

1 Deposited as pre-print on *medRxiv*

2
3
4 **Monitoring SARS-CoV-2 in sewage:**
5 **toward sentinels with analytical accuracy**

6
7 David Calderón-Franco^a, Laura Orschler^b, Susanne Lackner^b, Shelesh Agrawal^{b,§},

8 David G. Weissbrodt^{a,§,*}

9
10
11 ^aDepartment of Biotechnology, Delft University of Technology, van der Maasweg 9, 2629 HZ

12 Delft, The Netherlands

13 ^bTechnische Universität Darmstadt, Institute IWAR, Chair of Wastewater Engineering, 8


14 Franziska-Braun-Straße 7, 64287 Darmstadt, Germany

15 [§] Shared senior authorship

16
17
18 *Correspondence: David G. Weissbrodt (d.g.weissbrodt@tudelft.nl)

19 Graphical Abstract

20



21

22

23

Created with BioRender

24 **Abstract**

25

26 The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic has been one of
27 the most difficult challenges humankind has recently faced. Wastewater-based epidemiology has
28 emerged as a tool for surveillance and mitigation of potential viral outbreaks, circumventing biases
29 introduced by clinical patient testing. Due to the situation urgency, protocols followed for isolating
30 viral RNA from sewage were not adapted for such sample matrices. In parallel to their
31 implementation for fast collection of data to sustain surveillance and mitigation decisions,
32 molecular protocols need to be harmonized to deliver accurate, reproducible, and comparable
33 analytical outputs. Here we studied analytical variabilities linked to viral RNA isolation methods
34 from sewage. Three different influent wastewater volumes were used to assess the effect of filtered
35 volumes (50, 100 or 500 mL) for capturing viral particles. Three different concentration strategies
36 were tested by electronegative membranes, polyethersulfone membranes, and anion-exchange
37 diethylaminoethyl cellulose columns. To compare the number of viral particles, different RNA
38 isolation methods (column-based *vs.* magnetic beads) were compared. The effect of extra RNA
39 purification steps and different RT-qPCR strategies (one step *vs.* two-step) were also evaluated.
40 Results showed that the combination of 500 mL filtration volume through electronegative
41 membranes and without multiple RNA purification steps (using column-based RNA purification)
42 using two-step RT-qPCR avoided false negatives when basal viral load in sewage are present and
43 yielded more consistent results during the surveillance done during the second-wave in Delft (The
44 Hague area, The Netherlands). By paving the way for standardization of methods for the sampling,
45 concentration and molecular detection of SARS-CoV-2 viruses from sewage, these findings can
46 help water and health surveillance authorities to use and trust results coming from wastewater based
47 epidemiology studies in order to anticipate SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks.

48 **1. Introduction**

49

50 In December 2019, China reported the outbreak of a novel coronavirus named SARS-CoV-2 (genus
51 Betacoronavirus, family Coronaviridae), which has spread around the world fast and lethally. The
52 progression of this SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has been monitored primarily by clinically testing
53 symptomatic individuals for presence of viral RNA. However, as asymptomatic persons seem to
54 account for 40 - 45% of the infections (Ooi and Low, 2020), registering solely symptomatic cases
55 does not allow for prediction of the real cumulative incidence of the viral outbreak. In addition, the
56 number of detected cases highly depends on access to diagnostics as well as the threat of isolation
57 and quarantine dissuading people from getting tested. As SARS-CoV-2 RNA can be found in
58 patients' stool, samples of rectal swabs, urine and other bodily fluids, detection of the virus via
59 analysing wastewater has gained interest (Agrawal et al., 2021; Foladori et al., 2020; Kitajima et
60 al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020b; Randazzo et al., 2020a; Wu et al., 2020).

61

62 Wastewater-based epidemiology can serve as a tool to trace the circulation of a virus variant within
63 a community or municipality. It does not only protect the anonymity of community-members, but
64 it is also unbiased and focused on real-time information, becoming an early-warning system for
65 viral surveillance (Larsen and Wigginton, 2020). It can help make better-informed decisions in
66 public health policies. The urgency of the pandemics pressed the need for a rapid deployment of
67 available analytical methods to track the fate of the virus and its variants. This resulted in a large
68 palette of different protocols for every step. For instance, sampling volumes used vary from a
69 minimum of 2 mL (Rimoldi et al., 2020), to 45 - 60 mL (Hokajärvi et al., 2021; Westhaus et al.,
70 2021), to 100-200 mL (Medema et al., 2020b; Tanhaei et al., 2021), up to 1L (Agrawal et al., 2021);
71 concentration methods vary from precipitation, to centrifugation, ultrafiltration, conventional
72 filtration, filtration by negatively charged membranes, and a combination of these approaches
73 (Kitajima et al., 2020). There is a significant lack of quality controls, variable testing, and
74 methodology improvement that would be necessary to confidently provide analytical accuracy. The
75 global need for comparing virus levels across different communities underlines the need for a
76 standardized workflow (Kitajima et al., 2020). Fortunately, different groups across the world are
77 addressing this issue in order to overcome previous limitations. Protocol improvements have so far
78 been focused in testing different RNA extraction methods (Ambrosi et al., 2021) and on improving
79 the viral concentration steps (Parra Guardado et al., 2020). It has been previously mentioned that
80 one of the variables that should be checked is the filtered volume: low sample volume in
81 combination with low recovery yields could lead to false negative or lower measured SARS-CoV-
82 2 concentration (Alygizakis et al., 2021).


