

29 wastewater treatment plant in the city (Pearson coefficient: 0.6456, p-value: 6.36710^{-8}), than
30 in the largest university campus in the study (Pearson coefficient: 0.4860, p-value: 8.288×10^{-5}).
31 However, when comparing the data after urban mobility returned to pre-pandemic levels,
32 correlation levels in both locations became comparable (0.894 for the university campus and
33 0.865 for Dulces Nombres).

34 **Keywords:** WBS, Nationwide pathogen surveillance, COVID-19, Education institute as state
35 proxy,

36 1. Introduction

37 In recent years, wastewater-based surveillance (WBS) has emerged as a powerful toolset to
38 provide data regarding public and environmental health status in communities through the
39 detection and quantification of specific biomarkers in the sewage system (Choi et al., 2018,
40 Lorenzo and Picó, 2019). While initial studies focused on chemical indicators of exposure to
41 drugs, pharmaceuticals, contaminants, and personal care products, among others (Vitale et
42 al., 2021), WBS has proven valuable for the study of the epidemiology of infectious
43 diseases, such as Hepatitis E (Beyer et al., 2020), Norovirus (Guo et al., 2022), and other
44 enteric viruses (Janahi et al., 2021). However, WBS rose to prominence during the COVID-
45 19 pandemic, when it proved valuable for the prevention and contention of outbreaks by
46 detecting and quantifying viral genetic material using RT-PCR-based methods (Bivins et al.,
47 2020). It must be noted that WBS data has proven to be significantly more useful when used
48 in tandem with clinical reports, leading to robust risk assessment models that can be used to
49 predict surges in cases, allowing for well-informed decision-making (Islam et al., 2023).

50 In WBS platforms, sampling usually happens at wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs),
51 since municipal wastewater can be used as a representative sample of its served population,
52 allowing for reduced bias in the resulting datasets (Jimenez-Rodríguez et al., 2022).
53 Nevertheless, several studies have explored the potential of targeted systems to study the
54 circulation of pathogens within specific, high-affluence areas, such as schools, hospitals,

55 college campuses (Gonçalves et al., 2022), and airports (van der Drift et al., 2024). As
56 discussed by Wolken et al. (2023) strategic, targeted approaches are useful as a closer
57 representation of the health status of subpopulations within a city and to prevent these
58 buildings from becoming transmission hotspots, allowing for safer operations in the context
59 of a pandemic. Studies were proved to be effective as an effective early warning system in
60 the case of surges of COVID-19 cases, as sensitive and specific detection of viral genetic
61 materials allowed for detection of both symptomatic and asymptomatic cases (Scott et al.,
62 2021; Gibas et al., 2021; Corchis-Scott et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022; Godinez et al., 2022).
63 Moreover, longitudinal surveillance data can be used to reduce the intensity of individual
64 clinical testing in periods when on-campus activities were returning to normalcy (Betancourt
65 et al., 2021; Amirali et al., 2024), and to evaluate the efficacy of mitigation measures, such
66 as social distancing, compulsive facemask use (Rainey et al., 2023), and vaccination (Bivins
67 and Bibby, 2021), among others.

68 Previous efforts by our team explored the implementation of a WBS platform to survey the
69 SARS-CoV-2 viral loads in the WWTPs of the Monterrey Metropolitan Area (MMA) in
70 northern Mexico, correlating them with trends in clinical reports and urban mobility (Sosa-
71 Hernández et al., 2022). In the present work, we implemented a similar platform to report the
72 diversity and abundance of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern in wastewater samples from
73 the Mexico City's sewage system (Aguayo-Acosta et al., 2024). We now report on the
74 deployment and evaluation of a comprehensive WBS platform for the surveillance of SARS-
75 CoV-2 on a building-by-building level across all the facilities of the largest private university
76 in Mexico between January 2021 and June 2022. The institution operates 38 facilities in 19
77 of the 32 states of the country, serving 96,040 students as of 2022 (Tecnológico de
78 Monterrey, 2022).


79 This study's objectives were to establish an extensive, building-by-building WBS platform
80 across all facilities and to evaluate the correlation between the load of viral genetic materials
81 in wastewater samples with epidemiologic reports. Finally, to evaluate the effectiveness of

82 the mitigation measures taken by the institution, results from the central university campus,
83 located in the MMA (Campus Monterrey from now on) will be explored and compared to data
84 originating from wastewater samples from Dulces Nombres, the largest WWTP operating
85 within the MMA.

86 **2. Methods**

87 **2.1. Wastewater sampling protocols**

88 Wastewater sampling took place in 343 buildings across 39 participating facilities, including
89 high schools, university campuses, and hospitals. The geographical distribution of campuses
90 sampled in this study is shown in Figure 1. Samples were collected once a week between
91 January 29, 2021 (denoted as week 5 from now on) and June 20, 2022 (denoted as week 78
92 from now on) in the wastewater discharge point of each participant building. Simple, 1 L grab
93 samples were collected using high-density polyethylene (HDPE) bottles and stored at 4° C in
94 ice packs for shipping to the central WBS laboratory, located within Campus Monterrey. In
95 parallel, wastewater sampling was also conducted weekly at Dulces Nombres, the largest
96 WWTP in the MMA, with a capacity of 7,500 liters per second and a served population of
97 1,695,589 inhabitants, in continuation of previous efforts by our team (Sosa-Hernández et
98 al., 2022).



99
100 **FIGURE 1.** Geographical distribution of participating sampling sites across Mexico.

101 **2.2. Concentration and extraction of genetic materials**

102 Immediately after reception, samples were pre-processed to concentrate viral genetic
103 materials utilizing a PEG/NaCl precipitation method based on the one reported by Sapula et
104 al. (2021). Briefly, 70 mL from each sample was collected in two, 50 mL Falcon tubes and
105 clarified by centrifugation at 5,000 g for 5 minutes. Supernatants were collected into new
106 tubes with a polyethylene glycol 8000 and NaCl solution, shaken manually until the phases
107 were homogenized, and the genetic materials were precipitated by centrifugation at 12,000 g
108 for 100 minutes. After discarding the liquid phase, pelleted genetic materials were
109 resuspended in 300 μ L of Milli-Q water and stored at -20°C until extraction.

110 Extraction was conducted using a Water DNA/RNA Magnetic Bead Kit (IDEXX, Westbrook,
111 Maine) adapted for automation using a KingFisher™ Flex instrument (Thermo Fisher,
112 Waltham, Massachusetts) following the supplier's guidelines. Final elution volumes were
113 kept at 100 μ L in all cases. RT-PCR detection of SARS-CoV-2 genetic materials was
114 conducted on a QuantStudio 5 instrument (Applied Biosystems, Waltham, Massachusetts)

115 using the SARS-CoV-2 RTPCR Test kit for wastewater samples (IDEXX, Westbrook,
116 Maine). In accordance with the supplier's guidelines, reactions consisted of 5 μ L of SARS-
117 CoV-2 mix, 5 μ L of RNA Master Mix, and 5 μ L of extracted genetic material. The RT-PCR
118 program consisted of an initial hold for 15 min at 50 °C and then 1 min at 95 °C, followed by
119 45 amplification cycles of 95 °C for 15 s and 60 °C for 30 s. Ct values were collected for
120 each sample into a database for analysis.

