

# 1 Non-detection of emerging and re-emerging pathogens in wastewater 2 surveillance to confirm absence of transmission risk: a case study of 3 polio in New York

## 4 Article summary line

5 Wastewater surveillance can confirm the absence of transmission risk of an emerging disease with  
6 repeated non-detections, with a case study of polio.

## 7 Running title

8 Non-detection of pathogens in wastewater

## 9 Keywords

10 Emerging pathogens; wastewater surveillance; polio; freedom from disease; non-detection

## 11 Authors

12 David A Larsen<sup>1\*</sup>, Dustin Hill<sup>1</sup>, Yifan Zhu<sup>1</sup>, Mohammed Alazawi<sup>2</sup>, Dana Chatila<sup>1</sup>, Christopher Dunham<sup>1</sup>,  
13 Catherine Faruolo<sup>1</sup>, Brandon Ferro<sup>3</sup>, Alejandro Godinez<sup>2</sup>, Brianna Hanson<sup>2,4</sup>, Tabassum Insaf<sup>2</sup>, Dan Lang<sup>2</sup>,  
14 Dana Neigel<sup>2,4</sup>, Milagros Neyra<sup>1</sup>, Nicole Pulido<sup>1</sup>, Max Wilder<sup>3</sup>, Nan Yang<sup>1</sup>, Brittany Kmush<sup>1</sup>, Hyatt Green<sup>3</sup>

## 15 Affiliations

16 1. Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, USA

17 2. New York State Department of Health, Albany, NY, USA

18 3. SUNY-ESF, Department of Environmental Biology, Syracuse, NY, USA

19 4. CDC Foundation, Atlanta, GA, USA

20 \* Corresponding author: [dalarsen@syr.edu](mailto:dalarsen@syr.edu)

## 21 Abstract

22 Infectious disease surveillance systems, including wastewater surveillance, can alert communities to the  
23 threat of emerging pathogens. We need methods to infer understanding of transmission dynamics from  
24 non-detection. We estimate a sensitivity of detection of poliovirus in wastewater to inform the  
25 sensitivity of wastewater surveillance for poliovirus using both a clinical epidemiology and fecal  
26 shedding approach. We then apply freedom from disease to estimate the sensitivity of the wastewater  
27 surveillance network. Estimated sensitivity to detect a single poliovirus infection was low, <11% at most  
28 wastewater treatment plants and <3% in most counties. However, the maximum threshold for the  
29 number of infections when polio is not detected in wastewater was much lower. Prospective  
30 wastewater surveillance can confirm the absence of a polio threat and be escalated in the case of  
31 poliovirus detection. These methods can be applied to any emerging or re-emerging pathogen, and  
32 improve understanding from wastewater surveillance.

## 33 Introduction

34

35 Increasing vaccine hesitancy<sup>1</sup> and pandemic-disrupted childhood vaccine schedules<sup>2</sup> raise the potential  
36 for polio outbreaks in countries where polio had previously been eliminated. For example in 2022,  
37 London, England saw sustained transmission of polio (but no paralytic cases)<sup>3</sup> and New York State had a  
38 paralytic polio case and detection of poliovirus in wastewater also in 2022.<sup>4,5</sup> Although completely  
39 effective at preventing paralysis from a polio infection, the inactivated polio vaccine administered in the  
40 US and other wealthy countries is not completely effective at preventing onward transmission.<sup>6</sup> Further,  
41 county- and state-level vaccine coverages mask gaps in community-level vaccine coverages, with  
42 pockets of communities with very low vaccine uptake.<sup>7</sup>

43 In the United States, the transmission of poliovirus is currently monitored through acute flaccid paralysis  
44 (AFP) surveillance and follow-up testing for poliovirus. However, AFP is estimated to occur only once in  
45 200 wildtype polio infections and once in 2,000 infections of vaccine-derived poliovirus (VDPV).<sup>8</sup>  
46 Moreover, with high polio vaccination coverage the vast majority of infections are asymptomatic<sup>9</sup>  
47 suggesting that poliovirus could circulate without AFP surveillance providing any indication.

