

1 Simultaneous detection and quantification of multiple pathogen targets in wastewater

2

3 Gouthami Rao¹, Drew Capone², Kevin Zhu¹, Abigail Knoble¹, Yarrow Linden¹, Ryan Clark¹, Amanda
4 Lai¹, Juhee Kim³, Ching-Hua Huang³, Aaron Bivins⁴, Joe Brown¹

5

6 ¹Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings School of Public Health, University of
7 North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA.

8 ²Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, School of Public Health, Indiana University,
9 Bloomington, IN, USA

10 ³School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA

11 ⁴Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

12

13 *Corresponding author: Joe Brown, ¹Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings
14 School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. CB7431 Rosenau Hall,
15 Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7431, USA. Tel: +1 919 360 8752. Email: joebrown@unc.edu

16

17 Target Journal: PLOS NTDs

18 Total words (characters): 4518

19

20 Keywords: wastewater surveillance, multiplex, pathogen detection

21

22 **Abstract:**

23 Wastewater-based epidemiology has emerged as a critical tool for public health surveillance, building on
24 decades of environmental surveillance work for pathogens such as poliovirus. Work to date has been
25 limited to monitoring a single pathogen or small numbers of pathogens in targeted studies; however, few

26 studies consider simultaneous quantitative analysis of a wide variety of pathogens, which could greatly
27 increase the utility of wastewater surveillance. We developed a novel quantitative multi-pathogen
28 surveillance approach (35 pathogen targets including bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and helminths) using
29 TaqMan Array Cards (TAC) and applied the method on concentrated wastewater samples collected at
30 four wastewater treatment plants in Atlanta, GA from February to October of 2020. From sewersheds
31 serving approximately 2 million people, we detected a wide range of targets including many we expected
32 to find in wastewater (e.g., enterotoxigenic *E. coli* and *Giardia* in 97% of 29 samples at stable
33 concentrations) as well as unexpected targets including *Strongyloides stercoralis* (a human threadworm
34 rarely observed in the USA). Other notable detections included SARS-CoV-2, but also several pathogen
35 targets that are not commonly included in wastewater surveillance like *Acanthamoeba* spp., *Balantidium*
36 *coli*, *Entamoeba histolytica*, astrovirus, norovirus, and sapovirus. Our data suggest broad utility in
37 expanding the scope of enteric pathogen surveillance in wastewaters, with potential for application in a
38 variety of settings where pathogen quantification in fecal waste streams can inform public health
39 surveillance and selection of control measures to limit infections.

40 **Introduction**

41 Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) incorporates a range of tools intended to complement traditional
42 public health surveillance, optimally providing timely and actionable data on pathogens circulating in
43 populations of interest. Historically, wastewater monitoring has been used as a surveillance tool for
44 individual pathogens including poliovirus[1,2], hepatitis A[3], *Vibrio cholerae*[4], *Salmonella enterica*
45 serotype Typhi [5] as well as for chemical analytes (e.g., drug use) [6]. This strategy has gained global
46 prominence in the detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater[7–9], specifically
47 focusing on community prevalence[7,10,11], apparent trends in infections over time and space[12], and
48 emerging variants[13,14]. Advantages and limitations of wastewater as a surveillance matrix have been
49 widely discussed since 2020[15–17].

50 The need to expand wastewater monitoring to screen multiple pathogens or variants is a valuable
51 approach to better understand the possibility of emerging pathogens or circulating strains in a particular
52 population. In addition to a rapidly expanding array of sequencing techniques to more completely
53 characterize microbial composition of environmental samples, more sensitive quantitative or semi-
54 quantitative multiple-target detection approaches exist [18,19] and some have been subjected to cross-
55 method comparisons for pathogen detection and quantification [20–22]. Such tests could complement the
56 highly sensitive and precisely quantitative emerging digital PCR techniques now considered the gold
57 standard for single-pathogen detection in wastewater, either as a screening method as a precursor to more
58 in-depth work on targets of interest or to gain information on a wide range of pathogens of interest.
59 Emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases[23] – including those with pandemic potential[24] –
60 represent ongoing risks to society, and wastewater surveillance can fill critical gaps in data to inform
61 public health responses[25].

62 Based on the demonstrated potential for WBE to complement traditional diagnostic public health
63 surveillance for a diverse array of pathogens, we implemented a customized multi-parallel molecular
64 surveillance tool for simultaneous detection and quantification of 35 common pathogenic bacteria,
65 viruses, protozoa, and helminths in wastewater. Such approaches can expand the existing WBE platform
66 by screening for many more pathogens – including rare or emerging microbes of interest – enhancing
67 monitoring to inform public health response. We demonstrate the utility of this method in an analysis of
68 primary untreated influent samples from four wastewater treatment plants in metro Atlanta, Georgia,
69 USA.

70 **Materials & Methods**

71 *Sample Collection*

72 We collected one-liter primary influent grab samples (n=30) in high-density polyethylene (HDPE) plastic
73 bottles from four wastewater treatment plants (anonymized as WWTP A, B, C, D) in Atlanta, GA

74 between March 20th, 2020 - November 5th, 2020 between 9:30 AM—11 AM. We obtained permission for
75 sample collection from each WWTP manager prior to sampling. Flow values from the WWTPs ranged
76 from 14 – 80.2 million gallons per day. All samples were transferred to the laboratory on ice and stored at
77 -80°C until further processing was completed. Initial sample processing began on November 8th, 2021.
78 Frozen samples were thawed in a 5L bucket of water located in a 4°C walk-in fridge for up to 3 days or
79 until thawed. Samples were then recorded for temperature and pH, and a 50 mL aliquot was taken for
80 total suspended solids measurements (S1 Table). Each 1L sample was spiked with 10 µL of Calf-Guard
81 (Zoetis) resuspended vaccine, containing attenuated bovine coronavirus (BCoV), and 10 µL of MS2
82 (10⁵/µL), which served as the process recovery controls. A 1:100 ratio of 5% Tween 20 solution was
83 added to the sample bottle as recommended by InnovaPrep for processing wastewater samples [26]. A
84 graduated 1L bottle was used as a reference for the total volume in each sample bottle. Samples were
85 mixed by inverting the bottle 3-4 times. A subset of samples (n=4) were processed using three different
86 methods to establish a reasonable workflow for the remaining samples: (1) direct extraction, (2)
87 InnovaPrep Concentrating Pipette (CP) Select, and (3) skim milk flocculation (SMF).

88 *Sample Processing*

89 Direct Extraction

90 We directly extracted 200 µL of wastewater influent into the DNeasy PowerSoil Pro Manual extraction
91 kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). Technical representatives indicated kits co-purify DNA and RNA and
92 others have compared DNA kits with DNA + RNA kits with similar performance [27].

93 InnovaPrep Concentrating Pipette

94 150 mL from the wastewater influent sample was transferred into a 500 mL conical centrifuge tube.
95 Samples were centrifuged for 20 minutes at 4800 x g. The 500 mL conical tube was placed under the CP
96 Select, and the fluidics head lowered into the sample. The sample supernatant was filtered using a 0.05
97 µm unirradiated hollow-fiber CP tip and eluted using the InnovaPrep FluidPrep Tris elution canister.

