

# 1 Environmental surveillance for typhoidal 2 *Salmonellas* in household and surface waters in 3 Nepal identifies potential transmission pathways

4 Short title: Typhoidal *Salmonellas* in Kathmandu water

5 Authors: Christopher LeBoa<sup>1,2\*◇</sup>, Sneha Shrestha<sup>3◇</sup>, Jivan Shakya<sup>3◇</sup>, Shiva Ram Naga<sup>3</sup>, Sony  
6 Shrestha<sup>3</sup>, Mudita Shakya<sup>3</sup>, Alexander T. Yu<sup>1,4</sup>, Rajeev Shrestha<sup>3</sup>, Krista Vaidya<sup>3</sup>, Nishan  
7 Katuwal<sup>3</sup>, Kristen Aiemjoy<sup>1,5</sup>, Isaac I. Bogoch<sup>7</sup>, Christopher B. Uzzell<sup>7</sup>, Denise O. Garrett<sup>8</sup>,  
8 Stephen P. Luby<sup>1</sup>, Jason R. Andrews<sup>1#</sup>, Dipesh Tamrakar<sup>3#</sup>

9  
10 **Author affiliations:**

- 11 1- Stanford University, Division of Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine, 300 Pasteur  
12 Dr, Stanford, CA 94305  
13 2- University of California Berkeley, Department of Environmental Health Sciences, 2121  
14 Berkeley Way, Berkeley, CA 94720-7360  
15 3- Dhulikhel Hospital, Department of Research and Development, Dhulikhel 6, Kavre, Nepal  
16 4- California Department of Public Health, Surveillance Section, 850 Marina Bay Pkwy,  
17 Richmond, CA 94804  
18 5- University of California Davis, Division of Public Health Sciences, 1 Shields Avenue Davis,  
19 CA 95616  
20 6- Toronto General Hospital, Division of Infectious Diseases, Toronto, Canada, and  
21 Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto Canada  
22 7- Imperial College London, School of Public Health, Norfolk Place, London W2 1PG, United  
23 Kingdom  
24 8- Sabin Vaccine Institute, Applied Epidemiology Section, 2175 K Street, NW, Suite 400,  
25 Washington, DC 20037  
26

27 \* Corresponding author: e-mail [cleboa@berkeley.edu](mailto:cleboa@berkeley.edu)

28 ◇ Contributed equally

29 #Contributed equally

30

31 **Abbreviations**

32

33 DNA: Dideoxyribonucleic acid

34 qPCR: quantitative polymerase chain reaction

35

36

37

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 38 Abstract

39 **Introduction.** *Salmonella* Typhi and *Salmonella* Paratyphi, fecal-oral transmitted bacterium  
40 have temporally and geographically heterogeneous pathways of transmission. Previous  
41 work in Kathmandu Nepal implicated stone waterspouts as a dominant transmission pathway  
42 after 77% of samples tested positive for *S. Typhi* and 70% for *S. Paratyphi*. Due to a falling  
43 water table, these spouts no longer provide drinking water, but typhoid fever persists, and the  
44 question of the disease's dominant pathway of transmission remains unanswered.

45 **Methods.** We used environmental surveillance to detect *S. Typhi* and Paratyphi DNA from  
46 potential sources of transmission. We collected 1L drinking water samples from a population-  
47 based random sample of households between February and October 2019 Between November  
48 2019 and July 2021, we collected monthly 50 mL river water samples from 19 sites along the  
49 rivers leading through the Kathmandu and Kavre Districts of Nepal. We processed drinking  
50 water samples using a single qPCR and processed river water samples using differential  
51 centrifugation and qPCR at time 0 and after 16 hours of culture enrichment. A 3-cycle  
52 threshold (Ct) decrease of *S. Typhi* or *S. Paratyphi*, pre- and post-enrichment, was used as  
53 evidence of growth. We also performed structured observations of human-environment  
54 interactions to understand pathways of potential exposure.

55 **Results.** Among 370 drinking water samples, *S. Typhi* was detected in 7 samples (1.8%) and  
56 *S. Paratyphi* A was detected in 4 (1.0%) samples. Among 381 river water samples, *S. Typhi*  
57 was detected in 171 (45%) and *S. Paratyphi* A was detected in 152 (42%) samples. Samples  
58 located upstream of the Kathmandu city center were positive for *S. Typhi* 12% of the time  
59 while samples from locations in and downstream the city had bacterial DNA detected 58%  
60 and 67% of the time respectively. Individuals were observed bathing in the rivers, washing  
61 clothes, and washing vegetables for sale in Kathmandu markets.

62 **Implications.** These results suggest that drinking water was not the dominant pathway of  
63 transmission of *S. Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi* A in the Kathmandu Valley in 2019. The high  
64 degree of river water contamination and its use for washing vegetables raises the possibility  
65 that river systems represent an important source of typhoid exposure in Kathmandu.

66

67

68

69

70

## 71 **Author Summary**

72 Understanding the dominant route of transmission of a pathogen is important for designing  
73 and implementing effective control strategies. Salmonella Typhi and Paratyphi which cause  
74 typhoid and paratyphoid fever infect an estimated 10 million people and kill more than  
75 100,000 annually. In Kathmandu prior work suggested that stone spouts where people  
76 collected drinking water were contaminated and driving transmission of the diseases.  
77 However, many of these spouts no longer function, and people are still getting sick. We  
78 tested drinking water from households in this area as well as local river water and found that  
79 13 drinking water samples were positive for S.Typhi and 15 were positive for S. Paratyphi  
80 and many river samples tested positive for these bacterium. River water samples were not  
81 often positive upstream of Kathmandu city center (12% positive for S.Typhi) but were often  
82 positive within the city center (58% positive for S.Typhi) and in rural areas up to 10 km  
83 downstream of the city (67% positive for S.Typhi). During sample collection, individuals  
84 were observed interacting with rivers by walking in them, washing clothes and washing  
85 vegetables for sale in markets. This study shows that drinking water may not be primary  
86 driver of typhoid transmission in the Kathmandu valley, but that sewage contaminated river  
87 water may be a foci of transmission into the wider population.

## 88 Introduction

89 Typhoid fever, a fecal-oral transmitted febrile illness caused by *Salmonella enterica*  
90 serovars Typhi and Paratyphi A, B, and C, causes 10 to 20 million illnesses and over 100,00  
91 deaths annually [1]. Improvements in the sanitation infrastructure in much of Europe and  
92 North America in the 20th century eliminated typhoid fever transmission in those areas[2].  
93 However, typhoid fever remains highly endemic in many areas today, especially in Africa  
94 and South Asia [1]. Nepal, where this study takes place, has a high level of typhoid fever  
95 transmission with an estimated incidence rate of 330 cases per 100,000 person years and a  
96 seroincidence of 6.6 per 100 person years [1,3,4].

