

1 **Structured Ethical Review for Wastewater-Based Testing**

2 Devin A. Bowes^{1,2*}; Amanda Darling^{3*}; Erin M.Driver^{1*}; Devrim Kaya^{4,5*}; Rasha Maal-Bared⁶;
3 Lisa M. Lee⁷; Kenneth Goodman⁸; Sangeet Adhikari¹; Srijan Aggarwal⁹; Aaron Bivins¹⁰; Zuzana
4 Bohrerova¹¹; Alasdair Cohen^{3,12}; Claire Duvallet¹³; Rasha A. Elnimeiry¹⁴; Justin M. Hutchison¹⁵;
5 Vikram Kapoor¹⁶; Ishi Keenum¹⁷; Fangqiong Ling¹⁸; Deborah Sills¹⁹; Ananda Tiwari^{20,21}; Peter
6 Vikesland³; Ryan Ziels²²; Cresten Mansfeldt^{23,24†}

7

8 *These authors contributed equally to this work

9 †Corresponding author: cresten.mansfeldt@colorado.edu


10

- 11 1. Biodesign Center for Environmental Health Engineering, The Biodesign Institute, Arizona State University,
12 1001 S. McAllister Ave, Tempe, AZ, 85287
- 13 2. Center on Forced Displacement, Boston University, 111 Cummington Mall, Boston, MA, 02215
- 14 3. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Virginia Tech, 1145 Perry Street; 415 Durham Hall;
15 Blacksburg, VA 24061
- 16 4. School of Chemical, Biological, and Environmental Engineering, Oregon State University, 105 26th St,
17 Corvallis, Oregon 97331
- 18 5. School of Public Health, San Diego State University, San Diego and Imperial Valley, CA
- 19 6. Quality Assurance and Environment, EPCOR Water Services Inc., EPCOR Tower, 2000–10423 101 Street
20 NW, Edmonton, Alberta, CA
- 21 7. Department of Population Health Sciences and Division of Scholarly Integrity and Research Compliance,
22 Virginia Tech, 300 Turner St. NW, Suite 4120 (0497), Blacksburg, VA 24061
- 23 8. Institute for Bioethics and Health Policy, Miller School of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, Florida
- 24 9. Department of Civil, Geological, and Environmental Engineering, University of Alaska Fairbanks, 1764
25 Tanana Loop, Fairbanks, AK 99775
- 26 10. Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Louisiana State University, 3255 Patrick F. Taylor Hall,
27 Baton Rouge, LA 70803
- 28 11. The Ohio State University, Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering, 2070 Neil
29 Avenue, 470 Hitchcock Hall, Columbus, OH 43210
- 30 12. Department of Population Health Sciences, Virginia Tech, 205 Duck Pond Drive, Blacksburg, VA 24061
- 31 13. Biobot Analytics, Inc., 501 Massachusetts Avenue; Cambridge, MA; 02139
- 32 14. Public Health Outbreak Coordination, Informatics, Surveillance (PHOCIS) Office – Surveillance Section,
33 Division of Disease Control and Health Statistics, Washington State Department of Health, 111 Israel Rd
34 SE, Tumwater, WA 98501
- 35 15. Department of Civil, Environmental, and Architectural Engineering, University of Kansas, 1530 W 15th St,
36 Lawrence, KS 66045
- 37 16. School of Civil & Environmental Engineering, and Construction Management, University of Texas at San
38 Antonio, 1 UTSA Circle, San Antonio, TX 78249
- 39 17. Complex Microbial Systems Group, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 100 Bureau Dr,
40 Gaithersburg, MD 20899
- 41 18. Department of Energy, Environmental and Chemical Engineering, Washington University in St. Louis, One
42 Brookings Drive, St. Louis, MO, 63130
- 43 19. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA, 17837
- 44 20. Department of Food Hygiene and Environmental Health, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of
45 Helsinki, Agnes Sjöberginkatu 2 P.O. Box 66 FI 00014 Helsinki, Finland
- 46 21. Expert Microbiology Unit, Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Kuopio, Finland

- 47 22. Department of Civil Engineering, the University of British Columbia, 6250 Applied Science Ln #2002,
48 Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4
49 23. Department of Civil, Environmental, and Architectural Engineering, University of Colorado Boulder, UCB
50 428, Boulder, CO 80309
51 24. Environmental Engineering Program, University of Colorado Boulder, UCB 607, Boulder, CO 80309
52

53 **Keywords:** Wastewater-based epidemiology, building-scale, sub-sewershed, ethics, structured
54 review, SARS-CoV-2

55 =====



56
57 **Abstract.** Wastewater-based testing (WBT) for SARS-CoV-2 has rapidly expanded over the
58 past three years due to its ability to provide a comprehensive measurement of disease
59 prevalence independent of clinical testing. The development and simultaneous application of the
60 field blurred the boundary between measuring biomarkers for research activities and for pursuit
61 of public health goals, both areas with well-established ethical frameworks. Currently, WBT
62 practitioners do not employ a standardized ethical review process (or associated data
63 management safeguards), introducing the potential for adverse outcomes for WBT
64 professionals and community members. To address this deficiency, an interdisciplinary group
65 developed a framework for a structured ethical review of WBT. The workshop employed a
66 consensus approach to create this framework as a set of 11-questions derived from primarily
67 public health guidance because of the common exemption of wastewater samples to human
68 subject research considerations. This study retrospectively applied the set of questions to peer-
69 reviewed published reports on SARS-CoV-2 monitoring campaigns covering the emergent
70 phase of the pandemic from March 2020 to February 2022 (n=53). Overall, 43% of the
71 responses to the questions were unable to be assessed because of lack of reported information.

72 It is therefore hypothesized that a systematic framework would at a minimum improve the
73 communication of key ethical considerations for the application of WBT. Consistent application
74 of a standardized ethical review will also assist in developing an engaged practice of critically
75 applying and updating approaches and techniques to reflect the concerns held by both those
76 practicing and being monitored by WBT supported campaigns.

77

78 **Synopsis.** Development of a structured ethical review facilitates retrospective analysis of
79 published studies and drafted scenarios in the context of wastewater-based testing.

80

81 **Introduction: *The Need for a Structured Ethical Review.*** Wastewater-based testing (WBT)
82 describes the sampling of wastewater to support initiatives such as public health, scientific
83 research, law enforcement, and corporate surveillance. This flexibility of WBT originates from
84 the ability to collect wastewater samples in near real-time, at the population-level, and for a
85 variety of analytical targets, including pathogens that cause infectious diseases. Discussing the
86 technique of WBT often progresses rapidly to describing an application rather than exploring the
87 concept in application-free terms¹. For example, WBT has been used successfully to monitor
88 enteric and respiratory pathogens, such as poliovirus and coronaviruses^{2,3}. Integrating WBT into
89 public health surveillance is potentially less invasive, more efficient, and more inclusive than
90 clinical testing. Inclusivity is an inherent property of the aggregated nature of wastewater, which
91 contains target infection bioindicators (e.g., viral RNA) excreted by community members into a
92 municipal sewer network and can capture symptomatic, asymptomatic, and pre-symptomatic
93 carriers of infectious pathogens regardless of an individual's access to healthcare⁴. WBT can
94 also provide an early warning of pathogen presence within a given community, as well as detect
95 and track circulating and novel genomic variants (e.g., for SARS-CoV-2)⁵⁻⁷. As such, the use of

96 WBT presents as a reliable, cost-effective, objective, and rapid public health tool that
97 complements clinical testing methods that are increasingly being adopted^{8,9}.

98
99 This application-specific consideration of WBT may too easily borrow the well-established
100 public health ethical and legal frameworks to the analysis of a flexible tool. For example,
101 academic researchers who used WBT to monitor pathogens were exempt from, or did not seek,
102 standardized research ethics oversight or review because of the composite nature of the
103 collected wastewater^{10,11}. Whereas public health departments rapidly incorporated wastewater
104 sampling into the surveillance of SARS-CoV-2¹²⁻¹⁴, WBT additionally supported the research
105 activities of academics and services offered by commercial biotechnology firms. This
106 constellation of state, private, and academic entities is common within the operation and
107 development of public health surveillance, with all entities performing clinical sampling.
108 However, not all sampling translates into surveillance in support of public health, and each entity
109 has separate legal and ethical frameworks¹⁵. Therefore, even when considering the ethics of a
110 specific application of the tool, it is important to distinguish between WBT used for public health
111 surveillance, which follows well-established professional practice and WHO guidelines¹⁶, and
112 with WBT used for non-public health purposes (e.g., scientific research, law enforcement) or by
113 non-public health entities (e.g., private entities)¹⁷. This distinction between testing and
114 surveillance supports the usage of WBT throughout the text rather than the more often reported
115 wastewater-based surveillance (WBS). “Surveillance” is a term of art, and in the context of
116 public health, describes a method of learning about health, which is different from research or
117 other applications of WBT. “Testing” is the technology or tool that can be used for a number of
118 processes, including research, public health surveillance, or other types of monitoring.

119

120 When considering WBT in a more application-free context, concerns arise around data
121 utilization and civic governance^{1,15}. Whether WBT is used for research, private monitoring, or
122 public health surveillance, overarching ethical questions have yet to be fully explored. WBT
123 might negatively affect privacy expectations and civil liberties at the community or even
124 individual level¹⁸⁻²⁰. Cases in which wastewater-derived results prompt a targeted response in a
125 specific community could stigmatize or might, in principle, violate the privacy of the sampled
126 community, deflating the unique feature of conducting WBT; anonymity^{21,22}. Conversely, the
127 population at-large has a right to benefit from publicly-funded advanced surveillance
128 technologies and the right to information about particular outbreaks so that individuals can make
129 informed decisions about their health¹⁵, which ultimately requires broad and transparent
130 communication of WBT results²³. Generally, the usage of WBT to monitor for diseases, toxins,
131 and terrorists threats receive broad public support across the United States²⁴. Accordingly,
132 special attention should be paid to contextualize WBT in terms of culture and community values,
133 the intended result of the testing efforts, and the individuals connected to the sewer conveyance
134 network, such that results can be communicated quickly, effectively, equitably, and ethically to
135 maintain community buy-in^{25,26}. A similar point is made by those who advocate for community-
136 based participatory research whenever academic or government investigators seek to learn
137 more about groups of people in a particular or specific region or place. Notably, with specific
138 sampling place primarily occurring in fixed, publicly-owned or operated infrastructure, unique
139 considerations arise in comparison to other public health measures surrounding the civic
140 governance of WBT, necessitating development of a comprehensive framework that captures
141 this multi-profession collaboration¹⁵.

