

1 **Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in fourteen wastewater treatment systems in**
2 **Uttarakhand and Rajasthan States of North India**

3 Sudipti Arora^{1*}, Aditi Nag^{1*}, Ankur Rajpal², Satya Brat Tiwari^{3,4}, Jasmine Sethi¹, Devanshi
4 Sutaria¹, Jayana Rajvanshi¹, Sonika Saxena¹, Sandeep Srivastava⁵, A. A. Kazmi², Vinay Kumar
5 Tyagi^{2†}

6
7 ¹Dr. B. Lal Institute of Biotechnology, 6E, Malviya Industrial Area, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur-
8 302017, India

9 ² Environmental Biotechnology Group (EBiTG), Department of Civil Engineering, Indian
10 Institute of Technology Roorkee (India)

11 ³School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

12 ⁴Nanyang Environment and Water Research Institute, Interdisciplinary Graduate Programme,
13 Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

14 ⁵Centre for Innovation, Research & Development (CIRD), Dr. B. Lal Clinical Laboratory Pvt.
15 Ltd., Jaipur (India)

16


17 †**Corresponding author:** Vinay Kumar Tyagi, Ph.D, Ramalingaswami Fellow (DBT, GoI),
18 Department of Civil Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, Roorkee-247667,
19 Uttarakhand, INDIA, Office: +91 1332 284551 Mobile:+91-9068649528, Email:
20 vinayitrp@gmail.com; vinay.tyagi@ce.iitr.ac.in

21

22 †Sudipti Arora and Aditi Nag are equal contributors and thus shared the first authorship.

23

24 Graphical Abstract



25

26 **Highlights**

- 27 ● Mild to moderate genome load observed in the municipal wastewater samples.
- 28 ● Increased patient numbers post-lockdown correspond to a decrease in the C_T value of
- 29 genes.
- 30 ● Presence of SARS-CoV-2 genome load was observed in untreated wastewater.
- 31 ● E gene was present in abundance in wastewaters as compared to the N gene and RdRp
- 32 gene.
- 33 ● SARS-CoV-2 genome load was absent in secondary and tertiary treated effluent.

34 **Abstract**

35 We investigated the presence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-
36 CoV-2) RNA at different treatment stages of 15 wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) in two
37 North Indian states of Rajasthan and Uttarakhand. Untreated (influent), biologically treated, and
38 disinfected wastewater samples were collected from May to August 2020. The qualitative
39 analysis of the wastewater for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was done using different pre-
40 processing methods. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in 11 out of 39 wastewater samples in
41 Jaipur district and 5 out of 17 wastewater samples in Haridwar District using Reverse-
42 Transcriptase Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-qPCR) for qualitative detection.
43 None of the 56 samples tested for post-secondary or tertiary treatment were found positive for
44 SARS-CoV-2 RNA. The findings indicate that there are no SARS-CoV-2 related risks involved
45 with using the treated effluent for non-potable applications. In contrast, untreated wastewater
46 may be a potential route of viral transmission to the WWTP and sanitation workers. Future
47 studies are imperative to understand the survival rates of these viruses in wastewater.

48 **Keywords:** COVID-19, RT-PCR based detection, SARS-CoV-2, Sewage surveillance,
49 Wastewater epidemiology, Wastewater treatment.

50 **1. Introduction**

51 The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) caused by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
52 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has emerged as a worldwide public health emergency within few
53 months of its outbreak in Wuhan, China. Its spread is confirmed in more than 213
54 countries/regions worldwide (worldometers.info). COVID-19 is highly contagious and spreads
55 through different routes, like air droplets, and physical contact. Hence, early detection and rapid

56 containment protocols are crucial for its control and elimination. Especially for developing
57 countries, many of whom are densely populated and lack robust public health infrastructure.
58 Relying on clinical testing alone for detection and control is insufficient due to the scale of the
59 spread and many asymptomatic and pauci-asymptomatic cases. Wastewater based epidemiology
60 (WBE) or wastewater surveillance can be a useful tool for community-wide detection as both
61 viable SARS-CoV-2, and viral RNA are shed in bodily excreta, including saliva, sputum, and
62 feces, subsequently disposed of in wastewater.

63 WBE implies the extraction, detection, analysis and interpretation of the biomarkers from the
64 wastewater (generally obtained from a limited geographic area) (Sims and Hordern, 2020). It has
65 been successfully used to predict disease outbreak previously, like, the spread of wild poliovirus
66 type-1 (WPV-1) in Egypt and Palestine (WHO, 2013). Similarly, SARS-CoV-2 RNA fragments
67 were found in wastewater in Brazil (Fongaro et al., 2020), Italy (La Rosa et al., 2020), the
68 Netherlands (Medema et al., 2020) and Spain (Randazzo et al. (2020) before the first clinically
69 confirmed cases there. Various other studies detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater across
70 the globe (Ahmed et al., 2020; La Rosa et al., 2020; Lodder and Husman, 2020; Medema et al.,
71 2020; Rimoldi et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020), and wastewater surveillance
72 has been suggested as a non-invasive early-warning tool for monitoring the status and trend of
73 COVID-19 infection and for tuning public health response (Daughton, 2020; Mallapaty, 2020;
74 Naddeo and Liu, 2020). Combinations of clinical and environmental surveillance methods have
75 proven to be useful for planning, implementing and evaluating public health practices (Kroiss et
76 al., 2018). However, current evidence indicates the need for a better understanding of the role of
77 wastewater as potential sources of epidemiological data and as a factor of public health risk. A
78 recent study suggests that SARS-CoV-2 can be infective in aerosols for up to 16 hours (Fears et

