

1 **Within-Day Variability of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Municipal Wastewater Influent During**
2 **Periods of Varying COVID-19 Prevalence and Positivity**

3 Aaron Bivins^{1,2}, Devin North¹, Zhenyu Wu¹, Marlee Shaffer¹, Warish Ahmed³, Kyle Bibby^{1,2*}

4 ¹ Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering & Earth Sciences, University of Notre Dame,
5 156 Fitzpatrick Hall, Notre Dame, IN 46556

6 ² Environmental Change Initiative, University of Notre Dame, 721 Flanner Hall, Notre Dame, IN
7 46556

8 ³ CSIRO Land and Water, Ecosciences Precinct, 41 Boggo Road, Qld 4102, Australia

9 *kbibby@nd.edu

10 **ABSTRACT**

11 Wastewater surveillance of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)
12 RNA is being used to monitor Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) trends in communities;
13 however, within-day variation in primary influent concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA remain
14 largely uncharacterized. In the current study, grab sampling of primary influent was performed
15 every 2 hours over two different 24-hour periods at two wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs)
16 in northern Indiana, USA. In primary influent, uncorrected, recovery-corrected, and pepper mild
17 mottle virus (PMMoV)-normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations demonstrated ordinal
18 agreement with increasing clinical COVID-19 positivity, but not COVID-19 cases. Primary
19 influent SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations exhibited greater variation than PMMoV RNA
20 concentrations as expected for lower shedding prevalence. The bovine respiratory syncytial
21 virus (BRSV) process control recovery efficiency was low (mean: 0.91%) and highly variable
22 (coefficient of variation: 51% - 206%) over the four sampling events with significant differences
23 between the two WWTPs ($p < 0.0001$). The process control recovery was similar to the

24 independently assessed SARS-CoV-2 RNA recovery efficiency, which was also significantly
25 different between the two WWTPs ($p < 0.0001$). Recovery-corrected SARS-CoV-2 RNA
26 concentrations better reflected within-day changes in primary influent flow rate and fecal
27 content, as indicated by PMMoV concentrations. These observations highlight the importance of
28 assessing the process recovery efficiency, which is highly variable, using an appropriate
29 process control. Despite large variations, both recovery-corrected and PMMoV-normalized
30 SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in primary influent demonstrate potential for monitoring
31 COVID-19 positivity trends in WWTPs serving peri-urban and rural areas.

32 Keywords: Wastewater-based Epidemiology, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, variability, primary
33 influent

34 INTRODUCTION

35 When infected with severe acute coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the β -coronavirus which causes
36 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), humans, both symptomatic and asymptomatic¹, shed
37 the virus and its RNA, in various body fluids²⁻⁴ including: sputum, saliva, urine, and feces. Since
38 many of these body fluids are deposited into wastewater collection systems, wastewater-based
39 epidemiology (WBE) has emerged as a promising technique⁵ for corroborating clinical
40 surveillance observations, or monitoring SARS-CoV-2 infection when clinical surveillance
41 systems are unavailable or limited⁶.

42 Surveillance strategies and sampling methods for WBE remain diverse, with community-level
43 temporal trends monitored via both primary solids^{7,8} and primary influent⁹. Studies monitoring
44 primary influent for surveillance have used grab samples¹⁰⁻¹⁴, time-based composite
45 samples^{15,16}, and flow-based composite samples^{9,17}. Concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
46 wastewater and wastewater solids correlate with COVID-19 cases^{8,17,18} and positivity rates¹⁹.
47 Attempts to use wastewater data to estimate SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence remain limited
48 due to large uncertainty and variation in shedding rates and viral sewershed dynamics^{20,21}.

49 To reduce variation, normalization of SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations by pepper mild mottle
50 virus (PMMoV) RNA concentration has been suggested to account for the fecal content of
51 wastewater samples⁸. PMMoV is an elongated rod-shaped virus with a single-stranded
52 genome²² that is prevalent in human feces^{23,24} due to the consumption of produce and is
53 subsequently prevalent in wastewater globally²⁵. WBE studies of wastewater solids have
54 reported improved correlation with clinical case trends²⁶ and no effect⁸ associated with PMMoV-
55 normalization, while a study of wastewater influent found that PMMoV-normalization decreased
56 correlation with clinical case trends¹⁸.

57 The SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration in municipal wastewater influent is expected to exhibit
58 temporal trends consistent with domestic sewage inputs and PMMoV influent concentration due
59 to the fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by those infected. This variability then drives best
60 sampling practices, e.g., grab versus composite samples. Studies of within-day variation in
61 SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in primary influent remain limited. A recent study comparing
62 flow-weighted composites and grab samples found agreement between the two, but suggested
63 avoiding sampling during and immediately following early morning low flow periods due to low
64 concentrations from grab samples²⁷. Another study hypothesized that a 10-fold increase in
65 SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in flow-weighted influent composites compared to grab
66 samples suggested diurnal variation, but called for additional testing to confirm²⁸. Additional
67 evidence is necessary to identify best sampling practices and inform data interpretation.

68 The purpose of the current study was to assess the variability associated with SARS-CoV-2
69 RNA in primary influent at two wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) during distinct periods of
70 epidemic COVID-19. The effort had two primary goals. The first goal was to characterize the
71 within-day variation in influent SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations, PMMoV RNA concentrations,
72 and process control recovery efficiency. The second goal was to assess the relationships
73 between primary influent SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration, including normalized concentrations,
74 and COVID-19 clinical surveillance metrics.

75 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

76 *Primary Influent Sampling Locations*

77 The experiments described herein were conducted at two WWTPs located in two communities,
78 identified as community A and community B, in northern Indiana, USA. Records from the
79 Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO)
80 system indicate the design flow for each WWTP is 20 million gallons per day (MGD)

81 (<https://echo.epa.gov/>). The WWTP in community A (WWTP A) serves 56,227 residents and
82 had an average influent flow rate of 14.09 million gallons per day (MGD) in 2020 (250 gallons
83 per capita-day) while the WWTP in community B (WWTP B) serves 46,557 residents and had
84 an average influent flow rate of 11.50 MGD in 2020 (247 gallons per capita-day). Despite
85 serving fewer residents, the population density surrounding WWTP B is greater (2,995 persons
86 per square mile) than the density surrounding WWTP A (1,881 persons per square mile).
87 COVID-19 clinical surveillance data during the 14 days prior to each sampling period for the
88 counties A and B were obtained from the Indiana COVID-19 Dashboard and Map
89 (<https://www.coronavirus.in.gov/2393.htm>). COVID-19 clinical surveillance data at the sub-
90 county level are not publicly available for this region.

91 *24-h Sampling Experiments*

92 A total of four 24-hour sampling experiments were conducted: (1) WWTP A from 12:00 June 18
93 to 12:00 June 19, 2020; (2) WWTP A from 1:30 to 23:30 December 2; (3) WWTP B from 11:00
94 May 7 to 9:00 May 8, 2020; (4) WWTP B from 9:00 December 1 to 7:00 December 2, 2020.
95 During each experiment, 500 mL primary influent grab samples were collected at 2-hour
96 intervals and immediately stored at 4°C. Samples were then transported on ice to the laboratory
97 and again stored at 4°C until concentrated as described below within 24 hours. At WWTP A, 24-
98 hour time-based composite samples were also collected on 18 and 19 June and 2 December.
99 While at WWTP B, a 24-hour time-based composite sample was only prepared using the grab
100 samples from 1 December to 2 December. The average hourly flow rates were recorded during
101 each experiment and subsequently used to calculate average flow rates for each 2-hour interval
102 and for the entire 24-hour experiment.

103 *Electronegative Membrane Adsorption and Extraction*

104 Primary influent wastewater samples were concentrated using an electronegative membrane
105 followed by direct extraction of the membrane as has been previously reported for concentration
106 of viral markers from surface water²⁹ and SARS-CoV-2 for WBE applications²¹. During the
107 experiments, 100 mL of primary influent was filtered through a 0.45 µm 47 mm GN-6 Metrical
108 hydrophilic mixed cellulose ester membrane (Pall Corporation, Port Washington, NY, USA) on a
109 glass vacuum filtration assembly (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA).

