

1 **TITLE:** Meta-analyses on SARS-CoV-2 Viral Titers in Wastewater and Their Correlations to
2 Epidemiological Indicators

3

4 **AUTHORS:** David Mantilla-Calderon¹, Kaiyu (Kevin) Huang¹, Aojie Li¹, Kaseba Chibwe¹,
5 Xiaoqian Yu², Yinyin Ye³, Lei Liu⁴ and Fangqiong Ling^{1,5,6,7*}

6

7 **AFFILIATIONS**

8 [1] Washington University in St. Louis, Department of Energy, Environmental and Chemical
9 Engineering, St. Louis, MO, USA

10 [2] Department of Microbiology and Ecosystem Science, Division of Microbial Ecology,
11 University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

12 [3] Department of Civil, Structural and Environmental Engineering, University at Buffalo,
13 Buffalo, NY, USA

14 [4] Division of Biostatistics, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, US

15 [5] Washington University in St. Louis, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, St.
16 Louis, MO, USA

17 [6] Washington University in St. Louis, Division of Biological and Biomedical Sciences, St.
18 Louis, MO, USA

19 [7] Washington University in St. Louis, Division of Computational and Data Science, St. Louis,
20 MO, USA

21

22 *fangqiong@wustl.edu

23

24 **ABSTRACT**

25

26 **Background:** Recent applications of wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) have demonstrated
27 its ability to track the spread and dynamics of COVID-19 at the community level. Despite the
28 growing body of research, quantitative synthesis of SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater generated
29 from studies across space and time using diverse methods has not been performed.

30

31 **Objective:** The objective of this study is to examine the correlations between SARS-CoV-2 viral
32 titers in wastewater across studies, stratified by key covariates in study methodologies. In addition,
33 we examined the associations of proportions of positive detections (PPD) in wastewater samples
34 and methodological covariates.

35
36 **Methods:** We systematically searched the Web of Science for studies published by February 16th,
37 2021, performed a reproducible screen, and employed mixed-effects models to estimate the levels
38 of SARS-CoV-2 viral titers in wastewater samples and their correlations to case prevalence,
39 sampling mode (grab or composite sampling), and the fraction of analysis (FOA, i.e., solids, solid-
40 supernatant mixtures, or supernatants/filtrates)

41
42 **Results:** A hundred and one studies were found; twenty studies (1,877 observations) were retained
43 following a reproducible screen. The mean of PPD across all studies was 0.67 (95%-CI, [0.56,
44 0.79]). The mean titer was 5,244.37 copies/mL (95%-CI, [0; 16,432.65]). The Pearson Correlation
45 coefficients (PCC) between viral titers and case prevalences were 0.28 (95%-CI, [0.01; 0.51]) for
46 daily new cases or 0.29 (95%-CI, [-0.15; 0.73]) for cumulative cases. FOA accounted for 12.4%
47 of the variability in PPD, followed by case prevalence (9.3% by daily new cases and 5.9% by
48 cumulative cases) and sampling mode (0.6%). Among observations with positive detections, FOA
49 accounted for 56.0% of the variability in titers, followed by sampling mode (6.9%) and case
50 prevalence (0.9% by daily new cases and 0.8% by cumulative cases). While sampling mode and
51 FOA both significantly correlated with SARS-CoV-2 titers, the magnitudes of increase in PPD
52 associated with FOA were larger. Mixed-effects model treating studies as random effects and case
53 prevalence as fixed effects accounted for over 90% of the variability in SARS-CoV-2 PPD and
54 titers.

55
56 **Interpretations:** Positive pooled means and confidence intervals in PCC between SARS-CoV-2
57 titers and case prevalence indicators provide quantitative evidence reinforcing the value of
58 wastewater-based monitoring of COVID-19. Large heterogeneities among studies in proportions
59 of positive detections, titers, and PCC suggest a strong demand in methods to generate data
60 accounting for cross-study heterogeneities and more detailed metadata reporting. Large variance
61 explained by FOA suggesting FOA as a direction that needs to be prioritized in method

62 standardization. Mixed-effects models accounting for study level variations provide a new
63 perspective to synthesize data from multiple studies.

64

65 **1. INTRODUCTION**

66

67 Wastewater-based virus monitoring has been shown as a promising tool for tracking disease
68 dynamics in a large population during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic (Larsen and Wigginton,
69 2020). It has been reported that 39 to 65% of infected individuals may excrete viral particles
70 through urine and feces (Chen, Chen, et al., 2020; Xiao, Sun, et al., 2020; Guo, Tao, et al., 2021),
71 thus allowing wastewater-based detection. Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) has the
72 potential to circumvent biases caused by varied accesses to individual-based testing, presence of
73 asymptomatic cases, and social stigma (Murakami, Hata, et al., 2020). Moreover, WBE has been
74 applied in environmental monitoring of polioviruses, effectively detecting new variants and
75 preventing disease resurgence (Hovi, Shulman, et al., 2012). This past experience suggests the
76 long-term benefits in the development and refinement of WBE as a public health monitoring
77 technology.

78

79 While the number of WBE studies continues to grow, it demands attention to seek generalizable
80 relationships across studies and account for study-to-study variations. For example, though WBE
81 studies focusing on SARS-CoV-2 viruses are all conducted during the pandemic, not all
82 wastewater samples tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by qPCR/dPCR (Medema, Heijnen, et al.,
83 2020; Gonzalez, Curtis, et al., 2020; Gonçalves, Koritnik, et al., 2021; Graham, Loeb, et al., 2020;
84 Ahmed, Angel, et al., 2020; Baldovin, Amoroso, et al., 2021; Hata, Hara-Yamamura, et al., 2021;
85 Kitamura, Sadamasu, et al., 2021; Nemudryi, Nemudraia, et al., 2020; Saguti, Magnil, et al., 2021;
86 Sherchan, Shahin, et al., 2020; Trottier, Darques, et al., 2020; Randazzo, Truchado, et al., 2020).
87 In addition, while positive correlations between SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-based measurements
88 and COVID-19 cases have been described (Medema, Heijnen, et al., 2020; Gonzalez, Curtis, et
89 al., 2020; Graham, Loeb, et al., 2020; D’Aoust, Mercier, et al., 2021; D’Aoust, Graber, et al., 2021;
90 Peccia, Zulli, et al., 2020), the strength of the correlations may vary among studies. To fully untap
91 the potentials of WBE, research synthesis efforts are needed to quantify detection rates of SARS-
92 CoV-2 in wastewater, its titers, and their correlations to epidemiological indicators.

93
94 Meta-analysis provides an objective, quantitative, and powerful way to synthesize findings across
95 studies (Gurevitch, Koricheva, et al., 2018). This analysis methodology treats individual studies
96 as members of a population of studies that all provide information on a given effect instead of
97 drawing conclusions on exemplary studies that have shown strong positive effects (Murad and
98 Montori, 2013). Leveraging a large sample size, meta-analysis can help move the narrative beyond
99 statistical significance, and draw attention to the magnitude, direction, and variance in effects
100 (Gurevitch, Koricheva, et al., 2018). Furthermore, the meta-analytic approach allows us to
101 quantitatively examine heterogeneity among study results, thus motivating the generation of new
102 hypotheses (Linden and Hönekopp, 2021). Meta-analysis is considered beneficial in medicine
103 (Murad and Montori, 2013), social science (Card, 2015), ecology and evolution (Arnqvist and
104 Wooster, 1995), among other fields. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of WBE, a meta-
105 analysis about the booming literature providing pooled effect sizes and heterogeneity can provide
106 quantitative evidence to help justify research to refine and advance the technology by interested
107 researchers from multiple fields.

108
109 Here, we employed a meta-analytic methodology to synthesize wastewater-based SARS-CoV-2
110 viral titer data published by February 16th, 2021, approximately a year after the beginning of the
111 pandemic. Following a reproducible pipeline (PRISMA guideline, Page, McKenzie, et al., 2021),
112 we synthesized results from 1,877 observations in 20 studies. We asked four fundamental
113 questions; 1) what is the pooled proportion of positive detection of SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater
114 samples; 2) what are the titers of SARS-CoV-2 viruses in wastewater collectively and when
115 subgrouped by key methodological variables; 3) what are the overall strengths of correlation
116 between positive detection or titers of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater to epidemiological indicators
117 (active and cumulative cases); 4) how much of the variation in SARS-CoV-2 viral titers can be
118 explained by COVID-19 cases alone? Mixed effects models were employed to examine correlation
119 between SARS-CoV-2 viral titers and detection in wastewater while accounting for study-level
120 variations.

121
122 **2. METHODS**

123

124 This systematic review and subsequent meta-analysis have been conducted according to the
125 PRISMA guidelines (Page, McKenzie, et al., 2021). A PRISMA checklist is presented in Table
126 S1.

127
128 **2.1 Data sources.** We searched Web of Science (WoS) for any publications analyzing untreated
129 wastewater for SARS-CoV-2 viruses on February 16th, 2021. Studies were retrieved with the
130 search terms: TS = (SARS-CoV-2 AND (wastewater OR sewage)) from the WoS core collection.
131 The following search conditions were applied: i) language was restricted to English; ii) time span
132 was set to “All Years”; iii) records in the Science Citation Index Expanded (SCI-Expanded) were
133 included; and iv) document type was set to “article”, “early access” or “letter” to retain original
134 research (i.e., “reviews” or “editorial materials” were not selected).

