

1 Efficacy of Linear Regression Modelling of SARS-CoV-2 cases based on 2 local wastewater surveillance

3
4 Martin Lehmann ^{1,*}, Michael Geissler ^{2,*}, Waldemar Hahn ¹, Richard Gebler ¹, Björn Helm ³, Roger
5 Dumke ², Alexander Dalpke ^{2,4}, and Markus Wolfien ¹

¹ Institute for Medical Informatics and Biometry, Faculty of Medicine Carl Gustav Carus, Technische Universität Dresden, Germany

² Institute of Medical Microbiology and Virology, University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Dresden, Germany

³ Institute of Urban and Industrial Water Management, Technische Universität Dresden, Germany

⁴ Department of Infectious Diseases, Medical Microbiology and Hygiene, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany

* Contributed equally

Corresponding Author: Martin Lehmann, martin.lehmann2@ukdd.de

6

7 Abstract

8 In the ongoing SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, there is a need for new strategies for surveillance and
9 identification of arising infection waves. Reported cases of new infections based on individual testing
10 are soon deemed inaccurate due to ever changing regulations and limited testing capacity.
11 Wastewater based epidemiology is one promising solution that can be broadly applied with low efforts
12 in comparison to current large-scale testing of individuals. Here, we are combining local wastewater
13 data from the city of Dresden (Germany) along with reported cases and vaccination data from a central
14 database (Robert-Koch-Institute) with virus variant information to investigate the correlation of virus
15 concentrations in the wastewater and reported SARS-CoV-2 cases. In particular, we compared Linear
16 Regression and Machine Learning (ML) models, which are both revealing an existing correlation of
17 virus particles in wastewater and reported cases. Our findings demonstrate that the different virus
18 variants of concern (Alpha, Delta, BA.1, and BA.2) contribute differently over time and parameters vary
19 between variants, as well. By comparing the Linear Regression and ML-based models, we observed
20 that ML can achieve a good fit for training data, but Linear Regression is a more robust tool, especially
21 for new virus variants. We hereby conclude that deriving the rate of new infections from local
22 wastewater by applying Linear Regression may be a robust approximation of tracing the state of the
23 pandemic for practitioners and policy makers alike.

24 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, Wastewater, Correlation, Linear Regression, Machine Learning

25 1 Introduction

26 Recently, more contagious but less severe variants of the severe acute respiratory syndrome
27 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) occurred and encountered increasing vaccination rates. At the same time
28 community test resources, as well as testing rigour, are slowly diminishing. Hence, fewer people may
29 be tested, which poses the challenge of underestimating the community transmissions by magnitudes.
30 This affects both political and clinical pandemic management, community trust, and general risk
31 awareness. Since the beginning of the current pandemic, researchers have been studying the efficacy
32 of methods to detect the presence of the novel SARS-CoV-2 virus in municipal wastewater treatment
33 plants (WWTP). Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) shall be used as an early warning system since
34 it shows changes in community transmission levels days before affected persons even recognise their

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

1 infection and get themselves tested, if done at all (Olesen et al., 2021). In addition, long-term
2 monitoring can be achieved at a low cost and low impact compared to individual testing approaches
3 (Daughton, 2020; Han et al., 2022).

4 The current gold standard for the detection of the SARS-CoV-2 pathogen is the quantitative reverse
5 transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) to target different genomes by means of specific
6 primers. Advantages of RT-qPCR include high sensitivity and specificity, as well as wide adoption and
7 availability. Disadvantages are mainly due to relatively high costs compared to other individual clinical
8 testing methods (e.g., rapid antigen tests) and a long analysis time (Pérez-López & Mir, 2021).
9 However, for wastewater surveillance, these disadvantages are negligible due to the low sampling
10 frequency (once a day) and high pool-testing ratio (one test required for hundreds of thousands of
11 people). RT-qPCR allows for additional quantification of the collected SARS-CoV-2 material (Nagura-
12 Ikeda et al., 2020). All existing variants of concern (VOC) of this virus (e.g., Alpha, Delta) can be detected
13 by means of RT-qPCR tests with a high sensitivity, except for one specific S-gene target failure.
14 Therefore, the recommendation is to test for a minimum of two different genome targets (Ferré et al.,
15 2022), which was also done in this study. Furthermore, since virus generation times (time of a complete
16 infection cycle) and presence of distinct symptoms vary between variants and there remains a time lag
17 upon official case reporting, it is expected that time lags between wastewater and reported cases may
18 be different between virus variants as well (Abbott et al., 2022; Hart et al., 2022; Olesen et al., 2021).
19 Following advances in sample treatment and analysis methods, test sensitivity appears high for these
20 methods, so that SARS-CoV-2 residues can be detected in wastewater with a lower threshold of
21 13/100k people (Manuel et al., 2021).