83

84 Here, we aimed to establish a method to quantify SARS-CoV-2 from influent wastewater. The
85 effects of filtration volumes of influent wastewater (50, 100 and 500 mL), different concentration
86 methods (polyethersulfone membranes, electronegative membranes and anion-exchange
87 chromatography), different RNA isolation methods (column based *vs.* magnetic beads), and
88 different RT-qPCR strategies (one-step *vs.* two-step) were assessed. A methodology designed from
89 the selected best parameter testing outputs was used to survey viral gene copies across the second
90 wave of the pandemic in the Delfland water catchment area (The Hague, The Netherlands) and
91 compare it to publicly available clinical data. We deliver an assessment of method variability and
92 biases introduced when basal viral loads are present and establish a methodology implementable
93 in wastewater-based epidemiology. This will support health and water authorities to anticipate,
94 monitor, and control future outbreaks.

95 2. Material and Methods

96

97 A summary of the methodology can be found in **Figure 1**. In brief, municipal wastewater was
98 collected to test the effect of 3 filtration volumes (50, 100, 500 mL) and 3 virus concentration
99 methods (polyethersulfone membrane, electronegative membrane, anion exchange column) on
100 molecular analyses of 3 genes (spike S, nucleocapsid N, ORF1ab) of SARS-CoV-2 by one-step
101 and two-step reverse transcription (RT) and quantitative PCR (qPCR) after isolation of viral RNA
102 using single (magnetic beads, columns) and multiple purification methods. The optimal method
103 parameters were then applied to monitor a time series over the second wave of the epidemics.



104


105

106 **Figure 1.** Schematic representation of the experimental design followed in this study. Viral genes (S, N and
107 ORF1ab) were quantified by RT-qPCR (one-step vs two-step RT-qPCR) after testing the effect of the filtration
108 volume and different concentration methods. Created with BioRender.

109 2.1. Sampling of influent water from WWTP

110 Influent wastewater was collected before primary treatment from WWTP Harnaspolder (Delft,
111 The Netherlands). Volumes of 5 L from 24-h flow-proportional composite samples were collected
112 per time point. Samples were obtained every 3 weeks over 6 months from July 7 to December 1,
113 2020 covering the end of the first wave and the whole second wave of COVID-19 in The

114 Netherlands (**Figure 2**). The 24-composite sample from July 7 2020 was used for method
115 development. All samples were processed in a timeframe of less than 1 day after collection.
116



117
118 **Figure 2.** Graphical representation of the number of positive cases of COVID-19 cases in The Hague area (black
119 line) and the dates where samples were taken (blue dots) (Data source = Coronadashboard-RIVM
120 <https://coronadashboard.rijksoverheid.nl>).

121 2.2. Deactivation of SARS-CoV-2

122 Influent wastewater samples were heated at 65°C for 30 minutes to deactivate and handle the
123 sewage sample under biosafety conditions (Batéjat et al., 2021; Rabenau et al., 2005).

124 2.3. Concentration of SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater

125 The effect of used influent wastewater volume and the concentration method was assessed for viral
126 genes quantification. A 24-h composite sample (July 7 2020) was used, representing the beginning
127 of the second wave (**Figure 2**). The goal was to identify the best concentration method when basal
128 viral levels were present in influent wastewater. A volume of 200 μL ($50 \text{ ng } \mu\text{L}^{-1}$) of an F-specific
129 RNA MS2 phage (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Germany) was spiked as internal standard in the
130 influent wastewater solution before the concentration methods. The group of F specific RNA
131 phages (f2 and MS2 are the best known members of this group) are considered the most attractive
132 subgroup of phages to serve as indicator organisms because their physical structure closely
133 resembles that of enteroviruses in wastewater (Havelaar et al., 1985).

134 **2.3.1. Effect of the volume of influent wastewater used**

135 Volumes of 50, 100 and 500 mL of influent wastewater were tested. All the analyses were
136 performed in three replicates.

137 **2.3.2. Effect of methods used to concentrate virus particles**

138 These influent wastewater volumes were filtered (membranes) or loaded (chromatographic
139 column) in three technical replicates with three different methodologies: (i) filtration on
140 polyethersulfone (PES) membrane of 0.22 µm pore size (Pall Corporation, USA); (ii) retention on
141 a 1-mL diethylaminoethyl cellulose (DEAE) anion-exchange chromatography (BIA separations,
142 Slovenia) which is used for phages separations (Kattur Venkatachalam et al., 2014; Kramberger et
143 al., 2010) and for isolations of free-floating extracellular DNA from water matrices (Calderón-
144 Franco et al., 2021); and (iii) attraction on electronegative membranes of 0.45 µm pore size (Merck
145 Millipore, The Netherlands). Prior to loading on the DEAE chromatography column, the influent
146 wastewater was filtered through the 0.22 µm PES to remove biosolids and particles, which is
147 necessary to protect the DEAE column. Loading and elution in chromatography is more time
148 consuming than direct filtration. However, chromatography is more selective and leads to higher
149 grades of purity of concentrated analytes. Thus, we also considered the DEAE method as a way to
150 identify the recovery of viral RNA when compared to the filtration methods.