135
136 **2.2 Study selection and eligibility criteria.** Upon study retrieval from Web of Science, any
137 duplication of records was screened by titles and authors. No duplication was found. Next, full text
138 records were scanned to assess for eligibility. All studies that reported nucleic-acid detections of
139 SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater systems and associated epidemiological indicators were included.
140 Specifically, inclusion criteria were applied: 1) original qPCR data in terms of SARS-CoV-2
141 measurements in wastewater were reported, and data were reported as quantification cycle, copy
142 numbers/volume, genome equivalents/volume, or genome equivalents/weight of sample; 2)
143 sampling locations were identified as wastewater treatment plants (WWTP), sewage collection
144 networks, lift stations, manholes or septic tanks; 3) SARS-CoV-2 case incidences/prevalences are
145 reported for the associated locations during the sampling times. Rationales for each inclusion
146 criterion are provided in Table 1. The study eligibility was performed by David Mantilla-Calderon
147 (DMC), Kevin Huang (KH), Aoji Li (AL) and Fangqiong Ling (FL). In case of uncertainties, these
148 were discussed and resolved by consensus.

149
150 **2.3 Data extraction.** SARS-CoV-2 measurements in wastewater were extracted from the full texts
151 or supplementary materials. WebPlotDigitalizer version 4.4
152 (<https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer>) was used to retrieve the information using digitized
153 versions of figures. The qPCR/dPCR measurements themselves and the units (i.e., quantitative
154 cycles [Cq], or titers) were recorded. In addition, metadata about a sample was retrieved, including

155 study information, sample environment, and assay information. Study information included
156 author, title, and the year of publication. Sample environment included the following: i) the
157 geographical location (i.e., country and city where the study was performed); ii) sampling location
158 within a wastewater system (i.e., samples were taken from the sewage collection systems, at the
159 wastewater treatment plant after screens and before sedimentation, or at the primary sedimentation
160 tank); iii) sample processing prior to viral concentration (whether a sample was filtrated,
161 centrifuged or left untreated); iv) viral concentration method; v) the associated COVID case
162 incidence or prevalence as provided in the publication; vi) serviced population as provided in the
163 publication, and vii) the date of collection of each wastewater sample. Last but not the least, we
164 extracted assay information, including the choice of sampling techniques (i.e., grab or composite
165 sampling), qPCR gene markers, and primer sets.

166

167 **2.4 Data extraction and summary measures.** Upon data retrieval, SARS-CoV-2 measurements,
168 sample environment, assay information, COVID-19 case prevalence were recorded and converted
169 to consistent unit across studies (2.4.1-2.4.3). The proportion of positive detections was calculated
170 (2.4.4). Annotated data will be made available on github.com/linglab-washu/wbe-metaanalysis at
171 the time of publication.

172

173 **2.4.1 SARS-CoV-2 measurements.** SARS-CoV-2 measurements in wastewater were retrieved in
174 terms of copy numbers per mL, genome equivalents (ge) per mL or copy numbers per gram,
175 according to the way measurements were described in the Methods section of each study. Samples
176 that were analyzed using multiple SARS-CoV-2 markers were recorded as multiple entries and
177 denoted under the same sample ID (e.g., if a sample was analyzed for N1, N2 and N3 markers, all
178 measurements would be included in the analysis). In the case that a study reported a range of
179 concentrations for a particular sample (e.g., 1 to 10 copies/mL), the midrange was recorded (e.g.,
180 5 copies/mL). For studies reporting the average and standard deviations of multiple technical
181 replicates for a wastewater sample, only the average was recorded. All eligible studies were
182 included in the systematic review (3.1). Studies providing SARS-CoV-2 measurements as titers or
183 Cq were included in the analysis of positive detections (3.2, 3.4-3.7), and studies that provided
184 titers (copies per unit volume) were included in the analysis on titers (3.3 - 3.7).

185

186 **2.4.2 Sample environment and assay information** Sample environment and assay information
187 were usually described in free texts and hence manual curation was performed. Some sample
188 environment and assay information had a higher level of semantic consistency (e.g., grab vs.
189 composite samples), while others were described in more varied texts. In the case that varied
190 descriptions had suggested similar meanings, we annotated using consistent texts reflecting the
191 common meanings to facilitate synthesis across studies.

192
193 **Sampling location.** Specifically, the sampling locations were annotated as i) “WWTP” if a sample
194 was described as taken after primary screens and before the primary sedimentation tanks, as ii)
195 “municipal sewage network” if a sample was taken from manholes, septic tanks, or lift stations,
196 and as iii) “in premise”, if the sample was described as taken from the private sewage infrastructure
197 of a facility such as a hospital or dormitory.

198
199 **Fractions.** Wastewater and sludge samples are included in the review. Wastewater refers to
200 samples collected from the sewage network or the WWTP, consisting predominantly of a liquid
201 phase and to a lesser degree, a solid phase. The term sludge specifically refers to the slurry of
202 solids and liquid mixture collected from a primary clarifier. Liquid and solid phases of samples
203 can be separated/fractionated by laboratory methods. Fractions resulting from sample separation
204 processes were recorded and annotated. Specifically, a fraction was annotated as “Solids” when it
205 consisted of primary solids from a gravity thickener, or solids collected from wastewater by in-
206 laboratory sedimentation (e.g., pellets recovered from centrifugation of the wastewater sample at >
207 2000 g). A Fraction was annotated as “Supernatant/filtrate” if the sample had been pre-filtered at
208 0.22 to 0.7 μm or centrifuged at 2.000-10.000 g prior to viral concentration. A fraction was
209 annotated as “Mixture of supernatant and suspended solids” when a sample of raw unprocessed
210 wastewater was directly used for viral concentration.

211
212 **Viral concentration.** A fraction might be subjected to a subsequent viral concentration step.
213 Typically, viral concentrations methods were applied to mixture of supernatant and suspended
214 solids and supernatant/filtrate fractions. Solid fractions were not typically subjected to a viral
215 concentration step. Viral concentration methods were recorded as described in the original
216 publication.

217

218 **Gene targets.** Several SARS-CoV-2 qPCR gene targets were identified during the study screening
219 process and categorized in the marker variable. Targeted regions included ORF1ab, Nucleoprotein
220 (N), Spike protein (S), Envelop protein (E), Membrane protein (M) and the RNA-dependent RNA-
221 polymerase (RdRp) gene. The specific primer set that was used to target the marker gene was
222 recorded under the primer variable using the notation Author_Marker. Two abbreviations were
223 used in the field author, CDC, referring to the Center of Disease Control, USA (e.g., CDC_N1)
224 and NIID, referring to the National Institute of Infectious Disease, Japan (e.g., NIID_N).

225

226 In the cases that combinations of multiple primers were simultaneously used in a qPCR assay, the
227 value for primer for this specific sample was recorded by listing the primer sets spaced by an
228 underscore sign (e.g., CDC_N1_N2). In some instances, a study may analyze multiple markers but
229 report as one genome equivalent. A marker would be recorded if it was specified in the study which
230 marker was used to calculate the genome equivalent; alternatively, the marker recorded for the
231 sample would include all the markers used in the study separated by a comma (e.g., CDC_N1,
232 CDC_N2).

233

234 **2.4.3 COVID-19 case prevalence.** Daily new cases, cumulative cases, and active cases as
235 reported in the papers were retrieved and included in this analysis, with exceptions when i) a
236 sample was collected before epidemiological reporting by local health authorities was available or
237 ii) a sample was collected from sewage lines in buildings in which the incidence of SARS-CoV-2
238 may significantly differ from city/municipality case reports. Sample entries where consistent case
239 prevalence data were not found in the study, were excluded from the analysis. Case data were
240 recorded in the way that was reported in the study. For samples retrieved from WWTPs that extend
241 over multiple municipalities, case incidence was estimated by computing the average of the case
242 incidence (normalized by population size) of the municipalities contributing to the sewage of that
243 specific WWTP.

244

245 Epidemiological data reported as “cumulative cases” are denoted as “cumulative cases”. Cases
246 reported as “daily cases”, “new cases”, “positive daily test”, “new positive daily test”, or “seven-
247 day average cases” were denoted as “daily new cases”. “Hospital admissions” and “hospitalized

248 patients” were denoted as “hospitalized patients”. All case counts were converted to prevalence,
249 i.e., patients per 100,000 inhabitants to allow synthesis across studies.

250

251 **2.4.4. Proportions of positive detection.** Subgroups were defined by different aggregating
252 variables such as study ID, sample collection method, fraction type etc. The proportion of positive
253 detection was defined as the ratio of samples showing positive test results for SARS-CoV-2 in a
254 subgroup, over the total number of samples analyzed in each subgroup.

255

256 **2.5 Forest plot generation.** Forest plots were generated using the “dmetar” package for R (Harrer,
257 Cuijpers, et al., 2019) using a random-effects model. A random-effects meta-analysis model
258 assumes the observed average SARS-CoV-2 titers can vary across studies because of real
259 differences in the viruses present in the systems as well as sampling variability (chance). Thus,
260 even if all studies had an infinitely large sample size, the observed study effects would still vary
261 because of the real differences in the sewershed’s effects on viral titers. Such heterogeneity in
262 average viral titers can be caused by differences in study populations (such as local COVID-19
263 case prevalence), the wastewater system effects on dilution or decay, the methodological
264 differences, and other factors.