97 Currently inactivated whole cell (Ty21a) and oral vaccines (Vi) are used to prevent  
98 illness but these vaccines are only partially effective (~55%) and are not given to children  
99 under two years of age, an especially vulnerable population [5,6].Antibiotics are used to treat  
100 infection but drug resistance, including extreme drug resistant strains, are increasing,  
101 rendering treatment more difficult [5,7].The World Health Organization (WHO) prequalified  
102 typhoid conjugate vaccine (TyVAC) generated much hope as a solution to ongoing  
103 transmission with phase three trials showing it to be 85% effective, but with few indirect  
104 effects of vaccination[8]. In a Bangladeshi TCV mass vaccination campaign, inoculated areas  
105 still had a high incidence of typhoid fever (96 cases per 100,000 person years) indicating that  
106 even effective vaccines alone cannot end transmission[8]. Ending transmission also must also  
107 address environmental and political issues.

108 Clarifying pathways of *S. Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi* transmission permits focused  
109 interventions to interrupt this transmission. Environmental surveillance has emerged as a  
110 pragmatic, low-cost, non-invasive approach to detecting different pathogens, including *S.*  
111 *Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi*, across different mediums to help identify modalities by which people

112 are exposed[9–11]. Typhoid has been known to have different dominant mechanisms of  
113 transmission in different settings and at different time[12]. In some settings drinking water  
114 has been recognized as an important route of typhoid fever exposure, and a meta-analysis  
115 showed that people who drink water from unimproved sources have a greater risk of  
116 contracting typhoid fever[13].In Nepal, previous work implicated drinking water as a source  
117 of *Salmonella* exposure among the human population. They found evidence of frequent *S.*  
118 *Typhi* (77% sample positivity) and *S. Paratyphi A* (70%) DNA in water collected from public  
119 drinking water spouts, which led them to conclude “that the municipal water in Kathmandu is  
120 a predominant vehicle for the transmission of *S. Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi A* [in the Kathmandu  
121 Valley]”[9]. In the twelve years since their samples were collected, lowering aquifer levels  
122 and a large earthquake rendered many of the aquifers they tested inoperable yet typhoid  
123 cases in the Kathmandu Valley have remained high[3,14]. As such, other sources of  
124 transmission remain important to identify. A recent case-control study from Malawi found  
125 use of river water for cooking and cleaning to be the strongest individual risk factor for  
126 typhoid fever[15]. Additionally, researchers studying typhoid fever in Chile in the 1980’s had  
127 discovered typhoid fever causing bacteria in the river and irrigation water downstream of the  
128 capital, Santiago that was being used to irrigate crops[16]. This evidence was used to shape  
129 agricultural policy, banning the growth of salad greens downstream of Santiago and  
130 ultimately led to a decrease of typhoid fever incidence in the area[17]. The Kathmandu  
131 valley, a dense urban area with rivers running through it surrounded by agriculture, could  
132 potentially exhibit a similar cycle of typhoid fever transmission, but this exposure pathway  
133 has yet to be examined. This study seeks to understand the extent to which different water  
134 sources are contaminated with typhoid fever causing bacteria *S. Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi A*  
135 across the urban Kathmandu Valley and more rural Kavre district of Nepal. We test drinking  
136 water and surface water (river) samples from both Kathmandu and Kavre and record human

137 river interactions to understand the potential role of other waterborne transmission routes of  
138 typhoid fever in this area.

## 139 **Methods**

### 140 **Drinking water sampling**

141  
142 We leveraged a population-based household survey conducted between 2017 and 2019 in  
143 Kathmandu and Kavrepalanchok districts, which included urban, peri-urban and rural  
144 communities[18]. From that survey, we randomly sampled households for drinking water. At  
145 each household, team members collected a one-liter sample of the house's drinking water in a  
146 sterile Whirlpak bag (Nasco product Number: **B01027**) and secured it with bag locking pipe  
147 closures (Nasco product number: **B01595**). Samples were either collected directly from the  
148 tap or poured into a Whirlpak bag. If the water container was too heavy to lift, the sample  
149 was spooned from the container into the Whirlpak bag, using the same cup or device that the  
150 household used to transfer the water. For households receiving water from a municipal water  
151 source, we collected the sample from the actively running household pipe inlet to the house.  
152 If water was stored before drinking, we collected the sample from its primary storage  
153 container (i.e. underground or above building water tanks). In cases where primary storage  
154 was inaccessible, we collected the sample from the family's backup water reserve. For  
155 households using water from communal spigots, we collected water directly from the source  
156 spigot. If the communal spigot was not functioning, we collected a sample from a storage  
157 tank in the house, if the storage tank was inaccessible, sample was collected from water  
158 stored in a jug. For households purchasing water from a private vendor, in bottles, jars or  
159 tanks, we collected the sample directly from bottles or jars or primary storage jugs or tanks.  
160 All samples were put on ice for transportation back to the laboratory. At each household  
161 questionnaires were collected on household drinking water sourcing, water purification

162 processes using the Redcap Mobile application v5.19.15 (Vanderbilt University,  
163 Nashville, TN) on tablets.

#### 164 **Limit of Detection and Spiking**

165 We first characterized the sensitivity of the laboratory methods we utilized by  
166 performing a limit of detection assay on our proposed extraction and amplification processes.  
167 We used linearized standard plasmid containing *S. Typhi* STY0201 (132bp) and *S. Paratyphi*  
168 SSPA7038 (105bp) target gene for these experiments. We conducted a set of 11-10-fold  
169 serial dilutions starting at a concentration of 114 ng/ $\mu$ l to  $114 \times 10^{-11}$  ng/ $\mu$ l for STY0201  
170 and from 104 ng/ $\mu$ l to  $104 \times 10^{-11}$  ng/ $\mu$ l for SSPA7038. Each assay was performed in 4  
171 replicates. The mean Ct value and associated numbers of detected DNA copies were recorded  
172 for each dilution in excel.