110 Prior to concentration, each influent sample was seeded with a process control, bovine
111 respiratory syncytial virus (BRSV), in the form of Inforce 3, an intranasal cattle vaccine
112 consisting of live attenuated virus (Zoetis, Parsippany-Troy Hills, NJ, USA) at a ratio of 1 µL of
113 Inforce 3/mL of wastewater. The spike concentration was $4.73 \pm 0.09 \log_{10}$ RNA copy
114 number/µL as quantified by direct extraction of 500 µL aliquots of seeded wastewater. BRSV
115 was selected as a process control because of its similarity to SARS-CoV-2 morphology: both
116 are enveloped viruses with helical symmetry and negative sense single-stranded RNA
117 genomes³⁰.

118 Immediately after concentration, each membrane filter was rolled and placed into a 2 mL Garnet
119 PowerBead Tube (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) using aseptic technique and frozen at -80°C.
120 Nucleic acids were extracted from each sample using the AllPrep PowerViral DNA/RNA kit
121 (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). Prior to extraction, 800 µL of solution PM1 (heated to 55°C) and 8
122 µL of β-Mercaptoethanol (MP Biomedicals, Irvine, CA, USA) were added to each thawed
123 PowerBead tube, vortexed briefly, and homogenized on a FastPrep 24 beat beating instrument
124 for four rounds of 20 seconds at 4.5 M/s with 30 seconds rest between each round. After bead
125 beating, the PowerBead tubes were centrifuged at 13,000 x g for one minute and 500 µL of the
126 resulting supernatant was transferred into a clean 2 mL microcentrifuge tube. The extraction
127 was then completed following the Qiagen protocol. In the final step, nucleic acids were eluted in
128 80 µL of RNase free water (provided with the kit). The resulting eluate was centrifuged for two

129 minutes at 13,000 x g and 60 μ L of supernatant was transferred into a 2 mL DNA LoBind tube
130 (Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany) and stored at -80°C until assayed by reverse transcription
131 droplet digital polymerase chain reaction (RT-ddPCR).

132 *Direct Extractions*

133 In addition to the primary influent samples concentrated by the adsorption-extraction method, a
134 paired subset of 16 samples, eight collected from WWTP A and 8 from WWTP B (December
135 2020 experiments), were extracted by adding 500 μ L of influent directly into a Garnet
136 PowerBead tube and extracting the nucleic acids as described above. The purpose of these
137 direct extractions was to directly estimate the virus RNA concentration recovery efficiency by
138 comparing the direct extraction enumerations and the adsorption-extraction enumerations.

139 *RT-ddPCR*

140 RNA in sample extracts was detected and quantified by RT-ddPCR performed on the BioRad
141 QX200 Droplet Digital PCR System with thermal cycling performed on the C1000 Touch
142 Thermal Cycler (BioRad, Hercules, CA, USA). RNA reverse transcription and PCR amplification
143 was performed in a single reaction using the One-Step RT-ddPCR Advanced Kit for Probes
144 (BioRad, Hercules, CA, USA) per the manufacturer's instructions. Each reaction was prepared
145 as a 22 μ L volume consisting of 5.25 μ L of 4X reaction mix, 2.1 μ L of reverse transcriptase,
146 1.05 μ L of dithiothreitol, 6.45 μ L of molecular grade water, and 4 μ L of nucleic acid extract from
147 each sample. Primer and probe sequences, concentrations, and thermal cycling conditions for
148 each RT-ddPCR assay are summarized in Table S1. Each RT-ddPCR experiment included no-
149 template controls, positive controls, and the pertinent negative extraction controls as described
150 in further detail below. The RNA copy number for each RT-ddPCR reaction was estimated by
151 manual thresholding performed in QuantaSoft Version 1.7.4 (BioRad, Hercules, CA, USA) such
152 that the negative controls, both no-template and extraction, were negative for each assay.

153 To assess the extraction and RT-ddPCR efficiency, a subset of 16 concentrated influent
154 samples (8 WWTP A; 8 WWTP B) were seeded with Hepatitis G (Hep G) Armored RNA
155 (Asuragen, Austin, TX, USA) as a molecular process control^{9,31}. For these samples, 10 μ L of
156 Hep G Armored RNA was seeded into the 500 μ L supernatant resulting from membrane filter
157 homogenization and then extracted and subjected to RT-ddPCR as described above. The
158 starting titer of the Hep G spike ($1,140 \pm 152$ RNA GC/ μ L) was determined by heat-extracting an
159 aliquot of Hep G Armored RNA at 75°C for 3 minutes and quantifying the resulting RNA by RT-
160 ddPCR per the manufacturer's instructions. The extraction and RT-ddPCR recovery efficiency
161 was estimated by comparing the quantity of Hep G RNA recovered from each sample with the
162 starting titer.

163 *RT-ddPCR Assays*

164 SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected and quantified using the CDC N1 assay targeting the
165 nucleocapsid gene³². The N1 copy number in each sample was measured in triplicate RT-
166 ddPCR reactions using the premixed primers and probe (Table S1) from the 2019-nCoV RUO
167 Kit (IDT, Coralville, IA, USA). Each RT-ddPCR experiment included a no-template control, two
168 positive controls consisting of the 2019-nCoV_N_Positive Control plasmid (IDT, Coralville, IA,
169 USA), and the relevant negative extraction control. The 95% limit of detection (95%LOD) for the
170 N1 assay was estimated using a 1:3 dilution series of Synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA Control (MT
171 188340) (Twist Bioscience, San Francisco, CA, USA). At each step in the dilution series, 12 RT-
172 ddPCR replicates were assayed. A cumulative Gaussian distribution was fit to the observed
173 proportion of positive technical replicates along the dilution series, and the 95% LOD was
174 estimated as the 95th percentile of the resulting distribution.

175 PMMoV RNA was quantified using an RT-ddPCR assay targeting the replicase protein
176 gene^{23,33}. The forward and reverse primers (Table S1) were synthesized by IDT (Coralville, IA,
177 USA) while the Taqman minor-groove-binder probe was synthesized by Applied Biosystems

178 (Foster City, CA, USA). PMMoV RNA was quantified in a single RT-ddPCR reaction for each
179 sample with two negative controls included in each experiment.

180 RNA from the process control, BRSV, was detected and quantified using an assay targeting the
181 nucleoprotein gene³⁴ and adapted to RT-ddPCR format³⁵. The forward and reverse primers and
182 probe (Table S1) were synthesized by IDT (Coralville, IA, USA). BRSV RNA for each sample
183 was measured in a single RT-ddPCR reaction with two negative controls and two positive
184 controls consisting of extract (Qiagen AllPrep PowerViral) of Inforce 3 aliquots. RNA from the
185 extraction and molecular control, Hep G Armored RNA, was quantified in RT-ddPCR duplicates
186 using an RT-ddPCR assay targeting polyprotein precursor³¹ with primers and probes (Table S1)
187 synthesized by IDT (Coralville, IA, USA). RT-ddPCR experiments were deemed satisfactory
188 when each target was detected in the relevant positive controls and not detected in its negative
189 controls, the BRSV process control was detected in each sample, and PMMoV was detected in
190 each sample.