265

266 Weight of each study in the forest plot was calculated as

267

$$268 \quad W_i = 1 / (V_i + T^2)$$

269

270 where W_i denotes the weight of study $_i$, V is the variance and T^2 (tau) is the variance of each
271 distribution with respect to the grand mean estimated using the Sidik-Jonkman estimator (Sidik
272 and Jonkman, 2005). More details on the calculations can be found at Borenstein et al. (Borenstein,
273 Hedges, et al., 2010). Measurements of SARS-CoV-2 titers were transformed to log copies per mL
274 of sample to allow synthesis across studies and aid with visualization. Observations with SARS-
275 CoV-2 measurements equal to zero marker copies per mL were removed.

276

277 **2.6 General linear mixed effects model (GLMM).** General linear mixed effects models were
278 built to examine the epidemiological indicators (cumulative cases or daily new cases) as sources

279 of fixed effects and study as a source of random effects on SARS-CoV-2 measurements in
280 wastewater. A binomial GLMM was used to model the positive detections among all observations.
281 A linear mixed effects model (Gaussian) was used to fit the log-transformed titers using
282 observations where positive detections were made. GLMMs were built in the R package “lme4”
283 (Bates, Mächler, et al., 2014). Studies were treated as sources of random effects on intercepts.
284 Fixed-effects models were built using the same link functions to examine the significance of
285 random effects and assess the overall fits from fixed effects. Fitting of fixed-effects models were
286 performed using the “glm” and “lm” functions in R stats package (R Core Team, 2013). Akaike
287 information criterion (AIC), Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) and log likelihoods were
288 reported for model selection. The Nakagawa’s R-squared definitions were used to compute
289 marginal and conditional r-squared values using the R package “MuMIn” (Barton, 2009). The
290 Studies that reported daily new cases and cumulative cases were examined separately. Studies
291 reporting solids were excluded due to lack of replicates after being subset into studies reporting
292 daily new cases or cumulative cases (details can be found in Figure S1).

293

294 **3. RESULTS**

295

296 **3.1 Systematic review.** Our search identified 101 unique titles and abstracts; after screening
297 (Figure 1, Table S2), 20 papers were included in this review. These studies reported SARS-CoV-
298 2 measurements in wastewater in terms of titers or Ct and provided epidemiological indicators. A
299 total of 1877 observations were recorded. Figure 1 depicts details of the search.

300

301 Table 2 describes basic characteristics of the included resources. Eighteen studies reported
302 quantitative measurements for SARS-CoV-2 as titers (Medema, Heijnen, et al., 2020; Peccia,
303 Zulli, et al., 2020; Kumar, Patel, et al., 2020; Gonzalez, Curtis, et al., 2020; Graham, Loeb, et al.,
304 2020; D’Aoust, Mercier, et al., 2021; Hata, Hara-Yamamura, et al., 2021; Kitamura, Sadamasu, et
305 al., 2021; Nemudryi, Nemudraia, et al., 2020; Saguti, Magnil, et al., 2021; Sherchan, Shahin, et
306 al., 2020; Trottier, Darques, et al., 2020; Randazzo, Truchado, et al., 2020; Randazzo, Cuevas-
307 Ferrando, et al., 2020; Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020; Miyani, Fonoll, et al., 2020; Westhaus,
308 Weber, et al., 2021; Haramoto, Malla, et al., 2020), while two studies reported Ct values (Baldovin,
309 Amoruso, et al., 2021; Gonçalves, Koritnik, et al., 2021). Among the 18 quantitative studies,

310 seventeen reported marker copies or genome equivalent per mL (Medema, Heijnen, et al., 2020;
311 Peccia, Zulli, et al., 2020; Kumar, Patel, et al., 2020; Gonzalez, Curtis, et al., 2020; D'Aoust,
312 Mercier, et al., 2021; Hata, Hara-Yamamura, et al., 2021; Kitamura, Sadamasu, et al., 2021;
313 Nemudryi, Nemudraia, et al., 2020; Saguti, Magnil, et al., 2021; Sherchan, Shahin, et al., 2020;
314 Trottier, Darques, et al., 2020; Randazzo, Truchado, et al., 2020; Randazzo, Cuevas-Ferrando, et
315 al., 2020; Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020; Miyani, Fonoll, et al., 2020; Westhaus, Weber, et
316 al., 2021; Haramoto, Malla, et al., 2020), and one study reported marker copies per gram of
317 biomass (Graham, Loeb, et al., 2020). Epidemiological indicators were reported as daily cases in
318 nine studies, ranging from 0.6 per 100,000 inhabitants to 117 per 100,000 inhabitants (Graham,
319 Loeb, et al., 2020; D'Aoust, Mercier, et al., 2021; Baldovin, Amoruso, et al., 2021; Hata, Hara-
320 Yamamura, et al., 2021; Nemudryi, Nemudraia, et al., 2020; Sherchan, Shahin, et al., 2020;
321 Trottier, Darques, et al., 2020; Miyani, Fonoll, et al., 2020; Haramoto, Malla, et al., 2020),
322 cumulative cases were reported in ten studies ranging from 1.6 per 100,000 inhabitants to 808.2
323 per 100,000 inhabitants (Medema, Heijnen, et al., 2020; Kumar, Patel, et al., 2020; Gonzalez,
324 Curtis, et al., 2020; Hata, Hara-Yamamura, et al., 2021; Kitamura, Sadamasu, et al., 2021;
325 Sherchan, Shahin, et al., 2020; Randazzo, Truchado, et al., 2020; Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al.,
326 2020; Westhaus, Weber, et al., 2021; Haramoto, Malla, et al., 2020), active cases were reported in
327 four studies (D'Aoust, Mercier, et al., 2021; Gonçalves, Koritnik, et al., 2021; Randazzo, Cuevas-
328 Ferrando, et al., 2020; Westhaus, Weber, et al., 2021) and hospitalized cases in two studies
329 (Baldovin, Amoruso, et al., 2021; Saguti, Magnil, et al., 2021). Among these studies, two studies
330 reported both daily and cumulative cases (Sherchan, Shahin, et al., 2020; Haramoto, Malla, et al.,
331 2020), one study reported both daily and active cases (D'Aoust, Mercier, et al., 2021) and one
332 reported both cumulative cases and hospitalized cases (Baldovin, Amoruso, et al., 2021).
333 Cumulative COVID-19 cases were the most frequently reported, followed by daily, active, and
334 hospitalized cases. SARS-CoV-2 was detected in all studies, irrespective of case prevalence levels,
335 albeit at varying proportions of positive detections.

336
337 Correlations between COVID-19 cases and wastewater SARS-CoV-2 titers were reported in six
338 studies. This is confirmed by our analysis. We performed linear regression on each dataset. Six
339 out of eighteen studies detected significant linear correlations between SARS-CoV-2 titers and the
340 respective epidemiological indicators in the study (p -value < 0.05, Table 3, Figure S2-S4). All

341 these six studies were conducted at WWTPs, amongst which three analyzed the solid fraction, and
342 three analyzed the supernatant/filtrate fraction.

343
344 Methodological variability was present in all steps of sample collection and analysis procedures
345 (Figure 2). In terms of sampling locations within a wastewater system, most studies analyzed
346 samples collected at the WWTP (16 studies) (D'Aoust, Mercier, et al., 2021; Medema, Heijnen, et
347 al., 2020; Peccia, Zulli, et al., 2020; Kumar, Patel, et al., 2020; Gonzalez, Curtis, et al., 2020;
348 Graham, Loeb, et al., 2020; D'Aoust, Mercier, et al., 2021; Hata, Hara-Yamamura, et al., 2021;
349 Nemudryi, Nemudraia, et al., 2020; Saguti, Magnil, et al., 2021; Sherchan, Shahin, et al., 2020;
350 Trottier, Darques, et al., 2020; Randazzo, Truchado, et al., 2020; Randazzo, Cuevas-Ferrando, et
351 al., 2020; Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020; Westhaus, Weber, et al., 2021; Haramoto, Malla,
352 et al., 2020). A much smaller numbers of studies sampled at locations in the sewage collection
353 network (two studies) (Baldovin, Amoruso, et al., 2021; Miyani, Fonoll, et al., 2020) or in-premise
354 (one study) (Baldovin, Amoruso, et al., 2021). Kitamura, K et al. examined SARS-CoV-2 viruses
355 in wastewater at both municipal sewage network locations and WWTP influent samples
356 (Kitamura, Sadamasu, et al., 2021). Among the studies sampling at WWTPs, the service
357 population ranged from 12,770 to 3.2 million individuals, and covered territories in the Americas,
358 Asia, Europe, and Oceania.