48 Testing for poliovirus in wastewater complements AFP surveillance across the globe,<sup>10</sup> often to good  
49 effect. For example, in Pakistan, polio circulation was detected via wastewater an average of four  
50 months before AFP surveillance.<sup>11</sup> And in Israel, detection of poliovirus in wastewater prompted a  
51 vaccine campaign that was able to prevent any paralytic cases of polio.<sup>12</sup> Despite the utility of  
52 wastewater surveillance for polio and its widespread implementation, its sensitivity is not well defined.  
53 Previously, the sensitivity of wastewater surveillance to detect polio has been estimated to be 35-50% in  
54 Afghanistan and Pakistan depending on the sampling site and immunization activities.<sup>8</sup> These estimates  
55 are helpful, but are only derived from a single context. Accurate estimates of sensitivity are essential for  
56 estimating the probability of not only detecting an emerging pathogen, but also that the community is  
57 free from transmission upon consecutive non-detections following freedom from disease principles.<sup>13,14</sup>

58 In July of 2022 a local case of VDPV was confirmed in a patient with AFP in Rockland County, New York.<sup>4</sup>  
59 Immediately in coordination with the CDC, New York State's wastewater surveillance network began  
60 testing for polio in the wastewater throughout Rockland County, surrounding counties, New York City,  
61 and Long Island.<sup>5</sup> Widespread detection of poliovirus in the wastewater of Rockland County and five  
62 surrounding jurisdictions led New York State to declare a disaster emergency.<sup>15</sup> To aid interpretation of  
63 the non-detection of poliovirus in wastewater, we estimated the sensitivity of wastewater in detecting  
64 circulating poliovirus within each county and individual sewersheds using two different approaches: one  
65 based on spatiotemporal coverage of a represented population and another based on mass balance and  
66 fecal shedding. Based partially on these estimates, we outline a wastewater surveillance plan  
67 considering polio vaccine coverage to ensure both the elimination of polio transmission and provide  
68 early indication of any polio re-emergence.

## 69 Methods

### 70 Estimating sensitivity of wastewater surveillance of poliovirus

71 The sensitivity of an infectious disease surveillance system to detect emerging threats such as polio is a  
72 product of the population coverage, the temporal coverage, and the sensitivity of detection.<sup>16</sup> For

73 wastewater surveillance, the sensitivity of detection is determined by the limit of detection of the  
74 pathogen in wastewater, which is typically driven by the population served (dilution) and the amount of  
75 genetic material shed into wastewater. We used equation 1 to estimate the sensitivity of wastewater  
76 surveillance for poliovirus. We defined population coverage ( $C_p$ ) as the proportion of the population  
77 connected to the wastewater surveillance network. For estimates at the treatment plant level we  
78 assumed 100%. For estimates at the county level we use the calculated proportion of the population  
79 connected to the wastewater surveillance network from our previous work.<sup>17</sup> We relate temporal  
80 coverage ( $C_t$ ) to the length of poliovirus fecal shedding. Polio infections on average shed virus in feces  
81 for 3-4 weeks (midpoint of 25 days).<sup>18</sup> We divided 25 days by the number of days between consecutive  
82 wastewater sampling events. For sampling intervals smaller than 25 days we assigned  $C_t$  a value of  
83 100%. We estimated the sensitivity of detection ( $Se_d$ ) in two ways. First, we analyzed the New York State  
84 polio outbreak of 2022.<sup>4</sup> Second, we used modeled estimates of viral copy detection per wastewater  
85 treatment plant flow.

86

$WWS_{sensitivity} = C_p \times C_t \times Se_d$	Equation 1: The sensitivity of wastewater surveillance to detect a pathogen such as polio ( $WWS_{sensitivity}$ ) is a product of three proportions: 1) the population coverage of wastewater surveillance ( $C_p$ ), 2) the temporal coverage of wastewater surveillance ( $C_t$ ), and 3) the sensitivity of detection ( $Se_d$ ) or limit of detection of the wastewater test.
--	---

