

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

Wastewater Based Epidemiology as a surveillance tool during the current COVID-19 pandemic on a college campus (East Carolina University) and its accuracy in predicting SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks in dormitories

Avian White, MSEH, DrPH<sup>1</sup>, Guy Iverson, MS, PhD<sup>1</sup>, LaNika Wright, PhD WHNP-BC<sup>3,4</sup>, John T. Fallon III, MD, PhD<sup>2</sup>, Kimberly P. Briley<sup>2</sup>, Changhong Yin<sup>2</sup>, MD, Weihua Huang<sup>2</sup>, PhD, Charles Humphrey, MS, PhD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Environmental Health Sciences Program, Department of Health Education and Promotion,  
<sup>2</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, <sup>3</sup>Executive Director Student Health Services, <sup>4</sup>Associate Vice Chancellor of Health and Wellbeing, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

**Abstract**

The COVID-19 outbreak led governmental officials to close many businesses and schools, including colleges and universities. Thus, the ability to resume normal campus operation required adoption of safety measures to monitor and respond to COVID-19. The objective of this study was to determine the efficacy of wastewater-based epidemiology as a surveillance method in monitoring COVID-19 on a college campus. The use of wastewater monitoring as part of a surveillance program to control COVID-19 outbreaks at East Carolina University was evaluated. During the Spring and Fall 2021 semesters, wastewater samples (N= 830) were collected every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from the sewer pipes exiting the dormitories on campus. Samples were analyzed for SARS-CoV-2 and viral quantification was determined using qRT-PCR. During the Spring 2021 semester, there was a significant difference in SARS-CoV-2 virus copies in wastewater when comparing dorms with the highest number student cases of COVID-19 and those with the lowest number of student cases, ( $p= 0.002$ ). Additionally, during the Fall 2021 semester it was observed that when weekly virus concentrations exceeded 20 copies per ml, there were new confirmed COVID-19 cases 85% of the time during the following week. Increases in wastewater viral concentration spurred COVID-19 swab testing for students residing in dormitories, aiding university officials in effectively applying COVID testing policies. This study showed wastewater-based epidemiology can be a cost-effective surveillance tool to guide other surveilling methods (e.g., contact tracing, nasal/salvia testing, etc.) to identify and isolate afflicted individuals to reduce the spread of pathogens and potential outbreaks within a community.

**Keywords:** surveillance, wastewater, public health, COVID-19, disease surveillance

## 63 **Introduction**

64 The continuous systematic collection of data coupled with its analysis and interpretation  
65 describes the basic tenants of what is considered public health surveillance.<sup>1</sup> Equally important is  
66 the timely dissemination of this information to necessary officials, enabling them to make  
67 appropriate decisions in response to a problem.<sup>2</sup> Thus, public health surveillance systems are  
68 theoretically constructed to provide data to assist in interventions (e.g., inhibit spread of disease).<sup>3</sup>  
69 Indicator-based surveillance systems often includes some type of regular data collection and  
70 weekly alert threshold monitoring.<sup>4</sup> Hence, this system may be effective in monitoring weekly  
71 bacterial or viral concentrations of specified diseases.

72 First used as an indicator tool of community drug use, testing of untreated wastewater has  
73 progressed to measuring infectious pathogens.<sup>5,6,7</sup> The availability of sample procurement; there  
74 are typically multiple wastewater sampling locations (i.e., manholes) and feasibility of sampling  
75 tools (i.e., autosamplers), may enhance the ability to use wastewater as a form of surveillance.  
76 Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is based on the rationale that fecal and urinary  
77 biomarkers may be used to give time sensitive information on population health.<sup>9</sup> Thus, it is  
78 important to determine disease pathogens that may be stable in wastewater or detectable in  
79 sewage. Hence, with the first outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (SARS-  
80 CoV) in 2003, researchers studied and identified the detectability of the pathogen in wastewater  
81 of infected hospital patients.<sup>10</sup> The ability to detect SARS-CoV in wastewater has led researchers  
82 to reasonably conclude that wastewater may be used to detect to viral SARS-CoV-2 resulting  
83 from the current SARS COVID -19 outbreak.

84 The University of Arizona used wastewater-based epidemiology as part of a re-entry  
85 strategy for students returning to campus. Researchers there monitored wastewater in a student  
86 dormitory, where upon detection of SARS-CoV-2 resulted in clinical testing of students living in  
87 the dorm. Officials found WBE important in containing COVID-19.<sup>11</sup> Similarly, an  
88 interdisciplinary team at Norwich University set out to determine if WBE could be used to assist  
89 its school in COVID-19 surveillance and detection .<sup>12</sup> More universities have begun to  
90 incorporate the use of WBE as a part of their COVID-19 mitigation strategies. Schools like UNC  
91 Charlotte have sought to use the results obtained from their wastewater testing as part of their  
92 approach to stemming cases and found it to have been successful at early detection.<sup>13</sup> Thus, East

93 Carolina University implemented a WBE framework to identify dormitories with elevated  
94 SARS-CoV-2 concentrations to guide public health interventions.

95 The aim of this research was to evaluate the use of wastewater-based epidemiology as a  
96 surveillance tool during the COVID-19 pandemic by comparing SARS-CoV-2 concentration in  
97 wastewater to the number of confirmed cases of COVID-19 in dormitories on the campus of East  
98 Carolina University. Specifically, it was hypothesized that dorms with higher numbers of  
99 confirmed student COVID-19 cases would have statistically higher concentrations of SARS-  
100 CoV-2 in their wastewater. It was also hypothesized that sampling and analyses for SARS-CoV-  
101 2 in dorm wastewater would be effective in identifying new cases of COVID-19 in dormitories,  
102 thus potentially helping to prevent possible spread and future outbreaks of the disease.