359
360 Upon sample collection, studies showed great variability in sample pre-processing conditions,
361 resulting in the enrichment of different wastewater fractions (Figure 2). Supernatant/filtrate
362 fractions were recovered in 12 studies by means of centrifugation between 1.840 and 10.000 g
363 (Medema, Heijnen, et al., 2020; Kumar, Patel, et al., 2020; Gonzalez, Curtis, et al., 2020; Graham,
364 Loeb, et al., 2020; Hata, Hara-Yamamura, et al., 2021; Kitamura, Sadamasu, et al., 2021;
365 Nemudryi, Nemudraia, et al., 2020; Saguti, Magnil, et al., 2021; Sherchan, Shahin, et al., 2020;
366 Trottier, Darques, et al., 2020; Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020; Westhaus, Weber, et al.,
367 2021), while two studies retrieved this fraction by filtrating raw wastewater through 0.22
368 (Baldovin, Amoruso, et al., 2021) and 0.7 μm membranes (Gonçalves, Koritnik, et al., 2021)
369 respectively. Mixed supernatant and suspended solid fractions were identified in six studies where
370 liquid wastewater samples were not subjected to any type of preprocessing. Solid fractions were
371 retrieved in one study from influent wastewater by pellet collection after centrifugation at 1840 g

372 (Kitamura, Sadamasu, et al., 2021), while the remaining three studies utilizing solid fractions
373 collected sludge samples directly from primary sedimentation tanks (Peccia, Zulli, et al., 2020;
374 Graham, Loeb, et al., 2020; D'Aoust, Mercier, et al., 2021). It is important to highlight that a study
375 may pre-process for more than one fraction (Table 2).

376
377 Once a fraction of choice was generated, a viral concentration step was usually performed prior to
378 RNA extraction. The viral concentration protocols relied on principles of molecular weight cutoff
379 achieved through ultrafiltration at 10.000 kDa (Medema, Heijnen, et al., 2020; Baldovin, Amoruso,
380 et al., 2021; Gonçalves, Koritnik, et al., 2021; Kitamura, Sadamasu, et al., 2021; Nemudryi,
381 Nemudraia, et al., 2020; Sherchan, Shahin, et al., 2020; Trottier, Darques, et al., 2020; Ahmed,
382 Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020; Westhaus, Weber, et al., 2021), the affinity of enveloped viruses to
383 electro-negative membranes, electro-positive membranes, or other adsorbants/flocculants such as
384 PEG, skimmed milk, or aluminum (Kumar, Patel, et al., 2020; Gonzalez, Curtis, et al., 2020;
385 Graham, Loeb, et al., 2020; D'Aoust, Mercier, et al., 2021; Hata, Hara-Yamamura, et al., 2021;
386 Kitamura, Sadamasu, et al., 2021; Sherchan, Shahin, et al., 2020; Randazzo, Truchado, et al., 2020;
387 Randazzo, Cuevas-Ferrando, et al., 2020; Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020; Miyani, Fonoll, et
388 al., 2020; Haramoto, Malla, et al., 2020), or a combination of both mechanisms sequentially
389 (D'Aoust, Mercier, et al., 2021; Saguti, Magnil, et al., 2021; Haramoto, Malla, et al., 2020). Some
390 protocols did not include a concentration step and performed RNA extraction directly on the solid
391 fraction (Peccia, Zulli, et al., 2020; Graham, Loeb, et al., 2020). The methodological choices in
392 the concentration step are highly variable, and the twelve different workflows were reported.
393 Reviews on the viral concentration methodology and method evaluation employing surrogates can
394 be found elsewhere (Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020; Barril, Pianciola, et al., 2021; Philo,
395 Keim, et al., 2021; Silverman and Boehm, 2020; La Rosa, Bonadonna, et al., 2020; Bofill-Mas and
396 Rusiñol, 2020).

397
398 Notably, the various choices in separation methods result from an underlying assumption of
399 differential enrichment/partitioning of the viral particles within the fractions in a sample.
400 Therefore, we considered the fractions as subgroups in achieving pooled estimates of SARS-CoV-
401 2 titers in wastewater (3.2).

402

403 **3.2 Meta-analysis on the positivity of SARS-CoV-2 positive detections from untreated**
404 **wastewater.**

405
406 While all the current studies took place during the pandemic, the detections of SARS-CoV-2 from
407 wastewater were not always positive. We first ask, what was the grand mean of positivity of
408 detection among studies taking place in the first year of wastewater-based SARS-CoV-2
409 monitoring? We examined the overall positivity across 1,877 observations in 20 studies, which
410 was 0.67 and a 95%-CI [0.56, 0.79]. Because the sampling mode (i.e., grab or composite sampling)
411 and fractions for analysis (i.e., supernatants/filtrates, mixed supernatant and suspended solids, and
412 solids-only) were expected to introduce variations, we examined the means of the proportion of
413 positive detection by sampling modes (Figure 3) or fractions for analysis (Figure 4). Wastewater
414 SARS-CoV-2 measurements in composite sampling mode had a detection rate of 0.70 and a 95%-
415 CI of [0.47; 0.94], whereas those generated from the grab sampling had an average detection rate
416 of 0.56 and a 95%-CI of [0.32; 0.79]. The SARS-CoV-2 viral detection from the composite
417 sampling approach was significantly higher than those from the grab sample mode (one-sided t-
418 test, $p_{\text{BH-adjusted}}=5.63 \times 10^{-9}$). When grouped by fractions for analysis, the supernatant, mixed
419 supernatant and suspended solids, and solid fractions exhibited positive proportions of 0.53 (95%-
420 CI [0.32; 0.75]), 0.62 (95%-CI [0.12; 1]), and 0.82 (95%-CI [0.43; 1]), respectively. Solid and
421 solid-supernatant mixtures had significantly higher average positive proportion than the
422 supernatant/filtrate fraction ($p_{\text{BH-adjusted}} < 2 \times 10^{-16}$ and $p_{\text{BH-adjusted}} = 2.60 \times 10^{-10}$ in pairwise t-test,
423 respectively). Solid analysis exhibited a significantly higher average positive proportion than the
424 solid-supernatant mixtures ($p_{\text{BH-adjusted}} = 6.50 \times 10^{-8}$). It should be noted that even within subgroups,
425 high heterogeneity (I-squared 0.97-0.99) was revealed from the metanalysis. This could be caused
426 by the variations in COVID-19 cases or other local variables associated with a study, which will
427 be explored in the regression analysis in Section 3.4.

428
429 **3.3 Meta-analysis of SARS-CoV-2 titers in untreated wastewater.**

430
431 We focused on studies that reported SARS-CoV-2 titers as units per volume to calculate a pooled
432 estimate of SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater. These are seventeen studies including a total of

433 1,674 observations. Across these studies, the average SARS-CoV-2 titers was 5,244.37 copies/mL
434 (95%-CI [0; 16,432.65])

435
436 We then aggregated studies by the fractions analyzed, i.e., supernatants/filtrates, mixed
437 supernatant and suspended solids, and solids. A forest plot showing the study means, weighted
438 subgroup means, and confidence intervals is displayed in Figure 5. The average titers in
439 wastewater supernatant, mixture, and solids are 49.83 copies/mL (95%-CI [0; 136.87]), 180.7
440 copies/mL (95%-CI [0; 510.73]), and 30,455.7 copies/mL (95%-CI [0; 161,832.78]), respectively.
441 Viral titers from solid analysis exhibited significantly higher means than the other two groups ($p_{\text{BH-}}$
442 $\text{adjusted} < 2e-16$ for both comparisons), yet the other two groups did not significantly differ ($p_{\text{BH-}}$
443 $\text{adjusted} > 0.97$). This finding suggests that once the viral titers were beyond detection limits, the
444 difference between analyzing supernatants/filtrates or the mixture was not as strong.

445
446 Notably, viral titers varied largely even among studies investigating SARS-CoV-2 titers in the
447 same sample fractions, as shown by heterogeneity across studies (I^2) higher than 95% in all
448 subgroups (Figure 5). We further aggregated the observations by grab/composite and focused on
449 studies that reported WWTP samples alone (Figure S5). The cross-study heterogeneity remained
450 high ($I^2 > 93\%$) even after data were aggregated in such more methodologically homogenous
451 groups. The observed heterogeneity suggested that pandemic severity, as well as other local
452 variables, may drive the variations in SARS-CoV-2 titers among studies.

453
454 **3.4 Correlation between SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater and reported COVID-19 cases.**

455
456 The overall correlation between daily new cases and SARS-CoV-2 titers is 0.28 (95%-CI, [0.01;
457 0.51, Table S3). The Pearson Rho between cumulative case and SARS-CoV-2 titers as measured
458 by Pearson Rho was 0.29 (95%-CI, [-0.15; 0.73], Table S3). For both kinds of epidemiological
459 indicators, wastewater-based SARS-CoV-2 viral titers exhibited overall positive correlation.

460
461 **3.5 What drive the variations in SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater?**

462

463 We ask, how much of the large heterogeneity in the average copy numbers of SARS-CoV-2 in
464 wastewater can be explained by sampling mode, fraction for analysis, and COVID-19 case
465 prevalence, respectively? To answer this question, we built univariate models focusing on each
466 covariate, respectively. Studies reporting cumulative cases ($N_{[\text{observations}]} = 912$, $N_{[\text{studies}]} = 8$) and
467 daily cases ($N_{[\text{observations}]} = 500$, $N_{[\text{studies}]} = 8$) were examined separately to ensure consistent within-
468 group case reporting units.

469
470 First, we built logistic regression models to explain the relationships between positive SARS-CoV-
471 2 detection from sewage and each covariate considered. The models with sampling mode and
472 fraction of analysis as sole predictors explained 0.6% and 12.4% (Tjur's R-squared) of the total
473 variability in SARS-CoV-2 positive detections, respectively (Table 4). The proportion of variances
474 explained by daily and cumulative cases were 9.3% and 5.9%, respectively (Table 5).