121 **2.3. Epidemiological clinical data acquisition**

122 Total daily reported COVID-19 cases by the state were obtained from the dashboard
123 published by the National Council of Humanities, Sciences, and Technologies (CONAHCYT)
124 with data provided by the General Direction of Epidemiology, a part of the Mexican
125 Department of Health (available at <https://datos.covid-19.conacyt.mx/>). As WBS data was
126 collected weekly, a seven-day average of daily cases was calculated for each state across
127 the period of study. Fluctuations in urban mobility in the MMA due to social distancing and
128 other mitigation policies were accounted for using COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports
129 published by Google in 2021 and 2022 for the Mexican state of Nuevo León (available at
130 <https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/>). Total changes in mobility were estimated by
131 averaging the data from the six reported parameters (retail and recreation, groceries and
132 pharmacies, parks, transit stations, workplaces, and residential). Finally, as this data was
133 also reported daily, a seven-day average was paired to the weekly WBS data originating
134 from Campus Monterrey for analysis.

135 **2.4. Data analysis and visualization**

136 WBS and epidemiological data was originally captured and organized in spreadsheets using
137 Microsoft Excel, saved as CSV files, and imported into Matlab R2024a for visualization and
138 statistical analysis. To limit the impact of inconsistencies during sampling due to restrictions
139 at the sites or limited personnel, sites were clustered first by campus and by state for
140 analysis. Four parameters were calculated weekly for each cluster: the average viral load of

141 the weekly samples from each site (calculated as the sum of all the detected viral loads,
142 expressed as copies per liter, divided by the number of samples taken from the site each
143 week), the maximum viral load detected on the weekly samples from each site, the
144 proportion of weekly positive samples (calculated as the number of positive samples from a
145 site divided the total number of samples each week), and the proportion of buildings where
146 the viral load was detected (calculated as the number of weekly positive samples divided by
147 the total number of buildings sampled in the site).

148 Pearson correlation coefficients and their associated p-values were calculated for the seven-
149 day average daily new COVID-19 cases in the corresponding state and each of the four
150 parameters discussed above to evaluate the concordance of results obtained from the
151 detection of SARS-CoV-2 genetic materials in wastewater samples with the evolution of the
152 pandemic in the populations around each of the campuses studied. All correlations with a p-
153 value below 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

154 For the state of Nuevo León, a comparative analysis between the data obtained from
155 Campus Monterrey and Dulces Nombres was performed to evaluate the efficacy of the
156 preventive measures taken by the institution. For this, Pearson correlation coefficients
157 between the seven-day average new daily COVID-19 cases and the maximum viral load
158 detected at Campus Monterrey and at Dulces Nombres, respectively, using both data from
159 the entire study period and data obtained after urban mobility returned to pre-pandemic
160 levels.

161 **3. Results and discussion**

162 **3.1. Overview of wastewater sampling at Tecnológico de Monterrey**

163 A total of 9664 wastewater samples were collected, processed, and analyzed in this study.
164 However, as seen in Table 1, the distribution of sampling sites across facilities was not
165 homogeneous due to differences in area, the number of buildings and the size of the student
166 population in each one. The campuses from where most samples were collected were

167 Monterrey (1395 samples), Querétaro (975), Guadalajara (634), Laguna (619), and León
168 (551), all of them located in large metropolitan areas across Mexico. Similarly, the states
169 from which more samples originated from were Nuevo León (2006 samples), Mexico (987),
170 Querétaro (975), Chihuahua (879), and Mexico City (855). As observed previously in similar
171 efforts, such as the one reported by Wolken et al. (2023), weekly sampling was not perfectly
172 consistent due to factors including inaccessible sampling points, temporary closing of
173 buildings due to surges in cases, lack of trained personnel, and scheduled holiday periods.
174 As a result, while the total sampling period across the study extended for 74 weeks, the
175 actual number of weeks in which sampling took place at Tecnológico de Monterrey facilities
176 ranged from 62 at Campus Puebla to 14 at Hospital Zambrano. Likewise, the number of
177 weeks in which sampling took place in at least one site in each state went from 62 in Puebla
178 to 43 in Sinaloa. It must be noted that a total of two samples from Campus Veracruz were
179 taken at the beginning of the study, but no further sampling was possible since the facility
180 was closed shortly after. As such, it will not be considered in further data analysis.

181 **Table 1.** General summary of samples taken during the study, organized by campus and state of
182 origin.

No.	Site	Total samples	Weekly samplings	Buildings
Per campus				
1	Monterrey	1395	60	42
2	Querétaro	975	60	25
3	Guadalajara	634	60	28
4	Laguna	619	56	15
5	León	551	61	13
6	Chihuahua	502	60	14
7	Irapuato	378	59	10
8	CDJ	377	60	14
9	Estado de México	373	55	18
10	Zacatecas	337	51	8

11	Puebla	336	62	11
12	CDMX	281	60	8
13	Aguascalientes	258	61	9
14	Saltillo	236	52	7
15	Sonora Norte	228	57	10
16	Sinaloa	199	43	9
17	Toluca	194	52	8
18	SLP	158	56	6
19	Tampico	152	58	7
20	Santa Fe	140	57	9
21	Santa Catarina	139	47	4
22	Hidalgo	134	59	6
23	Cumbres	133	52	4
24	Morelia	112	58	7
25	Chiapas	98	59	4
26	Eugenio Garza Lagüera	90	45	3
27	Navojoa	88	54	5
28	Hospital Zambrano Hellion	70	14	5
29	Celaya	58	58	4
30	Ciudad Obregón	58	54	4
31	Cuernavaca	57	53	5
32	Esmeralda	56	53	4
33	Hospital San José	51	17	4
34	Valle Alto	50	44	4
35	Metepec	43	43	2
36	Eugenio Garza Sada	42	42	3
37	EGADE y EGOB	36	36	1
38	Santa Anita	24	24	2
39	Veracruz	2	2	1