173 We additionally conducted a series of spiking experiments to understand the limit of  
174 detection in settings that more simulated the samples that we collected of drinking and river  
175 water. We prepared a standard 0.5 McFarland standard inoculum (approx.  $1.5 \times 10^8$  CFU/ml)  
176 of Clinical *S. Typhi* strain in normal saline. We diluted the inoculum through a series of 8-10  
177 fold dilutions with the most dilute solution having  $1.5 \times 10^0$  CFU/ml *S. Typhi*. We then  
178 inoculated each dilution with  $1.5 \times 10^5$  CFU/ml *S. Typhi* to  $1.5 \times 10^0$  CFU/ml *S. Typhi* into  
179 separate 1L of commercially available mineral water bottles. These spiked water samples  
180 were mixed, then filtered through 0.45um Nalgene filter funnels. We performed DNA  
181 extraction on each spiked sample using Qiagen DNA PowerWater DNeasy Extraction Kit  
182 instructions and qPCR using the procedure available at (<https://www.protocols.io/view/qpcr-protocol-cs9iwh4e>).  
183

#### 184 **Drinking water assay**

185 We stored water samples at 4°C and processed them within 24 hours of collection except on  
186 holidays. Processing involved filtering the sample through a 0.45µm cellulose nitrate filter in  
187 a 250ml Nalgene Analytical Test Filter Funnel using a vacuum pump (Shiva Industries, New  
188 Delhi, India). Using sterile forceps and scissors, we cut the filter membrane into 4 even  
189 pieces and inserted them into a 5ml Power Water DNA Bead Tube with the sample side  
190 facing inward. We performed DNA extraction using a Qiagen Power Water Kit  
191 (<https://www.protocols.io/view/qiagen-dna-powerwater-dneasy-extraction-cs6ewhbe>) After  
192 extraction, we performed real-time PCR (RT-PCR) to detect *S. Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi* DNA  
193 using previously published primers and probes from Nga et al. [19,20]. RT-PCR reactions  
194 were performed in 20 µl reaction volumes consisting of 10µl master mix (TaqMan  
195 Environmental Master Mix 2.0), 0.8 µl of the forward and reverse primers (10 µM  
196 concentration), 0.4 µl of the probe (10 µM concentration), 4 µL template DNA and 4µL  
197 DNase/ RNase-Free water, for 45 cycles. We ran all samples in duplicate, and included two  
198 nuclease free water PCR negative controls on each 96 well plate. We chose a cycle threshold  
199 (Ct) cutoff value of 39 for determining sample positivity, as this achieved 100% specificity  
200 with process controls.

## 201 **River water sampling**

202 We collected monthly water samples between November 2019 and July 2021 from 19  
203 environmental surveillance sites (ES sites) located at distances 1, 5 and 10 km upstream and  
204 downstream from the main river confluence point in the Kathmandu Valley and at three  
205 locations 5 km apart on the Punyamata river in the more rural Kavre District (Figure 3). We  
206 chose this sampling strategy because it allowed us to sample from a range of environmental  
207 settings, including locations upstream of the major city center where settlement was relatively  
208 sparse, concentrate the majority of sampling locations within the population dense areas, and



209 sample at locations in agricultural areas downstream of the city. We collected each 50 mL  
210 river water sample directly into a Falcon tube, the exterior of which we then wiped down  
211 with a 0.5% bleach solution and 70% ethanol and placed into separate bags on ice for  
212 transportation to the laboratory. At the final sampling location of each day, research staff  
213 collected a field negative control by pouring sterile distilled water into a Falcon tube and  
214 placing it in the sample bag for transport back to the laboratory. At each site, team members  
215 collected information in the mobile application Redcap v5.19.15(Vanderbilt University,  
216 Nashville,TN) on abiotic factors that may affect bacterial input or survival in the water  
217 including observation of sewage pipes draining into the water, fecal matter, human / animal  
218 presence at the sampling point, water pH, temperature, and oxygen reduction potential (Apera  
219 Instruments, Columbus, OH, AI311) . Our field sampling protocol can be found online at  
220 (<https://www.protocols.io/view/field-protocol-for-river-water-sampling-cs9hwh36>)

## 221 **River water assay**

222       Upon returning to the laboratory, we mixed samples by vortexing and pipetted each  
223 into three parts. We used a densitometer (DEN-1, Grant Instruments Ltd., England) on the  
224 first 5 mL of the sample to conduct a turbidity test. The second 200µl of sample was used to  
225 detect *Escherichia. coli* as a measure of fecal contamination. We created a 1:200 dilution of  
226 this sample aliquot in sterile PBS and then plated the solution onto 3M *E.coli*/ Coliform  
227 Count Plates for overnight incubation at 37°C. Blue colonies with gas present the next day  
228 were recorded as *E. coli* coliforms.

229       We processed the remaining 45 mL of sample using differential centrifugation and  
230 enrichment PCR. We used different sample processing, extraction and assaying methods for  
231 the river water, compared with the drinking water samples, due to: 1) the different  
232 consistency, including a high level of particulate and sewage contamination in the former;

233 and 2) the low PCR positivity in the drinking water survey. First, we centrifuged the sample  
234 at 2000 rpm for 1 minute to separate larger debris. We transferred the supernatant to a new  
235 sterile tube and then centrifuged it at 4000 rpm for an additional 25 minutes to obtain the  
236 bacterial pellet. We resuspended the pellet in 0.5ml of sterile distilled water and then pipetted  
237 it into 10ml of Selenite F enrichment media. We pipetted one mL of the Selenite F bacterial  
238 mixture out of the culture media before incubation, and performed DNA extraction using the  
239 Qiagen Blood and Tissue Kit manufacturer specifications. This sample was considered the  
240 time 0 hour extraction. The remaining 9.5mL of Selenite F broth was then incubated at 37°C  
241 for 16 hours. At the 16-hour time point, we performed DNA extraction on an additional 1mL  
242 of this liquid media following the same procedures, which we called the T-16 extraction. We  
243 stored DNA extracts at -20°C until further processing. We additionally incubated and  
244 processed an uninoculated Selenite F media control each day as a laboratory control.