98 Processing times and eluted volumes were recorded. For each day samples were run, one negative control
99 consisting of 100 mL of DI water was also filtered and processed.

100

101 Skim Milk Flocculation

102 With the remaining wastewater sample, we proceeded to use the SMF method[28]. We combined 1 mL of
103 a 5% skimmed milk solution per 100 mL of wastewater sample (average volume = 750 mL) and adjusted
104 the pH of the skimmed-milk-wastewater solution between 3.0 – 4.0 using 1M HCl. Samples were placed
105 on a shaker plate at room temperature (20-25°C) at 200 RPM for two hours. After shaking, samples were
106 centrifuged at 3500 x g at 4°C for 30 minutes. The supernatant was discarded and the pellet was archived
107 at -80°C until two batch extractions of 15 samples were completed within one week.

108 A subset of 4 samples were directly extracted and the TaqMan Array Card (TAC) results from CP, SMF,
109 and the direct extractions were compared to determine an optimal concentration method prior to full scale
110 downstream processing. Additional details can be found in S2 Table. In the methods trial, SMF resulted
111 in greater number of pathogen detections and was therefore used for the subsequent full-scale analyses. In
112 the SMF workflow, skim milk pellets were processed for RNA using the Qiagen DNeasy PowerSoil Pro
113 manual extraction kit. One extraction blank was run using nuclease-free water for each batch of sample
114 extractions. Extracts were placed in the -80°C freezer until reverse transcriptase real-time (quantitative)
115 polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) or digital PCR (dPCR) processing followed within one week.

116 Skim milk pellets were run on TAC with 7% in duplicate. All CP eluants were extracted for RNA using
117 Qiagen AllPrep PowerViral manual kits following manufacturer instructions to be further processed using
118 dPCR. CP and dPCR were used for process controls and fecal indicators in the full-scale analyses.

119 **Molecular Analysis**

120 Two PCR platforms were used to process extracts, the first was an RT-qPCR QuantStudio (QS) 7 Flex
121 (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) and the second a dPCR QIAcuity Four (Qiagen, Hilden,

Germany). All skim milk pellets were analyzed using the QS7 Flex. The QS7 works in conjunction with a custom TAC, which is prespecified with lyophilized primers and probes for 35 enteric pathogen targets (see S3 Table). The card was designed to include bacterial, viral, protozoan, and helminth targets that may be circulating in the United States as well as the leading etiologies of diarrhea among children globally [29,30]. Cq values < 40 were considered positive for the target and confirmed through clear amplification signals in the amplification and multicomponent plots. We prepared our TAC by combining 38 μ L of template with 62 μ L of AgPath-ID One-Step RT-PCR Reagents (Applied Biosystems) and assessed TAC performance through an 8-fold dilution series (10^9 - 10^2 gene copies/reaction) using 2 plasmids (one for DNA and one for RNA targets) that were linearized, transcribed, cleaned, and quantified as described in [29]. The samples were analyzed in single, not replicates on the same TAC. Additional MIQE details are found in S4 Table. All CP eluant samples were analyzed using the dPCR QIAcuity Four platform (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). On the dPCR platform previously designed and optimized multiplex assays were used for bovine coronavirus (BCoV), pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV), and human mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA)[31] (see S5 Table, S1 Text, and S1 Fig). Gene copy concentration results for PMMoV and mtDNA were used as normalization markers for the TAC pathogen data so that we divided the sample gene copy concentrations/liter by the normalization marker gene copy concentrations/liter.

138 **Data Analysis**

139 When multiple gene targets for a single microbial taxon was detected, we used the highest concentration
 140 gene target to calculate summary statistics and supported figures. We used R Studio version 4.2.1 and
 141 specific R packages to complete all data cleaning (dplyr v1.1.2), analyses (janitor v2.2.0, gtsummary
 142 v1.7.1) and generate graphs (ggplot2 v3.4.2). All TAC data was analyzed using QuantStudio Design and
 143 Analysis Real-Time PCR software (v2.6.0, Thermo Fisher Scientific). Equivalent sample volumes (ESV)
 144 have previously been described as the original sample volume processed and analyzed in a PCR
 145 reaction[32]. Here, we calculated ESVs using the following equation:

$$ESV = \frac{\mu L \text{ RNA template}}{PCR \text{ rxn}} * \frac{\mu L \text{ pellet into extraction}}{\mu L \text{ extraction eluate}} * \frac{mL \text{ WW volume into SMF}}{\mu L \text{ concentrated pellet}}$$

146

147 The 95% limit of detections (LODs) were calculated for each assay using probit models[33]. We
148 translated these 95% analytical LODs (aLODs) into a 95% matrix LOD (mLOD) using the following
149 equation and the previously calculated effective volumes for SMF:

$$mLOD = \frac{1}{EV}(aLOD)$$

150

151 **Results**

152 TAC results were generated using skim milk pellets extracted by the PowerSoil Pro Manual kit to process
153 the influent samples. The average SMF pellet was 2.2 mL and the average wastewater influent processed
154 for SMF was 688 mL. Supplemental data on any other method performed (direct extraction or InnovaPrep
155 CP pellet) is provided in S2 Table and S2-S3 Figs.

156 *Enteric Pathogen Measurement by Skim Milk Flocculation*

157 The log₁₀-transformed gene copy concentrations by pathogen class and specific enteric pathogen (Fig 1)
158 demonstrates the wide range of pathogens detected in Atlanta wastewater influent (n=30). Enteric
159 bacteria, specifically enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC), were detected most frequently and at higher gene
160 copy concentrations compared to helminths and viruses. Notable protozoan detections were
161 *Acanthamoeba* spp. (28/30), *Balantidium coli* (29/30), *Entamoeba* spp. (29/30), and *Giardia* spp. (29/30).
162 While virus detections were relatively lower than protozoan detections, astrovirus (26/30), norovirus
163 GI/GII (28/30), and sapovirus (7/30) were detected in the processed samples. Additional comparison of
164 prevalence of pathogens by wastewater treatment plant are detailed in Table 2 with Plant C representing
165 the most samples processed (n=21). S4 Fig demonstrates the log₁₀ gene copies per liter of wastewater
166 influent stratified by gene targets. Interestingly, with the CP samples we detected *Strongyloides*
167 *stercoralis* in one wastewater sample (S2 Fig and S6 Table).

168

169 Fig 1. Log₁₀ concentrations of enteric pathogens per liter of wastewater influent using the SMF method
170 and PowerSoil Pro Manual extraction.

171

172 Of the SMF samples, the bacterial targets of highest concentration were ETEC and enteropathogenic *E.*
173 *coli* (EPEC - atypical), whereas viral targets were mainly astrovirus and norovirus GI/GII. Somewhat
174 unexpected protozoan targets detected were *Cyclospora cayetanensi* (3/30) and *Entamoeba histolytica*
175 (6/30). Both *Cryptosporidium* spp. and *Giardia* spp. were detected at means of 5.0 log₁₀ and 6.5 log₁₀,
176 respectively. Of the total samples, we detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in 50% of samples (n=15) at
177 concentrations between 3.0 log₁₀—6.0 log₁₀ gene copies per liter of wastewater influent.