142

143 An ethical framework applied to WBT might limit challenges that arise in contexts
144 characterized by persistent injustice or violations of human rights. In addition, clearly defined
145 ethical practices and processes can reduce or prevent community harm from and resistance to
146 WBT when used for public health surveillance or scientific research purposes. The importance
147 of clear ethical guidelines was recognized by the WHO's general framework for ethical public
148 health surveillance systems¹⁶. Thus, WBT practitioners, which include a mix of scientific experts
149 from highly diverse disciplines and public health authorities, are increasingly called to translate
150 this general framework into practice²⁷, to both protect the public and ensure a high level of
151 support from the community with broad social acceptance and trust²⁸⁻³⁰. However, as
152 demonstrated by lack of independent review and oversight of WBT for SARS-CoV-2 monitoring,
153 translating these guidelines into professional practice remains unstandardized and in an early
154 phase of adoption due to those initially conducting WBT having expertise and training outside of
155 public health practice. Additionally, as WBT continues to expand into further applications that
156 transcend multiple disciplines²³, such as opioid detection, monitoring campaigns should be
157 reassessed for each new application, community, and location³¹. Therefore, interpreting the
158 existing public health frameworks set forth by the WHO and others^{15,30,32-34} and translating them
159 into a concrete, actionable, and specific framework of questions, can assist wastewater
160 practitioners, public health officials, policy makers, utilities, and the public in interpreting the
161 suitability of WBT.

162

163 This question-oriented framework can also encourage new entities engaging in the field
164 to rapidly adopt best practices and can provide the tools to identify those applications that fail to
165 align. Critically, the framework is provided as a set of questions to interrogate an application, not
166 a set of finalized guidelines. This framework identifies concerns concretely and rapidly to enable

167 interdisciplinary teams to engage well-established professional practices in collaboration.
168 Additionally, this framework highlights areas that require further review rather than providing a
169 strict protocol given that ethical issues are often easily raised, yet require contextualized
170 analysis and continued engagement by all involved to address successfully. Finally, this
171 standardized set of questions might also promote an ethical research culture, if adopted and
172 upheld as an ongoing practice, and support the reputation and trust of the research field,
173 ensuring equitable and sustainable foundations for WBT systems and community
174 engagement³⁵. For these reasons, we present a structured ethical review framework designed
175 as a worksheet to assist in ensuring the successful, long-term, and wide-ranging implementation
176 of WBT.

177

178 **Methods: *Design of a Structured Ethical Review.*** Participants contributing to the
179 development of the structured ethical review were recruited through a public announcement at
180 the Water Environment Federation's Public Health and Water Conference & Wastewater
181 Disease Surveillance Summit on March 23, 2022, as well as active social media
182 announcements and word-of-mouth referrals. From this effort, 29 active participants were
183 involved in the formulation of this study. Participants included representatives from a range of
184 WBT activities, including academic researchers, public health and wastewater practitioners, and
185 private entities working in WBT. The workshops drew upon two previously published articles
186 describing ethical considerations of surveillance to develop the framework for a structured
187 ethical review of the existing COVID-19 WBT literature, with the concepts of structured reviews
188 being well-established in the creation of Institutional Review Board (IRB) processes³⁶. The first
189 selected article, written by Gary Marx (1997), emphasizes what the author calls "the new
190 surveillance"³⁷. Marx (1997) poses 29 questions in three categories (the means, the data

191 collection context, and uses) to assess the ethics of surveillance, which the workshop then
192 adapted to better suit WBT. The second article, by Hrudehy et al. (2021), explicitly focused on
193 ethical guidelines through 17 questions applied to SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance based
194 on a comprehensive literature review and previous WHO recommendations³². Hrudehy et al.
195 concluded the existing public health ethics literature fails to provide robust guidance for WBT
196 practitioners.

197
198 To apply and add to these previous works, the participants developed the structured
199 ethical review framework using a workshop approach. Prior to the workshop, each participant
200 reviewed these two articles on ethics of public health surveillance^{32,37} and drafted concise
201 descriptions for three levels of ethical sufficiency for each of the categories posed by Marx
202 (1997) and Hrudehy et al. (2021) applied to WBT activities. The three levels of ethical sufficiency
203 were as follows: 0 - minimal review required (no ethical concerns); 1 - review suggested (limited
204 ethical concerns); and 2 - review strongly suggested (broad ethical concerns). These levels
205 were selected to prioritize ethical reviews and communication efforts of those designing and
206 operating surveillance programs. Thereafter, each participant independently filled their brief
207 written descriptions within a shared document for each previously identified category of ethical
208 consideration identified in the two articles. During the virtual workshop, participants reviewed the
209 responses and identified the guidelines and questions that warranted further discussion; the
210 output thus identified consensus descriptions of ethical sufficiency rankings. After the workshop,
211 each participant adopted a category and prepared a final draft description for the three levels of
212 ethical sufficiency into a table (Supplemental Table 1). All co-authors then reviewed the table,
213 and revisions were made until a consensus final draft was reached, with duplicate categories
214 merged, but all others preserved from Marx (1997) and Hrudehy et al. (2021). The final, fully

215 consolidated framework comprises 37 categories of ethical consideration for WBT, with three
216 ordinal ranking descriptions within each category (Supplemental Table 1). These categories
217 broadly represent key considerations in community engagement, equality, establishment of a
218 new precedent, and data integrity. With the large size of the framework, the set was further
219 refined, with the participants being asked to list ten essential questions to include. In total, 16
220 participants provided a score, and those categories receiving over 9 votes or higher were
221 included in the final framework (Table 1). In essence, the developed structured ethical review
222 provides a set of questions that enables users to provide a score (higher the score the greater
223 the ethical concern) when considering a WBT application.

224

225 ***Inclusion Criteria for Published Studies Considered within the Application of the***

226 ***Structured Ethical Review.*** The initial collection of studies was obtained by searching for
227 articles containing the keyword phrases "SARS-CoV-2" and "wastewater," yielding a total of
228 5,632 articles as of February 2022. To focus on sampling strategies that potentially challenge
229 individuals' assumptions of privacy, further filtering was performed to include studies reporting
230 on near-building and/or within-sewer monitoring. This involved incorporating additional modifiers
231 such as "campus," "nursing home not campus," "prison not campus," "hospital and wastewater-
232 based and building not campus," and "neighborhood not campus." Consequently, the modified
233 search categories returned 1204, 240, 119, 201, and 313 articles, respectively. Studies were
234 excluded if they did not mention monitoring within a sewer collection system at the
235 neighborhood or building-level scale or if they were not yet published as peer-reviewed articles.
236 This strategy was used to narrow the database into a representative and manageable sub-
237 selection of WBT related literature covering the early phase of the pandemic as a case study.
238 The goal here was to emphasize the utility of the ethical framework applied to a coherent set of

239 WBT applications rather than defining the best practices for a given application. Therefore, this
240 structured review approach could be applied in the future to private residential settings³⁸ or at
241 wastewater treatment plant scales³⁹, but both areas were excluded from current consideration.
242 A note on private settings: If one accepts the utility of a robust ethics analysis to improve
243 practice and foster trustworthiness, it should not matter if an educational institution, for instance,
244 is public or private. The analysis of human biological material and data will always raise ethical
245 issues, and it is unacceptable to suggest that private institutions ought adhere to different
246 scientific or ethical standards.

247
248 After applying these filters, 25 near-building and 21 within-sewer SARS-CoV-2 WBT studies
249 were identified for review. The inclusion of 7 additional articles published after the initial search
250 that were previously in preprint status increased the number of studies included in this
251 structured ethical review to 53 (56 publications were represented by these studies, with 3 having
252 two publications describing the same monitoring campaign and were considered in concert).
253 While published research articles inherently connote research use of WBT, the selected articles
254 had potential direct applications to public health, facilitating their use in the evaluation of the
255 structured ethical review framework.

256
257 Papers were divided across participants for review, with overlapping assignments provided.
258 Overall, 79 reviews were completed by answering all 37 questions based on the reviewers'
259 analysis of the presented text alone. Conflicting assignments were evaluated, but were left
260 unchanged, resulting in an average score for those papers. The reviews were then consolidated
261 into a summary data frame for broad comparisons between the responses to individual
262 questions

Table 1. Consolidated framework for a structured ethical review to assess potential adverse outcomes of WBT efforts. Specific categories originated from either Marx 1997 [*] or Hrudey et al., 2021 [†]. The top 11 categories based on the internal voting are presented here, the full framework is presented as Supplemental Table 1, available at DOI:10.17632/2xkfkcsxx8.1.

