

Wastewater-based estimation of the effective reproductive number of SARS-CoV-2

Authors: Jana S. Huisman (1,2,3*), Jérémie Scire (2,3), Lea Caduff (4), Xavier Fernandez-Cassi (5), Pravin Ganesanandamoorthy (4), Anina Kull (4), Andreas Scheidegger (4), Elyse Stachler (4), Alexandria B. Boehm (6), Bridgette Hughes (7), Alisha Knudson (7), Aaron Topol (7), Krista R. Wigginton (8), Marlene K. Wolfe (6), Tamar Kohn (5,†), Christoph Ort (4,†), Tanja Stadler (2,3,†), Timothy R. Julian (4,9,10,†)

Affiliations

1. Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zurich, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, CH-8092, Switzerland
2. Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Lausanne, CH-1015, Switzerland
3. Department of Biosystems Science and Engineering, ETH Zurich, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Basel, CH-4058, Switzerland
4. Eawag, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Dübendorf, CH-8600, Switzerland
5. Laboratory of Environmental Chemistry, School of Architecture, Civil and Environmental Engineering, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne, CH-1015, Switzerland
6. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, 94305, California, United States of America
7. Verily Life Sciences, South San Francisco, 94080, California, United States of America
8. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor 48109, Michigan, United States of America
9. Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Basel, CH-4051, Switzerland
10. University of Basel, Basel, CH-4055, Switzerland

†These authors contributed equally

*Corresponding author: Jana S. Huisman; jana.huisman@env.ethz.ch; CHN K16, Universitätsstrasse 16, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland

Competing financial interests

The authors declare they have no actual or potential competing financial interests.

37 **Abstract:**

38 **Background:**

39 The effective reproductive number, R_e , is a critical indicator to monitor disease dynamics,
40 inform regional and national policies, and estimate the effectiveness of interventions. It
41 describes the average number of new infections caused by a single infectious person through
42 time. To date, R_e estimates are based on clinical data such as observed cases, hospitalizations,
43 and/or deaths. These estimates are temporarily biased when clinical testing or reporting
44 strategies change.

45 **Objectives:**

46 We show that the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater can be used to estimate R_e in
47 near real-time, independent of clinical data and without the associated biases.

48 **Methods:**

49 We collected longitudinal measurements of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in Zurich, CH, and
50 San Jose (CA), USA. We combined this data with information on the temporal dynamics of
51 shedding (the shedding load distribution) to estimate a time series proportional to the daily
52 COVID-19 infection incidence. We estimated a wastewater-based R_e from this incidence.

53 **Results:**

54 The method to estimate R_e from wastewater works robustly on data from two different countries
55 and two wastewater matrices. The resulting estimates are as similar to the R_e estimates from
56 case report data as R_e estimates based on observed cases, hospitalizations, and deaths are
57 among each other. We further provide details on the effect of sampling frequency and the
58 shedding load distribution on the ability to infer R_e .

59 **Discussion:**

60 To our knowledge, this is the first time R_e has been estimated from wastewater. This method
61 provides a low cost, rapid, and independent way to inform SARS-CoV-2 monitoring during the
62 ongoing pandemic and is applicable to future wastewater-based epidemiology targeting other
63 pathogens.

64

65 **Introduction:**

66 A critical quantity to monitor an ongoing epidemic is the effective reproductive number R_e ¹⁻⁴.
67 R_e describes the time-varying average number of new infections caused by a single infectious
68 person throughout the course of their infection. Typically, R_e is estimated from case report data
69 (hereafter referred to as R_{cc}), including the numbers of new clinical cases, hospitalizations, and
70 deaths^{1,3-5}. Here, we show that viral RNA concentrations measured in wastewater provide an
71 independent data set to estimate R_e (hereafter referred to as R_{ww}). This complements existing
72 R_{cc} estimates to provide a more complete picture of transmission dynamics.

73

74 R_e estimates for SARS-CoV-2 are used to inform regional and national policies^{6,7}. The R_e
75 changes through time and reflects changes in the immune status of the population, policy,
76 climate, and/or individual behaviors^{1,2}. It can thus be used to estimate the effectiveness of non-
77 pharmaceutical interventions in disease control^{5,8-11}. However, R_{cc} estimates have some
78 notable drawbacks. Most importantly, they depend on robust and accurate clinical case
79 surveillance and reporting. Temporal changes in testing capacity, hospitalization criteria, or the
80 definition of COVID-19-related deaths can bias the R_{cc} estimates^{1,12}. These estimates are also

81 inferred with a delay: R_{cc} is estimable once the infections occurring on that day tested positive
82 and were reported as clinical cases^{1,2}. This delay differs through time and space, yet is
83 necessary to accurately infer R_{cc} , thus complicating the simultaneous computation across
84 geographic regions. Wastewater data may provide an advantage over clinical case data in all
85 these aspects.

86
87 SARS-CoV-2 RNA measurements in wastewater can be used to understand COVID-19
88 epidemiology because infected individuals shed the virus into the sewer system throughout their
89 infection. During the COVID-19 pandemic, SARS-CoV-2 RNA has been repeatedly detected in
90 wastewater and sewage sludge globally¹³⁻¹⁹, and measured RNA concentrations or loads
91 correlate with clinical case data^{13-15,17}. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the wastewater
92 implies there is at least one actively shedding infected person in the catchment served by the
93 sewer system. Compared to clinical testing, substantially fewer wastewater samples are
94 required to track changes in infection incidence at the community level. Wastewater data has
95 also been integrated into compartmental models of infectious disease transmission, allowing
96 estimation of epidemiological parameters including incidence and the basic reproductive
97 number R_0 (which corresponds to the R_e in a fully susceptible population at the start of an
98 outbreak)^{20,21}. These model results are frequently validated against clinical case data, and the
99 good correspondence between both supports the use of SARS-CoV-2 RNA measurements in
100 wastewater to inform disease transmission dynamics. In addition, there are indications that the
101 wastewater may track transmission dynamics more truthfully than cases, especially when test
102 positivity is high²².

103
104 Models relating SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater to incidence or transmission rates are driven
105 by assumptions of virus excretion rates into the sewer system. Excretion (via feces, saliva,
106 and/or sputum) varies by individual and through time after infection. Generally, this can be
107 described using a shedding load profile, which captures both the temporal dynamics of
108 shedding (in the shedding load distribution; SLD), and the total amount of virus shed by an
109 infected individual. Clinical studies in various settings have measured shedding from symptom
110 onset onwards. Notable examples include Wölfel et al., who measured virus concentrations in
111 the stool of hospitalized patients^{21,23} and Han et al., who included symptomatic and
112 asymptomatic children²⁴. Benefield et al. combined such studies into a systematic review of
113 SARS-CoV-2 viral loads²⁵. However, little is known about shedding prior to symptom onset.
114 Given uncertainty and variation in estimates of SLDs, modeling approaches to relate
115 wastewater to transmission have varied. For example, Kaplan et al. used an infectivity profile
116 (based on virus concentrations in the upper and lower respiratory tract from Li et al.) rather than
117 information on gastrointestinal shedding to estimate the basic reproductive number R_0 from
118 wastewater data^{20,26}. More work is needed to determine both the SLD and the amount of virus
119 shed during an infection to relate SARS-CoV-2 RNA measurements in wastewater to
120 epidemiology.

121
122 We measure SARS-CoV-2 RNA in sewage sludge or wastewater from two distinct monitoring
123 programs (Zurich, Switzerland and San Jose, CA, USA), use the measured RNA to estimate
124 R_{ww} , and compare the estimates to R_{cc} obtained from clinical case data. We further determine

125 the SLD that optimizes the fit between R_{ww} and R_{cc} and compare it to previously reported SLDs.
126 We find that R_{ww} is a useful metric to monitor the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2,
127 independent from clinical case data. To our knowledge, this is the first time R_e has been
128 estimated from pathogen concentrations in wastewater.

129

130 **Methods:**

131 **SARS-CoV-2 RNA quantification in wastewater and primary sludge**

132 Overall approach.

133 Longitudinal samples of raw wastewater influent from Zurich (Switzerland) and primary sludge
134 from San Jose (California, USA) were collected over several weeks from late 2020 through early
135 2021. Samples were concentrated, viral RNA was extracted, and SARS-CoV-2 RNA markers as
136 well as pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV) RNA were quantified in each extract. PMMoV is a
137 plant virus that is found in wastewater at high concentrations and in fairly constant loads, and
138 serves to detect anomalies in the collected sample or problems during concentration and
139 extraction ²⁷.

140

141 Sample collection and processing

142 *Zurich approach.* From 03 September 2020 to 19 January 2021, 24-hour flow-proportional
143 composite samples of raw influent (after fine screening) were collected from the Werdhölzli
144 wastewater treatment plant (Zurich, Switzerland). Samples were collected twice per week
145 (Thursdays, Sundays) until October 29; afterwards, samples were collected almost daily.
146 Samples were collected in 500 mL polystyrene or polypropylene plastic bottles, shipped on ice,
147 and stored at 4°C for up to 8 days before processing. Samples were processed following the
148 protocol of Fernandez-Cassi et al. 2021 ²². Briefly, aliquots (50 mL) were stirred at room
149 temperature for 30 minutes and then clarified by sequential filtration through 2 µm glass fiber
150 pre-filters (Merck) and 0.22 µm SteriCup filters (Merck). The filtrates were concentrated by
151 centrifugation (3000xg for 30 minutes) using Centrifugal Filter Units (10kDa Centricon Plus-70,
152 Millipore, USA), followed by concentrate collection from the inverted filter during 3 min at
153 1000xg.

154

155 RNA was extracted from concentrates (140-280 µL) using the QiaAmp Viral RNA MiniKit
156 (Qiagen, USA) according to manufacturer's instructions, using 80 µL of eluate. Until 25 October,
157 samples were processed in duplicate (biological replicates). Samples were extracted once, and
158 a negative extraction control using molecular grade water was run in parallel for every batch of
159 extracted samples.

160

161 *San Jose approach.* From 15 November 2020 to 19 March 2021, 125 settled solids samples
162 (approximately 50 mL) were collected and processed daily from the primary settling tank at the
163 San Jose wastewater treatment plant (San Jose, CA, USA) using methods adapted from
164 Graham et al. and described in published protocols ^{15,28-30}. Briefly, 24-hour composite samples
165 were collected in clean plastic containers, immediately stored at 4°C, and transported to the lab
166 for initial processing within 6 hours of collection. The solids were dewatered by centrifugation at
167 24000xg for 30 minutes at 4°C. The supernatant was aspirated and discarded. A 0.5 - 1 g
168 aliquot of the dewatered solids was dried at 110°C for 19-24 hours to determine its dry weight.

169 Dewatered solids were resuspended in Bovine Coronavirus (BCoV)-spiked DNA/RNA Shield
170 (Zymo Research, Irvine, California, USA), to a concentration of 75 mg/mL. This concentration of
171 solids represented a concentration at which the PCR inhibition of the SARS-CoV-2 assays was
172 minimized based on experiments with solutions containing varying concentrations of solids (see
173 Supplemental Methods)³¹. BCoV was spiked as an external process control. To homogenize
174 samples, 5-10 5/32" Stainless Steel Grinding Balls (OPS Diagnostics) were added to each
175 sample before shaking with a Geno/Grinder 2010 (Spex SamplePrep). Samples were
176 subsequently briefly centrifuged to remove air bubbles introduced during the homogenization
177 process, and then vortexed to re-mix the sample. Samples were either further processed
178 immediately, or stored at 4°C for processing within 7 days.

179
180 RNA was extracted from 300 µL of homogenized sample using the Chemagic™ Viral DNA/RNA
181 300 Kit H96 for the Perkin Elmer Chemagic 360 into 60 µL of eluent followed by PCR Inhibitor
182 Removal with the Zymo OneStep-96 PCR Inhibitor Removal Kit²⁹. Each sample was extracted
183 ten times. In addition, extraction negative and extraction positive controls, consisting of
184 approximately 500 copies of SARS-CoV-2 genomic RNA (ATCC), were extracted using the
185 same protocol as the homogenized samples in each batch of sample extraction.

