# Freeze-drying as a novel concentrating method for wastewater detection of SARS-CoV-2

Rui Dong[a], Elizabeth Noriega Landa[a], Hugues Ouellet[b], Wen-Yee Lee[a], Chuan Xiao[a*]

[a]*Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, The University of Texas at El Paso, 500 W. University Ave, El Paso, TX 79902, USA*
[b]*Department of Biological Sciences, The University of Texas at El Paso, 500 W. University Ave, El Paso, TX 79902, USA*

**Abstract**

Extracting and detecting viral RNA in wastewater has proven to be a rapid and cost-effective approach for community-level monitoring during the recent global Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic. Various sample concentrating methods, such as centrifugal ultrafiltration, have been utilized in wastewater SARS-CoV-2 detection studies. However, freeze drying, a promising technique commonly used for concentrating and preserving various biological samples, has yet to be explored in this field. This study compared the performance of freeze-drying and the widely used centrifugal ultrafiltration method in terms of recovery rate, detection limit, and other key parameters for concentrating 72 wastewater samples collected from four facilities in El Paso, TX. Statistical analyses revealed that the freeze-drying method demonstrated higher overall recovery efficiency (20.33% vs 13.00%), a superior detection ratio (68.4% vs. 31.6%), and lower detection limits (0.06copies/mL vs 0.35copis/mL) than centrifugal ultrafiltration, particularly during the early stages of the pandemic. Despite its longer processing time than centrifugal ultrafiltration, freeze-drying offers several notable advantages, including eliminating pretreatment steps, providing flexible sample storage options, preventing signal loss and sample degradation, and reducing labor and exposure risks. Freeze-drying also does not require intensive training for concentrating sewage water. These benefits, combined with its efficient capture of viral RNA, position freeze-drying as a promising alternative for wastewater virus detection, especially in resource-constrained lab settings at local wastewater treatment plants. The protocol and findings reported here provide a baseline for further development of freeze-drying-based methods for enabling community-level early warning and surveillance against emerging viral threats in the future.

*Keywords:* wastewater; viral RNA detection; SARS-CoV-2; concentrating; freeze-drying; centrifugal ultrafiltration.

* Corresponding Author. Tel.: +01-915-747-8657
Email Address: cxiao@utep.edu

## 1. Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is caused by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), a single-stranded RNA virus. The World Health Organization has classified COVID-19 as a global pandemic. As of December 15, 2024, the total number of deaths attributed to the disease worldwide is 7,079,142 (CDC, 2020b; World Health Organization, 2020). To proactively monitor and mitigate the further dissemination of the virus at the early stage of a pandemic, the surveillance of viral presence in wastewater has emerged as a significant strategy. Notably, in March 2020, Medema et. al., conducted the first-ever successful research in the Netherlands, highlighting the feasibility of wastewater-based surveillance for COVID-19 (Medema et al., 2020). Subsequently, Wurtzerthe et. al. detected viral genetic material in wastewater samples before the epidemic reached a massive scale around March 8$^{th}$ (Wurtzer et al., 2020). Furthermore, Fontenele et. al. screened SARS-CoV-2 viral signals from 91 wastewater samples among 11 states (Fontenele et al., 2021). Quantifying of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in sewage offers the possibility to develop an early alarm system, providing valuable insights into disease prevalence and potential virus transmission within populations. A similar system can provide early alarm for future pandemics, allowing public health authorities more time to respond. Thus, a sensitive and cost-effective method will be desirable for such applications.

Nevertheless, assessing viral load within wastewater presents challenges due to the variable composition of sewage. Wastewater comprises both liquid and solid phases, each containing a variety of substances (Wakefield, 2015). The liquid phase primarily consists of water with dissolved substances, including organic and inorganic compounds, nutrients, and pathogens (Friedler et al., 2013; Henze, 2008; Prot et al., 2022; Shi et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021). The solid phase includes suspended solids, colloidal particles, and settleable materials based on their size and behavior in water (Otterpohl and Buzie, 2013; Rashid et al., 2021; Sahu et al., 2014). Moreover, the composition of wastewater is influenced by numerous factors, including local precipitation, drought conditions, temperature fluctuations, and water usage patterns (Hughes et al., 2021). Therefore, the concentration of viruses in wastewater can fluctuate widely. In addition, nuclease in the environment can potentially degrade viral nucleic acids, particularly RNA, representing another significant factor impacting RNA viral concentration in wastewater (Farkas et al., 2020). Considering all these variables, detecting minute quantities of specific pathogens in the complex matrix of wastewater represents a substantial challenge, necessitating proper sample handling to ensure the collection and preservation of viruses for subsequent detection.

To tackle these challenges, the detection method should be developed specifically to address the properties of wastewater. Such a method should efficiently collect viruses from both phases of wastewater while safeguarding the viral genomic materials from degradation. It is crucial to maintain appropriate temperatures during sample handling and minimize the processing time to prevent RNA degradation due to the ubiquitous existence of RNase in the environment (Farkas et al., 2020). Given the expected low viral load during the early stages of a pandemic and the fluctuation of viral concentration in wastewater, a substantial volume of samples is required to achieve detectable results. In addition, sampling at multiple sites and time points is required for such an early warning system to work. Thus, an efficient concentrating method that is safe and minimizes labor-intensive processes is highly desirable for long term surveillance. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have outlined five distinct methodologies for concentrating viral particles from wastewater: ultrafiltration, electronegative membrane filtration with sample pre-treatment, polyethylene glycol (PEG) precipitation, skim milk flocculation, and centrifugal ultrafiltration. While each of these methods employs different principles to address the challenge of low viral RNA content in wastewater, none fully meets all the criteria for effectively concentrating and detecting viruses. Filtration-based methods are limited to collecting viruses in the liquid phase, potentially missing those associated with solid particles. The use of additional chemicals in electronegative membrane filtration, precipitation, and flocculation potentially inhibits subsequence viral detection. Ultracentrifugation cannot handle large-volume samples, limiting its practicality for widespread usage. In summary, achieving sensitive viral RNA detection in wastewater samples, especially during the onset or decline of COVID-19 peaks with sporadic infections, necessitates the development of more strategic sample concentrating methods.

A promising yet unexplored approach in concentrating wastewater is freeze-drying. Traditionally, this technique has been widely used to preserve various biological products in laboratory and industry circumstances (Liu and Zhou, 2015). It has also been utilized for environmental samples, such as soil, to preserve and concentrate nucleic acids for next-generation sequencing (Weißbecker et al., 2017). Recently, freeze-drying was used to concentrate wastewater samples to evaluate the deactivating effect of $Fe^{3+}$ treatment on bacteria (Qin et al., 2018). However, freeze-drying has not been explored for virus detection in wastewater. During freeze drying, ice within samples is sublimated into vapor under vacuum and frozen temperature conditions, effectively removing water from wastewater matrices. This method uniquely retains viral entities from both the liquid and solid components of wastewater, potentially enhancing detection sensitivity. Additionally, freeze-drying does not rely on reagent-dependent sample pre-treatment, thus preserving sample integrity from chemical interventions. The cryogenic environment during freeze-drying prevents the degradation of viral RNA, thereby increasing the detection limit in the subsequent steps. Although the overall processing time for large-volume samples is lengthy, freeze drying offers operational convenience by requiring minimal human oversight after initial setup. In summary, freeze drying is an ideal choice for sensitive, reliable, and less labor-intensive virus detection methodologies, as it minimizes viral loss and optimizes the protection of viral RNA.

