

1 **Simultaneous detection and quantification of multiple enteric 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 Keywords: wastewater surveillance, multiplex, pathogen detection

18

19 **Abstract:**

20 Wastewater-based epidemiology has emerged as a critical tool for public health surveillance, building on
21 decades of environmental surveillance work for pathogens such as poliovirus. Work to date has been
22 limited to monitoring a single pathogen or small numbers of pathogens in targeted studies; however,
23 simultaneous analysis of a wide variety of pathogens would greatly increase the utility of wastewater
24 surveillance. We developed a novel quantitative multi-pathogen surveillance approach (33 pathogen
25 targets including bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and helminths) using TaqMan Array Cards (RT-qPCR) and

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

37 **Introduction**

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

47 Expanding wastewater monitoring efforts to include and screen multiple pathogens or variants could
48 maximize the potential of using wastewater as a valuable tool. A tool to better understand the possibility
49 of emerging pathogens or circulating strains in a particular population. The need to expand wastewater
50 monitoring to screen multiple pathogens or variants is a valuable tool to better understand the possibility

51 of emerging pathogens or circulating strains in a particular population. A tool for the simultaneous
52 detection of a broad range of pathogens quickly and accurately could be used for screening followed by
53 confirmatory testing with more sensitive methods. Emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases[18] –
54 including those with pandemic potential[19] – represent ongoing risks to society, and wastewater
55 surveillance can fill critical gaps in data to inform public health responses[20].

56 Based on the demonstrated potential for WBE to complement traditional diagnostic public health
57 surveillance for a diverse array of pathogens, we developed a customized multi-parallel molecular
58 surveillance tool for simultaneous detection and quantification of 33 common pathogenic bacteria,
59 viruses, protozoa, and helminths in wastewater. Such approaches can expand the existing WBE platform
60 by screening for many more pathogens – including rare or emerging microbes of interest – enhancing
61 monitoring to inform public health response. We demonstrate the utility of this method in an analysis of
62 primary influent samples from four wastewater treatment plants in metro Atlanta, Georgia, USA.

63 **Materials & Methods**

64 *Sample Collection*

65 We collected one-liter primary influent grab samples (n=30) in HDPE plastic bottles from four
66 wastewater treatment plants (anonymized as WWTP A, B, C, D) in Atlanta, GA between March 20th,
67 2020 - November 5th, 2020 between 9:30 AM—11 AM. Flow values from the WWTPs ranged from 14 –
68 80.2 million gallons per day. All samples were transferred to the laboratory on ice and stored at -80°C
69 until further processing was completed. Initial sample processing began on November 8th, 2021. Frozen
70 samples were thawed in a 5L bucket of water located in a 4°C walk-in fridge for up to 3 days or until
71 thawed. Samples were then recorded for temperature and pH, and a 50 mL aliquot was taken for total
72 suspended solids measurements (Table S1). Each 1L sample was spiked with 10 µL of Calf-Guard
73 (Zoetis) resuspended vaccine, containing attenuated bovine coronavirus (BCoV), and 10 µL of MS2
74 (10⁵/µL), which served as the process recovery controls. A 1:100 ratio of 5% Tween 20 solution was

75 added to the sample bottle. A graduated 1L bottle was used as a reference for the total volume in each
76 sample bottle. Samples were mixed by inverting the bottle 3-4 times. A subset of samples (n=4) were
77 processed using three different methods to establish a reasonable workflow for the larger scale
78 demonstration: (1) direct extraction, (2) InnovaPrep Concentrating Pipette (CP) Select, and (3) skim milk
79 flocculation (SMF).

80 *Sample Processing*

81 Direct Extraction

82 We directly extracted 200 μ L of wastewater influent into the DNeasy PowerSoil Pro Manual extraction
83 kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany).

84 InnovaPrep Concentrating Pipette

85 150 mL from the wastewater influent sample was transferred into a 500 mL conical centrifuge tube.
86 Samples were centrifuged for 20 minutes at 4800 x g. The 500 mL conical tube was placed under the CP
87 Select, and the fluidics head lowered into the sample. The sample was filtered using a 0.05 μ m
88 unirradiated hollow-fiber CP tip and eluted using the InnovaPrep FluidPrep Tris elution canister.
89 Processing times and eluted volumes were recorded. For each day samples were run, one negative control
90 consisting of 100 mL of DI water was also filtered and processed.

91

92 Skim Milk Flocculation

93 With the remaining wastewater sample, we proceeded to use the SMF method[22]. We combined 1 mL of
94 a 5% skimmed milk solution per 100 mL of wastewater sample and adjusted the pH of the skimmed-milk-
95 wastewater solution between 3.0 – 4.0 using 1M HCl. Samples were placed on a shaker plate at room
96 temperature (20-25°C) at 200 RPM for two hours. After shaking, samples were centrifuged at 3500 x g at
97 4°C for 30 minutes. The supernatant was discarded and the pellet was archived at -80°C until batch
98 extractions were complete within one week.

99 A subset of 4 samples were directly extracted and the TAC results from CP, SMF, and the direct
100 extractions were compared to determine an optimal concentration method prior to full scale downstream
101 processing. Additional details can be found in **Table S2**. In the methods trial, SMF resulted in greater
102 number of pathogen detections and was therefore used for the subsequent full-scale analyses. In the SMF
103 workflow, skim milk pellets were processed for RNA using the Qiagen DNeasy PowerSoil Pro manual
104 extraction kit. One extraction blank was run using nuclease-free water for each batch of sample
105 extractions. Extracts were placed in the -80°C freezer until RT-qPCR or dPCR processing followed
106 within one week. Skim milk pellets were run on TAC with 7% in duplicate. All CP eluants were extracted
107 for RNA using Qiagen AllPrep PowerViral manual kits following manufacturer instructions to be further
108 processed using digital PCR (dPCR). CP and dPCR were used for process controls and fecal indicators in
109 the full-scale analyses.

