26).
433



434

435 Figure 5. The 2-D plot of the ddCoV_N and ddCoV_E multiplexed assays for the first 9 samples
436 analyzed. Efficient clustering of the droplet populations is shown—gray = double negative, blue
437 = FAM positive, green = HEX positive, and orange = double positive.
438



439

440 Table 1. The N and E gene primer/probe sequences designed for RT-ddPCR. Genome locations
 441 based on SARS-CoV-2 (GenBank accession no. MN908947).

442

	Sequence (5'-3')	Genome Location	Amplicon Length
ddCoV_ N			95
forward	TGGGGACCAGGAACTAATCA	20131-29150	
reverse	ACATTCCGAAGAACGCTGAA	29225-29206	
probe	FAM/TGCACAATT/ZEN/TGCCCCAGCG/IABkFQ	29185-29204	
ddCoV_ E			100
forward	TCGGAAGAGACAGGTACGTT	26260-26279	
reverse	ATCGAAGCGCAGTAAGGATG	26359-26340	
probe	HEX/AGCGTACTT/ZEN/CTTTTCTTGCTTTCGTGG/IAB kFQ	26290-26317	

443

444 Table 2. Primer and probe sequence information. Sequences with an asterisk (*) exhibits high
 445 end self complementarity.

446

	Tm (°C)	GC (%)	ANY	SELF
ddCoV_N				
probe	66.8	60	6	2
forward	60	50	3	2
reverse	60.1	45	5	0
ddCoV_E				
probe	66.9	42.9	4	0
forward	60.4	50	4	2
reverse	60.4	50	4	0
nCoV_N2				
probe	68.8	56.5	6	2
forward*	59.4	40	5	5
reverse	60.7	55.6	5	2
E_Sarbeco				
probe	69.1	53.8	4	2
forward*	60.6	34.6	8	8
reverse	63.2	45.5	7	1

447