79 al., 2020), thus implying possible human health risk due to wastewater aerosolization, especially
80 among sanitation workers. Thus, it is imperative to investigate the presence of viral RNA in both
81 untreated and treated wastewater. Further, there are apprehensions about implementing WBE in
82 developing countries due to poor water supply network and sewerage system. While
83 infrastructure development is quintessential and a long-drawn process, sufficient good quality
84 data on WBE from these regions can be useful for future planning and computational modeling.

85 Most studies on WBE for SARS-CoV-2 are reported from developed countries. Therefore,
86 this study tries to bridge the crucial information gap regarding WBE in a developing region,
87 specifically India. The objective of this study is to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA fragments in both
88 untreated and treated wastewater samples collected from multiple locations. Experiments were
89 carried out to detect the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in influent, secondary treated and tertiary
90 treated effluent samples from 15 wastewater treatment systems of four cities (Roorkee,
91 Rishikesh, Haridwar, Jaipur) of two North Indian states of Uttarakhand and Rajasthan, and to
92 possibly decipher the potential of current biological treatment systems for removal of the virus.
93 The samples from multiple locations make the study more representative and indicate the
94 potential application of WBE across diverse climatic conditions. This study will add to the
95 existing literature on WBE and contribute to an efficient and resilient public health emergency
96 response mechanism for the future.

97

98 **2. Materials and methods**

99 **2.1. Sample collection**

100 Wastewater samples (grab) were collected during nine different time points from seven
101 wastewater treatment facilities of Jaipur city (Rajasthan). Grab, and composite samples were
102 collected during three different time points from eight wastewater treatment facilities at
103 Uttarakhand state (Rishikesh, Haridwar, Roorkee). The sampling was carried out during the
104 months of May to August 2020. Untreated wastewater (n= 23 and 9), secondary treated effluent
105 (n= 5 and 2) and tertiary treated effluent (n= 9 and 6) were collected from Rajasthan and
106 Uttarakhand states, respectively. The locations of the WWTPs are highlighted in [Figure 1 and](#)
107 [summarized in Table 1](#). During sampling, proper precaution and safety measures like using
108 standard personal protection equipment (PPE), were followed. Samples were collected in clean
109 pre-sterilized bottles and transported to Dr. B. Lal Clinical Laboratory, Jaipur for pre-processing
110 and RNA extraction.

111 **2.2. Sample pre-processing**

112 The samples were pre-processed using two different methods specified in [Figure 2](#). In method A,
113 a 50 ml sample was transferred into sterile falcon tubes in Biosafety Cabinet (BSL-II) followed
114 by surface sterilization of the falcons using 70% ethanol and exposure to UV light for 30
115 minutes. The heat inactivation of the virus was then done by placing the falcon tubes in a water
116 bath at 60°C for 90 mins. The samples were further filtered through a 0.45µm membrane using a
117 vacuum filter assembly. The filtrate was then transferred to a fresh falcon containing 4g PEG and
118 0.9g NaCl. The content was dissolved through manual mixing followed by centrifugation at 4°C
119 for 30mins at 7,000 rpm. The pellet obtained was then resuspended in 1X Phosphate Buffer
120 Saline (PBS).

121 Method B used for the detection of the SARS-CoV-2 virus was performed by the transfer of a
122 1ml sample in a 1.7ml centrifuge tube followed by centrifugation at 7,000 rpm for 15mins. The
123 supernatant was collected in a fresh tube and was again centrifuged at 7,000 rpm for 15mins. The
124 supernatant thus obtained was used for nucleic acid extraction. Since both methods A and B
125 showed similar patterns of detection of SARS-CoV-2 genes for early time points of the
126 collection time window (Arora et al., 2020); all further samples from July 2020 onwards were
127 pre-processed following method B.

128 **2.3. Nucleic acid extraction**

129 The viral RNA molecules present in the wastewater samples from May to early July 2020 were
130 isolated using a Biospin kit (Cat# BSC77M1). As per the vendor's instructions, 10 µl proteinase
131 K and 200 µl of lysis buffer were added to 200µl of sample into a 1.5 ml centrifuge tube
132 followed by vortex mixing and incubation at 56 °C for 15 minutes in a heating block. 250 µl of
133 ethanol was then added to the sample and mixed by vortexing for 15 secs. The mixture was then
134 transferred to the spin column and centrifuged at 10,000 g followed by sequential washing with
135 the three wash buffers provided in the kit followed by centrifugation at 10,000g for 1 min at each
136 washing step. After complete drying of the spin column, the RNA was eluted out using a 50-
137 100µl elution buffer. centrifugation was done at 12,000 g for 1 minute. The RNA from samples
138 collected in late July to August has been extracted using the automated KingFisher Flex
139 System™. (Cat#5400610).