110 **Molecular Analysis**

111 Two PCR platforms were used to process extracts, the first was an RT-qPCR QuantStudio (QS) 7 Flex
112 (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) and the second a dPCR QIAcuity Four (Qiagen, Hilden,
113 Germany). All skim milk pellets were analyzed using the QS7 Flex. The QS7 works in conjunction with a
114 custom TaqMan Array Card (TAC), which is prespecified with lyophilized primers and probes for 33
115 enteric pathogen targets (see Table S3). Cq values < 40 were considered positive for the target and
116 confirmed through clear amplification signals in the amplification and multicomponent plots. Additional
117 MIQE details are found in Table S12. All CP eluant samples were analyzed using the digital PCR
118 QIAcuity Four platform (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). On the dPCR platform previously designed and
119 optimized multiplex assays were used for bovine coronavirus (BCoV), pepper mild mottle virus
120 (PMMoV), and human mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA)[23] (see Table S4 and Text S1). Gene copy
121 concentration results for PMMoV and mtDNA were used as normalization markers for the TAC pathogen
122 data.

123 **Data Analysis**

124 All project data are available here: <https://osf.io/rg36f/>. When multiple gene targets for a single microbial
125 taxon was detected, we used the highest concentration gene target to calculate summary statistics and
126 supported figures. We used R Studio version 4.2.1 to complete all data cleaning, analyses and generate
127 graphs. Effective volumes (EV) were calculated using the following equation:

$$128 \quad EV = \frac{\mu L \text{ RNA template}}{PCR \text{ rxn}} * \frac{\mu L \text{ pellet into extraction}}{\mu L \text{ extraction eluate}} * \frac{mL \text{ WW volume into SMF}}{\mu L \text{ concentrated pellet}}$$

129
130 The 95% LODs were calculated for each assay using probit models[24]. We translated these 95%
131 analytical LODs (aLODs) into a 95% matrix LOD (mLOD) using the following equation and the
132 previously calculated effective volumes for SMF:

$$133 \quad mLOD = \frac{1}{EV} (aLOD)$$

134


135 **Results**

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

140 *Enteric Pathogen Measurement by Skim Milk Flocculation*

141 The log₁₀-transformed gene copy concentrations by pathogen class and specific enteric pathogen (Figure
142 1) demonstrates the wide range of pathogens detected in Atlanta wastewater influent (n=30). Enteric
143 bacteria, specifically enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC), were detected most frequently and at higher gene
144 copy concentrations compared to helminths and viruses. Notable protozoan detections were
145 *Acanthamoeba* spp. (28/30), *Balantidium coli* (29/30), *Entamoeba* spp. (29/30), and *Giardia* spp. (29/30).
146 While virus detections were relatively lower than protozoan detections, astrovirus (26/30), norovirus

147 GI/GII (28/30), and sapovirus (7/30) were detected in the processed samples. Additional comparison of
 148 prevalence of pathogens by wastewater treatment plant are detailed in Table 2 with Plant C representing
 149 the most samples processed (n=21). Figure S3 demonstrates the log₁₀ gene copies per liter of wastewater
 150 influent stratified by gene targets. Interestingly, with the CP samples we detected *Strongyloides*
 151 *stercorarius* in one wastewater sample (Figure S2 and Table S5).



152
 153 Figure 1. Log₁₀ concentrations of enteric pathogens per liter of wastewater influent using the SMF method
 154 and PowerSoil Pro Manual extraction.

155
 156 Of the SMF samples, the bacterial targets of highest concentration were ETEC and enteropathogenic *E.*
 157 *coli* (EPEC - atypical), whereas viral targets were mainly astrovirus and norovirus GI/GII. Somewhat
 158 unexpected protozoan targets detected were *Cyclospora cayatanensi* (3/30) and *Entamoeba histolytica*
 159 (6/30). Both *Cryptosporidium* spp. and *Giardia* spp. were detected at means of 5.0 log₁₀ and 6.5 log₁₀,
 160 respectively. Of the total samples, we detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in 50% of samples (n=15) at
 161 concentrations between 3.0 log₁₀—6.0 log₁₀ gene copies per liter of wastewater influent.

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

TARGET	WW Plant A (n=3)	WW Plant B (n=4)	WW Plant C (n=20)	WW Plant D (n=3)
<i>Acanthamoeba</i> spp.	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	19 (95%)	3 (100%)
<i>Ancylostoma duodenale</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
<i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
astrovirus	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	19 (95%)	2 (67%)
<i>Balantidium coli</i>	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
<i>Blastocystis</i> spp.	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
<i>Campylobacter jejuni/coli</i>	- (0)	1 (25%)	11 (55%)	- (0)
<i>Clostridium difficile</i>	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	15 (75%)	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>E. coli</i> O157:H7	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	19 (95%)	3 (100%)
EAEC*	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
<i>Encephalitozoon intestinalis</i>	3 (100%)	1 (25%)	13 (65%)	3 (100%)
<i>Entamoeba histolytica</i>	- (0)	- (0)	6 (30%)	- (0)
<i>Entamoeba</i> spp.	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
<i>Enterobius vermicularis</i>	0% (0)	0% (0)	3 (15%)	- (0)
<i>Enterocytozoon bieneusi</i>	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	75% (12)	1 (33%)
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>Giardia</i> spp.	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
<i>Helicobacter pylori</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
<i>Hymenolepis nana</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
<i>Necator americanus</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
norovirus GI/GII*	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
<i>Plesiomonas shigelloides</i>	2 (67%)	0% (0)	10 (50%)	2 (67%)
rotavirus	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	15 (75%)	3 (100%)