This study will be the first to apply freeze drying to measure SARS-CoV-2 levels in wastewater. A comparative analysis was conducted between freeze drying and centrifugal ultrafiltration as concentrating methods for wastewater samples. Throughout the subsequent sections, “ultrafiltration” will be used in lieu of the more descriptive term "centrifugal ultrafiltration" to improve conciseness. Ultrafiltration was chosen for comparison because it is the widely used method, having been employed in the first and several early publications on detecting of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater. In this study, factors such as recovery efficiency and detection limit were compared and evaluated between these two methods using Reverse Transcription Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-qPCR). The resulting data is pivotal for developing a sensitive, precise, reproducible, and practical system to detect viruses in wastewater, ultimately enhancing community-level early warning and surveillance capabilities.

## 2. Material and Methods

### *2.1. Sample collection and pasteurization*

On the designated sample collection dates, 500 mL 24-hour composite wastewater samples were obtained from four wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) in El Paso, Texas, USA. These WWTPs include Haskell Street Wastewater Plant (HS), John T. Hickerson Water Reclamation Facility (JH), Fred Hervey Water Reclamation (FH), and Roberto Bustamante Wastewater Plant (BU). For safety concerns during the pandemic before the person-to-person transmission pathway of the SARS-CoV-2 was elucidated (March 2020 to July 2020), a sample collecting protocol was developed and approved by the Institutional Biosafety Committee of the University of Texas at El Paso. Individuals collecting samples wore disposable single-use nitrile gloves (double layer), splash goggles, N95 or surgical masks, and disposable lab coats.

Samples were collected in the pre-cleaned wide-mouth leak-proof bottles (Fisherbrand™, Cat# 05719709), which were then capped and sealed with parafilm, and the exterior was disinfected with Cavicide using absorbent pads. Both the bottle and the absorbent pads were placed into one zip-lock bag, and then in a second zip-lock bag. The double zip-lock bagged samples were transferred to the non-porous hard-plastic transport cooler with coolant blocks and spill-absorbing materials inside until arrival at the biosafety level 2 (BSL-2) lab. Upon sample retrieval, the surface of the Ziploc bags was wiped with disinfectant one more time.

Samples collected in the early days of the pandemic, before the analysis protocol was fully developed, were immediately frozen and stored at -80°C until further analyses. Before analyses, these early pandemic samples were thawed and pasteurized in a water bath at 65°C for 90min to inactivate any remaining virus as recommended by the CDC guidelines (CDC, 2020a). After the protocol was fully developed during the later period of the pandemic, the collected samples were pasteurized before being stored at -80°C.

### *2.2. Sample concentrating via freeze-drying*

Although samples were pasteurized and thus considered to be biosafety level 1 (BSL-1) based on the CDC guidelines (CDC, 2020a), a fully sealed freeze-drying set-up was overcautiously designed and implemented using FreeZone 2.5 Liter -84°C Benchtop Freeze Dryer (Labconco™, Cat# 710201000), this design is illustrated in Fig. 1. The biosafety set-up incorporated multiple safeguards: (1) The freeze dryer vacuum chamber contained PTFE coated coil, which is resistant to erosive disinfectants that are used after each freeze-drying cycle; (2) Three layers of Filter papers (Labconco™, Cat# 7544810) and aseptic valve (Labconco™, Cat# 7543900) were added between the fast-freeze flask and manifold to prevent any potential accidental pathogen from passing through; (3) A HEPE filter was added before vacuum pump as the secondary filter to capture any potential accidental pathogen leakage and spillage; (4) Wastewater samples were placed inside plastic Erlenmeyer flasks which were wrapped with absorbent pads in 600ml Complete Fast-Freeze Flasks (Labconco™, Cat# 7540800). The absorbent pads were intended to capture any accidental spill; and (5) The exhausting pipe was connected to the chemical fume hood, to exhaust the odorous volatile organic compound from the wastewater. Even with these safety designs, as an extra precaution, all potentially contaminated containers and the flow path before the HEPA filter were disinfected after each freeze-drying run.

Prior to the freeze-drying procedure, 200ml of each pasteurized wastewater sample was weighed and aliquoted to a 250ml plastic Erlenmeyer flask, wrapped with absorbent pads, placed into a zip-lock bag, and frozen at −80°C at least overnight. On the day of concentrating, the frozen samples in Erlenmeyer flasks wrapped with absorbent pads were then placed in Fast-Freeze Flasks with plastic Erlenmeyer flask caps loosened. Freeze-drying was conducted with temperature set to −86°C and vacuum to 0.040mbar. After approximately three days of freeze-

drying, sample masses were reduced to about 3g. Volume reduction factors were estimated by sample weight before and after freeze drying. The freeze-dried samples were dissolved in three volumes (v/w), approximately 9mL, of TRIzol™ LS reagent (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat # 10296-028). Samples were vortexed to ensure thorough mixing before storing at –20°C until viral RNA extractions. It has been proven that TRIzol will deactivate all viral pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2 in the sample (Patterson et al., 2020). Therefore, the following steps will be considered as BSL-1.




**Fig. 1. Schematic diagram of freeze-drying set-up.** Key biosafety safeguard features are highlighted and labeled with numbers within the diagram.

### *2.3. Sample concentrating via ultrafiltration*

In parallel to concentrating samples via freeze-drying, another 200ml of pasteurized wastewater sample was aliquoted into four 50ml conical tubes and loaded into swinging buckets (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 75003655) with adaptors (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 75003683) for the TX-400 rotor (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 75003181). The swinging buckets are sealed with ClickSeal Biocontainment Lids (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 75003656) and wiped with disinfectant on the outside before centrifuging at 3000×*g* for 15min using Multifuge X1R Refrigerated Centrifuge (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 75004251). After centrifugation, the supernatant was filtered using a 0.22µm PES bottle filter (Corning™, Cat# 431096) while the pellets were collected and weighed. Three volumes of (v/w) TRIzol™ LS reagent was added to the weighed pellet. All these procedures were carried out in a biosafety cabinet (BSC) to ensure safety. Fig. 2 illustrates the filter system with multiple, overcautiously designed safeguards: (1) A trap bottle with disinfectant on the bottom was connected to the filter bottle to capture any potential accidental pathogen leakage and spillage; (2) An in-line 0.22µm filter was added before the vacuum valve further to capture any potential accidental pathogen leakage and spillage.