87

88

89 **The New York State polio outbreak of 2022** was identified when a young adult presented to the hospital  
90 with AFP caused by vaccine-derived poliovirus.<sup>4</sup> No other paralysis cases have yet been observed (as of  
91 June 2023), despite numerous detections of poliovirus DNA in wastewater in multiple communities.  
92 From the literature we assumed that one paralysis case of vaccine-derived poliovirus occurs for every  
93 2,000 infections.<sup>8</sup> Equation 2 shows our approach to estimating the sensitivity of detection from the  
94 New York State polio outbreak. We first simulated the total number of polio infections among  
95 unvaccinated individuals with 10,000 iterations ( $n$ ) of a binomial distribution ( $B$ ) using a probability of 1  
96 paralytic case per 2,000 infections ( $p$ ). From this number of infections we calculated a prevalence of  
97 polio among unvaccinated individuals ( $prev_{unvaccinated}$ ). Assuming equal mixing among unvaccinated and  
98 vaccinated populations, we applied the prevalence of polio among unvaccinated individuals to the  
99 population of vaccinated individuals and estimated the number of polio infections among vaccinated  
100 individuals. We then distributed the total number of infections across the sewersheds where poliovirus  
101 was detected proportional to the population of the sewershed. Lastly, the population size required for 1  
102 successful detection in the sewershed was divided by population to get the detection sensitivity.

$Se_d = \frac{population_{detect1}}{population_{wwtp}}$ $population_{detect1} = \frac{population_{wwtp}}{infections_{S_{wwtp}}}$ $infections_{S_{wwtp}} = infections_{total} \times w_{wwtp}$ $w = \text{popoulation weight of wwtp}$ $infections_{total} = infections_{unvaccinated} + infections_{vaccinated}$ $infections_{vaccinated} = prev_{unvaccinated} \times population_{vaccinated}$ $infections_{unvaccinated} \sim B(n,p)$ $n = 10,000$ $p = 1/2,000$	<p>Equation 2: Estimate of the sensitivity of wastewater surveillance to detect a poliovirus infection using the New York State polio case of 2022</p>
--	--

103

104 **Fecal shedding studies of poliovirus** are limited with fecal shedding studies reporting duration and  
 105 temporality of shedding but not quantity.<sup>18</sup> Still, Berchenko et al. estimated that wastewater  
 106 surveillance was able to identify one poliovirus shedder per 400,000 liters of sewage following an oral  
 107 polio vaccine campaign in Israel.<sup>19</sup> We can then estimate the sensitivity of wastewater surveillance to  
 108 identify poliovirus circulation as a function of a wastewater treatment plant’s daily flow using Berchenko  
 109 et al.’s estimate (Equation 3). We applied the mean daily flow to estimates of sensitivity for each  
 110 treatment plant. For any treatment plant without mean daily flow we applied an estimated mean ratio  
 111 of daily flow to permitted discharge capacity of those treatment plants with data to those treatment  
 112 plants without data.

$Se_d = \frac{400,000L}{daily\ flow\ in\ liters_{ww}}$ $Limit\ of\ detection = \frac{1\ polio\ shedder}{400,000L_{ww}}$	<p>Equation 3: Estimate of lower limit of sensitivity of wastewater surveillance to detect a single poliovirus infection based upon limits of detection calculated by Berchenko et al.<sup>19</sup></p>
---	---

113 [Understanding non-detection of poliovirus](#)

114 With the estimated sensitivity of the wastewater surveillance network to detect poliovirus from  
 115 equation 1, we calculated the probability that a community was free from poliovirus circulation  
 116 (freedom from disease) using equation 4. From the two estimated sensitivities of detection ( $Se_d$  in  
 117 equations 2 and 3) we applied whichever was lower. We estimated this probability for three consecutive  
 118 non-detections of poliovirus in wastewater for all treatment plants in the state network and for each NY  
 119 state county. Reversing equation 1, a sensitivity of 63% is required to obtain 95% confidence in zero  
 120 infections with three consecutive non-detections. We estimated an upper limit of the number of  
 121 poliovirus infections present with three consecutive non-detections of poliovirus in wastewater for all  
 122 treatment plants in the state network and for each NY state county using equation 5.

$FFD_{poliovirus} = 1 - (1 - WWS_{sensitivity})^n$	Equation 4: Probable confidence in the community being free from poliovirus circulation following a non-detection of poliovirus in wastewater. $WWS_{sensitivity}$ is estimated from equation 1; n is the number of consecutive non-detections.
--	---

123

$Upper\ limit_{poliovirus} = 0.63/WWS_{sensitivity}$	Equation 5: Reversing equation 4, a $WWS_{sensitivity}$ of 63% is required to ensure 95% confidence in zero infections with three consecutive non-detections. The upper limit of poliovirus infections in a community can be estimated as 0.63 divided by the actual estimated $WWS_{sensitivity}$ .
--	--