186 187 Quantification of viral targets

188 *Zurich approach.* SARS-CoV-2 N gene markers N1 and N2 were quantified immediately or
189 within one week after RNA extraction (storage at -80°C) using digital RT-PCR (RT-dPCR). RT-
190 dPCR was performed on 5 µL RNA extract as template on either the Bio-Rad QX200 Droplet
191 Digital (01 September 2020 - 7 October 2020) with the One-Step RT-ddPCR Advanced Kit for
192 Probes (Bio-Rad CN 1864021) or Crystal Digital PCR using the Naica System (Stilla
193 Technologies, 8 October - 20 January 2021) with the qScript XLT 1-Step RT-PCR Kit
194 (QuantaBio CN 95132-500). SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 markers for the N gene were detected
195 using the 2019-nCoV CDC ddPCR Triplex Probe Assay (Assay ID dEXD28563542, Bio-Rad)
196 according to manufacturer's instructions, with proprietary primer and probe concentrations.
197 Primer and probe sequences are specified in Table S4, and further dPCR details in Table S5.

198
199 For samples processed on the Bio-Rad QX200, 20 µL reaction volumes were prepared in a pre-
200 reaction volume of 22 µL consisting of 5.5 µL of template, 5.5 µL of Supermix, 2.2 µL of
201 Reverse Transcriptase, 1.1 µL of DTT and 1.1 µL of 20x 2019-nCoV CDC ddPCR Triplex Probe
202 Assay. Droplets were generated using the QX100 Droplet Generator (Bio-Rad). PCR was
203 performed on the T100 Thermal Cycler (Bio-Rad) with the following protocol: hold at 25°C for 3
204 minutes, reverse transcription at 50°C for 60 minutes, enzyme activation at 95°C for 10 minutes,
205 40 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 30 seconds and annealing and extension at 55°C for 1
206 minute, enzyme deactivation at 98°C for 10 minutes, and an indefinite hold at 4°C. Ramp rate
207 was 2°C/second, and the final hold at 4°C was at least 30 minutes to stabilize droplets. Droplets
208 were analyzed using the QX200 Droplet Reader (Bio-Rad) and thresholding done on the
209 QuantaSoft Analysis Pro Software (Bio-Rad, Version 1.0).

210 For samples processed on the Crystal Digital PCR, 25 µL reactions were prepared in 27 µL pre-
211 reaction volumes for Sapphire Chips (Stilla Technologies CN C14012) consisting of 5.4 µL of

212 template, 13.5 μ L of 2x qScript XLT One-Step RT-PCR, and 1.35 μ L of 20x 2019-nCov CDC
213 ddPCR Triplex Probe Assay. Droplet production and PCR were performed on the Naica Geode
214 with the following protocol: reverse transcription at 48°C for 50 minutes, denaturation at 94°C for
215 3 minutes, followed by 40 cycles of denaturation at 94°C for 30 seconds, annealing and
216 extension at 57°C for 1 minute. Chips were read and analyzed on the Naica Prism3 using the
217 Crystal Reader and Crystal Miner software (Stilla Technologies).

218 For the Bio-Rad QX200 samples with more than 12000 droplets with average partitioning
219 volume of 1 nL were deemed acceptable. For the Stilla Crystal Digital PCR 15000 droplets with
220 average 0.8 nL were deemed acceptable. The average (standard deviation) number of droplets
221 observed in samples from QX200 was 15000 (2100) and for the Crystal Digital PCR excluding
222 controls was 24000 (2000). Average copies per partition (relative uncertainty) was 8.7×10^{-3}
223 (54%). Technical replicate variability was, on average, less than 20%. The variation amongst
224 distinct RT-dPCR runs (inter-experimental variation) was quantified as the coefficient of
225 variation in the performance of a positive control (100 gene copies (gc)/reaction of synthetic
226 SARS-CoV-2 RNA reference material; EURM-019, Joint Research Center) across 87 runs, and
227 was less than 25%. Assays were only conducted in one laboratory, so reproducibility was not
228 assessed. Example fluorescence plots are provided in the Supporting Information (Figures S11,
229 S12).

230
231 Samples were diluted 10-fold in a single step using molecular grade water before quantification
232 in replicate wells. In addition, every thermal cycler run included one positive control and one no
233 template control (NTC) consisting of RNase/DNase-free water. Thermal cycle runs and
234 associated samples were deemed acceptable if the NTCs in the run contained 2 or fewer
235 positive droplets, and there was detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the positive controls. All RT-
236 dPCR runs fulfilled these criteria, with an average (standard deviation) concentration of the
237 positive controls of 101 (25) gc/reaction, in line with the target concentration. If the sample
238 concentration was below the limit of quantification (LOQ), an undiluted sample was quantified.
239 The limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantification (LOQ) of the N1 and N2 markers were
240 determined by processing 10 replicates of synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA reference material at
241 target concentrations of 5, 8, 10, 25, 30, and 50 gc/reaction. The LOD was defined as the lowest
242 sample concentration distinguishable from the no template control in at least 8 out of 10
243 replicates (3 or more positive droplets). At this concentration, there would be a >95% likelihood
244 of detecting the target in at least one of the two technical replicates³². Using this criterion, LOD
245 was determined to be 8 gc/reaction (equivalent to 2560 gc/L wastewater)³². LOQ was
246 determined to be 25 gc/reaction (equivalent to 8000 gc/L wastewater), which was the lowest
247 concentration with coefficient of variation less than 25%³². When sample concentrations were
248 below the LOQ, samples were processed without dilution. Only one sample (September 20,
249 replicate B) remained below LOQ in both dilute and undilute samples (22.5 gc/reaction). This
250 sample was included in the analysis anyway.

251
252 To test PCR inhibition, the RT-dPCR was repeated using mastermix with a spiked internal
253 positive control consisting of 800 gc/reaction of synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA reference material
254 (EURM-019, Joint Research Center) so inhibition testing could be performed on the same assay

255 used for quantification.³³ Samples were added to the mastermix with a spiked internal control at
256 the same dilution used for quantification of the N1 and N2 markers. If either the observed N1 or
257 N2 concentration in the samples analyzed in mastermix with synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA was
258 80% or less than the sum of the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the samples (unspiked)
259 plus the concentration in the sample-free, spiked internal positive control, then the samples
260 were considered inhibited. Inhibited samples were diluted 1:10, retested for SARS-CoV-2 as
261 well as inhibition using the same spiked internal positive control. Dilution sufficiently reduced
262 inhibition for all affected samples.

263 PMMoV was quantified by RT-qPCR using RNA UltraSense™ One-Step Quantitative RT-PCR
264 System (Applied Biosystems CN 11732927) on a LightCycler® 480 instrument (Roche Life
265 Science, Switzerland) using previously reported primers and probes (Microsynth AG,
266 Switzerland, Table S4)^{34,35}. RNA extract aliquots that were separately stored at -80°C for less
267 than three months were used as template. Samples were prepared in 25 µL reaction volumes
268 consisting of 5 µL of template, 5 µL of 5x Ultrasense Mix, 4 µL of Bovine Serum Albumin
269 (Sigma-Aldrich CN 05470-1G) at 2 mg/mL concentration, 1.25 µL of Reverse Transcriptase, and
270 1 µL of each primer at final concentrations of 400 nM and 0.25 µL of probe at a final
271 concentration of 250 nM. The RT-qPCR was run with the following program: reverse
272 transcription at 55°C for 60 minutes, denaturation at 95°C for 10 minutes, followed by 45 cycles
273 of denaturation at 95°C for 15 seconds, annealing and extension at 60°C for 1 minute. PMMoV
274 quantification was performed in six separate RT-qPCR runs by comparison to synthetic DNA
275 standards (gBlock, IDT Technologies) run in duplicate at tenfold dilutions between 5×10^2 (the
276 lowest concentration measured) and 5×10^7 per 5 µL reaction. All thermal cycler runs were
277 pooled for analysis. The pooled standard curve had an amplification efficiency of 97.4% and a
278 goodness-of-fit (R^2) of 0.997.

279
280 *San Jose approach.* RNA extracts were used as template in RT-dPCR assays for SARS-CoV-2
281 N, S, and ORF1a RNA gene targets in a triplex assay, and PMMoV and BCoV in a duplex
282 assay. All primers and probes are listed in Table S4. The SARS-CoV-2 assays were designed
283 using Primer3Plus (<https://primer3plus.com/>) based on the genome of the severe acute
284 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 isolate Wuhan-Hu-1 (Accession Number MN908947.3).
285 The assay was designed to target product size range of 60-200 bp at concentration of dNTPs of
286 0.8 mM and concentration of divalent cations of 3.8 mM, based on the following optimum
287 (range) conditions: primer size: 20bp (15bp, 36bp); primer melting temperature 60°C (50°C,
288 65°C); primer GC content: 50% (40%, 60%); hydrolysis probe size 20bp (15bp, 27bp); hydrolysis
289 probe melting temperature 63°C (62°C, 70°C); hydrolysis probe GC content: 50% (30%, 80%).
290 The location (length) of the amplicons for N is 28287-28457 (171 bp), S is 23591-23665 (75 bp),
291 and ORF1a is 12885-13063 (179 bp). Cross-reactivity was determined in silico using NCBI
292 Blast. The assays were optimized by varying annealing temperature, and benchmarked against
293 a respiratory virus verification panel using extracted RNA. Limit of the Blank was determined
294 using negative nasal swab samples.

295
296 RT-dPCR was performed as previously described for the Bio-Rad QX200 analysis conducted in
297 Zurich using the One-Step RT-ddPCR Advanced Kit for Probes (Bio-Rad 1863021) with primers

298 (900 nM) and probes (250 nM) targeting N, S, and ORF1a RNA. Droplets were generated using
299 the AutoDG Automated Droplet Generator (Bio-Rad). PCR was performed using Mastercycler
300 Pro with the following protocol: reverse transcription at 50°C for 60 minutes, enzyme activation
301 at 95°C for 5 minutes, 40 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 30 seconds and annealing and
302 extension at either 59°C (for SARS-CoV-2 assay) or 56°C (for PMMoV/BCoV duplex assay) for
303 30 seconds, enzyme deactivation at 98°C for 10 minutes then an indefinite hold at 4°C. The
304 ramp rate for temperature changes were set to 2°C/second and the final hold at 4°C was
305 performed for a minimum of 30 minutes to allow the droplets to stabilize.

306
307 Droplets were analyzed using the QX200 Droplet Reader (Bio-Rad), with thresholding done
308 using QuantaSoft™ Analysis Pro Software (Bio-Rad, Version 1.0.596). The average (standard
309 deviation) number of droplets in ten merged wells determined from a random subset of ten
310 samples was 176000 (14500). Average (relative uncertainty) of the number of copies per
311 partition in the same subset was 3.2×10^{-3} (52%). As the samples were extracted ten times and
312 each extract analyzed in one well, technical replicate variability incorporates variation from both
313 RNA extraction and RT-dPCR. Sample errors estimated from the merged wells were <10%, in
314 line with coefficient of variation estimates of <8% for all three targets (S, N, ORF1a) in an
315 experiment of replicate (n = 97) positive controls at target concentrations of 400 gc/reaction.
316 Assays were conducted in only one lab, so reproducibility was not assessed. Example
317 fluorescence plots are provided in the associated reference by Topol et al.³⁰. All liquid transfers
318 were performed using the Agilent Bravo (Agilent Technologies).

319
320 Undiluted extract was used for the SARS-CoV-2 assay template and a 1:100 dilution of the
321 extract (2 µL into 198 µL molecular grade water) was used for the PMMoV and BCoV assay
322 template. The 1:100 dilution is required since PMMoV is in high concentrations, and it is
323 important to be able to quantify the target and not saturate the number of positive partitions.

