

1 Evaluation of Simple and Convenient Methods for SARS-CoV-2 Detection in 2 Wastewater in high and Low Resource Settings

3 Pengbo Liu¹, Lizheng Guo¹, Matthew Cavallo¹, Caleb Cantrell^{1,2}, Stephen Patrick Hilton¹, Jillian Dunbar¹,
4 Robbie Barbero², Robert Barclay², Orlando III Sablon¹, Marlene Wolfe¹, Ben Lepene², Christine Moe¹

5 ¹Center for Global Safe Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory
6 University, Atlanta, GA 30322, USA

7 ²Ceres Nanosciences, Inc., 9460 Innovation Dr, Manassas, VA 20110, USA

8
9 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) RNA monitoring in wastewater
10 has become an important tool for COVID-19 surveillance. Although many viral concentration
11 methods such as membrane filtration and skim milk are reported, these methods generally
12 require large volumes of wastewater, expensive lab equipment, and laborious processes. We
13 utilized a Nanotrap[®] Microbiome A Particles (Nanotrap particle) method for virus concentration
14 in wastewater. The method was evaluated across six parameters: pH, temperature, incubation
15 time, wastewater volumes, RNA extraction methods, and two virus concentration approaches vs.
16 a one-step method. The method was further evaluated with the addition of the Nanotrap
17 Enhancement Reagent 1 (ER1) by comparing the automated vs. a manual Nanotrap particle
18 method. RT-qPCR targeting the nucleocapsid protein was used for detection and quantification
19 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Different pH, temperature, incubation time, wastewater volumes, and
20 RNA extraction methods did not result in reduced SARS-CoV-2 detection in wastewater
21 samples. The two-step concentration method showed significantly better results ($P<0.01$) than
22 the one-step method. Adding ER1 to wastewater prior to viral concentration using the Nanotrap
23 particles significantly improved PCR Ct results ($P<0.0001$) in 10 mL grab samples processed by
24 automated Nanotrap particle method or 10 mL and 40 mL samples processed by manual
25 Nanotrap particle method. SARS-CoV-2 detection in 10 mL grab samples with ER1 and the
26 automated method showed significantly better ($P=0.0008$) results than 150 mL grab samples
27 using the membrane filtration method. SARS-CoV-2 detection in 10 mL swab samples with
28 ER1 via the automated method was also significantly better than without ER1 ($P<0.0001$) and
29 the skim milk method in 250 mL Moore swab samples ($P=0.012$). These results suggest that
30 Nanotrap methods could substitute the traditional membrane filtration and skim milk methods for
31 viral concentration without compromising on the assay sensitivity. The manual method can be
32 used in resource-limited areas, and the high-throughput platform is appropriate for large-scale
33 COVID-19 wastewater-based surveillance.

34 **Key Words:** SARS-CoV-2; wastewater; Nanotrap particles; RT-qPCR; grab; Moore swab

35

36

37

38

39 INTRODUCTION

40 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome
41 coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2), a single-stranded RNA virus that can infect individuals who can
42 develop illness ranging in severity from life-threatening complications to mild symptomatic or
43 asymptomatic infections. SARS-CoV-2 is mainly transmitted among people via respiratory
44 droplets. However, it is also shed in feces at high concentrations and SARS-CoV-2 RNA titer in
45 feces has been reported to be 10^5 copies per gram of feces or between 10^2 - 10^7 genome copies per
46 milliliter of stool suspension ^[1], allowing the virus RNA to be detected in sewage samples
47 collected from wastewater treatment plants, community manholes, or buildings ^[2, 3]. Since the
48 early reported detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater ^[4, 5], monitoring for SARS-CoV-2 RNA
49 has become a critical tool for global COVID-19 surveillance and to guide response to COVID-19
50 outbreaks in communities. The initial step in processing wastewater samples for SARS-CoV-2
51 detection is to concentrate viruses from a relatively large volume to a small volume or pellet that
52 can be used for nucleic acid extraction. Previous studies reported that the typical volumes of
53 wastewater samples for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 range from 50-250 mL ^[6]. For this range
54 of volumes, SARS-CoV-2 was concentrated using several approaches: membrane filtration ^[4],
55 precipitation with polyethylene glycol (PEG) ^[7], skim milk ^[8], ultracentrifugation ^[9], and
56 ultrafiltration, ^[10]etc. This step usually requires a centrifuge that can spin down at least a 50-mL
57 tube, which is a problem for some laboratories with limited resources in the world. Using a small
58 volume of wastewater samples without this centrifuge and without compromise on assay
59 sensitivity would be preferable for broad application of SARS-COV-2 wastewater surveillance.
60 In addition, there are limited reports for application of novel viral concentration approach in
61 wastewater samples and consideration of small sample volume with better sensitivity.