Per state				
1	NUEVOLEON	2006	61	59
2	MEXICO	987	61	23
3	QUERETARO	975	60	27
4	CHIHUAHUA	879	61	28
5	DISTRITOFEDERAL	855	57	21
6	HIDALGO	658	60	27
7	JALISCO	610	55	26
8	COAHUILA	477	61	20
9	SONORA	374	57	15
10	ZACATECAS	337	51	8
11	PUEBLA	336	62	11
12	AGUASCALIENTES	258	61	9
13	SINALOA	199	43	9
14	SANLUISPOTOSI	158	56	6
15	TAMAULIPAS	152	58	10
16	GUANAJUATO	134	59	6
17	MICHOACAN	112	58	7
18	CHIAPAS	98	59	5
19	MORELOS	57	53	5
20	VERACRUZ	2	2	1

183

184 Similarly, a summary of the sampling results is presented in Figure 2A for campuses and
 185 Figure 2B for states. Red squares show weeks when sampling was conducted at a given site
 186 and at least one of the sampled buildings tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 genetic materials,
 187 white squares show weeks when sampling was conducted but no viral loads were detected,
 188 and grey squares show weeks when no sampling was conducted As a reference, a graph of
 189 the weekly evolution of new COVID-19 cases in Mexico is reported in Figure 2C. Complete
 190 records of all samples collected during the study, their origin, and the detected viral loads,

191 reported as copies per liter of the original wastewater sample, are available in the
192 Supplementary Materials.




Figure 2. Summary of samplings across participant sites. A) By campus, B) by state. C) Weekly evolution of new daily COVID-19 cases across Mexico.

3.2. Correlation between WBS results and epidemiological reports

197 As shown in Table 2, the maximum viral load and the average viral load in the weekly
 198 samples taken in each site showed the most consistent correlation to the seven-day average
 199 of new daily COVID-19 cases in the corresponding state (available in the Supplementary
 200 Materials), both when campuses were analyzed individually (average correlation coefficients
 201 of 0.448 ± 0.302 and 0.427 ± 0.303 , respectively) and when campuses were clustered by
 202 state (0.465 ± 0.276 and 0.438 ± 0.277). The correlation with the proportion of positive
 203 samples and positive buildings fell significantly (0.296 ± 0.197 and 0.309 ± 0.201 for
 204 individual campuses, 0.307 ± 0.153 and 0.317 ± 0.180 for states), likely due to the
 205 inconsistencies in samples discussed previously, which led to significant variations in the
 206 number of samples being obtained each week. The number of sites where correlation
 207 proved statistically significant (p-values below 0.05) showed similar behavior: correlation to
 208 the maximum viral load per site showed to be significant in 25 of the 38 campuses and 13 of
 209 the 19 states, followed by the average viral load per campus or state (24/38 and 13/19,
 210 respectively).

211 **Table 2.** Average correlation coefficients for the average viral load, maximum viral load, proportion of
 212 positive samples, and proportion of positive buildings across sampling sites, by campus and by state.

	Correlation with seven-day average new daily cases			
	Average viral load	Maximum viral load	Proportion of positive samples	Proportion of positive buildings
Per campus				
Average correlation coefficient (Pearson)	0.427 ± 0.303	0.448 ± 0.302	0.296 ± 0.197	0.309 ± 0.201
Sites with statistically significant correlation	24	25	22	22
Percentage of sites with statistically significant correlation	63.16%	65.79%	57.89%	57.89%

Per state				
Average correlation coefficient (Pearson)	0.438 ± 0.277	0.465 ± 0.276	0.307 ± 0.153	0.317 ± 0.180
Sites with statistically significant correlation	13	13	12	11
Percentage of sites with statistically significant correlation	68.42%	68.42%	63.16%	57.89%

213

214 As suggested previously, correlation coefficients vary greatly among campuses, going from
 215 0.9004 at Hospital San José to -0.0942 in Campus Sinaloa, although most campuses show
 216 positive correlation coefficients and 24 out of 38 show coefficients above 0.4. The complete
 217 list is presented in Table 3 of number of weekly samplings and the average coverage rate
 218 (calculated as the average of the ratios between samples taken on each campus per week
 219 and the total number of sampling sites within the campus) for each campus, the Pearson
 220 correlation between the maximum viral load found weekly on each campus and the seven-
 221 day average of new daily COVID-19 cases in the state where the campus is located, and its
 222 related p-value.

223 **Table 3.** Correlation coefficients between the maximum viral load and the seven-day average of new
 224 daily COVID-19 cases across campuses.

Campus	Weekly samplings	Coverage rate	Correlation coefficient (Pearson)	p-value
Hospital San José	17	0.750 ± 0.000	0.900	8.383E-07
Celaya	58	0.250 ± 0.000	0.843	1.073E-16
Zacatecas	51	0.826 ± 0.216	0.828	6.592E-14
Querétaro	60	0.650 ± 0.339	0.818	1.435E-15
Meteppec	43	0.500 ± 0.000	0.798	1.409E-10

Hospital Zambrano Hellion	14	1.000 ± 0.000	0.751	1.978E-03
Santa Catarina	47	0.739 ± 0.072	0.707	2.776E-08
León	61	0.695 ± 0.324	0.692	6.501E-10
Ciudad Obregón	54	0.269 ± 0.094	0.681	1.444E-08
Estado de México	55	0.377 ± 0.13	0.642	1.240E-07
Puebla	62	0.493 ± 0.334	0.640	2.155E-08
Esmeralda	53	0.264 ± 0.102	0.631	4.035E-07
Sonora Norte	57	0.400 ± 0.206	0.616	3.371E-07
Hidalgo	59	0.379 ± 0.247	0.603	4.244E-07
CDMX	60	0.585 ± 0.193	0.602	3.681E-07
Cuernavaca	53	0.215 ± 0.066	0.601	1.948E-06
Santa Fe	57	0.273 ± 0.075	0.598	9.178E-07
SLP	56	0.470 ± 0.232	0.595	1.334E-06
Laguna	56	0.737 ± 0.262	0.589	1.828E-06
Guadalajara	60	0.377 ± 0.174	0.575	1.574E-06
Eugenio Garza Lagüera	45	0.667 ± 0.000	0.574	3.701E-05
Irapuato	59	0.641 ± 0.243	0.574	1.989E-06
Saltillo	52	0.648 ± 0.195	0.527	6.084E-05
Monterrey	60	0.554 ± 0.341	0.486	8.288E-05
Toluca	52	0.466 ± 0.277	0.328	0.018
Aguascalientes	61	0.470 ± 0.187	0.247	0.055
Chiapas	59	0.415 ± 0.157	0.230	0.079
Valle Alto	44	0.284 ± 0.126	0.198	0.198
Tampico	58	0.374 ± 0.209	0.175	0.189
Navojoa	54	0.326 ± 0.097	0.084	0.544
Santa Anita	24	0.500 ± 0.000	0.061	0.777
CDJ	60	0.449 ± 0.312	0.059	0.652
Cumbres	52	0.639 ± 0.205	0.016	0.911

Morelia	58	0.276 ± 0.140	-0.007	0.960
Chihuahua	60	0.598 ± 0.149	-0.027	0.836
EGADE y EGOB	36	1.000 ± 0.000	-0.030	0.864
Eugenio Garza Sada	42	0.333 ± 0.000	-0.091	0.569
Sinaloa	43	0.514 ± 0.247	-0.094	0.548

225

226 Just as observed when clustering sampling sites by campus, correlation coefficients vary
 227 greatly among states, going from 0.8280 in Zacatecas to -0.0942 in Sinaloa, although most
 228 states show positive correlation coefficients, and 13 out of 19 show coefficients above 0.4.
 229 The complete list is presented in Table 4 with the number of weekly samplings and the
 230 average coverage rate (calculated as the average of the ratios between samples taken on
 231 each state per week and the total number of sampling sites within the campus) for each
 232 state, the Pearson correlation between the maximum viral load found weekly on each state
 233 and its seven-day average of new daily COVID-19 cases, and the related p-value.