245 We performed real-time PCR on the time 0h and time 16h extractions, in duplicate,  
246 using the same reaction volumes and conditions specifications described for the drinking  
247 water assay section (2.2), except the amplification for these samples was performed for 40  
248 cycles instead of 45. Sample positivity was defined in two different ways. First, if either of  
249 the PCR duplicates from the time 16 h extraction had a Ct (cycle threshold) value of  $\leq 35$  the  
250 sample was considered positive. While other environmental surveillance studies have used Ct  
251 value cutoffs of up 38 or 39, we chose to use this more conservative measure to account for  
252 possible nonspecific binding of the primers and to ensure spurious results were not  
253 considered positive[21,22]. We defined samples as potentially viable when the PCR results  
254 showed a minimum of 3 Ct downwards shift between extractions done at time 0 and time 16  
255 and if the sample had a Ct value of  $< 35$  at the endpoint (T16) extraction[21,22]. The river  
256 water laboratory processes can be found at [dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.261ge3mxol47/v1](https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.261ge3mxol47/v1))

257

## 258 **Statistical analyses**

259 We assembled maps of drinking water locations and river sampling point  
260 contamination in R using a basemap created in Mapbox Studio[23,24]. We obtained data on  
261 daily rainfall from weather station data obtained through the Nepal Department of Hydrology  
262 and Meteorology and plotted in R using *ggplot2* [25,26]. Using a standardized protocol,  
263 hydrological catchments for each river sampling point were generated using the Arc Hydro  
264 extension in ArcMap 10.7 (ESRI, Redlands, California, USA)[27]. Catchments were then  
265 geospatially intersected with the WorldPop gridded population dataset for the reference year  
266 2020 to estimate total upstream catchment population for each sampling location[28]. We  
267 modeled the proportion of samples as a function of distance from the river confluence point  
268 using generalized additive models with logistic link functions (R package “*mcgv*”)[29]. We  
269 conducted all statistical analyses using R (version 4.0.4). The code uses for cleaning the data  
270 and generating visualizations found in this text can be found at  
271 ([https://github.com/chrisleboa/nepal\\_typhoid](https://github.com/chrisleboa/nepal_typhoid))

## 272 **Results**

### 273 **Limit of detection results**


274 In the limit of detection tests, the RT-PCR assay we used consistently detected  
275 samples down to the  $10^{-10}$  dilution level, corresponding to a detection limit of 80 DNA copies  
276 per  $\mu\text{l}$  of sample. The average Ct value for *S. Typhi* DNA at this dilution was 35. At lower  
277 concentrations, the assay had lower sensitivity. For *S. Paratyphi A*, the minimum detectable  
278 dilution was also  $10^{-10}$  which corresponds to 92 DNA copies per  $\mu\text{l}$ . The average Ct value for  
279 this dilution was 37. The minimum detectable dilution of spiked *S. Typhi* in 1 liter water

280 samples was ~1500 colony forming units per liter (3.17 log cfu/L) which resulted in an  
281 average Ct value of 36.

## 282 Drinking water testing

283 Three hundred and seventy drinking water samples were collected between February  
284 and October, 2019. (146 in Kathmandu and 224 in Kavre) (Figure 1).

285



286  
287 **Figure 1: Drinking Water Sampling Locations** A random sample was drawn from a two-  
288 stage, cluster random sampling household survey of >25,000 households. The location of the  
289 400 drinking water samples collected are shown as points. The aggregation of clusters of  
290 points in Kavrepalanchok reflects peri-urban areas where a higher number of households  
291 were sampled in the parent survey.

292

293

294

295

296

297           Households' main source of drinking water varied: 154 samples (42%) came from  
298 the municipal water supply, 84 (23%) of the samples came from jugs purchased from private  
299 companies, 49 samples (13%) had an unknown origin, 41 samples (11%) came from surface  
300 water, 35 (9.5%) came from pipes of unknown origin, 5 samples (1.4%) were from a well at  
301 the house, and 2 samples (0.5%) came from water dropped off by a water tanker truck.

302 Households in the Kavre region were more likely to get water from the municipal water  
303 supply than those in Kathmandu (108/224 vs 46/146  $p = 0.0014$ ) and also were more likely to  
304 use surface water for drinking purposes (34/224 vs 7/146  $p = 0.0019$ ) while households in  
305 Kathmandu were more likely to purchase their drinking water from private companies, both  
306 jug and tanker samples (63/146 vs 20/224  $p < 0.01$ ). 77% of samples from pipes of unknown  
307 origin came from the more rural Kavre region. Of the 7 samples that tested positive for *S.*  
308 Typhi, one had come from Kathmandu while the other 6 originated from households in the  
309 Kavre region. Four of the positive samples came from municipal water (including the sample  
310 from Kathmandu, one came from a water sample from a private company, one came from  
311 surface water, and the last was undefined. Of the four samples that tested positive for *S.*  
312 Paratyphi, three came from Kathmandu and a single sample came from Kavre. Two of the  
313 samples' origin was undefined, one came from a well and one came from the municipal  
314 supply.


### 315 **River water testing**

316 We collected 381 water samples from the 19 sampling points, each site sampled 19 times  
317 between November 2019 and July 2021, on approximately a monthly basis, with brief  
318 interruptions due to COVID-19 associated lockdowns. Among these, 45% ( $n=171$ ) tested  
319 positive for *S.* Typhi DNA and 40% ( $n = 152$ ) of the samples tested positive for *S.* Paratyphi

320 A at the time 16-hour extraction. Overall positivity was much lower before the enrichment  
321 step, with only 13 samples testing positive for *S. Typhi* (3.4%) and three samples from *S.*  
322 *Paratyphi* (0.7%). Of samples that tested positive at endline, 92% (158/171) of the *S. Typhi*  
323 detected samples showed a > 3 CT shift between baseline and endline extractions while 95%  
324 (145/152) of *S. Paratyphi* samples showed this shift, suggesting viability. Of all samples run,  
325 42% (158/381) showed viability (a reduction of 3 Ct between time 0 and 16 extractions) for  
326 *S. Typhi* and 38% (145/381) showed potential viability for *S. Paratyphi*.

327 Sample positivity for typhoidal *Salmonellas* varied by month, with a lower  
328 percentage of locations testing positive during monsoon months (June - September)  
329 compared to the other parts of the year (*S. Typhi* 32% in summer, 52% non-summer  $p$   
330 =0.012, *S. Paratyphi* 24% summer, 42% non-summer  $p = 0.025$ ) (Figure 2). We observed a  
331 similar reduction in *E. coli* concentration during monsoon months.





332


333 **Figure 2. Presence of typhoidal *Salmonella* DNA in river water samples, *E. coli***  
334 **concentration and rainfall by month.**

335 A. The median number of *E. Coli* coliforms present per mL of sample by month. Note  
336 August was missed in both years of sampling due to Coronavirus Lockdowns. B. Monthly  
337 rainfall in Kathmandu and Kavrepalanchok. C. The proportion of river water samples PCR  
338 positive for *Salmonella* Typhi or Paratyphi A by month.