140 **2.4. Method for RT-qPCR based qualitative detection of viral RNA from sewage samples**

141 For the qualitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 in the wastewater samples, RT-PCR was performed
142 using FDA approved Allplex™ 2019-nCoV Assay kit (Cat# RP10244Y, 208 RP10243X) as per

143 protocol standardized in the laboratory (Arora et al., 2020). Recently published Real Time-PCR
144 assays were used as the basis for the detection of SARS- Co-V-2 in wastewater samples (Ahmed et
145 al., 2020; Corman et al., 2020). RT-PCR assays were performed using two of the ICMR approved
146 kits for standardizing detection of viral genome in wastewater samples. The two kits used were
147 FDA approved Allplex™ 2019-nCoV Assay kit (cat# RP10244Y, RP10243X) and TaqPath™
148 COVID-19 Combo Kit (Cat#A47814) for the qualitative detection of SAR-CoV-2 genomic RNA in
149 the sample on Applied Biosystems™ QuantStudio™ 5. Once the protocol was established and the
150 two kits performed without any noticeable difference in efficiency, further samples were all tested
151 by Allplex™ kit. The protocol for the same is as follows: the mastermix was prepared using the kit
152 content which was composed of Amplification and detection reagent, enzyme mix for one-time RT-
153 PCR, buffer containing dNTPs, buffer for one-step PCR and RNase free water. Each PCR tube
154 contained 8 µl RNA sample, 5µl 2019-nCoV MOM, 5 µl Real-time One-step buffer and 2µl Real-
155 time One-step enzyme and the final volume of the mixture was adjusted to 25µl using RNase free
156 water. A list of different fluorophores used for the detection run is given in Table 2. Thermal
157 cycling reactions were performed at 50 °C for 20 minutes, 95 °C for 15 minutes, 44 cycles at 94 °C
158 for 15 seconds, and 45 cycles at 58 °C for 30 seconds, in a thermal cycler. For each run, a set of
159 positive and negative controls were included.

160

161



162

163 **Fig. 1.** Locations of samples collection in the Uttarakhand and Rajasthan states of India.

164

165

166

167


168 **Table 1.** Sampling locations in Rajasthan and Uttarakhand states

| S.No. | Sampling Location | Secondary Treatment | Tertiary Treatment | Type of Sample |
|------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------|--|
| (A) Rajasthan | | | | |
| 1 | Rambagh Circle, Jaipur 26.8963° N, 75.8100° E | MBBR | UV | Influent, Effluent |
| 2 | Central Park, Jaipur 26.9048° N, 75.8073° E | SBR | Cl | Influent, Effluent |
| 3 | Dhelawas, Jaipur 27.3735° N, 75.8926° E | ASP | -- | Influent, Effluent |
| 4 | Jawahar Circle, Jaipur 26.8414°N, 75.8°E | MBBR | UV | Influent, Secondary treated, Tertiary treated (Disinfection) |
| 5 | Brahmpuri, Jaipur 26.9373° N, 75.8250° E | SBR | -- | Influent, Effluent |
| 6 | MNIT, Jaipur 26.8640° N, 75.8108° E | MBBR | Cl | Influent, Effluent |
| 7 | Dravyawati River Project, Jaipur 26.7980° N, 75.8039° E | SBR | Cl | Influent, Effluent |
| (B) Uttarakhand | | | | |
| 8 | IIT Roorkee 29.8649° N, 77.8965° E | SBR | UV | Influent, Secondary treated, Tertiary treated (Disinfection) |
| 9 | Muni ki Reti, Rishikesh 30.1199° N, 78.3031° E | MBBR | Cl | Influent, Effluent |
| 10 | Swarg Ashram, Rishikesh 30.1165° N, 78.3131° E | SBR | -- | Influent |
| 11 | Chandreshwar Nagar, Rishikesh 30.1115° N, 78.3056° E | MBBR | Cl | Influent, Effluent |
| 12 | Sarai, Haridwar 29.9043° N, 78.1080° E | SBR | Cl | Influent, Effluent |
| 13 | Jagjeetpur, Haridwar | MBBR | Cl | Influent, Effluent |

| | | | | |
|----|--|----|----|----------|
| | 29.9174° N, 78.1316° E | | | |
| 14 | Sewage Pump House, Haridwar 29°56'36.00°N, 78°9'20.06°E | -- | -- | Influent |

MBBR= Moving bed biofilm reactor, SBR= Sequencing batch reactor, ASP= Activated sludge process, UV= Ultra-violet, Cl= Chlorination

169



170

171 **Fig. 2.** Methodology for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 viral genome through RT-qPCR in
172 wastewater samples

173

174 3. Results and discussion

175 3.1. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in raw wastewater samples corresponds to 176 epidemiological data for detection of Hotspots

177 The wastewater influent samples were collected from various sites in Rajasthan and Uttarakhand
178 and tested for the presence of the viral genome. In Rajasthan, the sampling was started in early