234 **Table 4.** Correlation coefficients between the maximum viral load and the seven-day average of new
 235 daily COVID-19 cases across states.

Campus	Weekly sampling	Coverage rate	Correlation coefficient (Pearson)	p-value
ZACATECAS	51	0.826 ± 0.216	0.828	6.592E-14
QUERETARO	60	0.650 ± 0.339	0.818	1.435E-15
GUANAJUATO	61	0.952 ± 0.398	0.657	8.834E-09
MEXICO	55	0.616 ± 0.255	0.643	1.208E-07
PUEBLA	62	0.493 ± 0.334	0.640	2.155E-08
SONORA	57	0.596 ± 0.232	0.635	1.143E-07
COAHUILA	61	0.711 ± 0.239	0.632	4.829E-08
HIDALGO	59	0.379 ± 0.247	0.603	4.244E-07
MORELOS	53	0.215 ± 0.066	0.601	1.948E-06

SAN LUIS POTOSI	56	0.470 ± 0.232	0.595	1.334E-06
DISTRITO FEDERAL	57	0.882 ± 0.306	0.589	1.445E-06
JALISCO	60	0.392 ± 0.171	0.575	1.575E-06
NUEVO LEON	61	0.747 ± 0.451	0.486	7.067E-05
AGUASCALIENTES	61	0.47 ± 0.187	0.247	0.055
CHIAPAS	59	0.415 ± 0.157	0.230	0.079
TAMAULIPAS	58	0.374 ± 0.209	0.175	0.189
MICHOACAN	58	0.276 ± 0.14	-0.007	0.960
CHIHUAHUA	61	1.029 ± 0.432	-0.018	0.889
SINALOA	43	0.514 ± 0.247	-0.094	0.548

236

237 Limited correlation between the results of the WBS platform deployed across participating
238 facilities and the epidemiological reports was expected, as measures to prevent SARS-CoV-
239 2 transmission, including mandatory face mask-wearing, vaccination, and reduced levels of
240 in-person activities were implemented across the entire period of study, altering the
241 population dynamics, viral transmission dynamics, transmission risk and density of exposure
242 in campus, as studied by Tsang et al. (2023), affecting the correlation observed between
243 viral load in campus wastewater and daily cases of COVID-19 in MMA. In fact, WBS reports
244 obtained by our research team were used by officials to limit the activities in buildings that
245 proved positive for SARS-CoV-2 genetic materials in a mechanism like the one reported by
246 Wang et al. (2022). However, estimating the efficacy of outbreak prevention measures using
247 WBS data has proven difficult, as adequately modeling the rates of viral shedding (Zhu et al.,
248 2021) and RNA degradation in sewage systems (Parra-Arroyo et al., 2023) has been
249 identified as a challenge. Moreover, reports on the implementation of extensive, targeted
250 surveillance platforms, such as the ones by Bowes et al. (2023) and Wolken et al. (2023),
251 have stressed the importance of adequate standardization of sampling, pretreatment,
252 concentration and extraction procedures, as well as the proper identification the sensitivity,


253 specificity and limit of detection of the technique used for SARS-CoV-2 viral load detection to
254 minimize systematic variation and obtain complete, robust data sets.

255 While the performance of the building-by-building WBS platform was satisfactory, it is
256 important to highlight the challenges related to the operation of such a large network of
257 sampling sites distributed in a vast geographical area, including incomplete sample
258 collection due to unforeseeable circumstances during the study period and inadequate
259 sampling handling during transportation, likely a result of insufficient cold chains, as
260 reviewed by Bengiovanni et al. (2020). These obstacles led to the observed variation in the
261 number of weekly samplings taken per campus and by state, in the effective coverage rates,
262 and the representativity obtained in each campus when compared to the epidemiological
263 data reported by the public health authorities. Extensive networks would be ideal to obtain
264 more detailed information that could be used for better risk assessment models, especially in
265 areas that are particularly prone to disease outbreaks (Gonçalves et al., 2022); however,
266 limited datasets are to be expected as surveillance platforms expand, especially in Low-to-
267 Middle Income Countries like Mexico, where such systems are often operated with limited
268 resources (Shrestha et al., 2021; Hamilton et al., 2024). Similar surveillance efforts
269 conducted in the future would likely benefit from a more targeted approach, where sampling
270 sites are set strategically, to allow for more sustained, consistent coverage while retaining
271 sample representativity. In cases of public health emergencies where extensive, sustained
272 surveillance is crucial for public health, as in the case of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is likely
273 that WBS platforms would be more effective when operated collaboratively across
274 institutions as long as the procedures for sample handling, pretreatment, and viral genetic
275 material extraction and detection are properly standardized and proven reproducible.

276 **3.3. Comparisons between data from a college campus and a WWTP**

277 To offer insights on the effectiveness of the epidemiological contention and prevention taken
278 by Tecnológico de Monterrey (including reduced in-person activities, compulsive mask
279 wearing and vaccination), data obtained from wastewater surveillance in Campus Monterrey

280 and the Dulces Nombres WWTP (available in the Supplementary Materials), both located in
281 the MMA, was compared to epidemiological data reported by public health authorities for the
282 state of Nuevo León. After eliminating weeks when no sampling took place, correlation
283 between the maximum viral load found on all the samples originating from Campus
284 Monterrey each week and the corresponding seven-day average of new daily cases of
285 COVID-19 reported in Nuevo León was 0.486 (p-value: 8.2876×10^{-5}). For the viral load
286 detected at Dulces Nombres, the observed correlation coefficient reached 0.6356 (p-value:
287 6.3672×10^{-8}). Plots presenting the distribution of the data from each weekly sampling is
288 presented in Figure 3A.