178 Table 2. Prevalence of pathogens [n by column (%)] detected in wastewater influent from four treatment
179 plants in Atlanta, Georgia – using SMF method

MICROBE CATEGORY	TARGET	WW Plant A (n=3)	WW Plant B (n=4)	WW Plant C (n=20)	WW Plant D (n=3)
Bacteria	<i>Campylobacter jejuni/coli</i>	- (0)	1 (25%)	11 (55%)	- (0)
	<i>Clostridioides difficile</i>	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	15 (75%)	3 (100%)
	<i>E. coli</i> O157:H7	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	19 (95%)	3 (100%)
	EAEC*	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
	EPEC (atypical)†	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
	EPEC (typical)†	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
	ETEC*	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
	<i>Helicobacter pylori</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
	<i>Plesiomonas shigelloides</i>	2 (67%)	0% (0)	10 (50%)	2 (67%)
	<i>Salmonella</i> spp.	3 (100%)	1 (25%)	18 (90%)	2 (67%)
	<i>Shigella</i> /EIEC†	2 (67%)	0% (0)	19 (95%)	3 (100%)
	STEC*	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)

	<i>Yersinia enterocolitica</i>	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
Fungus/Algae	<i>Blastocystis</i> spp.	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
	<i>Encephalitozoon intestinalis</i>	3 (100%)	1 (25%)	13 (65%)	3 (100%)
	<i>Enterocytozoon bieneusi</i>	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	75% (12)	1 (33%)
Helminth	<i>Ancylostoma duodenale</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
	<i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
	<i>Enterobius vermicularis</i>	0% (0)	0% (0)	3 (15%)	- (0)
	<i>Hymenolepis nana</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
	<i>Necator americanus</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
	<i>Strongyloides stercoralis</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
	<i>Trichuris trichiura</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
Protozoa	<i>Acanthamoeba</i> spp.	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	19 (95%)	3 (100%)
	<i>Balantidium coli</i>	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
	<i>Cryptosporidium</i> spp.	- (0)	- (0)	8 (40%)	- (0)
	<i>Cyclospora cayetanensi</i>	- (0)	- (0)	3 (15%)	- (0)
	<i>Cystoisospora belli</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
	<i>Entamoeba histolytica</i>	- (0)	- (0)	6 (30%)	- (0)
	<i>Entamoeba</i> spp.	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
	<i>Giardia</i> spp.	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
Virus	astrovirus	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	19 (95%)	2 (67%)
	norovirus GI/GII*	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
	rotavirus	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	15 (75%)	3 (100%)
	sapovirus*	0% (0)	0% (0)	5 (25%)	2 (67%)
	SARS-CoV-2	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	9 (45%)	1 (33%)

180 *Enteroaggregative *E. coli* (EAEC) combined gene targets aatA and aaiC; enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC)
181 combined targets from gene LT, STh, and STp; norovirus included GI and GII targets; sapovirus
182 combined gene targets for I, II, IV, and V; shiga toxin-producing *E. coli* (STEC) combined gene targets
183 stx1 and stx2.

184 †Enteropathogenic *E. coli* (EPEC); enteroinvasive *E. coli* (EIEC)

185

186 *dPCR for Concentrating Pipette and normalization markers*

187 A total of n=30 CP samples were processed for PMMoV, mtDNA, and BCoV. Fig 2 demonstrates the
188 \log_{10} gene copies per liter of wastewater influent and indicates PMMoV concentrations exceed mtDNA
189 concentrations. The average concentrations for BCoV dPCR reactions was 43.3 gene copies (gc)/ μ L,
190 PMMoV was 1602 gc/ μ L, and mtDNA was 4.33 gc/ μ L. The average concentrations of \log_{10} gene
191 copies/liter per reaction of wastewater was 5.2×10^4 for mtDNA and 1.9×10^7 for PMMoV. All positive
192 controls and non-template controls performed without suspicion and additional details on control
193 performance is included in S2 Text and in the dMIQE checklist (S7 Table). Additionally, BCoV as a
194 process control yielded a 29% average recovery with a standard deviation of 28, with recovery by sample
195 available as S8 Table.

196

197 Fig 2. \log_{10} gene copies per liter of wastewater influent using the InnovaPrep Concentrating Pipette (CP)
198 method. The dashed line represents the limit of detection when calculated as 3 partitions out of the total
199 valid partitions. Figure includes all technical replicates per sample.

200

201 *Pathogen concentrations normalized by mtDNA and PMMoV*

202 Quantitative \log_{10} gene copies per liter of wastewater influent before (S9 Table) and after normalization
203 (S10-11 Tables), with mtDNA normalization resulting in overall higher \log_{10} ratios. In Fig 3, we note a
204 considerably smaller ratio when using PMMoV normalization over mtDNA. These concentrations are
205 caused by increased PMMoV concentrations in wastewater influent compared to mtDNA concentrations.

206

207 Fig 3. A) Pathogen data normalized by mtDNA. B) Pathogen data normalized by PMMoV. The dashed
208 line represents where pathogen and normalizer count are equivalent. Figure includes all technical
209 replicates per sample for mtDNA and PMMoV marker.

210

211 *TAC Performance Interpretation*

212 Standard Curves

213 The standard curves for this custom TAC included two assays (Adenovirus 40/41 and Hepatitis A) with
214 poor standard curve performances ($r^2 < .95$) and therefore were excluded from all analyses. Of the
215 remaining 40 enteric targets, the DNA control was phocine herpes virus and RNA control was MS2. For
216 performance metrics (S12 Table), reasonable linearity was detected for all included assays with an
217 average R^2 value of 0.997 across all assays with the lowest R^2 of 0.967 for STEC (stx2) and the highest
218 R^2 of 1 for *Acanthamoeba* spp., *Balantidium coli*, *E. coli* O157:H7, *Giardia* spp., *Plesiomonas*
219 *shigelloides*, *Salmonella* spp., and STEC (stx1). The lowest efficiency assay was Astrovirus at 87% while
220 the highest was *Entamoeba* spp. at 104%.

221

222 Effective Volume

223 The effective volume, which does not account for recovery efficiency, is calculated as the proportion of
224 original wastewater sample assayed in a single qPCR reaction. The effective analyzed wastewater volume
225 for InnovaPrep CP was 0.155 mL (SD 0.0605) per reaction and SMF was 0.410 mL of wastewater per
226 reaction (SD 0.121).

227 Limit of Detection and matrix LOD

228 The 95% aLOD was calculated for each assay in S12 Table, reported as gene copies per reaction. The
229 lowest detectable target as *Cryptosporidium* spp. at 0.6 gene copies per reaction and the highest as 291
230 gene copies per reaction for ETEC (LT), followed by 96 gene copies per reaction for STEC (stx2).