Inside the BSC, the filtered supernatants from the previous step were aliquoted (approximately 70ml) into Centricon Plus-70 with 10kDa MW cut-off membrane (MilliporeSigma, Cat# UFC701008) and placed into disinfected swinging buckets (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 75003655, with seal cap Cat# 75003656). The buckets were completely sealed with ClickSeal Biocontainment Lids (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 75003656) and wiped with disinfectant on the outside before being taken out from BSC to be loaded onto TX-400 rotor (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 75003181). The samples were centrifuged at 3500×*g* for about 15min using Multifuge X1R Refrigerated Centrifuge (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 75004251). After centrifugation, the swinging buckets were moved back into the BSC, and the passthrough liquid was disinfected and discarded. Following the same

centrifugation protocol, the remaining filtered supernatants were added to Centricon Plus-70 units for the next round of concentrating via ultrafiltration.

After three to four rounds of centrifugation, the sample volume was reduced from 200ml to approximately 0.5mL. Following the manufacturer's instructions, the filters were inverted and centrifuged at 1,000×*g* to collect the concentrates. The concentrated samples were subsequently transferred to new tubes and mixed with three volumes, approximately 1.5mL, of TRIzol™ LS reagent. TRIzol treated samples were vortexed to ensure thorough mixing before being stored at -20°C until viral RNA extractions. Volume reduction factors for ultrafiltration were determined by comparing the weights of the samples before and after concentrating. All the filters and liquid transfer pipettes were soaked in ~1% bleach for at least 15min before being safely discarded.




**Fig. 2. Schematic diagram of the in-line filter system.** Key biosafety safeguard features are highlighted and labeled with numbers within the diagram.

### *2.4. Viral RNA extraction and quantification*

SARS-CoV-2 RNA was extracted and purified using the PureLink™ RNA Extraction Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 12183018A). Prior to RNA extraction, the frozen samples mixed with TRIzol were thawed at room temperature. For every milliliter of sample mixed with TRIzol, 0.2ml of Chloroform was added. The mixture was then centrifuged at 12,000×*g* at 4°C for 30mins using ST16 Centrifuge (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# 75004381). Following centrifugation, the colorless upper aqueous phase, which contains the RNA, was carefully extracted and collected. Ethanol was then added to the collected sample to reach a final concentration of 35%. The samples were aliquoted (600µL each) into spin cartridge provided in the kit and then spun at 6,800×g for 30s. The process of aliquoting and spinning was repeated until the entire sample was passed through the spin cartridge. The bound RNA was eluted from the spin cartridge in 30µL of ribonuclease-free water and collected by centrifugation. To maximize RNA recovery, second and third elutions were performed by adding 100µL of ribonuclease-free water and centrifuging. The purified viral RNA was immediately analyzed by one-step RT–qPCR or stored at -20°C to minimize RNA degradation.

SARS-CoV-2 RNA was quantified by one-step RT–qPCR using N1 and N2 primers sets suggested by the CDC (Dare et al., 2007; Lu et al., 2020) (Table 1). Samples were analyzed using the TaqPath™ 1-Step RT-qPCR (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat# A15299) in 20-µL reactions. The PCR reactions were run at 50°C for 15min and 95 °C for 2min, followed by 45 cycles of 95°C for 5s and 55°C for 30s per manufacturer's recommendations. The performance and efficiency of N1 and N2 primers in the RT-qPCR assay were first evaluated by generating standard curves using ten-fold series dilution (100 to $10^5$ copies per reaction) of templates: (1) a DNA plasmid containing complete nucleocapsid gene from SARS-CoV-2 (IDT, Cat# 10006625), and (2) Twist synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Twist Bioscience, Cat# MT0075s44). The standard curve was plotted as RT-qPCR Ct value (*y*-axis) against the log of copy number (*x*-axis) estimated from the dilution of the original standards (Fig.4). Linear least square fitting was

performed for each set of plotted data using the equation $y = a \times x + b$. The quality of these fittings was accessed using the coefficient of determination $R^2$ values. To evaluate the stabilities of DNA and RNA standards, RT-qPCR standard curves were generated the day when they were prepared and again after three or four months of storage at -20°C. Small-scale RT-qPCR was performed using a Magnetic Induction Cycler (Bio Molecular System, Cat# 71-101). Later, the StepOnePlus™ Real-Time PCR System (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat#4376600) was used for large-scale RT-qPCR.

The original DNA and RNA stock had concentrations of $2.0\times10^5$copies/µL and $1.0\times10^6$copies/mL, respectively. According to the literature, the Ct value from RT-qPCR is linear to the logarithm of sample concentration (Bustin et al., 2009). Therefore, using the 10-fold diluted standard curves, Ct values from specific RT-qPCR can be converted into virus concentration in units of copies/mL using a fitted function of the standard curve as shown in Fig.4. Then, for each elution, the amount of virus detected can be calculated using the equation:

$$Virus\ detected = Virus\ concentration \times elution\ volumn\ (30\mu L\ for\ 1^{st}\ elution\ and\ 100\mu L\ for\ 2^{nd}\ elution) \quad \textbf{Eq. 2.1}$$

Total copies of the virus detected (column Total copies in Supplementary Table 1) will be the summation of the virus detected from both elutions. The detecting viral concentration in the original unconcentrated sample (column D.c. in Supplementary Table 1) can be determined using the equation:

$$Detected\ concentration = Total\ copies\ /\ original\ sample\ volume \quad \textbf{Eq. 2.2}$$

These calculations for detected concentration in the original unconcentrated sample also enable the comparison of analytical sensitivity between the two concentrating approaches. Method-specific detection limits were determined by the minimum detected concentration from all the wastewater samples using the same method (Supplementary Table 1 last row).

Table 1 RT-qPCR primer sequences

| Assay | Primer | Sequence |
|---|---|---|
| SARS-CoV-2 N1 | Forward primer | 5′-GACCCCAAAATCAGCGAAAT-3′ |
| | Reverse primer | 5′-TCTGGTTACTGCCAGTTGAATCTG-3′ |
| | Probe | 5′-FAM-ACCCCGCATTACGTTTGGTGGACC-BHQ1-3′ |
| SARS-CoV-2 N2 | Forward primer | 5′-TTACAAACATTGGCCGCAAA-3′ |
| | Reverse primer | 5′-GCGCGACATTCCGAAGAA-3′ |
| | Probe | 5′-FAM-ACAATTTGCCCCCAGCGCTTCAG-BHQ1-3′ |
| OC43 | Forward primer | 5′-CGATGAGGCTATTCCGACTAGGT-3′ |
| | Reverse primer | 5′-CCTTCCTGAGCCTTCAATATAGTAACC-3′ |
| | Probe | 5′-6FAM-TCCGCCTGGCACGGTACTCCCT-BHQ-3′ |

### *2.5. Recovery efficiency calculations using OC43*

OC43 was chosen as the surrogate virus in this study to calculate recovery efficiency for both concentrating methods: freeze-drying and ultrafiltration. To estimate the amount of virus to be spiked to wastewater for recovery efficiency calculation, a standard curve of heat-inactivated OC43 virus was generated. The virus infectivity of the original stock of heat-inactivated OC43 culture fluid (ZeptoMetrix, Cat# 0810024CFHI) is defined by the median tissue culture infectious dose ($TCID_{50}$), the dilution of virus required to infect 50% of the given cell monolayers (Lei et al. 2020). An exact 100µL aliquot of this inactivated OC43 at $5.0\times10^8TCID_{50}$/µL was used to prepare a10-fold serial dilutions with water. The concentration of inactivated OC43 in each dilution was determined based on the dilution factor. These serially diluted samples were then subjected to the same procedures aforementioned for TRIzol treatment, RNA extraction, and RT-qPCR, but with different primer/probe sets for OC43 (Sigma Custom DNA Oligos Cat# 41105327) (Table 1). Following a similar approach mentioned in Section 2.4 for DNA and RNA standards, a standard curve was established by plotting the RT-qPCR Ct value ($y$-axis) against the logarithm of heat-inactivated OC43 concentration, expressed in the units of $TCID_{50}$.