22 However, interpretation and quantification of results of wastewater investigations is difficult in
23 relation to officially reported community transmission levels since there are many differing influence
24 factors on both approaches. The European Union (EU) is recommending the use of WBE even beyond
25 the current pandemic for all its member states (Sinkevicius, 2021) and the World Health Organization
26 (WHO) recognises its advantages alike (World Health Organization, 2020). Nevertheless, without a
27 clear interpretation guideline for practitioners and policy makers, WBE alone might be prevented from
28 delivering on its full potential. Hence, we are proposing a means of linking the results with the well-
29 known and established cases of new infections towards specific virus variants.

30 This work shall investigate how effectively local wastewater data can be used to estimate community
31 transmission levels (reported by the German authority “Robert Koch Institut” [RKI]) based on data from
32 a medium-sized German city, namely Dresden (~500,000 inhabitants, area of 330 km²), in the time
33 from 15th March 2021 to 30th April 2022. Our study includes a comparison between Linear Regression
34 and Deep Learning (DL) models with Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) units, to account for an
35 interdependency and precise estimation between locally reported SARS-CoV-2 incidence and virus
36 level in the wastewater.

37 2 Methods

38 2.1 Dataset

39 For this analysis, SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater, reported case numbers, the virus variant
40 distribution, vaccination status, as well as precipitation were combined into a daily time-series dataset.
41 Cases are reported in numbers of infected people or in incidence rates (cases per 100,000 people). The
42 latter allows a better comparison of regions with very different population densities. All of the above-
43 mentioned data was sampled from five different data sources as the following:

- 1 i) The wastewater sampling, measurement and analysis were conducted and results were
2 provided by the TU Dresden wastewater and virology research groups (M. Geissler, R.
3 Dumke, A. Dalpke). The data comprises of daily virus concentration measurements from
4 wastewater samples (discharge proportional 24h composite samples, collected after the
5 grit chamber and before primary clarification) for the Dresden area (WWTP Dresden-
6 Kaditz). In the present study, the raw wastewater samples were analysed by means of
7 polyethylene glycol precipitation (PEG), RNA extraction, PCR inhibitor removal, and final
8 RT-qPCR using a commercial kit for amplification of E and S gene of SARS-CoV-2 as
9 published earlier (Dumke et al., 2021). Here, concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater
10 are referred to as wastewater data.
- 11 ii) The reported cases were provided by the RKI on their Github-page
12 (https://github.com/robert-koch-institut/SARS-CoV-2_Infektionen_in_Deutschland). It
13 contains data for each day and age group with an update of infection rates (also looking
14 back in time in case of late reports or error corrections). After aggregation, one row
15 remains for each day based on the most recent data. There were two different date
16 columns available: (a) when the result was reported to the authorities, (b) when the
17 patient reported symptom onset (which is usually a few days earlier; if no date was
18 reported by the patient, it matches (a)). As reference for later analysis, the symptom onset
19 date is used (“Refdate”), instead of the reporting date. Doing this will align the data better
20 with the SARS-CoV-2 concentration in wastewater.
- 21 iii) RKI data for virus variant sequencing (https://github.com/robert-koch-institut/SARS-CoV-2-Sequenzdaten_aus_Deutschland) contains a table of analysed virus samples with
22 attributes of date, found lineage, and sampling reason. According to their provided legend,
23 sampling reasons “X” (unknown) and “N” (None) were excluded.
- 24 iv) Vaccination data were also provided by RKI on their Github page
25 (https://github.com/robert-koch-institut/COVID-19-Impfungen_in_Deutschland). Data is
26 grouped by day and age group. It contains the number of vaccinated people in each group
27 and how many shots they have received so far. From this, time-series were built for both
28 the relative population with full vaccination status and booster status.
- 29 v) Precipitation data for Dresden was downloaded from Meteostat
30 (<https://meteostat.net/de/place/de/dresden?s=D1051&t=2021-03-15/2022-04-30>) and
31 contains accumulated samples for each day from 15th March 2021 to 30th April 2022.
32