231 A comprehensive mLOD table for each assay indicates the gene copy per mL of sewage is found in S13
232 Table and includes the minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviations, standard error, and confidence
233 intervals. These results indicate average gene copies per mL of wastewater influent as low as 1.591 for
234 *Cryptosporidium* spp. and 16S marker or as high as 264.7 gc/mL for ETEC (LT & ST). SARS-CoV-2
235 mLOD was 16.4 gc/mL influent.

236 Inhibition

237 We used MS2 as the extraction control and the average Cq for negative extraction controls (n=7) was
238 17.8 gene copies per reaction [confidence interval 0.821], whereas all SMP samples (n=30) had an
239 average Cq of 19.3 gene copies per reaction [CI 2.04]. With a Cq difference of 1.5, we can reasonably
240 conclude inhibition was not a major issue with our sample matrix since samples and controls had Cq
241 difference less than 2.

242 **Discussion**

243 Wastewater surveillance sampling, processing, storage, and analysis methods have advanced rapidly since
244 the emergence of SARS-CoV-2. Most studies have examined primary influent[34,35] and solids[36,37].
245 Sampling methods have also varied from grab, composite, and more recently passive techniques[38]. In
246 addition to testing different matrices, many laboratories have implemented various methods to
247 concentrate SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater using ultracentrifugation, polyethylene glycol precipitation,
248 electronegative membrane filtration, and ultrafiltration[28,39], but few have considered a concentration
249 step followed by a simultaneous, multi-parallel quantitative assay or multiple pathogen detection assays.
250 The possibility of high-plex, high throughput platforms are of particular interest to stakeholders looking
251 to expand wastewater monitoring nationally in the US and abroad. For example, the CDC has expanded
252 upon the previously single-plex N1 assay for SARS-CoV-2 to include influenza A and/or B for increased
253 testing capacity[40]. Practical applications of surveillance suggest that downstream sampling analyses of

254 3 or 4 samplings per week could provide useful results regarding trends, but the specific design would
255 have to be driven by local public health trends and goals [41–43].

256 *TAC performance metrics*

257 We compared our traditional metrics such as R^2 trends of standard curves and found that our TAC results
258 are within a reasonable R^2 range for almost all assays ($R^2 > 0.96$), except for two explicitly excluded due to
259 poor standard curve performance. Our 95% LODs calculated also indicate a broad range of analytical
260 sensitivities across all pathogen targets. With the lowest detections at 0.6 gene copies per reaction, we
261 also have targets on the higher end of 291 gene copies per reaction for ETEC. While other studies
262 indicate a loss of sensitivity when using TAC, there was still an 89% detection rate compared to single-
263 plex assays run[44].

264 *Prevalence of bacteria, protozoan, and viral targets*

265 Our qPCR data indicated 10^4 - 10^6 gene copies per liter for SARS-CoV-2 prior to normalization efforts,
266 which is comparable to other studies [45]. Researchers had previously detected *Giardia duodenale*.,
267 *Cryptosporidium* spp., and *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* at 82.6%, 56.2% and 87.6%, in combined sewer
268 overflows (CSO) around China[46]. These molecular surveillance findings were also similar to ours at
269 97% (n=29/30) for *Giardia* spp., not specifically *Giardia duodenale*, and 27% (n=8/30) for
270 *Cryptosporidium* spp., and 53% (n=16/30) for *E. bieneusi*. Our data showed the presence of *Strongyloides*
271 *stercoralis* in urban wastewater, a human parasite typically associated with rural, underserved
272 settings[47]. This finding is an example of the utility of screening for uncommon or unexpected targets,
273 revealing novel information that can supplement existing public health surveillance.

274

275 Groundwater and runoff can intrude into wastewater collection systems through inflow and infiltration
276 (I&I), which may be relevant for fungi and a possibility for other microbial species to mix with
277 wastewater flows[48]. Other potential explanations of sources into wastewater may include animal waste,
278 commercial and/or industrial waste. These influent flows and their sources are difficult to determine, but

279 routine surveillance – including with the addition of source-tracking – may provide additional insight
280 into influent pathogens, their possible origins, and their utility in understanding infection transmission and
281 control in the sewershed.

282 *Value of multiple detections on TAC*

283 Multi-parallel detection of pathogens of interest using TAC can be helpful in long-term surveillance or
284 monitoring of pathogens, including in rapid screening programs or where numerous pathogens may be of
285 interest. Apart from known, emerging, or suspected pathogens, antimicrobial resistance genes or other
286 PCR-detectable targets of public health relevance can be included in TAC design. One key premise of
287 WBE and monitoring is the potential value of using the method as an early detection for the onset of a
288 potential outbreak [49,50], yet most detection methods have a needle in a haystack approach versus a
289 wider screening that could be especially applicable to state health departments or in routine monitoring.
290 Most clinical testing is conducted one sample at a time and a high throughput method for simultaneous
291 testing could expand the early warning potential to many other pathogens.

292 The customizability of TAC has proven useful in other applications such as surveillance of respiratory
293 illness[51,52], acute-febrile illness for outbreak or surveillance purposes[53], and to improve etiological
294 detection of difficult neonatal infectious diseases for low-resource clinical settings[54]. Some studies
295 have focused on applications of combining nucleic acid detection with quantitative microbial risk
296 assessments[55], but none have considered such a broad set of applications to wastewater monitoring and
297 surveillance, although some have applied these methods qualitatively on fecal sludge samples[56,57]. It is
298 possible to create a multiplex assay for digital PCR, the leading technology for wastewater monitoring,
299 for up to five different genes, but no other platform provides quantitative data on up to 48 gene targets
300 during a single experimental run.

301 TAC methods can fill a critical gap in existing molecular monitoring tools. As a method yielding
302 quantitative estimates of potentially dozens of targets, it offers complementary advantages over emerging
303 digital PCR platforms (greater sensitivity and lower limits of quantification, but fewer targets) and

304 sequencing methods (many more targets, but high limits of detection and generally not quantitative). TAC
305 should be considered where targets are present in high numbers – like in wastewaters and fecal sludges –
306 and where many pathogens are of interest.

307 The application of improved methods for the detection and quantification of enteric pathogens in
308 wastewater, in addition to other enteric pathogens of interest, can then be translated into relevant
309 intervention and monitoring efforts[21]. As SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in wastewater reaches scale
310 [7,34,58], detection and quantification of other pathogens has been proposed. Researchers have expanded
311 on wastewater monitoring to focus increased surveillance on other respiratory viruses such as human
312 influenza and rhinovirus[59], norovirus[60], or as an outbreak detection tool for influenza,[61] and are
313 also considering other emerging infections such as monkeypox[62].

314

315 *Value of sensitivity of dPCR*

316 The current and suggested methodology to process wastewater samples using a molecular platform is
317 dPCR due to its low limit of detection and quantification. While these efforts make sense to consider
318 when focused on one particular pathogen, it is not as feasible and consumes several resources if
319 considering a truly practical monitoring system for wastewater. Time, technical staff labor and resources
320 are always a challenge for laboratories and especially public health laboratories that have been tasked
321 with monitoring wastewater for SARS-CoV-2. We can expect enteric targets to be present in wastewater,
322 but to further identify which enteric pathogens are present and their concentrations with respect to each
323 other would be a useful application towards building a wastewater monitoring system.