475
476 Next, we built linear models to examine the relationships between logarithmic transformed viral
477 titers and each covariate. The variance in titers explained by sampling mode and fraction of
478 analysis were 6.9% and a notable 56.0%, respectively, whereas the variance explained by daily
479 and cumulative cases were 0.9% and 0.8%, respectively. In all these models, the role of
480 methodological variables and epidemiological indicators were significant ($p < 0.005$, Table 4 and
481 5). Daily or cumulative cases and sampling mode explained comparable proportions of variances.
482 Notably, fraction of analysis explained dramatically higher variance in titers than any other
483 variables.

484
485 **3.6 Slope coefficients in Generalized linear models**

486
487 Successful detection of the virus from wastewater is fundamental to WBE; our generalized linear
488 models on positive detections can provide quantitative insights on the magnitude at which changes
489 in each variable increase the chance of the positive detections (Table 4 Binomial family models
490 and Table 5 Binomial Fixed-effects model). From our models, the odds of positive detection
491 decrease by a factor of 1.43 (95%-CI [1.81, 1.13]) when utilizing grab sampling in contrast to
492 composite sampling. The odds of positive detection increase by a factor of 8.16 (95%-CI [6.08,
493 12.92]) from solid fraction in contrast to supernatants/filtrates; they increase by a factor of 3.52

494 (95%-CI [2.43, 5.30]) from solid-supernatant mixture in contrast to supernatants/filtrates. With an
495 increase in active case prevalence of 10 per 100,000 inhabitants, the odds of positive detection
496 increase by a factor of 1.06 unit (95%-CI [1.04, 1.09]); with an increase in cumulative cases of 10
497 per 100,000 inhabitants, they increase by a factor of 1.02 (95%-CI [1.01, 1.03]).

498

499 **3.7 Mixed-effects model help account for variation by studies**

500

501 While many applications of WBE rely on positive correlations between SARS-CoV-2 titers in
502 wastewater and disease prevalence, larger or comparable variability was explained by
503 methodological covariates than the reported case prevalence in our models (Table 4 and 5). While
504 it is a consensus that documenting methodological covariates in WBE studies is crucial, learning
505 about important variables about WBE is an ongoing process. To address the need of building
506 explanatory or predictive models in WBE, we considered a mixed-effects framework for modeling
507 SARS-CoV-2 viral titers from multiple studies. Here, we treat studies as a collective source of
508 variance. We hypothesize that in addition to the role of cases as a source of fixed effects on the
509 wastewater measurements, each study presents a source of a study-specific intercept. We tested
510 for the significance of random effects. For both, positivity or titers from daily or cumulative cases,
511 the random effects from the studies were significant ($p\text{-value} < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$, Table 5). Mixed effects
512 models also showed a lower AIC or BIC than the corresponding fixed-effects models, suggesting
513 better fits to the data.

514

515 For a mixed effects model, we examined both the marginal R-squared, which is the proportion of
516 variance explained by the fixed effects alone (case daily or case cumulative), and the conditional
517 R-squared, which describes the proportion of variance explained by both the fixed and random
518 factors (cases and the study identities respectively). Notably, mixed models exhibited conditional
519 R-squared close to or over 0.9 for both positivity and titers models reporting daily new cases or
520 cumulative cases (Table 5). Thus, simultaneously considering variability across studies greatly
521 improved our ability to explain the variation in wastewater SARS-CoV-2 measurements.

522

523 **4. DISCUSSION**

524

525 We synthesized the available evidence on SARS-CoV-2 detection and titers in wastewater during
526 the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic. The combined detection rate across studies was 67%
527 (95%-CI, [0.56; 0.79]). The overall SARS-CoV-2 titers across all processing methods was
528 5,244.37 copies/mL (95%-CI, [0; 16,432.65]). The overall correlation between SARS-CoV-2 titers
529 in wastewater and daily new cases was 0.28 [0.01; 0.51], and the correlation between titers and
530 cumulative cases was 0.29 [-0.15; 0.73]. The overall positive associations reinforce that
531 wastewater is a favorable data source to track COVID-19 dynamics in a community backed by
532 meta-analysis.

533
534 Of interest, sampling modes and wastewater fractions had strong influences on the pooled means
535 in proportions of positive detection and SARS-CoV-2 titers. Composite sampling mode had a
536 higher detection rate than grab sampling, as seen from an average detection rate of 0.70 [0.47;
537 0.94]) and 0.56 (95%-CI, [0.32; 0.79], Figure 3), respectively. Supernatant/filtrates, solid-
538 supernatant mixture, and solid fractions increased by average detection rates 0.53 (95%-CI [0.32;
539 0.75]), 0.62 (95%-CI [0.12; 1]), and 0.82 (95%-CI [0.43; 1]), respectively, (Figure 4). Sampling
540 mode and fraction of analysis explained 0.6% and 12.4% of the variance in the proportions of
541 positive detection, and fraction of analysis explained 56% of variance in titers. These results can
542 be useful in designing experimental workflows for WBE. In particular, the large variance in titers
543 explained by fraction of analysis and the large magnitudes in regression coefficients suggest that
544 standardizing the fraction of analysis need to be prioritized when researchers would like to design
545 monitoring efforts across multiple labs. The overall detection rate and those in subgroups of any
546 sewage fraction was below one, suggesting a need for tools to maximize the chance of SARS-
547 CoV-2 detection from sewage samples.

548
549 In our meta-analysis, large heterogeneity was detected in all effect sizes investigated (i.e.,
550 proportions of positive detections, titers, and Pearson's Rhos between titers and daily or
551 cumulative cases, Figures 3, 4, and 5, Table S3). We hypothesize that the unexplained variations
552 in SARS-CoV-2 titers detected in wastewater can be affected by study-level factors specific to the
553 wastewater collection system, individual-based testing efforts, and methodological choices. In our
554 meta-analysis, we found that metadata about the collection system, such as per capita water
555 consumption, relative contributions of domestic vs. commercial/industrial water, or sewage travel

556 times (i.e., residence times) are currently rare. These collection system-level variables can affect
557 the dilution of fecal materials and the genetic decay of the viral signal (Silverman and Boehm,
558 2020; Foladori, Cutrupi, et al., 2020; Ahmed, Bertsch, Bibby, et al., 2020). Thus, more detailed
559 metadata reporting regarding the wastewater collection system is needed to better explain
560 variations across sites. Lately, it was proposed that wastewater be viewed as an independent
561 indicator of true prevalence, as epidemiological indicators from current reporting can be affected
562 by under-reporting (Olesen, Imakaev, et al., 2021). Therefore, methods and tools to interrogate the
563 wastewater metagenome and derive system-level data, or bridging wastewater-based
564 measurements to prevalence, deserve more attention.

565
566 It should be noted that heterogeneity in titers and correlations observed here may not be fully
567 explained by recovery efficiencies of viruses from wastewater samples during viral concentration
568 workflows. To illustrate this complexity, we discuss two studies where recovery efficiencies were
569 reported. In one study, an average viral titer of 881 ± 633 copies/mL was detected when COVID-
570 19 in the associated area was between 10-80 cumulative cases per 100,000 inhabitants (Medema,
571 Heijnen, et al., 2020); in another study, an average viral titer of 1.9 ± 6.0 marker copies/mL was
572 reported with the same range of COVID-19 prevalence (10-80 cumulative cases per 100,000
573 inhabitants). After adjusting titers by reported recovery efficiencies (73 and 7.7%, respectively),
574 the adjusted copy numbers (1,206 and 27 marker copies/mL, respectively) still vary by two orders
575 of magnitude.

576
577 While the field's ability to quantify the effects from methodological variables and collection
578 systems are important ongoing research topics, mixed-effects models treating "studies" as a source
579 of random effects can be considered a useful way to perform inference and prediction. Mixed-
580 effects models handle a wide range of scenarios where observations have been sampled in
581 hierarchical structure rather than completely independently. In this study, treating studies as a
582 source of random effects on intercepts profoundly improved the quality of the model, as seen in
583 improved AIC and BIC compared to respective fixed-effects models (Table 5). The final models
584 reached conditional R-squared values above 0.9. The mixed-effects approach provides an
585 alternative for researchers to leverage existing data from studies conducted elsewhere to build
586 models useful for explaining variations in local observations.

587

588 **5. Study limitations**

589

590 Our study had several limitations. The most notable is the large amount of unexplained
591 heterogeneity in positive detection, SARS-CoV-2 titers, and Pearson correlations across studies.
592 This is likely attributable to variability in methodological differences in SARS-CoV-2 virus
593 measurements, wastewater-system characteristics, and ways that epidemiological data were
594 collected and reported. Thus, we employed mixed-effects models to make inferences about the
595 correlation between epidemiological indicators and viral detection/titers, treating study-level
596 variations as a source of random effects. Second, the studies resulting from the screening method
597 were primarily carried out at wastewater treatment plants. Future meta-analysis focusing on
598 collection systems or buildings may become possible when more data become available.

599

600 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

601

602 **Figure 1.** Study selection flow diagram. The three criteria used in the screening for eligibility are:
603 Criterion 1, original data of SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater samples were provided in terms
604 quantification cycle (Cq), copy numbers per unit of volume or weight, or genome equivalents per
605 unit of volume or weight; Criterion 2, sampling location were reported as WWTPs, sewage
606 collection networks, buildings, or hospitals; Criterion 3, COVID-19 case counts of the
607 corresponding times and areas were reported in the study with a clear data source. Reports were
608 found to be primarily sampling at WWTP (17 studies) and less often at municipal sewage network
609 (3 studies) and in-premise (1 study); in-premise sampling location was carried out at a hospital.