191 *RNA Persistence Experiments*

192 In addition to the 24-h influent sampling experiments, a daily composite sample was collected
193 from WWTP A on 23 June 2020, seeded with BRSV, and used to investigate the stability of
194 RNA during storage, pasteurization, and freeze-thaw cycles. To assess persistence during
195 storage, the composite sample was aliquoted into 50 mL centrifuge tubes. The tubes were
196 incubated at either 4°C or 25°C with two tubes combined into a single 100 mL sample and
197 processed every 24 hours from time zero to seven days. Persistence through pasteurization
198 was assessed by pasteurizing two 50 mL aliquots in centrifuge tubes at 60°C for 90 minutes,
199 with a brief vortex mix at 45 minutes, and then combining the two aliquots into a single 100 mL
200 sample. The effect of freeze-thaw cycles was assessed by freezing 50 mL aliquots in centrifuge
201 tubes at -80°C for 48 hours, thawing the tubes at 4°C and refreezing at -80°C for up to three
202 cycles. After each thaw, two tubes were combined into one 100 mL sample for processing. For

203 the persistence assessments, SARS-CoV-2, PMMoV, and BRSV RNA were concentrated and
204 extracted at each time point using the adsorption-extraction method previously described.

205 Comparisons between two groups were made using Mann-Whitney tests and between multiple
206 groups using Kruskal-Wallis tests with Dunn's correction³⁶⁻³⁸. All graphing and statistical
207 analyses associated with the described experiments were performed using GraphPad Prism
208 Version 9.0.0 (GraphPad Software, LaJolla, CA, USA).

209 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

210 *Process Control, Molecular Control & Concentration Recovery Efficiency*

211 Across all experiments, 83 primary influent samples were concentrated by adsorption-extraction
212 and assayed for SARS-CoV-2 and PMMoV RNA: 58 from WWTP A and 25 from WWTP B (one
213 24-hour event did not include a composite sample). The BRSV recovery efficiency across all
214 samples processed using adsorption-extraction ranged from 0.03 to 15% with a mean of 0.91%
215 (95%CI: 0.53 – 1.3) (Figure S1). The observed recovery efficiency in samples from WWTP A
216 was greater than in samples from WWTP B ($p < 0.0001$); however, the coefficient of variation
217 (CV) in samples from WWTP A was also greater (169%) than WWTP B (83%). For a subset of
218 four samples where the solids fraction was removed prior to adsorption-extraction, the BRSV
219 mean recovery efficiency was 25% (95%CI: 22 – 28).

220 For a subset of 16 primary influent samples (8 from each WWTP), the recovery efficiency of the
221 extraction and molecular control, Hep G, ranged from 38.5% to 64.4% with a mean of 49.4%
222 (95%CI: 47.4 – 51.5) (Figure S2). Unlike the process control, the extraction and molecular
223 control recovery from WWTPs A and B samples was not significantly different ($p = 0.1034$).
224 Interestingly, the mean recovery for wastewater seeded with Hep G was greater than for PCR-
225 grade water seeded with Hep G (37%, $n = 2$). Although a statistical comparison could not be

226 made owing to the limited sample size, this suggests the extraction kit might be more efficient
227 for wastewater than PCR-grade water.

228 Paired measurements of N1 copy number per liter in directly extracted influent versus influent
229 concentrated via the adsorption-extraction method indicate that the concentration recovery
230 efficiency for SARS-CoV-2 RNA ranged from 0.14% to 10% with an average of 1.9% (Figure
231 S3; 95%CI: 1.4 – 2.5). Just as for the BRSV process control, the SARS-CoV-2 RNA recovery
232 was greater in WWTP A than WWTP B ($p < 0.0001$). PMMoV RNA concentration recovery,
233 determined in the same manner and shown in Figure S4, ranged from 7.4% to 41.3% with an
234 average of 19.2% (95%CI: 14.8 – 23.7) and was not statistically different between the two
235 WWTPs ($p = 0.0771$). The SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration recovery CV of 98% was greater
236 than PMMoV RNA recovery CV of 43%.

237 A wide variety of process controls have been reported in the WBE literature, including: bovine
238 coronavirus^{9,18}, f-specific RNA phages⁶, phi 6³⁹, murine hepatitis virus^{8,40}, vesicular stomatitis
239 virus²⁶, porcine endemic diarrhea virus¹², mengovirus¹², porcine respiratory and reproductive
240 syndrome virus and murine norovirus⁴¹, human coronavirus OC43⁴², human coronavirus 229E⁴³,
241 and even inactivated SARS-CoV-2^{40,44}. During a methods comparison, significantly different
242 recovery efficiencies were observed between a variety of process controls for a single method⁴².
243 In the current study SARS-CoV-2 and PMMoV were recovered at different mean efficiencies
244 (1.9% and 19.2%, respectively) using the adsorption-extraction method. The mean SARS-CoV-
245 2 RNA concentration recovery (1.9%) and molecular control recovery (49%) considered in
246 series result in an estimated mean process recovery efficiency of 0.93%. This is comparable
247 with the mean process efficiency estimated by the BRSV control (0.91%). For the workflow
248 described in this study, BRSV seems a reasonable process control for estimating the recovery
249 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA, given the limitations inherent to all process controls.⁴⁵ The mean recovery
250 of BRSV observed during this study is much lower than the 6.6% recovery reported for

251 electronegative membrane filtration with acidification and MgCl₂ amendment reported during a
252 study in Virginia⁹. However, electronegative membrane filtration methods have demonstrated
253 recoveries ranging from approximately 10% to less than 1% during virus concentration from
254 sewage⁴². While the BRSV recovery efficiencies in the current study span 2.7 orders of
255 magnitude, the range of SARS-CoV-2 concentration efficiencies, only spanned 1.9 orders of
256 magnitude.

257 Importantly, a statistically meaningful difference was observed in recovery efficiencies for the
258 process control between WWTP A and B. This difference was also observed for the
259 concentration recovery assessment of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Enveloped viruses, such as SARS-
260 CoV-2, partition favorably to solids^{43,46,47} and their recoveries from solids can be low⁴⁶. The
261 partitioning is likely further complicated by the presence of SARS-CoV-2 genetic material in
262 various forms in wastewater, including free RNA and capsid-contained RNA⁴⁸. In a study of
263 SARS-CoV-2 adsorption to surfaces in solution, electrostatic adhesion correlated with both
264 solution ionic strength and surface chemistry⁴⁹. Additionally, a physicochemical model
265 suggested specific absorbance of the wastewater as the parameter with the highest correlation
266 with RNA concentration⁵⁰. It could be expected that in wastewater, such parameters would be
267 highly variable, and could lead to highly variable recovery efficiencies both within and between
268 WWTPs. A negative correlation between solids and recovery efficiency was observed for
269 electronegative membrane concentration¹⁸ in a WBE study in Wisconsin. This is consistent with
270 the improved recoveries observed for BRSV after solids were removed. Despite the low and
271 variable recovery in the current study, adsorption-extraction using electronegative membranes
272 demonstrated reproducibility and sensitivity at reasonable cost in two previous methods
273 comparisons^{42,51}.

274 *SARS-CoV-2, PMMoV, and Process Control RNA Persistence*

275 SARS-CoV-2, BRSV, and PMMoV RNA persistence was assessed for seven days under
276 varying storage conditions to inform sample storage and handling recommendations. As shown
277 in Figure S5A, there was a slight increase in SARS-CoV-2 RNA N1 copy number over seven
278 days at 4°C. BRSV RNA also demonstrated a similar increase over seven days at 4°C (Figure
279 S5C). At 25°C, N1 copy numbers increased from time zero to 24 hours and then decreased
280 slightly over the remaining observations. A similar trend simultaneously observed for BRSV
281 RNA suggests improved process efficiency at 24 hours followed by decreasing recovery and/or
282 decay thereafter. PMMoV RNA copy numbers, shown in Figure S5B, displayed no appreciable
283 decay throughout the entire 7-day experiment at both 4°C and 25°C. During pasteurization,
284 there was no appreciable decrease of N1, PMMoV, or BRSV RNA copy numbers (Figure S6).
285 However, over three freeze-thaw cycles, both the N1 and PMMoV RNA copy numbers
286 decreased (Figure S7 A and B). After three freeze-thaw cycles, both SARS-CoV-2 RNA
287 replicates were below the N1 95% LOD of 3.3 (95% CI: 2.8 – 3.8) copies per reaction (Figure
288 S8). BRSV RNA was detectable through all three freeze-thaw cycles without a consistent
289 increasing or decreasing trend (Figure S7 C).