289

290

Figure 3. Correlation between the seven-day average of daily new cases of COVID-19 in the state of

291

Nuevo León and the viral load detected at Campus Monterrey (blue) and Dulces Nombres (red). A)

292

Including the entire period of study. B) Only considering data from January to June 2022. C) Evolution

293

of urban mobility in the MMA across the period of study.

294 Since samples from both sites originate from the same metropolitan area and were
295 transported a similar distance to the central laboratory following standard practices for
296 genetic material conservation, it can be suggested that the difference in their degree of
297 correlation to the epidemiological situation in the state is due to the different populational
298 dynamics they represent. Campus Monterrey, like most higher education facilities in Mexico,
299 greatly limited its in-person activities during the pandemic; maintenance personnel,
300 researchers, postgraduate students, and security guards were still going regularly into the
301 facilities, but most of the undergraduate students, faculty, and administrative personnel
302 conducted their activities remotely. Inversely, Dulces Nombres is the biggest collection point
303 for domestic and industrial wastewater in the MMA and, as a result, is representative of the
304 entire population within its catchment area, regardless of whether they adhered to social
305 distancing regulations, presented any symptoms of COVID-19, or received a clinical test and
306 were reported to the epidemiological databased compiled and published by public health
307 authorities. Therefore, it can be observed that, while extensive wastewater surveillance at
308 Campus Monterrey was useful for a safe continuation of strategic activities at campus that
309 could not be conducted remotely, WBS platforms centered on WWTPs were still more
310 representative of the epidemiological situation in the MMA, where the implementation of
311 transmission measure prevention doesn't impact in wastewater viral load, contrary to what
312 has been observed on the campuses.

313 In a related line, Figure 3B shows the evolution of urban activity in the state of Nuevo Leon
314 during the period of study as reported in the COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports
315 published by Google. Weeks are presented in the X-axis, while changes in mobility
316 compared to the baseline (from January 3 to February 6, 2020) are presented in the Y-axis.
317 Mobility surpassed the pre-pandemic baseline in week 43 (the last week of October 2021)
318 and remained above the baseline throughout 2022 (week 52 onwards) with the exceptions of
319 weeks 53-57 (in January 2022), likely due to the holiday season and increased cases in the
320 winter. This indicates a relative return to normalcy in the populational dynamics of the state.

321 Taking this into account, correlations between the maximum viral load found each week at
322 Campus Monterrey and at Dulces Nombres with the seven-day average of new daily cases
323 in the state of Nuevo Leon between January and June of 2022. As expected, correlation
324 increased noticeably in both cases due to less stringent epidemiological containment
325 measures, reaching correlation coefficients of 0.8655 (p-value: 8.3176×10^{-7}) for Dulces
326 Nombres, and 0.8938 (p-value: 3.0621×10^{-6}) for Campus Monterrey. Moreover, the fact that
327 correlation coefficients for both sites were so close after week 52 indicates that the
328 populational dynamics at Campus Monterrey became similar to MMA and more
329 representative to the ones shown in the MMA and the state of Nuevo León, further
330 suggesting the effectivity of epidemiological prevention taken at Campus Monterrey
331 throughout 2021, which were implemented in conjunction with the rest of the facilities of
332 Tecnológico de Monterrey across Mexico.

333 **4. Perspectives**

334 This work offers important insights into the operation of a large WBS platform for the
335 surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 across 39 facilities across Tecnológico de Monterrey,
336 encompassing high schools, college campuses, and hospitals in 20 of the 32 federal entities
337 of Mexico. The performance of such a platform was evaluated through comparisons to
338 epidemiological data reported by public health authorities and, in the case of Campus
339 Monterrey (the largest of all participant facilities), to data obtained from samples taken at
340 Dulces Nombres, the largest WWTP in the MMA. While it was observed that viral loads
341 detected in wastewater samples were correlated with the amount of daily new COVID-19
342 cases in 25 campuses across 13 states, and that WBS could be used as an effective
343 strategy to support epidemiological contention measures, as shown for the case of Campus
344 Monterrey, opportunities for improvement of WBS platforms persist.

345 Sampling across a large network of sites across participating facilities was relevant for the
346 institution, as it offered data to guide effective preventive efforts for a safe continuation of
347 priority in-person activities. However, encompassing such a large set of sampling points into

348 a single platform operated from a single laboratory made consistent coverage across
349 campuses (defined here as the rate of total weekly samples from a facility over the total
350 amount of participant buildings in the facility) difficult. While taking only the weekly maximum
351 viral load for each campus for correlation studies helped with consistency when handling
352 such an incomplete database, as shown by the performance metrics reported in the previous
353 section, significant variance in coverage rates may have contributed to limited correlation
354 between WBS data and epidemiological reports. Future efforts towards sustained, extensive
355 surveillance platforms, either for detection of endemic pathogens such as Influenza or
356 Norovirus, or future epidemiological outbreaks akin to SARS-CoV-2, may benefit from a
357 more strategic selection of sampling points that can be studied consistently and yield results
358 that can be representative of general populational dynamics, as previously suggested by
359 Safford et al. (2022).

360 Moreover, standardized, reproducible sample processing methods will be crucial for any
361 WBS platform, as inconsistent viral load detection and quantification may hinder data
362 comparability and analysis, as discussed previously by Bowes et al. (2023). Moreover, levels
363 of biomarkers in wastewater have been observed to vary significantly because of changes in
364 the flow at the designated sampling site, fluctuations in human activity, and possible
365 degradation of the molecule of interest (Ali et al., 2021). While the surveillance effort
366 reported here relied on simple grab samples, a limitation that could be mitigated by
367 clustering different sites by campus and by state during data analysis, smaller, more
368 targeted platforms could benefit from the use of composite sampling or implementation of
369 passive sampling technologies, although their applicability for wastewater surveillance of
370 pathogens still requires further studies (Aguayo-Acosta et al., 2023).

371 Finally, integration of viral load quantification in wastewater samples into complete
372 epidemiological models that could be used for risk assessment and prevention during a
373 public health emergency, such as the one posed by SARS-CoV-2, remains as an area of
374 opportunity for WBS. While certain directions for the interpretation of WBS data as an

375 indicator of public health status have been discussed elsewhere (Islam et al., 2023), data
376 normalization remains a challenge as no universal wastewater biomarker for population size
377 and levels of human activity have been agreed upon, although several options have been
378 suggested (Hsu et al., 2022). In any case, WBS should not be thought of as a substitute for
379 individual clinical tests, but as a complement for more robust epidemiological data. This work
380 focuses only on the main outcomes of the WBS platform deployed at Tecnológico de
381 Monterrey, while their integration into epidemiological models will be explored in future
382 studies.