<i>Salmonella</i> spp.	3 (100%)	1 (25%)	18 (90%)	2 (67%)
sapovirus*	0% (0)	0% (0)	5 (25%)	2 (67%)
SARS-CoV-2	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	9 (45%)	1 (33%)
<i>Shigella</i>/EIEC†	2 (67%)	0% (0)	19 (95%)	3 (100%)
STEC*	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
<i>Strongyloides stercoralis</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
<i>Trichuris trichiura</i>	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
<i>Yersinia enterocolitica</i>	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)


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

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

169

170 *dPCR for Concentrating Pipette and normalization markers*

171 A total of n=30 CP samples were processed for PMMoV, mtDNA, and BCoV. Figure 2 demonstrates the
 172 log₁₀ gene copies per liter of wastewater influent and indicates PMMoV concentrations exceed mtDNA
 173 concentrations. The average concentrations for BCoV dPCR reactions was 43.3 gc/μL, PMMoV was
 174 1602 gc/μL, and mtDNA was 4.33 gc/μL. The average concentrations of log₁₀ gene copies/liter per
 175 reaction of wastewater was 5.2 x 10⁴ for mtDNA and 1.9 x 10⁷ for PMMoV. All positive controls and
 176 non-template controls performed without suspicion and additional details on control performance is
 177 included in Text S2 and in the dMIQE checklist (Table S11).




178

179 Figure 2. Log₁₀ gene copies per liter of wastewater influent using the InnovaPrep Concentrating Pipette
180 (CP) method. The dashed line represents the limit of detection when calculated as 3 partitions out of the
181 total valid partitions. Figure includes all technical replicates per sample.

182


183 *Pathogen concentrations normalized by mtDNA and PMMoV*

184 Quantitative log₁₀ gene copies per liter of wastewater influent before (Table S6) and after normalization
185 (Tables S7-8), with mtDNA normalization resulting in overall higher log₁₀ ratios. Between Figures 3 and
186 4, we note a considerably smaller ratio when using PMMoV normalization over mtDNA. These
187 concentrations are caused by increased PMMoV concentrations in wastewater influent compared to
188 mtDNA concentrations.



189
190 Figure 3. Pathogen data normalized by mtDNA. The dashed line represents where pathogen and
191 normalizer count are equivalent. Figure includes all technical replicates per sample for mtDNA marker.

192
193



194
195 Figure 4. Pathogen data normalized by PMMoV. The dashed line represents where pathogen and
196 normalizer count are equivalent. Figure includes all technical replicates per sample for PMMoV marker.

197 *TAC Performance Interpretation*

198 Standard Curves

199 The standard curves for this custom TAC included two assays (Adenovirus 40/41 and Hepatitis A) with
200 poor standard curve performances and therefore were excluded from all analyses. Of the remaining 40
201 enteric targets, the DNA control was phocine herpes virus and RNA control was MS2. For performance
202 metrics (Table S9), reasonable linearity was detected for all included assays with an average R^2 value of
203 0.997 across all assays with the lowest R^2 of 0.967 for STEC (stx2) and the highest R^2 of 1 for
204 *Acanthamoeba* spp., *Balantidium coli*, *E. coli* O157:H7, *Giardia* spp., *Plesiomonas shigelloides*,
205 *Salmonella* spp., and STEC (stx1). The lowest efficiency assay was Astrovirus at 87% while the highest
206 was *Entamoeba* spp. at 104%.

207 Effective Volume

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

212 Limit of Detection and matrix LOD

213 The 95% analytical limit of detection (aLOD) was calculated for each assay in Table S9, reported as gene
214 copies per reaction. The lowest detectable target as *Cryptosporidium* spp. at 0.6 gene copies per reaction
215 and the highest as 291 gene copies per reaction for ETEC (LT), followed by 96 gene copies per reaction
216 for STEC (stx2).

217 A comprehensive mLOD table for each assay indicates the gene copy per mL of sewage is found in **Table**
218 **S10** and includes the minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviations, standard error, and confidence
219 intervals. These results indicate average gene copies per mL of wastewater influent as low as 1.591 for
220 *Cryptosporidium* spp. and 16S marker or as high as 264.668 gc/mL for ETEC (LT & ST). SARS-CoV-2
221 mLOD was 16.44 gc/mL influent.

222 Inhibition

223 We used MS2 as the extraction control and the average Cq for negative extraction controls (n=7) was
224 17.8 gene copies per reaction [confidence interval 0.821], whereas all SMP samples (n=30) had an
225 average Cq of 19.3 gene copies per reaction [CI 2.04]. With a Cq difference of 1.5, we can reasonably
226 conclude inhibition was not a major issue with our sample matrix since samples and controls had Cq
227 difference less than 2.