179 May 2020. In Uttarakhand, the sampling was started in July 2020. The early sampling in
180 Rajasthan coincided with the duration of community restrictions and lockdown and followed the
181 gradual relaxation in the same (Arora et al. 2020). The sampling was carried out until August
182 2020, when most establishments, including offices, barbershops, markets, malls, were opened,
183 and unrestricted city movements were allowed. In Uttarakhand, sampling was conducted under
184 partial lockdown conditions, with offices closed and restricted activities permitted in some areas.
185 The observations from RT-qPCR based qualitative genome detection showed that the spread of
186 COVID-19 in North India is highly extensive, and partial lockdowns had no apparent difference
187 in the viral genome load. The Ct values of all three genes (E, RdRp, and N) were found to be in
188 the range of 30-38 (Table 2), which corresponds to a mild to moderate genome load presence
189 in all the wastewater samples. In Jaipur, the Ct values indicate an increase in the genome load of
190 about 10 to 10³ fold after the restrictions were lifted. The Ct values in wastewater samples
191 collected from Uttarakhand indicate genome loads within the same orders of the loads present in
192 Jaipur during June 2020. It was the time when restrictions were being lifted partially in the cities.
193 The increase in the viral genome load concurs with the gradual rise in the number of infected
194 individuals, which have risen from 2138 and 720 active cases on first June to 10,260 and 5912
195 active cases by the end of August 2020 in Jaipur and Haridwar districts respectively (number of
196 cases for Jaipur district obtained from the newspaper, the case numbers for Haridwar as reported
197 by the Department of Medical Health and Family Welfare (<https://health.uk.gov.in/>)). During the
198 qualitative detection, the presence of gene E was frequently detected with the lowest of Ct values
199 as compared to the other two genes (Genes N and RdRP) (Table 2). In Uttarakhand, the Ct of E
200 gene in four samples out of five positive samples was the lowest compared to those of N and
201 RdRP genes in the same samples. In Jaipur, all the five-times sampling in August 2020 (overall

202 10 out of 12 samples), showing positive results for the presence of the SARS-CoV-2 genome,
203 had the lowest Ct values for the E gene. Interestingly, for the samples collected initially from
204 Jaipur, Ct values of E and N indicated that the genome loads were still within a difference of 10
205 times maximum. In contrast, the sample collected later into the time window clearly showed 100
206 to 1000 times lower genome load reflecting in the Ct values for the E gene than N. Several
207 studies have investigated the role of these viral genes. It has been known that these genes are
208 involved in different steps of viral assembly. Vennemal et al demonstrated that E protein along
209 with M protein alone is independently capable to assemble into viral capsid without requiring
210 any interactions with N or RdRp genes. Self-assembly of SARS-CoV-2 requires interaction of
211 the N gene with viral RNA for compaction and packaging into the viral capsid (Ye et al., 2020).
212 Thus, the observed Ct value trends might be interesting and may indicate towards shedding of
213 viral capsids before the packaging is complete. Alternatively, it could indicate the differential
214 expression rates of these genes in host under different conditions, like, genetic makeup of a
215 community, geographical, climatic, etc. These dynamics in E, N, and RdRP gene detection,
216 therefore might prove useful to understand the viral host interactions and transmission
217 probabilities through wastewater.

218 A few studies have also tried to correlate the Ct values with genome load and the
219 probability of that load to be infective. Lab level studies were conducted by investigating the
220 percentage of the cell cultures turning positive at various Ct levels of the SARS-CoV-2 genome
221 detected in the clinical samples of sputum and nasal swabs. The study shows that a sample with
222 genome load with Ct values greater or equal to 34 could not infect the cell lines tested and thus
223 postulates that the patients with higher or equal to 34 Ct values may be discharged out (La Scola
224 et al., 2020). However, those studies have been conducted in labs for clinical samples and might

225 not correspond to the infection probabilities that could occur through the contamination in the
 226 wastewater. Thus, it would be interesting to investigate the possibilities of transmission routes
 227 through contaminated wastewater.

228 **Table 2.** SARS CoV-2 RNA in untreated wastewater samples collected from different WWTPs