324 While SARS-CoV-2 was detected through TAC, we were also interested in detecting additionally relevant
325 targets, including BCoV, PMMoV, and mtDNA, which were not previously included on the TAC. The
326 normalization of pathogen concentrations using mtDNA consistently lowered concentrations across
327 samples and may be useful as a normalization variable instead of or in addition to PMMoV. While

328 PMMoV has been widely used for normalization of wastewater data[63,64], we found the normalization
329 efforts did not drastically reduce the noise-to-signal ratio. While several studies have used PMMoV as a
330 normalization marker for SARS-CoV-2[12,65,66], fewer studies have considered human mitochondrial
331 DNA markers and those who have found the marker to have strong correlations to clinical case
332 counts[67]. Additional studies have also considered the use of crAssphage[12,64], HF183[41,68], and
333 *Bacteroides* ribosomal RNA (rRNA) and human 18S rRNA as other normalization markers to explore
334 using for wastewater fecal concentration data[12]. Normalization techniques using a variety of biological
335 (PMMoV, HF183, crAssphage) and chemical markers (ammonia, total kjeldahl nitrogen, total
336 phosphorous, biochemical oxygen demand) have been proposed as a way of accounting for non-human
337 inputs to sewers (i.e., dilution effects) and improving correlation with clinical data and comparability
338 between sites. However, the effects of normalization with a variety of techniques on correlations with
339 clinical data have been mixed [41,63,69–71]. Our observations are consistent with those of previous
340 studies. Normalization with mtDNA nor PMMoV reduced the coefficient of variation for single analytes.

341

342 *Limitations*

343 Wastewater sample recovery for SARS-CoV-2 has been successful when using fresh samples, but for
344 many WWTP and their partners it may be unrealistic to complete same-day processing for logistical
345 reasons[72]. This work demonstrated the recovery of pathogen targets using archived grab samples,
346 which makes this approach open to a broader range of applications such as retrospective analyses where
347 clinical data is available or can be linked to these environmental surveillance results. However, more
348 research is needed to understand which recovery methods work best and can be performed efficiently for
349 archived samples. While we did not optimize methods for recovery across all targets, it will be
350 increasingly important to consider such methods when screening for multiple targets and depending on
351 target selection [68,73,74].

352 A major limitation to interpreting this work is limited data on using multiple TAC targets and their
353 incorporation into predictive models. Researchers have gained interest in calculating community-specific
354 or dorm-specific fecal shedding rates specifically for SARS-CoV-2[75,76], but there was no specific
355 information on the fecal shedding rates for this particular population to consider a modeling approach to
356 relate pathogen concentration and clinical case data for asymptomatic individuals. Additionally,
357 sewersheds of different sizes may have specific challenges in determining accurate shedding rates. Robust
358 data on enteric shedding rates is not widely available for high-income countries, but efforts to estimate
359 these variables and their uncertainties have been attempted[77].

360

361 TAC methods are also limited by the number of gene target detections one can consider. With the option
362 of detecting many pathogens comes with a need for determining the most relevant genes of interest.
363 While TAC can run up to 48 unique targets, the total amount of template that enters each individual well
364 is ~ 0.6 μ L. This low template volume, compared to a 2-5 μ L of template included in other molecular
365 assays can affect the overall limits of detection for this platform. While singleplex assays may have lower
366 limits of detection, the likelihood of optimizing a multiplex for up to 46 or more agents is unrealistic;
367 therefore, giving TAC a considerable advantage as a high parallel, multiple detection platform[44].
368 Additionally, these targets and the QA/QC involved require dedicated time and effort to include relevant
369 targets that may change based on future applications. The need for additional replicates run to produce
370 robust analytical limits of quantification are encouraged for future work. Using this multiple pathogen
371 detection tool does not account for variant changes and may not be suitable for all applications. Our
372 findings indicate TAC offers a multi-parallel platform for screening wastewater for a diverse array of
373 enteric pathogens of interest to public health with strong potential for screening other targets of interest
374 including respiratory viruses and antibiotic resistance genes.

375

376 **Acknowledgements**

377 The authors would like to acknowledge the wastewater treatment plants that permitted sample collection
378 and the National Science Foundation (NSF 2027752- Collaborative Research- RAPID: Wastewater
379 Informed Epidemiological Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2) for financial support in completing this work.
380 DC and AL were supported in part by T32ES007018, Biostatistics for Research in Environmental Health,
381 funded by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to the University of North Carolina at
382 Chapel Hill. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
383 preparation of the manuscript. GR led the initial draft, GR and DC led data analysis, JB and AB
384 conceived the work, and the following authors worked on data collection and sample processing: KZ, AK,
385 YL, RC, AL, JK, GR. All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript.

386 **References**

- 387 1. Brouwer AF, Eisenberg JNS, Pomeroy CD, Shulman LM, Hindiyeh M, Manor Y, et al.
388 Epidemiology of the silent polio outbreak in Rahat, Israel, based on modeling of environmental
389 surveillance data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
390 *America*. 2018;115: E10625–E10633. doi:10.1073/pnas.1808798115
- 391 2. Lago PM, Gary HE, Pérez LS, Cáceres V, Olivera JB, Puentes RP, et al. Poliovirus detection in
392 wastewater and stools following an immunization campaign in Havana, Cuba. *International Journal*
393 *of Epidemiology*. 2003;32: 772–777. doi:10.1093/ije/dyg185
- 394 3. La Rosa G, Della Libera S, Iaconelli M, Ciccaglione AR, Bruni R, Taffon S, et al. Surveillance of
395 hepatitis A virus in urban sewages and comparison with cases notified in the course of an outbreak,
396 Italy 2013. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2014. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-14-419
- 397 4. Barrett TJ, Blake PA, Morris GK, Puhr ND, Bradford HB, Wells JG. Use of Moore swabs for
398 isolating *Vibrio cholerae* from sewage. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 1980;11: 385–388.
399 doi:10.1128/JCM.11.4.385-388.1980
- 400 5. Moore B, Perry CEL, Chard ST. A survey by the sewage swab method of latent enteric infection in
401 an urban area. *Public Health Department*. 1950. doi:10.1017/S0022172400019501
- 402 6. Feng L, Zhang W, Li X. Monitoring of regional drug abuse through wastewater-based
403 epidemiology—A critical review. *Science China Earth Sciences*. 2018;61: 239–255.
404 doi:10.1007/s11430-017-9129-x
- 405 7. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, Bibby K, Bivins A, O’Brien JW, et al. First confirmed detection of
406 SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater
407 surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2020;728: 138764.
408 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764