62 Nanotrap particles are highly porous hydrogel particles that are versatile in their functionality for
63 the capture and concentration of analytes, such as proteins, peptides, nucleic acids, hormones,
64 viral antigens, and live infectious pathogens. This versatility allows Nanotrap particles to be
65 customized to capture analytes in various complex biological mixtures like blood, saliva, urine,
66 and wastewater^[11]. Nanotrap particles can perform three essential functions: capturing target
67 analytes from complex metrics, separating analytes from interfering materials, and protecting
68 target analytes from degradation. Nanotrap particles are capable of preserving viruses and
69 nucleic acids from degradation after sample concentration at both ambient and increased
70 temperature for up to 3 days^[12]. In addition to these advantages, Nanotrap particles can capture
71 and concentrate multiple pathogens in one sample^[13]. This capability has been demonstrated
72 with Nanotrap particles used in a coinfection scenario with HIV and Rift Valley Fever Virus in
73 bovine serum^[12]. Since the COVID-19 pandemic began, Nanotrap particles have been used to
74 detect SARS-CoV-2^[14, 15] and other respiratory viruses^[16, 17] in wastewater. For example,
75 Anderson et al^[17] demonstrated that Nanotrap particles can be used for simultaneous
76 concentration and detection of SARS-CoV-2, influenza, and Respiratory Syncytial Virus in
77 wastewater.

78 These sampling methods were used for SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-based epidemiology: grab,
79 composite, and passive sampling. Grab sampling is a simple and convenient method that
80 wastewater is collected at one point in time; however, interpretation of the results is limited
81 because the samples only represent a snapshot at one moment. Composite sampling has been
82 considered as a more representative method due to its ability to collect numerous individual
83 samples at regular time intervals, and the individual samples are subsequently combined in
84 proportion to the wastewater flow rate. However, composite sampling is more costly and time-

85 consuming, and it may not be feasible under certain environmental conditions. Passive sampling,
86 which a material is deployed in wastewater to trap SARS-CoV-2 over time, provides a sensitive,
87 low-cost, and convenient alternative to composite sampling. We used a Moore swab passive
88 sampling method, pieces of gauzes tied to a fishing line for SARS-CoV-2 wastewater
89 surveillance in institutional buildings. Grab samples were collected from manholes of the
90 buildings and membrane filtration method was used to concentrate the virus from 80-500 mL
91 wastewater because the grab samples usually had lower turbidity. Moore swab samples were
92 placed in the stream of wastewater and collected after 24 hours. Because these samples had
93 higher turbidity, the virus was concentrated using the skim milk method.

94 In this study, we evaluated whether some common parameters, such as pH, temperature,
95 incubation time, wastewater volume, RNA extraction method, and two-step (skim milk +
96 Nanotrap particle method) vs. one-step (Nanotrap particle method alone) concentration methods
97 impact the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater. The secondary objectives were to
98 compare: a) optimized high-throughput, automated sample processing vs. manual Nanotrap
99 particle methods with a small sample volume (10 mL) so we can scale up wastewater
100 surveillance if automated sample processing shows at least similar sensitivity as the manual
101 method, and b) compare manual Nanotrap concentration methods (for 10 mL) to membrane
102 filtration method for grab samples (150 mL) and skim milk method for Moore swab samples
103 (250 mL) so we can use this method in settings with low resources. We would like to ensure that
104 switching concentration methods and sample volumes from traditional membrane filtration and
105 skim milk methods to Nanotrap method do not compromise the sensitivity.

106

107 **MATERIALS and METHODS**

108 **Wastewater samples.** For this study, wastewater samples were collected weekly from
109 community manholes and influent lines of wastewater treatment plants in Atlanta from June
110 2021 to August 2021. Samples from community manholes were collected weekly using Moore
111 swabs made from cotton gauze and secured by tying the fishing line to a hook at the top of the
112 manhole and the swabs were placed in wastewater flows for 24 hours and then retrieved.
113 Samples from influent lines were 500 mL grab samples collected in wastewater treatment plants
114 in urban Atlanta areas, which represented tens of thousands of people. Sample collection
115 procedures are described in detail at [https://www.protocols.io/view/wastewater- sample-](https://www.protocols.io/view/wastewater-sample-collection-moore-swab-and-grab-s-b2rzqd76)
116 [collection-moore-swab-and-grab-s-b2rzqd76](https://www.protocols.io/view/wastewater-sample-collection-moore-swab-and-grab-s-b2rzqd76)