103

## 104 **Methods**

### 105 *Sample Procurement*

106 Wastewater from dormitories on ECU's campus was collected and analyzed during the 2021  
107 Spring (9 dormitories) and Fall semesters (16 dormitories), respectively. The university utilized  
108 fewer dormitories during the Spring semester, resulting in a difference between sampled dorms  
109 between the semesters. This was attributed to classes being held predominantly online during the  
110 Spring semester and the university only allowing for single occupancy in dormitories. Thus,  
111 fewer students stayed on campus. Wastewater samples were collected Monday, Wednesday, and  
112 Friday excluding holidays and university approved days off (n= 830). Wastewater samples from  
113 each dormitory on campus were collected using Hach AS950 portable samplers with vacuum  
114 tubes extending down a manhole and into the main sewer pipe exiting each dormitory (Figure 1).  
115 Each Hach AS950 used a peristaltic pump to pull wastewater through the tubing from the sewer  
116 pipe into a 7.6-L capacity sample bottle. Sample bottles were encased in ice within the sampler  
117 housing to ensure stability of samples at 4°C. For this study, the pumps were programmed to  
118 collect 21 mL of raw wastewater every 15 minutes, equating to 84 mL per hour, which allowed  
119 for collection of a daily composite wastewater sample. On sample collection days, composite  
120 samples were retrieved from autosamplers and stored on ice until they were delivered to the  
121 Water Research Laboratory at East Carolina University.

122

123 *Figure 1. Flow Diagram of Wastewater-Based Epidemiology on Campus of East Carolina*  
124 *University*

125

126 *Sample Processing*

127 Approximately 95 mL of composite sample was aliquoted into 2 labeled, 50 mL conical  
128 tubes corresponding with the respective dormitory. Samples were heat pasteurized via placement  
129 into a 75°C water bath for 45 minutes (Pecson et al., 2021; Kitajima et al., 2020; Ahmed et al.,  
130 2020). Next, samples were removed from water baths and placed into -80°C freezer to cool  
131 samples to between 2° - 8°C. Temperatures were verified using a Traceable Precision  
132 Thermometer (Fischer Scientific Cat# 150790712). Cooled samples were centrifuged at 4100  
133 RPM for 30 minutes at 4°C, to remove large particles. The supernatant was decanted into new 50  
134 mL ultra-centrifugation conical tubes containing a mixture of  $3.5 \pm 0.1$  g Polyethylene Glycol  
135 8000 (PEG) and  $0.788 \pm 0.01$  g NaCl and mixed until the PEG/NaCl mixture was dissolved. The  
136 resultant solution was centrifuged at  $12,000 \times g$  at 4° C for 30 minutes, ensuring the formation of  
137 the viral pellet. The supernatant was carefully decanted from the conical tube so as not to disturb  
138 the viral pellet. The pellet was resuspended using 1 mL of TRIzol and transferred to the second  
139 sample tube containing a viral pellet (IDEXX, Westbrook, Maine). The resultant 1 mL solution  
140 was transferred into a labeled 2 mL microcentrifuge tube and placed on ice. Samples were  
141 transferred to a Pathology laboratory at Brody School of Medicine, East Carolina University for  
142 RT-qPCR analysis.

143 *Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 Concentration using RT-qPCR*

144 RNA was extracted from PEG8000/NaCl precipitated pellet by combining resultant 1 mL  
145 solution in TRIzol with Lysing Matrix B beads (MP Biomedicals) in a 2 mL microcentrifuge tube  
146 and lysed using the FastPrep-24 5G (MP Biomedicals) at 6 m/s for 30 seconds (1 cycle). The  
147 lysate was centrifuged at  $12,000 \times g$  for 1 minute and transferred to a new 2 mL microcentrifuge  
148 tube and combined with an equal volume of ethanol (95% - 100%). The resultant mixture was  
149 transferred to a Zymo-Spin IC Column (Direct-Zol RNA microprep, Zymo Research) and  
150 centrifuged at  $12,000 \times g$  for 30 seconds, repeated until entire mixture flowed through column.  
151 The column was washed with 400  $\mu$ L RNA Pre-Wash Buffer. Next, 700  $\mu$ L RNA Wash Buffer  
152 was added to the column and centrifuged for 1 minute and then transferred to a new 1.5 mL

153 microcentrifuge tube. RNA was eluted by adding 20  $\mu$ L of nuclease-free water into the column  
154 and centrifuging for 1 minute.

155 Viral RNA was quantified using LUNA SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR multiplex Assay (New  
156 England Biolabs) in a 96-well MicroAmp Reaction Plate with the QuantStudio 5 thermocycler  
157 (Thermo Fisher, Carlsbad, CA.). Primer/probe mix (N1/N2/RP) (1  $\mu$ L), Luna One-step RT-  
158 qPCR 4x Mix with UDG (2.5  $\mu$ L), and nuclease-free water (2.5  $\mu$ L) were placed into 96-well  
159 plate and combined with extracted RNA (4  $\mu$ L). The plate was sealed and centrifuged at 1,000 g  
160 for 30 seconds to push reactions to the bottom of wells. The RT-qPCR detection was  
161 programmed for one cycle of (25°C 30 sec, 55°C 10 min, and 95°C 1 min) and 45 cycles of  
162 (95°C 10 sec and 60°C 30 sec with plate read), using fluorescence HEX for N1, FAM for N2,  
163 and Cy5 for RP targets. A standard curve was generated using diluted synthetic SARS-CoV-  
164 2 (Twist Bioscience) at 0, 10, 100, 1000, and 10000 copies. Prior to 15 February 2021,  
165 quantification of viral copies obtained from wastewater was not achieved, and thus only  
166 presence/absence data were available prior to this date.