124

## 125 [Spatial comparison of vaccination rates](#)

126 We compared zip code level polio vaccination rates provided by New York State Department of Health  
127 to municipal wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) catchment areas in NY with permitted discharge  
128 capacity of at least 1 million gallons per day (mgd). Zip codes with vaccination rates of less than 70% that  
129 intersected with sewersheds were flagged as being areas that were both extra vulnerable to polio  
130 transmission and also within the wastewater surveillance network. Sewersheds that intersected with  
131 these zip codes were then classified for whether they would be routine participants in the state's  
132 wastewater surveillance network (i.e., permitted discharge capacity above 1 mgd) or if they would not  
133 be routinely tested but could be enrolled for testing under special circumstances. Zip codes that did not  
134 intersect with any sewersheds were also noted as potential blind spots for the use of wastewater to test  
135 for polio presence.

136 We also explored other potential risk factors for polio circulation including social vulnerability. We  
137 estimated the Centers for Disease Control's (CDC) Social Vulnerability Index (SVI)<sup>20</sup> for each sewershed.  
138 The SVI uses U.S. Census data to identify if a community might have greater vulnerability to external  
139 stressors that might make the area at higher risk for negative outcomes of natural disasters or disease  
140 outbreaks. SVI values range from 0 to 1 with higher indexes being more vulnerable. We calculate the  
141 mean SVI for each sewershed from the NY census tracts that intersected with the sewershed. We then  
142 assessed correlation between the SVI and polio vaccine coverage using a Pearson correlation test. All  
143 spatial analyses were conducted in R programming software<sup>21</sup> using the package "sf".<sup>22</sup>

## 144 [Results](#)

### 145 [Estimating sensitivity of wastewater surveillance of poliovirus](#)

146 From the New York State polio outbreak we estimated 1,401 unvaccinated individuals infected with  
147 polio (95% CI = 1,359-1,439) in the counties with polio found in the wastewater. This represents a  
148 prevalence of 0.13% (95% CI = 0.12 – 0.13%) among the 1,115,881 unvaccinated individuals across the  
149 study area. Assuming the same prevalence among the 4,329,977 vaccinated individuals across the study  
150 area we estimated 5,436 vaccinated individuals infected with polio (95% CI = 5,273 – 5,584). After  
151 distributing all 6,837 estimated polio infections (95% CI = 6,632 – 7,023) across wastewater treatment  
152 plants proportional to the population served by the wastewater treatment plant we estimate that

153 wastewater surveillance was consistently able to detect one polio infection among 472 people  
 154 connected to the sewer system (95% CI = 460 – 487). This resulted in a sensitivity of detection of a single  
 155 polio infection ranging from 0.04% in the largest treatment plant in the study area to 12.2% in the  
 156 smallest (Table 1).

157 Using Berchenko et al’s estimate of wastewater surveillance being able to detect one polio infection per  
 158 400,000 liters of flow (95% CI: 231,000-656,000),<sup>19</sup> we find the sensitivity of detection to range from  
 159 0.05% in the largest treatment plants in the study area to 8.5% in the smallest (Table 1).


160 Table 1: Estimates of the probability of having at least one paralytic case among unvaccinated infections and lower limits of  
 161 sensitivity of detection of poliovirus in wastewater based upon a single paralytic polio case in Rockland County, NY and  
 162 subsequent detections of poliovirus in wastewater in surrounding counties using the New York State polio outbreak.