151 **2.4. Effect of isolations and purifications of the RNA of SARS-CoV-2**

152 Extractions of raw viral RNA from membrane filters and DEAE column eluents were performed
153 by using two different commercial kits for RNA extraction. First, we used the MagMax CORE
154 Nucleic Acid Purification kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, The Netherlands), that employ magnetic
155 beads for nucleic acid purification, together with the MagMax CORE Mechanical Lysis Module
156 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, The Netherlands) by following manufacturer's recommendations.
157 Second, we used the Fast RNA Blue kit (MP Biomedicals), which is based on column-based
158 purification (solid phase extraction), according to the manufacturer's protocol. In addition, the
159 effect of multiple RNA purification steps before quantification of genes by RT-qPCR was assessed
160 by involving the GeneJET NGS Cleanup Kit (Thermo Scientific, USA) according to
161 manufacturer's instructions obtaining the purified RNA sample.

162

163 The quality and quantity of raw and purified RNA extracts were measured with a NanoDrop
164 Spectrophotometer (ND-1000,USA).

165

166 **2.5. Effect of one-step vs. two-step RT-qPCR on detection of basal RNA concentrations**

167 On the lowest basal viral load day from our sampling campaign (7th July 2020), we compared one-
168 step and two-step RT-qPCRs in order to assess the effect of quantification of viral RNA genes
169 when the incidence of cases is low. This was assessed to avoid potential false negatives. One-step
170 RT-qPCR was performed using the isolated RNA as a template (raw RNA), which included
171 specific primers for the target genes. Two-step RT-qPCR was performed by synthesizing
172 complementary DNA (cDNA) from the pool of raw RNA isolated per sample using the SuperScript
173 VILO cDNA synthesis kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, The Netherlands) following manufacturer's
174 recommendations, included random primers, prior to using the cDNA as a template for qPCR. The
175 concentration of the synthesized cDNA was measured with Qubit® dsDNA assays (Thermo Fisher
176 Scientific, USA).

177 **2.6. Detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by RT-qPCR**

178 We quantified the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater samples by measuring
179 marker genes using the TaqPath COVID-19 RT-PCR Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Germany)
180 with a QuantStudio 3 Thermal Cycler, according to a previous study (Agrawal et al., 2021). The
181 TaqPath COVID-19 RT-PCR Kit includes primer pairs targeting genes that code for the structural
182 transmembrane spike (S) glycoprotein and nucleocapsid (N) protein, and for the non-structural
183 open reading frame of the replicase complex (ORF1ab) and that were used in a multiplex assay
184 (**Table S1**). Details about the kit are provided in the Supplementary Information. Each qPCR run
185 was performed in technical triplicates in reaction volumes of 50 µL, with 12.5 µL TaqPath 1-Step
186 Multiplex Master Mix (4X), 2.5 µL COVID-19 Real Time PCR Assay Multiplex Diagnostic
187 Solution, and 25 µL nuclease free water. To the reaction mix, 10 µL of purified and extracted viral
188 RNA were added. Thermal profiles are provided in Supplementary Information (**Table S2**).
189 Reactions were considered positive if the cycle threshold (CT) was below 40 cycles, otherwise
190 negative (*i.e.*, no detection of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the sample). The lower limit of detection
191 was 10 gene copies per RT-qPCR reaction.

192 **2.7. Statistics**

193 Statistical analyses were performed on all molecular datasets with R 3.5.1 ([R Foundation for](https://www.r-project.org/)
194 [Statistical Computing., 2018](https://www.r-project.org/)) and RStudio (<https://www.rstudio.com/>). The RT-qPCR abundance
195 data were analyzed in R using ggplot2 (v0.9.3.1).

196 **3. Results and Discussion**

197 The effect of different initial influent wastewater volumes (50, 100 and 500 mL), different viral
198 concentration methods, different RNA purification methods, and different one-step/two-step RT-
199 qPCR methods were assessed on a basal viral level timepoint (July 7 2020), corresponding to the
200 beginning of the second wave (**Figure 2**) and to the lowest day in terms of cumulative incidence of
201 COVID-19 cases. This timepoint served as reference for method standardization as basal viral load
202 levels from influent wastewater samples. The selected methodology was further used for surveilling
203 SARS-CoV-2 gene copies over the second wave (July to December 2020).

204 **3.1. Electronegative membranes and larger volumes were optimal to quantify SARS-CoV-2** 205 **from sewage samples**

206 Among the three different methods tested to concentrate virus particles (electronegative
207 membranes, PES membranes, DEAE column), concentration by electronegative membranes of
208 0.44 μm pore size was the only one displaying positive results in terms of detection of S, N, ORF1ab
209 genes and MS2 phage control (**Figure 3**).

210

211 When PES membranes were used, SARS-CoV-2 was not detected from the cake, suggesting that
212 there was no retention to the membrane. However, internal control MS2 phage, which was added
213 prior to filtration, was detected in PES membrane. This difference may result from structural viral
214 conformations such as particle sizes of 100 nm (SARS-CoV-2) vs. 20 nm (MS2) or if virus is
215 enveloped (SARS-CoV-2) vs. non-enveloped (MS2), resulting in different bindings to the
216 membrane materials (Rockey et al., 2020).

217

218 The permeate of PES membranes was subsequently loaded on a DEAE chromatographic column
219 to verify if the SARS-CoV-2 virus particles could be adsorbed and isolated similar to phages
220 (Kattur Venkatachalam et al., 2014; Kramberger et al., 2010) and free-floating exDNA (Calderón-
221 Franco et al., 2021). However, the DEAE method did not result in concentrating SARS-CoV-2,
222 suggesting that neither the PES membrane, nor the DEAE column is suitable for SARS-CoV-2
223 concentration from wastewater.