324
325 Each sample was run in 10 replicate wells, extraction negative controls were run in 7 wells, and
326 extraction positive controls in 1 well. In addition, PCR positive controls for SARS-CoV-2 RNA
327 were run in 1 well, and NTC were run in 7 wells. Results from replicate wells were merged for
328 analysis. Negative controls were required to have less than 2 droplets across all wells, PCR
329 positive controls were required to have ~200 positive droplets, and PCR positive extraction
330 controls were required to have ~ 50 positive droplets. If controls did not meet these acceptability
331 criteria, then the samples included on that plate were re-processed. Therefore, none of the
332 samples included in this study had controls that failed these acceptability criteria.

333
334 Data analysis and exclusion criteria
335 *Zurich approach.* Concentrations of RNA targets were multiplied by the daily flow rate to
336 estimate the total number of genome copies (gc) shed by people within the catchment per day
337 (referred to as loads and reported as gc/day). Samples with PMMoV loads outside the mean
338 plus or minus three times the standard deviation were considered as inconsistent with respect to
339 virus recovery and were excluded from further analysis. Inhibited samples were also removed
340 from further analysis.

341

342 *San Jose approach.* Concentrations of RNA targets were converted to concentrations per dry
343 weight of solids in units of gc/g dry weight. PMMoV was also used to monitor virus recovery in
344 the San Jose samples, using the same criteria as for the Zurich samples. BCoV was used to
345 assess virus recovery, and samples were removed from further analysis if the amount
346 recovered was less than 10% of the amount added.

347

348 **Deconvolution by the Shedding Load Distribution**

349 To relate the viral RNA loads or concentrations measured in wastewater to the number of new
350 infections per day, we used information on the profile of SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding into the
351 wastewater by an infected individual in days after infection or symptom onset. In general, this
352 profile contains information about both the magnitude and timing of viral RNA shedding: (i) the
353 SLD $\sum_j w_j$ (a unitless distribution which sums to 1) describes the temporal dynamics of
354 shedding, and (ii) a normalization factor N describes the total amount of virus shed by an
355 infected individual during the course of infection (in units of gc/infection). After shedding,
356 downstream processes further affect the total amount of viral RNA sampled per infected
357 individual. We assume this does not affect the temporal dynamics, and can be summarised into
358 a second normalization factor M . In general, M will depend on the sewer system, the sampling
359 point within the wastewater treatment plant, choice of sample matrix and processing pipeline.
360 The units of M differ depending on the way viral concentrations were measured: in this study M
361 is unitless for Zurich, and day/g-dry weight for San Jose.

362 With these definitions, the measurement C_i of viral RNA in the wastewater on day i is related to
363 the past incidence of infections I_j on day j :

$$364 \quad C_i = N \cdot M \sum_j w_{i-j} I_j,$$

365 i.e. the observed wastewater measurements are a convolution of the daily infection incidence
366 with the SLD.

367

368 To obtain the infection incidence, we first filled gaps in the wastewater data through linear
369 interpolation, and smoothed it using local polynomial regression (LOESS) with 1st order
370 polynomials and tricubic weights that take into account 21 days of data around each point. To
371 deconvolve the resulting time series we used an Expectation-Maximisation algorithm², which
372 iteratively determines the time series $I(t)$ that maximizes the likelihood of the smoothed
373 wastewater measurements $\bar{C}(t)$ (either in units of gc/day or gc/g-dry weight), given assumptions
374 on N , M , and $\sum_j w_j$.

375

376 For the main analysis, we deconvolved by a SLD which was a combination of the incubation
377 period (the time from infection to symptom onset) and the gastrointestinal SLD from Benefield et
378 al. for the time from symptom onset to shedding²⁵. Figure 3 from Benefield et al.²⁵ was digitized
379 manually, and yielded a gamma distribution with mean 6.7 days and standard deviation 7.0
380 days²². For the incubation period, we used the distribution of Linton et al.: a gamma distribution
381 with mean 5.3 days and standard deviation 3.2 days³⁶. For additional comparisons (Fig. S5,
382 S6), we exchanged the Benefield distribution for the SLD upon symptom onset reported by Han
383 et al., gamma distributed with mean 4.7 days, standard deviation 1.7 days²⁴, or the symptom

384 onset to death delay distribution from Linton et al., gamma distributed with mean 15 days,
385 standard deviation 6.9 days³⁶.

386
387 Since the normalization factors N and M are difficult to measure, and only influence R_{ww} point
388 estimates when off by several orders of magnitude (Fig. S6), we made a simplifying assumption.
389 We assumed the lowest measured RNA load (Zurich) or concentration (San Jose) represents
390 the viral load or concentration from a single infection ($N \cdot M$). For the Zurich wastewater data, this
391 was $1 \cdot 10^{12}$ gc per infection, and for the San Jose sewage sludge measurements this was
392 2663.7 gc/g-dry weight per infection/day.

393

394 **Effective Reproductive Number Estimates**

395 The effective reproductive number was estimated from SARS-CoV-2 RNA loads in wastewater
396 or concentrations in sewage sludge using the pipeline developed in Huisman *et al.*². In brief, we
397 first transformed SARS-CoV-2 RNA measurements into a time series of infection incidence as
398 described in the Deconvolution section above. Second, we used the R package EpiEstim to
399 estimate the effective reproductive number R_e from this infection incidence^{4,37}. The pipeline
400 further accounts for noise in the observation process, by bootstrapping the observations prior to
401 smoothing and deconvolution. Specifically, we block-bootstrap the log-transformed residuals
402 between the linear interpolated original observations and the smoothed value².

403

404 To estimate R_{cc} for Zurich, we obtained the cases reported for the catchment from the Health
405 Department of Canton Zurich. We then used the pipeline from Huisman *et al.*², where we
406 deconvolved by a distribution specifying the delay from infection to case confirmation. This was
407 parameterized as the sum of a gamma distributed incubation period with mean 5.3 days,
408 standard deviation 3.2 days³⁶; and a gamma distributed delay from symptom onset to case
409 confirmation with mean 2.8 days, standard deviation 3.0 days (estimated from line list data for
410 canton Zurich, Sep. 2020-Jan. 2021). The reported R_{cc} values for confirmed cases,
411 hospitalizations, and deaths at the cantonal level were taken from [https://github.com/covid-19-](https://github.com/covid-19-Re/dailyRe-Data)
412 [Re/dailyRe-Data](https://github.com/covid-19-Re/dailyRe-Data) (based on Huisman *et al.*²). For the Swiss data, “case confirmation” refers to
413 the earliest recorded date of either a positive test or case reporting.

414

415 To estimate R_{cc} in San Jose, we downloaded daily COVID-19 case incidence data for Santa
416 Clara County from the California Health and Human Services Open Data portal
417 (<https://data.chhs.ca.gov/dataset/covid-19-time-series-metrics-by-county-and-state>). The
418 wastewater from Santa Clara County (population of 1.7 million) is nearly all treated at the San
419 Jose wastewater treatment plant (catchment population of 1.5 million). We estimated R_{cc} using
420 the pipeline from Huisman *et al.*², with the incubation period as before³⁶; and a gamma
421 distributed symptom onset to case reporting delay distribution with a mean of 4.51 days and
422 standard deviation of 3.16 days (estimated from line list data for Santa Clara County in
423 December; based on personal correspondence with the California Department of Public Health
424 COVID-19 modelling team). During the study period, the mean of this distribution changed from
425 5.24 to 3.31 days, and the standard deviation from 3.55 to 2.32 days. Negative numbers of
426 cases reported (Dec. 30) were set to 0 for the main analysis (Fig. 2), and to 1000 to test the
427 impact of misreporting (Fig. S2).

428
429 To estimate R_e for the testing-adjusted cases, we extracted the daily number of positive tests /
430 total number of tests, multiplied by the mean number of tests during the time period (14960.3).
431 This time series was then used to estimate R_e , similar to the confirmed cases (with the same
432 delay distribution)². Technically, the tests are reported by testing date, which typically precedes
433 the reporting date, so this constitutes a misspecification of the delay distribution. However, an
434 analysis where the delay between symptom onset and testing was assumed 0 did not yield
435 qualitatively different results (Fig. S1). We additionally compared our estimates to the R_{cc}
436 estimates for Santa Clara County from the California COVID assessment tool
437 (<https://calcat.covid19.ca.gov/cacovidmodels/>).

438
439 **Comparing R_e traces**
440 We assessed how well the R_e estimates from SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater (R_{ww})
441 match those estimated from case report data (R_{cc}) using several measures. First, the average
442 root mean squared error between both point estimates across the time series (“RMSE”):

443
$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K (R_{ww,j} - R_{cc,j})^2},$$

444 where j describes the date, and K the length of the time series. Second, the fraction of dates
445 where the R_{ww} point estimate was within the confidence interval of the R_{cc} estimate (“coverage”).
446 Third, the mean average percentage error between the time series (“MAPE”):

447
$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \left| \frac{R_{cc,j} - R_{ww,j}}{R_{cc,j}} \right|.$$

448 **Scanning across shedding load distributions**
449 To investigate optimal parameters for the SLD, we conducted two separate scans. In the first
450 scan, we varied the parameters of the SLD from infection. In the second scan, we estimated the
451 parameters of the SLD from symptom onset onwards. In the latter case, the delay sampled from
452 the SLD was added to a second sampled delay corresponding to the incubation period (gamma
453 distributed with mean 5.3 days and standard deviation of 3.2 days)³⁶. In both cases, we
454 assumed the SLD was described by a gamma distribution, and varied the mean μ and standard
455 deviation σ on a grid ($\mu \in \{0.5, 1.0, \dots, 15\}$ and $\sigma \in \{0.5, 1.0, \dots, 10\}$). The normalization factor
456 ($N \cdot M$) was kept fixed to the location-specific value throughout. The R_{ww} for the wastewater data
457 was estimated across 50 bootstrap samples and compared to the R_{cc} for the catchment.

458
459 **Availability Statement**
460 All code and case data for Zurich are publicly available through the Github repository
461 <https://github.com/JSHuisman/wastewaterRe>. Wastewater measurements and daily flow rates
462 for Zurich are available at DOI: 10.25678/0003VC. Measurements from San Jose are available
463 from the Stanford Data Repository <https://purl.stanford.edu/bx987vn9177>³¹, and case data for
464 Santa Clara County is available from the California Health and Human Services Open Data
465 portal (<https://data.chhs.ca.gov/dataset/covid-19-time-series-metrics-by-county-and-state>).
466

467 **Approval**

468 No ethics approval was required for this study as no humans or animals were involved.

469

470 **Results:**

471 **SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater.** We tracked SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in Zurich,
472 Switzerland and San Jose, California, USA during a rise and fall in clinical COVID-19 cases
473 (Fig. 1A,B; Fig. 2A,B). Data from Zurich were used to develop and assess R_{ww} estimates, and
474 data from San Jose were used to assess the generalizability of the approach.

475

476 In Zurich, SARS-CoV-2 N1 and N2 markers of the N gene were detectable in the raw influent
477 samples from the Zurich wastewater treatment plant between 1 September 2020 and 19
478 January 2021 in all 99 samples collected (Fig. 1A). Of these, the average of the technical
479 replicates was above the limit of quantification in 97, yielding median [range] loads of 13.4 [<12
480 (limit of detection), 13.7] \log_{10} gc/day (Fig. 1A). Two samples (11 and 29 October 2020) were
481 excluded based on quality control, which included monitoring sample inhibition and consistency
482 of effluent pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV) loads.