228 **Discussion**

229 Wastewater surveillance sampling, processing, storage, and analysis methods have advanced rapidly since
230 the emergence of SARS-CoV-2. Most studies have examined primary influent[25,26] and solids[27,28].
231 Sampling methods have also varied from grab, composite, and more recently passive techniques[29]. In
232 addition to testing different matrices, many laboratories have implemented various methods to
233 concentrate SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater using ultracentrifugation, polyethylene glycol precipitation,
234 electronegative membrane filtration, and ultrafiltration[22,30], but few have considered a concentration
235 step followed by a simultaneous, multi-parallel quantitative assay or multiple pathogen detection assays.
236 The possibility of high-plex, high throughput platforms are of particular interest to stakeholders looking
237 to expand wastewater monitoring nationally in the US and abroad. For example, the CDC has expanded
238 upon the previously single-plex N1 assay for SARS-CoV-2 to include influenza A and/or B for increased
239 testing capacity.[31]

240 *TAC vs qPCR comparisons*

241 We compared our traditional metrics such as R^2 trends of standard curves and found that our TAC results
242 are within a reasonable R^2 range for almost all assays ($R^2 > 0.96$), except for two explicitly excluded due to
243 poor standard curve performance. Our 95% LODs calculated also indicate a broad range of analytical
244 sensitivities across all pathogen targets. With the lowest detections at 0.6 gene copies per reaction, we
245 also have targets on the higher end of 291 gene copies per reaction for ETEC. While other studies
246 indicate a loss of sensitivity when using TAC, there was still an 89% detection rate compared to single-
247 plex assays run.[32]

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

249 Our qPCR data indicated 10^4 - 10^6 gene copies per liter for SARS-CoV-2 prior to normalization efforts,
250 which is comparable to other studies [33]. Researchers had previously detected *Giardia duodenale*,
251 *Cryptosporidium* spp., and *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* at 82.6%, 56.2% and 87.6%, in combined sewer
252 overflows (CSO) around China.[34] These molecular surveillance findings were also similar to ours at
253 97% (n=29/30) for *Giardia* spp., not specifically *Giardia duodenale*, and 27% (n=8/30) for
254 *Cryptosporidium* spp., and 53% (n=16/30) for *E. bieneusi*. While we detected *Strongyloides stercoralis*,
255 we cannot interpret viability concerns; however, since the preferred host is humans it is possible this
256 detection was a real and rare example of detecting the unexpected. Recent evidence does suggest that
257 *Strongyloides stercoralis* antibodies remain endemic in some rural communities.[35] For the CP samples,
258 we also had a rare detection of *Helicobacter pylori* (n=1/28) and *Hymelopsis nana* (n=3/28) from the same
259 WWTP.

260
261 Groundwater and runoff can intrude into wastewater collection systems through inflow and infiltration
262 (I&I), which may be relevant for fungi and a possibility for other microbial species to mix with
263 wastewater flows.[36] Other potential explanations of sources into wastewater may include animal waste,
264 commercial and/or industrial waste. These influent flows and their sources are difficult to determine, but
265 routine surveillance – including with the addition of source-tracking – may provide additional insight
266 into influent pathogens, their possible origins, and their utility in understanding infection transmission and
267 control in the sewershed.

268 *Value of multiple detections on TAC*

269 Multi-parallel detection of pathogens of interest using TAC can be helpful in long-term surveillance or
270 monitoring of pathogens, including in rapid screening programs or where numerous pathogens may be of
271 interest. Apart from known, emerging, or suspected pathogens, antimicrobial resistance genes or other
272 PCR-detectable targets of public health relevance can be included in TAC design. One key premise of
273 wastewater-based epidemiology and monitoring is the potential value of using the method as an early

274 detection for the onset of a potential outbreak, yet most detection methods have a needle in a haystack
275 approach versus a wider screening that could be especially applicable to state health departments or in
276 routine monitoring.

277 The customizability of TAC has proven useful in other applications such as surveillance of respiratory
278 illness[37][38], acute-febrile illness for outbreak or surveillance purposes[39], and to improve etiological
279 detection of difficult neonatal infectious diseases for low-resource clinical settings.[40] Some studies
280 have focused on applications of combining nucleic acid detection with quantitative microbial risk
281 assessments[41], but none have considered such a broad set of applications to wastewater monitoring and
282 surveillance, although some have applied these methods qualitatively on fecal sludge samples[21,42]. It is
283 possible to create a multiplex assay for digital PCR, the leading technology for wastewater monitoring,
284 for up to five different genes, but no other platform provides quantitative data on up to 48 gene targets
285 during a single experimental run.

286 TAC methods can fill a critical gap in existing molecular monitoring tools. As a method yielding
287 quantitative estimates of potentially dozens of targets, it offers complementary advantages over emerging
288 digital PCR platforms (greater sensitivity and lower limits of quantification, but fewer targets) and
289 sequencing methods (many more targets, but high limits of detection and generally not quantitative). TAC
290 should be considered where targets are present in high numbers – like in wastewaters and fecal sludges –
291 and where many pathogens are of interest.