117 **Membrane filtration.** The wastewater samples were centrifuged at 5,000 rpm for 5 minutes at
118 4°C to remove solids in the sample that could clog the membrane filter. The method using 0.45-
119 μm -pore-size, 47-mm-diameter nitrocellulose filters, described by Liu et al ^[3], was used to
120 concentrate SARS-CoV-2 from 150 mL of wastewater grab samples after pH adjustment to 3.5
121 and 25 mM of magnesium chloride was added. Before filtration, 10^5 equivalent genome copies
122 (EGC) of Bovine Respiratory Syncytial Virus (BRSV) (INFORCE 3, Zoetis, Parsippany, NJ)
123 were added to the sample as a process control. After filtration, the membrane filter was placed
124 into a microcentrifuge tube and 800 μL of RLT buffer from the RNeasy Mini Kit (QIAGEN,
125 Hilden, Germany) was added immediately. The sample was vortexed at maximum speed for 10
126 minutes and then subjected to RNA extraction as described in the instructions of the RNeasy
127 Mini Kit.

128 **Skim milk flocculation concentration.** Skim milk flocculation method, described by Liu et al ^[3]
129 was used to concentrate SARS-CoV-2 from Moore swab samples collected from community
130 manholes in Atlanta. Briefly, a 5% (w/v) skimmed milk solution was prepared by dissolving 5 g

131 of skimmed milk powder (BD, #232100, Sparks, MD) in 100 mL of distilled water. Before the
132 flocculation step, the pH of the liquid sample squeezed from Moore swab was adjusted to 3.5
133 using 6 N HCL and then skimmed milk was added at a final concentration of 1%, followed by
134 addition of 10^5 EGC of BRSV and shaking for 2 h (<https://www.protocols.io/view/skim-milk-flocculation-and-rna-extraction-for-sars-b2uwqexe>).

136 **Manual Nanotrap particle method for concentration of SARS-CoV-2 and RNA extraction.**

137 Nanotrap Microbiome A Particles (SKU#44202, Ceres Nanosciences Inc., Manassas, VA) are
138 magnetically functionalized, affinity capture hydrogel particles that capture and concentrate
139 microbes from samples. Grab wastewater samples from influent lines or of the liquid squeezed
140 from Moore swab samples from community manholes were used for the manual Nanotrap
141 particle method. Four-hundred microliters of Nanotrap[®] particles and ten microliters of BRSV,
142 approximately equivalent to 10^5 EGC of BRSV, were added to 10 mL or 40 mL of wastewater.
143 Seeded samples were incubated for 20 minutes and were placed on a magnet rack (Thermo
144 Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) for 10 minutes. Supernatant was then removed without
145 disturbing the pellet of Nanotrap[®] particles. One milliliter of molecular grade water was used to
146 rinse the pellet off the side of the tube and the sample was transferred to a 1.7 mL tube. The
147 sample was then placed on a small magnet rack for 2 minutes to allow the particles to pellet,
148 followed by adding 140 μ L of 1 \times PBS to the particle pellet that was used for RNA extraction
149 using the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (QIAGEN, Valencia, CA) in accordance with the
150 manufacturer's instructions.

151 (<https://www.protocols.io/view/manual-nanotrap-concentration-and-rna-extraction-f-b2uzqex6>).

152 **Automated Nanotrap particle method for SARS-CoV-2 concentration and RNA extraction.**

153 KingFisher™ Apex robot platform (Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA), allowing to process 24
154 samples using a 24-plex head, was used for virus concentration and nucleic acid extraction from
155 wastewater. Briefly, 10 μL of BRSV (equivalent to 10^5 EGC of BRSV) and 50 μL of Nanotrap®
156 enhancement reagent 1 (ER1, Ceres Nanoscience Inc., #10111) were mixed with approximate 5
157 mL of wastewater and two replicate wells with a total of 10 mL of wastewater were used for
158 each sample. After 10 min of incubation at room temperature, 75 μL of Nanotrap® particles were
159 added and the sample plates were loaded into the KingFisher™ Apex, followed by running the
160 designated KingFisher™ script. After viral concentration, samples were processed for RNA
161 extraction using the Applied Biosystems MagMax™ nucleic acid isolation kit (Thermo Fisher
162 Scientific #48310) on the same platform following the instructions.

163 ([https://www.protocols.io/view/nanotrap-kingfisher-concentration-extraction-amp-m-](https://www.protocols.io/view/nanotrap-kingfisher-concentration-extraction-amp-m-b2nkqdcw)
164 [b2nkqdcw](https://www.protocols.io/view/nanotrap-kingfisher-concentration-extraction-amp-m-b2nkqdcw)).

