

1 Online trend estimation and detection of trend deviations in sub-sewershed 2 time series of SARS-CoV-2 RNA measured in wastewater

3 Katherine B. Ensor^{a,*}, Julia Schedler^a, Thomas Sun^a, Rebecca Schneider^c, Anthony Mulenga^c, Jingjing
4 Wu^b, Lauren B. Stadler^b, Loren Hopkins^d

^aRice University, Department of Statistics, 6100 Main St, Houston, 77005

^bRice University, Department of Civil and Environment Engineering, 6100 Main St, Houston, 77005

^cHouston Health Department, 8000 N. Stadium Dr., Houston, 7700

^dHouston Health Department and Department of Statistics, Rice University, 6100 Main St, Houston, 77005

5 Abstract

Wastewater surveillance has proven a key public health tool to understand a wide range of community health diseases and has proven to be especially critical to health departments throughout the SARS CoV-2 pandemic. The size of the population served by a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) may limit the targeted insight about community disease dynamics. To investigate this concern, samples of wastewater were obtained at lift stations upstream of WWTPs within the sewer network. First, an online, semi-automatic time series model is fitted to the weekly measurements of WWTP samples to estimate the viral trend for the community and compared to the time series observations from the lift stations. Second, deviations from the WWTP trend are identified using an Exponentially Weighted Moving Average (EWMA) control chart. The analysis reveals that the lift stations display slightly different dynamics than the larger WWTP, highlighting the more granular insight gleaned from sampling sites which represent smaller populations. Discussion focuses on the use of our methods to support rapid public health decision-making based on additional, targeted samples in times of concern.

6 *Keywords:* Wastewater-based epidemiology, COVID-19, Time series data

7 1. Introduction

8 Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is a cost-effective and fast way to survey the transmission of
9 disease in populations, and it has been widely applied for the monitoring of viral pathogens, including
10 SARS-CoV-2 (Kisand et al., 2023; Olesen et al., 2021). Multiple studies have confirmed the correlation
11 between SARS-CoV-2 wastewater monitoring data and COVID-19 clinical testing data (Hopkins et al., 2023b;
12 Ciannella et al., 2023; Kasprzyk-Hordern et al., 2023; Kaya et al., 2022; Mao et al., 2020; Peccia et al.,
13 2020; Wolken et al., 2023). Routine wastewater monitoring highlights SARS-CoV-2 dynamics and provides
14 early notice of the emergence in the population served by the wastewater catchment areas (Cao and Francis,
15 2021; Karthikeyan et al., 2021; Kisand et al., 2023; Li et al., 2021; Vallejo et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022;
16 Kirby et al., 2022). In short, wastewater epidemiology is an effective public health tool guiding meaningful
17 interventions (Hopkins et al., 2023a).

18 Wastewater monitoring for diseases has predominantly involved the collection of samples from the influent of
19 wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). Monitoring centralized WWTPs is typically easier for municipalities

*Katherine B. Ensor
Email address: ensor@rice.edu (Katherine B. Ensor)

20 to implement due to routine sampling that takes place at the treatment plants unrelated to WBE. Since
21 these centralized WWTPs in large municipalities often serve large populations, it can be unclear where to
22 take action when pathogens are detected.

23 Expanding spatial granularity of WBE surveillance can improve the accuracy and actionability of routine
24 wastewater monitoring. Several prior studies focused on sampling sites upstream of the WWTP, such as lift
25 stations, schools, universities, and hospitals (Castro-Gutierrez et al., 2022; Fielding-Miller et al., 2023; Gibas
26 et al., 2021; Haak et al., 2022; Holm et al., 2022; Scott et al., 2021; Spurbeck et al., 2021). The WBE program
27 for the City of Houston has routinely made use of sub-sewershed measurements (hou-wastewater.epi.org/,
28 2023). Moreover, the nested sampling strategy was proposed to monitor the trend of SARS-CoV-2 in the
29 catchment area and simultaneously identify and trace the community-level COVID-19 hotspots (Wolken
30 et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023; Yeager et al., 2021). The strategy highlighted the importance of sampling site
31 selection, which can help develop a more sensitive and effective wastewater surveillance system for COVID-19
32 and other diseases.

33 Studies on the use of nested sampling strategy for wastewater monitoring remain limited, and more
34 investigations are needed regarding the application of nested sampling on WBE to maximize the value of
35 the data and improve the system efficiency (Acosta et al., 2022; D'Aoust et al., 2021; Holm et al., 2022;
36 Wang et al., 2023; Yeager et al., 2021). D'Aoust et al. (2021) compared the wastewater SARS-CoV-2
37 surveillance results from two locations in a small, rural community with the community's COVID-19 cases,
38 and recommended sampling from lift stations, because they observed an overall higher and more stable
39 SARS-CoV-2 load as compared to its downstream wastewater treatment lagoon. Holm et al. (2022) observed
40 no statistical difference between SARS-CoV-2 viral concentrations in WWTPs and several upstream sampling
41 sites, including lift stations and manholes, and recommended sampling sites that support larger populations.
42 Acosta et al. (2022) observed a lower correlation between COVID-19 clinic data and SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
43 wastewater samples from neighborhoods compared to samples from WWTPs, indicating that the current
44 smaller wastewater monitoring system may induce more heterogeneous data that can reduce the sensitivity
45 of the surveillance. Acosta et al. (2022); Haak et al. (2022) also indicated that issues associated with sample
46 collection may decrease the stability and representativeness of the data collected at the community or
47 neighborhood level.