| S.No. | Sampling site | Sampling date | C _{TE} | C _{TR} | C _{TN} | C _{TTC} | Final result |
|-------|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|
| 1 | MBBR, Jaipur, Rambagh Circle | 04.05.2020 | 33.16 | 36.04 | 33.06 | 27.48 | Positive |
| | | 15.05.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 13 | Negative |
| | | 20.05.2020 | 31.93 | 38.84 | 34.32 | 31.15 | Positive |
| | | | 32.34 | 37.05 | 34.22 | 30.88 | Positive |
| | | 12.07.2020 | 36.16 | > 40 | 36.31 | 28.43 | Positive |
| | | 11.08.2020 | 35.68 | 36.24 | 36.28 | 29.24 | Positive |
| 2 | SBR, Central Park, Jaipur | 04.05.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 33.04 | Negative |
| | | 15.05.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | Negative |
| | | 20.05.2020 | 41.84 | 12.33 | > 40 | 35.06 | Positive |
| 3 | MBBR, Jawahar Circle, Jaipur | 04.05.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 27.13 | Negative |
| | | 12.06.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 29.17 | Negative |
| | | 04.08.2020 | 34.47 | > 40 | 38.01 | 29.07 | Positive |
| | | 08.08.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 29.32 | Negative |
| | | 11.08.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 29.64 | Negative |
| 4 | MBBR, MNIT Jaipur | 04.05.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 40.72 | Negative |
| | | 04.08.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 28.81 | Negative |
| 5 | SBR, Dravyavati River Project, Jaipur | 04.05.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 40.72 | Negative |
| 6 | ASP, Dhelawas, Jaipur | 04.08.2020 | 32.81 | 36 | 36.56 | 28.97 | Positive |
| | | 08.08.2020 | 34.09 | 35.99 | 36.29 | 29.68 | Positive |
| 7 | SBR, Brahmipuri, Jaipur | 15.05.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 20.8 | Negative |
| | | 20.05.2020 | 36.01 | 16.89 | 37.52 | 33.88 | Positive |
| | | 12.06.2020 | 36.82 | > 40 | 36.7 | 28.48 | Positive |
| | | 11.08.2020 | 33.34 | 34.8 | 35.83 | 29.84 | Positive |
| 8 | SBR, Swarg Ashram, Rishikesh | 25.07.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 27 | Negative |
| 9 | MBBR, Chandreshwer Nagar, Rishikesh | 25.07.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 27 | Negative |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|------------|-------|------|------|-------|----------|
| 10 | MBBR, Muni Ki Reti, Rishikesh | 25.07.2020 | 36 | 37 | 37 | 26.94 | Positive |
| 11 | MBBR, Jagjeetpur, Haridwar | 25.07.2020 | 33 | 37 | > 40 | 27 | Positive |
| 12 | SBR, Sarai, Haridwar | 25.07.2020 | 36 | > 40 | 37 | 29 | Positive |
| 13 | Sewage Pump House, Haridwar | 25.07.2020 | > 40 | > 40 | 37 | 27 | Negative |
| 14 | SBR, IIT Roorkee | 25.07.2020 | 33 | 37 | 37 | 27 | Positive |
| | | 14.08.2020 | 36.97 | 30.9 | 37.6 | 37.65 | Positive |

Red colour rows indicate samples which were concluded as positive while yellow are those which were ruled as negative for the presence of COVID-19 genome. * C_{TE} = C_T value of E gene, C_{TR} = C_T value of RdRp gene, C_{TN} = C_T value of N gene, C_{TIC} = C_T value of Internal Control. The value of C_t above 40 indicates that the gene tested is not present in the sample. The presence of at least two out of three positive genes in a sample was ruled to be positive for SARS-CoV-2 genome.

229

230 **3.2. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in effluent samples corresponds to the role of the** 231 **biological wastewater treatment process**

232 The presence of the SARS-CoV-2 genome in untreated wastewater is a cause of concern as the
 233 wastewater is a potential route of viral transmission to the sanitation workers. Additionally,
 234 aerosolization of wastewater during its treatment can promote infection via air provided the viral
 235 particle is active. The sludge and treated water from these treatment facilities are used for
 236 agricultural purposes, which can put end users' health at risk. To investigate the probability of
 237 such a transmission route, treated wastewater samples from all the sampling sites were collected
 238 and checked for the presence of viral RNA.

239 The samples were collected from both secondary and tertiary treatment stages of
 240 wastewater treatment plants. Interestingly, detectable and intact SARS-CoV-2 viral genome was
 241 not observed in any treated wastewater samples (Table 3). The sampling was conducted during
 242 the lockdown and after lifting of the lockdown regulations. While there is a constant increase in
 243 the number of COVID-19 cases, and by extension, the SARS-CoV-2 genome load per sample
 244 unit, treated samples were negative for the viral genome presence. It indicates that the

245 wastewater treatment facilities were capable of degrading the viral RNA significantly. The
 246 biological treatment stages were capable of removing the intact SARS-CoV-2 genome beyond
 247 the detection sensitivity and did not solely depend on the tertiary treatment (i.e., disinfection
 248 stage). Direct chlorination of untreated sewage might not show any significant reduction in the
 249 detected viral loads if the chlorine demand of the sample is not satisfied. Chlorine demand is
 250 directly proportional to the organic waste matter present in the water samples (Rudolf and
 251 Ziamba, 1983). Since there is a very large quantity of organic matter in the sewage; it is
 252 understandable if chlorination alone is not highly effective. Evidently, Zhang et al. (2020) found
 253 an unexpected occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in the septic tank even after disinfection
 254 with sodium hypochlorite. They suggested reevaluation of the existing disinfection approach
 255 (free chlorine: > 6.5 mg/L after 1.5-hour contact). Thus, highlighting the significant role played
 256 by biological treatment systems.