165 **Quantitative real-time RT-PCR method.** SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected via RT-qPCR
166 (<https://www.protocols.io/view/singleplex-qpcr-for-sars-cov-2-n1-and-brsv-b2qyqdxw>) using
167 the N1 primers described before [18, 3] and the TaqPath™ qPCR Master Mix (ThermoFisher
168 Scientific, Waltham, MA). Synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA (ATCC VR-3276SD, Manassas, VA)
169 with known concentration was 10-fold diluted and the standard curve was used for quantification
170 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA titers in wastewater. Potential PCR inhibition was examined in some
171 samples through testing dilutions (1:2, 1:5 and 1:10) and comparing the results to those from the
172 undiluted RNA. Positive samples were defined as the presence of Ct values in both duplicate
173 wells from one sample; if both Ct values were below 36 with the Ct difference <2 , we considered
174 the samples as positive; if both Ct values were above 36, the sample was classified as weak

175 positive; if both or either Ct were absent or greater than 36, the sample was classified as
176 negative.

177 **Statistical analysis**

178 A paired nonparametric Friedman test was used to compare the mean Ct values of the groups of
179 Nanotrap particle characterization experiments. Wilcoxon signed rank test was used to compare
180 the two-step vs. one-step concentration methods, the automated vs. manual Nanotrap particle
181 methods with and without ER1 in 10 mL and 40 mL grab and Moore swab samples, the
182 automated Nanotrap particle method vs. the membrane filtration method in grab samples, and the
183 automated Nanotrap particle method vs. the skim milk method in Moore swab samples.
184 Differences were considered statistically significant if the p-value was <0.05.

185 **RESULTS**

186 We first evaluated the effects of four physical and chemical parameters (incubation time,
187 temperature, pH, and sample volume) on the manual Nanotrap particle method without ER1
188 (Figure 1a-1d). Incubation of 10 mL wastewater with 140 μ L Nanotrap particles at different
189 temperatures (4°C, 22°C, 37°C, and 50°C) for 20 mins followed by RNA extraction and
190 detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA using RT-qPCR did not show a difference ($P>0.05$) in Ct values
191 (Figure 1a). Incubation of 10 mL wastewater samples with Nanotrap particles at room
192 temperature for different times (10, 20, 40, 60 minutes) did not show a significant difference
193 ($P>0.05$) in Ct values for SARS-CoV-2 detection (Figure 1b). Wastewater adjusted to pH values
194 of 5.0, 8.0, and 10.0 at room temperature before sample processing was not associated with
195 differences in SARS-CoV-2 Ct values in 10 mL wastewater samples using Nanotrap particles
196 (Figure 1c). Ct values of SARS-CoV-2 detection in 10 mL, 40 mL and 120 mL wastewater

197 samples showed no statistical difference ($P>0.05$) (Figure 1d). These results suggest that
198 Nanotrap particles are very stable and are environmentally tolerant, which is appropriate for
199 application in other countries and is convenient for transportation and storage.

200 We then compared a two-step concentration method that started with skim milk concentration
201 followed by Nanotrap particle concentration for 200 mL wastewater samples to the one-step
202 Nanotrap particle method for 40 mL wastewater samples. We observed significantly lower
203 SARS-CoV-2 Ct values ($P<0.0001$) with the two-step method and a larger sample volume
204 (Figure 1e), suggesting that two-step of viral concentration with large volume is more sensitive
205 for viral detection than one step concentration from a small volume of wastewater. Finally, we
206 compared three RNA extraction kits (QIAamp, MagMAX and IDEXX kits) to extract SARS-
207 CoV-2 RNA from 10 mL same wastewater samples for each kit followed by RT-qPCR detection
208 and observed that these gave similar results ($P=0.103$) (Figure 1f). These results indicate that the
209 three RNA extraction methods are same sensitive for viral detection.

210 The effect of ER1 for the Nanotrap particles was examined by comparing the automated
211 Nanotrap particle method with and without ER1 and the manual Nanotrap particle method with
212 two sample volumes (10 mL and 40 mL) with and without ER1 using wastewater grab samples
213 from influent lines (Figure 2).

214 Adding ER1 to 10 mL grab wastewater samples prior to viral concentration on the KingFisher
215 system resulted in significantly lower ($P=0.0005$) Ct values compared to the protocol without
216 ER1. When the manual Nanotrap particle method was used, adding ER1 to both 10 mL and 40
217 mL grab samples also showed a similar improvement ($P>0.05$) in Ct values (Figure 2). These
218 results suggest that including ER1 in the viral concentration significantly increase the viral
219 detection in in grab samples using both the manual and the automated Nanotrap assays.