167

#### 168 *Student COVID numbers and Vaccine information*

169 The number of confirmed cases of COVID-19 among students was obtained from student  
170 housing databases and only included students residing on campus. The numbers of student  
171 COVID-19 cases for each dorm during each semester were tallied. Total student housing  
172 numbers established at the beginning of the semester were used with the number of positive  
173 cases to determine incidence rates per semester. Student vaccine data were obtained from ECU  
174 COVID-19 vaccine dashboard on the ECU website. The ECU dashboard was a visual  
175 representation published on the university's website used to convey COVID-19 information. The  
176 dashboard was used as a tool to help monitor COVID-19 trends across campus.

#### 177 *Statistical Analysis*

178 Student COVID-19 cases were analyzed for each dormitory on a semester basis to  
179 determine the dorms that had the highest number of COVID-19 cases and dorms that had the  
180 lowest number of COVID-19 cases. The mean SARS-CoV-2 concentration (virus copies per mL)  
181 in wastewater for each dormitory was calculated during the Spring (Feb – May 2021) and Fall  
182 (Aug – Nov 2021) semesters. Mean concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater from

183 dormitories with relatively high student COVID-19 cases were compared to the concentrations of  
184 those with relatively low number of student cases to determine if the differences were  
185 statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). As dormitory capacity differed between Spring and Fall  
186 semesters, only single occupancy was allowed during the Spring, “low” and “high” numbers of  
187 confirmed COVID-19 student cases differed between the two semesters. Additionally, as classes  
188 were predominantly offered online during the Spring, fewer students opted to stay on campus.  
189 Thus, relatively high student cases were classified as dorms having greater than 5 cases in the  
190 Spring and greater than 10 cases for the Fall (dormitories returned to double occupancy during  
191 Fall semester). The normality and linearity of data were evaluated to determine which statistical  
192 tests were most appropriate. A chi-square test of independence was performed to determine if  
193 there was a statistically significant difference between mean viral copies per mL of sample  
194 between dorms with “low” and “high” numbers of confirmed COVID-19 student cases. For  
195 nonparametric data, Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to determine significance between data  
196 consisting of more than 2 categorical grouping variables, while Mann-Whitney testing were used  
197 to analyze significance between 2 samples. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS  
198 (SPSS Institute, Chicago, Ill). SPSS analysis also included a post-hoc pairwise Mann-Whitney  
199 with Bonferroni adjustments. Weekly averages for SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater were determined  
200 during each semester and any increases in the week-to-week viral concentrations were noted. If a  
201 new positive COVID-19 case in a dorm followed an increase in the weekly mean concentration  
202 of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater from that dorm, then the wastewater tests and analyses were  
203 considered an accurate predictor of new cases. Student COVID-19 cases documented the week  
204 following a high viral concentration were tabulated and used to calculate the percentage of time  
205 new cases were identified following high virus counts. Additionally, the relationship between the  
206 number of virus copies in wastewater during the spring semester and the number of student cases  
207 was evaluated using Pearson’s correlation.

## 208 **Results**

### 209 *Comparison of COVID Cases across dormitories*

210 Overall, there was a total of 367 ECU confirmed cases of COVID-19 within the  
211 dormitories during the Spring and Fall semesters of 2021 (Figure 2). The highest number of  
212 cases and highest incidence rates were observed during March (Spring) and September (Fall)  
213 (Table 1, Table 2). Both of the incidence rises align with campus events that may have

214 precipitated or affected the perceived increase in cases. For example, Spring increases occurred  
215 around the time of traditional spring break events for students, while Fall increases occurred  
216 during Labor Day weekend, which also coincided with the first home football game. During the  
217 Spring semester, the Greene, Scott and Jones dorms contained the highest number of COVID  
218 cases (combined total cases, n= 33). The highest mean (M) number of cases for those dorms was  
219 M = 11. Subsequently, White, Clement, and Ballard West dorms had the lowest number of  
220 COVID-19 cases (n = 9) and the lowest average number of cases per dorm (M = 3). For the Fall  
221 semester, sampling results indicated that Clement, Legacy and Fletcher dorms had the highest  
222 number of COVID cases (n = 113), and the three dorms averaged 37.7 cases each. Garrett,  
223 Fleming and Jarvis had the lowest number of cases (n = 21) and averaged 7 cases per dorm.

224

225 *Figure 2. Total number of COVID-19 cases among students residing in dorms during the Spring*  
226 *and Fall 2021 Semesters.*

227 Table 1. COVID Incidence Rates for Sampled Dormitories Between 15 February 2021 and 1 May.

228

Dormitory	Incident Rate (%) of COVID-19			
	February	March	April	Semester
<b>Greene</b>	4.4	2.7	0.0	6.6
<b>Scott</b>	0.7	2.8	0.4	3.9
<b>Jones</b>	0.5	3.6	1.0	5.2
<b>Legacy</b>	0.6	2.9	1.7	5.2
<b>Tyler</b>	0.5	3.2	0.0	3.7
<b>Ballard East</b>	0.6	3.0	0.6	4.2
<b>Ballard West</b>	0.0	2.8	0.6	3.3
<b>White</b>	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.2
<b>Clement</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

229

230

231

232

233



234 Table 2. COVID incidence rates for sampled dormitories between 30 August 2021 and 19  
235 November 2021.

Dormitory	Incident Rate (%) of COVID-19			
	September	October	November	Semester
<b>Clement</b>	11.7	0.3	0	11.9
<b>Legacy</b>	7.4	0.5	0.2	8.1
<b>Fletcher</b>	7.7	0.5	0	8.2
<b>Scott</b>	4.3	0.2	0.2	4.6
<b>Jones</b>	4.3	1	0.3	5.5
<b>Greene</b>	5	0.3	0	5.3
<b>Ballard East</b>	3.7	0.9	0.9	5.5
<b>Tyler</b>	3.7	0.2	0	3.9
<b>Umstead</b>	9	0	0	9
<b>Ballard West</b>	4.2	0.3	0	4.4
<b>White</b>	3.8	0.3	0	4.1
<b>Cotten</b>	4.6	0.5	0	5
<b>Garrett</b>	3.3	0	0.4	3.7
<b>Fleming</b>	5.3	0	0	5.3
<b>Jarvis</b>	0	0	0	0

236

237 Thus, there were large differences in the number of COVID-19 cases between dorms,  
238 with some having 3 or more times as many as others. However, not all dorms housed the same  
239 number of students. Additionally, there were differences in maximum student housing  
240 occupancy for the semesters. For example, during the Spring 2021 semester student housing was  
241 limited to one person residency per dorm room, which was approximately half capacity. The  
242 following semester (Fall 2021) those restrictions were lifted, and rooms could support normal  
243 occupancy, thus allowing multiple students to share a room. It may be possible that the number  
244 of students in the dorms affected the number of COVID cases captured.