33 2.2 Data preprocessing

34 The RKI data was filtered for the locality “SK Dresden” and daily reported cases were accumulated as
35 moving sum for n previous days (being 7, 14, and 28) respectively for each sample at time point t .
36 Accumulation for seven days was selected in accordance with the standard RKI reporting scheme, 14
37 days as it is handled often internationally, and 28 days was used as accumulation period in some
38 previous studies (Galani et al., 2022; Medema et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2022). Cases are represented as
39 incidence rates, i.e. the case numbers were divided by the population number. Additionally,
40 accumulates were normalised to seven days (equation (1)). This makes the results more comparable
41 (same value range) and improves later interpretation and application of the model.

$$sum_n_t = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n daily_{t-k}}{n} * 7 \quad (1)$$

42 The wastewater data was also accumulated for 7, 14, and 28 days using equation (1) and will be
43 analysed up until 30th April 2022, allowing for another three weeks (as per 22nd May 2022) of delayed

1 case reporting (which is then attributed to an earlier date). All data was merged and gaps were linearly
2 interpolated, as well as negative values excluded. In addition, for the linear model, all days with more
3 than 5mm precipitation were excluded according to Rubio et al. (2021), then interpolated before
4 aggregating additional columns.

5 The final data table summarises each variable together with their source and reason of inclusion after
6 preprocessing (Table 1). A plot of the resulting time series is given in Figure 5.

7 *Table 1 Summary of variables in the final dataset after preprocessing with data source and reason for inclusion. Data source*
8 *numbering according to dataset section -wastewater.*

Variable name	Data Source	Reason for inclusion	Comment
WW daily	i (UKDD)	correlation parameter/ Machine Learning input	raw data
WW 7 days	i (UKDD)	correlation parameter/ Machine Learning input	aggregated 7 days
WW 14 days	i (UKDD)	correlation parameter/ Machine Learning input	aggregated 14 days
WW 28 days	i (UKDD)	correlation parameter/ Machine Learning input	aggregated 28 days
Cases daily	ii (RKI)	correlation parameter/ estimation target	raw data
Cases 7 days	ii (RKI)	correlation parameter/ estimation target	aggregated 7 days
Cases 14 days	ii (RKI)	correlation parameter/ estimation target	aggregated 14 days
Cases 28 days	ii (RKI)	correlation parameter/ estimation target	aggregated 28 days
Variant contribution: Alpha	iii (RKI)	linear model separation/ Machine Learning input	potential influence on case numbers
Variant contribution: Delta	iii (RKI)	linear model separation/ Machine Learning input	potential influence on case numbers
Variant contribution: BA.1	iii (RKI)	linear model separation/ Machine Learning input	potential influence on case numbers
Variant contribution: BA.2	iii (RKI)	linear model separation/ Machine Learning input	potential influence on case numbers
# People 2nd vaccination shot	iv (RKI)	Machine Learning input	potential influence on case numbers
# People 3rd vaccination shot	iv (RKI)	Machine Learning input	potential influence on case numbers
Precipitation daily	v (Meteostat)	preprocessing input/ Machine Learning input	potential dilution of wastewater

1

2 2.3 Modelling of SARS-CoV-2 cases via Linear Regression

3 The simplest possible dependency between wastewater data and new infection cases is linear. Many
4 studies found that correlation of confirmed cases and concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater can
5 be very strong and models are effective (Ai et al., 2021; Medema et al., 2020). Under the assumption
6 of linear correlation and because of the independence of scale of its results, we used Pearson
7 correlation. In particular, the most common approach for time-series is to employ cross-correlation
8 (Bracewell, 1965) and calculate a “lead time” or “lag” by which both wastewater and reported cases
9 time series would need to be shifted against each other to yield a maximum correlation coefficient.
10 Medema et al. (2020) suggest that community prevalence should be accumulated for 28 days
11 (following indications that virus shedding continues for that long) and correlated against daily
12 wastewater data. However, their data was from early 2020, only targeting the “wildtype”
13 (unmutated/first occurring) virus variant and (comparably) low community transmission levels
14 (Incidence < 100). Newer studies employ varying periods between 3 and 28 days of averaging
15 depending on the target application. Interestingly, longer periods usually yield better correlation
16 coefficients and can therefore be used when a single conversion factor is required (Galani et al., 2022;
17 Weidhaas et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2022).