339 River water contamination with typhoidal *Salmonellas* varied spatially. *S. Typhi* was  
340 detected at 10 sampling sites more than 10 times, representing over 50% of sampling trips  
341 while *S. Paratyphi* was detected at 9 sites on at least 10 occasions (Figure 3) Three sampling  
342 locations tested positive for *S. Paratyphi* once; two sites tested positive a single time for *S.*  
343 *Typhi*. Central Kathmandu (samples 1km and 5 km upstream of confluence) was highly  
344 contaminated with 61% (86/140) of samples testing positive for *S. Typhi* and 53% (74/140)

345 positive for *S. Paratyphi*. Samples collected downstream of the city were positive 65%  
346 (39/60) of the time for *S. Typhi* and 60% (36/60) for *S. Paratyphi* A. Areas upstream from  
347 densely populated areas (samples 10 km upstream from the confluence) generally had lower  
348 positivity 13% (10/80) for *S. Typhi*; 6.3% (5/80) for *S. Paratyphi*. A chi square test with two  
349 degrees of freedom shows these groupings to be significantly different  $p < 0.001$  for both *S.*  
350 *Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi*. Similarly, samples collected from Kathmandu Valley were more  
351 often positive than those collected from the more rural Kavre region. For *S. Typhi*, 49% of  
352 Kathmandu Valley samples were positive (156/320) while 25% (15/60) of Kavre samples  
353 were positive. *S. Paratyphi* showed a similar pattern with 42% (135/320) and 28% (17/60) of  
354 samples testing positive in Kathmandu and Kavre respectively.

355 **Figure 3. Frequency of detection of *Salmonella Typhi* and *Salmonella Paratyphi* A in**  
356 **river water by sampling location.**



357  
358 Nineteen samples were collected from each of the 19 sampling points, and the proportion  
359 positive for *Salmonella Typhi* or *Salmonella Paratyphi* A are indicated by color of the  
360 sampling point. The size of the sampling point indicates the upstream population. Population  
361 density is indicated by shading.



362 **Observations of river usage**

363 At each sampling location, we conducted observations of possible sources of fecal  
364 contamination of waterways and human interactions with the rivers to understand how these  
365 water sources may facilitate exposure to *S. Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi*. At fifteen of the nineteen  
366 sampling locations, there were sewage or rainwater runoff pipes entering the river system (13  
367 from Kathmandu and 2 from Kavre). At 8 of 19 of these sites, we observed untreated sewage  
368 actively draining into the water. There were agricultural fields along the banks of the river at  
369 7 of 19 of the sampling sites, including the two most downstream sampling locations from  
370 the Kathmandu valley. We observed in one location, an irrigation pipe leading from the river  
371 to a nearby field.

372 Our field team also observed people interacting with the rivers. People walked  
373 through the rivers at 7 of 19 sampling locations, washed clothes in the rivers at 8 of 19  
374 sampling locations, bathed in the rivers at 3 of 19 sampling locations, and washed vegetables  
375 in the rivers two sampling points on twelve separate occasions (Figure 4). The corresponding  
376 water samples tested positive for *S. Typhi* on 9 occasions when people were observed  
377 walking, 5 occasions when people were washing clothes, four occasions when people were  
378 bathing and 4 occasions at which people were washing vegetables. Conversations with these  
379 individuals indicated that the vegetables were being washed before sale in markets in and  
380 around Kathmandu.

381



382

383 **Figure 4: Observations of individuals washing vegetables:** At two sampling points across  
384 twelve instances individuals were observed washing vegetables from the market. These  
385 images show that carrots and spinach were the most common vegetables being washed.

386

## 387 **Discussion**

### 388 **Drinking water and fecal-oral transmission**

389 In a population-based sample of household drinking water, we found low levels of  
390 contamination with typhoid fever causing *Salmonellas*. By contrast, sampling of river waters  
391 revealed the presence of *S. Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi A* in over 40% of river water samples.  
392 Contamination with typhoidal *Salmonellas* occurs more frequently in river segments within  
393 and downstream of densely populated areas. Additionally, the use of sewage-containing river  
394 water for washing vegetables, and the potential uses of irrigation of nearby agricultural fields,  
395 suggests possible routes for direct exposure or the food-borne spread of typhoidal  
396 *Salmonellas*.

397 Our findings diverge from previous studies in South Asia, which have reported high  
398 rates of *S. Typhi* in drinking water and had suggested drinking water as the primary route for

399 bacteria exposure [9,13]The Karkey et al study in Lalitpur, an area within the Kathmandu  
400 Valley, found 77% of the samples collected from 10 stone spouts contained *S. Typhi* DNA  
401 [9]. When we a representative sample of 370 hh from across the Kathmandu Valley and  
402 Kavre we found that no households reported using these spouts for drinking water  
403 procurement. Many of these spouts have become inoperable due to groundwater over  
404 extraction (the aquifer below Kathmandu is falling at a rate of 2 meters per year) and  
405 earthquake damage [14,30–32], Kathmandu suffers from increasing levels of municipal water  
406 scarcity, with demand (360,000 m<sup>3</sup>/day) exceeding supply (ranging between 90,000 and  
407 150,000 m<sup>3</sup>/day) [30]. In our study, less than 50% of households sampled from Kathmandu or  
408 the Kavre region (154/370) used municipal water as their main drinking water source  
409 although slightly more households used municipal water from Kavre than did in  
410 Kathmandu[33]. In our study, private water companies (63/146) supplied much of  
411 Kathmandu’s water, collecting water from uncharacterized areas outside the valley and  
412 selling it by the truckload or in 20L bottles to city residents [33,34] The sources of private  
413 company water may be from less populated areas and have less sewage in the groundwater or  
414 surface water than water originating in the Kathmandu Valley. In Kavre, a significant portion  
415 of households used surface water or locally constructed pipe systems for their drinking water  
416 (54/224). As this region is not downstream from a large population center, these surface  
417 samples were less likely to be contaminated with sewage effluent before reaching these rural  
418 and semi-rural households. We found that 7 drinking water samples were positive for  
419 *Salmonella* Typhi and 4 of drinking water samples had detectable levels of *S. Paratyphi* A,  
420 five of the positive samples (45%) came from the municipal water supply which due to the  
421 sporadic allows for surrounding sewage to leech into the pipes[35,36]