290 Consistent with previous reports, SARS-CoV-2 RNA exhibited little decay in primary influent
291 stored over seven days at both 4°C and 25°C⁵²⁻⁵⁴. However, freeze-thaw cycles degraded both
292 SARS-CoV-2 and PMMoV RNA copy numbers. Freezing at -20°C and -80°C has been reported
293 to decrease copy numbers for assays targeting the SARS-CoV-2 N gene^{48,54}. Based on these
294 observations, short-term storage of primary influent samples at 4°C prior to processing is
295 preferable to freezing at -80°C. While SARS-CoV-2 RNA did not appear to decay substantially
296 at 25°C, these observations in primary influent should not be extended to RNA persistence in
297 raw sewage as it travels through the wastewater collection system. During pasteurization,
298 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in primary influent persisted while infectious SARS-CoV-2 was rapidly
299 inactivated at 50°C and 70°C⁵³. Others have reported no effect of pasteurization on SARS-CoV-

300 2 RNA copy numbers⁴² or even increases in copy number associated with pasteurization⁵⁵.
301 Together these observations indicate pasteurization is a reasonable biosafety strategy to
302 mitigate infection risks associated with infectious SARS-CoV-2 while preserving genetic signal
303 for SARS-CoV-2 RNA surveillance.

304 *COVID-19 Clinical Surveillance During 24-hour Sampling*

305 Clinical COVID-19 data (both cases and percent positivity) were assessed for the two weeks
306 prior to each sampling event. During the two weeks prior to the June 18 to 19 sampling in the
307 county containing WWTP A, there was an average of 65.1 (95% CI: 50.5 – 79.8) daily new
308 cases of COVID-19 and a 12.8% positivity rate (95% CI: 11.0 – 14.6). Prior to the December 2
309 sampling event in the same county daily new cases of COVID-19 averaged 242 (95% CI: 199 –
310 285) and daily positivity was 24.3% (95% CI: 20.4 – 28.2). In the county containing WWTP B
311 from 25 April to 8 May an average of 16.4 (95% CI: 11.2 – 21.7) daily new cases and 7.0%
312 positivity (95% CI: 5.42 – 8.51) were observed, and from 19 November to 2 December an
313 average of 278 (95% CI: 180 – 376) daily new cases and 16.8% positivity (95% CI: 14.3 – 19.3)
314 were recorded. The clinical COVID-19 trends in each county are illustrated in Figures S9 and
315 S10. Statistically significant differences were inconsistent between adjacent pairs along the
316 COVID-19 case and positivity gradient. The average daily COVID-19 cases and positivity were
317 not statistically different between WWTP A and WWTP B during the May/June sampling ($p =$
318 0.1762 , $p = 0.0987$, respectively), nor during the December sampling ($p > 0.9999$, $p = 0.1761$,
319 respectively). However, average COVID-19 cases were significantly less at WWTP A in June
320 than in December ($p = 0.0038$). There was not a significant difference in the positivity rate
321 between WWTP A and WWTP B in December ($p = 0.4868$). These data indicate that although
322 there was a gradient in average daily COVID-19 cases and positivity between sampling events,
323 there was not a difference in the COVID-19 clinical status within the counties containing WWTP
324 A and WWTP B in the two weeks prior to sampling in May/June and in the two weeks prior to

325 sampling in December. There was, however, a significant increase in COVID-19 cases, but not
326 positivity, between May/June and December in both counties indicating that clinical surveillance
327 systems were testing a larger number of residents by December.

328 *Within-Day Variation in Primary Influent*

329 During both 24-hour sampling intervals at WWTP A (Figure S11), hourly flow rates peaked from
330 roughly 9:00 to midnight. At WWTP B, elevated hourly flows occurred from roughly mid-day
331 (11:00–13:00) to midnight. Flow rates were not different between sampling days for either
332 WWTP ($p > 0.9999$). Summary statistics for each parameter measured during the 24-hour
333 sampling events are listed in Table S2. At both WWTP A and B, higher PMMoV concentrations
334 primarily corresponded with periods of increased influent flow rate as illustrated in panels C & D
335 of Figures S11 and S12. PMMoV concentrations in primary influent at WWTP A were
336 comparable between sampling events ($p > 0.9999$), while PMMoV concentrations were greater
337 during the May than December sampling in primary influent at WWTP B ($p < 0.0001$). For two of
338 the four sampling days across both WWTPs, the daily time-based composites yielded lower
339 PMMoV concentrations than the average of the grab samples. The recovery of the process
340 control from primary influent at WWTP A was higher during periods of lower flow and PMMoV
341 concentration (Figure S11 A & B), but there was no difference in recovery between the two
342 sampling events at WWTP A ($p = 0.5610$). There was also no difference in BRSV recovery
343 between sampling events at WWTP B ($p = 0.4436$) (Figure S12 A & B). However, during the
344 May sampling event higher recoveries were observed during periods of both high and low flow.
345 During the December sampling at WWTP B, BRSV recovery followed a pattern more similar to
346 that observed at WWTP A with highest recoveries during periods of lower flow and PMMoV
347 concentration.

348 As shown in Figure 1 A & B, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in every primary influent grab
349 sample and composite sample during both sampling events at WWTP A. The highest SARS-

350 CoV-2 RNA concentrations were observed during overnight low-flow periods and in the
351 morning. After recovery correction of SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations, periods of increased
352 SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in the primary influent of WWTP A better aligned with
353 increased PMMoV concentrations. During the May sampling event at WWTP B, SARS-CoV-2
354 RNA was only detected in 6 of 12 primary influent grab samples, Figure 1 C, at concentrations
355 below the 95% LOD. These detections all occurred from 7:00 to 21:00 with no detections
356 overnight. During the December sampling at WWTP B (Figure 1 D), SARS-CoV-2 RNA was
357 detected in all grab samples and the daily composite sample and the highest concentrations
358 were observed in the morning and mid-day hours (7:00 – 15:00). Recovery adjustment of
359 SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in WWTP B primary influent accentuated the existing high
360 concentrations during periods with high PMMoV, but did not reshape temporal trends as
361 dramatically as the recovery adjustment at WWTP A. For all sampling days, daily time-based
362 composite samples yielded lower SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations than the average of the
363 grab samples. Process recovery efficiencies were generally lower for composite samples
364 (0.12%, 0.17%, 0.20%, 1.25%) than for the corresponding daily average recovery among grab
365 samples (Table S2). Even with recovery adjustment, composite samples still yielded lower
366 SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations than the 24-hour average from grab samples. SARS-CoV-2
367 RNA trends in primary influent were also assessed using the product of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA
368 concentration and the hourly flow rate, termed the SARS-CoV-2 RNA load in primary influent. At
369 both WWTPs, changes in the SARS-CoV-2 RNA within-day trends mediated by flow rate were
370 not as large as the changes mediated by recovery adjustment (Figure S13 A & B, Figure S14 A
371 & B). The ratio of SARS-CoV-2 RNA to PMMoV RNA in \log_{10} copy number per liter in primary
372 influent at WWTP A (Figure S13 C & D) and WWTP B (Figure S14 C & D) showed similar
373 within-day trends to the unadjusted SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration.

374 Across all sampling periods at both WWTPs, the lowest variance was observed in the influent
375 flow rates (CV: 7.97% - 17.1%). The greatest variance was observed for the process control
376 recovery efficiencies (CV: 50.9% - 206%). The large variation in recovery efficiency observed
377 during 24-hour sampling periods draws further attention to the importance the consistent use of
378 process controls in wastewater surveillance despite their limitations⁴⁵. Following the suggestion
379 of Kantor *et al.*, both the directly observed concentration data and recovery efficiency are
380 reported herein along with the recovery-corrected data. The recovery adjusted SARS-CoV-2
381 RNA data better reflected increased SARS-CoV-2 concentration during periods of increased
382 influent flow and fecal-indicator virus concentration. The sporadic use of process or molecular
383 controls observed in the WBE literature greatly limits the ability to compare SARS-CoV-2 RNA
384 measurements within and between WWTPs⁵⁶. The observations in this study reinforce that
385 consistent assessment of process recovery efficiency via appropriate controls is a vital
386 component of wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 RNA.