610

611 **Figure 2.** Diagram depicting reported sample collection locations, pre-processing methodologies,
612 and their respective annotations as sampling locations and fractions in this study.

613

614 **Figure 3.** Forest plot of selected aggregation reporting the proportions of positive detections for
615 SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples. Pooled estimates for (a) all studies utilizing grab samples
616 and (b) all studies utilizing composite samples.

617

618 **Figure 4.** Forest plot of selected aggregation reporting the proportions of positive detections for
619 SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples. Pooled estimates for (a) all studies analyzing
620 supernatant/filtrates (b) all studies analyzing mixtures without pre-processing, and (c) all studies
621 analyzing solids.

622
623 **Figure 5.** Forest plot of selected aggregations reporting weighted means of SARS-CoV-2 titers in
624 wastewater. Pooled estimates for (a) all studies analyzing supernatant/filtrates (b) all studies
625 analyzing mixtures without pre-processing, and (c) all studies analyzing solids. The forest plot
626 includes data from all studies that reported SARS-CoV-2 titers as copy numbers per unit volume.
627 CI-confidence interval.

628

629 REFERENCES

630

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

635 Ahmed, W., Bertsch, P. M., Bibby, K., Haramoto, E., Hewitt, J., Huygens, F., Gyawali, P.,
636 Korajkic, A., Riddell, S., and Sherchan, S. P. (2020) Decay of SARS-CoV-2 and surrogate
637 murine hepatitis virus RNA in untreated wastewater to inform application in wastewater-
638 based epidemiology. *Environmental Research*, **191**, 110092.

639 Ahmed, W., Bertsch, P. M., Bivins, A., Bibby, K., Farkas, K., Gathercole, A., Haramoto, E.,
640 Gyawali, P., Korajkic, A., McMinn, B. R., Mueller, J. F., Simpson, S. L., Smith, W. J. M.,
641 Symonds, E. M., Thomas, K. V., Verhagen, R., and Kitajima, M. (2020) Comparison of
642 virus concentration methods for the RT-qPCR-based recovery of murine hepatitis virus, a
643 surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 from untreated wastewater. *Science of The Total Environment*,
644 **739**, 139960.

645 Arnqvist, G. and Wooster, D. (1995) Meta-analysis: synthesizing research findings in ecology and
646 evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **10**(6), 236–240.

- 647 Baldovin, T., Amoruso, I., Fonzo, M., Buja, A., Baldo, V., Cocchio, S., and Bertoncello, C. (2021)
648 SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection and persistence in wastewater samples: An experimental
649 network for COVID-19 environmental surveillance in Padua, Veneto Region (NE Italy).
650 *Science of The Total Environment*, **760**, 143329.
- 651 Barril, P. A., Pianciola, L. A., Mazzeo, M., Ousset, M. J., Jaureguiberry, M. V., Alessandrello, M.,
652 Sánchez, G., and Oteiza, J. M. (2021) Evaluation of viral concentration methods for SARS-
653 CoV-2 recovery from wastewaters. *The Science of the Total Environment*, **756**, 144105.
- 654 Barton, K. (2009) MuMIn: multi-model inference, R package version 0.12. 0. [http://r-forge.r-](http://r-forge.r-project.org/projects/mumin/)
655 [project.org/projects/mumin/](http://r-forge.r-project.org/projects/mumin/).
- 656 Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2014) Fitting linear mixed-effects models
657 using lme4. arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5823.
- 658 Bofill-Mas, S. and Rusiñol, M. (2020) Recent trends on methods for the concentration of viruses
659 from water samples. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health*, **16**, 7–13.
- 660 Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P., and Rothstein, H. R. (2010) A basic introduction to
661 fixed-effect and random-effects models for meta-analysis. *Research synthesis methods*,
662 **1**(2), 97–111.
- 663 Card, N. A. (2015) *Applied meta-analysis for social science research*, Guilford Publications.
- 664 Chen, Y., Chen, L., Deng, Q., Zhang, G., Wu, K., Ni, L., Yang, Y., Liu, B., Wang, W., and Wei,
665 C. (2020) The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the feces of COVID-19 patients. *Journal*
666 *of medical virology*, **92**(7), 833–840.
- 667 D’Aoust, P. M., Graber, T. E., Mercier, E., Montpetit, D., Alexandrov, I., Neault, N., Baig, A. T.,
668 Mayne, J., Zhang, X., and Alain, T. (2021) Catching a resurgence: Increase in SARS-CoV-
669 2 viral RNA identified in wastewater 48 h before COVID-19 clinical tests and 96 h before
670 hospitalizations. *Science of The Total Environment*, **770**, 145319.
- 671 D’Aoust, P. M., Mercier, E., Montpetit, D., Jia, J.-J., Alexandrov, I., Neault, N., Baig, A. T.,
672 Mayne, J., Zhang, X., and Alain, T. (2021) Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA

- 673 from wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence.
674 Water research, **188**, 116560.
- 675 Foladori, P., Cutrupi, F., Segata, N., Manara, S., Pinto, F., Malpei, F., Bruni, L., and La Rosa, G.
676 (2020) SARS-CoV-2 from faeces to wastewater treatment: what do we know? A review.
677 Science of the Total Environment, **743**, 140444.
- 678 Gonçalves, J., Koritnik, T., Mioč, V., Trkov, M., Bolješič, M., Berginc, N., Prosenc, K., Kotar, T.,
679 and Paragi, M. (2021) Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in hospital wastewater from a low
680 COVID-19 disease prevalence area. Science of The Total Environment, **755**, 143226.
- 681 Gonzalez, R., Curtis, K., Bivins, A., Bibby, K., Weir, M. H., Yetka, K., Thompson, H., Keeling,
682 D., Mitchell, J., and Gonzalez, D. (2020) COVID-19 surveillance in Southeastern Virginia
683 using wastewater-based epidemiology. Water research, **186**, 116296.
- 684 Graham, K. E., Loeb, S. K., Wolfe, M. K., Catoe, D., Sinnott-Armstrong, N., Kim, S., Yamahara,
685 K. M., Sassoubre, L. M., Mendoza Grijalva, L. M., and Roldan-Hernandez, L. (2020)
686 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with COVID-19 Cases in
687 a Large Urban Sewershed. Environmental science & technology.
- 688 Guo, M., Tao, W., Flavell, R. A., and Zhu, S. (2021) Potential intestinal infection and faecal–oral
689 transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology, **18**(4),
690 269–283.
- 691 Gurevitch, J., Koricheva, J., Nakagawa, S., and Stewart, G. (2018) Meta-analysis and the science
692 of research synthesis. Nature, **555**(7695), 175–182.
- 693 Haramoto, E., Malla, B., Thakali, O., and Kitajima, M. (2020) First environmental surveillance for
694 the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and river water in Japan. Science of The
695 Total Environment, **737**, 140405.
- 696 Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T. A., and Ebert, D. D. (2019) Doing meta-analysis with R: A
697 hands-on guide.

- 698 Hata, A., Hara-Yamamura, H., Meuchi, Y., Imai, S., and Honda, R. (2021) Detection of SARS-
699 CoV-2 in wastewater in Japan during a COVID-19 outbreak. *Science of The Total*
700 *Environment*, **758**, 143578.
- 701 Hovi, T., Shulman, L. M., Van Der Avoort, H., Deshpande, J., Roivainen, M., and De Gourville,
702 E. M. (2012) Role of environmental poliovirus surveillance in global polio eradication and
703 beyond. *Epidemiology & Infection*, **140**(1), 1–13.
- 704 Kitamura, K., Sadamasu, K., Muramatsu, M., and Yoshida, H. (2021) Efficient detection of SARS-
705 CoV-2 RNA in the solid fraction of wastewater. *Science of The Total Environment*, **763**,
706 144587.
- 707 Kumar, M., Patel, A. K., Shah, A. V., Raval, J., Rajpara, N., Joshi, M., and Joshi, C. G. (2020)
708 First proof of the capability of wastewater surveillance for COVID-19 in India through
709 detection of genetic material of SARS-CoV-2. *Science of The Total Environment*, **746**,
710 141326.
- 711 La Rosa, G., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L., Kenmoe, S., and Suffredini, E. (2020) Coronavirus in
712 water environments: Occurrence, persistence and concentration methods-A scoping
713 review. *Water research*, **179**, 115899.
- 714 Larsen, D. A. and Wigginton, K. R. (2020) Tracking COVID-19 with wastewater. *Nature*
715 *Biotechnology*, **38**(10), 1151–1153.
- 716 Linden, A. H. and Hönekopp, J. (2021) Heterogeneity of research results: a new perspective from
717 which to assess and promote progress in psychological science. *Perspectives on*
718 *Psychological Science*, **16**(2), 358–376.
- 719 Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., and Brouwer, A. (2020) Presence of SARS-
720 Coronavirus-2 RNA in sewage and correlation with reported COVID-19 prevalence in the
721 early stage of the epidemic in the Netherlands. *Environmental Science & Technology*
722 *Letters*, **7**(7), 511–516.
- 723 Miyani, B., Fonoll, X., Norton, J., Mehrotra, A., and Xagorarakis, I. (2020) SARS-CoV-2 in Detroit
724 wastewater. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*, **146**(11), 06020004.