245 We also sought to determine whether the number of students in dorms could be used as a  
246 predictor of COVID-19 cases. Using linear regression, results showed that while the model  
247 generated was significant, ( $p = 0.006$ ), it may only explain 10.2% of the variance. Overall, the  
248 number of students in dorms did significantly predict the number of COVID-19 cases detected  
249 ( $\beta_1 = -0.026$ ,  $p = 0.006$ ), with a final predictive model =  $-1.24 + (0.023 * \text{Number of Students in}$   
250  $\text{Dorm})$ .

251 *SARS-CoV-2 Concentration in Wastewater*

252 Concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater exhibited temporal variation between  
253 semesters. Overall, changes in virus gene copies throughout both semesters were observed. Large  
254 increases in SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater during the early Spring semester were  
255 noticed. The City of Greenville was also conducting wastewater-based epidemiology during the  
256 same time frame. While the magnitude of wastewater flow and viral concentrations were  
257 different between the City of Greenville and ECU, both reported large increases in SARS-CoV-2  
258 concentrations in wastewater after the start of the Spring and Fall semesters during February and  
259 September, respectively (Figure 3A, Figure 3B). The September increases corresponded with a  
260 fully re-opened ECU campus and related activities (sports games, Labor Day festivities, etc.).<sup>14</sup>  
261 Near the start of the Spring semester in February 2021, concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in  
262 wastewater increased between 20 – 39% for the City of Greenville while ECU experienced an  
263 increase of 11.2%. Similarly, near the start of the Fall semester of 2021, ECU experienced a  
264 96.3% increase in SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in dorm wastewater while the City of Greenville  
265 experienced a 70 – 89% increase.

266  
267 *Figure 2A. SARS-CoV-2 in dormitory wastewater samples Collected throughout the Spring 2021*  
268 *and Fall 2021 Semesters. Red arrows denote times when the City of Greenville also saw*  
269 *noticeable increases in viral copies of COVID-19 in wastewater.*

270  
271 *Figure 3B. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples for the City of Greenville during the 2021 Year.*  
272 *Red arrows denote times when the East Carolina University also saw noticeable increases in*  
273 *COVID-19 virus in wastewater. Modified from NC DHHS (2022) wastewater sampling*  
274 *dashboard.*

275  
276  
277 *Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 Concentrations in Wastewater from Dormitories with Higher and*  
278 *Lower Student Cases of COVID-19*

279 During the Spring 2021 semester, student COVID-19 testing showed the highest number  
280 of confirmed cases were in the dormitories of Scott (n = 8) and Jones (n = 9). White (n = 2) and  
281 Clement (n = 1) had the lowest number of positive COVID-19 cases. During the Spring  
282 semester, the mean concentration of SARS-CoV-2 among dormitories with the highest number  
283 of student cases was 111.1 viral copies per mL, while dormitories with the lowest number of  
284 cases contained a mean concentration of 7.3 viral copies per mL. This difference was statistically

285 significant ( $U= 10.0, p= 0.002$ ). The results showed a statistically significant positive correlation  
286 between the two, ( $r = 0.642, N= 20, p= 0.002$ ). This indicates that when the number of virus  
287 copies increased there was a corresponding increase in the number of student cases during the  
288 Spring.

289 During the Fall 2021 semester, the dorms with the highest number of students with  
290 COVID-19 were Clement (45) and Legacy (31). Conversely, the dorms with the lowest numbers  
291 of COVID-19 cases were Fleming (8) and Jarvis (3). The mean concentration of SARS-CoV-2  
292 for the dormitories with the highest number of COVID-19 cases was 49.3 viral copies per mL,  
293 while the dorms with the lowest number of COVID-19 cases had a mean of 3.6 viral copies per  
294 mL. This difference was statistically significant ( $U= 34; p= 0.023$ ). A Pearson correlation  
295 performed on the Fall semester data also showed a significant positive relationship between virus  
296 copies and cases, ( $r = 0.522, N= 34, p= 0.013$ ).

297

#### 298 *Wastewater Sampling and Determination of New Cases*

299 Overall, of the 830 samples processed and analyzed, 594 (71%) tested positive for the  
300 virus. Prior to 15 February 2021, quantification of viral copies obtained from wastewater was not  
301 achieved, and thus only presence/absence data were available. However, in the week leading up  
302 to February 15, 2021, positive samples for 77% of dorms were reported. Student COVID-19  
303 cases were confirmed following this sampling period with 55% of dorms reporting cases and  
304 some dorms having multiple cases. Typically, ECU celebrates spring break around the 1<sup>st</sup> week  
305 of March (corresponding here 1 March – 7 March). During 2021, the University did not hold a  
306 traditional spring break, but there was a decrease in the number of students with COVID-19  
307 during that week. It may be possible that some students in keeping with past traditions left  
308 campus (as classes were virtual) and returned later. Additionally, in lieu of a full “Spring Break”  
309 week for students, the university sponsored a “Spring Festival” on 10 March. A 7-fold rise in  
310 cases after the festival and extending through the end of March 2021 was observed (Figure 4)