18 A Linear Regression is fitted (using the Python library “*scikit-learn*”), which approximately represents
19 the actual correlation between both series for each accumulation period, while accounting for the
20 relative proportion of the respective variant at each point in time by weighting the sample contribution
21 by equations (2) (sample weighting), (3) (weighted covariance), and (4) (weighted correlation
22 coefficient). i is the sample index, w_i the variant specific contribution factor, x_i the sample value of
23 the first time series and y_i the sample value of the other time series. Comparing actual and modelled
24 cases, the (weighted) correlation coefficient ($r \in [0; 1]$) will be used as a performance metric for each
25 partition and accumulation period, as well as for the entire data set.

$$m(x; w) = \frac{\sum_i w_i x_i}{\sum_i w_i} \quad (2)$$

$$cov(x, y; w) = \frac{\sum_i w_i \cdot (x_i - m(x; w))(y_i - m(y; w))}{\sum_i w_i} \quad (3)$$

$$corr(x, y; w) = \frac{cov(x, y; w)}{\sqrt{cov(x, x; w)cov(y, y; w)}} \quad (4)$$

26

27 The virus variant data is filtered for variants of concern (VOC), rolling averaged with a window of ten
28 days, to average out fluctuations in the sampling process (e.g. non-representative sampling, date not
29 aligned with symptom onset), and the relative contribution to all samples is calculated.

30 2.4 Modelling of SARS-CoV-2 cases via Machine Learning

31 More complex interdependences of multiple variables could be described with non-linear models, such
32 as neural networks. Machine Learning models have been trained to show an alternative route towards
33 the estimation of actual infections. Sequential models with LSTM units have been successfully used in
34 similar real-world applications (Ahmed et al., 2022; Nikparvar et al., 2021; Rashed et al., 2022).

35 The input data for this model comprises the wastewater data (accumulated for 14 days only, this seems
36 a good compromise between smoothness and timeliness of the results), virus variant distribution,


1 community vaccination status, and finally, the reported cases (14 days accumulated) as a target vector.
2 All input data has been scaled to the target range of 0-1 and two different sequential models have
3 been trained (Table 1), using Google’s python library “Tensorflow” (Abadi et al., 2016). Training data
4 has been split into windows of constant length (60 samples each) and two sets of windows for training
5 (75%) and validation (25%) of the model. A variable portion at the end of the dataset is excluded for
6 final evaluation of the model’s performance (e.g. the BA.2 wave, see Figure 4). Therefore, the models
7 are trained to predict each day’s actual reported cases based on the history of the input data
8 summarised. The training was conducted on a free instance of Google’s Colaboratory platform using
9 default GPU resources.

10 The properties of the layers of the models are outlined in Table 4 The first “simple” model has only 1
11 LSTM layer and ~5,000 neurons, and serves as a simple baseline; the “deep” model comprises 4 LSTM
12 layers and over 300,000 neurons to cover more complexity. LSTM units (“Long short-term memory”),
13 introduced by Hochreiter & Schmidhuber (1997), are used to model recurrent patterns in time series.
14 The main aspect is that non-linear correlations might also have a time dependent element of variable
15 length (Staudemeyer & Morris, 2019). The size of the networks are based on literature findings and
16 experimentation with the data. More details can be found in Table 4. Using variable-length windows,
17 (covering the entire training data from the beginning) instead of fixed-length windows, has been
18 considered for this work but did not yield better overall performance. The model is expected to learn
19 the influence of wastewater virus load on the reported case numbers, which is a pattern that seems
20 to repeat itself throughout the dataset with slightly different (and also time-dependent) parameters,
21 such as vaccination status and currently dominant virus variant.

22 3 Results

23 According to the methods described earlier, data was preprocessed, analysed, and evaluated against
24 the reported cases. Error and correlation metrics were used to compare different models and
25 architectures against each other.