#### 422 **Surface water as a foci for transmission**

423 River water yielded high rates of positivity (*S. Typhi* 45% and *S Paratyphi* 42%),  
424 particularly in segments located within and downstream from densely populated areas. These  
425 findings indicate fecal matter from population centers is entering river systems, and that the  
426 rivers are a potential hazard to human health even many kilometers past city boundaries. Our  
427 findings augment similar work describing high levels of fecal coliforms in the waters in  
428 Kathmandu's river system[37]. In Kathmandu, municipal sewage systems are absent or  
429 incomplete[38]. Our findings indicate that the samples from downstream river locations,  
430 adjacent to agricultural fields, were positive for *S. Typhi* 65% of the time suggesting that  
431 nearby irrigation water may also be contaminated and used on crops. This potential pathway  
432 of transmission would mirror what was described in Chile in the 1980's[16,17]. Additional  
433 analysis of irrigation water in areas downstream of Kathmandu could indicate whether  
434 irrigation of crops with *S. Typhi* contaminated water presents a potential foci of transmission.  
435 Our structured observations added evidence that rivers may be at locations at which people  
436 are exposed to typhoidal Salmonellas, as we observed agricultural workers washing carrots  
437 and spinach in the rivers before the market. Carrots especially are a potential source of  
438 contamination as they are commonly eaten raw in Nepal. Our work provides evidence that  
439 river water in Kathmandu is heavily contaminated with *S. Typhi* and *Paratyphi*, including  
440 several kilometers downstream of the population center and in some cases, people directly  
441 contact rivers or use river water for washing products. However, the scale to which this  
442 contact occurs is still not well characterized. The positivity of river water samples could  
443 simply be evidence of shedding from infected individuals and not a primary source of risk for  
444 disease exposure among the general population. Additional epidemiological investigations  
445 could be used to better understand the pathways of transmission in this context.

#### 446 **Surface water seasonality**

447 We found both *S. Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi A* contamination across the greatest number  
448 of sample sites during the dry season (October - May), we also found higher levels of *E. coli*  
449 contamination during these months. The higher levels of *S. Typhi* contamination during these  
450 months contrasts the seasonal pattern of typhoid fever incidence in the Kathmandu Valley,  
451 which have been reported to peak during the monsoon season [9,39]. We hypothesize the  
452 river may have more detectable levels of *S. Typhi* during dry seasons due to dilutional effects  
453 of monsoon rains increasing the overall water flow through the valley's river systems while  
454 the levels of sewage generated remain constant.

#### 455 **Environmental surveillance and case data**

456 We found sample locations from the Kathmandu Valley more often contaminated  
457 with *S. Typhi* and *Paratyphi* (49% *S. Typhi* and 42% *S. Paratyphi*) compared to locations  
458 from the more rural Kavre District (25% *S. Typhi* and 28% *S. Paratyphi*). Sero-  
459 epidemiological data from these two regions similarly shows higher levels of *S. Typhi*  
460 exposure in Kathmandu (6.6 per 100 person years) compared to Kavre (5.8 per 100 person  
461 years)[4]. Environmental surveillance for pathogens can be used to not only show sources of  
462 transmission but as a sentinel surveillance tool to understand ongoing nearby disease  
463 transmission. Wastewater based epidemiology has been used in the COVID-19 pandemic to  
464 understand trends in otherwise unreported cases, but more work must be done to relate a  
465 positive environmental sample with associated disease incidence in nearby  
466 populations[11,40,41].

#### 467 **Limitations and next steps**

468 The results of this work must be interpreted in the context of numerous limitations.  
469 First, drinking water samples were analyzed without an enrichment step while river water  
470 samples were extracted both pre and post enrichment (the T0 and T16 samples). If an

471 enrichment step was also added to drinking water samples, they may have more often shown  
472 detectable levels of *S. Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi A*. The earlier work by Karkey et. al also did  
473 not include an enrichment step before quantification through qPCR[9]. We attempted to  
474 culture and isolate *S. Typhi* from the water samples to directly demonstrate the viability of  
475 the organism in these samples, but were unsuccessful in doing so due to growth of other  
476 environmental bacterium, as was the experience of earlier work trying to culture *S. Typhi*  
477 from water[42]. To overcome this limitation, we used enrichment PCR in the river water  
478 samples, as previously described by the EPA for use on *Yersinia pestis* and other bioterrorism  
479 agents [21]. With this technique, a 2-cycle threshold shift represents a 4-fold increase in  
480 DNA detected, which is greater than would be expected by technical variability, providing  
481 evidence of bacterial growth but it is a proxy for the number of colony forming units present  
482 [34,43,44]. A positive river water sample test gives a binary, crude result indicating  
483 circulating disease nearby, but it is not possible to identify where the bacterium originated.  
484 Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic spurred lifestyle changes in the Kathmandu Valley,  
485 possibly shifting exposure pathways as well as overall typhoid fever incidence during this  
486 study period. Additional months of data collection could be used to see if the same trends  
487 identified in this publication are reproduced independent of potential influences of the  
488 pandemic.

## 489 **Conclusion**

490 In population-based sampling of drinking water sources in the Kathmandu Valley, we  
491 found low abundance of typhoidal *Salmonella* DNA, in contrast to an earlier study. Drinking  
492 water samples that tested positive came from both the Kathmandu and the Kavre districts and  
493 came from municipal pipes as well as from a private jug sample, surface water sample and  
494 from a well. We found that rivers flowing through Kathmandu were highly contaminated

495 with viable *S. Typhi* and *S. Paratyphi A*. These findings, together with observations of human  
496 use of river water for vegetable washing, suggest rivers as a potential transmission focus for  
497 typhoid fever in the Kathmandu Valley. Fecal contamination of river water should be  
498 addressed through improved sewage and sanitation infrastructure, and while such efforts are  
499 planned, they have yet to be implemented. A deeper understanding of the transmission  
500 pathways of typhoid fever in this region would frame effective measures for controlling its  
501 spread. These results show other sources beyond drinking water should be considered as  
502 possible pathways for transmission in this geographical context.

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519



520 **Acknowledgements:**

521

522 A large team of individuals from multiple institutions helped make this project possible.  
523 Puspa Raj Bhatt, Bipin Thapa, Anil Khanal, Karuna Timilsina, Rojina Bhaila Shrestha,  
524 Natasha Shrestha, Shisir Ranjit, Lokmani Bhatt, Ashmita Karmacharya, Apekshya  
525 Chaulagain, Sudan Maharjan, Sabin Bikram Shahi, Sudichhya Tamrakar, Aastha Shrestha,  
526 Laxmi Chauguthi, Aarjya Tara Bajracharya, Suraj Jakibanzar, Melina Thapa and Neeru  
527 Suwal have helped with Sample/Data collection.