311 *Figure 4. Time-lapse of mean SARS-CoV-2 virus copy per mL extracted from wastewater and*  
312 *students COVID-19 cases in dormitories during the spring semester. Bars represent mean virus*  
313 *copy per mL and lines represent student cases.*

314 An increase in virus concentrations in wastewater at the beginning of the Fall semester  
315 corresponded with an increase in the number of student cases (Figure 5). More specifically, at  
316 the beginning of semester, testing showed a rise in viral copies of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater  
317 starting on 23 August 2021 (208.2 copies per mL) to 3 September 2021 (1070 copies per mL)  
318 which coincided with a 97.5% increase in the number of students testing positive for COVID-19.  
319 The number of positive students peaked on 4 September 2021. Students that tested positive for  
320 COVID-19 were removed from their respective dorms and placed into isolation dorms. During  
321 that time in isolation dorms, concentrations of viral copies in wastewater from the home dorms  
322 of the students declined 67.2%. Virus copies may have also fallen during this time due to  
323 students traveling for the Labor Day holiday on 6 September 2021. However, when students  
324 began returning to their original dorms from isolation (~10 days, around 13 to 17 September  
325 2021), a 74.1% rise in virus concentration in wastewater sampled from their original dorms was  
326 observed, possibly because those students were still shedding the virus. This may explain the  
327 persistence of relatively high concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater even as the number  
328 of student cases declined.

329

330 *Figure 5. Time-lapse of mean SARS-CoV-2 virus copy per mL extracted from wastewater and*  
331 *students COVID-19 cases in dormitories during the fall semester. Bars represent mean virus copy*  
332 *per mL and lines represent student cases.*  
333

334 Studies have shown persons may shed the virus many days prior to symptom onset  
335 (typically persons seek testing after experiencing symptoms).<sup>15,16</sup> For this reason, new COVID  
336 cases (n= 1) in students that occurred within a week following a high viral count in wastewater  
337 were recorded and the frequency of positive cases calculated. Overall, about 60% of the time at  
338 least 1 new case of COVID-19 was observed following a SARS-CoV-2 concentration of 9.2  
339 copies per mL in wastewater sampled from a dorm. There was great variability between the  
340 Spring and Fall semesters regarding the results though. During the Spring semester, when  
341 wastewater samples from dorms yielded at least 9.2 SARS-CoV-2 viral copies per ml there was  
342 at least 1 new COVID-19 case in dorms within the following week during 47% of the times  
343 tested. New cases of students with COVID-19 were observed the subsequent week following a  
344 testing that yielded 9.2 copies of the virus 73.8% of time during the Fall semester. Additionally,

345 as some students recognized they may have had an increased chance of exposure, they may have  
346 voluntarily removed themselves from dormitories which may have also impacted the results from  
347 that time period, with new cases not showing as students left before being tested. When the data  
348 are reviewed based on percentage increases in SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater and  
349 identification of new cases, less variability is observed between semesters. More specifically,  
350 during the Spring semester, when the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater increased by  
351 24.4% in a dormitory, a new case of COVID-19 was observed 68.8% of the time the week  
352 following the increase. During the Fall semester, a new case of COVID-19 was observed 64.3%  
353 of time the week following a 17.6% increase in SARS-CoV-2 concentration in wastewater.

### 354 *Saliva Surveillance*

355 Students, faculty, and staff participated in saliva surveillance particularly if they had been  
356 exposed to someone who had COVID-19. During the Spring semester, it was required that all  
357 student athletes and 25% of students who lived on-campus participate in saliva testing. As the  
358 university fully opened in Fall 2021, students enrolled in face-to-face classes, residing on  
359 campus and participating in NCAA athletics were required to be a part of the routine  
360 surveillance. At the beginning of the Fall semester at least 50% of on campus students were  
361 required to be tested weekly. However, as the number of cases increased, it was determined  
362 beginning 1 September 2021, that surveillance testing frequency would also increase with  
363 unvaccinated students residing in residence halls. Unvaccinated students living in dorms had to  
364 undergo weekly testing, with some testing being PCR testing. Saliva surveillance of students  
365 living in residence halls during 1 September 2021 through 30 September 2021 were analyzed.  
366 During this time, the University processed 2820 samples with 16 samples (0.56%) testing  
367 positive. During the first 2 weeks the trend in number of positive saliva tests and the mean  
368 concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater was similar. An initial drop in both the mean virus  
369 concentrations in wastewater and the number of positive saliva tests over the first week (3  
370 September to 11 September 2021) were followed by at least 2-fold increases in virus  
371 concentrations in wastewater and positive saliva tests the next week (Figure 6). However, the  
372 trends for mean virus concentrations in wastewater and number of positive saliva tests diverged  
373 in the last week of September 2021. A Spearman's rho correlation determined an overall weak  
374 association between SARS-CoV-2 obtained from wastewater and positive saliva samples ( $r =$   
375 0.200,  $p = 0.800$ ). The overall weak association between virus concentrations in wastewater and

376 the number of positive saliva samples may be because the sample populations were different. All  
377 students that had face to face classes including those that lived off campus were included in the  
378 saliva testing, while the wastewater analyses were only applicable for students that lived on  
379 campus. Thus, the sample sizes and populations were different.

380

381 *Figure 3.6. Positive Saliva Surveillance Samples compared to mean SARS-CoV-2 copies per mL*  
382 *obtained from wastewater.*

383

384

## 385 **Discussion**

386 The COVID-19 pandemic was unprecedented in that it led governmental officials to shut  
387 down and/or pivot routine services. This included educational institutions and many private  
388 businesses. Colleges and universities were tasked with developing and/or incorporating new  
389 ways to monitor SARS-CoV-2 on their campuses to keep students, faculty, and staff safe as  
390 services and operations were gradually restored. WBE was a tool used by ECU to help prevent  
391 the spread of COVID-19. Wastewater solids tend to be negatively charged and SARS-CoV-2 is a  
392 positive-sense single stranded virus.<sup>17,18</sup> Thus, SARS-CoV-2 may sorb to wastewater solids and  
393 the wastewater may be used as an indicator of the virus. This study aimed to determine if  
394 wastewater-based epidemiology was effective as an environmental public health surveillance  
395 system to help control COVID-19 outbreaks on college campuses.