County	Treatment plant	WWTP capacity (millions of liters)	Population served	Paralytic polio cases	Polio vaccine coverage	Estimated polio infections (95% CI)	Approach #1 estimated sensitivity of detection (95% CI)	Approach #2 estimated sensitivity of detection (95% CI)	Approach #3 estimated sensitivity of detection (95% CI)
Kings (Brooklyn)	Coney Island	416	711,000	0	85%	1505 (1459 – 1545)	0.07% (0.06 – 0.07%)	0.13% (0.07 – 0.22%)	
Kings (Brooklyn)	Newtown Creek	1,173	1,197,000	0	87%	2533 (2457 – 2602)	0.04% (0.04 – 0.04%)	0.05% (0.03 – 0.09%)	
Kings (Brooklyn)	Owls Head	454	825,000	0	86%	1746 (1693 – 1793)	0.06% (0.06 – 0.06%)	0.11% (0.06 – 0.18%)	
Nassau	Port Washington	15	21,000	0	66%	44 (43 – 46)	2.3% (2.2 – 2.3%)	3.87% (2.29 – 6.52%)	
Orange	Harriman	23	43,000	0	53%	91 (88 – 93)	1.1% (1.1 – 1.1%)	2.24% (1.32 – 3.76%)	
Richmond (Staten Island)	Port Richmond	227	211,000	0	86%	447 (433 – 459)	0.2% (0.2 – 0.2%)	0.38% (0.22 – 0.64%)	
Rockland	Rockland County #1	109	207,000	1	76%	438 (425 – 450)	0.2% (0.2 – 0.2%)	0.48% (0.29 – 0.81%)	
Rockland	Western Ramapo	5.7	4,000	0	66%	9 (8 – 9)	11.8% (11.5 – 12.2%)	8.50% (5.04 – 14.32%)	
Sullivan	Monticello	11.7	7,000	0	73%	15 (14 – 15)	6.8% (6.6 – 7.0%)	4.92% (2.92 – 8.30%)	
Sullivan	South Fallsburg	10	5,000	0	57%	11 (10 – 11)	9.5% (9.2 – 9.7%)	4.83% (2.86 – 8.13%)	

163 [Understanding non-detection of poliovirus](#)


164 Figure 1A shows estimates of sensitivity to detect a single poliovirus infection at the wastewater  
 165 treatment plant level across New York State, using whichever estimated sensitivity of detection ( $Se_d$ ) is  
 166 higher from the two different approaches. Three consecutive non-detections of poliovirus provide  
 167 confidence in zero poliovirus infections in the community ranging from 0.2% to 99% (Figure 1B) and 95%

168 confidence that the number of infections within a community range from 0 to fewer than 1,079 (Figure  
169 1C).



170  
171 *Figure 1: The sensitivity of wastewater treatment plants in New York State to a) detect a single poliovirus infection, b) provide*  
172 *confidence in the freedom from poliovirus transmission with three consecutive non-detections, and c) provide 95% confidence in*  
173 *the upper limit of the number of poliovirus infections with three consecutive non-detections.*

174 Once applying county-level population coverage, we find the sensitivity of wastewater surveillance to  
175 detect a single poliovirus infection to range from 0.5% in New York County (Manhattan) to 10.7% in  
176 Clinton County (Figure 2A). Three consecutive non-detections of poliovirus provide confidence in zero  
177 poliovirus infections in the county ranging from 0.1% to 28.7% (Figure 2B) and 95% confidence that the  
178 number of infections within a county range from fewer than 6 to fewer than 1,570 (Figure 2C).



179  
180 *Figure 2: The sensitivity of New York State's wastewater surveillance to identify at the county level a) a single poliovirus*  
181 *infection, b) confidence in the freedom from poliovirus transmission with three consecutive non-detections, and c) an upper limit*  
182 *of the number of poliovirus infections given three consecutive non-detections.*

### 183 Spatial comparison of vaccination rates

184 Sewersheds with higher social vulnerability had lower vaccination rates (Pearson correlation coefficient  
185 of -0.2298,  $p$  value < 0.01). The majority of sewersheds in New York ( $n=459$ , 76.6%) have vaccination  
186 rates above 70% and lower vaccination coverage sewersheds ( $n=140$ , 23.4%) ranged in vulnerability  
187 between 0.1 and 0.85 with a median SVI of 0.51. Sewersheds with an average vaccination rate greater  
188 than 70% ranged between an SVI of 0 and 0.8 with a median SVI of 0.45.

189 An estimated 1.76 million New Yorkers reside in zip codes with poliovirus vaccination coverage < 70%.  
190 The majority of these New Yorkers (81%) are covered by the wastewater surveillance network (Table 2).  
191 A further 11% of these New Yorkers live in communities connected to sewer, but their wastewater  
192 treatment plants are not currently enrolled. (The threshold for inclusion in the state's wastewater  
193 surveillance network is a treatment plant permitted to discharge at least 1 million gallons per day). Eight

194 percent of New Yorkers living in zip codes with poliovirus vaccination coverage < 70% are not connected  
195 to any public sewer system.