383 **5. Conclusions**

384 Overall, the extensive, building-by-building WBS platform deployed across Tecnológico de
385 Monterrey successfully reflected the evolution of the COVID-19 epidemic in 25 of the 38
386 facilities in the study and provided valuable insights for effective epidemiological containment
387 during 2021, allowing for the continuation of priority in-person activities. Moreover,
388 implementing a WBS platform targeting educative institutions like university campuses
389 proved a suitable proxy to study the epidemiological dynamics in tandem with clinical reports
390 published by public health authorities in larger communities, like states.

391 Additionally, this study evaluates the optimal strategy to obtain correlations between viral
392 loads in wastewater samples from individual buildings and published clinical reports, proving
393 that clustering sampling points by campus or state and using the maximum viral load found
394 in each cluster is a feasible strategy to generate robust, insightful datasets for informed
395 decision-making. In fact, data from Campus Monterrey became more representative of the
396 public health condition in the state of Nuevo León after urban mobility went back to pre-
397 pandemic levels at the start of 2022, indicating that the altered populational dynamics within
398 the campus during 2021 due to limited in-person activities were effective to prevent COVID-
399 19 outbreaks within the facility.

400 However, further studies regarding the optimization of such a vast platform and the
401 integration of WBS data into broader epidemiological models are still needed for the
402 development of robust, efficient surveillance platforms for future public health emergencies.

403 **Credit author statement**

404 **Arnoldo Armenta-Castro:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Visualization, Methodology,
405 Data Curation, Writing-Original draft preparation. **Alberto Aguayo-Acosta:**
406 Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal analysis, Validation, Methodology, Writing-Original
407 draft preparation, Writing - Review & Editing. **Mariel A. Oyervides-Muñoz:**
408 Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal analysis, Validation, Methodology, Writing-Original
409 draft preparation, Supervision, Writing - Review & Editing. **Sofia Liliana Lucero-Saucedo:**
410 Investigation, Writing-Original draft preparation, Writing - Review & Editing. **Alejandro**
411 **Robles-Zamora:** Investigation, Writing-Original draft preparation, Writing - Review & Editing.
412 **Kassandra O. Rodriguez-Aguillón:** Investigation, Writing-Original draft preparation, Writing
413 - Review & Editing. **Antonio Ovalle-Carcaño:** Investigation, Writing-Original draft
414 preparation, Writing - Review & Editing. **Roberto Parra-Saldívar:** Conceptualization,
415 Investigation, Writing-Original draft preparation, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Writing -
416 Review & Editing. **Juan Eduardo Sosa-Hernández:** Conceptualization, Investigation,
417 Writing-Original draft preparation, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition,
418 Writing - Review & Editing.

419

420 **Funding**

421 This research was funded by the Fundación FEMSA project entitled “Unidad de respuesta
422 rápida al monitoreo de COVID19 por agua residual” (grant number NA). This work was
423 supported by Tecnológico de Monterrey through the project Challenge-Based Research
424 Funding Program 2022 (Muestreador Pasivo I026 - IAMSM005 - C4-T1 - T).

425 **Declaration of competing interest**

426 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal
427 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

428 **Acknowledgments**

429 The authors would like to thank the Bioproduction Systems and MARTEC lab from
430 Tecnológico de Monterrey, Mexico. The authors appreciate the support of Tecnológico de
431 Monterrey for granting access to literature services and the scholarship awarded to Arnoldo
432 Armenta-Castro (CVU: 1275527) and partially supporting this work under Sistema Nacional
433 de Investigadores program awarded to Alberto Aguayo-Acosta (CVU: 403948), Mariel A.
434 Oyervides-Muñoz (CVU: 422778), Roberto Parra-Saldívar (CVU: 35753) and Juan Eduardo
435 Sosa-Hernández (CVU: 375202).

436 **References**

- 437 1. Aguayo-Acosta, A., Jiménez-Rodríguez, M. G., Silva-Lance, F., Oyervides-Muñoz, M. A.,
438 Armenta-Castro, A., De La Rosa, O., Ovalle-Carcaño, A., Melchor-Martínez, E. M., Aghalari,
439 Z., Parra-Saldívar, R., & Sosa-Hernández, J. E. (2023). Passive Sampler Technology for Viral
440 Detection in Wastewater-Based Surveillance: Current State and Nanomaterial Opportunities.
441 *Viruses*, 15(9), 1941. <https://doi.org/10.3390/v15091941>
- 442 2. Aguayo-Acosta, A., Oyervides-Muñoz, M. A., Rodríguez-Aguillón, K. O., Ovalle-Carcaño, A.,
443 Romero-Castillo, K. D., Robles-Zamora, A., Johnson, M., Parra-Saldívar, R., & Sosa-
444 Hernández, J. E. (2024). Omicron and Delta variant prevalence detection and identification
445 during the fourth COVID-19 wave in Mexico using wastewater-based epidemiology. *IJID*
446 *Regions*, 10, 44–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijregi.2023.11.005>
- 447 3. Ali, W., Zhang, H., Wang, Z., Chang, C., Javed, A., Ali, K., Du, W., Niazi, N. K., Mao, K., &
448 Yang, Z. (2021). Occurrence of various viruses and recent evidence of SARS-CoV-2 in
449 wastewater systems. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 414, 125439.
450 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.125439>
- 451 4. Amirali, A., Babler, K. M., Sharkey, M. E., Beaver, C. C., Boone, M. M., Comerford, S.,
452 Cooper, D., Currall, B. B., Goodman, K. W., Grills, G. S., Kobetz, E., Kumar, N., Laine, J.,
453 Lamar, W. E., Mason, C. E., Reding, B. D., Roca, M. A., Ryon, K., Schürer, S. C., ... Solo-