Category	0 - Minimal Review Required	1 - Review Suggested	2 - Review Strongly Suggested
Legitimacy: Are surveillance data collected only for a legitimate public health purpose?†	Data support public health agents for public health measures	Data support non-public health agents for public health measures	Data support non-public health agents (or public health agents acting outside of public health) for non-public health purposes
Unfair Disadvantage: Is the information used in such a way as to cause unwarranted harm or disadvantage to its subject?*	WBT is implemented with clear scope, oversight, and decision-making procedures including procedures for response to wastewater data with policies for follow-up clinical testing applicable to full communities	Unintentionally subjecting specific areas to the possibility of a disruptive intervention (lockdowns, quarantines, isolations of entire areas without any process for identifying and isolating relevant individuals; mandatory testing of individuals in response to wastewater data) whereas excluding others from the same level of surveillance scrutiny and response	Intentionally subjecting specific areas to the possibility of a disruptive intervention (lockdowns, quarantines, isolations of entire areas without any process for identifying and isolating relevant individuals; mandatory testing of individuals in response to wastewater data) whereas excluding others from the same level of surveillance scrutiny and response
Data Stewardship and Protection: Is the data properly maintained to protect those monitored?*	Data managed per requirements of community monitored	Data managed per requirements of funding agency	Data management plan absent
Creation of Unwanted Precedents: Is it likely to create precedents that will lead to its application in undesirable ways?*	Analysis for individual identification prohibited; explorations outside of agreed-upon community scope is explicitly prohibited	No positional statement regarding individual identification; No discussion of future research is discussed	Explicitly for identification of individuals or otherwise unethical applications
Awareness: Are individuals informed they are being monitored and why?*	Representative(s) of the monitoring campaign are in a cycle of continued community outreach and engagement during WBT and over the clearly defined reporting period providing contextualization of the scope and intent to minimize misrepresentation or misuse; those monitoring capture the questions from the community rather than the wastewater utility operators	Duration, scope, and intent is communicated and disseminated in a passive manner without contextualization or engagement OR communicated to a single representative of the community; the wastewater utility operators respond to increased inquiries but have access to those collecting the data to direct inquiries	No direct communication of the duration, scope, and intent to the monitored community members; the burden of communication falls solely on the third-party wastewater utility operators rather than the data collectors

<p>External Data Sharing: Is the public health surveillance data shared with other public health agencies when addressing a public health need?†</p>	<p>Collected WBT-supported public health data is shared freely with/between public health agencies when a public health need presents or persists</p>	<p>Collected WBT-supported public health data only partially shared with/between public health agencies when a public health need presents or persists</p>	<p>No data is shared when a public health need presents or persists</p>
<p>Public Decision-Making: Was the decision to use WBT in surveillance arrived at through some public discussion and decision-making process?*</p>	<p>Surveillance program was designed in a public manner (e.g., review by elected officials and public through town halls for initial implementation and continued operation) with a good-faith effort to reach both those receptive or resistant to the objectives of public health</p>	<p>Program does not receive formal public authorization but is broadly supported by the public (as informed by representative public surveys)</p>	<p>Program does not receive formal public authorization and is not supported by the public (as informed by representative public surveys)</p>
<p>Right of Inspection: Are people aware of the findings of WBT supported surveillance and how they were created?*</p>	<p>Representative(s) of the monitoring campaign are in a cycle of continued community outreach and engagement during the sample collection and reporting period providing contextualization of the collected data to minimize misrepresentation or misuse (e.g., updating an annotated and agreed-upon internet-accessible dashboard; timely and routine public town-halls or open seminars; direct mailing to surveyed individuals)</p>	<p>The collected data is communicated and disseminated in a passive manner without contextualization or engagement OR communicated to a single representative of the community</p>	<p>No direct communication of the collected data to the monitored community members</p>
<p>Equality-inequality: Is WBT broadly applied to all or only those able to resist?*</p>	<p>Entire community is monitored (e.g., treatment plant; jail sampling that monitors the effluent of the whole jail including staff and inmates)</p>	<p>Representative coverage is achieved (e.g., manhole sampling, but ensuring that demographics of surveilled communities are representative of the entire city; jail sampling that has sites for staff and inmates separately)</p>	<p>Only protected-class communities are monitored (e.g., manhole sampling that surveils only low-GDP per capita areas; jail sampling that only surveils inmates)</p>
<p>Community Values: Are the values and concerns of the communities taken into account in planning, implementing, and using data from surveillance?†</p>	<p>Representative of the monitoring campaign are in a cycle of continued community outreach and engagement during the planning and implementing period to address the concerns and support the values of the community</p>	<p>Representative of the monitoring campaign are engaged during the planning period only to address the concerns and support the values of the community</p>	<p>No direct involvement of the monitored community members</p>
<p>Consequence of Inaction: What are the consequences of taking no surveillance action?*</p>	<p>Mortality, morbidity, or other adverse effects is imposed on community by lack of surveillance</p>	<p>The surveillance data does not minimize adverse effects to the community</p>	<p>The community benefits by not being surveyed</p>


266 **Results and Discussion:**

267 **Reconsidering SARS-CoV-2: Application of the structured ethical review.** The main
268 goal of this study was to develop a framework to assist in identifying gaps in ethical
269 considerations of WBT as a tool. This was accomplished by first developing and then
270 demonstrating the framework by applying the structured ethical review framework to previously
271 reported SARS-CoV-2 WBT studies (Figure 1). Application of the structured ethical review
272 framework highlighted that throughout the published articles reviewed in this work, gaps in
273 information were observed in both the manuscript and supplemental information (1247 of 2923
274 answers provided (43%) indicated “Not Recorded in the Main Text”). This absence may be the
275 result of the inclusion of studies predominantly reported by non-public health agents (e.g.,
276 academics, researchers). For example, when compared to clinical research in which detailed
277 informed consent (i.e., voluntariness, information disclosure, decision-making capacity, and
278 communication of results) is required⁴⁰, few WBT studies articulated whether consent was
279 obtained from the studied community, whether those results were communicated back to the
280 community, and/or whether those results were used with clear public health objectives and
281 outcomes. It is important to note that WBT can be applied as a public health surveillance tool
282 that would then operate within existing legal and regulatory frameworks. Within these specific
283 applications, consent for the collection and testing of wastewater samples may not be required
284 from individuals when a pooled sample is being analyzed, as this is considered to be part of
285 routine public health surveillance⁴¹. However, there may be legal and ethical considerations
286 around the use of the WBT data collected, for example, in research applications, and these
287 should be addressed by relevant authorities and other frameworks. Broadly, the absence of
288 reported information for evaluating community engagement and data safeguards reflects the
289 current lack of a standardized ethical framework for WBT campaigns.

290
291 This exemption from reporting and lack of oversight may also be due to a lack of clarity
292 for the motivation of the WBT study. For example, these articles could have been originally
293 motivated by a research interest with results that prompted a public health action. Conversely,
294 authors may have retrospectively published results from a public health surveillance system. In
295 the former case, authors may have assumed the research study was exempted from IRB
296 approval given the composite nature of the sample, which is believed to prevent the ability to
297 identify specific individuals in a given sewer catchment⁴². In certain cases, authors referenced
298 IRB approvals for utilizing individual case data⁴³, but in most cases, WBT sample data itself was
299 determined to be exempt from IRB oversight. In select cases, ambiguity surrounded whether the
300 IRBs themselves arrived at these determinations or the researchers, a key consideration given
301 that these oversight bodies are responsible for conforming to federal regulations.

302
303 However, the data collected from WBT were sometimes used for direct public health
304 interventions, a usage of WBT that aligns with public health surveillance and that is distinct from
305 research activities governed by IRB protocols. For example, other studies (mainly dormitory and
306 hospital surveys) reported on positive SARS-CoV-2 detection in wastewater, triggering
307 mandatory clinical or individualized testing from which infected individuals were identified⁴³⁻⁴⁶.
308 In contrast, WBT of a cargo ship specifically explored border protection against infected
309 seafarers as a potential public health intervention⁴⁷, a more intervention-driven approach than
310 that described as a complementary monitoring tool for airplanes⁴⁸. Ultimately, the study did not
311 support WBT in the cargo ship application, notably because individualized testing was already
312 deployed. This highlights a key finding: the motivation for the use of WBT during the early phase
313 of the pandemic was blurred between research and public health surveillance.

314 This dual nature of early monitoring campaigns complicates their interpretation. For
315 example, if WBT was conducted as part of a public health surveillance effort, informing
316 subsequent action where individuals were identified through individualized testing regimes (e.g.,
317 isolation), then IRB oversight would be unnecessary as this use of WBT would fall under ethical
318 guidelines for public health surveillance. This determination that IRB is not required rests on
319 WBT being used as a tool for public health surveillance conducted by a public health authority,
320 which is explicitly excluded from the US IRB regulations (Subpart A of 45 CFR Part 46)⁴⁹.
321 However, if the wastewater data itself triggered direct public health outcomes without
322 subsequent independent surveillance, such as clinical testing confirmation during the early
323 phase of the pandemic, or if the subsequent clinical testing had the additional goal to produce
324 generalizable knowledge, then IRB oversight is likely needed because both of these areas
325 include research components during the development phase. This requirement results from
326 either using non-clinical data, that at the time was relatively new to the public health field, for a
327 direct health intervention; or using clinical data for a research purpose rather than public health
328 surveillance (see Categories 4, 10, & 28 in Supplemental Table 1). Notably, none of the 53
329 studies reviewed with the proposed structured ethical review were flagged by their institutions
330 for IRB approval for the WBT portion alone, suggesting that IRB approval may have been
331 granted to other types of ongoing research such as individualized saliva testing when needed
332 and used in combination with these programs. In compliance with the IRB regulations, studies
333 that pair WBT with public health surveillance should seek IRB review to address the research
334 aspects of the work.



335 ■ Minimal Review Required ■ Review Suggested ■ Review Strongly Suggested ■ Not Available in the Main Text ■ Not Applicable

336 **Figure 1.** The distribution of assigned flags (“minimal review required”, “review suggested”, “review
 337 strongly suggested”, “not available in the main text”, “not applicable”) for the top 11 categories in the
 338 structured ethical review, represented as a fraction percent of all publications analyzed (n=53) with
 339 multiple reviewers providing reports for select individual studies, resulting in more reviews than studies
 340 (n=79)^{12,42–46,50–99}. In total, 56 publications were represented by these studies, with 3 having two
 341 publications describing the same monitoring campaign and were considered in concert. The categories
 342 are sorted by ascending proportion of “minimal review required”.

343
 344 In contrast to the ambiguity surrounding IRB review reporting, the WBT community has
 345 already taken to reporting on other ethical areas including the scale of testing (e.g., wastewater
 346 treatment plants [WWTPs], building-level), the identifiability of populations represented, the
 347 presence/absence of validated QA/QC workflows, and the need for clear statements of goals
 348 supporting public health. However, gaps in presenting ethical considerations were found with
 349 respect to stakeholder participation in the development and deployment of WBT efforts as well
 350 as data and sample management. Only 5 of 53 studies clearly identified a data management
 351 plan, with no study combining an additional communication or engagement plan. Elements that
 352 were considered when screening for a communication or engagement plan included statements

353 surrounding how or whether the public or public representatives were engaged in the
354 development, deployment, or future applications of WBT; the surveilled parties knew their rights
355 or were given the right to challenge, express grievances, or seek redress; and if the potential
356 risks and/or benefits were outlined in detail to these populations or third parties. It is possible
357 that some studies developed communication and engagement plans that were not explicitly
358 reported in the published research, and we acknowledge this limitation in our review. Further,
359 wastewater data security, handling, and subsequent use in and outside the scope of the project
360 (including the fate of remaining samples) were largely neither acknowledged nor discussed.
361 Details on data ownership, security, management plans, and dissemination were generally
362 absent, but key elements were provided in select studies^{44,51,82,96,98}. Several elements that
363 require more explicit elaboration include how data were reported during the operation of the
364 campaign, by what mechanism, at what frequency (weekly, bi-weekly, etc.), and how thresholds
365 of concern were established in terms of viral titers.