528

529 **Author Contributions:**

530

531 KA, DT, SL, CL, AY, SnehaS, and JA were responsible for project conceptualization. KA,  
532 KV, SnehaS, JA, CL, SN, and DT performed project coordination. JA, SL, KA and AY  
533 secured funding for this work. CL, JS, JA, KS, AY, SN, SonyS and SnehaS worked on  
534 methodology. JS, SnehaS, MS, SN, SnehaS, RS, CL, and many in the acknowledgements  
535 conducted the investigation. CL, KA, NK, JA, IB and KV procured study resources. CL,  
536 KA, AY, and CU worked on software and formal analysis. JA, DT, SL, NK, SN, RS and JS  
537 provided supervision. CL, JA and CU created visualizations. SonyS, SnehaS, JS and JA  
538 worked on validation. CL, SnehaS and JA wrote the original draft. All authors supported the  
539 reviewing and editing of this manuscript.

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548



549 **References**

550

- 551 1. Stanaway JD, Reiner RC, Blacker BF, Goldberg EM, Khalil IA, Troeger CE, et al. The  
552 global burden of typhoid and paratyphoid fevers: a systematic analysis for the Global  
553 Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2019;19: 369–381.  
554 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(18)30685-6
- 555 2. Achievements in Public Health, 1900-1999: Control of Infectious Diseases. [cited 14  
556 Feb 2017]. Available: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm4829a1.htm>
- 557 3. Garrett DO, Longley AT, Aiemjoy K, Yousafzai MT, Hemlock C, Yu AT, et al.  
558 Incidence of typhoid and paratyphoid fever in Bangladesh, Nepal, and Pakistan: results  
559 of the Surveillance for Enteric Fever in Asia Project. *The Lancet Global Health*.  
560 2022;10: e978–e988. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(22)00119-X
- 561 4. Aiemjoy K, Seidman JC, Saha S, Munira SJ, Islam Sajib MS, Sium SMA, et al.  
562 Estimating typhoid incidence from community-based serosurveys: a multicohort study.  
563 *Lancet Microbe*. 2022;3: e578–e587. doi:10.1016/S2666-5247(22)00114-8
- 564 5. Yang Y-A, Chong A, Song J. Why Is Eradicating Typhoid Fever So Challenging:  
565 Implications for Vaccine and Therapeutic Design. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2018;6:  
566 doi:10.3390/vaccines6030045
- 567 6. Birkhold M, Mwisongo A, Pollard AJ, Neuzil KM. Typhoid Conjugate Vaccines:  
568 Advancing the Research and Public Health Agendas. *The Journal of Infectious  
569 Diseases*. 2021;224: S781–S787. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiab449
- 570 7. World Health Organization null. Typhoid vaccines: WHO position paper, March 2018 -  
571 Recommendations. *Vaccine*. 2019;37: 214–216. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.04.022
- 572 8. Qadri F, Khanam F, Liu X, Theiss-Nyland K, Biswas PK, Bhuiyan AI, et al. Protection  
573 by vaccination of children against typhoid fever with a Vi-tetanus toxoid conjugate  
574 vaccine in urban Bangladesh: a cluster-randomised trial. *The Lancet*. 2021;398: 675–  
575 684. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01124-7
- 576 9. Karkey A, Jombart T, Walker AW, Thompson CN, Torres A, Dongol S, et al. The  
577 Ecological Dynamics of Fecal Contamination and *Salmonella* Typhi and *Salmonella*  
578 Paratyphi A in Municipal Kathmandu Drinking Water. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2016;10:  
579 e0004346. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004346
- 580 10. Sato MO, Rafalimanantsoa A, Ramarokoto C, Rahetilahy AM, Ravoniarimbinina P,  
581 Kawai S, et al. Usefulness of environmental DNA for detecting *Schistosoma mansoni*  
582 occurrence sites in Madagascar. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2018;76: 130–136.  
583 doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2018.08.018
- 584 11. Bonanno Ferraro G, Veneri C, Mancini P, Iaconelli M, Suffredini E, Bonadonna L, et al.  
585 A State-of-the-Art Scoping Review on SARS-CoV-2 in Sewage Focusing on the  
586 Potential of Wastewater Surveillance for the Monitoring of the COVID-19 Pandemic.  
587 *Food Environ Virol*. 2021 [cited 24 Jun 2022]. doi:10.1007/s12560-021-09498-6

- 588 12. Akullian A, Ng'eno E, Matheson AI, Cosmas L, Macharia D, Fields B, et al.  
589 Environmental Transmission of Typhoid Fever in an Urban Slum. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*.  
590 2015;9: e0004212. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004212
- 591 13. Mogasale VV, Ramani E, Mogasale V, Park JY, Wierzba TF. Estimating Typhoid Fever  
592 Risk Associated with Lack of Access to Safe Water: A Systematic Literature Review.  
593 In: *Journal of Environmental and Public Health* [Internet]. Hindawi; 2018 [cited 12 Apr  
594 2020] p. e9589208. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/9589208>
- 595 14. Thapa BR, Ishidaira H, Pandey VP, Shakya NM. Impact Assessment of Gorkha  
596 Earthquake 2015 on Portable Water Supply in Kathmandu Valley: Preliminary  
597 Analysis. *土木学会論文集b1 (水工学)*. 2016;72: I\_61-I\_66.  
598 doi:10.2208/jscejhe.72.I\_61
- 599 15. Gauld JS, Olgemoeller F, Nkhata R, Li C, Chirambo A, Morse T, et al. Domestic River  
600 Water Use and Risk of Typhoid Fever: Results From a Case-control Study in Blantyre,  
601 Malawi. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;70: 1278–1284. doi:10.1093/cid/ciz405
- 602 16. Sears SD, Ferreccio C, Levine MM, Cordano AM, Monreal J, Black RE, et al. The Use  
603 of Moore Swabs for Isolation of *Salmonella typhi* from Irrigation Water in Santiago,  
604 Chile. *J Infect Dis*. 1984;149: 640–642. doi:10.1093/infdis/149.4.640
- 605 17. Marco C, Delgado I, Vargas C, Muñoz X, Bhutta ZA, Ferreccio C. Typhoid Fever in  
606 Chile 1969–2012: Analysis of an Epidemic and Its Control. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*.  
607 2018;99: 26–33. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.18-0125
- 608 18. Yu AT, Shakya R, Adhikari B, Tamrakar D, Vaidya K, Maples S, et al. A Cluster-  
609 based, Spatial-sampling Method for Assessing Household Healthcare Utilization  
610 Patterns in Resource-limited Settings. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2020;71: S239–  
611 S247. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1310
- 612 19. Nga TVT, Karkey A, Dongol S, Thuy HN, Dunstan S, Holt K, et al. The sensitivity of  
613 real-time PCR amplification targeting invasive *Salmonella* serovars in biological  
614 specimens. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2010;10: 125. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-10-125
- 615 20. Andrews JR, Yu AT, Saha S, Shakya J, Aiemjoy K, Horng L, et al. Environmental  
616 Surveillance as a Tool for Identifying High-risk Settings for Typhoid Transmission.  
617 *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;71: S71–S78. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa513
- 618 21. Kane SR, Shah SR, Alfaro TM. Development of a rapid viability polymerase chain  
619 reaction method for detection of *Yersinia pestis*. *Journal of Microbiological Methods*.  
620 2019;162: 21–27. doi:10.1016/j.mimet.2019.05.005
- 621 22. Létant SE, Murphy GA, Alfaro TM, Avila JR, Kane SR, Raber E, et al. Rapid-Viability  
622 PCR Method for Detection of Live, Virulent *Bacillus anthracis* in Environmental  
623 Samples. *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 2011;77: 6570–6578. doi:10.1128/AEM.00623-11
- 624 23. Pebesma E. Simple Features for R: Standardized Support for Spatial Vector Data. *The R*  
625 *Journal*. 2018;10: 439–446. Available: [https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2018/RJ-](https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2018/RJ-2018-009/index.html)  
626 [2018-009/index.html](https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2018/RJ-2018-009/index.html)
- 627 24. Mapbox. Mapbox Studio. Mapbox; 2022. Available: <https://www.mapbox.com/>