- 725 Murad, M. H. and Montori, V. M. (2013) Synthesizing evidence: shifting the focus from individual
726 studies to the body of evidence. *Jama*, **309**(21), 2217–2218.
- 727 Murakami, M., Hata, A., Honda, R., and Watanabe, T. (2020) Letter to the Editor: Wastewater-
728 Based Epidemiology Can Overcome Representativeness and Stigma Issues Related to
729 COVID-19. *Environmental Science & Technology*, **54**(9), 5311–5311.
- 730 Nemudryi, A., Nemudraia, A., Wiegand, T., Surya, K., Buyukyoruk, M., Cicha, C., Vanderwood,
731 K. K., Wilkinson, R., and Wiedenheft, B. (2020) Temporal detection and phylogenetic
732 assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in municipal wastewater. *Cell Reports Medicine*, **1**(6),
733 100098.
- 734 Olesen, S. W., Imakaev, M., and Duvallet, C. (2021) Making waves: Defining the lead time of
735 wastewater-based epidemiology for COVID-19. *Water Research*, **202**, 117433.
- 736 Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D.,
737 Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., and Brennan, S. E. (2021) The PRISMA 2020
738 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Bmj*, **372**.
- 739 Peccia, J., Zulli, A., Brackney, D. E., Grubaugh, N. D., Kaplan, E. H., Casanovas-Massana, A.,
740 Ko, A. I., Malik, A. A., Wang, D., and Wang, M. (2020) Measurement of SARS-CoV-2
741 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics. *Nature Biotechnology*, **38**(10),
742 1164–1167.
- 743 Philo, S. E., Keim, E. K., Swanstrom, R., Ong, A. Q. W., Burnor, E. A., Kossik, A. L., Harrison,
744 J. C., Demeke, B. A., Zhou, N. A., Beck, N. K., Shirai, J. H., and Meschke, J. S. (2021) A
745 comparison of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentration methods for environmental
746 surveillance. *The Science of the Total Environment*, **760**, 144215.
- 747 R Core Team (2013) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna: R Core
748 Team.
- 749 Randazzo, W., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Sanjuán, R., Domingo-Calap, P., and Sánchez, G. (a) (2020)
750 Metropolitan wastewater analysis for COVID-19 epidemiological surveillance.
751 *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*, **230**, 113621.

- 752 Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Simón, P., Allende, A., and Sánchez, G. (b)
753 (2020) SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low
754 prevalence area. *Water research*, **181**, 115942.
- 755 Saguti, F., Magnil, E., Enache, L., Churqui, M. P., Johansson, A., Lumley, D., Davidsson, F.,
756 Dotevall, L., Mattsson, A., and Trybala, E. (2021) Surveillance of wastewater revealed
757 peaks of SARS-CoV-2 preceding those of hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *Water*
758 *research*, **189**, 116620.
- 759 Sherchan, S. P., Shahin, S., Ward, L. M., Tandukar, S., Aw, T. G., Schmitz, B., Ahmed, W., and
760 Kitajima, M. (2020) First detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in North America:
761 a study in Louisiana, USA. *Science of The Total Environment*, **743**, 140621.
- 762 Sidik, K. and Jonkman, J. N. (2005) Simple heterogeneity variance estimation for meta-analysis.
763 *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, **54**(2), 367–384.
- 764 Silverman, A. I. and Boehm, A. B. (2020) Systematic review and meta-analysis of the persistence
765 and disinfection of human coronaviruses and their viral surrogates in water and wastewater.
766 *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, **7**(8), 544–553.
- 767 Trottier, J., Darques, R., Mouheb, N. A., Partiot, E., Bakhache, W., Deffieu, M. S., and Gaudin,
768 R. (2020) Post-lockdown detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the wastewater of
769 Montpellier, France. *One Health*, **10**, 100157.
- 770 Westhaus, S., Weber, F.-A., Schiwy, S., Linnemann, V., Brinkmann, M., Widera, M., Greve, C.,
771 Janke, A., Hollert, H., and Wintgens, T. (2021) Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in raw and
772 treated wastewater in Germany—suitability for COVID-19 surveillance and potential
773 transmission risks. *Science of The Total Environment*, **751**, 141750.
- 774 Xiao, F., Sun, J., Xu, Y., Li, F., Huang, X., Li, H., Zhao, Jingxian, Huang, J., and Zhao, Jincun
775 (2020) Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in feces of patient with severe COVID-19. *Emerging*
776 *infectious diseases*, **26**(8), 1920.

777

Table 1. Inclusion criteria for eligibility of studies

Inclusion Criteria	Rationales
C1: qPCR data were reported as quantification cycle, copy numbers/volume, genome equivalents/ml, or genome equivalents/weight	C1 provides comparable data among studies
C2: Sampling locations for raw sewage were identified as wastewater treatment plants (WWTP), sewage collection network, lift station, manholes or septic tanks.	C2 allows comparisons of SARS-CoV-2 viral titers and percent positivity in wastewater within and across studies.
C3: COVID-19 case records were reported for the associated locations during the sampling times.	C3 allows comparisons of SARS-CoV-2 viral titers in wastewater within and across studies.

Table 2. General features of studies included. COVID-19 cases are reported per 100,000 inhabitants unless otherwise stated. COVID-19 cases are rounded to the nearest unit.
 * Semi-quantitative studies. † cases not normalized by 100,000 inhabitants

Author	Country / Date of sampling	Sample collection point	Sample type	Population served	Sample fraction	Viral concentration method	Type of case (mean, min, max)
Ahmed, W et al. (2020)	Australia	Pumping station, WWTP influent	Grab and composite	736,172	Supernatant and suspended solids	Electronegative membrane adsorption-Direct RNA extraction	Cumulative cases. (50, 0, 70)
	Feb - April, 2020				Supernatant	Ultrafiltration (Centricon)	
Baldovin, T et al. (2021) *	Italy	Municipal sewage network	Grab	12,770 - 36,042	Supernatant	Ultrafiltration	Cumulative cases (169, 141, 205)
	April 23 and May 05, 2020						Hospitalized cases (34, 30, 39)
D'Aoust, P. M et al. (2021)	Canada	Postgrid solids	Grab and composite	1,300,000	Solids	PEG precipitation	Daily cases (117, 19, 572)
	April - June, 2020	Primary sludge				Alum precipitation - Ultrafiltration	Active cases (19, 6, 58)
Gonçalves, J et al. (2021)*	Slovenia	Hospital sewage	Composite	NA	Supernatant	Ultrafiltration	Cumulative cases † (2, 0, 4)
	June, 2020						Active cases † (2, 0, 4)
Gonzalez, R et al. (2020)	USA	WWTP influent	Grab and Composite	1,700,000	Supernatant	Hollow fiber concentrating pipet	Cumulative cases (229, 1, 2,288)
	March - May, 2020					Adsorption-Elution Electronegative membrane	
Graham, K et al. (2020)	USA	WWTP Influent	Composite	1,700,000	Supernatant	PEG precipitation	Daily cases (2, 1, 12)
	March-April, 2020						
	March-July, 2020	Primary settling tank	Composite		Primary solids	No concentration	

Author	Country / Date of sampling	Sample collection point	Sample type	Population served	Sample fraction	Concentration method	Type of case
Haramoto, E et al. (2020)	Japan	WWTP influent	Grab	817,192*	Supernatant and suspended solids	Electronegative vortex - ultrafiltration	Cumulative cases (5, 0, 7)
	March - May, 2020					Electronegative membrane adsorption-Direct RNA extraction	Daily cases. (1, 0, 1.0)
Hata, A et al. (2021)	Japan	WWTP influent	Grab	697,000	Supernatant	PEG precipitation	Daily cases (8, 0, 19)
	March - April, 2020						Cumulative cases (15, 0, 26)
Kitamura, K et al. (2021)	Japan	WWTP influent, Municipal sewage network	Grab	NA	Supernatant	Adsorption-Elution Electronegative membrane	Cumulative cases † (122, 19, 209)
	June - August, 2020					PEG precipitation	
					Solids	Ultrafiltration Solid precipitation - centrifugation	
Kumar, M et al. (2020)	India	WWTP influent	Grab	NA	Supernatant	PEG precipitation	Cumulative cases † (7,793, 4,912, 10,674)
	May, 2020						
Medema, G et al. (2020)	Netherlands	WWTP influent	Composite	2,800,000	Supernatant	Ultrafiltration (Centricon)	Cumulative cases (16, 0, 87)
	Feb - March, 2020						
Miyani, B et al. (2020)	USA	Municipal sewage network	Grab	3,200,000	Supernatant and suspended solids	Adsorption-Elution Electropositive column filters	Daily cases (6, 4, 8)
	April - May, 2020						
Nemudryi, A et al. (2020)	USA	WWTP influent	Composite	49,831	Supernatant	Ultrafiltration	Daily cases (6, 0, 14)
	March - June, 2020						