483

484 In San Jose, SARS-CoV-2 N, S, and ORF1a genes were quantifiable in the settled solids of the
485 primary settling tank in all 125 samples collected between 15 November 2020 and 19 March
486 2021 (Fig. 2A). The median [range] concentrations were 4.9 [3.4, 6.0], 5.0 [3.9, 6.0], and 5.0
487 [3.8, 6.0] \log_{10} gene copies per gram dry weight (gc/g-dry weight) for N, S, and ORF1a genes,
488 respectively (Fig. 2A). Three samples (03 January, 18 February, 19 March 2021) were excluded
489 based on quality control using consistency of PMMoV concentrations.

490

491 Details pertaining to PMMoV measurements in all samples and resulting sample exclusion are
492 given in the Supplemental Results.

493


494 **Inferring the infection incidence dynamics.** Next, we related the RNA measurements in
495 wastewater to the original infection incidence by applying a deconvolution with the shedding
496 load distribution. SARS-CoV-2 wastewater measurements reflect the cumulative contributions of
497 all infected individuals actively shedding virus into the wastewater. The amount of virus shed by
498 each individual varies through time after infection, and is captured in the shedding load profile.
499 In general, this profile contains information about the timing of viral shedding - the shedding load
500 distribution (SLD; which sums to 1) - and the total amount of virus shed - captured by a
501 normalization factor N . To estimate the true number of infections in the sewer shed it is
502 important to estimate the exact value of the normalization factor N , as well as a factor M
503 describing losses along the way from shedding to sample processing. However, to estimate R_e
504 it suffices to know the temporal dynamics of shedding and infection (described in more detail in
505 the Methods). As a first approximation, we assumed individuals do not shed prior to symptom
506 onset, and thereafter shed according to the gastrointestinal SLD reported by Benefield et al.²⁵.
507 With this assumption, we found that the dynamics of infection incidence inferred from
508 wastewater measurements in Zurich are similar to the dynamics inferred from clinical case data
509 (Fig. 1C). In particular, both data sources show a steep increase starting from mid-September,
510 and capture two peaks (indicative of $R_e=1$) around late October and early December, each of

511 which is followed by relatively rapid decline in daily case incidence. We later test the sensitivity
512 of our results to the assumed SLD and normalization.

513
514 **Estimating the effective reproductive number R_{ww} from wastewater measurements.** We
515 used the inferred time series of infection incidence from SARS-CoV-2 RNA measured in
516 wastewater to estimate R_{ww} in Zurich (Fig. 1D). The N1 and N2 markers result in nearly identical
517 R_{ww} estimates, and there is a good correspondence between R_{ww} and R_{cc} . Both estimates show
518 a rapid increase up to $Re = 1.5$ in mid-September, a decline to below 1 in late October, followed
519 by a period where Re was slightly above 1 until dropping more clearly below 1 from early
520 December onwards. R_{ww} and R_{cc} are changing in similar ways, with R_{cc} lagging the R_{ww}
521 trajectory. Since both estimates describe the same underlying epidemic, this suggests that the
522 wastewater measurements may be deconvolved too far back in time (the mean of the SLD is
523 too high), or that the confirmed cases are not deconvolved back far enough (the mean of the
524 delay distribution is too low).


525
526 Over the entire time period, the average root mean squared error (RMSE) between R_{ww} and R_{cc}
527 is 0.11 and 0.12 for N1 and N2 respectively. This is smaller than the RMSE between the Re
528 estimates based on different sources of case report data: 0.13 between confirmed cases and
529 hospitalizations; and 0.26 between confirmed cases and deaths (estimated on case report data
530 from canton Zurich, which has a population 3.4x the size of the catchment, for the same time
531 period as R_{ww}).

532



533
 534 **Fig. 1: R_{ww} estimation from Zurich (CHE) wastewater measurements.** (A) Measured RNA
 535 loads of the N1 and N2 markers (green and yellow respectively) between 1 September 2020
 536 and 19 January 2021. Imputed values are indicated in grey. (B) Confirmed cases (purple) in the
 537 catchment during the same time period. (C) The estimated infection incidence in the catchment
 538 per day from normalized RNA loads of the N1 and N2 markers (top; green and yellow
 539 respectively), and case reports (bottom; purple). The measured loads were normalized by the
 540 lowest measured value ($N \cdot M = 1 \cdot 10^{12}$ gc per infection). The ribbons indicate the mean \pm

541 standard deviation across 1000 bootstrap replicates. (D) The estimated R_{ww} compared to the R_{cc}
 542 from confirmed cases. The colored line indicates the point estimate on the original data, and the
 543 ribbons the 95% confidence interval across 1000 bootstrap replicates. The N1 and N2-based
 544 confidence intervals nearly completely overlap.



545
 546 **Fig. 2: R_{ww} estimation from San Jose (USA) sludge measurements:** (A) Measured RNA
 547 concentrations of the N, S and ORF1a genes (blue, green, yellow respectively) between 15
 548 November 2020 and 19 March 2021. (B, C) Confirmed cases and testing-adjusted cases in
 549 Santa Clara county (purple, red) during the same time period. The testing-adjusted cases

550 describe the number of positive tests / total number of tests per day, normalized by the mean
551 number of tests per day in Santa Clara county during the study period. (D) The estimated
552 infection incidence per day from normalized RNA concentrations (top), case reports (middle)
553 and testing-adjusted cases (bottom). The gene copies per gram dry weight were normalized by
554 the lowest measured value ($N \cdot M = 2663.7$ gc/g-dry weight per infection/day). The ribbons
555 indicate the mean \pm standard deviation across 1000 bootstrap replicates. (E) The estimated R_{ww}
556 compared to R_{cc} from confirmed cases (top) and testing-adjusted cases (bottom). The colored
557 line indicates the point estimate on the original data, and the ribbons the 95% confidence
558 interval across 1000 bootstrap replicates.

559

560 **Application to an independent data source and different wastewater matrix.** To test
561 whether these results could be generalized to different geographic locations and wastewater
562 matrices, we analyzed daily-sampled primary sewage sludge data from the San Jose
563 wastewater treatment plant in California.

564

565 In San Jose, the inferred infection incidence curves between confirmed cases and wastewater
566 data follow similar trends (Fig. 2D). The inferred incidence from confirmed cases rises rapidly,
567 reaching a maximum and fluctuating at a plateau throughout December. This fluctuation seems
568 primarily caused by reporting errors on Dec. 30th, as it fully disappears when replacing the 0
569 cases reported that day by 1000 (Fig. S2). Instead, wastewater estimates continue to rise more
570 gradually throughout December, similar to the cases adjusted for test-positivity. Starting in late
571 December, all traces show a similar decrease.

572

573 We found that R_{ww} agreed with R_{cc} , although there is again some temporal lag between both,
574 which seems more pronounced in November/December than in the second half of the time
575 series (Fig. 2D). The R_e estimates based on the testing-adjusted cases are more comparable to
576 R_{ww} , both in terms of slope (especially in December) and a more uniform delay throughout the
577 entire time period. This further suggests that the R_{cc} estimates are biased by underreporting and
578 increased testing delays, and not as trustworthy as R_{ww} in this case. A comparison between R_{cc}
579 estimated using different methods (as reported on the website of the California State
580 Department of Public Health) shows substantially larger differences than between the
581 wastewater and the confirmed case estimates from the same pipeline (Fig. S3).

582

583 **Minimal Frequency of Wastewater Sampling needed to inform R_{ww} .** While designing
584 wastewater-based epidemiology studies, an important cost-benefit trade-off centers around the
585 frequency of sampling. We subsampled the daily sampled wastewater measurements in Zurich
586 and San Jose, prior to the R_e estimation pipeline, to determine how this would affect the
587 estimated R_{ww} . We assessed a range of sampling strategies that differed in the number and
588 identity of the days sampled (e.g. Mon-Wed-Fri or Tue-Fri). For Zurich, we restricted ourselves
589 to the period with daily sampling (22 November 2020 to 11 January 2021). Using the RMSE to
590 quantify the similarity between different R_{ww} estimates, we found that subsampling down to 3
591 measurements per week still leads to results comparable to a daily sampling regime (Fig. S4,
592 Table S1, Table S2). However, below this frequency the representativity of the R_{ww} estimate
593 starts to depend on which days were sampled.

594

595 **Susceptibility of R_{ww} estimates to the shedding load distribution.** We showed that R_e can
596 be estimated from RNA measurements in wastewater, given an assumption for the SLD.
597 However, there is substantial variation between SLDs described in the literature, across
598 patients, bodily fluids, and geographic locations. The shape of the SLD, in particular the mean of
599 the gamma distribution used, affects the inferred timing of peak infection incidence (with larger
600 means shifting the incidence further back in time; Fig. S5). In our pipeline, we also observe that
601 smaller normalization factors $N \cdot M$ increase the amplitude of the estimated R_{ww} , albeit only when
602 mis-specified by more than 5 orders of magnitude (Fig. S6). In principle, the inference of the R_e
603 point estimate from an infection incidence is independent of the magnitude of this incidence^{2,4}.
604 However, the expectation maximization algorithm used for deconvolution in our pipeline was
605 optimized for data on the scale of infections per day. Here, we have chosen to normalize the
606 wastewater measurements such that the considered gene loads are on that same scale, since
607 R_{ww} otherwise reacts too strongly to changes in the daily incidence.

608

609 **Estimating the shedding load distribution from the fit between clinical and wastewater**
610 **data.** Instead of assuming a single SLD and estimating R_{ww} based only on that distribution, we
611 also asked which SLD would maximize the similarity between the R_{ww} and R_{cc} estimates. We
612 numerically scanned across different SLDs and quantified the resulting goodness of fit between
613 the R_{ww} and R_{cc} for both Zurich and San Jose. We assumed the SLD is described by a single
614 gamma distribution, starting at infection, and searched for the optimal fit on a grid of mean-
615 standard deviation parameter pairs (Table 1, Fig. 3). The fit was quantified using the root mean
616 squared error (RMSE), coverage, and mean absolute percentage error (MAPE). Since the
617 measurements of the different genetic markers followed nearly identical patterns in both
618 locations (Figs. 1 and 2), we conducted the SLD optimization analysis only for the N1 marker in
619 Zurich, and S gene in San Jose.


620

621 The optimal fits based on these metrics suggest that the SLD has a mean between 7-11 days in
622 Zurich and 5-7 days in San Jose, with a very low standard deviation of 0.5 days in both
623 locations (Table 1). However, there is some non-identifiability in our analysis, with most optimal
624 value pairs lying along a ridge (Fig. 3; repeated for coverage: S7, and MAPE: S8). This ridge
625 corresponds to SLDs with a similar median, which result in nearly indistinguishable R_{ww}
626 estimates (examples shown in Fig. S9). If we consider the parameters yielding a fit within 10%
627 from the optimum, the parameter ranges found in both locations are compatible and jointly
628 suggest an SLD with mean between 6-9 days, and standard deviation between 0.5-3 days.
629 Longer time series and more locations would further constrain this distribution. Compared to the
630 delay between infection and case reporting, the SLD introduces a similar or lower mean delay to
631 R_{ww} . For Zurich, the cases were delayed with respect to infection by 8.1 days on average, which
632 is comparable to the 6-9 days for R_{ww} . For San Jose, instead, the delay distribution of the case
633 report data had a mean of 9.8 days. There, the wastewater may lead the confirmed cases by 1-
634 4 days, if the current testing and reporting regime is upheld.