- 409 8. La Rosa G, Mancini P, Bonanno Ferraro G, Veneri C, Iaconelli M, Bonadonna L, et al. SARS-CoV-
410 2 has been circulating in northern Italy since December 2019: Evidence from environmental
411 monitoring. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2021;750: 141711.
412 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141711
- 413 9. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2
414 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the
415 Epidemic in the Netherlands. *Environmental Science and Technology Letters*. 2020;7: 511–516.
416 doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357
- 417 10. Morvan M, Jacomo AL, Souque C, Wade MJ, Hoffmann T, Pouwels K, et al. An analysis of 45
418 large-scale wastewater sites in England to estimate SARS-CoV-2 community prevalence. *Nat*
419 *Commun*. 2022;13: 4313. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-31753-y
- 420 11. Karthikeyan S, Ronquillo N, Belda-Ferre P, Alvarado D, Javidi T, Longhurst CA, et al. High-
421 Throughput Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Detection Enables Forecasting of Community Infection
422 Dynamics in San Diego County. Cristea IM, editor. *mSystems*. 2021;6: e00045-21.
423 doi:10.1128/mSystems.00045-21
- 424 12. Greenwald HD, Kennedy LC, Hinkle A, Whitney ON, Fan VB, Crits-Christoph A, et al. Tools for
425 interpretation of wastewater SARS-CoV-2 temporal and spatial trends demonstrated with data
426 collected in the San Francisco Bay Area. *Water Research X*. 2021;12: 100111.
427 doi:10.1016/j.wroa.2021.100111
- 428 13. Jahn K, Dreifuss D, Topolsky I, Kull A, Ganesanandamoorthy P, Fernandez-Cassi X, et al.
429 Detection and surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 genomic variants in wastewater. *medRxiv*. 2021;
430 2021.01.08.21249379. doi:10.1101/2021.01.08.21249379
- 431 14. Fontenele RS, Kraberger S, Hadfield J, Driver EM, Bowes D, Holland LA, et al. High-throughput
432 sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater provides insights into circulating variants. *medRxiv* □:
433 the preprint server for health sciences. 2021; 2021.01.22.21250320.
434 doi:10.1101/2021.01.22.21250320
- 435 15. Safford HR, Shapiro K, Bischel HN. Wastewater analysis can be a powerful public health tool—if
436 it’s done sensibly. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2022;119: e2119600119.
437 doi:10.1073/pnas.2119600119
- 438 16. Naughton CC, Roman FA, Alvarado AGF, Tariqi AQ, Deeming MA, Kadonsky KF, et al. Show us
439 the data: global COVID-19 wastewater monitoring efforts, equity, and gaps. *FEMS Microbes*.
440 2023;4: xtad003. doi:10.1093/femsmc/xtad003
- 441 17. Medema G, Been F, Heijnen L, Petterson S. Implementation of environmental surveillance for
442 SARS-CoV-2 virus to support public health decisions: Opportunities and challenges. *Current*
443 *Opinion in Environmental Science & Health*. 2020;17: 49–71. doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.006
- 444 18. Malla B, Thakali O, Shrestha S, Segawa T, Kitajima M, Haramoto E. Application of a high-
445 throughput quantitative PCR system for simultaneous monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 variants and
446 other pathogenic viruses in wastewater. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2022;853: 158659.
447 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158659

- 448 19. Hill ER, Chun CL, Hamilton K, Ishii S. High-Throughput Microfluidic Quantitative PCR Platform
449 for the Simultaneous Quantification of Pathogens, Fecal Indicator Bacteria, and Microbial Source
450 Tracking Markers. *ACS EST Water*. 2023;3: 2647–2658. doi:10.1021/acsestwater.3c00169
- 451 20. Grembi JA, Mayer-Blackwell K, Luby SP, Spormann AM. High-Throughput Multiparallel
452 Enteropathogen Detection via Nano-Liter qPCR. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol*. 2020;10: 351.
453 doi:10.3389/fcimb.2020.00351
- 454 21. Lappan R, Henry R, Chown SL, Luby SP, Higginson EE, Bata L, et al. Monitoring of diverse
455 enteric pathogens across environmental and host reservoirs with TaqMan array cards and standard
456 qPCR: a methodological comparison study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2021;5: e297–e308.
457 doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00051-6
- 458 22. Lappan R, Jirapanjawat T, Williamson DA, Lange S, Chown SL, Greening C. Simultaneous
459 detection of multiple pathogens with the TaqMan Array Card. *MethodsX*. 2022;9: 101707.
460 doi:10.1016/j.mex.2022.101707
- 461 23. Nii-Trebi NI. Emerging and Neglected Infectious Diseases: Insights, Advances, and Challenges.
462 *BioMed Research International*. 2017;2017: 1–15. doi:10.1155/2017/5245021
- 463 24. Morens DM, Fauci AS. Emerging Pandemic Diseases: How We Got to COVID-19. *Cell*. 2020;182:
464 1077–1092. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.08.021
- 465 25. Zhu K, Hill C, Muirhead A, Basu M, Brown J, Brinton MA, et al. Zika Virus RNA Persistence and
466 Recovery in Water and Wastewater: An Approach for Zika Virus Surveillance in Resource-
467 constrained Settings. *Water Research*. 2023; 120116. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2023.120116
- 468 26. InnovaPrep. Protocol: Concentrating SARS-CoV-2 from Raw and Primary Wastewater Using the
469 InnovaPrep Concentrating Pipette™ (Revision C).
- 470 27. Liu J, Gratz J, Amour C, Nshama R, Walongo T, Maro A, et al. Optimization of Quantitative PCR
471 Methods for Enteropathogen Detection. Chan KH, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2016;11: e0158199.
472 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0158199
- 473 28. Philo SE, Keim EK, Swanstrom R, Ong AQW, Burnor EA, Kossik AL, et al. A comparison of
474 SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentration methods for environmental surveillance. *Science of The
475 Total Environment*. 2021;760: 144215. doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2020.144215
- 476 29. Capone D, Bakare T, Barker T, Chatham AH, Clark R, Copperthwaite L, et al. Risk Factors for
477 Enteric Pathogen Exposure among Children in Black Belt Region of Alabama, USA. *Emerg Infect
478 Dis*. 2023;29. doi:10.3201/eid2912.230780
- 479 30. Poole C, Barker T, Bradbury R, Capone D, Chatham AH, Handali S, et al. Cross-Sectional Study of
480 Soil-Transmitted Helminthiasis in Black Belt Region of Alabama, USA. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
481 2023;29. doi:10.3201/eid2912.230751
- 482 31. Zhu K, Suttner B, Pickering A, Konstantinidis KT, Brown J. A novel droplet digital PCR human
483 mtDNA assay for fecal source tracking. *Water Research*. 2020;183: 116085.
484 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.116085