48 Despite the potential community-wide benefits in wastewater monitoring at the sub-sewershed level,
49 statistical analyses on this approach have been limited in their modelling assumptions and flexibility. Several
50 analyses assume wastewater measurements over time to be independent (Acosta et al., 2022; D'Aoust et al.,
51 2021; Holm et al., 2022) and compare differences between sewershed and sub-sewershed measurements using
52 a simple group-level difference of means or pairwise correlations. Failure to account for time dependence may
53 underestimate variability and inadequately capture the temporal dynamics of the wastewater measurements,
54 where clear trends and patterns in the data exist. Within the wide literature of statistical models for
55 SARS-CoV-2 wastewater longitudinal trends, most typically fall under the categories of autoregressive
56 or regression-based models (Cao and Francis, 2021; Peccia et al., 2020; Jeng et al., 2023), SEIR models
57 (McMahan et al., 2021; Fazli et al., 2021), or machine learning approaches such as the artificial neural
58 network (ANN) of Li et al. (2021) or the time-series based machine learning approaches in Lai et al. (2023).
59 Application of these models to the comparison of sub-sewershed time series has been sparse to nonexistent,
60 and many may not be appropriate for detection of structural deviations away from downstream measurements.

61 Previously, cubic smoothing splines have been used by the City of Houston (Hopkins et al., 2023b; Stadler
62 et al., 2020) to identify the sometimes rapidly changing signal in the noisy wastewater time series obtained
63 through routine monitoring of the city wastewater. This spline model captures the trend and curvature of
64 the trend in the nonlinear time series from the noisy wastewater measurements. However, smoothing splines
65 cannot separate the inherent variability of the time series from the measurement process.

66 We conduct two statistical analyses that offer flexible, semi-automatic, and online estimation of wastewater
67 dynamics between large WWTPs and sub-sewersheds. First, we model the wastewater measurements using
68 a dynamic linear state-space time series model. This modelling framework allows for both online and

69 retrospective estimation of wastewater trends accompanied with confidence bands to capture the precision of
70 the estimates via the Kalman filter and smoother [Shumway and Stoffer \(2017\)](#). These estimates give broad
71 insight into whether sub-sewershed time series give different information from large, centralized WWTP
72 time series, as well as the ability to forecast future values. Second, we utilize tools from statistical process
73 control (SPC) literature, namely exponentially weighted moving average (EWMA) control charts, to monitor
74 whether even just one of the lift station measurements deviates significantly from the trend estimate for the
75 larger WWTP, allowing for immediate online detection of community-specific spikes in SARS-CoV-2.

76 2. Methods

77 2.1. Data description

78 The City of Houston has 39 WWTPs, serving populations from approximately 500,000 to 600 individuals.
79 Within the larger WWTPs, there are a number of lift station (LS) facilities where wastewater can be sampled
80 and may serve to refine the geographic resolution provided by wastewater analysis. This work focuses on the
81 largest WWTP that serves a population of roughly 551,150 people. Wastewater was sampled from May 24,
82 2021 through March 13, 2023 for four lift stations (see [Figure 1](#)) which are geographically contained within
83 the large WWTP catchment area.




Figure 1: (a) The WWTP catchment areas for the City of Houston, with the WWTP of focus shaded. The box shows the extent of (b), the map showing the 4 lift stations considered in the analysis. (c)-(f) plot the time series of Log10 Copies/L for the WWTP and the 4 lift station facilities, referred to as Lift Station A-D.

84 Data on wastewater analysis results for the lift stations and the WWTP was updated on a weekly basis. For
85 each weekly sample, we quantified SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 gene copies per liter of wastewater, as described
86 previously ([Hopkins et al., 2023b](#)). We average the N1 and N2 concentrations to simplify our analysis and
87 focus on the comparison between the WWTP and LS time series. All measurements taken in a given week

88 were aligned to the corresponding Monday of that week. Wastewater viral concentration data was received
89 in units of copies per liter and was subsequently log transformed in base 10 (\log_{10}). Any measurements
90 below the level of detection (LOD) were labeled as missing values. Table 1 contains the names of the 5 series
91 considered and summary statistics for each series. Figure 1 (a) and (b) are maps of the WWTP and LS
92 catchments for each of the series, and Figure 1 (c)-(f) plot the time series of observed values for all 5 series
93 on the \log_{10} scale.

Name	Population	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max	Missing
WWTP	551150	4.51	0.50	3.29	5.74	4
Lift Station A	2442	4.72	0.70	3.26	6.51	11
Lift Station B	373937	4.89	0.43	3.92	6.00	28
Lift Station C	4849	4.72	0.73	3.26	5.89	42
Lift Station D	1724	4.88	0.74	3.48	7.81	18

Table 1: Name, size of population, and summary statistics Log10 of average of replicate RNA N1 and N2 copies/L for each wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) or lift station (LS) considered. The study period spanned 93 weeks.

94 2.2. Hierarchical Time Series Model for Trend Estimation

95 When time series data are collected, the goal is often to estimate a trend, that is, whether the “typical values”
96 are changing in time. For example, 1 (c)-(g) show the times series of viral concentration of SARS-CoV-2.
97 Visually, it is clear that these values are changing in time, and even seem to exhibit similar behavior that
98 may be predictable with a well-chosen model. Such a model should be able to separate out the “noise”, or
99 observation/measurement error, in these observations from the “signal”, or trend. An additional constraint
100 when modeling time series data is the presence of temporal correlation structure, i.e. the values are not
101 independent, so models which assume independence can lead to misleading forecasts and/or conclusions
102 about which variables are important in modeling a time series (Hyndman and Athanasopoulos, 2021). In
103 summary, the desired model will separate sources of variability for both the trend and the observation as
104 well as account for temporal correlation.

105 The state space modeling framework can accommodate both these needs. A state space model represents a
106 time series in two levels: an unobserved trend which encodes temporal dependence structure and a noisy
107 observed time series. In other words, it is a hierarchical model which is able to separate sources of variability
108 as desired. In the time series literature, the levels of this model are called the state equation and the
109 observation equation. Equations 1 and 2 display the state space model used for each series in this particular
110 study:

$$\text{Observation equation: } y_t = \mu_t + v_t \quad (1)$$

$$\text{State equation: } (\mu_t - \mu_{t-1}) = (\mu_{t-1} - \mu_{t-2}) + w_t. \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Initial condition: } \mu_0 \sim N(c_0, m_0). \quad (3)$$

111 The error terms v_t and w_t are independent and normally distributed with mean zero, and variances denoted
112 by σ_v^2 for the observation error and σ_w^2 for the state error.