292 The application of improved methods for the detection and quantification of enteric pathogens in
293 wastewater, in addition to other enteric pathogens of interest, can then be translated into relevant
294 intervention efforts. As SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in wastewater reaches scale [7,25,43], detection and
295 quantification of other pathogens has been proposed. Researchers have expanded on wastewater
296 monitoring to focus increased surveillance on other respiratory viruses such as human influenza and
297 rhinovirus[44], norovirus[45], or as an outbreak detection tool for influenza,[46] and are also considering
298 other emerging infections such as monkeypox.[47]

299

300 *Value of sensitivity of dPCR*

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

309 While SARS-CoV-2 was detected through TAC, we were also interested in detecting additionally relevant
310 targets, including BCoV, PMMoV, and mtDNA, which were not previously included on the TAC. The
311 normalization of pathogen concentrations using mtDNA consistently lowered concentrations across
312 samples and may be useful as a normalization variable instead of or in addition to PMMoV. While
313 PMMoV has been widely used for normalization of wastewater data[48,49], we found the normalization
314 efforts did not drastically reduce the noise-to-signal ratio. While several studies have used PMMoV as a
315 normalization marker for SARS-CoV-2[12,50][51], fewer studies have considered human mitochondrial
316 DNA markers and those who have found the marker to have strong correlations to clinical case
317 counts[52]. Additional studies have also considered the use of crAssphage[12][49], HF183[53][54], and
318 *Bacteroides* ribosomal RNA (rRNA) and human 18S rRNA as other normalization markers to explore
319 using for wastewater fecal concentration data[12].

320

321 *Shedding rates/Limitations*

322 Wastewater sample recovery for SARS-CoV-2 has been successful when using fresh samples, but for
323 many WWTP and their partners it may be unrealistic to complete same-day processing for logistical

324 reasons[55]. This work demonstrated the recovery of pathogen targets using archived grab samples,
325 which makes this approach open to a broader range of applications such as retrospective analyses where
326 clinical data is available or can be linked to these environmental surveillance results. However, more
327 research is needed to understand which recovery methods work best and can be performed efficiently for
328 archived samples.

329 A major limitation to understanding this work is limited data on fecal shedding rates and their
330 incorporation into predictive models. Researchers have gained interest in calculating community-specific
331 or dorm-specific fecal shedding rates specifically for SARS-CoV-2[56][57], but there was no specific
332 information on the fecal shedding rates for this particular population to consider a modeling approach to
333 relate pathogen concentration and clinical case data for asymptomatic individuals. Additionally,
334 sewersheds of different sizes may have specific challenges in determining accurate shedding rates. Robust
335 data on enteric shedding rates is not widely available for high-income countries, but efforts to estimate
336 these variables and their uncertainties have been attempted.[58]

337
338 Another major limitation with TAC methods is the limit of gene target detections one can consider. With
339 the option of detecting many pathogens comes with a need for determining the most relevant genes of
340 interest. While TAC can run up to 48 unique targets, the total amount of template that enters each
341 individual well is $\sim 0.6 \mu\text{L}$. This low template volume, compared to a 2-5 μL of template included in
342 other molecular assays can affect the overall limits of detection for this platform. While singleplex assays
343 may have lower limits of detection, the likelihood of optimizing a multiplex for up to 46 or more agents is
344 unrealistic; therefore, giving TAC a considerable advantage as a high parallel, multiple detection
345 platform.[32] Additionally, these targets and the QA/QC involved require dedicated time and effort to
346 include relevant targets that may change based on future applications. The need for additional replicates
347 run to produce robust analytical limits of quantification are encouraged for future work. Using this
348 multiple pathogen detection tool does not account for variant changes and may not be suitable for all

349 applications. Our findings indicate TAC offers a multi-parallel platform for screening wastewater for a
350 diverse array of enteric pathogens of interest to public health with strong potential for screening other
351 targets of interest including respiratory viruses and antibiotic resistance genes.

352 **Acknowledgements**

353 The authors would like to acknowledge the wastewater treatment plants that permitted sample collection
354 and the National Science Foundation (NSF 2027752- Collaborative Research- RAPID: Wastewater
355 Informed Epidemiological Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2) for financial support in completing this work.
356 DC was supported in part by T32ES007018, Biostatistics for Research in Environmental Health, funded
357 by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to the University of North Carolina at Chapel
358 Hill. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
359 preparation of the manuscript. Specific author contributions were: original draft and data analysis (GR,
360 DC); conceptualization (JB, AB); sample collection and processing (KZ, AK, YL, RC, AL, JK, GR);
361 reviewing and editing (all authors).

362 **References**

- 363 1. Brouwer AF, Eisenberg JNS, Pomeroy CD, Shulman LM, Hindiyeh M, Manor Y, et al.
364 Epidemiology of the silent polio outbreak in Rahat, Israel, based on modeling of environmental
365 surveillance data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
366 *America*. 2018;115: E10625–E10633. doi:10.1073/pnas.1808798115
- 367 2. Lago PM, Gary HE, Pérez LS, Cáceres V, Olivera JB, Puentes RP, et al. Poliovirus detection in
368 wastewater and stools following an immunization campaign in Havana, Cuba. *International Journal*
369 *of Epidemiology*. 2003;32: 772–777. doi:10.1093/ije/dyg185
- 370 3. La Rosa G, Della Libera S, Iaconelli M, Ciccaglione AR, Bruni R, Taffon S, et al. Surveillance of
371 hepatitis A virus in urban sewages and comparison with cases notified in the course of an outbreak,
372 Italy 2013. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2014. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-14-419