635

636 To compare against published SLDs, which are frequently parameterized from symptom onset
637 instead of infection, we conducted a second analysis. Here we assumed individuals do not shed

638 during their incubation period and subsequently shed with a gamma distribution, starting at
 639 symptom onset. In this case, we find optimal SLDs with a mean between 0.5-3 days for San
 640 Jose and 3.5-5.5 days for Zurich (Table S3, Fig. S10). These optimal distributions have a lower
 641 mean than the SLD reported by Benefield et al. (mean 6.7 days), and Han et al. (mean 4.7
 642 days)^{24,25}. If we add the mean incubation period (5.3 days) to the results of this scan, we find
 643 that for both locations the mean delay between infection and shedding is comparable to the
 644 mean of the SLD we estimated from infection.
 645



646 **Fig. 3: RMSE between R_{cc} and R_{ww} for different shedding load distributions.** We scanned
 647 across different parameter pairs (mean, standard deviation in days) for the SLD from time since
 648 infection. For the city of Zurich, the R_{ww} from N1 loads in wastewater was compared to that of
 649 confirmed cases in the catchment. For San Jose, we compared S gene concentrations to
 650 confirmed cases in Santa Clara County. The contour lines show SLD parameter pairs with equal
 651 RMSE, in steps of 10% of the optimum value.
 652
 653

Comparison Method	Optimal pair (mean; sd)	Mean within 10% from the optimum	SD within 10% from the optimum
RMSE (Zurich)	(7.5; 0.5)	[6, 11.5]	[0.5, 10]
Coverage (Zurich)	(7.5; 0.5)	[6, 12.5]	[0.5, 10]
MAPE (Zurich)	(11; 9.5)	[6.5, 11]	[0.5, 10]
RMSE (San Jose)	(7.0; 0.5)	[6, 9]	[0.5, 3]
Coverage (San Jose)	(5; 0.5)	[1, 11]	[0.5, 10]
MAPE (San Jose)	(6; 0.5)	[5, 8]	[0.5, 2.5]

654 **Table 1: Parameters of the optimal shedding distribution from infection.** We scanned
 655 across different (mean, standard deviation) parameter pairs for the SLD from time since
 656 infection. For Zurich, the R_e from N1 loads in wastewater was compared to that of confirmed
 657 cases in the catchment. For San Jose, we compared S gene concentrations to confirmed cases
 658

659 *in Santa Clara County. For all values of the scan see Figs. 3, S7, S8. All parameters are in units*
660 *of days. For the coverage, the 95% confidence intervals of R_{cc} and R_{ww} were based on 50*
661 *bootstrap replicates in each comparison.*

662

663 **Discussion:**

664 We showed that regular measurements of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater and
665 settled solids can be used to estimate the effective reproductive number R_e . The difference
666 between R_e estimates from wastewater (R_{ww}) and from case report data (R_{cc}) is similar to the
667 difference between R_e estimates based on different types of case report data (clinical cases,
668 hospitalizations, and deaths). This did not depend on which of the measured gene targets was
669 used to estimate R_{ww} . We further showed wastewater samples should be collected at least 3
670 times per week to reliably estimate past R_{ww} , in line with analyses based on direct comparison
671 of wastewater signals to clinical cases^{15,38}. For real-time monitoring of R_{ww} , more frequent
672 measurements may be preferable to ensure stable estimates when new data comes in.

673

674 Estimating R_{ww} requires accurate characterization of the SLD, i.e. the temporal dynamics of
675 shedding. In our primary analysis, we used the distribution for gastrointestinal shedding from
676 Benefield et al.²⁵. In using this SLD, we implicitly assumed that fecal shedding dominates the
677 viral load in wastewater. However, there is a wide range in published viral shedding loads, and it
678 is unclear which - if any - accurately capture viral shedding dynamics of people within a
679 catchment. Virus shed in saliva, sputum, and feces are possible contributors to the total amount
680 of virus RNA in the wastewater³⁹. While upper respiratory tract swabs show peak viral loads
681 around the day of symptom onset, there are indications that sputum samples peak a few days
682 later, and feces even after that⁴⁰⁻⁴². Studies differ in the inferred timing of peak viral load (even
683 in the same bodily fluids), and there is a general lack of information to constrain dynamics prior
684 to symptom onset⁴³. Additionally, the duration and magnitude of viral shedding seem to differ
685 within different populations (for example, due to age or severity of disease)^{44,45}. However, these
686 individual differences will probably average out in a sufficiently large catchment and better
687 estimates of the SLD are likely to become available as prospective sampling studies report
688 results.

689

690 We showed that the optimal SLD can also be inferred from the fit between R_{ww} and R_{cc} . Once
691 the SLD has been estimated from historic wastewater and case data, it may from then on
692 provide a more accurate estimation of R_{ww} , than using one of the published SLDs. Indeed, here
693 we show a range of gamma-distributed SLDs inferred from our wastewater data that generally
694 align with, but have lower means than published SLDs based on patient shedding profiles.
695 Optimization based on alignment between R_{ww} and R_{cc} assumes accuracy of R_{cc} , which only
696 holds when there is adequate clinical case surveillance. However, given widespread wastewater
697 monitoring coincident to clinical case reporting, broader application of our methods would help
698 constrain the SLD of SARS-CoV-2.

699

700 The utility of wastewater measurements for R_e estimation is independent of the pipeline used to
701 estimate R_e . Here, we report results obtained with the pipeline of Huisman et al.². However,
702 many estimation methods exist, differing in assumptions on smoothing, deconvolution,

703 uncertainty quantification as well as the underlying method to estimate R_e from infection
704 incidence^{1,3,7,46,47}. Although the R_e point estimate is not affected by the absolute magnitude of
705 the infection incidence (and thus comparable across wastewater treatment plants with differing
706 sampling protocols), the rest of our pipeline (in particular the deconvolution) was originally
707 developed specifically for use with clinical data. Thus, we had to normalize the measured
708 wastewater concentrations to the same order of magnitude as the case data. Further
709 development could make the method more specifically adapted to wastewater data, and
710 alleviate this dependence on the normalization.

711
712 Estimates of R_{ww} are independent of biases influencing clinical case-based estimates. R_{cc}
713 estimates are based on only the subset of infections, hospitalizations, and/or deaths that are
714 captured by surveillance within the healthcare system. If this subset changes, for instance due
715 to developments in testing or reporting policy, the resulting R_{cc} estimates will be temporarily
716 biased^{2,4}. In Geneva, Switzerland, seroprevalence studies showed that the number of infections
717 per reported case varied substantially, from an estimated 11.6 infections per reported case as of
718 May 2020 to only 2.7 as of December 2020^{48,49}. During that period, SARS-CoV-2 RNA
719 concentrations in wastewater better reflected the dynamics than the clinical cases²².

720
721 However, R_{ww} estimates are also prone to biases. People's behaviors, such as defecation timing
722 outside of a daily routine⁵⁰ and/or movement into or out of the catchment⁵¹ can influence R_{ww}
723 estimates, particularly when the number of infected individuals is low. RNA signals may also be
724 impacted during sewer transport, with persistence influenced by environmental conditions (i.e.,
725 temperature) and/or sewage composition (i.e., solids content)⁵²⁻⁵⁵. Furthermore, sample
726 processing required to quantify SARS-CoV-2 RNA may introduce variation, as suggested by
727 substantial day-to-day variation in measurements^{13,15,22,56}. Finally, R_{ww} estimates are informed
728 by the number and proportion of infected and/or shedding people within the catchment: if there
729 are too few active shedders, R_{ww} may be very sensitive to the increased fluctuations in SARS-
730 CoV-2 RNA concentrations.

731
732 To conclude, deriving R_e from wastewater offers an independent method to track disease
733 dynamics. Wastewater-based epidemiology is used globally to track the COVID-19 pandemic
734 (<https://www.covid19wbec.org/covidpooops19>)¹³⁻¹⁹. The data collected within these campaigns
735 could be used to estimate R_{ww} with a robust method, not influenced by heterogeneous testing
736 and reporting strategies, and hence more comparable across geographic areas. Additionally,
737 R_{ww} estimates could be derived for the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 variants and/or other
738 pathogens for which SLDs are known. SARS-CoV-2 variants, including Variants of Concern
739 (VOCs), are readily detectable in wastewater⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹ as are other pathogens (e.g., norovirus,
740 enterovirus, hepatitis A)⁶⁰⁻⁶². This could provide the temporal, quantitative wastewater
741 measurements needed to estimate R_{ww} . Wastewater surveillance allows estimating R_{ww} to track
742 disease transmission dynamics in near-real time, using low cost, rapid, and geographically-
743 comparable methods, and can be used when reporting clinical cases is not feasible, mandatory,
744 or much delayed compared to infection and shedding.

745
746

747

748 **Acknowledgements:**

749 We thank members from the Bonhoeffer and Stadler groups for helpful discussions, Carola
750 Bänziger (Eawag), Claudia Scheckel (Oncobit AG, Switzerland), and Bruno Mueller and Sergey
751 Yakushev (Microsynth AG, Switzerland) for assistance with and/or knowledge exchange on
752 method development. We further thank the operators of the Zurich WWTP for providing
753 samples; Alexander J. Devaux and Charlie Gan for their help in analyzing the Zurich samples;
754 the staff of the San Jose WWTP including Payak Sarkar, Noel Enoki, and Amy Wong; the
755 Health Department of Canton Zurich for catchment-specific case numbers; and the California
756 Department of Public Health Covid-19 modelling team for input on the Re estimates and
757 symptom onset to case confirmation delay distribution for the state of California. We thank the
758 reviewers for their suggestions to improve the manuscript. XFC, TS, CO, TRJ and TK
759 acknowledge funding from the Swiss National Science foundation (Special Call on
760 Coronaviruses; 31CA30_196267 and 31CA30_196538). CO, TRJ and TK further acknowledge
761 discretionary funding from Eawag and EPFL. XFC was a fellow of the European Union's
762 Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska–Curie Grant
763 Agreement No. 754462. The San Jose wastewater data acquisition and curation was funded by
764 the CDC-Foundation.

765

766 **Author contributions:**

767 JSH, TK, CO, TS, TRJ conceived the study; JSH developed the analytical framework, designed
768 and performed computational analyses; JS, AS, TS contributed to the analytical methods; LC,
769 XFC, PG, AKu, ES, ABB, BH, AKn, AT, KRW, MKW, TK, CO, TRJ developed experimental
770 protocols and performed wastewater sampling; XFC, ABB, KRW, TK, CO, TS, TRJ supervised
771 the study and secured funding; JSH, TK, TRJ wrote the original draft; all authors reviewed and
772 approved the final manuscript.

773

774

775

776 **References:**

- 777 1. Gostic KM, McGough L, Baskerville EB, et al. Practical considerations for measuring the
778 effective reproductive number, *R*. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2020;16(12):e1008409.
- 779 2. Huisman JS, Scire J, Angst DC, Neher RA, Bonhoeffer S, Stadler T. Estimation and
780 worldwide monitoring of the effective reproductive number of SARS-CoV-2. *medrxiv*.
781 Published online 2020.
782 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.11.26.20239368v1.abstract>
- 783 3. Wallinga J, Teunis P. Different epidemic curves for severe acute respiratory syndrome
784 reveal similar impacts of control measures. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2004;160(6):509-516.
- 785 4. Cori A, Ferguson NM, Fraser C, Cauchemez S. A new framework and software to estimate
786 time-varying reproduction numbers during epidemics. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2013;178(9):1505-
787 1512.
- 788 5. Brauner JM, Mindermann S, Sharma M, et al. Inferring the effectiveness of government
789 interventions against COVID-19. *Science*. 2021;371(6531). doi:10.1126/science.abd9338
- 790 6. Der Schweizerische Bundesrat. *Verordnung über Massnahmen in Der Besonderen Lage*
791 *Zur Bekämpfung Der Covid-19-Epidemie.*; 2020.
- 792 7. Anderson R, Donnelly C, Hollingsworth D, et al. *Reproduction Number (R) and Growth*
793 *Rate (r) of the COVID-19 Epidemic in the UK: Methods of Estimation, Data Sources,*
794 *Causes of Heterogeneity, and Use as a Guide in Policy Formulation.* The Royal Society;
795 2020.
- 796 8. Yabe T, Tsubouchi K, Fujiwara N, Wada T, Sekimoto Y, Ukkusuri SV. Non-compulsory
797 measures sufficiently reduced human mobility in Tokyo during the COVID-19 epidemic. *Sci*
798 *Rep*. 2020;10(1):18053.
- 799 9. Pan A, Liu L, Wang C, et al. Association of Public Health Interventions With the
800 Epidemiology of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. 2020;323(19):1915-
801 1923.
- 802 10. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, et al. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical
803 interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*. 2020;584(7820):257-261.
- 804 11. Soltész K, Gustafsson F, Timpka T, et al. The effect of interventions on COVID-19. *Nature*.
805 2020;588(7839):E26-E28.
- 806 12. Rossen LM, Branum AM, Ahmad FB, Sutton P, Anderson RN. Excess Deaths Associated
807 with COVID-19, by Age and Race and Ethnicity — United States, January 26–October 3,
808 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2020;69(42):1522-1527.
809 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6942e2
- 810 13. Peccia J, Zulli A, Brackney DE, et al. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater
811 tracks community infection dynamics. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2020;38(10):1164-1167.
- 812 14. Karthikeyan S, Ronquillo N, Belda-Ferre P, et al. High-Throughput Wastewater SARS-CoV-
813 2 Detection Enables Forecasting of Community Infection Dynamics in San Diego County.