113 The observation model of Equation 1 represents the model fit to the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
114 wastewater measured by the lab. The observation model is the underlying state μ_t plus a variance term σ_v^2
115 corresponding to the inherent measurement and sampling error. The state model in Equation 2 represents
116 the true state of the viral trend derived from the measured concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA, for the
117 sampled region. The noise term associated with the state equation, σ_w^2 , represents the natural variability in
118 the viral concentration in the population as measured by wastewater.

119 Within this framework, the state variable serves as the core component of the model, characterizing the
120 underlying system’s behavior and dynamics, in other words the trend of the virus concentration. Note

121 the temporal structure encoded by Equation 2: the right hand side concerns the previous two time points,
122 while the left hand side concerns the current and past time point. In particular, Equation 2 encompasses a
123 statistical framework that employs the concept of first difference applied twice. The first difference operation
124 captures the change in the state variable over successive time periods, and by applying this operation twice,
125 we gain insights into the acceleration or curvature of the trend. That is, this choice of structure for the
126 state equation is chosen to capture the temporal dependence of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration. For
127 additional details about the state-space modeling framework and its relations to smoothing splines, see
128 [Shumway and Stoffer \(2017\)](#).

129 Once the structure of the model is chosen, the model can be fit to the data with three goals in mind:
130 retrospective estimates of the trend using all available data, online estimates of the trend using only past data
131 up to a given time point, and one-step-ahead forecasts of the next time point. In the time series literature,
132 the retrospective and online estimates are referred to as smoothers and filters, respectively. We focus on
133 retrospective and online estimates for this paper, but provide steps for obtaining the one-step-ahead forecasts
134 in the supplemental materials.

135 To estimate the online and retrospective trends, four parameters are themselves estimated: the initial
136 state mean and variance, the variance of the measurement and sampling error (σ_v^2), and the variance of the
137 trend (σ_w^2). Estimates are obtained through maximum likelihood estimation which is computationally fast
138 due to use of the Kalman Filter for updating linear Gaussian systems. For the online estimates, a rolling
139 estimation structure is used, meaning the parameters are re-estimated with each new time point. Estimation
140 is implemented using the KFAS package in R [Helske \(2017\)](#), which can easily handle missing data. Once an
141 estimate of the model is obtained, a step to check that the model fits the data is required. For the present
142 model, an autocorrelation plot of the model's residuals can be checked for autocorrelation. If no correlation
143 is present in the residuals, the model can be considered a good fit. Additional details of estimation and
144 model fit checks as well as all code used for the analysis are available in the supplemental materials.

145 The inputs, outputs, and process of fitting the spline state space model of Equations 1 and 2 are summarized
146 in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Variability-separating trend estimation

Input: Raw lab values

- 1 Process the raw data (average N1 and N2 replicates, identify non-detects, transform copies/L to Log10).
- 2 Initialize the model by estimating parameters using the first 10 weeks of data.
- 3 Compute online trend estimates and confidence limits using Equation 2 and re-estimating parameters with each additional data point.
- 4 Compute retrospective trend estimates and confidence limits.
- 5 Verify convergence of estimates and time series modeling assumptions.
- 6 Compute table of state and observation variances for each time series.
- 7 Compare visualizations of retrospective estimates of WWTP and sub-sewershed trends to determine whether a difference was present.

Output: Online and retrospective trend estimates, estimates of trend variability and measurement/sampling variability.

147 Visualizations of the retrospective and online estimates along with the data are provided in 2.

148 2.3. Detection of trend deviations

149 Recall the goal of determining whether sub-sewershed measurements give different information than the
150 routinely monitored centralized WWTP measurements. Using all available data, the retrospective estimates
151 from the model fit using Equations 1 and 2. These estimates, visualized in Figure 3, show some periods of
152 separation, indicating that the sub-sewershed measurements do indeed give different information. However,




Figure 2: Retrospective and online estimates of the viral concentration trend with uncertainty quantification for the large WWTP. The vertical axis is log₁₀ copies/liter. The shaded grey rectangles correspond to periods of missing data. Note that the online trend estimates are “noisier” and have wider uncertainty bands than the retrospective trend estimates.

153 if the goal is to extract actionable information from the data, the online estimates, which only use data
154 up to the current time point, should be used. While the retrospective estimates show clear separation, the
155 online estimates are noisier, so detecting when the sub-sewersheds may be deviating from the WWTP's trend
156 requires more than a visual comparison of the two series. In addition, sub-sewersheds may not be sampled
157 frequently enough to support the model described in Section 2.2, so a method which can be used with at
158 least one sub-sewershed observation is ideal.

159 The statistical process control (SPC) literature provides a framework for iterative improvement of a decision-
160 making process based on time series data. Some examples of the traditional applications of SPC include
161 ensuring a given percentage of on-time deliveries to a client, speed and consistency of service quality in a
162 bank, and loading passengers onto an airplane (Montgomery, 2009). In short, SPC provides a framework for
163 identifying when a time series of interest is “out of control” so that steps can be taken to bring that series
164 back “in control”. Although the ability to bring disease burden in a community back “in control” is limited
165 in WBE compared to traditional applications, ideas from SPC can be borrowed to improve the actionability
166 of the information contained in wastewater time series.

167 For this paper, the time series of interest is the difference between the sub-sewershed and the WWTP. If
168 we simply subtract the observed values for each series, the resulting difference will contain the “noise”, or
169 measurement and sampling error. Instead, we use the online estimate of the trend for the WWTP obtained
170 from Equations 1 and 2, which can be assumed to be free of observation error. Since the online estimate of
171 the trend requires 10 weeks of data to be initialized, we use the observed (unmodeled) value(s) from the
172 sub-sewershed directly.