- 373 4. Barrett TJ, Blake PA, Morris GK, Puhr ND, Bradford HB, Wells JG. Use of Moore swabs for
374 isolating *Vibrio cholerae* from sewage. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 1980;11: 385–388.
375 doi:10.1128/JCM.11.4.385-388.1980
- 376 5. Moore B, Perry CEL, Chard ST. A survey by the sewage swab method of latent enteric infection in
377 an urban area. Public Health Department. 1950. doi:10.1017/S0022172400019501
- 378 6. Feng L, Zhang W, Li X. Monitoring of regional drug abuse through wastewater-based
379 epidemiology—A critical review. *Science China Earth Sciences*. 2018;61: 239–255.
380 doi:10.1007/s11430-017-9129-x
- 381 7. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, Bibby K, Bivins A, O’Brien JW, et al. First confirmed detection of
382 SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater
383 surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2020;728: 138764.
384 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764
- 385 8. La Rosa G, Mancini P, Bonanno Ferraro G, Veneri C, Iaconelli M, Bonadonna L, et al. SARS-CoV-
386 2 has been circulating in northern Italy since December 2019: Evidence from environmental
387 monitoring. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2021;750: 141711.
388 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141711
- 389 9. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2
390 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the
391 Epidemic in the Netherlands. *Environmental Science and Technology Letters*. 2020;7: 511–516.
392 doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357
- 393 10. Karthikeyan S, Ronquillo N, Belda-Ferre P, Alvarado D, Javidi T, Longhurst CA, et al. High-
394 Throughput Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Detection Enables Forecasting of Community Infection

- 395 Dynamics in San Diego County. Cristea IM, editor. *mSystems*. 2021;6: e00045-21.
396 doi:10.1128/mSystems.00045-21
- 397 11. Morvan M, Jacomo AL, Souque C, Wade MJ, Hoffmann T, Pouwels K, et al. An analysis of 45
398 large-scale wastewater sites in England to estimate SARS-CoV-2 community prevalence. *Nat*
399 *Commun*. 2022;13: 4313. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-31753-y
- 400 12. Greenwald HD, Kennedy LC, Hinkle A, Whitney ON, Fan VB, Crits-Christoph A, et al. Tools for
401 interpretation of wastewater SARS-CoV-2 temporal and spatial trends demonstrated with data
402 collected in the San Francisco Bay Area. *Water Research X*. 2021;12: 100111.
403 doi:10.1016/j.wroa.2021.100111
- 404 13. Jahn K, Dreifuss D, Topolsky I, Kull A, Ganesanandamoorthy P, Fernandez-Cassi X, et al.
405 Detection and surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 genomic variants in wastewater. *medRxiv*. 2021;
406 2021.01.08.21249379. doi:10.1101/2021.01.08.21249379
- 407 14. Fontenele RS, Kraberger S, Hadfield J, Driver EM, Bowes D, Holland LA, et al. High-throughput
408 sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater provides insights into circulating variants. *medRxiv : the*
409 *preprint server for health sciences*. 2021; 2021.01.22.21250320. doi:10.1101/2021.01.22.21250320
- 410 15. Safford HR, Shapiro K, Bischel HN. Wastewater analysis can be a powerful public health tool—if
411 it’s done sensibly. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2022;119: e2119600119.
412 doi:10.1073/pnas.2119600119
- 413 16. Naughton CC, Roman FA, Alvarado AGF, Tariqi AQ, Deeming MA, Kadonsky KF, et al. Show us
414 the data: global COVID-19 wastewater monitoring efforts, equity, and gaps. *FEMS Microbes*.
415 2023;4: xtad003. doi:10.1093/femsmc/xtad003

- 416 17. Medema G, Been F, Heijnen L, Petterson S. Implementation of environmental surveillance for
417 SARS-CoV-2 virus to support public health decisions: Opportunities and challenges. *Current*
418 *Opinion in Environmental Science & Health*. 2020;17: 49–71. doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.006
- 419 18. Nii-Trebi NI. *Emerging and Neglected Infectious Diseases: Insights, Advances, and Challenges*.
420 *BioMed Research International*. 2017;2017: 1–15. doi:10.1155/2017/5245021
- 421 19. Morens DM, Fauci AS. Emerging Pandemic Diseases: How We Got to COVID-19. *Cell*. 2020;182:
422 1077–1092. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.08.021
- 423 20. Zhu K, Hill C, Muirhead A, Basu M, Brown J, Brinton MA, et al. Zika Virus RNA Persistence and
424 Recovery in Water and Wastewater: An Approach for Zika Virus Surveillance in Resource-
425 constrained Settings. *Water Research*. 2023; 120116. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2023.120116
- 426 21. Capone D, Berendes D, Cumming O, Knee J, Nalá R, Risk BB, et al. Analysis of Fecal Sludges
427 Reveals Common Enteric Pathogens in Urban Maputo, Mozambique. *Environ Sci Technol Lett*.
428 2020;7: 889–895. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00610
- 429 22. Philo SE, Keim EK, Swanstrom R, Ong AQW, Burnor EA, Kossik AL, et al. A comparison of
430 SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentration methods for environmental surveillance. *Science of The*
431 *Total Environment*. 2021;760: 144215. doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2020.144215
- 432 23. Zhu K, Suttner B, Pickering A, Konstantinidis KT, Brown J. A novel droplet digital PCR human
433 mtDNA assay for fecal source tracking. *Water Research*. 2020;183: 116085.
434 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.116085
- 435 24. Stokdyk JP, Firnstahl AD, Spencer SK, Burch TR, Borchardt MA. Determining the 95% limit of
436 detection for waterborne pathogen analyses from primary concentration to qPCR. *Water Research*.
437 2016;96: 105–113. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2016.03.026