220 We then examined the effect of ER1 using Moore swab samples and again compared the
221 automated Nanotrap particle method (10 mL sample) and manual Nanotrap particle method (10
222 mL and 40 mL) with and without ER1 (Figure 3). Adding ER1 to the liquid squeezed from 10
223 mL Moore swab samples prior to viral concentration with Nanotrap particles yielded
224 significantly lower Ct values ($P<0.05$) in the automated Nanotrap particle method. Adding ER1
225 to 10 mL and 40 mL Moore swab samples and using the manual Nanotrap particle method also
226 demonstrated lower Ct values compared to samples without ER1, but the Ct values from the
227 Moore swab samples were more variable than those from the grab samples (Figure 3). These
228 results indicate that ER1 significantly increase viral concentration in Moore swab samples using
229 both the manual and the automated Nanotrap assays

230 Typically, virus detection in environmental samples requires concentration from large sample
231 volumes which can be more challenging to process with a high-throughput platform. We
232 compared the automated Nanotrap particle method and ER1 using 10 mL wastewater samples to
233 two traditional concentration methods that use larger volume samples: the membrane filtration
234 method using 150 mL grab samples (Figure 4 and Table 1) and the skim milk method using 250
235 mL Moore swab samples (Figure 5 and Table 2).

236 Fifteen wastewater grab samples were processed in parallel using the automated Nanotrap
237 particle method with ER1 (10 mL) and without ER1 (10 mL), as well as by the membrane
238 filtration method (150 mL). In comparison to without ER1, adding ER1 to Nanotrap particles in
239 wastewater significantly improved SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in 10 mL wastewater by an
240 average of 4.05 Ct values ($P<0.0001$). Although all 15 samples were positive by both methods,
241 SARS-CoV-2 detection in 10 mL grab samples with ER1 and Nanotrap particles showed
242 significantly lower average Ct values ($P=0.0083$) than the membrane filtration method using 150

243 mL grab sample. SARS-CoV-2 detection in 10 mL sample without ER1 was also significantly
244 better ($P=0.0008$) than the membrane filtration method using 150 mL grab sample (Table 1).
245 These results suggest that using Nanotrap particles to concentrate viruses from small volume of
246 grab samples can achieve even better results than using membrane filtration method in large
247 volume wastewater.

248 Similarly, wastewater extracted from 29 Moore swab samples was processed side-by-side using
249 the automated Nanotrap particle method with ER1 with 10 mL samples and without ER1 in 10
250 mL samples vs. using the skim milk method with 250 mL samples. SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection
251 in 10 mL swab sample with the automated Nanotrap particle method and ER1 was statistically
252 significantly better ($p<0.0001$) than the automated Nanotrap particle method without ER1 when
253 Ct values were compared. In addition, the average Ct value for the 10 mL samples processed
254 using the Nanotrap particles were significantly lower ($p=0.006$) than average Ct values for the
255 skim milk method using 250 mL samples (Table 2 and Figure 5). These results indicate that
256 using Nanotrap particles to concentrate viruses from small volume of Moore swab samples can
257 achieve significant better results than using skim milk method in large volume swab samples.

258

259 **DISCUSSION**

260 Since the COVID-19 pandemic started, many studies have focused on the detection of SARS-
261 CoV-2 RNA in wastewater collected from wastewater treatment plants, community manholes,
262 campus residence halls and other buildings. Although infected human subjects shed a relatively
263 high titer of SARS-CoV-2 in their feces, the viruses can become highly diluted in wastewater
264 and are generally present in low concentration in wastewater^[19], especially when case numbers

265 are lower in communities. To detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater, investigators tend to
266 concentrate the viruses from large volumes ^[20, 10, 21] into smaller volumes or precipitate the
267 viruses into a pellet ^[22] so that nucleic acid amplification and detection methods such as RT-
268 qPCR can be applied. For this reason, most studies describe one or two in-series methods for
269 viral concentration in wastewater samples. These methods include adsorption and elution ^[20],
270 polyethylene glycol (PEG) ^[7], skim milk ^[8], membrane filtration ^[4], ultracentrifugation ^[9],
271 ultrafiltration^[10], bag-mediated filtration system ^[21], etc. When considering these concentration
272 methods, factors such as sample volume, turbidity, and required lab equipment are critical since
273 these factors affect the efficiency of virus concentration, RNA extraction, and subsequent RT-
274 qPCR detection, as well as the feasibility of analyzing large numbers of samples on a routine
275 basis. Another important consideration with molecular detection of viral RNA in wastewater
276 samples is that certain organic matter and chemicals that can inhibit RT-PCR reactions can be
277 concentrated along with SARS-CoV-2 and negatively affect the RT-qPCR results. These
278 inhibitors can cause a weaker PCR signal or even false negative results. Due to these limitations
279 of the aforementioned concentration methods, there is a need for a simple, rapid, robust, and
280 efficient concentration method that can be automated for large-scale COVID-19 wastewater
281 surveillance or that can be performed manually in resource limited areas.