173 Formally, using the previous notation, the standardized difference at time point t , for lift station $i = 1, \dots, 4$
174 is given by:

$$d_{i,t} = \frac{y_{i,t} - \hat{\mu}_t}{\tilde{\sigma}_d}, \quad (4)$$

175 where $\tilde{\sigma}_d^2 = \text{Var}(y_{i,t} - \hat{\mu}_t)$. This variance is approximated by

$$\tilde{\sigma}_d^2 \approx \hat{\sigma}_{v_t}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{w_t}^2 - 2\text{Corr}(y_i, \hat{\mu}) \cdot \hat{\sigma}_{v_t} \cdot \hat{\sigma}_{w_t}, \quad (5)$$

176 where $\text{Corr}(y_i, \hat{\mu})$ is the Pearson correlation coefficient between the WWTP estimated state time series and
177 the observed copies/liter from the i^{th} lift station. If any of the sub-sewershed values $y_{i,t}$ are missing, we
178 replace these values with the online trend estimate for the WWTP, which will yield a value of 0.

179 If the sub-sewershed and the WWTP are “in control”, or gave equivalent information, then $d_{i,t}$ would
180 be normally distributed with mean 0, and there would be no autocorrelation in the series. To determine
181 whether the sub-sewershed is “out of control”, or separating from the trend of the WWTP, a control chart
182 can be constructed. Many types of control charts are available for different scenarios, for example, Shewhart
183 (Shewhart, 1931) and CUSUM (Page, 1954) control charts. We choose an Exponentially Weighted Moving
184 Average control chart (Roberts, 1959), which can detect small shifts in temporally correlated series such as
185 our $d_{i,t}$ and is appropriate for use with individual observations (Montgomery, 2009). The EWMA chart is
186 based on the following series:

$$z_{i,t} = \lambda d_{i,t} + (1 - \lambda)z_{i,t-1}, \quad (6)$$

187 where $z_{i,t}$ can be interpreted as a weighted average of all past values for series i , where the weighting is
188 controlled by the value λ , for which we use the estimate of the lag 1 autocorrelation of $d_{i,t}$. In the case of a
189 missing sub-sewershed value, the aforementioned replacement with the WWTP online estimate allows for the
190 exponential weighting of past values to continue under the assumption of no separation. The EWMA charts
191 are visualized for each of the 4 lift stations compared to the WWTP in Figure 4.

192 The dots on Figure 4 represent the values of z_t . The dotted lines are the upper and lower confidence
193 limits. When z_t exceeds one of these confidence limits, the point is colored red, and the sub-sewershed can
194 be considered “out of control”, in other words, the sub-sewershed time series is separating from the WWTP
195 time series which gives different information. The direction of the separation can also be determined by
196 examining whether the point exceeds the upper limit, indicating the viral concentration is higher for the
197 sub-sewershed, or the lower limit, indicating the sub-sewershed is lower.

198 We summarize the creation of the EWMA chart in Algorithm 2. For additional discussion of EWMA
199 charts and examples of their use with correlated data, see [Hunter \(1986\)](#); [Lucas and Saccucci \(1990\)](#);
200 [Supharakonsakun et al. \(2020\)](#).

Algorithm 2: Detecting deviation of sub-sewershed measurement from centralized WWTP trend estimate

Input: At least $10 + n$ WWTP observations, $n \geq 1$ sub-sewershed observations

- 1 Read in cleaned WWTP series and apply 1 to obtain online trend estimates through the date of the first sub-sewershed observation.
- 2 Replace any missing sub-sewershed observations with WWTP online trend estimate for corresponding date.
- 3 Create difference time series of sub-sewershed observed copies/liter (\log_{10}) - WWTP Online Trend Estimate.
- 4 Standardize the difference series by dividing by the standard deviation computed in Equation 5.
- 5 Construct EWMA chart for the standardized difference series.
- 6 Inspect EWMA chart for separation.

Output: EWMA chart for determining separation of sub-sewershed from centralized WWTP.

201 Data Availability

202 Given the small populations associated with some of the lift stations, real data will be made available on
203 a case-by-case basis by contacting the corresponding author and subsequent approval by Houston Health
204 Department. Synthetic wastewater surveillance data which preserves the statistical properties of the real
205 data are available along with code on a [GitHub repository](#).

206 Code Availability

207 All code used to fit the models described in this paper are available in a public [GitHub repository](#). All code
208 is written in the R language ([R Core Team, 2023](#)).

209 3. Results

210 3.1. Trend Estimation

211 The retrospective estimates depicted in Figure 3 indicates three peaks in the estimated population viral
212 dynamics for the population served by the WWTP, with maximums that occur on January 3 and July
213 18, 2022, and January 9, 2023. We will refer to these peaks as PK1, PK2 and PK3, respectively. The
214 retrospective review illustrates there are instances where the lift stations provided early information with
215 respect to increasing or decreasing viral trends in the population measured. Again, these features are
216 highlighted in Figure 4. A separation in the confidence intervals for each series indicates a statistically
217 significant difference in the estimated trend for the respective series, namely the trend estimated for the
218 WWTP and each of the lift stations.

219 We also see in the retrospective review that three of the four lift stations, namely Lift station A, Lift station
220 C, and Lift station D, exhibit a comparable trend as that estimated from the WWTP, with a few deviations




Figure 3: Retrospective estimates of the viral concentration trend with uncertainty quantification for the WWTP and each LS series, using all available information. The vertical axis is log₁₀ copies/liter. The shaded grey rectangles correspond to periods of missing data and the dotted lines correspond to the peaks of three surges. Note that the time series model is still able to provide estimates of the trend during periods of missing data, though with greater uncertainty. Compared to Figure 1, the start date of this trend plot is later, since the first 10 weeks of data are used to initialize the model.