- 485 32. Crank K, Papp K, Barber C, Wang P, Bivins A, Gerrity D. Correspondence on “The Environmental
486 Microbiology Minimum Information (EMMI) Guidelines: qPCR and dPCR Quality and Reporting
487 for Environmental Microbiology.” *Environ Sci Technol.* 2023; acs.est.3c07968.
488 doi:10.1021/acs.est.3c07968
- 489 33. Stokdyk JP, Firnstahl AD, Spencer SK, Burch TR, Borchardt MA. Determining the 95% limit of
490 detection for waterborne pathogen analyses from primary concentration to qPCR. *Water Research.*
491 2016;96: 105–113. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2016.03.026
- 492 34. Randazzo W, Truchado P, Cuevas-Ferrando E, Simón P, Allende A, Sánchez G. SARS-CoV-2
493 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water Research.*
494 2020;181. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.115942
- 495 35. Bivins A, North D, Wu Z, Shaffer M, Ahmed W, Bibby K. Within-Day Variability of SARS-CoV-2
496 RNA in Municipal Wastewater Influent During 1 Periods of Varying COVID-19 Prevalence and
497 Positivity 2. *medRxiv.* 2021; 2021.03.16.21253652. doi:10.1101/2021.03.16.21253652
- 498 36. Graham KE, Loeb SK, Wolfe MK, Catoe D, Sinnott-Armstrong N, Kim S, et al. SARS-CoV-2
499 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with COVID-19 Cases in a Large Urban
500 Sewershed. *Environmental Science and Technology.* 2021;55: 488–498.
501 doi:10.1021/ACS.EST.0C06191/SUPPL_FILE/ES0C06191_SI_002.XLSX
- 502 37. D’Aoust PM, Mercier E, Montpetit D, Jia JJ, Alexandrov I, Neault N, et al. Quantitative analysis of
503 SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and
504 prevalence. *Water Research.* 2021;188: 116560. doi:10.1016/J.WATRES.2020.116560
- 505 38. Schang C, Crosbie ND, Nolan M, Poon R, Wang M, Jex A, et al. Passive Sampling of SARS-CoV-2
506 for Wastewater Surveillance. *Cite This: Environ Sci Technol.* 2021;55. doi:10.1021/acs.est.1c01530
- 507 39. Ahmed W, Bivins A, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Choi PM, Farkas K, et al. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2
508 RNA in wastewater: Methods optimization and quality control are crucial for generating reliable
509 public health information. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science and Health.* Elsevier B.V.;
510 2020. pp. 82–93. doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.003
- 511 40. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC’s Influenza SARS-CoV-2 Multiplex Assay. 14
512 Nov 2022. Available: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/multiplex.html>
- 513 41. Feng S, Roguet A, McClary-Gutierrez JS, Newton RJ, Kloczko N, Meiman JG, et al. Evaluation of
514 Sampling, Analysis, and Normalization Methods for SARS-CoV-2 Concentrations in Wastewater to
515 Assess COVID-19 Burdens in Wisconsin Communities. *ACS EST Water.* 2021;1: 1955–1965.
516 doi:10.1021/acsestwater.1c00160
- 517 42. Schoen ME, Wolfe MK, Li L, Duong D, White BJ, Hughes B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA
518 Wastewater Settled Solids Surveillance Frequency and Impact on Predicted COVID-19 Incidence
519 Using a Distributed Lag Model. *ACS EST Water.* 2022;2: 2167–2174.
520 doi:10.1021/acsestwater.2c00074
- 521 43. Chan EMG, Kennedy LC, Wolfe MK, Boehm AB. Identifying trends in SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
522 wastewater to infer changing COVID-19 incidence: Effect of sampling frequency. Kapoor V, editor.
523 *PLOS Water.* 2023;2: e0000088. doi:10.1371/journal.pwat.0000088

- 524 44. Rachwal PA, Rose HL, Cox V, Lukaszewski RA, Murch AL, Weller SA. The Potential of TaqMan
525 Array Cards for Detection of Multiple Biological Agents by Real-Time PCR. Chuang EY, editor.
526 PLoS ONE. 2012;7: e35971. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0035971
- 527 45. Gerrity D, Papp K, Stoker M, Sims A, Frehner W. Early-pandemic wastewater surveillance of
528 SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Nevada: Methodology, occurrence, and incidence/prevalence
529 considerations. Water Research X. 2021;10: 100086. doi:10.1016/j.wroa.2020.100086
- 530 46. Li N, Xiao L, Wang L, Zhao S, Zhao X, Duan L, et al. Molecular Surveillance of Cryptosporidium
531 spp., Giardia duodenalis, and Enterocytozoon bienersi by Genotyping and Subtyping Parasites in
532 Wastewater. Walson JL, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2012;6: e1809.
533 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0001809
- 534 47. Russell ES, Gray EB, Marshall RE, Davis S, Beaudoin A, Handali S, et al. Prevalence of
535 Strongyloides stercoralis Antibodies among a Rural Appalachian Population—Kentucky, 2013. The
536 American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2014;91: 1000–1001. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.14-
537 0310
- 538 48. Barber C, Crank K, Papp K, Innes GK, Schmitz BW, Chavez J, et al. Community-Scale Wastewater
539 Surveillance of *Candida auris* during an Ongoing Outbreak in Southern Nevada. Environ Sci
540 Technol. 2023;57: 1755–1763. doi:10.1021/acs.est.2c07763
- 541 49. Bibby K, Bivins A, Wu Z, North D. Making waves: Plausible lead time for wastewater based
542 epidemiology as an early warning system for COVID-19. Water Research. 2021;202: 117438.
543 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2021.117438
- 544 50. Hellmér M, Paxéus N, Magnus L, Enache L, Arnholm B, Johansson A, et al. Detection of
545 Pathogenic Viruses in Sewage Provided Early Warnings of Hepatitis A Virus and Norovirus
546 Outbreaks. Schaffner DW, editor. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2014;80: 6771–6781.
547 doi:10.1128/AEM.01981-14
- 548 51. Kodani M, Yang G, Conklin LM, Travis TC, Whitney CG, Anderson LJ, et al. Application of
549 TaqMan Low-Density Arrays for Simultaneous Detection of Multiple Respiratory Pathogens. J Clin
550 Microbiol. 2011;49: 2175–2182. doi:10.1128/JCM.02270-10
- 551 52. Weinberg GA, Schnabel KC, Erdman DD, Prill MM, Iwane MK, Shelley LM, et al. Field evaluation
552 of TaqMan Array Card (TAC) for the simultaneous detection of multiple respiratory viruses in
553 children with acute respiratory infection. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2013;57: 254–260.
554 doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2013.03.016
- 555 53. Liu J, Ochieng C, Wiersma S, Ströher U, Towner JS, Whitmer S, et al. Development of a TaqMan
556 Array Card for Acute-Febrile-Illness Outbreak Investigation and Surveillance of Emerging
557 Pathogens, Including Ebola Virus. McAdam AJ, editor. J Clin Microbiol. 2016;54: 49–58.
558 doi:10.1128/JCM.02257-15
- 559 54. Diaz MH, Waller JL, Napoliello RA, Islam MdS, Wolff BJ, Burken DJ, et al. Optimization of
560 Multiple Pathogen Detection Using the TaqMan Array Card: Application for a Population-Based
561 Study of Neonatal Infection. Lin B, editor. PLoS ONE. 2013;8: e66183.
562 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066183