224

225 SARS-CoV-2, among other viruses, has an isoelectric point ($pI = \frac{1}{2} (pK_{a1} + pK_{a2})$) below 7. The
226 pH of the influent wastewater pH ranged between 6.3 - 6.8. At pH values below the isoelectric
227 point, the charge of SARS-CoV-2 and MS2 phage could be positive, thus explaining why they did

228 not bind to the DEAE (positive net charge) column and did bind to the electronegative membranes
 229 (Joonaki et al., 2020).

230

231 When expressing the RT-qPCR results in concentrations of viral gene copies detected per L,
 232 filtering 500 mL influent water through electronegative membranes gave, in average, higher values
 233 of gene copies per L ($7.2 \cdot 10^4 \pm 1.7 \cdot 10^4$ viral gene copies L^{-1}) when compared to gene copies
 234 obtained from 50 mL ($7.4 \cdot 10^3 \pm 4.1 \cdot 10^3$ viral gene copies L^{-1}) or 100 mL ($3.0 \cdot 10^4 \pm 1.9 \cdot 10^4$ viral
 235 gene copies L^{-1}). In **Figure 3**, individual gene results were also more consistent when 500 mL were
 236 filtered (S gene: $5.6 \cdot 10^4 \pm 2.8 \cdot 10^4$ viral gene copies L^{-1} ; N gene: $6.0 \cdot 10^4 \pm 2.6 \cdot 10^3$ viral gene copies
 237 L^{-1} ; ORF1ab gene: $7.5 \cdot 10^4 \pm 2.4 \cdot 10^4$ viral gene copies L^{-1}) when compared to filtered 50 mL (S
 238 gene: $1.3 \cdot 10^4 \pm 1.0 \cdot 10^4$ viral gene copies L^{-1} ; N gene: $4.2 \cdot 10^3 \pm 2.3 \cdot 10^3$ viral gene copies L^{-1} ;
 239 ORF1ab gene: $6.9 \cdot 10^3 \pm 2.9 \cdot 10^3$ viral gene copies L^{-1}) and 100 mL (S gene: $5.2 \cdot 10^4 \pm 1.6 \cdot 10^4$ viral
 240 gene copies L^{-1} ; N gene: $9.7 \cdot 10^3 \pm 6.7 \cdot 10^3$ viral gene copies L^{-1} ; ORF1ab gene: $2.9 \cdot 10^4 \pm 4.7 \cdot 10^3$
 241 viral gene copies L^{-1}).




242 **Figure 3.** Concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in influent wastewater as determined by the N, ORF1ab, S and MS2 control
 243 gene assays in gene copies per liter, using different isolation methods (electronegative membranes filtration, polyethersulfone
 244 membrane (PES) filtration and diethylaminoethyl cellulose (DEAE) column) and different initial volumes (50, 100 and 500
 245 mL).
 246

247 Here we demonstrated that filtration of larger volumes (*i.e.*, 500 mL) in combination of
 248 electronegative membranes allowed, in the lowest day of COVID-19 incidence of the second wave,
 249 to adsorb and concentrate enough SARS-CoV-2 for highest and most consistent (uniform results
 250 among gene tested) detection and quantification by two-step RT-qPCR.
 251

252 3.2. Avoiding multiple RNA purification steps and performing two-step RT-qPCR resulted 253 in higher viral quantification

254 One of the major analytical concerns related to the wastewater-based epidemiology of SARS-CoV-
255 2 is the quality and purity of the isolated RNA, especially when low viral loads are present. This
256 can potentially compromise the accuracy of the results obtained through false negatives. The effect
257 of multiple RNA purification steps and one-step/two-step RT-qPCR strategies were assessed. The
258 best concentration method obtained during the first phase of this study (*i.e.*, 500 mL influent
259 wastewater filtered on electronegative membranes) was utilized.



260 **Figure 4.** Concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in influent wastewater as determined by the N, ORF1ab, S and MS2 control
261 gene assays in gene copies per 500 mL, using one-step (raw RNA and purified RNA) and two-step (cDNA-raw RNA and
262 cDNA-purified RNA) RT-qPCR.
263

264 In **Figure 4**, it can be observed that for the three genes tested (N, ORF1ab and S), the two-step RT-
265 qPCR performed from raw and purified RNA displayed, on average, higher values ($1.6 \cdot 10^5 \pm$
266 $1.0 \cdot 10^4$ viral gene copies 500 mL^{-1}) than one-step RT-qPCR (no positive results from tested genes).
267 No detection was obtained from one-step RT-qPCR both from raw RNA and purified RNA with
268 the exception of the control MS2 sample, whereas one-step RT-qPCR from purified RNA resulted
269 in the detection of $2.9 \cdot 10^7 \pm 4.2 \cdot 10^6$ MS2 gene copies 500 mL^{-1} . Raw RNA obtained with magnetic
270 beads contained high concentration of environmental inhibitors that made the binding between
271 RNA and beads difficult during the processing of large volumes of influent wastewater, hampering
272 the qPCR analysis (Graham et al., 2021; Kitajima et al., 2020; Schrader et al., 2012). This can affect
273 the sensitivity of the assay and result in false-negative results (Ahmed et al., 2020).
274