396 An objective of this study was to determine if wastewater monitoring could be used to  
397 reduce the likelihood of outbreaks by triggering student testing and isolation when SARS-CoV-2  
398 concentration in wastewater spiked and subsequent testing for related dorms showed positive  
399 cases. The CDC has stated that COVID-19 outbreaks may be foreshadowed by results of  
400 wastewater tested 7 days earlier.<sup>19</sup> For the current study, it was noted that at specific times during  
401 each semester when a rise in virus concentrations in wastewater was observed an increase in the  
402 number of COVID-19 cases in on-campus students typically (60% of times) followed 5-7 days  
403 later. This same trend was noted when observing percentage increases in virus concentration in  
404 wastewater, where overall new COVID cases were found ~ 71.2% of times. Thus, WBE may  
405 help reduce the likelihood of future outbreaks as this potential 7-day period may provide  
406 meaningful time for public health officials in contacting/identifying potential cases and placing

407 those cases in isolation. This would be of tremendous aid in helping to mitigate the spread of  
408 disease, as this would possibly help to reduce the number of potential contacts for the infected  
409 persons.

410 However, it is important to note that changes in guidelines and protocols may affect how  
411 data are used to predict cases. For example, during the Fall semester, students were allowed to  
412 have visitors that did not live in the dormitories. This was not allowed during the Spring  
413 semester. It is possible that visitors with COVID-19 contributed to viral concentrations in  
414 wastewater to the tested dorms. This may cause a large enough rise in viral concentration to  
415 trigger mass PCR/swab testing without yielding new cases from that specific dorm, thereby  
416 negatively affecting the accuracy of WBE in predicting future cases. Researchers and  
417 decisionmakers need to also be aware of those returning from quarantine and isolation. As  
418 guidelines and timelines change, more people could be introduced back into the dorms  
419 potentially shedding the virus. Studies have shown that the medium detectable timeframe for the  
420 virus in stools was 17 (11-32) days, but some patients may shed up to 59 days.<sup>20,21</sup> Students at  
421 ECU were allowed to leave quarantine and return to their dorms after 10 days. It is not practical  
422 for infected students to isolate for 32 - 59 days due to logistical and social concerns. The  
423 isolation dorm does not have the capacity to house a substantial percentage of the student  
424 population for 1 – 2 months. Furthermore, long-term isolation could excessively burden  
425 university staff and administration due to the time and resource investment required to regulate  
426 compliance and resolve conflicts with students and their families. Therefore, those returning  
427 students may have continued shedding detectable SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater, increasing the  
428 virus concentrations, and triggering “false alarms” regarding the need for saliva testing.

429 Persons may also shed the virus at different rates. Studies have shown persons affected  
430 with coronaviruses typically have lower rates of viral shedding in the initial days, with peak  
431 shedding 12-14 days after disease onset.<sup>22</sup> However, viral shedding is known to occur prior to the  
432 onset of symptoms for SARS-CoV-2.<sup>20,23</sup> These issues may impact an important component of  
433 using wastewater surveillance as a predictor tool. Public health officials have to be able to set  
434 viral thresholds that may trigger additional testing. Skewing of this data may affect the ability of  
435 public health professionals to use one standard isolation protocol. Thresholds for triggering

436 actions such as swarm testing may need to be set for individual entities and may need to be fluent  
437 and allow for change during different time periods of an outbreak.

438 An additional challenge may be testing compliance. The timing and ability to test  
439 suspected persons is important in mitigating spread of the virus. Students often have differing  
440 schedules, and this may impede swarm testing. Some may also feel testing is not important or  
441 they have an aversion to how the test is performed. Politicizing of COVID-19 virus and  
442 vaccinations resulted in polarization of the issue, which may have added to unease of virus  
443 discussion among healthcare professionals. For these reasons, it is imperative that colleges and  
444 universities develop plans to help increase the percentage of students who are compliant with  
445 testing protocols.

446 Despite these challenges, wastewater surveillance may be an effective tool as part of a  
447 comprehensive surveillance system for use by colleges, universities, and other institutions.  
448 Persons who are asymptomatic or have mild symptoms may not realize they are carriers and/or  
449 are spreading the virus. Asymptomatic patients may forego contact tracing, which may lead to  
450 underestimates of the case numbers and may exacerbate the viral spread. Thus, detection using  
451 WBE may be helpful in identifying these cases. Wastewater-based surveillance may also be  
452 useful to determine fluctuations in outbreaks once they become endemic in an area. As viruses  
453 mutate, the virulence and transmissibility may be affected.<sup>24</sup> Upticks in cases may alert officials  
454 to changes in the virus.

455 Additionally, use of wastewater viral data may help inform officials of the efficacy of  
456 existing mitigation strategies and protocols and whether current strategies need to be adjusted. It  
457 may also be used to implement focused surveys or questionnaires to determine compliance with  
458 existing strategies and whether compliance is an issue. Using wastewater-based epidemiology as  
459 an early warning system may allow public health officials to evaluate the spread or potential  
460 future spread of a disease.