387 In primary influent PMMoV RNA concentrations exhibited greater mean concentration (6.6 – 7.1
388 log₁₀ CN/L) and lower variance (CV: 34.9 – 67.5%) than SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations
389 (mean: 3.1 log₁₀ – 3.8 log₁₀ CN/L; CV: 70 – 100%). Increased mean concentration and lower
390 variance in primary influent, consistent with other observations of primary influent^{57,58}, is
391 expected given the likely greater prevalence of PMMoV RNA shedding²³ compared to SARS-
392 CoV-2 RNA shedding among the sewershed population. Similar trends between PMMoV and
393 human adenovirus DNA were observed during 24-hour sampling of primary influent from
394 WWTPs in Australia⁵⁹. Unlike the studies in Nevada²⁸ and Virginia⁶⁰, PMMoV RNA and SARS-
395 CoV-2 RNA concentrations in 24-hour time-based composite samples were frequently lower
396 than the grab sample derived average. The process control recoveries were also generally
397 lower for the composite samples. Interpreted together, the low SARS-CoV-2 RNA
398 concentrations using time-based composites in the current study combined with the similar and

399 higher concentrations using flow-weighted composites in the previous studies strongly suggest
400 diurnal variation in SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in primary influent. Recovery adjustment
401 increased the variation in SARS-CoV-2 concentrations more greatly than flow adjustment (CV:
402 16.3 – 104% compared to 11 – 76%, respectively). Normalization of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
403 concentrations using PMMoV, as has been done for both primary influent¹⁸ and primary
404 solids^{8,61}, greatly reduced the observed variation (CV: 4 – 13%). For comparing to clinical
405 surveillance data, variations in recovery efficiency likely represent a significant covariant⁶², but
406 normalization by PMMoV may greatly reduce the variability of the genetic signal in wastewater.

407 *WWTP Influent SARS-CoV-2 RNA and Clinical Surveillance*

408 Due to the agreement between BRSV and SARS-CoV-2 RNA recovery, the effect of recovery-
409 correction on within-day trends, and the large variance associated with recovery efficiency,
410 recovery-corrected SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in primary influent were compared to
411 county-level COVID-19 cases and positivity rates during the two weeks prior to each 24-hour
412 sampling period. SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations (Figure 2A) did not consistently increase
413 with increasing average daily COVID-19 cases. The observed non-linear trend was also
414 observed between PMMoV-normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations (Figure 2C). For
415 average daily COVID-19 positivity (Figure 2B) there was ordinal agreement between positivity
416 and mean SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in primary influent. However, after accounting for
417 within-day variation in SARS-CoV-2 concentrations and recovery, the statistical differences
418 between SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations and COVID-19 positivity were only consistent for
419 two of three increases. As shown in Figure 2D, a similar trend was observed between the
420 ordinal agreement of PMMoV-normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations and COVID-19
421 positivity. Trends between unadjusted SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations and clinical
422 surveillance data, which do not demonstrate improved agreement, are shown in Figure S15.

423 Both recovery-corrected SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations and PMMoV-normalized SARS-
424 CoV-2 RNA concentrations in primary influent demonstrated non-linear trends with county-level
425 average daily COVID-19 cases. However, county-level COVID-19 positivity showed ordinal
426 agreement with both SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration (both corrected and uncorrected for
427 recovery) and PMMoV-normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration in primary influent. Given
428 that each of the WWTPs in the current study are located in counties with large peri-urban and
429 rural areas and large portions of the population living outside the sewershed or connected to on-
430 site septic systems, it is reasonable that positivity in COVID-19 testing better reflects primary
431 influent concentrations than total new COVID-19 cases for the county. Positivity at the county-
432 level is more likely to represent the clinical trends within the sewershed since it accounts for the
433 number of cases, the number of tests administered, and presence of unidentified infections.
434 Correlations have been demonstrated between COVID-19 cases within sewershed boundaries
435 and SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater^{17,18}, primary solids^{7,8}, and between PMMoV-normalized
436 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in primary solids²⁶. SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in wastewater have
437 also been found to correlate with positivity¹⁹. The results of the current study indicate that when
438 sub-county level COVID-19 clinical surveillance data are not available, positivity may offer a
439 better metric for comparison with wastewater data.

440 Despite the ordinal agreement between positivity and the average concentrations in the primary
441 influent, differences in the primary influent concentrations during each of these periods were
442 often not meaningfully different after accounting for variation in concentration and recovery. A
443 Bayesian modeling experiment indicated that variation in recovery efficiency is a key constraint
444 in using wastewater data to estimate prevalence⁶². These observations indicate that quantitative
445 relationships between wastewater data and SARS-CoV-2 infection prevalence, particularly
446 those premised on material balance, are likely to remain constrained by variability and
447 uncertainty²¹.

448 There are several limitations for the current study. The work included only two WWTPs in
449 northern Indiana, USA sampled over two 24-hour periods each. These WWTPs are located in
450 counties that include large rural and peri-urban areas with many residents connected to septic
451 systems and may not be generalized to all sewersheds particularly urban ones. The four 24-
452 hour sampling periods spanned weekday periods from Tuesday to Wednesday and Thursday to
453 Friday and do not include weekend periods. The sewershed served by WWTP A, where large
454 variations in process recovery were observed, includes large manufacturing and industrial areas
455 characterized by 24-hour shift work. Additionally, flow patterns during all the sampling events
456 were likely affected by changes in human behavior patterns associated with lockdowns and
457 interrupted domestic and working routines. The concentration method utilized to detect and
458 quantify RNA present at low levels was characterized by low and variable recovery in the course
459 of the study. This injects additional variation and uncertainty into the trends that were observed.
460 Even so, recovery-corrected SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations reflected within-day trends in
461 influent flow rate and fecal-indicator virus concentrations. Both recovery-corrected and PMMoV-
462 normalized SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in primary influent demonstrated increases that were
463 consistent with ordinal increases in COVID-19 positivity prior to each of the 24-hour sampling
464 periods. These findings indicate the genetic signal in primary influent from two WWTPs, both in
465 rural and peri-urban counties, reflects increasing COVID-19 positivity. In such communities,
466 where clinical surveillance capacity might be limited, WBE shows potential for monitoring SARS-
467 CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 trends.

468 **AUTHOR'S STATEMENT**

469 The authors declare no competing financial interest.

470 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

471 This study was funded by United States National Science Foundation under grant 2027752.
472 This study would not be possible without the gracious support of our municipal utility partners
473 who collected the primary influent samples used in this study and provided access to their
474 facilities.