1 3.1 Linear Regression




2 *Figure 1 Linear regression for each virus variant and accumulation period (point size relative to strain contribution, r: Pearson correlation coefficient, y: regression equation, error: root mean squared error (RMSE))*

3
 4 A local linear fit for each of the virus variants (rows) and each of the accumulation periods (columns)
 5 with data that has been time shifted already according to maximum Pearson coefficient (Equations (2)-
 6 (4)) together with the best linear fit is displayed in Figure 1, where each subtitle also indicates a lag
 7 period. A positive lag means that wastewater data leads and case data lags, a negative lag vice versa.
 8 Since virus variant contribution varies in time, the input samples for the time lagging, the generation
 9 of the Linear Regression model, as well as the calculation of Pearson r have been weighted according
 10 to the respective variant's contribution of each sample. This results in a strong influence of samples
 11 where a variant is dominant and a weak influence of samples with a relative variant contribution of
 12 <0.5 . Generally, longer accumulation periods result in a better fit of the Linear Regression and
 13 therefore higher values for the Pearson Correlation Coefficient r and lower errors. Samples with lower

1 variant contribution (smaller scatter points) do not seem to have a higher likelihood of being outliers
2 in terms of the Linear Model.


3 Figure 2 shows a combination of all derived linear models. In general, a positive proportional relation
4 between wastewater and case data prevailed. Yet, different curves for each virus variant highlight the
5 differences between the individual models. BA.2 and Delta are very close to the global model, Alpha
6 and BA.1 have a significantly different slope, while all models are roughly pointing towards the origin
7 of coordinates.



8
9 *Figure 2 Linear Regression for each virus variant (Blue: Alpha, Orange: Delta, Green: BA.1, Red: BA.2) and combined global*
10 *linear model (black line). Scatter points: raw data. Accumulated over 14 days.*

11 By applying the regression models to the time series of wastewater data, virus variant specific as well
12 as overall estimates of cases for each aggregation period can be derived (see Figure 3). Each of the
13 models fits the data best in the periods where the respective variant is dominant and is less accurate

- 1 for other periods. While estimates from the Delta, BA.2 and global model lie very close together, the
- 2 Alpha and BA.1 models mark the upper and lower boundaries respectively.



- 3
- 4 *Figure 3 Estimation of reported cases from wastewater data from individual models. Color shades represent local dominance*
- 5 *of virus variants. Blue: Alpha, Orange: Delta, Green: BA.1, Red: BA.2*

6 3.2 Machine Learning

7 Machine Learning models have been trained to show an alternative route towards the estimation of

8 actual cases. The input data for this model comprises the wastewater data (accumulated for 14 days

9 only, which poses a good compromise between smoothness and timeliness of the results), virus variant

10 distribution, community vaccination status, precipitation, and finally, as a target vector, the reported

11 cases (14 days accumulated). All input data has been scaled to the target range of 0-1.

12 After training each model for a maximum of 500 epochs (i.e. iterations of the entire data) until

13 convergence with a batch size of 32 samples (per update of the internal weights), the wastewater data,

14 reported cases, estimate (model output) together with the resulting error are plotted in Figure 4. The

15 red and green shades indicate the model's variation of estimate and error within ten iterations of the

16 entire training process, including random split of training and validation data. The dashed vertical line

17 indicates the split between training and testing data (between BA.1 & BA.2 wave). Data before the line

18 (2022-03-11) was used for training, while data beyond the line was only used for evaluating the model


19 after training. Here, the BA.2 wave was used as a realistic testing scenario for new variants, which the

20 model will have to predict. While there is good fit of the models in the first three waves, errors increase

21 significantly after that for the last BA.2 wave (dashed line) where they have never seen the training

22 data. The simple model exhibits higher errors in the training section, but shows some correlation in

1 the testing section, where the deep models fails to fit the target curve. Both ML-based models are
2 exhibiting a relatively low variation in the training interval (until BA.2).



3
4 *Figure 4 Estimations with the “simple” and “deep” model based on training data up to the BA.1 wave (April 2022). Red and*
5 *green shades are variations between different training batches.*

6
7 3.3 Comparison of estimation outcome for Linear Regression and Machine Learning
8 For the comparison of the two methods, the 14-days aggregated input data was segmented according
9 to periods of dominant variants, i.e. Alpha, Delta, BA.1, and BA.2 as shown in the methods section.
10 Models were fitted to the respective individual periods or consecutive multiple periods. Subsequently,
11 the fitted models were applied to the periods of the other variants. For all model-period combinations,
12 after correcting for the time lag of each wave, goodness-of-fit was evaluated separately. Root Mean
13 Squared Errors (RMSE) and Pearson Correlation Coefficients served as indicators for model
14 performance. Results for all models and combinations of training and testing data are displayed in
15 Table 2 and Table 3 respectively. The columns either describe a single wave, for which the model was
16 trained (e.g. “Alpha”) or a series of consecutive waves (e.g. “Alpha->Delta”), i.e. all data included in the
17 period which were used for training.