To calculate the recovery efficiency of the virus from the wastewater sample, an exact 20uL aliquot of Zeptometrix heat-inactivated OC43 was spiked into 400ml wastewater sample. To demonstrate that RT-qPCR

cannot detect the virus without concentrating the wastewater sample, 1mL of spiked sample was collected and treated with 3 mL of TRIzol™ LS reagent. The remaining spiked sample was divided into two parts (approximately 200mL each) and concentrated via either freeze drying or ultrafiltration, following the same procedure described in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 on sample concentrating. Viral RNA was then extracted and analyzed by RT-qPCR using the same procedure described previously in Section 2.4, but with a different primer/probe set for OC43 as listed in Table 1.

Using the initial concentration ($5.0\times10^{8}TCID_{50}/\mu L$) and volume (20µL) of heat-inactivated virus spiked into wastewater, the total amount of virus added was estimated to be $2.67\times10^{4}TCID_{50}/\mu L$. After concentrating the spiked wastewater sample using freeze-drying and ultrafiltration, RT-qPCR was performed on the extracted and purified RNA sample using the same conditions as used for the heat-inactivated OC43 standard curve. The Ct value from the RT-PCR and the standard curve allowed the estimation of the amount of virus recovered by the two methods, expressed in the unit of $TCID_{50}/\mu L$. Recovery efficiency was then calculated as the ratio of the recovered virus amount to the amount initially spiked, with both values expressed in units of $TCID_{50}$. The recovery efficiency estimations were performed in triplicate, allowing for the calculating the mean and standard deviation for each method. A Wilcoxon test, a nonparametric statical hypothesis test without assuming a normal distribution of the data (Damian Riina et al., 2023), was subsequently conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between the two methods.

### *2.6. Creatinine measurement*

Creatinine concentration was measured to evaluate human contribution to wastewater. Frozen pasteurized samples were thawed at 4°C, and 100µL was aliquoted for creatinine analyses using a creatinine colorimetric detection assay (Enzo Life Sciences, Cat# ADI-907-030).

### *2.7. Epidemiological data and statistical analysis*

Daily COVID-19 record from April 14, 2020, to May 28, 2021 in El Paso, TX, was collected from https://www.epstrong.org/results.php and https://elpasocovid19tracker.com/index.html. Sampling dates with associated viral load calculations from all four wastewater plant sites are listed in Supplementary Table 1. The correlation between the total COVID-19 cases and SARS-CoV-2 viral load in wastewater was evaluated using the Pearson correlation coefficient (Lee Rodgers and Nicewander 1988). This correlation coefficient, ranging from -1 to 1, provided a quantitative measure of the observed relationship between the two variables: COVID-19 case numbers and SARS-CoV-2 viral load in wastewater. A correlation coefficient close to zero means no correlation, while close to 1 and -1 indicate strong positive or negative correlation, respectively. All data processing and statistical analyses were conducted using R Studio (Rstudio Team, 2020).

## 3. Results and Discussion

Our study underscores the importance of strict safety procedures when handling wastewater samples containing emerging pathogens, particularly in adhering to the stringent biosafety standards set by institutions such as the CDC and NIH. The designs of our wastewater sample collection and processing protocols reflect a strong commitment to these high safety standards. A multilayer safety setup was implemented during sample collection and pasteurization, including the use of disposable protective gear, rigorous disinfection protocols, and an approved safety protocol developed early in the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. This proactive approach to biosafety was crucial during uncertain times. Combining sample collection with immediate pasteurization, a swift transition to BSL-1 became possible, offering a versatile solution for handling unknown emerging pathogens. This approach is particularly beneficial for laboratories with limited resources, such as those affiliated with wastewater treatment plants.

### *3.1. Number of Samples*

A total of 83 wastewater samples were collected from four wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) in El Paso, Texas, USA, from April 14, 2020, to May 28, 2021. However, some samples from certain WWTPs were unavailable due to technical and personnel challenges encountered during the pandemic. During the initial small peak between April 2020 and May 2020, 71 samples were collected and stored in a -80°C freezer using sample collection protocol approved by the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) at the University of Texas at El Paso

(UTEP) before the analytic protocol was fully developed and approved by IBC. Due to the limited lab accessibility during the pandemic, human resources constraints, and the restricted storage space in -80°C freezers, sample collection was paused between August 2020 and April 2021. Once the samples were processed using the fully developed and approved protocol and storage space was freed up in -80°C freezers, sample collection was resumed in May 2021. The collection frequency during this period was more sporadic, depending on the processing speed of stored samples. For the second period, a total of 12 samples were collected. Following pasteurization to inactivate wastewater pathogens, 71 samples were concentrated using freeze-drying and 70 using ultrafiltration respectively. Additionally, 56 pellets were collected from 70 ultrafiltration samples (Fig.3). Unfortunately, RT-qPCR date for about 10 samples were lost due to an unexpected crash of the computer that controls the StepOnePlus™ Real-Time PCR System. At the end, data from a total of 72 samples were obtained (Fig. 3, Supplementary Table 1).




**Fig. 3. Flowchart of sample processing with sample numbers.** Samples collected from four different WWTPs were inactivated through pasteurization, and then concentrated using two methods. The number of samples processed at each pre-process step is indicated in parentheses after "n =". Viral RNA of all the samples was extracted from concentrated samples and subjected to RT-qPCR for quantification. FH, Fred Hervey Water Reclamation Plant; JH, John T. Hickerson Water Reclamation Facility; HS, Haskell R. Street Wastewater Treatment Plant, Bu, Roberto Bustamante Wastewater Treatment Plant.

### *3.2. RT-qPCR primer selection and template stabilities*

Fig. 4 (original data in Supplementary Table 2) shows standard curves and their least-squares regression equations $y = a \times x + b$, with coefficients $a$ and $b$. The slope $a$ should be negative, with an absolute value between 3.3 and 3.4, as the literature suggests that each 10-fold drop of the template is expected to increase approximately 3 PCR cycles to reach the same fluorescent signal value (Svec et al., 2015). Any value out of this range indicates potential issues with the dilution of standard templates or suboptimal RT-qPCR conditions. The y-intercept b represents the Ct value when there is no template, where the fluorescence may arise from one or more of the following: non-specific amplification, primer-dimer formation, and background signal (Taylor et al., 2017).