366
367 In the case of campus- or dormitory-wide testing at colleges and universities, authors
368 provided more information for these programs when compared to studies for large sewersheds,
369 for instance at the level of a WWTP. Specifically, these studies detailed follow-up procedures for
370 wastewater samples that resulted in positive detection of the virus (e.g., lockdowns, contact
371 tracing), stakeholder engagement, and data dissemination plans. Likely, this higher level of
372 detail resulted from building-level monitoring programs intentionally designed to use WBT to
373 assist clinical testing and quarantine procedures. However, of all papers reviewed, only a few
374 noted a process for obtaining consent from the studied populations^{45,50,63,78,80,84,90,99}.

375
376 **Learning from SARS-CoV-2: Sustaining Future Applications of WBS.** The structured ethical
377 review aims to provide a framework to assess new areas or targets of monitoring and to

378 document evolving ethical applications of WBT when uniting technical innovation, community
379 engagement, and professional collaboration¹⁰⁰. For instance, the unique characteristics of an
380 orthopoxvirus outbreak, which differs in transmission classification and carries higher pre-
381 existing stigma, present additional ethical considerations within WBT¹⁰¹. Future applications will
382 present new and unique challenges to the ethical application of WBT as a tool, promoting a
383 continuous evaluation of the structured ethical review adopted here. Therefore, establishing,
384 applying, and updating this structured ethical review over time will result in a transparent record
385 of our understanding of the best ethical practices when applying WBT within and beyond public
386 health surveillance.⁹⁹

387
388 Future WBT structured ethical reviews may need to consider human-specific, rather than
389 just pathogen-specific, target biomolecules. Early within the development of this structured
390 ethical review, it was established that the purview of recovering human genetic material was not
391 the main focus of this tool given that considerations for targeted human monitoring are already
392 developed in the biomedical research community and remain a bioethics concern beyond that of
393 WBT¹⁰². However, with the technical capabilities of WBT advancing, the application of next-
394 generation sequencing tools to collect personally identifiable health information opens unique
395 and potentially community-desired possibilities¹⁰³. Although relatively few papers used
396 sequencing techniques and, when applied, were exercised only for detecting variants of SARS-
397 CoV-2 in which human-specific DNA is masked from publicly-posted samples, there is an
398 evident lack of guidelines when analyzing complete genetic data recovered from wastewater¹⁸.
399 Notably, previous applications successfully applied more targeted approaches to screen for
400 human mitochondrial sequences within wastewater as a population biomarker highlighting
401 outside of sequencing technologies¹⁰⁴. This necessitates a better understanding of the views
402 and tolerances of those conducting targeted human-DNA testing, those using the data, and

403 persons whose samples are being tested¹⁰⁵, potentially informing the evolution and revision of
404 the categories within the structured ethical review.

405
406 Importantly, this framework does not define which applications of WBT are ethically
407 appropriate and which are not; it is simply a tool to guide the development and evolution of WBT
408 campaigns by highlighting aspects which may require additional ethical review. In an ideal
409 world, all WBT campaigns would receive ratings of "minimal review required" for all categories,
410 but in practice this will almost certainly never be the case. Applying WBT requires trade-offs to
411 maximize benefit and minimize harms. For example, waiting to implement WBT for a novel
412 pathogen until all ethical concerns are fully resolved may hinder progress in public health
413 surveillance to identify new outbreaks and intervene in their early stages. Different categories
414 within the framework can also be in tension with one another, which is common for large
415 frameworks and, thus, is expected. Additionally, the interpretation of each category will change
416 accordingly as sampling campaigns are run by or analyzed through the viewpoint of
417 researchers, governmental public health agencies, or private entities.

418
419 The role and utility of ethics analysis in public health, research, and clinical practice is
420 rarely to give approvals or disapprovals of inherently challenging issues and conflicts. It is,
421 rather, to inform an already complex environment or problem by making clear salient values –
422 some of which might be in conflict – and help practitioners weigh and apply these values. How,
423 for instance, ought scientists balance a duty to protect privacy with an equally compelling right
424 to benefit from science? The challenge is lensed when reasonable people disagree about an
425 appropriate course of action. In such cases, the existence of an objective and transparent ethics
426 process can guide both investigators and communities such that whatever action is decided,

427 there will be a mutual understanding of the cause. It is our view and recommendation that WBT
428 and the communities it serves will improve with the adoption of structured ethics reviews.

429
430 As WBT expands and new practitioners and researchers enter the field, this structured ethical
431 review framework will provide education and guidance to promote best practices¹⁰⁶. Given the
432 length of the full, structured ethical review in terms of the number of categories, further
433 development surrounding the ease-of-use is required to ensure wide-scale adoption of the
434 structured ethical review framework by the WBT community. This adaptive, iterative approach to
435 improving the framework is critical for managing this technology in the future, to safeguard the
436 well-being of those under surveillance, and communicate robust ethical guidelines to protect the
437 intended applications. Therefore, we strongly recommend the implementation of the structured
438 ethical review by all those involved in both ongoing and future WBT campaigns to promote
439 activities supporting ethical best practices.

440
441 **Acknowledgements:** We thank Dr. Kyle Bibby (University of Notre Dame), Dr. Steve Hrudehy
442 (University of Alberta), William Johnson (University of Colorado Boulder), Dr. Todd Schenk
443 (Virginia Tech), Dr. Scott Meschke (University of Washington), Dr. Scott Olesen (Biobot
444 Analytics), and Dr. Rachel Poretzky (University of Illinois Chicago) for their participation in the
445 workshops. We also thank Dr. Stefan Wuertz (University of California Davis) for feedback on an
446 initial outline of this work. This work was supported in part by the National Institute of General
447 Medical Sciences (NIGMS) under award numbers P20GM113117 for the participation of Justin
448 Hutchison and by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under award number NSF 2047470
449 for the participation of Fangqiong Ling.

450

451

452 REFERENCES:

- 453 (1) Doorn, N. Wastewater Research and Surveillance: An Ethical Exploration. *Environ. Sci.*
454 *Water Res. Technol.* **2022**, 8 (11), 2431–2438. <https://doi.org/10.1039/D2EW00127F>.
- 455 (2) Ivanova, O. E.; Yarmolskaya, M. S.; Ereemeeva, T. P.; Babkina, G. M.; Baykova, O. Y.;
456 Akhmadishina, L. V.; Krasota, A. Y.; Kozlovskaya, L. I.; Lukashev, A. N. Environmental
457 Surveillance for Poliovirus and Other Enteroviruses: Long-Term Experience in Moscow,
458 Russian Federation, 2004–2017. *Viruses* **2019**, 11 (5), 424.
459 <https://doi.org/10.3390/v11050424>.
- 460 (3) Más Lago, P.; Gary, H. E.; Pérez, L. S.; Cáceres, V.; Olivera, J. B.; Puentes, R. P.;
461 Corredor, M. B.; Jiménez, P.; Pallansch, M. A.; Cruz, R. G. Poliovirus Detection in
462 Wastewater and Stools Following an Immunization Campaign in Havana, Cuba. *Int. J.*
463 *Epidemiol.* **2003**, 32 (5), 772–777. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyg185>.
- 464 (4) Chavarria-Miró, G.; Anfruns-Estrada, E.; Martínez-Velázquez, A.; Vázquez-Portero, M.;
465 Guix, S.; Paraira, M.; Galofré, B.; Sánchez, G.; Pintó, R. M.; Bosch, A. Time Evolution of
466 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in Wastewater during
467 the First Pandemic Wave of COVID-19 in the Metropolitan Area of Barcelona, Spain.
468 *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2021**, 87 (7), e02750-20. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.02750-20>.
- 469 (5) Crits-Christoph, A.; Kantor, R. S.; Olm, M. R.; Whitney, O. N.; Al-Shayeb, B.; Lou, Y. C.;
470 Flamholz, A.; Kennedy, L. C.; Greenwald, H.; Hinkle, A.; Hetzel, J.; Spitzer, S.; Koble, J.;
471 Tan, A.; Hyde, F.; Schroth, G.; Kuersten, S.; Banfield, J. F.; Nelson, K. L. Genome
472 Sequencing of Sewage Detects Regionally Prevalent SARS-CoV-2 Variants. *mBio* **2021**,
473 12 (1), e02703-20. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.02703-20>.
- 474 (6) Lin, X.; Glier, M.; Kuchinski, K.; Ross-Van Mierlo, T.; McVea, D.; Tyson, J. R.;
475 Prystajeky, N.; Ziels, R. M. Assessing Multiplex Tiling PCR Sequencing Approaches for
476 Detecting Genomic Variants of SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Wastewater. *mSystems* **2021**, 6
477 (5), e01068-21. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.01068-21>.
- 478 (7) Sutton, M.; Radniecki, T. S.; Kaya, D.; Alegre, D.; Geniza, M.; Girard, A.-M.; Carter, K.;
479 Dasenko, M.; Sanders, J. L.; Cieslak, P. R.; Kelly, C.; Tyler, B. M. Detection of SARS-
480 CoV-2 B.1.351 (Beta) Variant through Wastewater Surveillance before Case Detection in
481 a Community, Oregon, USA. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2022**, 28 (6), 1101–1109.
482 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2806.211821>.
- 483 (8) Karthikeyan, S.; Ronquillo, N.; Belda-Ferre, P.; Alvarado, D.; Javidi, T.; Longhurst, C. A.;
484 Knight, R. High-Throughput Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Detection Enables Forecasting of
485 Community Infection Dynamics in San Diego County. *mSystems* **2021**, 6 (2), e00045-21.
486 <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00045-21>.
- 487 (9) Hart, O. E.; Halden, R. U. Computational Analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19
488 Surveillance by Wastewater-Based Epidemiology Locally and Globally: Feasibility,
489 Economy, Opportunities and Challenges. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 730, 138875.
490 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138875>.
- 491 (10) Wolfe, M. K. Invited Perspective: The Promise of Wastewater Monitoring for Infectious
492 Disease Surveillance. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2022**, 130 (5), 051302.
493 <https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP11151>.
- 494 (11) Verovšek, T.; Krizman-Matasic, I.; Heath, D.; Heath, E. Site- and Event-Specific
495 Wastewater-Based Epidemiology: Current Status and Future Perspectives. *Trends*
496 *Environ. Anal. Chem.* **2020**, 28, e00105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teac.2020.e00105>.
- 497 (12) Layton, B.; Kaya, D.; Kelly, C.; Williamson, K.; Bachhuber, S.; Banwarth, P.; Bethel, J.;
498 Carter, K.; Dalziel, B.; Dasenko, M.; Geniza, M.; Gibbon, D.; Girard, A.-M.; Haggerty, R.;
499 Higley, K.; Hynes, D.; Lubchenko, J.; McLaughlin, K.; Nieto, F. J.; Noakes, A.; Peterson,
500 M.; Piemonti, A.; Sanders, J.; Tyler, B.; Radniecki, T. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology

- 501 Predicts COVID-19 Community Prevalence. *Res. Sq.* **2021**.
502 <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-690031/v1>.
- 503 (13) McClary-Gutierrez, J. S.; Mattioli, M. C.; Marcenac, P.; Silverman, A. I.; Boehm, A. B.;
504 Bibby, K.; Balliet, M.; de los Reyes, F. L.; Gerrity, D.; Griffith, J. F.; Holden, P. A.; Katehis,
505 D.; Kester, G.; LaCross, N.; Lipp, E. K.; Meiman, J.; Noble, R. T.; Brossard, D.; McLellan,
506 S. L. SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater Surveillance for Public Health Action. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*
507 **2021**, 27 (9), e210753. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2709.210753>.
- 508 (14) H. Holm, R.; Mukherjee, A.; P. Rai, J.; A. Yeager, R.; Talley, D.; N. Rai, S.; Bhatnagar, A.;
509 Smith, T. SARS-CoV-2 RNA Abundance in Wastewater as a Function of Distinct Urban
510 Sewershed Size. *Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol.* **2022**, 8 (4), 807–819.
511 <https://doi.org/10.1039/D1EW00672J>.
- 512 (15) Scassa, T.; Robinson, P.; Mosoff, R. The Datafication of Wastewater:: Legal, Ethical and
513 Civic Considerations. *Technol. Regul.* **2022**, 2022, 23–35.
514 <https://doi.org/10.26116/techreg.2022.003>.
- 515 (16) World Health Organization. *WHO Guidelines on Ethical Issues in Public Health*
516 *Surveillance*; World Health Organization: Geneva, 2017.
- 517 (17) Wu, F.; Zhang, J.; Xiao, A.; Gu, X.; Lee, W. L.; Armas, F.; Kauffman, K.; Hanage, W.;
518 Matus, M.; Ghaeli, N.; Endo, N.; Duvallet, C.; Poyet, M.; Moniz, K.; Washburne, A. D.;
519 Erickson, T. B.; Chai, P. R.; Thompson, J.; Alm, E. J. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater
520 Are Higher than Expected from Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems* **2020**, 5 (4),
521 e00614-20. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00614-20>.
- 522 (18) Jacobs, D.; McDaniel, T.; Varsani, A.; Halden, R. U.; Forrest, S.; Lee, H. Wastewater
523 Monitoring Raises Privacy and Ethical Considerations. *IEEE Trans. Technol. Soc.* **2021**, 2
524 (3), 116–121. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TTS.2021.3073886>.
- 525 (19) Gable, L.; Ram, N.; Ram, J. L. Legal and Ethical Implications of Wastewater Monitoring of
526 SARS-CoV-2 for COVID-19 Surveillance. *J. Law Biosci.* **2020**, 7 (1), Isaa039.
527 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/Isaa039>.
- 528 (20) Hall, W.; Prichard, J.; Kirkbride, P.; Bruno, R.; Thai, P. K.; Gartner, C.; Lai, F. Y.; Ort, C.;
529 Mueller, J. F. An Analysis of Ethical Issues in Using Wastewater Analysis to Monitor Illicit
530 Drug Use. *Addiction* **2012**, 107 (10), 1767–1773. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2012.03887.x>.
- 531 (21) Sims, N.; Kasprzyk-Hordern, B. Future Perspectives of Wastewater-Based Epidemiology:
532 Monitoring Infectious Disease Spread and Resistance to the Community Level. *Environ.*
533 *Int.* **2020**, 139, 105689. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105689>.
- 534 (22) Shultz, J. M.; Cooper, J. L.; Baingana, F.; Oquendo, M. A.; Espinel, Z.; Althouse, B. M.;
535 Marcelin, L. H.; Towers, S.; Espinola, M.; McCoy, C. B.; Mazurik, L.; Wainberg, M. L.;
536 Neria, Y.; Rechkemmer, A. The Role of Fear-Related Behaviors in the 2013–2016 West
537 Africa Ebola Virus Disease Outbreak. *Curr. Psychiatry Rep.* **2016**, 18 (11), 104.
538 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-016-0741-y>.
- 539 (23) Price, M.; Trowsdale, S. The Ethics of Wastewater Surveillance for Public Health. *J.*
540 *Hydrol. N. Z.* **2022**, 61 (1), 59–75. <https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.548101814967529>.
- 541 (24) LaJoie, A. S.; Holm, R. H.; Anderson, L. B.; Ness, H. D.; Smith, T. Nationwide Public
542 Perceptions Regarding the Acceptance of Using Wastewater for Community Health
543 Monitoring in the United States. *PLOS ONE* **2022**, 17 (10), e0275075.
544 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0275075>.
- 545 (25) Polo, D.; Quintela-Baluja, M.; Corbishley, A.; Jones, D. L.; Singer, A. C.; Graham, D. W.;
546 Romalde, J. L. Making Waves: Wastewater-Based Epidemiology for COVID-19 –
547 Approaches and Challenges for Surveillance and Prediction. *Water Res.* **2020**, 186,
548 116404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116404>.
- 549

- 550 (26) Coffman, M. M.; Guest, J. S.; Wolfe, M. K.; Naughton, C. C.; Boehm, A. B.; Vela, J. D.;
551 Carrera, J. S. Preventing Scientific and Ethical Misuse of Wastewater Surveillance Data.
552 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**, *55* (17), 11473–11475.
553 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c04325>.
- 554 (27) Ram, N.; Shuster, W.; Gable, L.; Ram, J. L. Ethical and Legal Wastewater Surveillance.
555 *Science* **2023**, *379* (6633), 652–652. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adg7147>.
- 556 (28) Holm, R. H.; Brick, J. M.; Amraotkar, A. R.; Hart, J. L.; Mukherjee, A.; Zeigler, J.; Bushau-
557 Sprinkle, A. M.; Anderson, L. B.; Walker, K. L.; Talley, D.; Keith, R. J.; Rai, S. N.; Palmer,
558 K. E.; Bhatnagar, A.; Smith, T. Public Awareness of and Support for the Use of
559 Wastewater for SARS-CoV-2 Monitoring: A Community Survey in Louisville, Kentucky.
560 *ACS EST Water* **2022**. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsestwater.1c00405>.
- 561 (29) Thompson, J. R.; Nancharaiyah, Y. V.; Gu, X.; Lee, W. L.; Rajal, V. B.; Haines, M. B.;
562 Girones, R.; Ng, L. C.; Alm, E. J.; Wuertz, S. Making Waves: Wastewater Surveillance of
563 SARS-CoV-2 for Population-Based Health Management. *Water Res.* **2020**, *184*, 116181.
564 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116181>.
- 565 (30) Cooper, B.; Donner, E.; Crase, L.; Robertson, H.; Carter, D.; Short, M.; Drigo, B.; Leder,
566 K.; Roiko, A.; Fielding, K. Maintaining a Social License to Operate for Wastewater-Based
567 Monitoring: The Case of Managing Infectious Disease and the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J.*
568 *Environ. Manage.* **2022**, *320*, 115819. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.115819>.
- 569 (31) Bowes, D. A.; Driver, E. M.; Halden, R. U. A Framework for Wastewater Sample
570 Collection from a Sewage Cleanout to Inform Building-Scale Wastewater-Based
571 Epidemiology Studies. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2022**, *836*, 155576.
572 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155576>.
- 573 (32) Hrudehy, S. E.; Silva, D. S.; Shelley, J.; Pons, W.; Isaac-Renton, J.; Chik, A. H.-S.;
574 Conant, B. Ethics Guidance for Environmental Scientists Engaged in Surveillance of
575 Wastewater for SARS-CoV-2. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2021**, *55* (13), 8484–8491.
576 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c00308>.
- 577 (33) Manning, S.; Walton, M. *Ethical and Responsible Development of Wastewater-Based*
578 *Epidemiology Technologies*; report; Institute of Environmental Science and Research,
579 2021. <https://doi.org/10.26091/ESRNZ.16825243.v1>.
- 580 (34) Prichard, J.; Hall, W.; Zuccato, E.; Voogt, P.; Voulvoulis, N.; Kummerer, K.; Kasprzyk-
581 Hordern, B.; Barbato, A.; Parabiaghi, A.; Hernandez, F.; others. Ethical Research
582 Guidelines for Wastewater-Based Epidemiology and Related Fields. *Sew. Anal. Core*
583 *Group Eur. SCORE* **2016**.
- 584 (35) Prichard, J.; Hall, W.; de Voogt, P.; Zuccato, E. Sewage Epidemiology and Illicit Drug
585 Research: The Development of Ethical Research Guidelines. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2014**,
586 *472*, 550–555. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.11.039>.
- 587 (36) Savulescu, J. Editorial: Two Deaths and Two Lessons: Is It Time to Review the Structure
588 and Function of Research Ethics Committees? *J. Med. Ethics* **2002**, *28* (1), 1–2.
- 589 (37) Marx, G. T. Ethics for the New Surveillance. *Inf. Soc.* **1998**, *14* (3), 171–185.
590 <https://doi.org/10.1080/019722498128809>.
- 591 (38) Wong, J. C. C.; Tan, J.; Lim, Y. X.; Arivalan, S.; Hapuarachchi, H. C.; Mailepessov, D.;
592 Griffiths, J.; Jayarajah, P.; Setoh, Y. X.; Tien, W. P.; Low, S. L.; Koo, C.; Yenamandra, S.
593 P.; Kong, M.; Lee, V. J. M.; Ng, L. C. Non-Intrusive Wastewater Surveillance for
594 Monitoring of a Residential Building for COVID-19 Cases. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *786*,
595 147419. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147419>.
- 596 (39) Kirby, A. E.; Walters, M. S.; Jennings, W. C.; Fugitt, R.; LaCross, N.; Mattioli, M.; Marsh,
597 Z. A.; Roberts, V. A.; Mercante, J. W.; Yoder, J.; Hill, V. R. Using Wastewater
598 Surveillance Data to Support the COVID-19 Response — United States, 2020–2021.