- 438 25. Randazzo W, Truchado P, Cuevas-Ferrando E, Simón P, Allende A, Sánchez G. SARS-CoV-2
439 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water Research*.
440 2020;181. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.115942
- 441 26. Bivins A, North D, Wu Z, Shaffer M, Ahmed W, Bibby K. Within-Day Variability of SARS-CoV-2
442 RNA in Municipal Wastewater Influent During 1 Periods of Varying COVID-19 Prevalence and
443 Positivity 2. *medRxiv*. 2021; 2021.03.16.21253652. doi:10.1101/2021.03.16.21253652
- 444 27. Graham KE, Loeb SK, Wolfe MK, Catoe D, Sinnott-Armstrong N, Kim S, et al. SARS-CoV-2
445 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with COVID-19 Cases in a Large Urban
446 Sewershed. *Environmental Science and Technology*. 2021;55: 488–498.
447 doi:10.1021/ACS.EST.0C06191/SUPPL_FILE/ES0C06191_SI_002.XLSX
- 448 28. D’Aoust PM, Mercier E, Montpetit D, Jia JJ, Alexandrov I, Neault N, et al. Quantitative analysis of
449 SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and
450 prevalence. *Water Research*. 2021;188: 116560. doi:10.1016/J.WATRES.2020.116560
- 451 29. Schang C, Crosbie ND, Nolan M, Poon R, Wang M, Jex A, et al. Passive Sampling of SARS-CoV-2
452 for Wastewater Surveillance. *Cite This: Environ Sci Technol*. 2021;55. doi:10.1021/acs.est.1c01530
- 453 30. Ahmed W, Bivins A, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Choi PM, Farkas K, et al. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2
454 RNA in wastewater: Methods optimization and quality control are crucial for generating reliable
455 public health information. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science and Health*. Elsevier B.V.;
456 2020. pp. 82–93. doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.003
- 457 31. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC’s Influenza SARS-CoV-2 Multiplex Assay. 14
458 Nov 2022. Available: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/multiplex.html>

- 459 32. Rachwal PA, Rose HL, Cox V, Lukaszewski RA, Murch AL, Weller SA. The Potential of TaqMan
460 Array Cards for Detection of Multiple Biological Agents by Real-Time PCR. Chuang EY, editor.
461 PLoS ONE. 2012;7: e35971. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0035971
- 462 33. Gerrity D, Papp K, Stoker M, Sims A, Frehner W. Early-pandemic wastewater surveillance of
463 SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Nevada: Methodology, occurrence, and incidence/prevalence
464 considerations. Water Research X. 2021;10: 100086. doi:10.1016/j.wroa.2020.100086
- 465 34. Li N, Xiao L, Wang L, Zhao S, Zhao X, Duan L, et al. Molecular Surveillance of *Cryptosporidium*
466 spp., *Giardia duodenalis*, and *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* by Genotyping and Subtyping Parasites in
467 Wastewater. Walson JL, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2012;6: e1809.
468 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0001809
- 469 35. Russell ES, Gray EB, Marshall RE, Davis S, Beaudoin A, Handali S, et al. Prevalence of
470 *Strongyloides stercoralis* Antibodies among a Rural Appalachian Population—Kentucky, 2013. The
471 American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2014;91: 1000–1001. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.14-
472 0310
- 473 36. Barber C, Crank K, Papp K, Innes GK, Schmitz BW, Chavez J, et al. Community-Scale Wastewater
474 Surveillance of *Candida auris* during an Ongoing Outbreak in Southern Nevada. Environ Sci
475 Technol. 2023;57: 1755–1763. doi:10.1021/acs.est.2c07763
- 476 37. Weinberg GA, Schnabel KC, Erdman DD, Prill MM, Iwane MK, Shelley LM, et al. Field evaluation
477 of TaqMan Array Card (TAC) for the simultaneous detection of multiple respiratory viruses in
478 children with acute respiratory infection. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2013;57: 254–260.
479 doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2013.03.016

- 480 38. Kodani M, Yang G, Conklin LM, Travis TC, Whitney CG, Anderson LJ, et al. Application of
481 TaqMan Low-Density Arrays for Simultaneous Detection of Multiple Respiratory Pathogens. *J Clin*
482 *Microbiol.* 2011;49: 2175–2182. doi:10.1128/JCM.02270-10
- 483 39. Liu J, Ochieng C, Wiersma S, Ströher U, Towner JS, Whitmer S, et al. Development of a TaqMan
484 Array Card for Acute-Febrile-Illness Outbreak Investigation and Surveillance of Emerging
485 Pathogens, Including Ebola Virus. McAdam AJ, editor. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2016;54: 49–58.
486 doi:10.1128/JCM.02257-15
- 487 40. Diaz MH, Waller JL, Napoliello RA, Islam MdS, Wolff BJ, Burken DJ, et al. Optimization of
488 Multiple Pathogen Detection Using the TaqMan Array Card: Application for a Population-Based
489 Study of Neonatal Infection. Lin B, editor. *PLoS ONE.* 2013;8: e66183.
490 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066183
- 491 41. Capone D, Bivins A, Knee J, Cumming O, Nalá R, Brown J. Quantitative Microbial Risk
492 Assessment of Pediatric Infections Attributable to Ingestion of Fecally Contaminated Domestic
493 Soils in Low-Income Urban Maputo, Mozambique. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2021;55: 1941–1952.
494 doi:10.1021/acs.est.0c06972
- 495 42. Capone D, Chigwechokha P, de los Reyes FL, Holm RH, Risk BB, Tilley E, et al. Impact of
496 sampling depth on pathogen detection in pit latrines. Lamberton PHL, editor. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.*
497 2021;15: e0009176. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0009176
- 498 43. Ahmed W, Simpson SL, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Bivins A, Blackall LL, et al. Minimizing errors in
499 RT-PCR detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA for wastewater surveillance. *Science of*
500 *The Total Environment.* 2022;805: 149877. doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2021.149877
- 501 44. Boehm AB, Hughes B, Duong D, Chan-Herur V, Buchman A, Wolfe MK, et al. Wastewater
502 concentrations of human influenza, metapneumovirus, parainfluenza, respiratory syncytial virus,