282 In this study, we first evaluated the robustness of the Nanotrap particle methods across six
283 parameters (pH, temperature, incubation time, wastewater volumes, RNA extraction methods,
284 and two virus concentration approaches: a two-step process vs. a one-step method). Different pH,
285 temperature, incubation time, wastewater volumes, and RNA extraction methods did not result in
286 reduced SARS-CoV-2 detection in wastewater samples, demonstrating the robustness of the
287 Nanotrap particle methods for virus capture from wastewater. Adding a skim milk flocculation

288 step from a larger sample volume prior to the Nanotrap particle method offered significantly
289 better results than the Nanotrap particle method by itself. These results indicate that virus
290 concentration methods using Nanotrap particles from large volumes might be beneficial during
291 times when lower number of COVID-19 cases are reported and greater detection sensitivity is
292 required.

293 We utilized a Nanotrap particle method for virus concentration in 10 mL wastewater samples
294 using: 1) a KingFisher Apex system for automated virus concentration and RNA extraction, and
295 2) a manual viral concentration method using a magnetic tube rack. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was
296 extracted using an Applied Biosystems MagMax nucleic acid isolation kit. Subsequently, RT-
297 qPCR with primers and probes targeting the nucleocapsid protein was used for detection and
298 quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Our results indicated that adding ER1 to wastewater prior
299 to viral concentration using the Nanotrap particles significantly improved PCR results in 10 mL
300 samples processed in an automated method or in 10 mL and 40 mL samples processed using the
301 manual method compared to not using ER1 for the same wastewater samples. We noted
302 generally increasing Ct values by 3.05 for grab samples and 2.25 for swab samples compared to
303 the same sample and the same method without ER1. In addition, SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection
304 in 10 mL grab samples with Nanotrap particles and ER1 showed significantly better results than
305 150 mL grab samples using the membrane filtration method and 250 mL Moore swab samples
306 using the skim milk method.

307 Compared to traditional pathogen concentration methods such as skim milk and membrane
308 filtration methods (Table 3), concentrating viruses from wastewater using Nanotrap particles has
309 several advantages: 1) small sample volume (10 mL), which is easier to collect and transport; 2)
310 simple equipment, only requiring a magnetic tube rack, which is appropriate for low-resource

311 settings; 3) potential to adapt to high throughput platform for scalable implementation; 4) more
312 sensitive than traditional large volume concentration methods (membrane filtration and skim
313 milk methods); and 5) rapid – viral concentration takes significantly less than an hour and
314 requires no additional centrifugation or filtrations steps for both the high throughput and manual
315 methods; 6) long shelf life of Nanotrap particles which makes easy for storage and
316 transportation. All of these advantages enable this method to be used in resource-limited areas
317 and allow SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance to be implemented via an efficient and scalable
318 approach.

319 **Acknowledgements**

320 We thank the financial support from the NIH Rapid Acceleration of Diagnostics (RADx)
321 initiative (contract No. 75N92021C00012 to Ceres Nanosciences, Inc). We are debt to Salvins J.
322 Strods, Chipo Chemoyo J. Baker Afamefuna from RADx Initiative and Dr. Louis J. Vuga from
323 NIH. We appreciate all of the wastewater collection support from Jamie VanTassell (Emory
324 University), Lorenzo Freeman, Wayne Rose and Carl Holt at the City of Atlanta Department of
325 Watershed Management.