- 454 Gabriele, H. M. (2024). Wastewater based surveillance can be used to reduce clinical testing
455 intensity on a university campus. *Science of The Total Environment*, 918, 170452.
456 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.170452>
- 457 5. Bengiovanni, T., Rosito, R. C., Lacasa, V., Simone, E., Sergi, I., Iacovone, V., Viggiano, M., &
458 Patrono, L. (2020). Risk Management and Healthcare: IoT Technologies and Smart
459 Monitoring System for a Good Cold Chain Management. *2020 5th International Conference*
460 *on Smart and Sustainable Technologies (SpliTech)*, 1–6.
461 <https://doi.org/10.23919/SpliTech49282.2020.9243821>
- 462 6. Betancourt, W. Q., Schmitz, B. W., Innes, G. K., Prasek, S. M., Pogreba Brown, K. M., Stark,
463 E. R., Foster, A. R., Sprissler, R. S., Harris, D. T., Sherchan, S. P., Gerba, C. P., & Pepper, I.
464 L. (2021). COVID-19 containment on a college campus via wastewater-based epidemiology,
465 targeted clinical testing and an intervention. *Science of The Total Environment*, 779, 146408.
466 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146408>
- 467 7. Beyer, S., Szewzyk, R., Gnirss, R., Johne, R., & Selinka, H.-C. (2020). Detection and
468 Characterization of Hepatitis E Virus Genotype 3 in Wastewater and Urban Surface Waters in
469 Germany. *Food and Environmental Virology*, 12(2), 137–147. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-020-09424-2)
470 [020-09424-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-020-09424-2)
- 471 8. Bivins, A., & Bibby, K. (2021). Wastewater Surveillance during Mass COVID-19 Vaccination
472 on a College Campus. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 8(9), 792–798.
473 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00519>
- 474 9. Bivins, A., North, D., Ahmad, A., Ahmed, W., Alm, E., Been, F., Bhattacharya, P., Bijlsma, L.,
475 Boehm, A. B., Brown, J., Buttiglieri, G., Calabro, V., Carducci, A., Castiglioni, S., Cetecioglu
476 Gurol, Z., Chakraborty, S., Costa, F., Curcio, S., De Los Reyes, F. L., ... Bibby, K. (2020).
477 Wastewater-Based Epidemiology: Global Collaborative to Maximize Contributions in the Fight
478 Against COVID-19. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 54(13), 7754–7757.
479 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c02388>
- 480 10. Bowes, D. A., Driver, E. M., Kraberger, S., Fontenele, R. S., Holland, L. A., Wright, J.,
481 Johnston, B., Savic, S., Engstrom Newell, M., Adhikari, S., Kumar, R., Goetz, H., Binsfeld, A.,
482 Nesi, K., Watkins, P., Mahant, A., Zevitz, J., Deitrick, S., Brown, P., ... Halden, R. U. (2023).
483 Leveraging an established neighbourhood-level, open access wastewater monitoring network

- 484 to address public health priorities: A population-based study. *The Lancet Microbe*, 4(1), e29–
485 e37. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247\(22\)00289-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(22)00289-0)
- 486 11. Choi, P. M., Tschärke, B. J., Donner, E., O'Brien, J. W., Grant, S. C., Kaserzon, S. L., Mackie,
487 R., O'Malley, E., Crosbie, N. D., Thomas, K. V., & Mueller, J. F. (2018). Wastewater-based
488 epidemiology biomarkers: Past, present and future. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, 105,
489 453–469. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2018.06.004>
- 490 12. Corchis-Scott, R., Geng, Q., Seth, R., Ray, R., Beg, M., Biswas, N., Charron, L., Drouillard, K.
491 D., D'Souza, R., Heath, D. D., Houser, C., Lawal, F., McGinlay, J., Menard, S. L., Porter, L.
492 A., Rawlings, D., Scholl, M. L., Siu, K. W. M., Tong, Y., ... McKay, R. M. L. (2021). Averting
493 an Outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 in a University Residence Hall through Wastewater
494 Surveillance. *Microbiology Spectrum*, 9(2), e00792-21.
495 <https://doi.org/10.1128/Spectrum.00792-21>
- 496 13. Gibas, C., Lambirth, K., Mittal, N., Juel, M. A. I., Barua, V. B., Roppolo Brazell, L., Hinton, K.,
497 Lontai, J., Stark, N., Young, I., Quach, C., Russ, M., Kauer, J., Nicolosi, B., Chen, D., Akella,
498 S., Tang, W., Schlueter, J., & Munir, M. (2021). Implementing building-level SARS-CoV-2
499 wastewater surveillance on a university campus. *Science of The Total Environment*, 782,
500 146749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146749>
- 501 14. Godinez, A., Hill, D., Dandaraw, B., Green, H., Kilaru, P., Middleton, F., Run, S., Kmush, B.
502 L., & Larsen, D. A. (2022). High Sensitivity and Specificity of Dormitory-Level Wastewater
503 Surveillance for COVID-19 during Fall Semester 2020 at Syracuse University, New York.
504 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(8), 4851.
505 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19084851>
- 506 15. Gonçalves, J., Torres-Franco, A., Rodríguez, E., Diaz, I., Koritnik, T., Silva, P. G. D.,
507 Mesquita, J. R., Trkov, M., Paragi, M., Muñoz, R., & García-Encina, P. A. (2022). Centralized
508 and decentralized wastewater-based epidemiology to infer COVID-19 transmission – A brief
509 review. *One Health*, 15, 100405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2022.100405>
- 510 16. Guo, Y., Li, J., O'Brien, J., Sivakumar, M., & Jiang, G. (2022). Back-estimation of norovirus
511 infections through wastewater-based epidemiology: A systematic review and parameter
512 sensitivity. *Water Research*, 219, 118610. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2022.118610>

- 513 17. Hamilton, K. A., Wade, M. J., Barnes, K. G., Street, R. A., & Paterson, S. (2024). Wastewater-
514 based epidemiology as a public health resource in low- and middle-income settings.
515 *Environmental Pollution*, 351, 124045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2024.124045>
- 516 18. Hsu, S.-Y., Bayati, M., Li, C., Hsieh, H.-Y., Belenchia, A., Klutts, J., Zemmer, S. A., Reynolds,
517 M., Semkiw, E., Johnson, H.-Y., Foley, T., Wieberg, C. G., Wenzel, J., Johnson, M. C., & Lin,
518 C.-H. (2022). Biomarkers selection for population normalization in SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-
519 based epidemiology. *Water Research*, 223, 118985.
520 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2022.118985>
- 521 19. Islam, Md. A., Hossen, F., Rahman, Md. A., Sultana, K. F., Hasan, M. N., Haque, Md. A.,
522 Sosa-Hernández, J. E., Oyervides-Muñoz, M. A., Parra-Saldívar, R., Ahmed, T., Islam, Md.
523 T., Dhama, K., Sangkham, S., Bahadur, N. M., Reza, H. M., Jakariya, Md., Al Marzan, A.,
524 Bhattacharya, P., Sonne, C., & Ahmed, F. (2023). An opinion on Wastewater-Based
525 Epidemiological Monitoring (WBEM) with Clinical Diagnostic Test (CDT) for detecting high-
526 prevalence areas of community COVID-19 infections. *Current Opinion in Environmental*
527 *Science & Health*, 31, 100396. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2022.100396>
- 528 20. Janahi, E. M., Mustafa, S., Parkar, S. F. D., Naser, H. A., & Eisa, Z. M. (2020). Detection of
529 Enteric Viruses and Bacterial Indicators in a Sewage Treatment Center and Shallow Water
530 Bay. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(18), 6483.
531 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17186483>
- 532 21. Jiménez-Rodríguez, M. G., Silva-Lance, F., Parra-Arroyo, L., Medina-Salazar, D. A.,
533 Martínez-Ruiz, M., Melchor-Martínez, E. M., Martínez-Prado, M. A., Iqbal, H. M. N., Parra-
534 Saldívar, R., Barceló, D., & Sosa-Hernández, J. E. (2022). Biosensors for the detection of
535 disease outbreaks through wastewater-based epidemiology. *TrAC Trends in Analytical*
536 *Chemistry*, 155, 116585. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2022.116585>
- 537 22. Lorenzo, M., & Picó, Y. (2019). Wastewater-based epidemiology: Current status and future
538 prospects. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health*, 9, 77–84.
539 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2019.05.007>
- 540 23. Parra-Arroyo, L., Martínez-Ruiz, M., Lucero, S., Oyervides-Muñoz, M. A., Wilkinson, M.,
541 Melchor-Martínez, E. M., Araújo, R. G., Coronado-Apodaca, K. G., Velasco Bedran, H.,
542 Buitrón, G., Noyola, A., Barceló, D., Iqbal, H. M. N., Sosa-Hernández, J. E., & Parra-Saldívar,