475

476 **REFERENCES**

- 477 (1) Lee, S.; Kim, T.; Lee, E.; Lee, C.; Kim, H.; Rhee, H.; Park, S. Y.; Son, H.-J.; Yu, S.; Park,
478 J. W.; ... Kim, T. H. Clinical Course and Molecular Viral Shedding Among Asymptomatic
479 and Symptomatic Patients With SARS-CoV-2 Infection in a Community Treatment Center
480 in the Republic of Korea. *JAMA Intern. Med.* **2020**, *180* (11), 1447.
481 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3862>.
- 482 (2) Wölfel, R.; Corman, V. M.; Guggemos, W.; Seilmaier, M.; Müller, M. A.; Niemeyer, D.;
483 Kelly, T. C. J.; Vollmar, P.; Hoelscher, M.; Bleicker, T.; ... Bleicker, T. Virological
484 Assessment of Hospitalized Cases of Coronavirus Disease 2019. *medRxiv* **2020**.
- 485 (3) He, X.; Lau, E. H. Y.; Wu, P.; Deng, X.; Wang, J.; Hao, X.; Lau, Y. C.; Wong, J. Y.; Guan,
486 Y.; Tan, X.; ... Leung, G. M. Temporal Dynamics in Viral Shedding and Transmissibility of
487 COVID-19. *Nat. Med.* **2020**, *26* (5), 672–675. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5>.
- 488 (4) Li, W.; Su, Y.-Y.; Zhi, S.-S.; Huang, J.; Zhuang, C.-L.; Bai, W.-Z.; Wan, Y.; Meng, X.-R.;
489 Zhang, L.; Zhou, Y.-B.; ... Ma, Y. Virus Shedding Dynamics in Asymptomatic and Mildly
490 Symptomatic Patients Infected with SARS-CoV-2. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **2020**, *26* (11),
491 1556.e1-1556.e6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.07.008>.
- 492 (5) Bivins, A.; North, D.; Ahmad, A.; Ahmed, W.; Alm, E.; Been, F.; Bhattacharya, P.; Bijlsma,
493 L.; Boehm, A. B.; Brown, J.; ... Bibby, K. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology: Global
494 Collaborative to Maximize Contributions in the Fight against COVID-19. *Environ. Sci.*
495 *Technol.* **2020**, No. Figure 1. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c02388>.
- 496 (6) Medema, G.; Heijnen, L.; Elsinga, G.; Italiaander, R.; Brouwer, A. Presence of SARS-
497 Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in

- 498 the Early Stage of the Epidemic in the Netherlands. **2020**.
499 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357>.
- 500 (7) Peccia, J.; Zulli, A.; Brackney, D. E.; Grubaugh, N. D.; Edward, H.; Casanovas-massana,
501 A.; Ko, A. I.; Malik, A. A.; Wang, D. SARS-CoV-2 RNA Concentrations in Primary
502 Municipal Sewage Sludge as a Leading Indicator of COVID-19 Outbreak Dynamics.
503 **2020**, *1* (203).
- 504 (8) Graham, K. E.; Loeb, S. K.; Wolfe, M. K.; Catoe, D.; Sinnott-Armstrong, N.; Kim, S.;
505 Yamahara, K. M.; Sassoubre, L. M.; Mendoza Grijalva, L. M.; Roldan-Hernandez, L.; ...
506 Boehm, A. B. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with COVID-
507 19 Cases in a Large Urban Sewershed. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**, *55* (1), 488–498.
508 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c06191>.
- 509 (9) Gonzalez, R.; Curtis, K.; Bivins, A.; Bibby, K.; Weir, M. H.; Yetka, K.; Thompson, H.;
510 Keeling, D.; Mitchell, J.; Gonzalez, D. COVID-19 Surveillance in Southeastern Virginia
511 Using Wastewater-Based Epidemiology. *Water Res.* **2020**, *186*, 116296.
512 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116296>.
- 513 (10) Hemalatha, M.; Kiran, U.; Kuncha, S. K.; Kopperi, H.; Gokulan, C. G.; Mohan, S. V.;
514 Mishra, R. K. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 Spread Using Wastewater-Based
515 Epidemiology: Comprehensive Study. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *768*, 144704.
516 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144704>.
- 517 (11) Hata, A.; Hara-Yamamura, H.; Meuchi, Y.; Imai, S.; Honda, R. Detection of SARS-CoV-2
518 in Wastewater in Japan during a COVID-19 Outbreak. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *758*,
519 143578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143578>.
- 520 (12) Randazzo, W.; Truchado, P.; Cuevas-Ferrando, E.; Simón, P.; Allende, A.; Sánchez, G.
521 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Anticipated COVID-19 Occurrence in a Low

- 522 Prevalence Area. *Water Res.* **2020**, *181*, 115942.
523 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.115942>.
- 524 (13) *Emerging Issues in the Water Environment during Anthropocene: A South Asian*
525 *Perspective*; Kumar, M., Snow, D. D., Honda, R., Eds.; Springer: Singapore, 2020.
526 <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9771-5>.
- 527 (14) Kumar, M.; Patel, A. K.; Shah, A. V.; Raval, J.; Rajpara, N.; Joshi, M.; Joshi, C. G. First
528 Proof of the Capability of Wastewater Surveillance for COVID-19 in India through
529 Detection of Genetic Material of SARS-CoV-2. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *746*, 141326.
530 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141326>.
- 531 (15) La Rosa, G.; Iaconelli, M.; Mancini, P.; Bonanno Ferraro, G.; Veneri, C.; Bonadonna, L.;
532 Lucentini, L.; Suffredini, E. First Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Untreated Wastewaters in
533 Italy. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *736*, 139652.
534 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139652>.
- 535 (16) Nemudryi, A.; Nemudraia, A.; Wiegand, T.; Surya, K.; Buyukyoruk, M.; Cicha, C.;
536 Vanderwood, K. K.; Wilkinson, R.; Wiedenheft, B. Temporal Detection and Phylogenetic
537 Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Wastewater. *Cell Reports Med.* **2020**, *1* (6),
538 100098. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xcrm.2020.100098>.
- 539 (17) Weidhaas, J.; Aanderud, Z. T.; Roper, D. K.; VanDerslice, J.; Gaddis, E. B.; Ostermiller,
540 J.; Hoffman, K.; Jamal, R.; Heck, P.; Zhang, Y.; ... LaCross, N. Correlation of SARS-CoV-
541 2 RNA in Wastewater with COVID-19 Disease Burden in Sewersheds. *Sci. Total Environ.*
542 **2021**, *775*, 145790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145790>.
- 543 (18) Feng, S.; Roguet, A.; McClary-Gutierrez, J. S.; Newton, R. J.; Kloczko, N.; Meiman, J. G.;
544 McLellan, S. L. Evaluation of Sampling Frequency and Normalization of SARS-CoV-2
545 Wastewater Concentrations for Capturing COVID-19 Burdens in the Community.

- 546 *medRxiv* **2021**, preprint. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251867v2>.
- 547 (19) Stadler, L. B.; Ensor, K. B.; Clark, J. R.; Kalvapalle, P.; LaTurner, Z. W.; Mojica, L.;
548 Terwilliger, A.; Zhuo, Y.; Ali, P.; Avadhanula, V.; ... Hopkins, L. Wastewater Analysis of
549 SARS-CoV-2 as a Predictive Metric of Positivity Rate for a Major Metropolis. *medRxiv*
550 **2020**, preprint. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.04.20226191v1>.
- 551 (20) Wu, F.; Zhang, J.; Xiao, A.; Gu, X.; Lee, W. L.; Armas, F.; Kauffman, K.; Hanage, W.;
552 Matus, M.; Ghaeli, N.; ... Alm, E. J. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than
553 Expected from Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems* **2020**, 5 (4).
554 <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00614-20>.
- 555 (21) Ahmed, W.; Angel, N.; Edson, J.; Bibby, K.; Bivins, A.; O'Brien, J. W.; Choi, P. M.;
556 Kitajima, M.; Simpson, S. L.; Li, J.; ... Mueller, J. F. First Confirmed Detection of SARS-
557 CoV-2 in Untreated Wastewater in Australia: A Proof of Concept for the Wastewater
558 Surveillance of COVID-19 in the Community. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 138764.
559 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764>.
- 560 (22) Bivins, A.; Crank, K.; Greaves, J.; North, D.; Wu, Z.; Bibby, K. CrAssphage and Pepper
561 Mild Mottle Virus as Viral Water Quality Monitoring Tools – Potential, Research Gaps,
562 and Way Forward. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sci. Heal.* **2020**.
563 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.02.001>.
- 564 (23) Zhang, T.; Breitbart, M.; Lee, W. H.; Run, J. Q.; Wei, C. L.; Soh, S. W. L.; Hibberd, M. L.;
565 Liu, E. T.; Rohwer, F.; Ruan, Y. RNA Viral Community in Human Feces: Prevalence of
566 Plant Pathogenic Viruses. *PLoS Biol.* **2006**, 4 (1), 0108–0118.
567 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0040003>.
- 568 (24) Rosario, K.; Symonds, E. M.; Sinigalliano, C.; Stewart, J.; Breitbart, M. Pepper Mild
569 Mottle Virus as an Indicator of Fecal Pollution. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2009**, 75 (22),