326

327

328

329

330

331

332 References

- 333 1. Jones DL, Baluja MQ, Graham DW, Corbishley A, McDonald JE, Malham SK, et al. Shedding of
334 SARS-CoV-2 in feces and urine and its potential role in person-to-person transmission and the
335 environment-based spread of COVID-19. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020 Dec 20;749:141364.
- 336 2. Gibas C, Lambirth K, Mittal N, Juel MAI, Barua VB, Roppolo Brazell L, et al. Implementing
337 building-level SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance on a university campus. *Sci Total Environ.*
338 2021 Aug 15;782:146749.
- 339 3. Liu P, Ibaraki M, VanTassell J, Geith K, Cavallo M, Kann R, et al. A sensitive, simple, and low-cost
340 method for COVID-19 wastewater surveillance at an institutional level. *Sci Total Environ.* 2022
341 Feb 10;807(Pt 3):151047.
- 342 4. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, Bibby K, Bivins A, O'Brien JW, et al. First confirmed detection of
343 SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater
344 surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020 Aug 1;728:138764.
- 345 5. Wu F, Zhang J, Xiao A, Gu X, Lee WL, Armas F, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher
346 than Expected from Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems.* 2020 Jul 21;5(4).
- 347 6. Khan K, Tighe SW, Badireddy AR. Factors influencing recovery of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in raw sewage
348 and wastewater sludge using polyethylene glycol-based concentration method. *J Biomol Tech.*
349 2021 Sep;32(3):172-79.
- 350 7. Wu F, Xiao A, Zhang J, Moniz K, Endo N, Armas F, et al. Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2
351 across 40 U.S. states from February to June 2020. *Water Res.* 2021 Sep 1;202:117400.
- 352 8. Philo SE, Ong AQW, Keim EK, Swanstrom R, Kossik AL, Zhou NA, et al. Development and
353 Validation of the Skimmed Milk Pellet Extraction Protocol for SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater
354 Surveillance. *Food Environ Virol.* 2022 Feb 10.
- 355 9. Wurtzer S, Marechal V, Mouchel JM, Maday Y, Teyssou R, Richard E, et al. Evaluation of
356 lockdown effect on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics through viral genome quantification in waste water,
357 Greater Paris, France, 5 March to 23 April 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020 Dec;25(50).
- 358 10. Fores E, Bofill-Mas S, Itarte M, Martinez-Puchol S, Hundesa A, Calvo M, et al. Evaluation of two
359 rapid ultrafiltration-based methods for SARS-CoV-2 concentration from wastewater. *Sci Total*
360 *Environ.* 2021 May 10;768:144786.
- 361 11. Jaworski E, Saifuddin M, Sampey G, Shafagati N, Van Duyne R, Iordanskiy S, et al. The use of
362 Nanotrap particles technology in capturing HIV-1 virions and viral proteins from infected cells.
363 *PLoS One.* 2014;9(5):e96778.
- 364 12. Shafagati N, Narayanan A, Baer A, Fite K, Pinkham C, Bailey C, et al. The use of NanoTrap
365 particles as a sample enrichment method to enhance the detection of Rift Valley Fever Virus.
366 *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2013;7(7):e2296.
- 367 13. Lin SC, Carey BD, Callahan V, Lee JH, Bracci N, Patnaik A, et al. Use of Nanotrap particles for the
368 capture and enrichment of Zika, chikungunya and dengue viruses in urine. *PLoS One.*
369 2020;15(1):e0227058.
- 370 14. Karthikeyan S, Nguyen A, McDonald D, Zong Y, Ronquillo N, Ren J, et al. Rapid, Large-Scale
371 Wastewater Surveillance and Automated Reporting System Enable Early Detection of Nearly
372 85% of COVID-19 Cases on a University Campus. *mSystems.* 2021 Aug 31;6(4):e0079321.
- 373 15. Karthikeyan S, Ronquillo N, Belda-Ferre P, Alvarado D, Javidi T, Longhurst CA, et al. High-
374 Throughput Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Detection Enables Forecasting of Community Infection
375 Dynamics in San Diego County. *mSystems.* 2021 Mar 2;6(2).
- 376 16. Shafagati N, Fite K, Patanarut A, Baer A, Pinkham C, An S, et al. Enhanced detection of
377 respiratory pathogens with nanotrap particles. *Virulence.* 2016 Oct 2;7(7):756-69.

- 378 17. Anderson P BS, Barclay RA, Smith N, Fernandes J, Besse K, Goldfarb D, Barbero R, Dunlap R, et al.
379 Nanotrap particles improve nanopore sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory viruses.
380 bioRxiv Preprint. 2021 December 9, 2021.
- 381 18. Lu X, Wang L, Sakthivel SK, Whitaker B, Murray J, Kamili S, et al. US CDC Real-Time Reverse
382 Transcription PCR Panel for Detection of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2.
383 *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020 Aug;26(8).
- 384 19. Yang S, Dong Q, Li S, Cheng Z, Kang X, Ren D, et al. Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater
385 after the end of the COVID-19 epidemics. *J Hazard Mater.* 2022 May 5;429:128358.
- 386 20. Barril PA, Pianciola LA, Mazzeo M, Ousset MJ, Jaureguiberry MV, Alessandrello M, et al.
387 Evaluation of viral concentration methods for SARS-CoV-2 recovery from wastewaters. *Sci Total*
388 *Environ.* 2021 Feb 20;756:144105.
- 389 21. Philo SE, Keim EK, Swanstrom R, Ong AQW, Burnor EA, Kossik AL, et al. A comparison of SARS-
390 CoV-2 wastewater concentration methods for environmental surveillance. *Sci Total Environ.*
391 2021 Mar 15;760:144215.
- 392 22. Wolfe MK, Topol A, Knudson A, Simpson A, White B, Vugia DJ, et al. High-Frequency, High-
393 Throughput Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids at Eight Publicly
394 Owned Treatment Works in Northern California Shows Strong Association with COVID-19
395 Incidence. *mSystems.* 2021 Oct 26;6(5):e0082921.