- 599 *Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **2021**, 70 (36), 1242–1244.
600 <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7036a2>.
- 601 (40) Gupta, U. C. Informed Consent in Clinical Research: Revisiting Few Concepts and Areas.
602 *Perspect. Clin. Res.* **2013**, 4 (1), 26–32. <https://doi.org/10.4103/2229-3485.106373>.
- 603 (41) Lee, L. M. Health Information in the Background: Justifying Public Health Surveillance
604 Without Patient Consent. In *Emerging Pervasive Information and Communication*
605 *Technologies (PICT): Ethical Challenges, Opportunities and Safeguards*; Pimple, K. D.,
606 Ed.; Law, Governance and Technology Series; Springer Netherlands: Dordrecht, 2014;
607 pp 39–53. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6833-8_3.
- 608 (42) Wright, J.; Driver, E. M.; Bowes, D. A.; Johnston, B.; Halden, R. U. Comparison of High-
609 Frequency in-Pipe SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater-Based Surveillance to Concurrent COVID-
610 19 Random Clinical Testing on a Public U.S. University Campus. *Sci. Total Environ.*
611 **2022**, 820, 152877. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.152877>.
- 612 (43) Betancourt, W. Q.; Schmitz, B. W.; Innes, G. K.; Prasek, S. M.; Pogreba Brown, K. M.;
613 Stark, E. R.; Foster, A. R.; Sprissler, R. S.; Harris, D. T.; Sherchan, S. P.; Gerba, C. P.;
614 Pepper, I. L. COVID-19 Containment on a College Campus via Wastewater-Based
615 Epidemiology, Targeted Clinical Testing and an Intervention. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**,
616 779, 146408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146408>.
- 617 (44) Schmitz, B. W.; Innes, G. K.; Prasek, S. M.; Betancourt, W. Q.; Stark, E. R.; Foster, A. R.;
618 Abraham, A. G.; Gerba, C. P.; Pepper, I. L. Enumerating Asymptomatic COVID-19 Cases
619 and Estimating SARS-CoV-2 Fecal Shedding Rates via Wastewater-Based
620 Epidemiology. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 801, 149794.
621 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149794>.
- 622 (45) Reeves, K.; Liebig, J.; Feula, A.; Saldi, T.; Lasda, E.; Johnson, W.; Lilienfeld, J.; Maggi,
623 J.; Pulley, K.; Wilkerson, P. J.; Real, B.; Zak, G.; Davis, J.; Fink, M.; Gonzales, P.; Hager,
624 C.; Ozeroff, C.; Tat, K.; Alkire, M.; Butler, C.; Coe, E.; Darby, J.; Freeman, N.; Heuer, H.;
625 Jones, J. R.; Karr, M.; Key, S.; Maxwell, K.; Nelson, L.; Saldana, E.; Shea, R.; Salvesson,
626 L.; Tomlinson, K.; Vargas-Barriga, J.; Vigil, B.; Brisson, G.; Parker, R.; Leinwand, L. A.;
627 Bjorkman, K.; Mansfeldt, C. High-Resolution within-Sewer SARS-CoV-2 Surveillance
628 Facilitates Informed Intervention. *Water Res.* **2021**, 204, 117613.
629 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117613>.
- 630 (46) Brooks, Y. M.; Gryskwicz, B.; Sheehan, S.; Piers, S.; Mahale, P.; McNeil, S.; Chase, J.;
631 Webber, D.; Borys, D.; Hilton, M.; Robinson, D.; Sears, S.; Smith, E.; Leshner, E. K.;
632 Wilson, R.; Goodwin, M.; Pardales, M. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater at
633 Residential College, Maine, USA, August–November 2020. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2021**, 27
634 (12), 3111–3114. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2712.211199>.
- 635 (47) Coxon, S. E.; Hopley, T.; Gilpin, B. J. Exploring Opportunities for Sewage Testing on
636 Cargo Ships as a Tool to Screen Seafarers for COVID-19. *J. Hydrol. N. Z.* **2022**, 61 (1),
637 5–30. <https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.548045916053754>.
- 638 (48) Ahmed, W.; Bivins, A.; Simpson, S. L.; Bertsch, P. M.; Ehret, J.; Hosegood, I.; Metcalfe,
639 S. S.; Smith, W. J. M.; Thomas, K. V.; Tynan, J.; Mueller, J. F. Wastewater Surveillance
640 Demonstrates High Predictive Value for COVID-19 Infection on Board Repatriation Flights
641 to Australia. *Environ. Int.* **2022**, 158, 106938.
642 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106938>.
- 643 (49) Safford, H. R.; Shapiro, K.; Bischel, H. N. Wastewater Analysis Can Be a Powerful Public
644 Health Tool—If It's Done Sensibly. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2022**, 119 (6), e2119600119.
645 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2119600119>.
- 646 (50) Acosta, N.; Bautista, M. A.; Hollman, J.; McCalder, J.; Beaudet, A. B.; Man, L.; Waddell,
647 B. J.; Chen, J.; Li, C.; Kuzma, D.; Bhatnagar, S.; Leal, J.; Meddings, J.; Hu, J.; Cabaj, J.

- 648 L.; Ruecker, N. J.; Naugler, C.; Pillai, D. R.; Achari, G.; Ryan, M. C.; Conly, J. M.;
649 Frankowski, K.; Hubert, C. R.; Parkins, M. D. A Multicenter Study Investigating SARS-
650 CoV-2 in Tertiary-Care Hospital Wastewater. Viral Burden Correlates with Increasing
651 Hospitalized Cases as Well as Hospital-Associated Transmissions and Outbreaks. *Water*
652 *Res.* **2021**, *201*, 117369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117369>.
- 653 (51) Ahmed, W.; Angel, N.; Edson, J.; Bibby, K.; Bivins, A.; O'Brien, J. W.; Choi, P. M.;
654 Kitajima, M.; Simpson, S. L.; Li, J.; Tscharke, B.; Verhagen, R.; Smith, W. J. M.; Zaugg,
655 J.; Dierens, L.; Hugenholtz, P.; Thomas, K. V.; Mueller, J. F. First Confirmed Detection of
656 SARS-CoV-2 in Untreated Wastewater in Australia: A Proof of Concept for the
657 Wastewater Surveillance of COVID-19 in the Community. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *728*,
658 138764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764>.
- 659 (52) Ahmed, F.; Islam, Md. A.; Kumar, M.; Hossain, M.; Bhattacharya, P.; Islam, Md. T.;
660 Hossen, F.; Hossain, Md. S.; Islam, Md. S.; Uddin, Md. M.; Islam, Md. N.; Bahadur, N. M.;
661 Didar-ul-Alam, Md.; Reza, H. M.; Jakariya, Md. First Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Genetic
662 Material in the Vicinity of COVID-19 Isolation Centre in Bangladesh: Variation along the
663 Sewer Network. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *776*, 145724.
664 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145724>.
- 665 (53) Albastaki, A.; Najji, M.; Lootah, R.; Almeheiri, R.; Almulla, H.; Almarri, I.; Alreyami, A.;
666 Aden, A.; Alghafri, R. First Confirmed Detection of SARS-COV-2 in Untreated Municipal
667 and Aircraft Wastewater in Dubai, UAE: The Use of Wastewater Based Epidemiology as
668 an Early Warning Tool to Monitor the Prevalence of COVID-19. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**,
669 *760*, 143350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143350>.
- 670 (54) Arora, S.; Nag, A.; Sethi, J.; Rajvanshi, J.; Saxena, S.; Shrivastava, S. K.; Gupta, A. B.
671 Sewage Surveillance for the Presence of SARS-CoV-2 Genome as a Useful Wastewater
672 Based Epidemiology (WBE) Tracking Tool in India. *Water Sci. Technol. J. Int. Assoc.*
673 *Water Pollut. Res.* **2020**, *82* (12), 2823–2836. <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2020.540>.
- 674 (55) Barrios, R. E.; Lim, C.; Kelley, M. S.; Li, X. SARS-CoV-2 Concentrations in a Wastewater
675 Collection System Indicated Potential COVID-19 Hotspots at the Zip Code Level. *Sci.*
676 *Total Environ.* **2021**, *800*, 149480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149480>.
- 677 (56) Bivins, A.; Bibby, K. Wastewater Surveillance during Mass COVID-19 Vaccination on a
678 College Campus. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2021**, *8* (9), 792–798.
679 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00519>.
- 680 (57) Bivins, A.; Lott, M.; Shaffer, M.; Wu, Z.; North, D.; K. Lipp, E.; Bibby, K. Building-Level
681 Wastewater Surveillance Using Tampon Swabs and RT-LAMP for Rapid SARS-CoV-2
682 RNA Detection. *Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol.* **2022**, *8* (1), 173–183.
683 <https://doi.org/10.1039/D1EW00496D>.
- 684 (58) Black, J.; Aung, P.; Nolan, M.; Roney, E.; Poon, R.; Hennessy, D.; Crosbie, N. D.; Deere,
685 D.; Jex, A. R.; John, N.; Baker, L.; Scales, P. J.; Usher, S. P.; McCarthy, D. T.; Schang,
686 C.; Schmidt, J.; Myers, S.; Bogue, N.; Kaucner, C.; Thorley, B.; Druce, J.; Monis, P.; Lau,
687 M.; Sarkis, S. Epidemiological Evaluation of Sewage Surveillance as a Tool to Detect the
688 Presence of COVID-19 Cases in a Low Case Load Setting. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, *786*,
689 147469. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147469>.
- 690 (59) Carrillo-Reyes, J.; Barragán-Trinidad, M.; Buitrón, G. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in
691 Sewage and Wastewater Treatment Plants in Mexico. *J. Water Process Eng.* **2021**, *40*,
692 101815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwpe.2020.101815>.
- 693 (60) Chakraborty, P.; Pasupuleti, M.; Jai Shankar, M. R.; Bharat, G. K.; Krishnasamy, S.;
694 Dasgupta, S. C.; Sarkar, S. K.; Jones, K. C. First Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 and
695 Organic Tracers in Community Wastewater during Post Lockdown in Chennai, South