- 570 7261–7267. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00410-09>.
- 571 (25) Symonds, E. M.; Rosario, K.; Breitbart, M. Pepper Mild Mottle Virus: Agricultural Menace
572 Turned Effective Tool for Microbial Water Quality Monitoring and Assessing
573 (Waste)Water Treatment Technologies. *PLoS Pathog.* **2019**, *15* (4), e1007639.
574 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1007639>.
- 575 (26) D’Aoust, P. M.; Mercier, E.; Montpetit, D.; Jia, J.-J.; Alexandrov, I.; Neault, N.; Baig, A. T.;
576 Mayne, J.; Zhang, X.; Alain, T.; ... Delatolla, R. Quantitative Analysis of SARS-CoV-2
577 RNA from Wastewater Solids in Communities with Low COVID-19 Incidence and
578 Prevalence. *Water Res.* **2021**, *188*, 116560.
579 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116560>.
- 580 (27) Curtis, K.; Keeling, D.; Yetka, K.; Larson, A.; Gonzalez, R. Wastewater SARS-CoV-2
581 Concentration and Loading Variability from Grab and 24-Hour Composite Samples.
582 *medRxiv* **2020**, preprint. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.10.20150607v1>.
- 583 (28) Gerrity, D.; Papp, K.; Stoker, M.; Sims, A.; Frehner, W. Early-Pandemic Wastewater
584 Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Nevada: Methodology, Occurrence, and
585 Incidence/Prevalence Considerations. *Water Res. X* **2021**, *10*, 100086.
586 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wroa.2020.100086>.
- 587 (29) Ahmed, W.; Harwood, V. J.; Gyawali, P.; Sidhu, J. P. S.; Toze, S. Comparison of
588 Concentration Methods for Quantitative Detection of Sewage-Associated Viral Markers in
589 Environmental Waters. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2015**, *81* (6), 2042–2049.
590 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.03851-14>.
- 591 (30) Valarcher, J.-F.; Taylor, G. Bovine Respiratory Syncytial Virus Infection. *Vet. Res.* **2007**,
592 *38* (2), 153–180. <https://doi.org/10.1051/vetres:2006053>.

- 593 (31) Cashdollar, J. L.; Brinkman, N. E.; Griffin, S. M.; McMinn, B. R.; Rhodes, E. R.;
- 594 Varughese, E. A.; Grimm, A. C.; Parshionikar, S. U.; Wymer, L.; Fout, G. S. Development
- 595 and Evaluation of EPA Method 1615 for Detection of Enterovirus and Norovirus in Water.
- 596 *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2013**, *79* (1), 215–223. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02270-12>.
- 597 (32) Lu, X.; Wang, L.; Sakthivel, S. K.; Whitaker, B.; Murray, J.; Kamili, S.; Lynch, B.; Malapati,
- 598 L.; Burke, S. A.; Harcourt, J.; ... Lindstrom, S. US CDC Real-Time Reverse Transcription
- 599 PCR Panel for Detection of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *Emerg.*
- 600 *Infect. Dis.* **2020**, *26* (8), 1654–1665. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2608.201246>.
- 601 (33) Haramoto, E.; Kitajima, M.; Kishida, N.; Konno, Y.; Katayama, H.; Asami, M.; Akiba, M.
- 602 Occurrence of Pepper Mild Mottle Virus in Drinking Water Sources in Japan. *Appl.*
- 603 *Environ. Microbiol.* **2013**, *79* (23), 7413–7418. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02354-13>.
- 604 (34) Boxus, M.; Letellier, C.; Kerkhofs, P. Real Time RT-PCR for the Detection and
- 605 Quantitation of Bovine Respiratory Syncytial Virus. *J. Virol. Methods* **2005**, *125* (2), 125–
- 606 130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2005.01.008>.
- 607 (35) Bivins, A.; Lowry, S.; Murphy, H. M.; Borchardt, M.; Coyte, R.; Labhasetwar, P.; Brown, J.
- 608 Waterborne Pathogen Monitoring in Jaipur, India Reveals Potential Microbial Risks of
- 609 Urban Groundwater Supply. *npj Clean Water* **2020**, *3* (1), 35.
- 610 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41545-020-00081-3>.
- 611 (36) Dunn, O. J. Multiple Comparisons Using Rank Sums. *Technometrics* **1964**, *6* (3), 241–
- 612 252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00401706.1964.10490181>.
- 613 (37) Kruskal, W. H.; Wallis, W. A. Use of Ranks in One-Criterion Variance Analysis. *J. Am.*
- 614 *Stat. Assoc.* **1952**, *47* (260), 583–621. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1952.10483441>.
- 615 (38) Mann, H. B.; Whitney, D. R. On a Test of Whether One of Two Random Variables Is

- 616 Stochastically Larger than the Other. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **1947**, 18 (1), 50–60.
617 <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177730491>.
- 618 (39) Sherchan, S. P.; Shahin, S.; Ward, L. M.; Tandukar, S.; Aw, T. G.; Schmitz, B.; Ahmed,
619 W.; Kitajima, M. First Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater in North America: A
620 Study in Louisiana, USA. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 743, 140621.
621 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140621>.
- 622 (40) Ahmed, W.; Bertsch, P. M.; Bivins, A.; Bibby, K.; Farkas, K.; Gathercole, A.; Haramoto,
623 E.; Gyawali, P.; Korajkic, A.; McMinn, B. R.; ... Kitajima, M. Comparison of Virus
624 Concentration Methods for the RT-QPCR-Based Recovery of Murine Hepatitis Virus, a
625 Surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 from Untreated Wastewater. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 739
626 (June), 139960. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139960>.
- 627 (41) Farkas, K.; Hillary, L. S.; Thorpe, J.; Walker, D. I.; Lowther, J. A.; McDonald, J. E.;
628 Malham, S. K.; Jones, D. L. Concentration and Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
629 Wastewater Using Polyethylene Glycol-Based Concentration and QRT-PCR. *Methods*
630 *Protoc.* **2021**, 4 (1), 17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/mps4010017>.
- 631 (42) Pecson, B. M.; Darby, E.; Haas, C. N.; Amha, Y. M.; Bartolo, M.; Danielson, R.;
632 Dearborn, Y.; Di Giovanni, G.; Ferguson, C.; Fevig, S.; ... SARS-CoV-2 Interlaboratory
633 Consortium. Reproducibility and Sensitivity of 36 Methods to Quantify the SARS-CoV-2
634 Genetic Signal in Raw Wastewater: Findings from an Interlaboratory Methods Evaluation
635 in the U.S. *Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol.* **2021**.
636 <https://doi.org/10.1039/D0EW00946F>.
- 637 (43) Chik, A. H. S.; Glier, M. B.; Servos, M.; Mangat, C. S.; Pang, X.-L.; Qiu, Y.; D'Aoust, P.
638 M.; Burnet, J.-B.; Delatolla, R.; Dorner, S.; ... Hruday, S. E. Comparison of Approaches to
639 Quantify SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater Using RT-QPCR: Results and Implications from a