- 563 55. Capone D, Bivins A, Knee J, Cumming O, Nalá R, Brown J. Quantitative Microbial Risk
564 Assessment of Pediatric Infections Attributable to Ingestion of Fecally Contaminated Domestic
565 Soils in Low-Income Urban Maputo, Mozambique. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2021;55: 1941–1952.
566 doi:10.1021/acs.est.0c06972
- 567 56. Capone D, Berendes D, Cumming O, Knee J, Nalá R, Risk BB, et al. Analysis of Fecal Sludges
568 Reveals Common Enteric Pathogens in Urban Maputo, Mozambique. *Environ Sci Technol Lett.*
569 2020;7: 889–895. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00610
- 570 57. Capone D, Chigwechokha P, de los Reyes FL, Holm RH, Risk BB, Tilley E, et al. Impact of
571 sampling depth on pathogen detection in pit latrines. Lamberton PHL, editor. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.*
572 2021;15: e0009176. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0009176
- 573 58. Ahmed W, Simpson SL, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Bivins A, Blackall LL, et al. Minimizing errors in
574 RT-PCR detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA for wastewater surveillance. *Science of*
575 *The Total Environment.* 2022;805: 149877. doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2021.149877
- 576 59. Boehm AB, Hughes B, Duong D, Chan-Herur V, Buchman A, Wolfe MK, et al. Wastewater
577 concentrations of human influenza, metapneumovirus, parainfluenza, respiratory syncytial virus,
578 rhinovirus, and seasonal coronavirus nucleic-acids during the COVID-19 pandemic: a surveillance
579 study. *The Lancet Microbe.* 2023; S266652472200386X. doi:10.1016/S2666-5247(22)00386-X
- 580 60. Markt R, Stillebacher F, Nägele F, Kammerer A, Peer N, Payr M, et al. Expanding the Pathogen
581 Panel in Wastewater Epidemiology to Influenza and Norovirus. *Viruses.* 2023;15: 263.
582 doi:10.3390/v15020263
- 583 61. Wolfe MK, Duong D, Bakker KM, Ammerman M, Mortenson L, Hughes B, et al. Wastewater-
584 Based Detection of Two Influenza Outbreaks. *Environ Sci Technol Lett.* 2022;9: 687–692.
585 doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.2c00350
- 586 62. Wolfe MK, Duong D, Hughes B, Chan-Herur V, White BJ, Boehm AB. Detection of monkeypox
587 viral DNA in a routine wastewater monitoring program. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS);*
588 2022 Jul. doi:10.1101/2022.07.25.22278043
- 589 63. Rainey AL, Liang S, Bisesi JH, Sabo-Attwood T, Maurelli AT. A multistate assessment of
590 population normalization factors for wastewater-based epidemiology of COVID-19. Sambri V,
591 editor. *PLoS ONE.* 2023;18: e0284370. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0284370
- 592 64. Holm RH, Nagarkar M, Yeager RA, Talley D, Chaney AC, Rai JP, et al. Surveillance of RNase P,
593 PMMoV, and CrAssphage in wastewater as indicators of human fecal concentration across urban
594 sewer neighborhoods, Kentucky. *FEMS Microbes.* 2022;3: xtac003. doi:10.1093/femsmc/xtac003
- 595 65. Wolfe MK, Archana A, Catoe D, Coffman MM, Dorevich S, Graham KE, et al. Scaling of SARS-
596 CoV-2 RNA in Settled Solids from Multiple Wastewater Treatment Plants to Compare Incidence
597 Rates of Laboratory-Confirmed COVID-19 in Their Sewersheds. *Environ Sci Technol Lett.* 2021;8:
598 398–404. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00184
- 599 66. Zhan Q, Babler KM, Sharkey ME, Amirali A, Beaver CC, Boone MM, et al. Relationships between
600 SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater and COVID-19 Clinical Cases and Hospitalizations, with and without
601 Normalization against Indicators of Human Waste. *ACS EST Water.* 2022;2: 1992–2003.
602 doi:10.1021/acsestwater.2c00045

- 603 67. Hutchison JM, Li Z, Chang C-N, Hiripitiyage Y, Wittman M, Sturm BSM. Improving correlation of
604 wastewater SARS-CoV-2 gene copy numbers with COVID-19 public health cases using readily
605 available biomarkers. *FEMS Microbes*. 2022;3: xtac010. doi:10.1093/femsmc/xtac010
- 606 68. Vadde KK, Al-Duroobi H, Phan DC, Jafarzadeh A, Moghadam SV, Matta A, et al. Assessment of
607 Concentration, Recovery, and Normalization of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from Two Wastewater
608 Treatment Plants in Texas and Correlation with COVID-19 Cases in the Community. *ACS EST*
609 *Water*. 2022;2: 2060–2069. doi:10.1021/acsestwater.2c00054
- 610 69. Maal-Bared R, Qiu Y, Li Q, Gao T, Hrudey SE, Bhavanam S, et al. Does normalization of SARS-
611 CoV-2 concentrations by Pepper Mild Mottle Virus improve correlations and lead time between
612 wastewater surveillance and clinical data in Alberta (Canada): comparing twelve SARS-CoV-2
613 normalization approaches. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2023;856: 158964.
614 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158964
- 615 70. Mazumder P, Dash S, Honda R, Sonne C, Kumar M. Sewage surveillance for SARS-CoV-2:
616 Molecular detection, quantification, and normalization factors. *Current Opinion in Environmental*
617 *Science & Health*. 2022;28: 100363. doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2022.100363
- 618 71. Dhiyebi HA, Abu Farah J, Ikert H, Srikanthan N, Hayat S, Bragg LM, et al. Assessment of
619 seasonality and normalization techniques for wastewater-based surveillance in Ontario, Canada.
620 *Front Public Health*. 2023;11: 1186525. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2023.1186525
- 621 72. Kitajima M, Ahmed W, Bibby K, Carducci A, Gerba CP, Hamilton KA, et al. SARS-CoV-2 in
622 wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. *Science of the Total Environment*. Elsevier
623 B.V.; 2020. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076
- 624 73. LaTurner ZW, Zong DM, Kalvapalle P, Gamas KR, Terwilliger A, Crosby T, et al. Evaluating
625 recovery, cost, and throughput of different concentration methods for SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-
626 based epidemiology. *Water Research*. 2021;197: 117043. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2021.117043
- 627 74. Barril PA, Pianciola LA, Mazzeo M, Ousset MJ, Jaureguiberry MV, Alessandrello M, et al.
628 Evaluation of viral concentration methods for SARS-CoV-2 recovery from wastewaters. *Science of*
629 *The Total Environment*. 2021;756: 144105. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144105
- 630 75. Schmitz BW, Innes GK, Prasek SM, Betancourt WQ, Stark ER, Foster AR, et al. Enumerating
631 asymptomatic COVID-19 cases and estimating SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding rates via wastewater-
632 based epidemiology. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2021;801: 149794.
633 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149794
- 634 76. Prasek SM, Pepper IL, Innes GK, Slinski S, Ruedas M, Sanchez A, et al. Population level SARS-
635 CoV-2 fecal shedding rates determined via wastewater-based epidemiology. *Science of The Total*
636 *Environment*. 2022;838: 156535. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.156535
- 637 77. Li X, Zhang S, Shi J, Luby SP, Jiang G. Uncertainties in estimating SARS-CoV-2 prevalence by
638 wastewater-based epidemiology. *Chemical Engineering Journal*. 2021;415: 129039.
639 doi:10.1016/j.cej.2021.129039

640