The standard curve analysis provides valuable insights into the performance and suitability of the N1 and N2 primers for quantifying RNA and DNA targets from SARS-CoV-2 samples. Across all time points of RNA and DNA standards, the N1 primer consistently exhibited higher $R^2$ values than the N2 primer, indicating a stronger linear correlation between the measured and expected quantities. Additionally, the fitted lines of N1 for both RNA and DNA are lower than those of N2, reflecting overall lower Ct values for the N1 primer. These higher $R^2$ values and lower overall Ct values highlight the superior quantification accuracy and reliability of the N1 primer, making it the preferred choice. However, the impact of standards degradation over time cannot be overlooked, as evidenced by the progressive increase in the heights (Ct values) of fitting lines observed for both RNA and DNA standards. Obviously, RNA exhibited more significant degradation than DNA underscoring its higher susceptibility to

degradation. The crossing observed in the RNA and DNA standard curves using N2 primers after storage in Fig. 4B and Fig. 4D suggests that the N2 primer region may be more susceptible to degradation, resulting in deviations from the expected slope (approximately -3) of the standard curve. Consequently, while the N1 primer is the optimal choice for fresh samples due to its stronger linear correlation, DNA standards are more suitable for long-term studies or situations requiring extended sample storage, owing to its greater stability. Therefore, for the subsequent studies, we used DNA standards to estimate the total number of detected viruses.




**Fig. 4. RNA and DNA standard curves.** Panels A and B display the fitted lines of qPCR Ct values plotted against gene copies of serially diluted RNA standards, using the N1 and N2 primers, respectively. Panels C and D present similar fitted lines for DNA standards. As the legend indicates, the different line colors represent standard curves generated from fresh samples or samples stored at -20°C for 3 or 4 months. The fitted equations and corresponding $R^2$ values are shown in the same colors as their respective lines.

### *3.3. Comparison of recovery efficiency of two concentrating methods*

To compare the recovery efficiency of the two concentrating methods, OC43 was spiked into a wastewater sample. Both OC43 and SARS-CoV-2 are beta-coronaviruses that cause respiratory infections in humans and are transmitted via droplets and/or aerosols. However, unlike SARS-CoV-2, OC43 does not cause severe disease in humans, making it an ideal surrogate for laboratory recovery tests without biosafety concerns.




**Fig. 5. OC43 standard curve.** qPCR Ct values are plotted against gene copies in units of $TCID_{50}/\mu L$, derived from serial dilutions of OC43 RNA standards. The fitted line illustrates the relationship using specific primers targeting OC43, with the corresponding equation and $R^2$ value shown on the graph.

Table 2. Recovery rate of freeze-drying and ultrafiltration

| Method | Ct | | | Average Ct (±SD) | Recovered virus ($TCID_{50}/\mu L$) | Recovery rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Freeze drying | 27.93 | 27.38 | 27.70 | 27.67 (±0.34) | $5.42 \times 10^3$ | 20.33% |
| Ultrafiltration | 28.61 | 28.22 | 28.18 | 28.34 (±0.66) | $3.47 \times 10^3$ | 13.00% |

Based on the standard curve using heat-inactivated OC43 virus (Fig.5, original data in Supplementary Table 3), approximately $10.0\times10^9 TCID_{50}$ of the virus was spiked into 400mL of wastewater. This sample was divided into two equal volumes and concentrated using either freeze-drying or ultrafiltration methods. A control sample without concentrating had an undetermined Ct value, indicating that RT-qPCR could not detect the OC43 signal prior to concentrating. Recovery rates were calculated based on the Ct values from the first RNA extraction elution and were found to be 20.33% for the freeze-drying method and 13.00% for the ultrafiltration method. The freeze-drying method demonstrated a recovery efficiency that was superior to or at least comparable with the widely used ultrafiltration technique.

Notably, the second elution from the freeze-dried sample exhibited a lower Ct value than the first elution (Supplementary Table 1). This phenomenon was also observed in other freeze-dry concentrated wastewater samples during SARS-CoV-2 detection but not in the sample concentrated via ultrafiltration or RNA extracted from heat-inactivated OC43 serial dilution when establishing the standard curve. Since the freeze-drying process concentrates all small molecules, it is possible that inhibitory substances affecting RT-qPCR may also be enriched. When combining the recovery rates from both the first and second elutions, the overall recovery rates remained at 22.37% for freeze-drying and 13.93% for ultrafiltration, demonstrating the potential advantage of the freeze-drying approach.

### *3.4. Comparison of early detection of two concentrating methods*

To evaluate the detection sensitivities of the freeze-drying and ultrafiltration methods, wastewater viral load data from the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic (April 2020 to May 2020) were analyzed. A total of 38 samples were collected from various wastewater treatment plants in El Paso, Texas. The freeze-drying method identified 26 positive samples (68.4%) (Table 3). As previously discussed, the freeze-drying method yielded lower Ct values (indicating more sensitive detection) in the second elution. When the second elution was included, the detection ratio increased to 28 positive samples (73.7%). In contrast, the ultrafiltration detected only 12 positive samples (31.6%), which increased slightly to 13 positive samples (34.2%) when including the second elution (Table 3). The higher detection ratio observed with the freeze-drying method highlights its superior ability to concentrate viral material compared to ultrafiltration.

Table 3 Positive ratio and Ct value range for samples collected from four WWTPs between April 2020 to May 2020

| Site | Sample Number | Positive numbers | | Positive Ratio % | | Range of Ct Value | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Freeze dry | Ultrafiltration | Freeze dry | Ultrafiltration | Freeze Dry | Ultrafiltration |
| HS | 18 | 12 (14) | 5 (6) | 66.7 (77.8) | 27.8 (33.3) | 31 (32) – 42 (42) | 33 (33) – 38 (38) |
| JH | 1 | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 100.0 (100.0) | 100.0 (100.0) | 33 (33) – 33 (35) | 35 (35) – 36 (36) |
| FH | 8 | 6 (6) | 5 (5) | 75.0 (75.0) | 62.5 (62.5) | 32 (32) – 39 (39) | 32 (32) – 41 (41) |
| BU | 11 | 7 (7) | 1 (1) | 63.6 (63.6) | 9.1 (9.1) | 33 (33) – 37(37) | 33 (33) – 34 (34) |
| Total | 38 | 26 (28) | 12 (13) | 68.4 (73.7) | 31.6 (34.2) | | |

* Numbers in the parentheses are values obtained from the second elution

The superior detection sensitivity of the freeze-drying method was further supported by the lower average Ct values obtained during RT-qPCR analyses. Across all four wastewater treatment plants, the freeze-drying method consistently exhibited lower Ct values compared to ultrafiltration (Table 3), indicating a higher amount of viral RNA in the concentrated samples. Furthermore, a paired T-test analysis was conducted to compare virus copies in the original wastewater samples across all four facilities. As described in the Section 2., the total virus copies were estimated using the DNA standard curve and the Ct values. For both freeze dry and ultrafiltration methods, both first and second elutions were combined to calculate the total RNA copies in the original wastewater samples. Where a method or elution did not detect the virus, it was recorded as zero copies. A total of 11 data pairs showed that freeze-drying method detected significantly higher virus concentration than ultrafiltration with a p-value smaller than 0.0068 from the Wilcoxon test. As described in Section 2.4, method-specific detection limits can be determined using the highest Ct value for each method and the standard curves. The freeze-drying method demonstrated a lower limit of detection (0.06 copies/mL) compared to ultrafiltration (0.35 copies/mL) (Supplementary Table 1).