257
 258 **Table 3.** SARS CoV-2 RNA in secondary and tertiary treated wastewater samples collected
 259 from WWTPs

| S.No. | Sampling site | Sampling date | Type of samples | C _{TE} | C _{TR} | C _{TN} | C _{TIC} | Final result |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|
| (A) Rajasthan | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | MBBR, Rambagh Circle, Jaipur | 04.05.2020 | Tertiary treated | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 35.51 | Negative |
| | | 26.07.2020 | Tertiary treated | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | Negative |
| | | 12.06.2020 | Tertiary treated | 35.63 | > 40 | > 40 | 29.06 | Negative |
| 2 | SBR, Central | 11.08.2020 | Secondary | > 40 | > 40 | 16.23 | 30.35 | Negative |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|------------|----------------------|------|------|------|-------|----------|----------|
| | Park, Jaipur | | treated | | | | | | |
| | | | Tertiary treated | 8.52 | > 40 | > 40 | 31.66 | Negative | |
| | | 04.05.2020 | Tertiary treated | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 30.95 | Negative | |
| 3 | MBBR, Jawahar Circle, Jaipur | 08.08.2020 | Secondary treated | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 30.04 | Negative | |
| | | | Tertiary treated | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 30.07 | Negative | |
| 4 | MBBR, MNIT, Jaipur | 04.05.2020 | Tertiary treated | | | | | Negative | |
| 5 | SBR, Dravyavati River Project, Jaipur | 04.05.2020 | Tertiary treated | | | | | | |
| | | | | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 33.19 | Negative | |
| 6 | ASP, Dhelawas, Jaipur | 11.08.2020 | Secondary treated | | | | | | Negative |
| | | | | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 28.66 | | |
| 7 | SBR, Brahmpuri, Jaipur | 12.06.2020 | Secondary treated | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 29.36 | | Negative |
| | | 11.08.2020 | Secondary treated | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 28.44 | | Negative |
| (B) Uttarakhand | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | MBBR, Chandreshwer Nagar, Rishikesh | 30.07.2020 | Tertiary treated | | | | | | |
| | | | | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 27.56 | | Negative |
| 9 | MBBR, Muni Ki Reti, Rishikesh | 25.07.2020 | Tertiary treated | | | | | | |
| | | | | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 27.11 | | Negative |
| 10 | MBBR, Jagjeetpur, Haridwar | 25.07.2020 | Tertiary treated | | | | | | |
| | | | | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 27.49 | | Negative |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|------------|----------------------|------|------|------|-------|----------|
| 11 | SBR, Sarai, Haridwar | 25.07.2020 | Tertiary treated | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 27.62 | Negative |
| 12 | SBR, IIT Roorkee | 11.08.2020 | Secondary treated | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 30.94 | Negative |
| | | 11.08.2020 | Tertiary treated | > 40 | > 40 | > 40 | 31.27 | Negative |

* $C_{TE} = C_T$ value of E gene, $C_{TR} = C_T$ value of RdRp gene, $C_{TN} = C_T$ value of N gene, $C_{TIC} = C_T$ value of Internal Control. The value of Ct above 40 indicates that the gene tested is not present in the sample. The presence of at least two out of three positive genes in a sample was ruled to be positive for SARS-CoV-2 genome.

260

261 **4. Discussion**

262 This study highlights the effect of an increase in the viral genome load per unit of wastewater. In
 263 the post lockdown period (August 2020), the rapid increase in the numbers of COVID-19
 264 patients were corroborated by the decrease in Ct values. Additionally, the genes tested for SARS-
 265 CoV-2 in the wastewater showed different gene load levels, as indicated by the Ct values. The E
 266 gene seems to be present more abundantly than N and RdRP in the samples. This observation
 267 can be explained by either of two reasons. One reason could be the host-pathogen interaction
 268 which is different for different populations; thus it is possible that a particular gene is more
 269 abundantly or stably expressed in a community. Another reason could be that the E gene is
 270 responsible for the structural assembly of the viral particles without interacting with N and RdRp
 271 genes (Vennemal et al., 1996) and thus could be simply overexpressed as compared to other
 272 SARS-CoV-2 genes in affected individuals leading to shedding of assembled capsids without
 273 packaged RNA genome

274 Throughout the sampling period, the SARS-CoV-2 genome could not be detected in the
 275 secondary or tertiary treated samples. However, few studies reported a low probability of viral

276 detection until the tertiary treatment is carried out (Randazzo et al., 2020). The difference in
277 observations could be explained by multiple factors, e.g., the physical factors (temperature, pH),
278 and chemical factors, present as the constituents of the wastewater (i.e., constituents of
279 wastewater may affect the stability of viral genes.)or the microbiome involved in the biological
280 treatment process itself. The absence of any detectable viral genome in wastewater samples
281 collected post-secondary treatment might indicate the efficacy of the biofilm generated by the
282 microflora in the biological reactors in removing the viral genome loads. This hypothesis is
283 based on several studies that have reported the role of biofilms in the removal of various types of
284 viruses(Quignon et al., 1997; Esfahani et al., 2020). A biofilm can be defined as a well-organized
285 community consisting of cooperating microorganisms immobilized in an extracellular
286 polysaccharide (EPS) matrix (Mortensen, 2014; Maurya, and Raj, 2020). Biofilms can be an
287 association of a single, or multiple species of bacteria, fungi, algae, protozoans, and rotifers in
288 combinations (Maurya and Raj, 2020). These unique combinations allow the matrix to
289 effectively trap and assist in removing the viral particles present in raw wastewater flowing
290 through it. Further studies investigating the composition of the biofilms present in the secondary
291 treatment systems might provide a deep insight into the structures and composition of biofilms,
292 which are specifically effective in SARS-CoV-2 removal.