(see Figure 3). Lift station A indicates an early signal leading up to PK1. Lift station C separates from the WWTP trend by remaining at high levels between PK1 and PK2. It is important to note that there are several missing values in the Lift station A series during this time, as highlighted by the light grey bars in Figure 3. However, the estimated level for Lift station C does not show an increase in uncertainty due to the fact that the observed levels during this time were relatively consistent (see Figure 1). Lift station D registers a statistically higher trend in PK3. Lift station B was unique amongst the four lift stations, in that its estimated trend separated from the estimated WWTP trend following PK1 and remained higher until PK2. Lift station B also failed to drop as low between PK2 and PK3. However, the trend estimates for the WWTP and Lift station B were not significantly different in PK3. It is also worth noting that Lift station A, Lift station C, and Lift station D exhibited more variation in their trend estimates as evidenced by the width of the respective confidence intervals, than that of the WWTP.

Recall that the hierarchical trend estimation framework can separate variability associated with the trend from the “noise”, or lab and sampling error. These results are summarized in Table 2. We see from this table that the measurement and sampling variation are highest for Lift station A and Lift station D, and also elevated for Lift station C. Since we expect the lab variability to be approximately constant across all measurements, the extra variation is most likely due to the lift station wastewater containing highly variable levels of SARS-CoV-2 due to the small population that it serves. Based on this observation, the sampling variation is approximately equivalent for Lift station B as it is for the WWTP. The state dynamics for each location exhibit similar variability, with slightly elevated variation for Lift station D.

Name	Sampling and Lab Variability	Trend Variability	Population
WWTP	0.0372	0.0130	551150
Lift station A	0.2798	0.0105	2442
Lift station B	0.0350	0.0130	373937
Lift station C	0.1374	0.0134	4849
Lift station D	0.2810	0.0175	1724

Table 2: Estimates of inherent variability, σ_w (state) and measurement variability σ_v (observation, lab and sampling variability) for each series.

Again, the retrospective review provides the best understanding of the dynamic population trend in virus levels for location as well as insight into the lab and sampling variability over the entire study period. However, this retrospective review is not useful in real time as it requires knowledge of the full time series, i.e. the future, to implement.

3.2. Trend Deviations

The results of Algorithm 2 applied to each lift station and the WWTP are graphically introduced in Figure 4. The information is consistent with the retrospective study in that Lift station A, Lift station C and Lift station D, all demonstrate minor perturbations from the trend estimated for the WWTP. Further, Lift station B clearly demonstrates a strong and consistent deviation from the WWTP estimated trend, between PK1 and PK2, and then again between PK2 and PK3. In Figure 4 we also include the observed standardized difference between the two measurements. You will note that the differences may be large, but they are not statistically significant based on the EWMA control chart. The control chart is used to identify a level shift in the trend, and not specific outlying events. Based on the EWMA control chart, statistically significant level shifts occurred at the red highlighted temporal locations.

4. Discussion

The objective of this paper is to highlight the additional information gleaned from samples taken within the sewer network and upstream of WWTPs, namely lift stations. We bring forward a hierarchical time

EWMA plots comparing LS to WWTP




Figure 4: The EWMA chart for the observed values at each lift station compared to the WWTP online estimate. The solid dots represent the exponentially weighted standardized difference while the plus signs represent the actual standardized difference. Observations which correspond to a structural break, or exponentially weighted values beyond the dotted control limits, are colored red. The dark grey vertical lines are the approximate dates of the peaks of different surges.

257 series approach to capture the dynamic trend in population viral dynamics from each wastewater series.
258 The state-space time series model is simple to implement both in a retrospective, and real-time mode,
259 and naturally adapts to the nonlinear dynamics in the population viral trend. The EWMA control charts
260 provide a framework for identifying when sub-sewershed measurements deviate from measurements in a
261 larger, centralized WWTP. Note that these deviations could be due to any number of factors, for example,
262 number of infections, dilution, degradation, inhibitors, etc.

263 For our system the only lift station within the large wastewater catchment area of the WWTP whose trend
264 consistently deviated from that of the WWTP was Lift station B. Further, the measurement and sampling
265 uncertainty for Lift station B was on par with that of the WWTP. This lift station serves 373,937 people
266 whereas the WWTP serves 551,150 people. In other words, Lift station B serves 68% of the people in the
267 large catchment area. Regular monitoring of Lift station B in addition to the WWTP is warranted based on
268 this study. The Lift station B state estimate of viral load and its uncertainty, indicates that for the 68%
269 of the population served by Lift station B, the viral load did not decrease as substantially as that of the
270 WWTP between PK1 and PK2, and also between PK2 and PK3.

271 For the lift stations serving smaller populations, namely Lift station A, Lift station C and Lift station D,
272 we see evidence of early signals through each COVID-19 peak. However, the measurement and sampling
273 uncertainty with these smaller lift stations was substantially higher. Although routine monitoring may be
274 prohibitively expensive, monitoring through times of high concern to public health may be warranted.

275 A side result of our modeling approach is the opportunity to separate the variation in the trend of the
276 viral load from the measurement and sampling variation. In this comparison, and assuming a consistent
277 measurement or lab variability across all samples, we find that the sampling variation for the smaller lift
278 stations is much greater than that for the WWTP and the large Lift station B. If regular sampling at smaller
279 lift stations, where flow may be irregular, is required, sampling strategies may need to be reviewed.

280 Acknowledgements

281 The authors disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or
282 publication of this article: This work was supported by the CDC Foundation (project no. 1085.46) and the
283 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (ELC-ED grant no. 6NU50CK000557-01-05 and ELC-CORE
284 grant no. NU50CK000557). The work was also supported by the Rockefeller Foundation.