- 814 *mSystems*. 2021;6(2). doi:10.1128/mSystems.00045-21
- 815 15. Graham KE, Loeb SK, Wolfe MK, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Is
816 Associated with COVID-19 Cases in a Large Urban Sewershed. *Environ Sci Technol*.
817 2021;55(1):488-498.
- 818 16. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-
819 Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the
820 Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environ Sci Technol Lett*. 2020;7(7):511-
821 516.
- 822 17. Agrawal S, Orschler L, Lackner S. Long-term monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
823 wastewater of the Frankfurt metropolitan area in Southern Germany. *Sci Rep*.
824 2021;11(1):5372.
- 825 18. Arora S, Nag A, Sethi J, et al. Sewage surveillance for the presence of SARS-CoV-2
826 genome as a useful wastewater based epidemiology (WBE) tracking tool in India. *Water Sci*
827 *Technol*. 2020;82(12):2823-2836.
- 828 19. Haramoto E, Malla B, Thakali O, Kitajima M. First environmental surveillance for the
829 presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and river water in Japan. *Sci Total Environ*.
830 2020;737:140405.
- 831 20. Kaplan EH, Wang D, Wang M, Malik AA, Zulli A, Peccia J. Aligning SARS-CoV-2 indicators
832 via an epidemic model: application to hospital admissions and RNA detection in sewage
833 sludge. *Health Care Manag Sci*. Published online October 28, 2020. doi:10.1007/s10729-
834 020-09525-1
- 835 21. McMahan CS, Self S, Rennert L, et al. COVID-19 Wastewater Epidemiology: A Model to
836 Estimate Infected Populations. *MedRxiv*. Published online 2020.
837 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.11.05.20226738v1.abstract>
- 838 22. Fernandez-Cassi X, Scheidegger A, Bänziger C, et al. Wastewater monitoring outperforms
839 case numbers as a tool to track COVID-19 incidence dynamics when test positivity rates
840 are high. doi:10.1101/2021.03.25.21254344
- 841 23. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients
842 with COVID-2019. *Nature*. 2020;581(7809):465-469.
- 843 24. Han MS, Seong MW, Kim N, et al. Viral RNA Load in Mildly Symptomatic and
844 Asymptomatic Children with COVID-19, Seoul, South Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
845 2020;26(10):2497-2499.
- 846 25. Benefield AE, Skrip LA, Clement A, Althouse RA, Chang S, Althouse BM. SARS-CoV-2
847 viral load peaks prior to symptom onset: a systematic review and individual-pooled analysis
848 of coronavirus viral load from 66 studies. *medRxiv*. Published online 2020.
849 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.28.20202028v1.abstract>
- 850 26. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel
851 Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(13):1199-1207.
- 852 27. Symonds EM, Nguyen KH, Harwood VJ, Breitbart M. Pepper mild mottle virus: A plant

- 853 pathogen with a greater purpose in (waste)water treatment development and public health
854 management. *Water Res.* 2018;144:1-12.
- 855 28. Topol A, Wolfe M, White B, Wigginton K, Boehm A. High Throughput pre-analytical
856 processing of wastewater settled solids for SARS-CoV-2 RNA analyses v1
857 (protocols.io.btyqnpvw). *protocols.io*. Published online 2021.
858 doi:10.17504/protocols.io.btyqnpvw
- 859 29. Topol A, Wolfe M, Wigginton K, White B, Boehm A. High Throughput RNA Extraction and
860 PCR Inhibitor Removal of Settled Solids for Wastewater Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
861 v1 (protocols.io.btyrnpv6). *protocols.io*. Published online 2021.
862 doi:10.17504/protocols.io.btyrnpv6
- 863 30. Topol A, Wolfe M, White B, Wigginton K, Boehm A. High Throughput SARS-COV-2,
864 PMMOV, and BCoV quantification in settled solids using digital RT-PCR v1
865 (protocols.io.btywnpxe). *protocols.io*. Published online 2021.
866 doi:10.17504/protocols.io.btywnpxe
- 867 31. Wolfe MK, Topol A, Knudson A, et al. High-Frequency, High-Throughput Quantification of
868 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids at Eight Publicly Owned Treatment Works
869 in Northern California Shows Strong Association with COVID-19 Incidence. *mSystems*.
870 2021;6(5):e0082921.
- 871 32. Zhu K, Suttner B, Pickering A, Konstantinidis KT, Brown J. A novel droplet digital PCR
872 human mtDNA assay for fecal source tracking. *Water Res.* 2020;183:116085.
- 873 33. Huggett JF, Novak T, Garson JA, et al. Differential susceptibility of PCR reactions to
874 inhibitors: an important and unrecognised phenomenon. *BMC Res Notes*. 2008;1:70.
- 875 34. Haramoto E, Kitajima M, Kishida N, et al. Occurrence of pepper mild mottle virus in drinking
876 water sources in Japan. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2013;79(23):7413-7418.
- 877 35. Zhang T, Breitbart M, Lee WH, et al. RNA Viral Community in Human Feces: Prevalence of
878 Plant Pathogenic Viruses. *PLoS Biol.* 2005;4(1):e3.
- 879 36. Linton NM, Kobayashi T, Yang Y, et al. Incubation period and other epidemiological
880 characteristics of 2019 novel Coronavirus infections with right truncation: A statistical
881 analysis of publicly available case data. *J Clin Med Res.* 2020;9(2):538.
- 882 37. Cori A, Cauchemez S, Ferguson NM, et al. EpiEstim: estimate time varying reproduction
883 numbers from epidemic curves. *R package version*. Published online 2019:2-2.
- 884 38. Feng S, Roguet A, McClary-Gutierrez JS, et al. Evaluation of sampling frequency and
885 normalization of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentrations for capturing COVID-19 burdens
886 in the community. *medRxiv*. Published online 2021.
887 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.02.17.21251867v2.abstract>
- 888 39. Kitajima M, Ahmed W, Bibby K, et al. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge
889 and research needs. *Sci Total Environ.* 2020;739:139076.
- 890 40. Cevik M, Tate M, Lloyd O, Maraolo AE, Schafers J, Ho A. SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and
891 MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness: a

- 892 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Microbe*. 2021;2(1):e13-e22.
- 893 41. Zheng S, Fan J, Yu F, et al. Viral load dynamics and disease severity in patients infected
894 with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-March 2020: retrospective cohort
895 study. *BMJ*. 2020;369:m1443.
- 896 42. Walsh KA, Jordan K, Clyne B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 detection, viral load and infectivity over
897 the course of an infection. *J Infect*. 2020;81(3):357-371.
- 898 43. Hoffmann T, Alsing J. Faecal shedding models for SARS-CoV-2 RNA amongst hospitalised
899 patients and implications for wastewater-based epidemiology. *medRxiv*. Published online
900 2021. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.03.16.21253603v1.abstract>
- 901 44. Liu Y, Yan LM, Wan L, et al. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of COVID-19. *Lancet*
902 *Infect Dis*. 2020;20(6):656-657.
- 903 45. Zhou C, Zhang T, Ren H, et al. Impact of age on duration of viral RNA shedding in patients
904 with COVID-19. *Aging*. 2020;12(22):22399-22404.
- 905 46. Parag KV. Improved estimation of time-varying reproduction numbers at low case incidence
906 and between epidemic waves. *medRxiv*. Published online 2020.
907 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.14.20194589v1.abstract>
- 908 47. Abbott S, Hellewell J, Thompson RN, et al. Estimating the time-varying reproduction
909 number of SARS-CoV-2 using national and subnational case counts. *Wellcome Open*
910 *Research*. 2020;5:112. doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16006.1
- 911 48. Stringhini S, Wisniak A, Piumatti G, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG
912 antibodies in Geneva, Switzerland (SEROCoV-POP): a population-based study. *Lancet*.
913 2020;396(10247):313-319.
- 914 49. Stringhini S, Zaballa ME, Perez-Saez J, et al. Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2
915 antibodies after the second pandemic peak. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. Published
916 online 2021. doi:10.1016/s1473-3099(21)00054-2
- 917 50. Heaton KW, Radvan J, Cripps H, Mountford RA, Braddon FE, Hughes AO. Defecation
918 frequency and timing, and stool form in the general population: a prospective study. *Gut*.
919 1992;33(6):818-824.
- 920 51. Thomas KV, Amador A, Baz-Lomba JA, Reid M. Use of Mobile Device Data To Better
921 Estimate Dynamic Population Size for Wastewater-Based Epidemiology. *Environ Sci*
922 *Technol*. 2017;51(19):11363-11370.
- 923 52. Kantor RS, Nelson KL, Greenwald HD, Kennedy LC. Challenges in Measuring the
924 Recovery of SARS-CoV-2 from Wastewater. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2021;55(6):3514-3519.
- 925 53. de Oliveira LC, Torres-Franco AF, Lopes BC, et al. Viability of SARS-CoV-2 in river water
926 and wastewater at different temperatures and solids content. *Water Res*. 2021;195:117002.
- 927 54. Bivins A, Greaves J, Fischer R, et al. Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in Water and
928 Wastewater. *Environ Sci Technol Lett*. 2020;7(12):937-942.
- 929 55. Hokajärvi AM, Rytönen A, Tiwari A, et al. The detection and stability of the SARS-CoV-2


- 930 RNA biomarkers in wastewater influent in Helsinki, Finland. *Sci Total Environ.*
931 2021;770:145274.
- 932 56. Gerrity D, Papp K, Stoker M, Sims A, Frehner W. Early-pandemic wastewater surveillance
933 of SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Nevada: Methodology, occurrence, and incidence/prevalence
934 considerations. *Water Res X.* 2021;10:100086.
- 935 57. Jahn K, Dreifuss D, Topolsky I, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 variants in Switzerland by
936 genomic analysis of wastewater samples. *medRxiv.* Published online 2021.
937 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.01.08.21249379v1.abstract>
- 938 58. Crits-Christoph A, Kantor RS, Olm MR, et al. Genome Sequencing of Sewage Detects
939 Regionally Prevalent SARS-CoV-2 Variants. *MBio.* 2021;12(1). doi:10.1128/mBio.02703-20
- 940 59. Martin J, Klapsa D, Wilton T, et al. Tracking SARS-CoV-2 in Sewage: Evidence of Changes
941 in Virus Variant Predominance during COVID-19 Pandemic. *Viruses.* 2020;12(10).
942 doi:10.3390/v12101144
- 943 60. Brinkman NE, Fout GS, Keely SP. Retrospective Surveillance of Wastewater To Examine
944 Seasonal Dynamics of Enterovirus Infections. *mSphere.* 2017;2(3).
945 doi:10.1128/mSphere.00099-17
- 946 61. Kazama S, Masago Y, Tohma K, et al. Temporal dynamics of norovirus determined through
947 monitoring of municipal wastewater by pyrosequencing and virological surveillance of
948 gastroenteritis cases. *Water Res.* 2016;92:244-253.
- 949 62. McCall C, Wu H, Miyani B, Xagorarakis I. Identification of multiple potential viral diseases in
950 a large urban center using wastewater surveillance. *Water Res.* 2020;184:116160.
- 951 63. dMIQE Group, Huggett JF. The Digital MIQE Guidelines Update: Minimum Information for
952 Publication of Quantitative Digital PCR Experiments for 2020. *Clin Chem.* 2020;66(8):1012-
953 1029.
- 954