Table n: Number of zip codes across NY with vaccination rates below 70% and whether they are within a sewer system that can be monitored using wastewater surveillance.			
Status of zip code	Number of zip codes with vaccination rates <70%	Total population of the zip codes	Percent of total
Zip code included in network and eligible for ongoing surveillance	87	1,420,000	81
Zip code intersects with a small sewershed and could be included in potential scale-up of surveillance	67	190,000	11
Zip code not in a sewershed	115	150,000	8
Total	269	1,760,000	100

## 196 Discussion

197 We find that the sensitivity of wastewater surveillance to detect any circulating poliovirus is highly  
198 dependent upon the size of the population contributing to the wastewater sample and unique to each  
199 sewershed. In general, when using the input parameters herein the sensitivity of a single test of  
200 wastewater collected from a wastewater treatment plant to detect poliovirus is low, < 10% throughout  
201 much of New York State. This issue is compounded by gaps in population coverage of wastewater  
202 surveillance when estimating county-level sensitivity, < 2% sensitivity throughout much of New York  
203 State. Three consecutive non-detections of poliovirus are slightly better rising at treatment plants  
204 throughout the state and but still < 5% sensitivity at the county level. Despite the low sensitivities  
205 observed, non-detection of poliovirus in wastewater can still provide maximum thresholds of the  
206 number of poliovirus infections within the sewer catchment or the county.

207 These estimates of sensitivity are primarily driven by the sensitivity of detection, which we consider in  
208 these analyses to be highly conservative. For example, we estimate a sensitivity of detection of one  
209 shedder per 472 population, much lower than the one shedder per 10,000 population that Hovi et al.  
210 estimated following flush experiments.<sup>23</sup> If using Hovi et al's one shedder per 10,000 population the  
211 confidence in no transmission is greatly increased, above 50% throughout much of New York State. We  
212 elected not to include results using Hovi et al's estimated sensitivity of detection due to the huge  
213 difference between that method and the methods estimated from Berchenko and our crude modeling.  
214 The low sensitivity in these results further align with those by O'Reilly et al., who also found < 10%  
215 sensitivity in the surveillance system to identify polio transmission when the number of shedders is  
216 minimal.<sup>23</sup>

217 We consider these estimates to be conservative for a number of reasons. First, we rely heavily on  
218 Berchanko et al.<sup>19</sup> in the absence of fecal shedding data. Fecal shedding studies that estimate the  
219 number of viral copies per gram of feces excreted among polio-infected individuals would allow for a  
220 more robust approach. Second, we presume equal mixing and equal onward polio transmission of  
221 vaccinated and unvaccinated populations. Polio vaccines are extremely effective at eliminating the risk  
222 of paralysis, however only oral polio vaccine is considered a transmission-interrupting vaccine. The  
223 inactivated polio vaccine that is administered throughout New York does not produce sterilizing




224 immunity – vaccinated individuals can still contract and transmit polio albeit to a lesser degree than  
225 unvaccinated individuals.<sup>24</sup> The exclusion of the effect of vaccines from estimates on the number of  
226 infected individuals likely overestimates the number of polio infections throughout New York State in  
227 Table 1. This would likely reduce our estimates of sensitivity to detect any poliovirus circulating. It is  
228 unlikely that poliovirus is widespread and circulating everywhere among individuals vaccinated with  
229 inactivated polio vaccine,<sup>8</sup> otherwise we would see much more paralytic polio among unvaccinated  
230 individuals. To date (August 2023) in the Rockland County outbreak we have only seen a single paralytic  
231 case of polio, and this is the first polio case detected in New York since 2013. Furthermore, public health  
232 is primarily concerned with polio infections among vulnerable (unvaccinated) individuals. A small  
233 outbreak among vaccinated individuals that never reaches susceptible unvaccinated individuals is of  
234 minimal concern.

235 The most vulnerable communities to polio outbreaks (zip codes with < 70% vaccine coverage) are largely  
236 connected to the state’s wastewater surveillance network that we have established. In these  
237 communities 81% of residents are wholly encompassed within the network, and a further 11% of  
238 residents intersect in some way with smaller treatment plant catchments. It is likely that any polio  
239 outbreak in low vaccination communities would first be identified in wastewater, as has been observed  
240 elsewhere.<sup>11,12</sup>

241 We can apply these results to inform testing frequency in a statewide wastewater surveillance network  
242 (Figure 3). The cost of wastewater surveillance is primarily driven by the number of samples (the spatial  
243 scale) and frequency of sampling. The system should more often test communities vulnerable to  
244 outbreak including communities with lower vaccine coverage, larger cities, and globally connected  
245 communities. We suggest a baseline prospective surveillance sampling frequency of once every two  
246 weeks. If poliovirus is detected in wastewater, we recommend scaling up the sampling frequency to  
247 weekly and expanding the spatial coverage in the county with the detection and connected  
248 communities. Three consecutive non-detections prompt a reduction in temporal frequency, reducing to  
249 once every two weeks (scaling back surveillance). Once elimination is confirmed again (zero poliovirus  
250 found in consecutive samples in any area) then baseline prospective surveillance can resume. This is just  
251 one way of operationalizing wastewater surveillance system with guidance on where and how often to  
252 test wastewater.