- 696 India: Methods, Occurrence and Concurrence. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 778, 146252.
697 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146252>.
- 698 (61) Colosi, L. M.; Barry, K. E.; Kotay, S. M.; Porter, M. D.; Poulter, M. D.; Ratliff, C.;
699 Simmons, W.; Steinberg, L. I.; Wilson, D. D.; Morse, R.; Zmick, P.; Mathers, A. J.
700 Development of Wastewater Pooled Surveillance of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
701 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) from Congregate Living Settings. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*
702 **2021**. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00433-21>.
- 703 (62) Corchis-Scott, R.; Geng, Q.; Seth, R.; Ray, R.; Beg, M.; Biswas, N.; Charron, L.;
704 Drouillard, K. D.; D'Souza, R.; Heath, D. D.; Houser, C.; Lawal, F.; McGinlay, J.; Menard,
705 S. L.; Porter, L. A.; Rawlings, D.; Scholl, M. L.; Siu, K. W. M.; Tong, Y.; Weisener, C. G.;
706 Wilhelm, S. W.; McKay, R. M. L. Averting an Outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 in a University
707 Residence Hall through Wastewater Surveillance. *Microbiol. Spectr.* **2021**.
708 <https://doi.org/10.1128/Spectrum.00792-21>.
- 709 (63) Crowe, J.; Schnaubelt, A. T.; SchmidtBonne, S.; Angell, K.; Bai, J.; Eske, T.; Nicklin, M.;
710 Pratt, C.; White, B.; Crofts-Hannibal, B.; Staffend, N.; Herrera, V.; Cobb, J.; Conner, J.;
711 Carstens, J.; Tempero, J.; Bouda, L.; Ray, M.; Lawler, J. V.; Campbell, W. S.; Lowe, J.-
712 M.; Santarpia, J.; Bartelt-Hunt, S.; Wiley, M.; Brett-Major, D.; Logan, C.; Broadhurst, M. J.
713 Assessment of a Program for SARS-CoV-2 Screening and Environmental Monitoring in
714 an Urban Public School District. *JAMA Netw. Open* **2021**, 4 (9), e2126447.
715 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.26447>.
- 716 (64) Daigle, J.; Racher, K.; Hazenberg, J.; Yeoman, A.; Hannah, H.; Duong, D.; Mohammed,
717 U.; Spreitzer, D.; Gregorchuk, B. S. J.; Head, B. M.; Meyers, A. F. A.; Sandstrom, P. A.;
718 Nichani, A.; Brooks, J. I.; Mulvey, M. R.; Mangat, C. S.; Becker, M. G. A Sensitive and
719 Rapid Wastewater Test for SARS-COV-2 and Its Use for the Early Detection of a Cluster
720 of Cases in a Remote Community. *medRxiv* **2021**, 2021.08.13.21262039.
721 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.13.21262039>.
- 722 (65) Fahrenfeld, N. L.; Morales Medina, W. R.; D'Elia, S.; Modica, M.; Ruiz, A.; McLane, M.
723 Comparison of Residential Dormitory COVID-19 Monitoring via Weekly Saliva Testing
724 and Sewage Monitoring. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 151947.
725 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151947>.
- 726 (66) Fongaro, G.; Rogovski, P.; Savi, B. P.; Cadamuro, R. D.; Pereira, J. V. F.; Anna, I. H. S.;
727 Rodrigues, I. H.; Souza, D. S. M.; Saravia, E. G. T.; Rodríguez-Lázaro, D.; da Silva
728 Lanna, M. C. SARS-CoV-2 in Human Sewage and River Water from a Remote and
729 Vulnerable Area as a Surveillance Tool in Brazil. *Food Environ. Virol.* **2021**.
730 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-021-09487-9>.
- 731 (67) Galani, A.; Aalizadeh, R.; Kostakis, M.; Markou, A.; Alygizakis, N.; Lytras, T.;
732 Adamopoulos, P. G.; Peccia, J.; Thompson, D. C.; Kontou, A.; Karagiannidis, A.;
733 Lianidou, E. S.; Avgeris, M.; Paraskevis, D.; Tsiodras, S.; Scorilas, A.; Vasiliou, V.;
734 Dimopoulos, M.-A.; Thomaidis, N. S. SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater Surveillance Data Can
735 Predict Hospitalizations and ICU Admissions. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2022**, 804, 150151.
736 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150151>.
- 737 (68) Gerrity, D.; Papp, K.; Stoker, M.; Sims, A.; Frehner, W. Early-Pandemic Wastewater
738 Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Nevada: Methodology, Occurrence, and
739 Incidence/Prevalence Considerations. *Water Res. X* **2021**, 10, 100086.
740 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wroa.2020.100086>.
- 741 (69) Gibas, C.; Lambirth, K.; Mittal, N.; Juel, M. A. I.; Barua, V. B.; Roppolo Brazell, L.; Hinton,
742 K.; Lontai, J.; Stark, N.; Young, I.; Quach, C.; Russ, M.; Kauer, J.; Nicolosi, B.; Chen, D.;
743 Akella, S.; Tang, W.; Schlueter, J.; Munir, M. Implementing Building-Level SARS-CoV-2

- 744 Wastewater Surveillance on a University Campus. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 782, 146749.
745 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146749>.
- 746 (70) Giraud-Billoud, M.; Cuervo, P.; Altamirano, J. C.; Pizarro, M.; Aranibar, J. N.; Catapano,
747 A.; Cuello, H.; Masachessi, G.; Vega, I. A. Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
748 Wastewater as an Epidemiological Surveillance Tool in Mendoza, Argentina. *Sci. Total*
749 *Environ.* **2021**, 796, 148887. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.148887>.
- 750 (71) Godinez, A.; Hill, D.; Dandaraw, B.; Green, H.; Kilaru, P.; Middleton, F.; Run, S.; Kmush,
751 B. L.; Larsen, D. A. High Sensitivity and Specificity of Dormitory-Level Wastewater
752 Surveillance for COVID-19 during Fall Semester 2020 at Syracuse University, New York.
753 *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2022**, 19 (8), 4851.
754 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19084851>.
- 755 (72) Gonçalves, J.; Koritnik, T.; Mioč, V.; Trkov, M.; Bolješič, M.; Berginc, N.; Prosenč, K.;
756 Kotar, T.; Paragi, M. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Hospital Wastewater from a Low
757 COVID-19 Disease Prevalence Area. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 755, 143226.
758 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143226>.
- 759 (73) Haak, L.; Delic, B.; Li, L.; Guarin, T.; Mazurowski, L.; Dastjerdi, N. G.; Dewan, A.; Pagilla,
760 K. Spatial and Temporal Variability and Data Bias in Wastewater Surveillance of SARS-
761 CoV-2 in a Sewer System. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2022**, 805, 150390.
762 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150390>.
- 763 (74) Hasan, S. W.; Ibrahim, Y.; Daou, M.; Kannout, H.; Jan, N.; Lopes, A.; Alsafar, H.; Yousef,
764 A. F. Detection and Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater and Treated
765 Effluents: Surveillance of COVID-19 Epidemic in the United Arab Emirates. *Sci. Total*
766 *Environ.* **2021**, 764, 142929–142929. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142929>.
- 767 (75) Hong, P.-Y.; Rachmadi, A. T.; Mantilla-Calderon, D.; Alkahtani, M.; Bashawri, Y. M.; Al
768 Qarni, H.; O'Reilly, K. M.; Zhou, J. Estimating the Minimum Number of SARS-CoV-2
769 Infected Cases Needed to Detect Viral RNA in Wastewater: To What Extent of the
770 Outbreak Can Surveillance of Wastewater Tell Us? *Environ. Res.* **2021**, 195, 110748.
771 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.110748>.
- 772 (76) Juel, M. A. I.; Stark, N.; Nicolosi, B.; Lontai, J.; Lambirth, K.; Schlueter, J.; Gibas, C.;
773 Munir, M. Performance Evaluation of Virus Concentration Methods for Implementing
774 SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater Based Epidemiology Emphasizing Quick Data Turnaround.
775 *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 801, 149656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149656>.
- 776 (77) Karami, C.; Dargahi, A.; Vosoughi, M.; Normohammadi, A.; Jeddi, F.; Asghariazar, V.;
777 Mokhtari, A.; Sedigh, A.; Zandian, H.; Alighadri, M. SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Wastewater
778 Treatment Plant, Collection Network, and Hospital Wastewater. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.*
779 **2021**. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-15374-4>.
- 780 (78) Karthikeyan, S.; Nguyen, A.; McDonald, D.; Zong, Y.; Ronquillo, N.; Ren, J.; Zou, J.;
781 Farmer, S.; Humphrey, G.; Henderson, D.; Javidi, T.; Messer, K.; Anderson, C.;
782 Schooley, R.; Martin, N. K.; Knight, R. Rapid, Large-Scale Wastewater Surveillance and
783 Automated Reporting System Enable Early Detection of Nearly 85% of COVID-19 Cases
784 on a University Campus. *mSystems* **2021**. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00793-21>.
- 785 (79) Kitamura, K.; Sadamasu, K.; Muramatsu, M.; Yoshida, H. Efficient Detection of SARS-
786 CoV-2 RNA in the Solid Fraction of Wastewater. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 763, 144587.
787 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144587>.
- 788 (80) Koureas, M.; Amoutzias, G. D.; Vontas, A.; Kyritsi, M.; Pinaka, O.; Papakonstantinou, A.;
789 Dadouli, K.; Hatzinikou, M.; Koutsolioutsou, A.; Mouchtouri, V. A.; Speletas, M.; Tsiodras,
790 S.; Hadjichristodoulou, C. Wastewater Monitoring as a Supplementary Surveillance Tool
791 for Capturing SARS-COV-2 Community Spread. A Case Study in Two Greek