### *3.5. Correlated virus load and case number in epidemic*

Due to the substantial variation in wastewater flow rate caused by weather conditions (rainfall, drought, and temperature-dependent evaporation) and fluctuations in water usage throughout the day, estimating the proportion of human contribution to wastewater is challenging (Katukiza et al., 2012). To address this issue, the concentration of creatinine, a metabolic product from humans, has been proposed as an internal control for assessing human contribution to wastewater (Chen et al., 1977; Daughton, 2012). However, many of the reported creatinine levels in wastewater, as low as 0.01 mg/dL (Rusiñol et al., 2021), are close to or outside the limit of the detection kit (0.042 mg/dL) (Enzo Life Sciences Cat# ADI-907-030), raising concerns about the reliability of using creatinine as the internal standard for human contribution. This discrepancy may be attributed to the dilution effect of non-human wastewater components, such as industrial and agricultural effluents, which can significantly impact creatinine concentrations (Choi et al., 2018). In this study, the creatinine levels detected were listed in Supplementary Table 1. When using pure water as blank, as recommended by the manufacturer, some of our measurements yield negative values, suggesting the presence of certain interfering substances in wastewater that require further investigation (Xagoraraki and O'Brien, 2020). As a result, we decided not to use creatinine concentrations to normalize our viral load data, as the low levels of creatinine detected in our samples might not accurately reflect the human contribution to the wastewater.

To investigate the correlation between the measured viral load in wastewater and the reported COVID-19 cases in El Paso, TX, available viral load data from Haskell Street Wastewater Plant which serves the central and east area of El Paso were collated with the corresponding daily COVID-19 case counts on the wastewater sample collection dates in the city covering zip codes 79901, 79902, 79903, 79904, 79905, 79907, 79912, 79915, 79922, 79925, 79928, 79930, 79935, 79936, and 79938. The data was tested for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk test. Since $p<0.05$, it was concluded that the data was not normally distributed. Given the small sample size, a non-parametric test was chosen instead of a parametric test (de Souza et al., 2023; King and Eckersley, 2019). The Spearman rank correlation test was applied to evaluate the association between the total viral load and the total number of reported cases on each date across the studied areas. The Spearman rank test is a non-parametric method that uses the correlation coefficient rho ($\rho$) to measure the strength and direction of a monotonic relationship between two variables, with values ranging from -1 (perfect negative correlation) to 1 (perfect positive correlation). The Spearman correlation coefficient was calculated to assess the relationship between mean virus concentrations

and total COVID-19 case counts in the datasets. Due to the unavailability of active case numbers during the early stages of the pandemic (April 2020 to May 2020), the analysis was conducted using cumulative case numbers. During this period, the difference between active and cumulative cases was likely minimal. Additionally, prior studies have indicated that recovered patients may continue shedding the virus (Kampen et al., 2021). During the early period, the analysis revealed a moderate negative correlation of -0.072 between the freeze-dried viral load and the cumulative case numbers. However, this correlation was not statistically significant ($p=0.808$). Similarly, for the ultrafiltration method, using data from the same period, the analysis showed a moderate negative correlation of -0.316 between the viral load and the cumulative COVID-19 case numbers, which was also not statistically significant ($p=0.270$).

## 4. Discussion

Specific precautions must be followed to mitigate RNA degradation in concentrated wastewater and preserve its integrity for potential future analyses. Immediate sample processing post-collection is ideal for maximizing RNA extraction yield and maintaining its integrity. However, logistical constraints often necessitate sample storage, for which TRIzol or similar denaturing reagents are highly recommended. TRIzol effectively inhibits RNase activity, thereby preventing RNA degradation (Chomczynski and Sacchi, 2006). Concentrated samples in TRIzol demonstrate superior stability for long-term storage, particularly when stored at -80°C freezer (Fabre et al., 2014). Thus, maintaining samples in TRIzol without RNA extraction until imminent RT-qPCR analysis is considered the optimal storage strategy. Moreover, minimizing freeze-thaw cycles of samples, regardless of the storage method, is critical to prevent RNA degradation. RNases are prevalent and can regain enzymatic activity after removing denaturing conditions (Thatcher, 2015). Consequently, after RNA is extracted from the TRIzol storage solution, downstream procedures should be performed promptly to minimize RNA degradation and ensure the reliability and accuracy of the subsequent RT-qPCR analyses.

The two concentrating methods demonstrated contrasting advantages and disadvantages. For the pretreatment step, ultrafiltration requires centrifugation and filtration to remove larger solid particles (sewage sludge) that may clog the concentrator. Both steps may result in the loss of viral signals, as evidenced by the signal detection in the pellet collected during the pretreatment steps (Supplementary Table 4). Other studies have also observed a reduction in viral detection after removing solids from wastewater (Ahmed et al., 2020). Accordingly, some studies recommend retaining solids in the wastewater for analysis. In contrast, the freeze-drying method does not involve pretreatment steps to remove solids. All solids are retained in the final concentrate, allowing RNA from these solids to be extracted. However, the freeze-drying method does require an initial overnight low-temperature freezing step (-80°C), which can be time-consuming. Considering that most wastewater samples are pasteurized and stored at -80°C rather than being processed on the same day of collection, this freezing step could also provide flexibility for both sample storage and processing time.