396

397

398

399


400

401

402

403

404




405

406 *Four samples tested in duplicate experiments with duplicate wells in RT-qPCR yielded 16 data points
407 for each parameter evaluation

408 **Figure 1.** Nanotrap Microbiome A Particles captured SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater. a)
409 Incubation temperature (4°C, 23°C, 37°C, and 50°C) of wastewater samples with Nanotrap
410 particles; b) Incubation time (10 min, 20 min, 40 min, and 60 min) of wastewater samples with
411 Nanotrap particles; c) pH (5, 8, and 10) of wastewater sample; d) Processing sample volumes (10
412 mL, 40 mL, and 120 mL) with SARS-CoV-2 detection; e) Two-step concentration method (skim
413 milk + Nanotrap particle method) for 200 mL wastewater samples compared to Nanotrap particle
414 method alone for 40 mL samples showed significance difference when compared two-step vs.
415 one-step using Wilcoxon signed rank test; f) Comparison of three RNA extraction methods
416 (IDEXX, MagMax and QIAamp)

417

418



419


420 **Figure 2.** Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in 10 mL grab wastewater samples from
421 influent lines processed using the automated Nanotrap particle method and the manual Nanotrap
422 particle method (10 mL and 40 mL) with and without ER1.

423

424

425


426



427

428 **Figure 3.** Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in Moore swab samples processed using
429 the automated Nanotrap particle method (10 mL) and the manual Nanotrap particle method (10
430 mL and 40 mL) with and without adding ER1.


431



432

433

434 **Figure 4.** Comparison of automated Nanotrap particle method and ER1 for processing 10 mL
435 grab wastewater with vs. membrane filtration method for processing of 150 mL wastewater in
436 detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA.



437

438 **Figure 5.** Comparison of automated Nanotrap particle method for processing 10 mL Moore swab
439 wastewater vs. skim milk method for processing of 250 mL Moore swab wastewater for
440 detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA.

441 **Table 1.** Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 detection in 10 mL grab wastewater using the automated
442 Nanotrap particle method with and without ER1 vs. membrane filtration method in 150 mL
443 wastewater.

Method	Sample Number	Positive (%)	Average Ct (SD*)
Automated Nanotrap particle method w/ ER1	15	15 (100)	31.55 (1.15)
Automated Nanotrap particle method w/o ER1	15	15 (100)	35.60 (1.13)
Membrane Filtration	15	15 (100)	32.78 (1.96)

444 *Standard deviation
445 Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test:
446 Automated Nanotrap particle method with ER1 vs. Automated Nanotrap particle method w/o
447 ER1, $P < 0.0001$
448 Automated Nanotrap particle method with ER1 vs. membrane filtration, $P = 0.0083$
449 Automated Nanotrap particle method w/o ER1 vs. membrane filtration, $P = 0.0008$

450
451
452

453 **Table 2.** Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in 10 mL Moore swab samples using the
454 automated Nanotrap particle method and membrane filtration method for processing of 150 mL

Method	Sample Number	Positive (%)	Average Ct (SD*)
Automated Nanotrap particle method with ER1	29	29 (100)	31.92 (1.60)
Automated Nanotrap particle method w/o ER1	29	29 (100)	34.17 (2.01)
Skim milk	29	29 (100)	32.97 (1.58)

455 *Standard deviation
456 Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test:
457 Automated Nanotrap particle method with ER1 vs. w/o ER1, $P < 0.0001$
458 Automated Nanotrap particle method with ER1 vs. skim milk, $P = 0.006$
459 Automated Nanotrap particle method w/o ER1 vs. skim milk, $P = 0.012$

460
461
462
463

Table 3. Comparison of Nanotrap Microbiome A Particles, skim milk, and membrane filtration methods for SARS-CoV-2 detection in wastewater

	Nanotrap Microbiome A Particles		Skim Milk	Membrane Filtration
	KingFisher Apex	Manual		
Cost (\$)/per Sample*	14.8	12.0	8.3	10.0
Processing Time (hrs) for 10 samples*	2.5	3.0-3.5	4.0-5.0	4.0-6.0
Sample Volume (mL)	10	10 or 40	250	150
Sample Type	Grab or Swab	Grab or swab	Better for swab samples	Better for grab samples
Advantage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Automatic - Less labor - Small sample volume - Sensitive - Can be used on turbid and clear water samples - Only a microcentrifuge required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easy to use and not a long protocol - Stable to store and transport - Small volume of sample for high sensitivity - Can be used on turbid and clear water samples - Only a microcentrifuge required - Affordable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affordable - Low number of consumables used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affordable - Only a microcentrifuge required - Low number of consumables used
Disadvantage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expensive equipment - More plastic consumable 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires centrifuge if large volume is used - More time consuming for flocculation - Not sensitive compared with the Nanotrap method 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Filtration may take more time if water sample is turbid - Not sensitive compared with the Nanotrap method

*Including both virus concentration and RNA extraction