293

294 **5. Conclusions**

295 Following conclusions can be put forward from this study:

- 296 • Ct values corresponding to mild-moderate levels of viral genome loads were observed
297 and direct effects of physical distancing and lockdown regulations on the Ct values could
298 be seen.

- 299 • Further, differences in the presence of genes were observed; Ct values of gene E
300 indicated its abundance compared to the N or RdRP gene in the samples collected post
301 lockdown.
- 302 • Biological treatment plants might be appropriate to perform with high efficiency in
303 SARS-CoV-2 removal, diminishing any possibility of the fecal route of disease
304 transmission through treated wastewater.
- 305 • It also assessed the efficacy of biological treatment followed by tertiary treatment
306 (disinfection) to avoid contamination from treated urban wastewater, and establish a
307 surveillance system through sewage monitoring of the potential virus circulation.
- 308 • This study provides a new direction to understand the survival of these viruses in natural
309 conditions, at different temperatures, and in various wastewater types.

310

311 **Acknowledgements**

312 Authors are thankful to the Department of Biotechnology-GoI (GrantNo. BT/RLF/Re-
313 entry/12/2016) for financial support to this research.

314 **References**

315 Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J. W., et al. (2020). First
316 confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of
317 concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Sci Total Environ*,
318 728, 138764.

- 319 Arora, S., Nag, A., Sethi, J., Rajvanshi, J., Saxena, S., Shrivastava, S. K., Gupta, A. B. (2020).
320 Sewage surveillance for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 genome as a useful wastewater based
321 epidemiology (WBE) tracking tool in India. MedRxiv.
- 322 Chin, A., Chu, J., Perera, M., Hui, K., Yen, H. L., Chan, M., et al. (2020). Stability of SARS-
323 CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. MedRxiv.
- 324 Corman, V. M., Landt, O., Kaiser, M., Molenkamp, R., Meijer, A., Chu, D. K., Drosten, C.
325 (2020). Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-537 PCR. Euro
326 Surveill, 25(3). doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.es.2020.25.3.2000045
- 327 Daughton, C. G. (2020). Wastewater surveillance for population-wide Covid-19: The present and
328 future. Sci. Total Environ., 139631.
- 329 Esfahani, A. R., Batelaan, O., Hutson, J. L., Fallowfield, H. J. (2020). Combined physical,
330 chemical and biological clogging of managed aquifer recharge and the effect of biofilm on
331 virus transport behavior: A column study. J. Water Process Eng., 33, 101115.
- 332 Fears, A.C., Klimstra, W.B., Duprex, P., Hartman, A., Weaver, S.C., Plante, K.C., Mirchandani,
333 D., Plante, J.A., Aguilar, P.V., Fernández, D., Nalca, A., Totura, A., Dyer, D., Kearney, B.,
334 Lackemeyer, M., Bohannon, J.K., Johnson, R., Garry, R.F., Reed, D.S., Roy, C.J., 2020.
335 Comparative dynamic aerosol efficiencies of three emergent coronaviruses and the unusual
336 persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in aerosol suspensions. medRxiv.
337 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.13.20063784>
- 338 Fongaro, G., Stoco, P.H., Souza, D.S.M., Grisard, E.C., Magri, M.E., Rogovski, P., Schorner,
339 M.A., Barazzetti, F.H., Christoff, A.P., de Oliveira, L.F.V., Bazzo, M.L., Wagner, G.,
340 Hernandez, M. and Rodriguez-Lazaro, D., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 in human sewage in Santa
341 Catalina, Brazil, November 2019. medRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.26.20140731>

- 342 Heijnen, L., Medema, G. (2011). Surveillance of influenza A and the pandemic influenza A
343 (H1N1) 2009 in sewage and surface water in the Netherlands. *J Water Health*, 9(3), 434-442.
344 doi: 10.2166/wh.2011.019
345 <https://health.uk.gov.in/> (accessed on September 15, 2020)
- 346 Kroiss, S. J., Ahmadzai, M., Ahmed, J., Alam, M. M., Chabot-Couture, G., Famulare, M., et al.
347 (2018). Assessing the sensitivity of the polio environmental surveillance system. *PloS one*,
348 13(12), e0208336.
- 349 Kumar, M., Patel, A.K., Shah, A.V., Raval, J., Rajpara, N., Joshi, M., Joshi, C.J. (2020) First
350 proof of the capability of wastewater surveillance for COVID-19 in India through detection
351 of genetic material of SARS-CoV-2. *Sci. Total Environ.* 746 (2020) 141326.
- 352 La Rosa, G., Mancini, P., Ferraro, G.B., Veneri, C., Iaconelli, M., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L.
353 and Suffredini, E., 2020b. SARS-CoV-2 has been circulating in northern Italy since
354 December 2019: evidence from environmental monitoring. *medRxiv*.
355 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.25.20140061>
- 356 La Rosa, G., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L., Kenmoe, S., Suffredini, E. (2020). Coronavirus in
357 water environments: Occurrence, persistence and concentration methods - A scoping review.
358 *Water Res.*, 179, 115899.
- 359 La Scola, B., Le Bideau, M., Andreani, J., Hoang, V. T., Grimaldier, C., Colson, P., ... & Raoult,
360 D. (2020). Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a management tool for discharge
361 of SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease wards. *European Journal of Clinical*
362 *Microbiology & Infectious Diseases*, 39(6), 1059.