253 The methods we outline here can be used to estimate the sensitivity of wastewater surveillance for any  
254 pathogen.<sup>25</sup> Required inputs are fecal/urinary shedding rates and/or case data. In the absence of  
255 incident polio cases without paralysis, we used an upper limit of the number of infections thought to  
256 occur before a paralytic case is observed. This approach was not needed for our estimates of the  
257 sensitivity of wastewater surveillance to detect COVID-19 infections, where we used reported case  
258 data,<sup>13</sup> nor would it be needed for any infectious disease where case data more accurately reflect the  
259 number of infected individuals. As wastewater surveillance becomes more routine and established,<sup>26</sup> the  
260 methods outlined here can inform public health understanding from non-detections. We expect these  
261 methods to be most valuable in the context of emerging and re-emerging diseases, or disease  
262 elimination situations.



263

264 Figure 3: Conceptual framework to guide the frequency and scale of testing wastewater for poliovirus.  
265 Baseline prospective surveillance regularly tests wastewater from communities vulnerable to polio  
266 outbreaks. Detection prompts a scale-up in surveillance, increasing both the spatial coverage and  
267 temporal frequency. Consecutive non-detections prompt scaling back in surveillance, reducing the  
268 temporal frequency. Once elimination is confirmed the system returns to baseline prospective  
269 surveillance.

## 270 References


- 271 1. McClure CC, Cataldi JR, O’Leary ST. Vaccine Hesitancy: Where We Are and Where We Are Going.  
272 *Clinical Therapeutics*. 2017 Aug 1;**39**(8):1550–1562.
- 273 2. Bramer CA, Kimmins LM, Swanson R, et al. Decline in child vaccination coverage during the COVID-  
274 19 pandemic — Michigan Care Improvement Registry, May 2016–May 2020. *American Journal of*  
275 *Transplantation*. 2020;**20**(7):1930–1931.
- 276 3. Klapsa D, Wilton T, Zealand A, et al. Sustained detection of type 2 poliovirus in London sewage  
277 between February and July, 2022, by enhanced environmental surveillance. *The Lancet* [Internet].  
278 Elsevier; [cited 2022 Oct 17]; Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(22\)01804-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(22)01804-9)
- 279 4. Link-Gelles R, Lutterloh E, Ruppert PS, et al. Public Health Response to a Case of Paralytic  
280 Poliomyelitis in an Unvaccinated Person and Detection of Poliovirus in Wastewater — New York,  
281 June–August 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2022;**71**.
- 282 5. Ryerson AB. Wastewater Testing and Detection of Poliovirus Type 2 Genetically Linked to Virus  
283 Isolated from a Paralytic Polio Case — New York, March 9–October 11, 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal*  
284 *Wkly Rep* [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Dec 19];**71**. Available from:  
285 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/71/wr/mm7144e2.htm>