275

276 The three genes were consistently detected by two-step RT-qPCR from both raw RNA and purified
277 RNA. However, RNA purification induced higher variability on the average of all the tested genes
278 ($1.7 \cdot 10^5 \pm 1.1 \cdot 10^5$ gene copies in 500 mL, 65% relative standard deviation (RSD)) when compared
279 to the lower standard deviation obtained with two-step RT-qPCR ($1.5 \cdot 10^5 \pm 3.7 \cdot 10^4$ gene copies in
280 500 mL, 25% RSD). When individual genes were tested, the N gene exhibited the highest
281 variability (2-fold) between raw ($1.2 \cdot 10^5 \pm 8.0 \cdot 10^4$ gene copies in 500 mL) and purified ($7.3 \cdot 10^4 \pm$
282 $6.0 \cdot 10^4$ gene copies in 500 mL) RNA. Thus, multiple RNA purification stages before RT-qPCR are
283 not recommended: RNA from viral particles were lost during the purification process even if
284 detected with two-step RT-qPCR. The same trend was observed during the time course of the 6-
285 months sampling campaign, where two-step RT-qPCR measurements displayed higher and more
286 consistent results (*i.e.*, uniform values between the three tested genes) (**Figure S1**).

287

288 Our observation about how relevant it is to consider one-step *vs.* two-step RT-qPCR when viral
289 load in wastewater samples is very low is in consensus with a previous study (Chik et al., 2021).
290 This was of high importance as it was the day, from the sampling campaign, with the lowest viral
291 load. Chik et al. (2021) also emphasize that, when the viral load is highly concentrated, the effect
292 of one-step *vs.* two-step RT-qPCR is less relevant. However, assessing ways of quantifying RNA
293 while avoiding false negatives are needed to get accurate values to sustain decisions to mitigate
294 outbreaks. Chik et al. (2021) have performed collaborative inter-laboratory experiments where they
295 spiked low and high levels of surrogate SARS-CoV-2 virus. They have observed less variation
296 between laboratories when high-spike conditions were compared to the low-spike conditions. The
297 Ct value Chik et al. (2021) obtained from analysis of the surrogates in the low-spike samples was
298 not in the linear range of PCR amplification and approached the sensitivity limit. Therefore, it is
299 recommended to: (1) avoid multiple RNA purification steps for reducing loss of the RNA; (2) and
300 run a two-step RT-qPCR analysis, which allow enhancing the resolution. This is because cDNA is
301 firstly synthesized from total viral RNA using random primers followed by specific primers for
302 qPCR analysis, being able to detect low-levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies in sewage.

303 **3.3. Wastewater-based epidemiology as a tool to anticipate viral outbreaks**


304 The range of commercial options to isolate RNA and quantify SARS-CoV-2 viral particles is
305 diverse and complex. Two different RNA isolation methods were chosen to survey the number of
306 viral particles over the sampling campaign (**Figure 5**): one column-based microbial RNA
307 extraction kit (Fast RNA) and one magnetic beads-based kit (MagMax Core kit).

308

309 Comparative analysis between RNA extraction methods are displayed in **Figure 5**. Both methods
310 showed similar results in terms of gene copies per liter (no significant difference; $p > 0.05$) during
311 the whole sampling campaign with the exception of October 20, 2020 ($p < 0.05$), which happened
312 to be the peak of the second wave. The column-based method resulted in less variation between
313 replicates when compared to the magnetic beads method. Our results can be compared with the
314 results from a previous measuring campaign performed in The Hague (Medema et al., 2020a),
315 where results were reported as concentrations of N gene copies per mL on the first wave of the
316 pandemics from February 2020 until August 2020. The results of July and August were in the range
317 of 10^4 - 10^5 viral N gene copies L^{-1} . The concentrations obtained with our optimized methodology
318 are 10-fold higher (10^5 - 10^6 gene copies L^{-1}) taking into account the average of these three genes
319 (N, S and ORF1ab) than those obtained by Medema et al. (2020a). It allowed a more sensitive
320 quantification of viral gene copies at the beginning of the pandemic second-wave.

321
322 Early detection of SARS-CoV-2 and other future possible viral agents from wastewater requires
323 accurate and adapted-to-matrix methodologies. Thus, being able to quantify low viral levels with
324 non-clinical samples is an important factor to consider in wastewater-based epidemiology, as early
325 communication to the competent authorities is necessary to have enough reaction time to prevent
326 viral outbreaks in urban settlements.

327
328 The concentrations measured matched with the COVID19 incidences reported by the National
329 Institute for Public Health and Environment (RIVM, The Netherlands) and seemed to slightly
330 anticipate by 1-2 weeks the start of the second wave. The second peak started to increase in the
331 beginning of September 2020 while significant viral copies could already be quantified by August
332 18, 2020 ($1.73 \cdot 10^6$ viral gene copies L^{-1}). This is in accordance with Larsen and Wigginton (2020),
333 who have claimed that wastewater-based epidemiology remediates clinical biases that result from
334 low access to isolation diagnostics and quarantine threat dissuading citizens from getting tested. It
335 also helps understand the locations and dynamics of community transmissions, becoming a more
336 cost-effective and less invasive method. Randazzo et al. (2020b) have highlighted the importance
337 of wastewater-based epidemiology as an early indicator, revealing that members of the community
338 were shedding SARS-CoV-2 RNA particles in their stool even before the first cases had been
339 reported by the authorities in Murcia (Spain).