18 It can be observed, that the deep ML model, while yielding lower errors on the training data, does not
19 consistently yield lower errors on the test data (Table 2). Variance is low for training and high for testing
20 periods for both ML models (Figure 4). Conversely, the correlation coefficients are high for training and
21 low for testing periods (Table 3).

22 The Linear Model’s correlation (Table 3) with the training data is lower than that of the ML models,
23 because there is no curve fitting process involved and wastewater data is simply shifted linearly in y-
24 direction. Hence, the correlation coefficient is the same for each wave, independently of the model
25 used, since the time lag is corrected in the evaluation stage of each wave.

26 Of note, due to the lack of sufficient training data on the Alpha wave (due to 60 days window length),
27 results might not be directly comparable to the linear model for this wave.

Table 2 Errors (RMSE) for all models, training and testing sections. Lowest errors for each column are in bold font.

	Linear Model							Simple LSTM Model						Deep LSTM Model							
Train on→	Alpha	Delta	BA.1	BA.2	Alpha -> Delta	Alpha -> BA.1	Alpha -> BA.2	Alpha	Delta	BA.1	BA.2	Alpha -> Delta	Alpha -> BA.1	Alpha -> BA.2	Alpha	Delta	BA.1	BA.2	Alpha -> Delta	Alpha -> BA.1	Alpha -> BA.2
Test on ↓																					
Alpha	0.005	0.074	0.123	0.061	0.071	0.150	0.142	0.003	0.136	0.222	0.150	0.004	0.005	0.006	0.001	0.461	0.190	0.144	0.002	0.005	0.006
Delta	0.148	0.029	0.161	0.071	0.029	0.168	0.082	0.189	0.042	0.145	0.193	0.014	0.017	0.018	0.196	0.161	0.145	0.128	0.007	0.009	0.010
BA.1	0.357	0.182	0.061	0.195	0.184	0.070	0.120	0.499	0.147	0.082	0.297	0.245	0.070	0.061	0.539	0.112	0.091	0.331	0.136	0.014	0.015
BA.2	0.501	0.107	0.421	0.069	0.108	0.414	0.083	0.557	0.412	0.233	0.332	0.547	0.203	0.063	0.598	0.224	0.192	0.370	0.211	0.228	0.015
Avg.	0.253	0.098	0.191	0.099	0.098	0.201	0.107	0.312	0.184	0.171	0.243	0.203	0.074	0.037	0.334	0.239	0.155	0.243	0.089	0.064	0.012

Table 3 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for all models, training and testing sections. Lowest errors for each column are in bold font.

	Linear Model							Simple LSTM Model						Deep LSTM Model							
Train on→	Alpha	Delta	BA.1	BA.2	Alpha -> Delta	Alpha -> BA.1	Alpha -> BA.2	Alpha	Delta	BA.1	BA.2	Alpha -> Delta	Alpha -> BA.1	Alpha -> BA.2	Alpha	Delta	BA.1	BA.2	Alpha -> Delta	Alpha -> BA.1	Alpha -> BA.2
Test on ↓																					
Alpha	0.975	0.975	0.975	0.975	0.975	0.975	0.975	0.988	0.830	0.772	-0.553	0.985	0.983	0.982	0.999	0.737	0.681	0.915	0.995	0.997	0.996
Delta	0.985	0.985	0.985	0.985	0.985	0.985	0.985	0.929	0.977	0.598	0.630	0.997	0.995	0.994	0.800	0.614	0.868	0.960	0.999	0.999	0.999
BA.1	0.912	0.912	0.912	0.912	0.912	0.912	0.912	0.880	0.947	0.956	0.646	0.937	0.967	0.981	0.634	0.919	0.941	0.850	0.914	0.999	0.999
BA.2	0.959	0.959	0.959	0.959	0.959	0.959	0.959	0.611	0.200	0.461	0.730	0.223	0.665	0.969	0.324	0.335	0.634	-0.043	0.442	0.510	0.998
Avg.	0.958	0.958	0.958	0.958	0.958	0.958	0.958	0.852	0.739	0.697	0.363	0.786	0.902	0.982	0.689	0.651	0.781	0.670	0.838	0.876	0.998