For the concentrating process, ultrafiltration involves using expensive filters and multiple centrifugation and liquid handling steps. These steps prolong operator exposure to wastewater, increasing the potential risk of pathogen transmission. Consequently, ultrafiltration requires rigorous personal protective equipment (PPE) and extensive decontamination procedures for centrifuges, rotors, and buckets. This makes the process labor-intensive, thus limiting the throughput to approximately eight samples per day. Contrariwise, the freeze-drying method only uses inexpensive sample bottles. It minimizes operator exposure to wastewater, with only brief handling required for cap loosening of the bottles and mounting the Fast-Freeze Flask (Fig. 1). Decontamination was only needed at the end of the freeze-drying process. Although the freeze-drying method does require three days to concentrate eight samples to the desired volume, it demands minimal labor and reduces exposure to wastewater. Furthermore, the whole process for freeze drying does not require extensive training such as aliquoting and transferring wastewater safely in BSC in ultrafiltration technique (Section 2.3)

Detection sensitivity is a critical factor in evaluating concentrating methods. The higher detection sensitivity of the freeze-drying method can be attributed to several potential factors. Firstly, as literature demonstrated, many viruses can be associated with sewage sludge (Kitajima et al., 2020; Ye et al., 2016). By retaining all components of the wastewater, freeze-drying maximizes the capture of viruses present in wastewater. In contrast, ultrafiltration may exclude viral particles bound to sewage sludge, potentially resulting in signal loss. Secondly, the freeze-drying process involves fewer liquid handling steps and minimizes sample loss during processing, further contributing to its higher detection efficiency. Additionally, the cryogenic environment maintained during freeze-drying helps prevent RNA degradation, preserving the integrity of viral genetic material for downstream detection. The freeze-drying method's higher detection ratio and lower detection limit highlight its advantages for early detection of viral pathogens during the onset of a pandemic. By effectively capturing and

concentrating viral material from wastewater samples, freeze-drying facilitates the identification of emerging viral threats at lower prevalence levels, enabling the timely implementation of public health interventions and surveillance strategies.

The relationship between wastewater viral load and community COVID-19 cases is a key consideration in evaluating the utility of wastewater surveillance. Our finding is consistent with the literature, which has reported varying degrees of correlation between wastewater viral loads and community-level COVID-19 cases. Several studies have demonstrated a positive correlation, with higher viral loads in wastewater preceding or coinciding with increased case counts in the corresponding communities (Medema et al. 2020; Randazzo et al. 2020). However, other studies have reported weaker or inconsistent correlations, potentially due to factors such as varying viral shedding patterns, differences in testing rates, and the influence of local conditions on viral transport and persistence in wastewater systems (Gonzalez et al. 2020). It is important to note that the correlation observed in this study is based on minimal data from the early stages of the pandemic and lacks reliable normalization of human contribution to wastewater. Although this study's primary focus is the evaluation and comparison of the freeze-drying and ultrafiltration methods for concentrating viral particles from wastewater samples, the correlation analysis still offered some insights into the relationship between wastewater viral loads and community-level case counts.

In summary, this study demonstrated that the freeze-drying method outperforms the widely used ultrafiltration technique for concentrating viral particles from wastewater samples. The freeze-drying approach exhibited higher overall recovery rates for the surrogate virus OC43, a higher detection ratio for SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA, and lower detection limits, particularly during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. These findings highlight the superior ability of freeze-drying to capture and retain viral material from complex wastewater matrices. While freeze-drying is more time-consuming, it offers several advantages over ultrafiltration. It eliminates the need for pretreatment steps that might exclude viral signals associated with sewage sludge. Additionally, freeze-drying provides flexibility in sample storage, reduces labor demands and exposure risks, and requires minimum training. These advantages make freeze-drying a favorable option for wastewater virus detection, especially in resource-constrained settings such as wastewater treatment facilities with limited personnel and training resources. Combining efficient viral particle capture and operational practicality, positions freeze-drying as a promising approach for enhancing community-level early warning and surveillance capabilities against emerging viral threats.

**Statement:**

During the preparation of this work, the author(s) utilized ChatGPT to enhance readability and improve language. Following its use, the authors carefully reviewed and edited the content as necessary and took full responsibility for the final version of the publication.

**Acknowledgements:**

The authors would like to acknowledge Teresa T. Alcala and El Paso Water Laboratory personnel: Hugo Ruiz at John T. Hickerson Water Reclamation Facility, Martin L. Ortiz at Roberto Bustamante Wastewater Plant, Rick Dominguez at Haskell Street Wastewater Plant, Roberto Hernandez at Fred Hervey Water Reclamation, for their assistance during wastewater sample collection especially during the COVID-19 pandemic period. This work received funding from the College of Science, University of Texas at El Paso. The work has used instruments in the Border Biomedical Research Center (BBRC) that is supported by the National Institutes on Minority Health and Health Disparities (NIMHD) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) under award number U54MD007592. Special thanks go to BBRC personnel Georgialina Rodriguez and Ana P. Betancourt who helped us use the instruments. RD and CX also received support from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS) of NIH under award number R01GM129525 and from the Welch Foundation under Grant Number AH-2126-20220331. WYL received support from NIGMS of NIH under award number SC1CA245675. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the funding agencies.

## Reference:


Ahmed W, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Haramoto E, Hewitt J, Huygens F, et al. Decay of SARS-CoV-2 and surrogate murine hepatitis virus RNA in untrea ted wastewater to inform application in wastewater-based epidemiology. Environmental Research 2020; 191: 110092.

Bustin SA, Benes V, Garson JA, Hellemans J, Huggett J, Kubista M, et al. The MIQE guidelines: minimum information for publication of quantitati ve real-time PCR experiments. Clinical Chemistry 2009; 55: 611-622.

CDC. Interim Laboratory Biosafety Guidelines for Handling and Processing Specimens Associated with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020a; 2020/2/11/ https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/lab-biosafety-guidelines.html

CDC. Number of COVID-19 deaths reported to WHO (cumulative total). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020b; Last Update on 12/15/2024. https://data.who.int/dashboards/covid19/deaths

Chen Y, Senesi N, Schnitzer M. Information Provided on Humic Substances by E4/E6 Ratios. Soil Science Society of America Journal 1977; 41: 352-358.

Choi PM, Tscharke BJ, Donner E, O'Brien JW, Grant SC, Kaserzon SL, et al. Wastewater-based epidemiology biomarkers: Past, present and future. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry 2018; 105: 453-469.

Chomczynski P, Sacchi N. The single-step method of RNA isolation by acid guanidinium thiocyanat e–phenol–chloroform extraction: twenty-something years on. Nature Protocols 2006; 1: 581-585.

Damian Riina M, Stambaugh C, Stambaugh N, Huber KE. Chapter 28 - Continuous variable analyses: t-test, Mann–Whitney, Wilcoxin rank. In: Eltorai AEM, Bakal JA, Kim DW, Wazer DE, editors. Translational Radiation Oncology. Academic Press, 2023, pp. 153-163.

Dare RK, Fry AM, Chittaganpitch M, Sawanpanyalert P, Olsen SJ, Erdman DD. Human coronavirus infections in rural Thailand: a comprehensive study using real-time reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction assays. J Infect Dis 2007; 196: 1321-8.

Daughton CG. Real-time estimation of small-area populations with human biomarkers i n sewage. The Science of the Total Environment 2012; 414: 6-21.

de Souza RR, Toebe M, Mello AC, Bittencourt KC. Sample size and Shapiro-Wilk test: An analysis for soybean grain yield. European Journal of Agronomy 2023; 142.

Fabre A-L, Colotte M, Luis A, Tuffet S, Bonnet J. An efficient method for long-term room temperature storage of RNA. European Journal of Human Genetics 2014; 22: 379-385.

Farkas K, Hillary LS, Malham SK, McDonald JE, Jones DL. Wastewater and public health: the potential of wastewater surveillance for monitoring COVID-19. Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health 2020; 17: 14-20.