- 503 rhinovirus, and seasonal coronavirus nucleic-acids during the COVID-19 pandemic: a surveillance
504 study. *The Lancet Microbe*. 2023; S266652472200386X. doi:10.1016/S2666-5247(22)00386-X
- 505 45. Markt R, Stillebacher F, Nägele F, Kammerer A, Peer N, Payr M, et al. Expanding the Pathogen
506 Panel in Wastewater Epidemiology to Influenza and Norovirus. *Viruses*. 2023;15: 263.
507 doi:10.3390/v15020263
- 508 46. Wolfe MK, Duong D, Bakker KM, Ammerman M, Mortenson L, Hughes B, et al. Wastewater-
509 Based Detection of Two Influenza Outbreaks. *Environ Sci Technol Lett*. 2022;9: 687–692.
510 doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.2c00350
- 511 47. Wolfe MK, Duong D, Hughes B, Chan-Herur V, White BJ, Boehm AB. Detection of monkeypox
512 viral DNA in a routine wastewater monitoring program. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*;
513 2022 Jul. doi:10.1101/2022.07.25.22278043
- 514 48. Rainey AL, Liang S, Bisesi JH, Sabo-Attwood T, Maurelli AT. A multistate assessment of
515 population normalization factors for wastewater-based epidemiology of COVID-19. Sambri V,
516 editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2023;18: e0284370. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0284370
- 517 49. Holm RH, Nagarkar M, Yeager RA, Talley D, Chaney AC, Rai JP, et al. Surveillance of RNase P,
518 PMMoV, and CrAssphage in wastewater as indicators of human fecal concentration across urban
519 sewer neighborhoods, Kentucky. *FEMS Microbes*. 2022;3: xtac003. doi:10.1093/femsmc/xtac003
- 520 50. Zhan Q, Babler KM, Sharkey ME, Amirali A, Beaver CC, Boone MM, et al. Relationships between
521 SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater and COVID-19 Clinical Cases and Hospitalizations, with and without
522 Normalization against Indicators of Human Waste. *ACS EST Water*. 2022;2: 1992–2003.
523 doi:10.1021/acsestwater.2c00045

- 524 51. Wolfe MK, Archana A, Catoe D, Coffman MM, Dorevich S, Graham KE, et al. Scaling of SARS-
525 CoV-2 RNA in Settled Solids from Multiple Wastewater Treatment Plants to Compare Incidence
526 Rates of Laboratory-Confirmed COVID-19 in Their Sewersheds. *Environ Sci Technol Lett.* 2021;8:
527 398–404. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00184
- 528 52. Hutchison JM, Li Z, Chang C-N, Hiripitiyage Y, Wittman M, Sturm BSM. Improving correlation of
529 wastewater SARS-CoV-2 gene copy numbers with COVID-19 public health cases using readily
530 available biomarkers. *FEMS Microbes.* 2022;3: xtac010. doi:10.1093/femsmc/xtac010
- 531 53. Feng S, Roguet A, McClary-Gutierrez JS, Newton RJ, Kloczko N, Meiman JG, et al. Evaluation of
532 Sampling, Analysis, and Normalization Methods for SARS-CoV-2 Concentrations in Wastewater to
533 Assess COVID-19 Burdens in Wisconsin Communities. *ACS EST Water.* 2021;1: 1955–1965.
534 doi:10.1021/acsestwater.1c00160
- 535 54. Vadde KK, Al-Duroobi H, Phan DC, Jafarzadeh A, Moghadam SV, Matta A, et al. Assessment of
536 Concentration, Recovery, and Normalization of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from Two Wastewater
537 Treatment Plants in Texas and Correlation with COVID-19 Cases in the Community. *ACS EST*
538 *Water.* 2022;2: 2060–2069. doi:10.1021/acsestwater.2c00054
- 539 55. Kitajima M, Ahmed W, Bibby K, Carducci A, Gerba CP, Hamilton KA, et al. SARS-CoV-2 in
540 wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. *Science of the Total Environment.* Elsevier
541 B.V.; 2020. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076
- 542 56. Prasek SM, Pepper IL, Innes GK, Slinski S, Ruedas M, Sanchez A, et al. Population level SARS-
543 CoV-2 fecal shedding rates determined via wastewater-based epidemiology. *Science of The Total*
544 *Environment.* 2022;838: 156535. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.156535
- 545 57. Schmitz BW, Innes GK, Prasek SM, Betancourt WQ, Stark ER, Foster AR, et al. Enumerating
546 asymptomatic COVID-19 cases and estimating SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding rates via wastewater-

547 based epidemiology. Science of The Total Environment. 2021;801: 149794.

548 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149794

549 58. Li X, Zhang S, Shi J, Luby SP, Jiang G. Uncertainties in estimating SARS-CoV-2 prevalence by

550 wastewater-based epidemiology. Chemical Engineering Journal. 2021;415: 129039.

551 doi:10.1016/j.cej.2021.129039

552