- 792 Municipalities. *Environ. Res.* **2021**, *200*, 111749.
793 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.111749>.
- 794 (81) Kumar, M.; Patel, A. K.; Shah, A. V.; Raval, J.; Rajpara, N.; Joshi, M.; Joshi, C. G. First
795 Proof of the Capability of Wastewater Surveillance for COVID-19 in India through
796 Detection of Genetic Material of SARS-CoV-2. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *746*, 141326.
797 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141326>.
- 798 (82) Landstrom, M.; Braun, E.; Larson, E.; Miller, M.; Holm, G. H. Efficacy of SARS-CoV-2
799 Wastewater Surveillance for Detection of COVID-19 at a Residential Private College.
800 medRxiv September 22, 2021, p 2021.09.15.21263338.
801 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.15.21263338>.
- 802 (83) Li, B.; Di, D. Y. W.; Saingam, P.; Jeon, M. K.; Yan, T. Fine-Scale Temporal Dynamics of
803 SARS-CoV-2 RNA Abundance in Wastewater during A COVID-19 Lockdown. *Water Res.*
804 **2021**, *197*, 117093. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117093>.
- 805 (84) Melvin, R. G.; Hendrickson, E. N.; Chaudhry, N.; Georgewill, O.; Freese, R.; Schacker, T.
806 W.; Simmons, G. E. A Novel Wastewater-Based Epidemiology Indexing Method Predicts
807 SARS-CoV-2 Disease Prevalence across Treatment Facilities in Metropolitan and
808 Regional Populations. *Sci. Rep.* **2021**, *11* (1), 21368. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-00853-y)
809 [00853-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-00853-y).
- 810 (85) Mota, C. R.; Bressani-Ribeiro, T.; Araújo, J. C.; Leal, C. D.; Leroy-Freitas, D.; Machado,
811 E. C.; Espinosa, M. F.; Fernandes, L.; Leão, T. L.; Chamhum-Silva, L.; Azevedo, L.;
812 Morandi, T.; Freitas, G. T. O.; Costa, M. S.; Carvalho, B. O.; Reis, M. T. P.; Melo, M. C.;
813 Ayrimoraes, S. R.; Chernicharo, C. A. L. Assessing Spatial Distribution of COVID-19
814 Prevalence in Brazil Using Decentralised Sewage Monitoring. *Water Res.* **2021**, *202*,
815 117388–117388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117388>.
- 816 (86) Nemudryi, A.; Nemudraia, A.; Wiegand, T.; Surya, K.; Buyukyoruk, M.; Cicha, C.;
817 Vanderwood, K. K.; Wilkinson, R.; Wiedenheft, B. Temporal Detection and Phylogenetic
818 Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Wastewater. *Cell Rep. Med.* **2020**, *1* (6),
819 100098. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xcrm.2020.100098>.
- 820 (87) Prado, T.; Fumian, T. M.; Mannarino, C. F.; Resende, P. C.; Motta, F. C.; Eppinghaus, A.
821 L. F.; Chagas do Vale, V. H.; Braz, R. M. S.; de Andrade, J. da S. R.; Maranhão, A. G.;
822 Miagostovich, M. P. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology as a Useful Tool to Track SARS-
823 CoV-2 and Support Public Health Policies at Municipal Level in Brazil. *Water Res.* **2021**,
824 *191*, 116810–116810. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.116810>.
- 825 (88) Rodríguez Rasero, F. J.; Moya Ruano, L. A.; Rasero Del Real, P.; Cuberos Gómez, L.;
826 Lorusso, N. Associations between SARS-CoV-2 RNA Concentrations in Wastewater and
827 COVID-19 Rates in Days after Sampling in Small Urban Areas of Seville: A Time Series
828 Study. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2022**, *806*, 150573.
829 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150573>.
- 830 (89) Rios, G.; Lacoux, C.; Leclercq, V.; Diamant, A.; Lebrigand, K.; Lazuka, A.; Soyeux, E.;
831 Lacroix, S.; Fassy, J.; Couesnon, A.; Thiery, R.; Mari, B.; Pradier, C.; Waldmann, R.;
832 Barbry, P. Monitoring SARS-CoV-2 Variants Alterations in Nice Neighborhoods by
833 Wastewater Nanopore Sequencing. *Lancet Reg. Health - Eur.* **2021**, *10*, 100202.
834 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100202>.
- 835 (90) Scott, L. C.; Aubee, A.; Babahaji, L.; Vigil, K.; Tims, S.; Aw, T. G. Targeted Wastewater
836 Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 on a University Campus for COVID-19 Outbreak Detection
837 and Mitigation. *Environ. Res.* **2021**, *200*, 111374.
838 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.111374>.
- 839 (91) Sherchan, S. P.; Shahin, S.; Ward, L. M.; Tandukar, S.; Aw, T. G.; Schmitz, B.; Ahmed,
840 W.; Kitajima, M. First Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater in North America: A

- 841 Study in Louisiana, USA. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 743, 140621.
842 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140621>.
- 843 (92) Spurbeck, R. R.; Minard-Smith, A.; Catlin, L. Feasibility of Neighborhood and Building
844 Scale Wastewater-Based Genomic Epidemiology for Pathogen Surveillance. *Sci. Total*
845 *Environ.* **2021**, 789, 147829–147829. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147829>.
- 846 (93) Sweetapple, C.; Melville-Shreeve, P.; Chen, A. S.; Grimsley, J. M. S.; Bunce, J. T.; Gaze,
847 W.; Fielding, S.; Wade, M. J. Building Knowledge of University Campus Population
848 Dynamics to Enhance Near-to-Source Sewage Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 Detection.
849 *Sci. Total Environ.* **2022**, 806, 150406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150406>.
- 850 (94) Vo, V.; Tillett, R. L.; Chang, C.-L.; Gerrity, D.; Betancourt, W. Q.; Oh, E. C. SARS-CoV-2
851 Variant Detection at a University Dormitory Using Wastewater Genomic Tools. *Sci. Total*
852 *Environ.* **2022**, 805, 149930. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149930>.
- 853 (95) Wang, Y.; Liu, P.; Zhang, H.; Ibaraki, M.; VanTassell, J.; Geith, K.; Cavallo, M.; Kann, R.;
854 Saber, L.; Kraft, C. S.; Lane, M.; Shartar, S.; Moe, C. Early Warning of a COVID-19 Surge
855 on a University Campus Based on Wastewater Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 at
856 Residence Halls. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2022**, 821, 153291.
857 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153291>.
- 858 (96) Wurtz, N.; Revol, O.; Jardot, P.; Giraud-Gatineau, A.; Houhamdi, L.; Soumagnac, C.;
859 Annessi, A.; Lacoste, A.; Colson, P.; Aherfi, S.; La Scola, B. Monitoring the Circulation of
860 SARS-CoV-2 Variants by Genomic Analysis of Wastewater in Marseille, South-East
861 France. *Pathogens* **2021**, 10 (8), 1042. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens10081042>.
- 862 (97) Xu, X.; Zheng, X.; Li, S.; Lam, N. S.; Wang, Y.; Chu, D. K. W.; Poon, L. L. M.; Tun, H. M.;
863 Peiris, M.; Deng, Y.; Leung, G. M.; Zhang, T. The First Case Study of Wastewater-Based
864 Epidemiology of COVID-19 in Hong Kong. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 790, 148000.
865 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.148000>.
- 866 (98) Yeager, R.; Holm, R. H.; Saurabh, K.; Fuqua, J. L.; Talley, D.; Bhatnagar, A.; Smith, T.
867 Wastewater Sample Site Selection to Estimate Geographically Resolved Community
868 Prevalence of COVID-19: A Sampling Protocol Perspective. *GeoHealth* **2021**, 5 (7),
869 e2021gh000420. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021gh000420>.
- 870 (99) Zdenkova, K.; Bartackova, J.; Cermakova, E.; Demnerova, K.; Dostalkova, A.; Janda, V.;
871 Novakova, Z.; Rumlova, M.; Ambrozova, J. R.; Skodakova, K.; Swierczkova, I.; Sykora,
872 P.; Vejmelkova, D.; Wanner, J.; Bartacek, J. Monitoring COVID-19 Spread in Prague
873 Local Neighborhoods Based on the Presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater
874 Collected throughout the Sewer Network. *medRxiv* **2021**, 2021.07.28.21261272.
875 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.28.21261272>.
- 876 (100) Korfmacher, K. S.; Harris, -Lovett Sasha. Invited Perspective: Implementation of
877 Wastewater-Based Surveillance Requires Collaboration, Integration, and Community
878 Engagement. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **130** (5), 051304.
879 <https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP11191>.
- 880 (101) Berkman, B. E.; Mastroianni, A. C.; Jamal, L.; Solis, C.; Taylor, H. A.; Hull, S. C. The
881 Ethics of Repurposing Previously Collected Research Biospecimens in an Infectious
882 Disease Pandemic. *Ethics Hum. Res.* **2021**, 43 (2), 2–18.
883 <https://doi.org/10.1002/eahr.500083>.
- 884 (102) Vears, D. F.; Borry, P.; Savulescu, J.; Koplin, J. J. Old Challenges or New Issues?
885 Genetic Health Professionals' Experiences Obtaining Informed Consent in Diagnostic
886 Genomic Sequencing. *AJOB Empir. Bioeth.* **2021**, 12 (1), 12–23.
887 <https://doi.org/10.1080/23294515.2020.1823906>.

- 888 (103) Dupras, C.; Bunnik, E. M. Toward a Framework for Assessing Privacy Risks in Multi-Omic
889 Research and Databases. *Am. J. Bioeth.* **2021**, *21* (12), 46–64.
890 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2020.1863516>.
- 891 (104) Yang, Z.; Xu, G.; Reboud, J.; Kasprzyk-Hordern, B.; Cooper, J. M. Monitoring Genetic
892 Population Biomarkers for Wastewater-Based Epidemiology. *Anal. Chem.* **2017**, *89* (18),
893 9941–9945. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.analchem.7b02257>.
- 894 (105) Machado, H.; Silva, S.; Cunha, M. Multiple Views of DNA Surveillance: The Surveilled,
895 the Surveillants and the Academics. In *Crime, Security and Surveillance. Effects for the*
896 *Surveillant and the Surveilled*; Boom Eleven Publishers, 2012; pp 179–194.
- 897 (106) *Wastewater-Based Disease Surveillance for Public Health Action*; National Academies of
898 Sciences, Engineer (WASHINGTON, District of Columbia), Ed.; The National Academies
899 Press: WASHINGTON, 2023.
- 900
901
902