Author	Country / Date of sampling	Sample collection point	Sample type	Population served	Sample fraction	Concentration method	Type of case
Peccia, J et al. (2020)	USA March - June, 2020	Primary settling tank	Grab	200,000	Solids	No concentration	Daily positive test (26, 3, 60)
Randazzo, W et al. (2020) (a)	Spain Feb - April, 2020	WWTP influent	Grab	1,200,000	Supernatant and suspended solids	Aluminium flocculation	Active cases (80, 1, 111)
Randazzo, W et al. (2020) (b)	Spain March - April, 2020	WWTP influent	Grab	1,357,177	Supernatant and suspended solids	Aluminum hydroxide adsorption-precipitation	Cumulative cases (36, 0, 140)
Saguti, F et al. (2021)	Sweden February - July, 2020	WWTP influent	Composite	800,000	Supernatant	PS Hollow fiber concentrating pipette Adsorption-Elution Electropositive cartridges - Ultrafiltration	Newly hospitalized patients per day (9, 0, 20)
Sherchan, S.P et al. (2020)	USA Jan - April, 2020	WWTP Influent	Grab and composite	290,321	Supernatant and suspended solids	Adsorption-Elution Electronegative membrane	Cumulative cases (808, 0, 2,534)
					Supernatant	Ultrafiltration	Daily cases (16, 0, 32)
Trottier, J et al. (2020)	France May - July, 2020	WWTP influent	Composite	470,000	Supernatant	Ultrafiltration	Daily cases (1, 0, 2)
Westhaus, S et al. (2021)	Germany April 08, 2020	WWTP influent	Composite	4,429,500	Supernatant	Ultrafiltration	Cumulative cases (123, 72, 220)
							Active cases (72, 30, 174)

Table 3. Regression coefficients for individual studies correlating SARS-CoV-2 measurements in wastewater (copies / mL) with COVID-19 case data of associated locations.

Author	Linear regression		
	Slope	R-squared	p-value
D'Aoust, P.M et al.	0.52	0.511	1.03E-07
Graham, K et al.	196.64	0.351	3.99E-17
Scherchan, S.P et al	0.03	0.169	1.44E-01
Peccia, J et al.	1994.77	0.163	2.79E-10
Hata, A et al.	0.16	0.0494	3.85E-02
Miyani, B et al.	-0.20	0.0141	5.10E-01
Haramoto, E et al	-4.14	0.00358	7.29E-01
Trottier, J et al	0.19	0.00294	8.54E-01
Nemudryi, A et al.	-0.02	0.00282	7.65E-01

Cumulative COVID-19 cases per 100,000 inhabitants

Author	Linear regression		
	Slope	R-squared	p-value
Gonzalez, R et al.	0.04	0.613	4.81E-124
Medema, G et al	14.82	0.398	1.30E-09
Sherchan, S.P et al.	0.00	0.0938	2.87E-01
Haramoto, E et al.	-4.62	0.0784	9.81E-02
Hata, A et al.	0.08	0.0283	1.19E-01
Westhaus, S et al.	-0.01	0.0121	6.63E-01
Randazzo, W et al (b)	0.45	0.00775	5.79E-01

Active COVID-19 cases per 100,000 inhabitants

Author	Linear regression		
	Slope	R-squared	p-value
D'Aoust, P.M et al.	3.85	0.329	4.70E-05
Randazzo, W et al (a)	1.61	0.107	1.19E-01
Westhaus, S et al.	-0.01	0.00774	7.28E-01

Table 4. Methodological variables explaining variances in SARS-CoV-2 positive detections and titers.

Univariate models	Binomial (N _{obs} = 1508)			Gaussian (log transformation on titers) (N _{obs} = 936)		
	Coefficient [95%-CI]	p-values	Explained variance (R-squared)	Coefficient [95%-CI]	p-values	Explained variance (R-squared)
Grab_composite			0.006			0.069
Intercept	0.7480 [0.5505 0.9502]	2.1 x 10 ⁻¹³ ***		2.4902 [1.9952 2.9852]	< 2 x 10 ⁻¹⁶ ***	
Grab_composite: Grab	-0.3565 [-0.5925 -0.1239]	0.00284 **		2.545 [1.9447 3.1456]	3.1 x 10 ⁻¹⁶ ***	
Fraction			0.124			0.560
Intercept	0.0099 [-0.1135 0.1334]	0.875		1.5115 [1.2497 1.7733]	< 2 x 10 ⁻¹⁶ ***	
Fraction:Solid	2.1675 [1.8058 2.5591]	< 2 x 10 ⁻¹⁶ ***		7.5277 [7.0983 7.9570]	< 2 x 10 ⁻¹⁶ ***	
Fraction:Solid-supernatant mixture	1.2664 [0.8874 1.6685]	1.9 x 10 ⁻¹⁰ ***		2.1430 [1.5617 2.7243]	9.7 x 10 ⁻¹³ ***	

Table 5. Fixed-effects and mixed-effects modeling of the effects of COVID-19 daily new cases or cumulative cases on the positive detection and titers of SARS-CoV-2 viruses in wastewater. CI: confidence interval, AIC: Akaike information criterion, BIC: Bayesian information criterion, Loglik: Log likelihood.

Model name	Daily case model (N _[observations] = 500, N _[studies] = 8)				Cumulative case model (N _[observations] = 912, N _[studies] = 8)			
	Binomial		Gaussian (log transformation on titers)		Binomial		Gaussian (log transformation on titers)	
	Fixed effects	Mixed effects	Fixed effects	Mixed effects	Fixed effects	Mixed effects	Fixed effects	Mixed effects
Fixed effects	b [95% CI]	b [95% CI]	b [95% CI]	b [95% CI]	b [95% CI]	b [95% CI]	b [95% CI]	b [95% CI]
Intercept	0.6494 [0.3341, 0.9646]	3.3253 [-1.3492, 7.9997]	6.2329 [5.6278, 6.8380]	1.7822 [-1.0955, 4.6598]	-0.0350 [-0.1976, 0.1265]	-0.0637 [-3.9539, 3.8265]	1.7848 [1.5272, 2.0425]	1.0549 [-1.2556, 3.3654]
Daily new cases	0.0630 [0.0424, 0.0865]	0.1064 [0.04792, 0.1649]	0.0107 [0.0011, 0.0202]	0.0061 [0.0035, 0.0086]	--	--	--	--
Cumulative cases	--	--	--	--	0.0018 [0.0012, 0.0025]	0.0054 [0.0041, 0.0066]	0.0007 [0.0001, 0.0013]	0.0017 [0.0013, 0.0020]
Random effects								
Study_ID (variance)	--	23.15	--	17.124	--	29.75	--	10.926
Adjusted R ²	0.0935	--	0.0093	--	0.0592	--	0.0084	--
Marginal R ²	--	0.5399	--	0.0056	--	0.0832	--	0.0239
Conditional R ²	--	0.9427	--	0.9253	--	0.9087	--	0.8992
AIC	422.2	200.3590	2579.109	1406.1	1213.9	1012.1423	2381.286	1691.9
BIC	430.6259	213.0028	2591.157	1422.2	1223.536	1026.5892	2394.007	1708.9
Loglik	-209.098	-97.179	-1286.55	-699.07	-604.95	-503.07	-1187.64	-841.95
Random effects (p-values)	--	< 2.2 x 10 ⁻¹⁶ ***	--	< 2.2 x 10 ⁻¹⁶ ***	--	< 2.2 x 10 ⁻¹⁶ ***	--	< 2.2 x 10 ⁻¹⁶ ***




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure S1. Schematic showing the aggregation of studies based i) fraction type, ii) sample collection location and iii) case type reported by study. Two entries are included for Ahmed, W et al. and Kitamura, K et al. as these studies report data for multiple fractions. Studies are listed only if two or more studies fall within the same group.

* Baldovin, T et al. and Goncalves, J et al. reports only qualitative data.

** Cases are reported. However no information was available to allow for normalization of daily cases by population size.




Figure S2. Individual correlations (per study) of SARS-CoV-2 measurements in wastewater with daily COVID cases reported. Daily cases are normalized by population size and reported as cases in 100,000 inhabitants. Only data for supernatant fraction (S) in Sherchan, S.P. et al. is presented, as supernatant and suspended solids fraction did not show positive results for SARS-CoV-2.




Figure S3. Individual correlations (per study) of SARS-CoV-2 measurements in wastewater with cumulative COVID cases reported. Cumulative cases are normalized by population size and reported as cases in 100.000 inhabitants. Only data for supernatant fraction (S) in Sherchan, S.P. et al. is presented, as supernatant and suspended solids fraction did not show positive results for SARS-CoV-2. Data for Ahmed, W et al. is not presented as only one sample per fraction type was positive for SARS-CoV-2.




Figure S4. Individual correlations (per study) of SARS-CoV-2 measurements in wastewater with active COVID cases reported. Active cases are normalized by population size and reported as cases in 100.000 inhabitants.




Figure S5. Standardized mean difference of SARS-CoV-2 copy numbers per mL of wastewater. Studies are grouped based on fraction type and location of sample collection. Five studies are not included in the forest plot. These are: i) Graham, K et al. data is not presented as this study uniquely reports SARS-CoV-2 levels per unit of mass, ii and iii) Goncalvez, J et al. and Baldovin, T et al. reports only qualitative data for SARS-CoV-2 measurements in wastewater (quantification cycle for qPCR), and iv and v) Ahmed, W et al. and Sherchan, S.P et al. as these studies reported only two samples with a positive result for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 for the respective sample groupings. Kitamura, K et al. examined SARS-CoV-2 levels in both, solids and supernatant and suspended solids samples. Values for each type of sample are presented in the relevant group. Scales between fraction groups differ. Prediction interval can not be calculated for two studies.