340
341 **Figure 5.** Concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in influent wastewater as determined by the average of N, ORF1ab and S
342 gene assays in gene copies per L using two RNA extraction methods: FastRNA and MagMax (Magnetic beads) over the whole
343 sampling campaign (July 2020 until December 2020) covering the second wave in The Netherlands.

344
345 Overall, a global effort is necessary to generate, harmonize, and use standardized analytical
346 protocols for an accurate, reproducible, and comparable detection and quantification of SARS-
347 CoV-2 (Bivins et al., 2020). On a wastewater-based epidemiology basis, crucial considerations are
348 needed from sampling to preparation and measurements in order to define (i) the sampling points,
349 (ii) the sample size and frequency, (iii) the method to efficiently concentrate viral particles, (iv) the
350 quantification methods used, (v) the primer set(s), (vi) the controls, and (vii) the normalization
351 methods. Some initiatives on protocol standardization have been taken such as the NORMAN-
352 SCORE joint initiative to facilitate data comparison between “SARS-CoV-2 in sewages” studies
353 (Lundy et al., 2021). Knowing the inherent biases associated with qPCR analysis of wastewater
354 samples due to the variability in the matrix of the samples (Agrawal et al., 2021; Chik et al., 2021)
355 and the urgency of time, we believe that it is currently important to focus on the robustness and
356 reproducibility of the qPCR method used in each respective lab, especially during low incidence
357 values. Analytical robustness should help translate risk in the form of viral concentrations per
358 volume filtered to react fast enough to minimize undesirable infective and spreading consequences.

359 **4. Conclusions**

360 Molecular sentinels require analytical accuracy for inter-comparison and information delivery.

361 From this work, we conclude that:

362

363 1. The higher the influent wastewater sample volume was (500 mL instead of 100 or 50 mL),
364 the more uniform the concentrations of the three viral genes (N, S, ORF1ab) were,
365 especially when low incidence were reported

366 2. Employing a two-step RT-qPCR method would help to enhance the resolution for samples
367 with low viral loads.

368 3. Electronegative membranes were optimal and cheap for the concentration of SARS-CoV-
369 2 from pre-settled influent wastewater.

370 4. Multiple RNA purification steps are not recommended, due to plausible loss of SARS-
371 CoV-2 RNA and thereby, affecting qPCR analysis outcomes. While comparing the
372 column-based vs. magnetic beads method for the RNA purification, we found that the
373 column-based purification method displayed less variability amongst the biological
374 triplicates throughout the sampling campaign than magnetic beads.

375 **Conflict of interests statement**

376 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

377 **Authors' contributions**

378 DCF, SA and DGW designed the study. DCF, SA and LO performed the experimental
379 investigations. DCF wrote the manuscript with direct contribution, edits, and critical feedback by
380 all authors.

381 **Acknowledgements**


382 We are grateful to Mariska Ronteltap from the Delfland Water Authority and Abdelmaoula Idrissi
383 from Delfluent Services and WWTP Harnashpolder, The Netherlands, for helping us arrange this
384 sampling campaign in such difficult moments, as well as Gertjan Medema from KWR and TU Delft
385 for the comparison of results with the measurement campaign in The Hague. This work is part of
386 the research project “Transmission of Antimicrobial Resistance Genes and Engineered DNA from
387 Transgenic Biosystems in Nature” (Targetbio) funded by the program Biotechnology &
388 Safety (grant no. 15812) of the Applied and Engineering Sciences Division of the Dutch Research
389 Council (NWO).