Fontenele RS, Kraberger S, Hadfield J, Driver EM, Bowes D, Holland LA, et al. High-throughput sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater provides insigh ts into circulating variants. Water Research 2021; 205: 117710.

Friedler E, Butler D, Alfiya Y. Wastewater composition. In: Larsen TA, Udert KM, Lienert J, editors. Source Separation and Decentralization for Wastewater Management, 2013, pp. 240-257.

Henze M. Biological wastewater treatment : principles, modelling and design. London: IWA Pub., 2008.

Hughes J, Cowper-Heays K, Olesson E, Bell R, Stroombergen A. Impacts and implications of climate change on wastewater systems: A New Zealand perspective. Climate Risk Management 2021; 31: 100262.

Kampen JJA, Vijver DAMC, Fraaij PLA, Haagmans BL, Lamers MM, Okba N, et al. Duration and key determinants of infectious virus shedding in hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19). Nature Communications 2021; 12: 267.

Katukiza AY, Ronteltap M, Niwagaba CB, Foppen JWA, Kansiime F, Lens PNL. Sustainable sanitation technology options for urban slums. Biotechnology Advances 2012; 30: 964-978.

King AP, Eckersley RJ. Chapter 7 - Inferential Statistics IV: Choosing a Hypothesis Test. In: King AP, Eckersley RJ, editors. Statistics for Biomedical Engineers and Scientists. Academic Press, 2019, pp. 147-171.

Kitajima M, Ahmed W, Bibby K, Carducci A, Gerba CP, Hamilton KA, et al. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. The Science of the Total Environment 2020; 739: 139076.

Liu B, Zhou X. Freeze-Drying of Proteins. In: Wolkers WF, Oldenhof H, editors. Cryopreservation and Freeze-Drying Protocols. Springer, New York, NY, 2015, pp. 459-476.

Lu X, Wang L, Sakthivel SK, Whitaker B, Murray J, Kamili S, et al. US CDC Real-Time Reverse Transcription PCR Panel for Detection of Seve re Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. Emerging Infectious Diseases 2020; 26: 1654-1665.

Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in sewage and correlation with repo rted COVID-19 prevalence in the early stage of the epidemic in the Net herlands. Environmental Science & Technology Letters 2020.

Otterpohl R, Buzie C. Treatment of the solid fraction. In: Larsen TA, Udert KM, Lienert J, editors. Source Separation and Decentralization for Wastewater Management, 2013, pp. 258-273.

Patterson EI, Prince T, Anderson ER, Casas-Sanchez A, Smith SL, Cansado-Utrilla C, et al. Methods of Inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 for Downstream Biological Assays. The Journal of Infectious Diseases 2020; 222: 1462-1467.

Prot T, Korving L, Van Loosdrecht MCM. Ionic strength of the liquid phase of different sludge streams in a wastewater treatment plant. Water Sci Technol 2022; 85: 1920-1935.

Qin C, Chen C, Shang C, Xia K. Fe3+-saturated montmorillonite effectively deactivates bacteria in was tewater. Science of The Total Environment 2018; 622-623: 88-95.

Rashid R, Shafiq I, Akhter P, Iqbal MJ, Hussain M. A state-of-the-art review on wastewater treatment techniques: the effectiveness of adsorption method. Environ Sci Pollut Res Int 2021; 28: 9050-9066.

Rstudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, PBC, Boston, MA. 2020; Last Update on https://support.posit.co/hc/en-us/articles/206212048-Citing-RStudio

Rusiñol M, Zammit I, Itarte M, Forés E, Martínez-Puchol S, Girones R, et al. Monitoring waves of the COVID-19 pandemic: Inferences from WWTPs of di fferent sizes. Science of The Total Environment 2021; 787: 147463.

Sahu O, Mazumdar B, Chaudhari PK. Treatment of wastewater by electrocoagulation: a review. Environ Sci Pollut Res Int 2014; 21: 2397-413.

Shi W, Zhuang WE, Hur J, Yang L. Monitoring dissolved organic matter in wastewater and drinking water treatments using spectroscopic analysis and ultra-high resolution mass spectrometry. Water Res 2021; 188: 116406.

Svec D, Tichopad A, Novosadova V, Pfaffl MW, Kubista M. How good is a PCR efficiency estimate: Recommendations for precise and robust qPCR efficiency assessments. Biomolecular Detection and Quantification 2015; 3: 9-16.

Taylor SC, Laperriere G, Germain H. Droplet Digital PCR versus qPCR for gene expression analysis with low abundant targets: from variable nonsense to publication quality data. Scientific Reports 2017; 7: 2409.

Thatcher SA. DNA/RNA preparation for molecular detection. Clinical Chemistry 2015; 61: 89-99.

Wakefield JH. Understanding Separation Essentials For Wastewater Treatment. Water Online. 2015; Last Update on 05/15/2015. https://www.wateronline.com/doc/understanding-separation-essentials-for-wastewater-treatment-0001

Weißbecker C, Buscot F, Wubet T. Preservation of nucleic acids by freeze-drying for next generation seq uencing analyses of soil microbial communities. Journal of Plant Ecology 2017; 10: 81-90.

World Health Organization W. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): situation report, 158. World Health Organization, 2020.

Wurtzer S, Marechal V, Mouchel JM, Maday Y, Teyssou R, Richard E, et al. Evaluation of lockdown effect on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics through viral gen ome quantification in waste water, Greater Paris, France, 5 March to 2 3 April 2020. Eurosurveillance 2020; 25: 2000776.

Xagoraraki I, O'Brien E. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology for Early Detection of Viral Outbreaks. In: O'Bannon DJ, editor. Women in Water Quality: Investigations by Prominent Female Engineers. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020, pp. 75-97.

Ye Y, Ellenberg RM, Graham KE, Wigginton KR. Survivability, Partitioning, and Recovery of Enveloped Viruses in Untr eated Municipal Wastewater. Environmental Science & Technology 2016; 50: 5077-5085.

Zhang S, Li X, Wu J, Coin L, O'Brien J, Hai F, et al. Molecular Methods for Pathogenic Bacteria Detection and Recent Advances in Wastewater Analysis. Water 2021; 13: 3551.


Wastewater Treatment Plant
Sample Collection
Virus concentrating
Freeze drying
VS
Ultrafiltration





1. Collect samples from April 14, 2020, to May 28, 2021 (n=72): FH (n=17); JH (n=12); HS (n=26); BU (n=17)

2. Inaction via pasteurization

3a. Concentrate samples via freeze-drying (n=71)

3b. Concentrate samples via ultrafiltration

Centrifuge

Pellet (n=56)

Supernatant

Filter

Solid (n=4)

Centrifuge

Concentrate (n=70)

4.Trizol inactivation (flexible storage time)

5. RNA extraction

6. RNA quantification via RT-qPCR*

# A. RNA standard curves (N1 assay)



# B. RNA standard curves (N2 asssay)



# C. DNA standard curves (N1 assay)



# D. DNA standard curves (N2 assay)