285 Bibliography

- 286 Acosta, N., Bautista, M.A., Waddell, B.J., McCalder, J., Beaudet, A.B., Man, L., Pradhan, P., Sedaghat, N., Papparis, C.,
287 Bacanu, A., Hollman, J., Krusina, A., Southern, D.A., Williamson, T., Li, C., Bhatnagar, S., Murphy, S., Chen, J., Kuzma,
288 D., Clark, R., Meddings, J., Hu, J., Cabaj, J.L., Conly, J.M., Dai, X., Lu, X., Chekouo, T., Ruecker, N.J., Achari, G., Ryan,
289 M.C., Frankowski, K., Hubert, C.R.J., Parkins, M.D., 2022. Longitudinal SARS-CoV-2 RNA wastewater monitoring across a
290 range of scales correlates with total and regional COVID-19 burden in a well-defined urban population. *Water Research* 220,
291 118611. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2022.118611>, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2022.118611.
- 292 Cao, Y., Francis, R., 2021. On forecasting the community-level COVID-19 cases from the concentration of SARS-CoV-2
293 in wastewater. *Science of The Total Environment* 786, 147451. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147451>,
294 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147451.
- 295 Castro-Gutierrez, V., Hassard, F., Vu, M., Leitao, R., Burczynska, B., Wildeboer, D., Stanton, I., Rahimzadeh, S., Baio, G.,
296 Garelick, H., Hofman, J., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., Kwiatkowska, R., Majeed, A., Priest, S., Grimsley, J., Lundy, L., Singer,
297 A.C., Di Cesare, M., 2022. Monitoring occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 in school populations: A wastewater-based approach.
298 *PLOS ONE* 17, e0270168. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0270168>, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0270168.
- 299 Ciannella, S., González-Fernández, C., Gomez-Pastora, J., 2023. Recent progress on wastewater-based epidemiology for
300 COVID-19 surveillance: A systematic review of analytical procedures and epidemiological modeling. *Science of The Total*
301 *Environment* 878, 162953. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.162953>, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.162953.
- 302 D'Aoust, P.M., Towhid, S.T., Mercier, , Hegazy, N., Tian, X., Bhatnagar, K., Zhang, Z., Naughton, C.C., MacKenzie, A.E.,
303 Graber, T.E., Delatolla, R., 2021. COVID-19 wastewater surveillance in rural communities: Comparison of lagoon and pumping
304 station samples. *Science of The Total Environment* 801, 149618. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149618>,
305 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149618.
- 306 hou-wastewater-epi.org/, 2023. Houston Wastewater Epidemiology. URL: <https://hou-wastewater-epi.org>.