- 363 Ling, Y., Xu, S. B., Lin, Y. X., Tian, D., Zhu, Z. Q., Dai, F. H., et al. (2020). Persistence and
364 clearance of viral RNA in 2019 novel coronavirus disease rehabilitation patients. Chinese
365 Medical J. 133 (9), 1039-1043.
- 366 Lodder, W., de Roda Husman, A. M. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: potential health risk,
367 but also data source. The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology, 5(6), 533-534.
- 368 Mallapaty, S. (2020). How sewage could reveal true scale of coronavirus outbreak. Nature 580,
369 176-177.
- 370 Maurya, A., Raj, A. (2020). Recent advances in the application of biofilm in bioremediation of
371 industrial wastewater and organic pollutants. Microorg. Sustain. Environ. Health, 81-118.
- 372 Mortensen, B. K. (2014). Formation and detection of biofilms. Bac To
373 Force.[https://www.bactoforce.fi/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Formation-and-detection-of-](https://www.bactoforce.fi/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Formation-and-detection-of-biofilms.pdf)
374 [biofilms.pdf](https://www.bactoforce.fi/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Formation-and-detection-of-biofilms.pdf) (accessed on Sept 10, 2020)
- 375 Naddeo, V., Liu, H. (2020). Editorial Perspectives: 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2):
376 what is its fate in urban water cycle and how can the water research community respond?.
377 Environmental Science: Water Res. Technol. 6(5), 1213-1216.
- 378 Quignon, F., Sardin, M., Kiene, L., Schwartzbrod, L. (1997). Poliovirus-1 inactivation and
379 interaction with biofilm: a pilot-scale study. Appl. Environ. Microbiol.63(3), 978-982.
- 380 Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Simón, P., Allende, A., Sánchez, G. (2020).
381 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence
382 area. Water Res., 181, 115942.
- 383 Rimoldi, S. G., Stefani, F., Gigantiello, A., Polesello, S., Comandatore, F., Mileto, D., et al.
384 (2020). Presence and infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 virus in wastewaters and rivers. Sci. Total
385 Environ., 744, 140911.

- 386 Rudolfs, W., Ziemba, J. V. (1934). The efficiency of chlorine in sewage disinfection as affected
387 by certain environmental factors. *J. Bacteriol.*, 27 (4), 419-422.
- 388 Sims, N. and Hordern, B.K., 2020. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology:
389 monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level. *Environ.*
390 *International* 139,105689.
- 391 Vennemal, H., Godeke, G., Rossen, J. W. A., Voorhout, W. F., Horzinek, M. C., Opstelten, D.
392 E., Rottier, P. J. M. (1996). Nucleocapsid-independent assembly of coronavirus-like
393 particles by co-expression of viral envelope protein genes. *The EMBO J.*, 15, 2020–2028.
- 394 World Health Organization (WHO), 2013a. Poliovirus detected from environmental samples in
395 Israel and West Bank and Gaza Strip. WHO.
396 https://www.who.int/csr/don/2013_09_20_polio/en/ . [Online; accessed on 21-May-2020]
- 397 Wu, F., Xiao, A., Zhang, J., Gu, X., Lee, W. L., Kauffman, K., ...&Duvall, C. (2020a). SARS-
398 CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from clinically confirmed cases.
399 medRxiv. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.05.20051540>
- 400 Wurtzer, S., Marechal, V., Mouchel, J. M., Maday, Y., Teyssou, R., Richard, E., et al. (2020).
401 Evaluation of lockdown impact on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics through viral genome
402 quantification in Paris wastewaters. medRxiv.
- 403 Ye, Q, West, AMV, Silletti, S, Corbett, KD. Architecture and self-assembly of the SARS-CoV-2
404 nucleocapsid protein. *Protein Science*. 2020; 29: 1890– 1901.
- 405 Zhang, D., Ling, H., Huang, X., Li, J., Li, W., Yi, C., Zhang, T., Jiang, Y., He, Y., Deng, S.,
406 Zhang, X., Wang, X., Liu, Y., Li, G., and Qu, J., 2020. Potential spreading risks and
407 disinfection challenges of medical wastewater by the presence of Severe Acute Respiratory

408 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) viral RNA in septic tanks of Fangcang Hospital.

409 Sci. Total Environ., 741, p.140445.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140445>

410

411

412