- 286 6. Grassly NC. Immunogenicity and Effectiveness of Routine Immunization With 1 or 2 Doses of  
287 Inactivated Poliovirus Vaccine: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *The Journal of Infectious*  
288 *Diseases*. 2014 Nov 1;**210**(suppl\_1):S439–S446.
- 289 7. Masters NB, Eisenberg MC, Delamater PL, Kay M, Boulton ML, Zelner J. Fine-scale spatial clustering  
290 of measles nonvaccination that increases outbreak potential is obscured by aggregated reporting  
291 data. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2020 Nov 10;**117**(45):28506–28514.
- 292 8. Kroiss SJ, Ahmadzai M, Ahmed J, et al. Assessing the sensitivity of the polio environmental  
293 surveillance system. Iturriza-Gómara M, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2018 Dec 28;**13**(12):e0208336.
- 294 9. Melnick J L. Current status of poliovirus infections. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*. American Society  
295 for Microbiology; 1996 Jul 1;**9**(3):293–300.
- 296 10. Asghar H, Diop OM, Weldegebriel G, et al. Environmental surveillance for polioviruses in the global  
297 polio eradication initiative. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2014;**210**(Suppl 1):S294–S303.
- 298 11. Cowger TL, Burns CC, Sharif S, et al. The role of supplementary environmental surveillance to  
299 complement acute flaccid paralysis surveillance for wild poliovirus in Pakistan - 2011-2013. *PLoS*  
300 *One*. 2017;**12**(7):e0180608.
- 301 12. Brouwer AF, Eisenberg JNS, Pomeroy CD, et al. Epidemiology of the silent polio outbreak in Rahat,  
302 Israel, based on modeling of environmental surveillance data. *Proceedings of the National Academy*  
303 *of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2018;**115**(45):E10625–E10633.
- 304 13. Larsen DA, Collins MB, Du Q, et al. Coupling freedom from disease principles and early warning from  
305 wastewater surveillance to improve health security. *PNAS Nexus*. 2022 Mar 1;**1**(1):pgac001.
- 306 14. Cameron AR, Baldock FC. A new probability formula for surveys to substantiate freedom from  
307 disease. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*. 1998;**34**:1–17.
- 308 15. Tanne JH. Polio emergency declared in New York State over virus found in wastewater. *BMJ*. British  
309 Medical Journal Publishing Group; 2022 Sep 12;**378**:o2211.
- 310 16. Cameron AR, Meyer A, Faverjon C, Mackenzie C. Quantification of the sensitivity of early detection  
311 surveillance. *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2020 Nov  
312 **1**;**67**(6):2532–2543.
- 313 17. Hill DT, Larsen DA. Using geographic information systems to link population estimates to  
314 wastewater surveillance data in New York State, USA. *PLOS Global Public Health*. Public Library of  
315 Science; 2023 Jan 26;**3**(1):e0001062.
- 316 18. Alexander JP Jr, Gary HE Jr, Pallansch MA. Duration of Poliovirus Excretion and Its Implications for  
317 Acute Flaccid Paralysis Surveillance: A Review of the Literature. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*.  
318 1997 Feb 1;**175**(Supplement\_1):S176–S182.
- 319 19. Berchenko Y, Manor Y, Freedman LS, et al. Estimation of polio infection prevalence from  
320 environmental surveillance data. *Sci Transl Med*. 2017 Mar 29;**9**(383).


- 321 20. CDC. CDC/ATSDR Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Aug 31]. Available  
322 from: <https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/index.html>
- 323 21. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. [Internet]. Vienna, Austria: R  
324 Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 325 22. Pebesma E. Simple features for R: Standardized support for spatial vector data. *The R Journal*.  
326 2018;**10**(1):439–446.
- 327 23. Hovi T, Stenvik M, Partanen H, Kangas A. Poliovirus Surveillance by Examining Sewage Specimens.  
328 Quantitative Recovery of Virus after Introduction into Sewerage at Remote Upstream Location.  
329 *Epidemiology and Infection*. Cambridge University Press; 2001;**127**(1):101–106.
- 330 24. Parker EP, Molodecky NA, Pons-Salort M, O’Reilly KM, Grassly NC. Impact of inactivated poliovirus  
331 vaccine on mucosal immunity: implications for the polio eradication endgame. *Expert Review of*  
332 *Vaccines*. Taylor & Francis; 2015 Aug 3;**14**(8):1113–1123.
- 333 25. Kilaru P, Hill D, Anderson K, et al. Wastewater Surveillance for Infectious Disease: A Systematic  
334 Review. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2022 Oct 13;kwac175.
- 335 26. Kirby AE. Using Wastewater Surveillance Data to Support the COVID-19 Response — United States,  
336 2020–2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Dec 7];**70**. Available from:  
337 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7036a2.htm>
- 338

**A)**

Sensitivity to detect a single poliovirus infection

**B)**

Confidence in freedom from poliovirus transmission

**C)**

95% confidence in the upper limit of infections






Figure 1

Sensitivity to detect a single poliovirus infection



Confidence in freedom from poliovirus transmission



95% confidence in the upper limit of infections




Figure 2

# NYS POLIO WASTEWATER SURVEILLANCE STRATEGIC PLAN




Figure 3