- 307 Fazli, M., Sklar, S., Porter, M.D., French, B.A., Shakeri, H., 2021. Wastewater-Based Epidemiological Modeling for Continuous
308 Surveillance of COVID-19 Outbreak, in: 2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data), IEEE, Orlando, FL,
309 USA. pp. 4342–4349. URL: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9671543/>, doi:10.1109/BigData52589.2021.9671543.
- 310 Fielding-Miller, R., Karthikeyan, S., Gaines, T., Garfein, R.S., Salido, R.A., Cantu, V.J., Kohn, L., Martin, N.K., Wynn,
311 A., Wijaya, C., Flores, M., Omaleki, V., Majnoonian, A., Gonzalez-Zuniga, P., Nguyen, M., Vo, A.V., Le, T., Duong, D.,
312 Hassani, A., Tweeten, S., Jepsen, K., Henson, B., Hakim, A., Birmingham, A., De Hoff, P., Mark, A.M., Nasamran, C.A.,
313 Rosenthal, S.B., Moshiri, N., Fisch, K.M., Humphrey, G., Farmer, S., Tubb, H.M., Valles, T., Morris, J., Kang, J., Khaleghi,
314 B., Young, C., Akel, A.D., Eilert, S., Eno, J., Curewitz, K., Laurent, L.C., Rosing, T., Knight, R., Baer, N.A., Barber, T.,
315 Castro-Martinez, A., Chacón, M., Cheung, W., Crescini, E.S., Eisner, E.R., Franco Vargas, L., Hakim, A., Hobbs, C., Lastrella,
316 A.L., Lawrence, E.S., Matteson, N.L., Gangavarapu, K., Ngo, T.T., Seaver, P., Smoot, E.W., Tsai, R., Xia, B., Aigner, S.,
317 Anderson, C., Belda-Ferre, P., Sathe, S., Zeller, M., Andersen, K.G., Yeo, G.W., Kurzban, E., 2023. Safer at school early
318 alert: an observational study of wastewater and surface monitoring to detect COVID-19 in elementary schools. *The Lancet*
319 *Regional Health - Americas* 19, 100449. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2023.100449>, doi:10.1016/j.lana.2023.100449.
- 320 Gibas, C., Lambirth, K., Mittal, N., Juel, M.A.I., Barua, V.B., Roppolo Brazell, L., Hinton, K., Lontai, J., Stark, N., Young, I.,
321 Quach, C., Russ, M., Kauer, J., Nicolosi, B., Chen, D., Akella, S., Tang, W., Schlueter, J., Munir, M., 2021. Implementing
322 building-level SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance on a university campus. *Science of The Total Environment* 782, 146749.
323 URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146749>, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146749.
- 324 Haak, L., Delic, B., Li, L., Guarin, T., Mazurowski, L., Dastjerdi, N.G., Dewan, A., Pagilla, K., 2022. Spatial and temporal
325 variability and data bias in wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in a sewer system. *Science of The Total Environment*
326 805, 150390. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150390>, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150390.
- 327 Helske, J., 2017. KFAS: Exponential Family State Space Models in R. *Journal of Statistical Software* 78, 1–39. URL:
328 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v078.i10>, doi:10.18637/jss.v078.i10.
- 329 Holm, R.H., Mukherjee, A., Rai, J.P., Yeager, R.A., Talley, D., Rai, S.N., Bhatnagar, A., Smith, T., 2022. SARS-CoV-2
330 RNA abundance in wastewater as a function of distinct urban sewershed size. *Environmental Science: Water Research &*
331 *Technology* 8, 807–819. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1039/D1EW00672J>, doi:10.1039/D1EW00672J. publisher: The Royal Society
332 of Chemistry.
- 333 Hopkins, L., Ensor, K.B., Stadler, L., Johnson, C.D., Schneider, R., Domakonda, K., McCarthy, J.J., Septimus, E.J., Persse, D.,
334 Williams, S.L., 2023a. Public Health Interventions Guided by Houston’s Wastewater Surveillance Program During the COVID-
335 19 Pandemic. *Public Health Reports* , 00333549231185625 URL: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00333549231185625>,
336 doi:10.1177/00333549231185625.
- 337 Hopkins, L., Persse, D., Caton, K., Ensor, K., Schneider, R., McCall, C., Stadler, L.B., 2023b. Citywide wastewater
338 SARS-CoV-2 levels strongly correlated with multiple disease surveillance indicators and outcomes over three COVID-
339 19 waves. *Science of The Total Environment* 855, 158967. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158967>,
340 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158967.
- 341 Hunter, J.S., 1986. The Exponentially Weighted Moving Average. *Journal of Quality Technology* 18, 203–210. URL:
342 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224065.1986.11979014>, doi:10.1080/00224065.1986.11979014.
- 343 Hyndman, R.J., Athanasopoulos, G., 2021. Forecasting: Principles and Practice. 3rd edition ed., OTexts, Melbourne, Australia.
344 URL: <https://otexts.com/fpp3/expsmooth.html>.
- 345 Jeng, H.A., Singh, R., Diawara, N., Curtis, K., Gonzalez, R., Welch, N., Jackson, C., Jurgens, D., Adikari, S., 2023. Application
346 of wastewater-based surveillance and copula time-series model for COVID-19 forecasts. *Science of The Total Environment*
347 885, 163655. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0048969723022751>, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.163655.
- 348 Karthikeyan, S., Ronquillo, N., Belda-Ferre, P., Alvarado, D., Javidi, T., Longhurst, C.A., Knight, R., 2021. High-Throughput
349 Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Detection Enables Forecasting of Community Infection Dynamics in San Diego County. *mSystems*
350 6, e00045–21. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00045-21>, doi:10.1128/mSystems.00045-21.
- 351 Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., Sims, N., Farkas, K., Jagadeesan, K., Proctor, K., Wade, M.J., Jones, D.L., 2023. Wastewater-based
352 epidemiology for comprehensive community health diagnostics in a national surveillance study: Mining biochemical markers
353 in wastewater. *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 450, 130989. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2023.130989>,
354 doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2023.130989.
- 355 Kaya, D., Falender, R., Radniecki, T., Geniza, M., Cieslak, P., Kelly, C., Lininger, N., Sutton, M., 2022. Correlation between
356 Clinical and Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Genomic Surveillance, Oregon, USA. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 28, 1906–1908.
357 URL: <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2809.220938>, doi:10.3201/eid2809.220938.
- 358 Kirby, A.E., Welsh, R.M., Marsh, Z.A., Yu, A.T., Vugia, D.J., Boehm, A.B., Wolfe, M.K., White, B.J., Matzinger, S.R.,
359 Wheeler, A., Bankers, L., Andresen, K., Salatas, C., New York City Department of Environmental Protection, Gregory, D.A.,
360 Johnson, M.C., Trujillo, M., Kannoly, S., Smyth, D.S., Dennehy, J.J., Sapoval, N., Ensor, K., Treangen, T., Stadler, L.B.,
361 Hopkins, L., 2022. Notes from the Field: Early Evidence of the SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.529 (Omicron) Variant in Community
362 Wastewater — United States, November–December 2021. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 71, 103–105.
363 URL: http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/71/wr/mm7103a5.htm?s_cid=mm7103a5_w, doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7103a5.
- 364 Kisand, V., Laas, P., Palmik-Das, K., Panksep, K., Tammert, H., Albrecht, L., Allemann, H., Liepkalns, L., Vooro, K., Ritz,
365 C., Hauryliuk, V., Tenson, T., 2023. Prediction of COVID-19 positive cases, a nation-wide SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-based
366 epidemiology study. *Water Research* 231, 119617. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2023.119617>, doi:10.1016/j.watres
367 .2023.119617.
- 368 Lai, M., Cao, Y., Wulff, S.S., Robinson, T.J., McGuire, A., Bisha, B., 2023. A time series based machine learning strategy for
369 wastewater-based forecasting and nowcasting of COVID-19 dynamics. *Science of The Total Environment* 897, 165105. URL:
370 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0048969723037282>, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.165105.
- 371 Li, X., Kulandaivelu, J., Zhang, S., Shi, J., Sivakumar, M., Mueller, J., Luby, S., Ahmed, W., Coin, L., Jiang, G., 2021.