955 **Supplemental Material:**
956




957
958 Fig. S1: R_{ww} estimation from San Jose (USA) sludge measurements, assuming zero delay
959 between symptom onset and testing: (A) Measured RNA concentrations of the N, S and ORF1a
960 genes (blue, green, yellow respectively) between 15 November 2020 and 19 March 2021. (B, C)
961 Confirmed cases and testing-adjusted cases in Santa Clara county (purple, red) during the
962 same time period. The testing-adjusted cases describe the number of positive tests / total
963 number of tests per day, normalized by the mean number of tests per day in Santa Clara county

964 during the study period. In contrast to Fig. 2 in the main text, the delay between symptom onset
965 and testing was assumed 0, rather than the same as for case reporting. (D) The estimated
966 infection incidence per day from normalized RNA concentrations (top), case reports (middle)
967 and testing-adjusted cases (bottom). The gene copies per gram dry weight were normalized by
968 the lowest measured value ($N \cdot M = 2663.7$ gc/g-dry weight per infection/day). The ribbons
969 indicate the mean \pm standard deviation across 1000 bootstrap replicates. (E) The estimated R_{ww}
970 compared to R_{cc} from confirmed cases (top) and testing-adjusted cases (bottom). The colored
971 line indicates the point estimate on the original data, and the ribbons the 95% confidence
972 interval across 1000 bootstrap replicates.
973




974
 975 Fig. S2: R_{ww} estimation from San Jose (USA) sludge measurements, accounting for case
 976 reporting errors: (A) Measured RNA concentrations of the N, S and ORF1a genes (blue, green,
 977 yellow respectively) between 15 November 2020 and 19 March 2021. (B, C) Confirmed cases

978 and testing-adjusted cases in Santa Clara county (purple, red) during the same time period. In
979 contrast to Fig. 2 in the main text, the missing cases on Dec. 30th were set to 1000 in panel (B).
980 The testing-adjusted cases describe the number of positive tests / total number of tests per day,
981 normalized by the mean number of tests per day in Santa Clara county during the study period.
982 (D) The estimated infection incidence per day from normalized RNA concentrations (top), case
983 reports (middle) and testing-adjusted cases (bottom). The gene copies per gram dry weight
984 were normalized by the lowest measured value ($N \cdot M = 2663.7$ gc/g-dry weight per
985 infection/day). The ribbons indicate the mean \pm standard deviation across 1000 bootstrap
986 replicates. (E) The estimated R_{ww} compared to R_{cc} from confirmed cases (top) and testing-
987 adjusted cases (bottom). The colored line indicates the point estimate on the original data, and
988 the ribbons the 95% confidence interval across 1000 bootstrap replicates.



989
 990 **Fig. S3: The estimated R_{ww} based on N gene measurements in San Jose (black line, grey**
 991 **95% confidence intervals) compared to different R_{cc} estimates for Santa Clara county**
 992 **from the California COVID assessment tool (CalCat). The R_{ww} estimate from Fig. 2D was**
 993 **compared to 6 methods to estimate R_{cc} , indicated by the color and panel title. “ETH” refers to**
 994 **the pipeline of Huisman et al. ² applied to the daily confirmed case data from Santa Clara**

995 county, i.e. the same comparison as shown in Fig. 2D. We excluded the SEIR model based
 996 estimates included on the CalCat website (since these performed visibly worse than the other
 997 methods).



998
 999 **Fig. S4: The effect of sampling frequency on the R_{ww} estimates in Zurich and San Jose.**
 1000 **The data stems from measurements of the N1 marker for Zurich between 2020-11-22 and**
 1001 **2021-01-11, and the S gene for San Jose between 2020-11-15 and 2021-03-19. The row**
 1002 **indicates the number of samples taken per week (1, 2, 3, 5), while the colors indicate the**

1003 sampling schedule: MTWTFSS corresponds to daily sampling, MTWTF sampling during the
 1004 working week, MWF Mon-Wed-Fri, TTS Tue-Thu-Sat, MT Mon-Thu, TF Tue-Fri, WS Wed-Sat,
 1005 M Monday, W Wednesday, F Friday. The colored line indicates the point estimate on the
 1006 original data, and the ribbons the 95% confidence interval across 1000 bootstrap replicates.

1007
 1008 **Table S1: The match between the daily and further subsampled R_{ww} traces for Zurich.** The
 1009 data stems from measurements of the N1 marker for Zurich between 2020-11-22 and 2021-01-
 1010 11. All traces are compared to the daily sampling; MTWTF corresponds to sampling during the
 1011 working week, MWF Mon-Wed-Fri, TTS Tue-Thu-Sat, MT Mon-Thu, TF Tue-Fri, WS Wed-Sat,
 1012 M Monday, W Wednesday, F Friday.

1013

	MTWTF	MWF	TTS	MT	TF	WS	M	W	F
RMSE	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.12	0.09	0.06	0.17	0.06	0.18
Coverage	1.00	0.97	0.94	0.78	0.83	0.92	0.53	0.83	0.61
MAPE	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.12	0.04	0.17

1014

1015 **Table S2: The match between the daily and further subsampled R_{ww} traces for San Jose.**
 1016 The data stems from the S gene measurements for San Jose. All traces are compared to the
 1017 daily sampling; MTWTF corresponds to sampling during the working week, MWF Mon-Wed-Fri,
 1018 TTS Tue-Thu-Sat, MT Mon-Thu, TF Tue-Fri, WS Wed-Sat, M Monday, W Wednesday, F Friday.


1019

	MTWTF	MWF	TTS	MT	TF	WS	M	W	F
RMSE	0.05	0.09	0.08	0.15	0.06	0.16	0.13	0.13	0.08
Coverage	0.95	0.88	0.91	0.83	0.93	0.60	0.76	0.68	0.84
MAPE	0.05	0.08	0.07	0.15	0.06	0.14	0.11	0.11	0.07


1020

1021

1022




1023
1024 **Fig. S5: The impact of the shedding load distribution on (A) the inferred infection**
1025 **incidence and (B) R_{ww} estimation from the Zurich wastewater data.** The results are
1026 compared for four SLDs (see Methods): the Benefield SLD upon symptom onset (Incubation +
1027 Benefield)²⁵, the Han SLD upon symptom onset (Incubation + Han)^{24,25}, shedding only on the
1028 day of symptom onset (Incubation only), shedding only on the day of death (Incubation + Death)
1029 ³⁶. The error bars (A; mean \pm standard deviation) and 95% confidence intervals (B) are based
1030 on 50 bootstrap replicates per condition.
1031




1032
 1033 **Fig. S6: The effect of data normalization on the estimated R_{ww} in Zurich.** We calculated R_{ww}
 1034 from the measured N1 marker indicating the N gene copy loads, normalized in four different
 1035 ways: by 1×10^{12} gc per infection (the order of magnitude of the lowest measured concentration),
 1036 by 5×10^{10} gc per infection (roughly rescaled to case incidence), by 1×10^5 gc per infection (to
 1037 cover the space of possible orders of magnitude), no normalization. **(A)** After normalization the
 1038 measurements were deconvolved, and rescaled back to the original magnitude (multiplied by
 1039 the normalization factor) to illustrate differences in the inferred infection incidence. **(B)** The

1040 resulting R_{ww} estimates differ both in the mean (due to the deconvolution illustrated in A) and
1041 width of the uncertainty interval. The results are compared for four SLDs (panels; see Methods):
1042 the Benefield SLD upon symptom onset (Incubation + Benefield)²⁵, the Han SLD upon
1043 symptom onset (Incubation + Han)^{24,25}, shedding only on the day of symptom onset (Incubation
1044 only), shedding only on the day of death (Incubation + Death)³⁶. The 95% confidence intervals
1045 (B) are based on 50 bootstrap replicates per condition.
1046




1047 **Fig. S7: Coverage between R_{cc} and R_{ww} for different shedding load distributions.** We
1048 scanned across different parameter pairs (mean, standard deviation in days) for the SLD from
1049 time since infection. For the city of Zurich, the R_{ww} from N1 loads in wastewater was compared
1050 to that of confirmed cases in the catchment. For San Jose, we compared S gene concentrations
1051 to confirmed cases in Santa Clara County. The contour lines show SLD parameter pairs with
1052 equal coverage, in steps of 10% of the optimum value. In each comparison (grid-point) the 95%
1053 confidence intervals of R_{cc} and R_{ww} are based on 50 bootstrap replicates.
1054
1055



1056 **Fig. S8: MAPE between R_{cc} and R_{ww} for different shedding load distributions.** We scanned
1057 across different parameter pairs (mean, standard deviation in days) for the SLD from
1058 time since infection. For the city of Zurich, the R_{ww} from N1 loads in wastewater was compared to that of
1059 confirmed cases in the catchment. For San Jose, we compared S gene concentrations to
1060 confirmed cases in Santa Clara County. The contour lines show SLD parameter pairs with equal
1061 MAPE, in steps of 10% of the optimum value.
1062

1063



1064

1065

Fig. S9: The optimal shedding load distributions for Zurich and two counterexamples.

1066

Counterexample A has a mean of 2 days and standard deviation of 5 days; Counterexample B a

1067

mean of 13 days, and a standard deviation of 5 days. (A) The SLDs and their associated

1068

cumulative distribution functions. Although the SLDs differ when optimized for RMSE,

1069

Coverage, or MAPE, the median (i.e. the time after which they reach half their overall probability

1070

mass) is very comparable. (B) The resulting R_{ww} estimates for Zurich are highly similar for

1071

RMSE, Coverage, and MAPE based optimal SLDs; but differ substantially for the two


1072

counterexamples. The illustrated 95% confidence intervals of R_{ww} are based on 50 bootstrap

1073

replicates.

1074



1075
 1076 **Fig. S10: RMSE between R_{cc} and R_{ww} for different shedding load distributions from**
 1077 **symptom onset.** We scanned across different parameter pairs (mean, standard deviation in
 1078 days) for the SLD from time since symptom onset. For the city of Zurich, the R_e from N1 loads
 1079 in wastewater was compared to that of confirmed cases in the catchment. For San Jose, we
 1080 compared S gene concentrations to confirmed cases in Santa Clara County. The incubation
 1081 period is assumed gamma distributed with mean 5.3, and standard deviation 3.2. The contour
 1082 lines show SLD parameter pairs with equal RMSE, in steps of 10% of the optimum value.

1083
 1084 **Table S3: Parameters of the optimal shedding distribution from symptom onset.** We
 1085 scanned across different (mean, standard deviation) parameter pairs for the SLD from time
 1086 since symptom onset. For the city of Zurich, the R_{ww} from N1 loads in wastewater was
 1087 compared to that of confirmed cases in the catchment. For San Jose, we compared S gene
 1088 concentrations to confirmed cases in Santa Clara County. For all RMSE values of the scan see
 1089 Fig. S9. All parameters are in units of days. For the coverage, the 95% confidence intervals of
 1090 R_{cc} and R_{ww} were based on 50 bootstrap replicates in each comparison.