390 **References**


- 391 Agrawal, S., Orschler, L., Lackner, S., 2021. Long-term monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater of the
392 Frankfurt metropolitan area in Southern Germany. *Sci. Rep.* 11, 5372. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84914-2)
393 [021-84914-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84914-2)
- 394 Ahmed, W., Bivins, A., Bertsch, P.M., Bibby, K., Choi, P.M., Farkas, K., Gyawali, P., Hamilton, K.A.,
395 Haramoto, E., Kitajima, M., Simpson, S.L., Tandukar, S., Thomas, K. V., Mueller, J.F., 2020.
396 Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater: Methods optimization and quality control are crucial
397 for generating reliable public health information. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sci. Heal.* 17, 82–93.
398 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.003>
- 399 Alygizakis, N., Markou, A.N., Rousis, N.I., Galani, A., Avgeris, M., Adamopoulos, P.G., Scorilas, A., Lianidou,
400 E.S., Paraskevis, D., Tsiodras, S., Tsakris, A., Dimopoulos, M.A., Thomaidis, N.S., 2021. Analytical
401 methodologies for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: Protocols and future perspectives. *TrAC -*
402 *Trends Anal. Chem.* 134, 116125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2020.116125>
- 403 Ambrosi, C., Prezioso, C., Checconi, P., Scribano, D., Sarshar, M., Capannari, M., Tomino, C., Fini, M., Garaci,
404 E., Palamara, A.T., De Chiara, G., Limongi, D., 2021. SARS-CoV-2: Comparative analysis of different
405 RNA extraction methods. *J. Virol. Methods.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2020.114008>
- 406 Batéjat, C., Grassin, Q., Manuguerra, J.-C., Leclercq, I., 2021. Heat inactivation of the severe acute respiratory
407 syndrome coronavirus 2. *J. Biosaf. Biosecurity* 3, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobb.2020.12.001>
- 408 Bivins, A., North, D., Ahmad, A., Ahmed, W., Alm, E., Been, F., Bhattacharya, P., Bijlsma, L., Boehm, A.B.,
409 Brown, J., Buttiglieri, G., Calabro, V., Carducci, A., Castiglioni, S., Cetecioglu Gurol, Z., Chakraborty, S.,
410 Costa, F., Curcio, S., De Los Reyes, F.L., Delgado Vela, J., Farkas, K., Fernandez-Casi, X., Gerba, C.,
411 Gerrity, D., Girones, R., Gonzalez, R., Haramoto, E., Harris, A., Holden, P.A., Islam, M.T., Jones, D.L.,
412 Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., Kitajima, M., Kotlarz, N., Kumar, M., Kuroda, K., La Rosa, G., Malpei, F.,
413 Mautus, M., McLellan, S.L., Medema, G., Meschke, J.S., Mueller, J., Newton, R.J., Nilsson, D., Noble,
414 R.T., Van Nuijs, A., Peccia, J., Perkins, T.A., Pickering, A.J., Rose, J., Sanchez, G., Smith, A., Stadler, L.,
415 Stauber, C., Thomas, K., Van Der Voorn, T., Wigginton, K., Zhu, K., Bibby, K., 2020. Wastewater-Based
416 Epidemiology: Global Collaborative to Maximize Contributions in the Fight against COVID-19. *Environ.*
417 *Sci. Technol.* 54, 7754–7757. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c02388>
- 418 Calderón-Franco, D., van Loosdrecht, M.C.M., Abeel, T., Weissbrodt, D.G., 2021. Free-floating extracellular
419 DNA: Systematic profiling of mobile genetic elements and antibiotic resistance from wastewater. *Water*
420 *Res.* 189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116592>
- 421 Chik, A.H.S., Glier, M.B., Servos, M., Mangat, C.S., Pang, X.L., Qiu, Y., D’Aoust, P.M., Burnet, J.B.,
422 Delatolla, R., Dorner, S., Geng, Q., Giesy, J.P., McKay, R.M., Mulvey, M.R., Prystajecy, N., Srikanthan,
423 N., Xie, Y., Conant, B., Hruday, S.E., 2021. Comparison of approaches to quantify SARS-CoV-2 in
424 wastewater using RT-qPCR: Results and implications from a collaborative inter-laboratory study in
425 Canada. *J. Environ. Sci. (China)* 107, 218–229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jes.2021.01.029>
- 426 Foladori, P., Cutrupi, F., Segata, N., Manara, S., Pinto, F., Malpei, F., Bruni, L., La Rosa, G., 2020. SARS-CoV-
427 2 from faeces to wastewater treatment: What do we know? A review. *Sci. Total Environ.*
428 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140444>
- 429 Graham, K.E., Loeb, S.K., Wolfe, M.K., Catoe, D., Sinnott-Armstrong, N., Kim, S., Yamahara, K.M.,

- 430 Sassoubre, L.M., Mendoza Grijalva, L.M., Roldan-Hernandez, L., Langenfeld, K., Wigginton, K.R.,
431 Boehm, A.B., 2021. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with COVID-19
432 Cases in a Large Urban Sewershed. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 55, 488–498.
433 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c06191>
- 434 Havelaar, A.H., Hogeboom, W.M., Pot, R., 1985. F specific RNA bacteriophages in sewage: Methodology and
435 occurrence. *Water Sci. Technol.* 17, 645–655. <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.1985.0167>
- 436 Hokajärvi, A.M., Rytönen, A., Tiwari, A., Kauppinen, A., Oikarinen, S., Lehto, K.M., Kankaanpää, A.,
437 Gunnar, T., Al-Hello, H., Blomqvist, S., Miettinen, I.T., Savolainen-Kopra, C., Pitkänen, T., 2021. The
438 detection and stability of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA biomarkers in wastewater influent in Helsinki, Finland.
439 *Sci. Total Environ.* 770, 145274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145274>
- 440 Joonaki, E., Hassanpouryouzband, A., Heldt, C.L., Areo, O., 2020. Surface Chemistry Can Unlock Drivers of
441 Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in a Variety of Environmental Conditions. *Chem.*
442 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chempr.2020.08.001>
- 443 Kattur Venkatachalam, A.R., Szyporta, M., Kiener, T.K., Balraj, P., Kwang, J., 2014. Concentration and
444 purification of enterovirus 71 using a weak anion-exchange monolithic column. *Virol. J.* 11, 1–8.
445 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-422X-11-99>
- 446 Kitajima, M., Ahmed, W., Bibby, K., Carducci, A., Gerba, C.P., Hamilton, K.A., Haramoto, E., Rose, J.B.,
447 2020. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. *Sci. Total Environ.*
448 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076>
- 449 Kramberger, P., Honour, R.C., Herman, R.E., Smrekar, F., Peterka, M., 2010. Purification of the
450 *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteriophages VDX-10 on methacrylate monoliths. *J. Virol. Methods* 166, 60–64.
451 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2010.02.020>
- 452 Larsen, D.A., Wigginton, K.R., 2020. Tracking COVID-19 with wastewater. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 38, 1151–1153.
453 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0690-1>
- 454 Lundy, L., Fatta-Kassinos, D., Slobodnik, J., Karaolia, P., Cirka, L., Kreuzinger, N., Castiglioni, S., Bijlsma, L.,
455 Dulio, V., Deviller, G., Lai, F.Y., Alygizakis, N., Barneo, M., Baz-Lomba, J.A., Béen, F., Cíhová, M.,
456 Conde-Pérez, K., Covaci, A., Donner, E., Ficek, A., Hassard, F., Hedström, A., Hernandez, F., Janská, V.,
457 Jellison, K., Hofman, J., Hill, K., Hong, P.-Y., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., Kolarević, S., Krahulec, J.,
458 Lambropoulou, D., de Llanos, R., Mackuľak, T., Martinez-García, L., Martínez, F., Medema, G.,
459 Micsinai, A., Myrmel, M., Nasser, M., Niederstätter, H., Nozal, L., Oberacher, H., Očenášková, V.,
460 Ogorzaly, L., Papadopoulos, D., Peinado, B., Pitkänen, T., Poza, M., Rumbo-Feal, S., Sánchez, M.B.,
461 Székely, A.J., Soltysova, A., Thomaidis, N.S., Vallejo, J., van Nuijs, A., Ware, V., Viklander, M., 2021.
462 Making Waves: Collaboration in the time of SARS-CoV-2 - rapid development of an international co-
463 operation and wastewater surveillance database to support public health decision-making. *Water Res.* 199,
464 117167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117167>
- 465 Medema, G., Been, F., Ruijgers, H., KWR, 2020a. De SARS-CoV-2 rioolwatermonsters van 12 augustus. KWR
466 [WWW Document]. Nieuws. URL <https://www.kwrwater.nl/actueel/de-nieuwste-rioolwatermonsters/>
- 467 Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., Brouwer, A., 2020b. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2
468 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic
469 in the Netherlands. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* 7, 511–516. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357>