- 372 Data-driven estimation of COVID-19 community prevalence through wastewater-based epidemiology. *Science of The Total*
373 *Environment* 789, 147947. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147947>, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147947.
- 374 Lucas, J.M., Saccucci, M.S., 1990. Exponentially Weighted Moving Average Control Schemes: Properties and Enhancements.
375 *Technometrics* 32, 1–12. URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00401706.1990.10484583>, doi:10.1080/004017
376 [06.1990.10484583](https://doi.org/10.1080/00401706.1990.10484583).
- 377 Mao, K., Zhang, K., Du, W., Ali, W., Feng, X., Zhang, H., 2020. The potential of wastewater-based epidemiology as surveillance
378 and early warning of infectious disease outbreaks. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health* 17, 1–7. URL:
379 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.04.006>, doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.04.006.
- 380 McMahan, C.S., Self, S., Rennert, L., Kalbaugh, C., Kriebel, D., Graves, D., Colby, C., Deaver, J.A., Popat, S.C., Karanfil,
381 T., Freedman, D.L., 2021. COVID-19 wastewater epidemiology: a model to estimate infected populations. *The Lancet*
382 *Planetary Health* 5, e874–e881. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2542519621002308>, doi:10.1016/S2542-
383 [5196\(21\)00230-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00230-8).
- 384 Montgomery, D.C., 2009. Introduction to statistical quality control. 6th ed ed., Wiley, Hoboken, N.J.
- 385 Olesen, S.W., Imakaev, M., Duvallet, C., 2021. Making waves: Defining the lead time of wastewater-based epidemiology for
386 COVID-19. *Water Research* 202, 117433. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117433>, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2021.
387 [117433](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117433).
- 388 Page, E.S., 1954. Continuous Inspection Schemes. *Biometrika* 41, 100–115. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2333009>,
389 doi:10.2307/2333009. publisher: [Oxford University Press, Biometrika Trust].
- 390 Peccia, J., Zulli, A., Brackney, D.E., Grubaugh, N.D., Kaplan, E.H., Casanovas-Massana, A., Ko, A.I., Malik, A.A., Wang, D.,
391 Wang, M., Warren, J.L., Weinberger, D.M., Arnold, W., Omer, S.B., 2020. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater
392 tracks community infection dynamics. *Nature Biotechnology* 38, 1164–1167. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0684-z>,
393 doi:10.1038/s41587-020-0684-z.
- 394 R Core Team, 2023. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
395 Vienna, Austria. URL: <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 396 Roberts, S.W., 1959. Control Chart Tests Based on Geometric Moving Averages. *Technometrics* 1, 239–250. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1266443>, doi:10.2307/1266443. publisher: [Taylor & Francis, Ltd., American Statistical Association,
397 American Society for Quality].
- 398 Scott, L.C., Aubee, A., Babahaji, L., Vigil, K., Tims, S., Aw, T.G., 2021. Targeted wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2
399 on a university campus for COVID-19 outbreak detection and mitigation. *Environmental Research* 200, 111374. URL:
400 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.111374>, doi:10.1016/j.envres.2021.111374.
- 401 Shewhart, W.A., 1931. Economic Quality Control of Manufactured Product. *Bell Syst Tech J* 9, 364–389.
- 402 Shumway, R.H., Stoffer, D.S., 2017. Time Series Analysis and Its Applications: With R Examples. Springer Texts in
403 Statistics, Springer International Publishing, Cham. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-52452-8>,
404 doi:10.1007/978-3-319-52452-8.
- 405 Spurbeck, R.R., Minard-Smith, A., Catlin, L., 2021. Feasibility of neighborhood and building scale wastewater-based genomic
406 epidemiology for pathogen surveillance. *Science of The Total Environment* 789, 147829. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147829>,
407 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147829.
- 408 Stadler, L., Ensor, K., Clark, J., Kalvapalle, P., LaTurner, Z.W., Mojica, L., Terwilliger, A., Zhuo, Y., Ali, P., Avadhanula, V.,
409 Bertolusso, R., Crosby, T., Hernandez, H., Hollstein, M., Weesner, K., Zong, D., Persse, D., Piedra, P., Maresso, A., Hopkins,
410 L., 2020. Wastewater Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 as a Predictive Metric of Positivity Rate for a Major Metropolis. preprint.
411 *Epidemiology*. URL: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.11.04.20226191>, doi:10.1101/2020.11.04.20226191.
- 412 Supharakonsakun, Y., Areepong, Y., Sukparungsee, S., 2020. The performance of a modified EWMA control chart for monitoring
413 autocorrelated PM2.5 and carbon monoxide air pollution data. *PeerJ* 8, e10467. URL: [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/a
414 rticles/PMC7747693/](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7747693/), doi:10.7717/peerj.10467.
- 415 Vallejo, J.A., Trigo-Tasende, N., Rumbo-Feal, S., Conde-Pérez, K., López-Oriona, , Barbeito, I., Vaamonde, M., Tarrío-
416 Saavedra, J., Reif, R., Ladra, S., Rodiño-Janeiro, B.K., Nasser-Ali, M., Cid, , Veiga, M., Acevedo, A., Lamora, C., Bou,
417 G., Cao, R., Poza, M., 2022. Modeling the number of people infected with SARS-COV-2 from wastewater viral load in
418 Northwest Spain. *Science of The Total Environment* 811, 152334. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.152334>,
419 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.152334.
- 420 Wang, Y., Liu, P., VanTassell, J., Hilton, S.P., Guo, L., Sablon, O., Wolfe, M., Freeman, L., Rose, W., Holt, C., Browning, M.,
421 Bryan, M., Waller, L., Teunis, P.F., Moe, C.L., 2023. When case reporting becomes untenable: Can sewer networks tell us
422 where COVID-19 transmission occurs? *Water Research* 229, 119516. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2022.119516>,
423 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2022.119516.
- 424 Wolken, M., Sun, T., McCall, C., Schneider, R., Caton, K., Hundley, C., Hopkins, L., Ensor, K., Domakonda, K., Kalvapalle, P.,
425 Persse, D., Williams, S., Stadler, L.B., 2023. Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 and influenza in preK-12 schools shows
426 school, community, and citywide infections. *Water Research* 231, 119648. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2023.119648>,
427 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2023.119648.
- 428 Yeager, R., Holm, R.H., Saurabh, K., Fuqua, J.L., Talley, D., Bhatnagar, A., Smith, T., 2021. Wastewater Sample Site Selection
429 to Estimate Geographically Resolved Community Prevalence of COVID-19: A Sampling Protocol Perspective. *GeoHealth* 5,
430 e2021GH000420. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GH000420>, doi:10/gnqvjt. zSCC: 0000001 Publisher: John Wiley &
431 Sons, Ltd.
- 432 Zhao, L., Zou, Y., Li, Y., Miyani, B., Spooner, M., Gentry, Z., Jacobi, S., David, R.E., Withington, S., McFarlane, S., Faust, R.,
433 Sheets, J., Kaye, A., Broz, J., Gosine, A., Mobley, P., Busch, A.W.U., Norton, J., Xagorarakis, I., 2022. Five-week warning
434 of COVID-19 peaks prior to the Omicron surge in Detroit, Michigan using wastewater surveillance. *Science of The Total*
435 *Environment* 844, 157040. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.157040>, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.157040.
- 436