1091

Comparison Method	Optimal pair (mean; sd)	Mean within 10% of the optimum	SD within 10% of the optimum
RMSE (Zurich)	(5.5; 10)	[1.5, 7]	[0.5, 10]
Coverage (Zurich)	(3.5; 5)	[1.5, 8]	[0.5, 10]
MAPE (Zurich)	(5.5; 10)	[2, 6]	[0.5, 10]
RMSE (San Jose)	(3; 0.5)	[1, 5]	[0.5, 9]
Coverage (San Jose)	(0.5; 0.5)	[0.5, 6]	[0.5, 10]
MAPE (San Jose)	(1; 0.5)	[0.5, 3]	[0.5, 10]

1092
 1093
 1094
 1095


1096 **Table S4: Primer and Probes**
1097

<u>Site</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Primer/Probe</u>	<u>Sequence</u>
Zurich	N1	Forward	GACCCCAAATCAGCGAAAT
		Reverse	GACCCCAAATCAGCGAAAT
		Probe	ACCCCGCATTACGTTTGGTGGACC (5' FAM/ZEN/3' IBFQ)
	N2	Forward	TTACAAACATTGGCCGCAA
		Reverse	GCGCGACATTCCGAAGAA
		Probe	ACAATTTGCCCCAGCGCTTCAG (5' FAM/HEX/ZEN/ 3' IBFQ)
	PMMoV	Forward	GAGTGGTTTGACCTTAACGTTTGA
		Reverse	TTGTCGGTTGCAATGCAAGT
		Probe	CCTACCGAAGCAAATG (5' FAM/3' MGB)
San Jose	N Gene	Forward	CATTACGTTTGGTGGACCCT
		Reverse	CCTTGCCATGTTGAGTGAGA
		Probe	CGCGATCAAACAACGTCGG (5' FAM/ZEN/3' IBFQ)
	S Gene	Forward	CAGACTAATTCTCCTCGGCG
		Reverse	TGCACCAAGTGACATAGTGT
		Probe	AGCTAGTCAATCCATCATTGCCT (5' HEX/ZEN/3' IBFQ)
	ORF1a	Forward	CAGAACTGGAACCACCTTGT
		Reverse	TACAGTTGAATTGGCAGGCA
		Probe	TGCCACAGTACGTCTACAAGC (5' FAM or HEX/ZEN/3' IBFQ)


PMMoV	Forward	GAGTGGTTTGACCTTAACGTTTGA
	Reverse	TTGTCGGTTGCAATGCAAGT
	Probe	CCTACCGAAGCAAATG (5' HEX/ZEN/3' IBFQ)
BCoV	Forward	CTGGAAGTTGGTGGAGTT
	Reverse	ATTATCGGCCTAACATACATC
	Probe	CCTTCATATCTATACACATCAAGTTGTT (5' FAM/ZEN/3' IBFQ)

1098
1099
1100

1101




1102




1103

1104 **Fig. S11: Fluorescence plots from the Stilla Naica Crystal Droplet PCR used for the**
1105 **wastewater** samples from Zurich collected after 23 September 2020 from positive (top) and
1106 negative (bottom) experimental results. Droplets positive for N1 (blue) and N2 (brown) and both
1107 N1 and N2 (purple). RPP30 markers, detectable as elevated fluorescence in Green channel, are
1108 included in the commercial assay used, but are not further analyzed.


1109



1110



1111



1112

1113 **Fig. S12: Fluorescence plots from the Bio-Rad QX200 used for the wastewater samples.**

1114 Samples from Zurich collected from 03-20 September 2020 are shown in positive (top) and

1115 negative (middle) experimental results. Droplets positive for N1 (red) and N2 (yellow) and both

1116 N1 and N2 (brown) markers. Negative (bottom) experimental results are also shown for San

1117 Jose Corresponding positive experimental results are provided in the reference of the

1118 associated protocol ³⁰.

1119

1120

1121

1122

ITEM TO CHECK	PROVIDED	COMMENT
	Y/N	
1. SPECIMEN		
Detailed description of specimen type and numbers	Y	Methods of Main Text
Sampling procedure (including time to storage)	Y	Methods of Main Text
Sample aliquotation, storage conditions and duration	Y	Methods of Main Text
2. NUCLEIC ACID EXTRACTION		
Description of extraction method including amount of sample	Y	Methods of Main Text
Volume of solvent used to elute/resuspend extract	Y	Methods of Main Text
Number of extraction replicates	Y	Methods of Main Text
Extraction blanks included?	Y	Methods of Main Text
3. NUCLEIC ACID ASSESSMENT AND STORAGE		
Method to evaluate quality of nucleic acids	N	Not Done
Method to evaluate quantity of nucleic acids (including molecular	N	Not Done
Storage conditions: temperature, concentration, duration, buffer, aliquots	Y	Methods of Main Text
Clear description of dilution steps used to prepare working DNA solution	Y	Methods of Main Text
4. NUCLEIC ACID MODIFICATION		
Template modification (digestion, sonication, pre-amplification,	N	NA
Details of repurification following modification if performed	Y	No Repurification for Zurich Samples, Zymo Column for San Jose Samples Described in Methods of Main Text
5. REVERSE TRANSCRIPTION		
cDNA priming method and concentration	N	NA
One or two step protocol (include reaction details for two step)	Y	Methods of Main Text
Amount of RNA added per reaction	Y	Methods of Main Text
Detailed reaction components and conditions	Y	Supplemental Information
Estimated copies measured with and without addition of RT*	N	Not Done
Manufacturer of reagents used with catalogue and lot numbers	N	Reagents, Manufacturers, and Catalogue Numbers Reported in Supplemental Material. Lot Numbers are Not Reported
Storage of cDNA: temperature, concentration, duration, buffer and	Y	NA
6. dPCR OLIGONUCLEOTIDES DESIGN AND TARGET INFORMATION		
Sequence accession number or official gene symbol	Y	Published Reference (Zurich) or Supplemental (San Jose)
Method (software) used for design and <i>in silico</i> verification	Y	Published Reference (Zurich) or Supplemental (San Jose)
Location of amplicon	Y	Published Reference (Zurich) or Supplemental (San Jose)
Amplicon length	Y	Published Reference (Zurich) or Supplemental (San Jose)
Primer and probe sequences (or amplicon context sequence)**	Y	Supplemental Information
Location and identity of any modifications	Y	NA
Manufacturer of oligonucleotides	Y	Supplemental Information
7. dPCR PROTOCOL		
Manufacturer of dPCR instrument and instrument model	Y	Supplemental Information
Buffer/kit manufacturer with catalogue and lot number	Y	Supplemental Information
Primer and probe concentration	Y	Supplemental Information
Pre-reaction volume and composition (incl. amount of template	Y	Supplemental Information
Template treatment (initial heating or chemical denaturation)	N	NA
Polymerase identity and concentration, Mg ²⁺ and dNTP concentrations***	N	Included in Kit Manuals
Complete thermocycling parameters	Y	Supplemental Information
8. ASSAY VALIDATION		
Details of optimisation performed	N	Commercial Kit, Followed Manufacturer's Instructions
Analytical specificity (vs. related sequences) and limit of blank (LOB)	N	Not done (Zurich) or Supplemental (San Jose)
Analytical sensitivity/LoD and how this was evaluated	Y	Methods of Main Text
Testing for inhibitors (from biological matrix/extraction)	Y	Methods of Main Text
9. DATA ANALYSIS		
Description of dPCR experimental design	Y	Methods of Main Text
Comprehensive details negative and positive of controls (whether a	Y	Methods of Main Text
Partition classification method (thresholding)	Y	Supplemental Information
Examples of positive and negative experimental results (including	Y	Supplemental Information
Description of technical replication	Y	Methods of Main Text
Repeatability (intra-experiment variation)	Y	Supplemental Information
Reproducibility (inter-experiment/user/lab etc. variation)	N	Assays were only completed within one laboratory
Number of partitions measured (average and standard deviation)	Y	Supplemental Information
Partition volume	Y	Reported by Manufacturer
Copies per partition (λ or equivalent) (average and standard deviation)	Y	Supplemental Information
dPCR analysis program (source, version)	Y	Methods of Main Text
Description of normalisation method	N	NA
Statistical methods used for analysis	Y	Methods of Main Text
Data transparency	raw data available on request:	Data Availability Statement Includes Resources for Zurich Measurements, Contact Information for San Jose Measurements

1123

1124 **Table S5: dMIQE Checklist⁶³ for RT-dPCR assays targeting SARS-CoV-2 gene markers**
 1125 **N1 and N2 (Zurich Site) and S, N, and Orf1a (San Jose Site).** Checklist is not included for
 1126 other RT-qPCR (PMMoV, Zurich Site) or RT-dPCR (BCoV, PMMoV, San Jose) Assays.

1127 **Supplemental Results:**

1128 **Quality Control:**

1129 *Zurich, Switzerland.* One sample (11 October) was removed from analysis because the dilute
1130 sample (1:10) was below LOQ and the undiluted sample was inhibited, as defined by recovery
1131 of less than 80% of the synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA added in.


1132 PMMoV concentrations were obtained for all dates except October 4. Mean (standard deviation)
1133 PMMoV loads were 16.5 (0.12) \log_{10} (gc/day). All PMMoV loads fell within 3 standard deviations
1134 of the mean, consistent with a normal distribution, except on 29 October (16.1 \log_{10} gc/day). The
1135 sample was subsequently removed from further analysis.

1136 *San Jose, California, USA.* From San Jose Wastewater Treatment Plant (San Jose, California,
1137 USA), daily samples were collected and processed throughout. PMMoV concentrations were
1138 mean (standard deviation) 8.9 (0.20) \log_{10} (gc/g-dry weight). On two days (03 January 2021, 18
1139 February 2021), PMMoV concentrations exceeded the mean plus three times the standard
1140 deviation. On one day (19 March 2021), PMMoV concentrations fell below the mean minus
1141 three times the standard deviation. These three samples were excluded from further analysis.
1142 All samples met criteria for inclusion based on BCoV concentrations, which were all greater than
1143 10% of the expected concentrations based on the amount added.

1144 **Supplemental Methods:**

1145 **Managing PCR inhibition in San Jose sludge samples:**

1146 We diluted the solids in DNA/RNA Shield (Zymo Research, Irvine, CA, USA) (hereafter referred
1147 to as “diluent”) prior to RNA extraction, inhibitor removal, and RT-dPCR, as described in the
1148 main text. This dilution was necessary as direct RNA extraction from the solids contained
1149 inhibitors so dilution of the RNA template prior to RT-dPCR was required¹⁵. To determine an
1150 optimal concentration of solids to add to the diluent (mg wet weight / mL diluent) to reduce
1151 inhibition, but retain reasonable sensitivity, we quantified SARS-CoV-2 RNA in solutions with
1152 solids concentrations from 7.5 mg/mL to 150 mg/mL, where we used the exact methods
1153 described in the main text. We aimed to identify the highest concentrations of solids in solution
1154 that did not show inhibition. Representative results from two different samples from San Jose
1155 are shown in Figure S13 where concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA per g dry weight of solids
1156 is shown for different starting concentrations of solids in diluent. Note that the numbers on the y-
1157 axis are directly comparable between solutions, as we account for the different mass of solids in
1158 the dimensional analysis to derive the SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration. The relatively lower
1159 concentrations for SARS-CoV-2 RNA for solutions of 150 mg/mL suggest the presence of
1160 inhibition at this relatively high solids concentration. Concentrations are relatively similar among
1161 the lower concentration solutions suggesting that starting at 75 mg/mL, inhibition is mostly
1162 alleviated. Only one gene target from one of the samples (the N gene in sample A shown in the
1163 top graph) showed slightly higher concentrations in more dilute solutions. Given these results
1164 we therefore moved forward using 75 mg/mL for the method.



1165

1166 **Figure S13.** Representative results from inhibition titration experiments with two samples from
1167 San Jose. The x-axis shows the concentration of solids (wet weight) added to the DNA/RNA
1168 Shield diluent in units of mg/mL. The y-axis shows the concentration of the three SARS-CoV-2
1169 RNA targets in the solids in units of gc/g dry weight. Error bars represent standard deviations as
1170 total error from the dPCR instrument's software.

1171