- 628 25. Nepal Rainfall data. Nepal Department of Hydrology and Meteorology; 2019.  
629 Available: [http://hydrology.gov.np/#/?\\_k=cq0rbh](http://hydrology.gov.np/#/?_k=cq0rbh)
- 630 26. Create Elegant Data Visualisations Using the Grammar of Graphics. [cited 21 Apr  
631 2023]. Available: <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org/>
- 632 27. HydroSHEDS. [cited 21 Apr 2023]. Available: <https://www.hydrosheds.org/>
- 633 28. Gridded population estimate datasets and tools. - WorldPop. [cited 21 Apr 2023].  
634 Available: <https://www.worldpop.org/methods/populations/>
- 635 29. Wood SN. Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R, Second Edition. 2nd  
636 edition. Boca Raton: Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2017.
- 637 30. Bhushal R. Kathmandu's traditional water spouts dry out. In: The Third Pole [Internet].  
638 27 Mar 2014 [cited 28 Nov 2022]. Available:  
639 <https://www.thethirdpole.net/en/pollution/kathmandus-traditional-water-spouts-dry-out/>
- 640 31. Pandey VP, Chapagain SK, Kazama F. Evaluation of groundwater environment of  
641 Kathmandu Valley. *Environ Earth Sci.* 2010;60: 1329–1342. doi:10.1007/s12665-009-  
642 0263-6
- 643 32. Bhandari P, Banjara MR, Singh A, Kandel S, Rawal DS, Pant BR. Water quality status  
644 of groundwater and municipal water supply (tap water) from Bagmati river basin in  
645 Kathmandu valley, Nepal. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development.*  
646 2020;11: 102–111. doi:10.2166/washdev.2020.190
- 647 33. Gurung Y, Zhao J, Kumar KC B, Wu X, Suwal B, Whittington D. The costs of delay in  
648 infrastructure investments: A comparison of 2001 and 2014 household water supply  
649 coping costs in the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal. *Water Resources Research.* 2017;53:  
650 7078–7102. doi:10.1002/2016WR019529
- 651 34. Hagedorn BL, Zhou NA, Fagnant-Sperati CS, Shirai JH, Gauld J, Wang Y, et al. The  
652 cost of building an environmental surveillance system for typhoid. *medRxiv*; 2021. p.  
653 2021.07.12.21260395. doi:10.1101/2021.07.12.21260395
- 654 35. Luby SP. Urban Slums: A Supportive Ecosystem for Typhoidal Salmonellae. *J Infect*  
655 *Dis.* 2018;218: S250–S254. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiy324
- 656 36. Kumpel E, Nelson KL. Mechanisms Affecting Water Quality in an Intermittent Piped  
657 Water Supply. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2014;48: 2766–2775. doi:10.1021/es405054u
- 658 37. Regmi RK, Mishra BK. Current Water Quality Status of Rivers in the Kathmandu  
659 Valley. 2016 [cited 29 Nov 2022]. Available:  
660 <https://collections.unu.edu/view/UNU:5530#viewAttachments>
- 661 38. Shrestha N, Mishra B, Lamsal A. Current Status of Water Environment in Kathmandu  
662 Valley, Nepal. 2016. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.16039.14246
- 663 39. Karkey A, Arjyal A, Anders KL, Boni MF, Dongol S, Koirala S, et al. The burden and  
664 characteristics of enteric fever at a healthcare facility in a densely populated area of  
665 Kathmandu. *PLoS One.* 2010;5: e13988. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0013988

- 666 40. Aguiar-Oliveira M de L, Campos A, R. Matos A, Rigotto C, Sotero-Martins A, Teixeira  
667 PFP, et al. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology (WBE) and Viral Detection in Polluted  
668 Surface Water: A Valuable Tool for COVID-19 Surveillance—A Brief Review.  
669 International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2020;17: 9251.  
670 doi:10.3390/ijerph17249251
- 671 41. Guerrero-Latorre L, Ballesteros I, Villacrés-Granda I, Granda MG, Freire-Paspuel B,  
672 Ríos-Touma B. SARS-CoV-2 in river water: Implications in low sanitation countries.  
673 Science of The Total Environment. 2020;743: 140832.  
674 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140832
- 675 42. Karkey A, Aryjal A, Basnyat B, Baker S. Kathmandu, Nepal: still an enteric fever  
676 capital of the world. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2008;2: 461–465. doi:10.3855/jidc.162
- 677 43. Matrajt G, Lillis L, Meschke JS. Review of Methods Suitable for Environmental  
678 Surveillance of Salmonella Typhi and Paratyphi. Clin Infect Dis. 2020;71: S79–S83.  
679 doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa487
- 680 44. Rigby J, Elmerhebi E, Diness Y, Mkwanda C, Tonthola K, Galloway H, et al.  
681 Optimized methods for detecting Salmonella Typhi in the environment using validated  
682 field sampling, culture and confirmatory molecular approaches. J Appl Microbiol.  
683 2022;132: 1503–1517. doi:10.1111/jam.15237
- 684