- 640 Collaborative Inter-Laboratory Study in Canada. *J. Environ. Sci.* **2021**, *107*, 218–229.
641 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jes.2021.01.029>.
- 642 (44) Karthikeyan, S.; Ronquillo, N.; Belda-Ferre, P.; Alvarado, D.; Javidi, T.; Longhurst, C. A.;
643 Knight, R. High-Throughput Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Detection Enables Forecasting of
644 Community Infection Dynamics in San Diego County. *mSystems* **2021**, *6* (2).
645 <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00045-21>.
- 646 (45) Kantor, R. S.; Nelson, K. L.; Greenwald, H. D.; Kennedy, L. C. Challenges in Measuring
647 the Recovery of SARS-CoV-2 from Wastewater. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**,
648 *acs.est.0c08210*. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c08210>.
- 649 (46) Ye, Y.; Ellenberg, R. M.; Graham, K. E.; Wigginton, K. R. Survivability, Partitioning, and
650 Recovery of Enveloped Viruses in Untreated Municipal Wastewater. *Environ. Sci.*
651 *Technol.* **2016**, *50* (10), 5077–5085. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b00876>.
- 652 (47) Balboa, S.; Mauricio-Iglesias, M.; Rodriguez, S.; Martínez-Lamas, L.; Vasallo, F. J.;
653 Regueiro, B.; Lema, J. M. The Fate of SARS-COV-2 in WWTPS Points out the Sludge
654 Line as a Suitable Spot for Detection of COVID-19. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *772*,
655 *145268*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145268>.
- 656 (48) Wurtzer, S.; Waldman, P.; Ferrier-Rembert, A.; Frenois-Veyrat, G.; Mouchel, J. M.; Boni,
657 M.; Maday, Y.; OBEPINE Consortium; Marechal, V.; Moulin, L. Several Forms of SARS-
658 CoV-2 RNA Can Be Detected in Wastewaters: Implication for Wastewater-Based
659 Epidemiology and Risk Assessment. *medRxiv* **2020**, *preprint*.
660 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.19.20248508v1>.
- 661 (49) Liu, Y.-N.; Lv, Z.-T.; Yang, S.-Y.; Liu, X.-W. Optical Tracking of the Interfacial Dynamics
662 of Single SARS-CoV-2 Pseudoviruses. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**, *acs.est.0c06962*.
663 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c06962>.

- 664 (50) Petala, M.; Dafou, D.; Kostoglou, M.; Karapantsios, T.; Kanata, E.; Chatziefstathiou, A.;
665 Sakaveli, F.; Kotoulas, K.; Arsenakis, M.; Roilides, E.; ... Papaioannou, N. A
666 Physicochemical Model for Rationalizing SARS-CoV-2 Concentration in Sewage. Case
667 Study: The City of Thessaloniki in Greece. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *755*, 142855.
668 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142855>.
- 669 (51) Zachary W. LaTurner, David M. Zong, Prashant Kalvapalle, Kiara Reyes Gamas, Austen
670 Terwilliger, Tessa Crosby, Priyanka Ali, Vasanthi Avadhanula, Haroldo Hernandez
671 Santos, Kyle Weesner, Loren Hopkins, Pedro A. Piedra, Anthony W. Maresso, L. B. S.
672 Evaluating Recovery, Cost, and Throughput of Different Concentration Methods for
673 SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater-Based Epidemiology. *medRxiv* **2020**, *preprint*.
- 674 (52) Ahmed, W.; Bertsch, P. M.; Bibby, K.; Haramoto, E.; Hewitt, J.; Huygens, F.; Gyawali, P.;
675 Korajkic, A.; Riddell, S.; Sherchan, S. P.; ... Bivins, A. Decay of SARS-CoV-2 and
676 Surrogate Murine Hepatitis Virus RNA in Untreated Wastewater to Inform Application in
677 Wastewater-Based Epidemiology. *Environ. Res.* **2020**, *191*, 110092.
678 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110092>.
- 679 (53) Bivins, A.; Greaves, J.; Fischer, R.; Yinda, K. C.; Ahmed, W.; Kitajima, M.; Munster, V. J.;
680 Bibby, K. Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in Water and Wastewater. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*
681 *Lett.* **2020**, *acs.estlett.0c00730*. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00730>.
- 682 (54) Markt, R.; Mayr, M.; Peer, E.; Wagner, Andreas O., N. L.; Insam, H. Detection and
683 Stability of SARS-CoV-2 Fragments in Wastewater: Impact of Storage Temperature.
684 *medRxiv* **2021**, *preprint*.
- 685 (55) Monica Trujillo, Kristen Cheung, Anna Gao, Irene Hoxie, Sherin Kannoly, Nanami
686 Kubota, Kaung Myat San, D. S. S.; Dennehy, J. J. Protocol for Safe, Affordable, and
687 Reproducible Isolation and Quantitation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from Wastewater. *medRxiv*

- 688 **2021**, preprint. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.16.21251787v1>.
- 689 (56) Ahmed, W.; Bivins, A.; Bertsch, P. M.; Bibby, K.; Choi, P. M.; Farkas, K.; Gyawali, P.;
690 Hamilton, K. A.; Haramoto, E.; Kitajima, M.; ... Mueller, J. F. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2
691 RNA in Wastewater: Methods Optimisation and Quality Control Are Crucial for
692 Generating Reliable Public Health Information. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sci. Heal.* **2020**.
693 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.003>.
- 694 (57) Tandukar, S.; Sherchan, S. P.; Haramoto, E. Applicability of CrAssphage, Pepper Mild
695 Mottle Virus, and Tobacco Mosaic Virus as Indicators of Reduction of Enteric Viruses
696 during Wastewater Treatment. *Sci. Rep.* **2020**, *10* (1), 1–8.
697 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-60547-9>.
- 698 (58) Kitajima, M.; Iker, B. C.; Pepper, I. L.; Gerba, C. P. Relative Abundance and Treatment
699 Reduction of Viruses during Wastewater Treatment Processes - Identification of Potential
700 Viral Indicators. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2014**, *488–489* (1), 290–296.
701 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.04.087>.
- 702 (59) Ahmed, W.; Bivins, A.; Bertsch, P. M.; Bibby, K.; Gyawali, P.; Sherchan, S. P.; Simpson,
703 S. L.; Thomas, K. V.; Verhagen, R.; Kitajima, M.; ... Korajkic, A. Intraday Variability of
704 Indicator and Pathogenic Viruses in 1-h and 24-h Composite Wastewater Samples:
705 Implications for Wastewater-Based Epidemiology. *Environ. Res.* **2020**, 110531.
706 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110531>.
- 707 (60) Curtis, K.; Keeling, D.; Yetka, K.; Larson, A.; Gonzalez, R. Wastewater SARS-CoV-2
708 Concentration and Loading Variability from Grab and 24-Hour Composite Samples.
709 *medRxiv* **2020**, 2020.07.10.20150607. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.10.20150607>.
- 710 (61) D'Aoust, P. M.; Graber, T. E.; Mercier, E.; Montpetit, D.; Alexandrov, I.; Neault, N.; Baig,
711 A. T.; Mayne, J.; Zhang, X.; Alain, T.; ... Delatolla, R. Catching a Resurgence: Increase in

712 SARS-CoV-2 Viral RNA Identified in Wastewater 48 h before COVID-19 Clinical Tests

713 and 96 h before Hospitalizations. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *770*, 145319.


714 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145319>.

715 (62) Li, X.; Zhang, S.; Shi, J.; Luby, S. P.; Jiang, G. Uncertainties in Estimating SARS-CoV-2

716 Prevalence by Wastewater-Based Epidemiology. *Chem. Eng. J.* **2021**, *415*, 129039.

717 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2021.129039>.

718




719

720 Figure 1 | SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations, N1 copy number (CN) per liter, and recovery-
721 corrected concentrations as observed in grab samples and daily composite samples of primary
722 influent during four 24-hour sampling events at two WWTPs: June 18 to 19 at WWTP A (A),
723 December 2 at WWTP A (B), May 7 to 8 at WWTP B (C), and December 1 to 2 at WWTP B (D).

724

725



726

727 Figure 2 | Recovery corrected SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations, N1 copy number (CN) per
 728 liter, in primary influent stratified by increasing average daily COVID-19 cases (A) and average
 729 daily COVID-19 positivity (B) and PMMoV-normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations (\log_{10}

730 N1 CN per L/ \log_{10} CN per L) in primary influent by increasing average daily COVID-19 cases (C)
731 and average daily COVID-19 positivity (D). COVID-19 case and positivity averages and
732 confidence intervals are calculated for the two-week period prior to each 24-h sampling event.
733 Statistical comparisons between adjacent pairs were made using Kruskal-Wallis tests with
734 Dunn's correction.