461

## 462 **Limitations**

463 While this study aimed to analyze wastewater-based epidemiology in public health  
464 surveillance, several limitations were encountered. Current research has shown SARS-Cov-2



465 may be extracted from wastewater; however, data are lacking on the concentration of the virus  
466 that is typically shed in feces (i.e., illness duration and differences in persons). Thus, it was  
467 possible for us to quantify SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater over time, however we  
468 were not able to estimate or determine the exact number of virus copies that would correspond to  
469 an infected individual. Researchers have also noted as time passed during the semester, it was  
470 difficult to determine SARS-CoV-2 virus copies shed from persons returning from quarantine  
471 and new cases in the same dorm. Additionally, issues such as clogged autosamplers resulting  
472 from inappropriate student waste disposal may have affected the ability to collect full-volume  
473 samples. Student compliance with regards to saliva testing also inhibited timely testing at times  
474 during the semester, affecting case identification. We also were not able to ascertain flow rate  
475 from dormitories into the sewer system, which could be used to determine flow-weighted  
476 concentrations. These data can be valuable in assessing wastewater concentrations since certain  
477 activities (e.g., washing clothes, dishwashing, showering) may generate large flow volumes  
478 without contributing as much virus as toilets or sinks. Thus, sudden declines in SARS-CoV-2  
479 concentrations that are not explainable via public health data could be attributed to differences in  
480 flow on sampling day.

481

482

### 483 **Acknowledgments**

484 We would like to acknowledge ECU facility services, ECU Student Affairs, ECU Student  
485 Health, Cavanagh Lab, Fallon Lab, and the Wastewater lab for their immeasurable help on this  
486 project.

### 487 **Declaration of Conflicts of Interests**

488 The authors declared no conflicts of interest.

489

### 490 **Funding**

491 The authors received the following financial support for research of this project: the Coronavirus  
492 Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES) and American Rescue Plan (ARP) provided to  
493 East Carolina University.

494


## References

1. (CDC) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Public Health Training: Introduction to Public Health Surveillance. 2018. Accessed at: <https://www.cdc.gov/training/publichealth101/surveillance.html>
2. Groseclose SL, Buckeridge DL. Public health surveillance systems: Recent advances in their use and evaluation. 2017. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 38: 57-79
3. Nsubuga P, White ME, Thacker SB, Anderson MA, Blout SB, Broome CV, Chiller TM, Espitia V, Imtiaz R, Sosin D, Stroup DF, Tauxe RV, Vijayaraghavan M, Trostle M. *Public Health Surveillance: A Tool for Targeting and Monitoring Interventions. Disease Control Priorities in Developing Countries*. 2nd edition. Washington (DC). Oxford University Press, New York. 2006. Accessed at. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK11770/>
4. Balajee AS, Salyer SJ, Greene-Cramer B, Sadek M, Mounts AW. The practice of event-based surveillance: concepts and methods. *Global Security: Health, Science and Policy*. 2020. 6(1): 1-9
5. Devault DA, Karolak S. Wastewater-based epidemiology approach to assess population exposure to pesticides: a review of a pesticide pharmacokinetic dataset. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. 2020. 27: 4695-4702
6. Zuccato E, Chiabrando C, Castiglioni S, Calamari D, Bagnati R, Schiarea S, Fanelli R. Cocaine in surface waters: a new evidence-based tool to monitor community drug use. *Environmental Health*. 2005.4: 14. doi :[10.1186/1476-069X-4-14](https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-069X-4-14)
7. Kankaanpää A, Ariniemi K, Heininen M, Kuoppasalmi K, Gunnar T. Current trends in Finnish drug abuse: Wastewater based epidemiology combined with other national indicators. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.06.06
8. Yang Z, Kasprzk-Hordern B, Frost CG, Estrela P, Thomas KV. Community sewage sensors for monitoring public health. *Environmental Science and Technology*. 2015. 49(10): 5845-5846
9. Sims N, Kaspryzk-Hordern B. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology: Monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level. *Environmental International*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.envint.2020.105689
10. Wang MY, Zhao R., Gao L J, Gao X F, Wang DP, Cao JM. SARS-CoV-2: Structure, Biology, and Structure-Based Therapeutics Development. *Frontiers in cellular and infection microbiology*. *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology*. 2020. 10: 587269. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2020.587269>
11. Betancourt WQ, Schmitz BW, Innes GK, Prasek SM, Pogreba Brown KM, Stark ER, Foster AR, Sprissler RS, Harris DT, Sherchan SP, Gerba CP, Pepper IL. COVID-19 containment on a college campus via wastewater-based epidemiology, targeted clinical

- testing and an intervention. *Science of the Total Environment* 2021. 779: doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146408
12. Crowley M. Testing the waters for clues of the pandemic. Norwich Newsroom. 2020. Accessed at: <https://www.norwich.edu/news/2858-norwich-university-wastewater-based-epidemiology-initiative>
  13. Gibas C, Lambirth K, Mittal N, Islam MA, Barua VB, Brazell LR, Hinton K, Lontai J, Stark N, Young I, Quach C, Russ M, Kauer J, Nicolosi B, Chen D, Akella S, Tang W, Schlueter J, Munir M. Implementing building-level SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance on a university campus. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2021. 782: doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146749
  14. (NCDHHS) North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services. NCDHHS Shares Updated Rollout Plan for COVID-19 Vaccinations. 2020. Accessed at: <https://www.ncdhhs.gov/news/press-releases/2020/12/30/ncdhhs-shares-updated-rollout-plan-covid-19-vaccinations>
  15. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, Chung YC, Wong JY, Guan Y, Tan X, Mo X, Chen Y, Liao B, Chen W, Hu F, Zhang Q, Zhong M, Wu Y, Zhao L, Zhang F, Cowling BJ, Li F, Leung GM. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine*. 2020. (26): 672–675
  16. Lewis NM, Duca LM, Marcenac P, Dietrich EA, Gregory CJ, Fields VL, Banks MM, Rispen JR, Hall A, Harcourt JL, Tamin A, Willardson S, Kiphibane T, Christensen K, Dunn AC, Tate JE, Nabity S, Matanock AM, Kirking HL. Characteristics and Timing of Initial Virus Shedding in Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2, Utah, USA. *Emerging Infectious Disease*. 2021.27(2): 352-359
  17. Ye Y, Ellenburg RM, Graham KE, Wigginton KR. Survivability, Partitioning, and recovery of Enveloped Viruses in Untreated Municipal Wastewater. *Environmental Science Technology*. 2016. 50(10): 5077-5085
  18. Jackson CB, Farzan M, Chen B, Choe H. Mechanisms of SARS-CoV-2 entry into cells. *National Review of Molecular Cell Biology*. 2022. 23(1): 3-20
  19. Crowley M. Northfield, Norwich University partner, invited to join national wastewater surveillance system. Norwich University Newsroom. 2022. Accessed at: <https://www.norwich.edu/news/3602-norwich-university-northfield-wastewater-based-epidemiology-initiative>