- 543 R. (2023). Degradation of viral RNA in wastewater complex matrix models and other
544 standards for wastewater-based epidemiology: A review. *TrAC Trends in Analytical*
545 *Chemistry*, 158, 116890. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2022.116890>
- 546 24. Rainey, A. L., Buschang, K., O'Connor, A., Love, D., Wormington, A. M., Messcher, R. L.,
547 Loeb, J. C., Robinson, S. E., Ponder, H., Waldo, S., Williams, R., Shapiro, J., McAlister, E. B.,
548 Lauzardo, M., Lednicky, J. A., Maurelli, A. T., Sabo-Attwood, T., & Bisesi, J. H. (2023).
549 Retrospective Analysis of Wastewater-Based Epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 in Residences on
550 a Large College Campus: Relationships between Wastewater Outcomes and COVID-19
551 Cases across Two Semesters with Different COVID-19 Mitigation Policies. *ACS ES&T Water*,
552 3(1), 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsestwater.2c00275>
- 553 25. Safford, H. R., Shapiro, K., & Bischel, H. N. (2022). Wastewater analysis can be a powerful
554 public health tool—If it's done sensibly. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
555 119(6), e2119600119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2119600119>
- 556 26. Sapula, S. A., Whittall, J. J., Pandopoulos, A. J., Gerber, C., & Venter, H. (2021). An optimized
557 and robust PEG precipitation method for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater. *Science of*
558 *The Total Environment*, 785, 147270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147270>
- 559 27. Scott, L. C., Aube, A., Babahaji, L., Vigil, K., Tims, S., & Aw, T. G. (2021). Targeted
560 wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 on a university campus for COVID-19 outbreak
561 detection and mitigation. *Environmental Research*, 200, 111374.
562 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.111374>
- 563 28. Shrestha, S., Yoshinaga, E., Chapagain, S. K., Mohan, G., Gasparatos, A., & Fukushi, K.
564 (2021). Wastewater-Based Epidemiology for Cost-Effective Mass Surveillance of COVID-19
565 in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Challenges and Opportunities. *Water*, 13(20), 2897.
566 <https://doi.org/10.3390/w13202897>
- 567 29. Sosa-Hernández, J. E., Oyervides-Muñoz, M. A., Melchor-Martínez, E. M., Driver, E. M.,
568 Bowes, D. A., Kraberger, S., Lucero-Saucedo, S. L., Fontenele, R. S., Parra-Arroyo, L.,
569 Holland, L. A., Peña-Benavides, S. A., Newell, M. E., Martínez-Ruiz, M., Adhikari, S., Rodas-
570 Zuluaga, L. I., Kumar, R., López-Pacheco, I. Y., Castillo-Zacarias, C., Iqbal, H. M. N., ...
571 Parra-Saldívar, R. (2022). Extensive Wastewater-Based Epidemiology as a Resourceful Tool
572 for SARS-CoV-2 Surveillance in a Low-to-Middle-Income Country through a Successful

- 573 Collaborative Quest: WBE, Mobility, and Clinical Tests. *Water*, 14(12), 1842.
574 <https://doi.org/10.3390/w14121842>
- 575 30. Tecnológico de Monterrey. (2022). *Tecnológico de Monterrey, informe anual 2022*. Mexico.
576 [https://tec.mx/sites/default/files/repositorio/Marketing/informe-anual/pdf/informe-2022-
578 tecnologico-de-monterrey.pdf](https://tec.mx/sites/default/files/repositorio/Marketing/informe-anual/pdf/informe-2022-
577 tecnologico-de-monterrey.pdf)
- 578 31. Tsang, T. K., Huang, X., Wang, C., Chen, S., Yang, B., Cauchemez, S., & Cowling, B. J.
579 (2023). The effect of variation of individual infectiousness on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in
580 households. *eLife*, 12, e82611. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.82611>
- 581 32. Van Der Drift, A.-M. R., Haver, A., Kloosterman, A., Van Der Beek, R. F. H. J., Nagelkerke,
582 E., Eggink, D., Laros, J. F. J., Nrs, C., Van Dissel, J. T., De Roda Husman, A. M., & Lodder,
583 W. J. (2024). Long-term wastewater monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 viral loads and variants at the
584 major international passenger hub Amsterdam Schiphol Airport: A valuable addition to
585 COVID-19 surveillance. *Science of The Total Environment*, 937, 173535.
586 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.173535>
- 587 33. Vitale, D., Morales Suárez-Varela, M., & Picó, Y. (2021). Wastewater-based epidemiology, a
588 tool to bridge biomarkers of exposure, contaminants, and human health. *Current Opinion in
589 Environmental Science & Health*, 20, 100229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2021.100229>
- 590 34. Wang, Y., Liu, P., Zhang, H., Ibaraki, M., VanTassell, J., Geith, K., Cavallo, M., Kann, R.,
591 Saber, L., Kraft, C. S., Lane, M., Shartar, S., & Moe, C. (2022). Early warning of a COVID-19
592 surge on a university campus based on wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 at
593 residence halls. *Science of The Total Environment*, 821, 153291.
594 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153291>
- 595 35. Wolken, M., Sun, T., McCall, C., Schneider, R., Caton, K., Hundley, C., Hopkins, L., Ensor,
596 K., Domakonda, K., Kalvapalle, P., Persse, D., Williams, S., & Stadler, L. B. (2023).
597 Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 and influenza in preK-12 schools shows school,
598 community, and citywide infections. *Water Research*, 231, 119648.
599 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2023.119648>
- 600 36. Zhu, Y., Oishi, W., Maruo, C., Saito, M., Chen, R., Kitajima, M., & Sano, D. (2021). Early
601 warning of COVID-19 via wastewater-based epidemiology: Potential and bottlenecks. *Science
602 of The Total Environment*, 767, 145124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145124>
- 603