- 470 Ooi, E.E., Low, J.G., 2020. Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Lancet Infect. Dis.*
471 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30460-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30460-6)
- 472 Parra Guardado, A.L., Sweeney, C.L., Hayes, E., Trueman, B.F., Huang, Y., Jamieson, R.C., Rand, J.L.,
473 Gagnon, G.A., Stoddart, A.K., 2020. Development and optimization of a new method for direct extraction
474 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from municipal wastewater using magnetic beads. *medRxiv.*
475 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20237230>
- 476 Rabenau, H.F., Cinatl, J., Morgenstern, B., Bauer, G., Preiser, W., Doerr, H.W., 2005. Stability and inactivation
477 of SARS coronavirus. *Med. Microbiol. Immunol.* 194, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00430-004-0219-0>
- 478 Randazzo, W., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Sanjuán, R., Domingo-Calap, P., Sánchez, G., 2020a. Metropolitan
479 wastewater analysis for COVID-19 epidemiological surveillance. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health.*
480 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2020.113621>
- 481 Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Simón, P., Allende, A., Sánchez, G., 2020b. SARS-CoV-2
482 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water Res.* 181.
483 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.115942>
- 484 Rimoldi, S.G., Stefani, F., Gigantiello, A., Polesello, S., Comandatore, F., Mileto, D., Maresca, M., Longobardi,
485 C., Mancon, A., Romeri, F., Pagani, C., Cappelli, F., Roscioli, C., Moja, L., Gismondo, M.R., Salerno, F.,
486 2020. Presence and infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 virus in wastewaters and rivers. *Sci. Total Environ.* 744.
487 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140911>
- 488 Rockey, N., Arts, P.J., Li, L., Harrison, K.R., Langenfeld, K., Fitzsimmons, W.J., Lauring, A.S., Love, N.G.,
489 Kaye, K.S., Raskin, L., Roberts, W.W., Hegarty, B., Wigginton, K.R., 2020. Humidity and deposition
490 solution play a critical role in virus inactivation by heat treatment on N95 respirators. *medRxiv* 5, 1–14.
491 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.22.20137448>
- 492 Schrader, C., Schielke, A., Ellerbroek, L., Johne, R., 2012. PCR inhibitors - occurrence, properties and removal.
493 *J. Appl. Microbiol.* 113, 1014–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2012.05384.x>
- 494 Tanhaei, M., Mohebbi, S.R., Hosseini, S.M., Rafieepoor, M., Kazemian, S., Ghaemi, A., Shamloei, S., Mirjalali,
495 H., Asadzadeh Aghdaei, H., Zali, M.R., 2021. The first detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the wastewater
496 of Tehran, Iran. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-13393-9>
- 497 Westhaus, S., Weber, F.A., Schiwy, S., Linnemann, V., Brinkmann, M., Widera, M., Greve, C., Janke, A.,
498 Hollert, H., Wintgens, T., Ciesek, S., 2021. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in raw and treated wastewater in
499 Germany – Suitability for COVID-19 surveillance and potential transmission risks. *Sci. Total Environ.*
500 751, 141750. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141750>
- 501 Wu, F., Zhang, J., Xiao, A., Gu, X., Lee, W.L., Armas, F., Kauffman, K., Hanage, W., Matus, M., Ghaeli, N.,
502 Endo, N., Duvallet, C., Poyet, M., Moniz, K., Washburne, A.D., Erickson, T.B., Chai, P.R., Thompson, J.,
503 Alm, E.J., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than Expected from Clinically Confirmed
504 Cases. *mSystems.* <https://doi.org/10.1128/msystems.00614-20>
505







Type  cDNA  RNA



FastRNA kit Magnetic beads