20. Jones DL, Baluja MQ, Graham DW, Corbishley A, McDonald JE, Malham SK, Hillary LS, Conner TR, Gaze WH, Moura IB, Wilcoz MH, Farkas K. Shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in feces and urine and its potential role in person-to-person transmission and the environment-based spread of COVID-19. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2020. 749: doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141364
21. Huang J, Mao T, Li S, Wu L, Xu X, Li H, Xu C, Su F, Dai J, Shi J, Cai J, Huang C, Lin X, Chen D, Lin X, Sun B, Tang S. Long Period Dynamics of Viral Load and Antibodies for SARS-CoV-2 Infection: An Observational Cohort Study. 2020. Accessed at: medRxiv. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.22.20071258>
22. Cheng P.K.C., Wong D.A., Tong L.K.L., Ip S.M., Lo A.C.T., Lau C.S., Yeung E.Y.H., Lim W.W.L. Viral shedding patterns of coronavirus in patients with probable severe acute respiratory syndrome. *Lancet*. 2004;363:1699–1700. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(04)16255-7
23. Wei WE, Li Z, Chiew CJ, Yong SE, Toh MP, Lee VJ. Presymptomatic transmission of SARS-CoV-2-Singapore. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2020. 69:411-415
24. Shao W, Li X, Goraya MU, Wang S, Chen J-L. Evolution of Influenza A Virus by Mutation and Reassortment. *International Journal of Molecular Science*. 2017. 18(8): 1650. DOI: 10.3390/ijms18081650


- 1 List of Tables and Figures
- 2 Figures.
- 3



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.04.23293359>; this version posted August 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

- 4
- 5 Figure 1 Flow Diagram of Wastewater -Bases Epidemiology on Campus of East Carolina
- 6 University


- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.04.23293359>; this version posted August 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

24  
 25 Figure 2. Total Number of Student COVID-19 Cases Per Dorm During the Spring and Fall 2021  
 26 Semesters


27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.04.23293359>; this version posted August 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

34  
 35 Figure 2A. SARS-CoV-2 in Dormitory Wastewater Samples Collected Throughout the Spring  
 36 2021 and Fall 2021 Semesters. Red arrows denote times where the City of Greenville also saw  
 37 noticeable increases in COVID-19 virus in wastewater.


38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.04.23293359>; this version posted August 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

45  
 46 **Figure 3B. SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater Samples for the City of Greenville During the 2021 Year.**  
 47 Figure obtained from the NCDHHS wastewater sampling dashboard (NCDHHS, 2022). Red  
 48 arrows denote times where the City of Greenville also saw noticeable increases in COVID-19 virus  
 49 in wastewater


50  
 51  
 52



53  
 54 **Figure 4. Time-lapse of Mean SARS-CoV-2 Virus Copy per mL Extracted from Wastewater and**  
 55 **Students COVID-19 Cases in Dormitories During Spring Semester. Bars represent mean virus**  
 56 **copy per mL and lines represent student cases.**


57





59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69

Figure 5. Time-lapse of Mean SARS-CoV-2 Virus Copy per mL Extracted from Wastewater and Students COVID-19 Cases in Dormitories During Fall Semester. Bars represent mean virus copy per mL and lines represent student cases



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.04.23293359>; this version posted August 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

Figure 6. Positive Saliva Surveillance Samples compared to mean SARS-CoV-2 copies per mL obtained from wastewater.

101 Tables

102

103 Table 1. COVID Incidence Rates for Sampled Dormitories Between 15 February 2021 and 01  
104 May.

Dormitory	Incident Rate (%) of COVID-19			
	February	March	April	Semester
Greene	4.4	2.7	0.0	6.6
Scott	0.7	2.8	0.4	3.9
Jones	0.5	3.6	1.0	5.2
Legacy	0.6	2.9	1.7	5.2
Tyler	0.5	3.2	0.0	3.7
Ballard East	0.6	3.0	0.6	4.2
Ballard West	0.0	2.9	0.6	3.3
White	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.2
Clement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

105

106

107

108

109

110 Table 2. COVID Incidence Rates for sampled Dormitories Between 30 August 2021 and 19  
111 November 2021

Dormitory	Incident Rate (%) of COVID-19			
	September	October	November	Semester
Clement	11.7	0.3	0	11.9
Legacy	7.4	0.5	0.2	8.1
Fletcher	7.7	0.5	0	8.2
Scott	4.3	0.2	0.2	4.6
Jones	4.3	1	0.3	5.5
Greene	5	0.3	0	5.3
Ballard East	3.7	0.9	0.9	5.5
Tyler	3.7	0.2	0	3.9
Umstead	9	0	0	9
Ballard West	4.2	0.3	0	4.4
White	3.8	0.3	0	4.1
Cotten	4.6	0.5	0	5
Garrett	3.3	0	0.4	3.7
Fleming	5.3	0	0	5.3
Jarvis	0	0	0	0

112

113

114

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.04.23293359>; this version posted August 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).