1 4 Discussion

2 While being aware of a multitude of uncertainties in the input data, which are often impossible to
3 quantify (see Limitations), the above work shows that a good correlation can be found when building
4 separate models for each virus variant. In contrast to other findings, those correlations can all be
5 described as linear and none of the axes was transformed. Linearity was inherently assumed at the
6 beginning of the analysis when calculating the time lag. For this calculation, the Pearson coefficient
7 has been used, which is a linear measure. More research could be conducted using non-linear
8 correlation measures, such as spearman or dynamic time warping (Berndt & Clifford, 1994; Spearman,
9 1961; Tsinaslanidis et al., 2014). Furthermore, potential heteroscedasticity (scale-dependent variance)
10 of the linear correlation models should be investigated.

11 When analysing Figure 1, some scatter plots showed hysteresis around the linear model which may
12 result from a different time lag depending on whether slopes are rising or falling (e.g.: “BA.2, 28 days”).
13 A potential explanation could be that cases are only reported once when an infection is detected
14 whereas virus material can be found in wastewater for a longer period. This seems to be dependent
15 on the respective virus variant as indicated earlier in the literature, where shedding patterns were
16 found to differ between virus variants (Bertels et al., 2022; Sapoval et al., 2021; Wurtzer et al., 2022).
17 It may be worthwhile to train a separate model (and lag) for each slope of the data to enhance
18 coherence. Different, more fine-tuned aggregation times could be investigated as indicated by some
19 of the literature (Galani et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2022). Furthermore, different testing efficiencies for
20 establishing case numbers might impact lag time and shape parameters of the functional relation
21 between wastewater and case data (Xiao et al., 2022). A correction of testing efficiency to estimate
22 total infected population, e.g. provided by (Chiu & Ndeffo-Mbah, 2021) might improve the consistency
23 in parameter estimation.

24 As shown in Figure 3, the different models can be used to estimate today’s rate of new infections for
25 each virus variant. However, as models are derived for individual virus variants, deriving new models
26 for new variants can be very challenging, as case reports may not continue to be as reliable in the
27 future. Potential solutions may be: (1) Using the global model, which is derived from all data,
28 disregarding the influence of different virus variants. This would significantly add to the overall
29 uncertainty but may reduce specific uncertainty for unknown novel virus variants until more
30 information is available. (2) Small scale studies of specific shedding patterns of future variants and their
31 correlation to actual reported cases. This could happen in closed communities, e.g. in hospitals, cruise
32 ships or small towns. Further research would be necessary on how that is applicable to larger WWTPs
33 and areas, such as the case shown. (3) Tune a free modelling parameter for new virus variants, which
34 are easily adjusted as more information about variant specific properties become available. A future
35 model might comprise of e.g. 80% Delta and 20% BA.2 characteristics.

36 It could be shown that, with relatively little effort, an accurate machine-learning model can be trained
37 for periods where data is available. However, in the testing periods (beyond training period), those
38 models often fail to even correlate to the target variable. Without more insight into the inner workings
39 of the black box or lengthy hyperparameter tuning, it is difficult to build a reasonable predictive model
40 for new data samples, especially new virus variants, as model parameters are difficult to adjust
41 manually. An interesting future research question will be how to update future models with a less than
42 optimal target vector. Still, gaining practitioner’s trust in such models remains a challenge and linear
43 models are often much easier to implement, e.g. in database systems and visualisations. Since the ML
44 models learn from the features in the training data and because each virus variant development is
45 stored in its own feature, new variants are only represented in their own feature, which was not

1 present (or holding meaningful data) during the training process. So whatever characteristics the
2 model has learnt from those features is significantly crippled when they vanish for new testing data.
3 Given that little hyperparameter-tuning has been done there is a large potential for further
4 optimisation of all presented model types and room for research on different model architectures.
5 Furthermore, overfitting might have occurred during the training process and should be investigated.

6 Given the results of this work, we conclude that ML may not be the best tool for this task because of
7 the mentioned drawbacks and difficult tuning process. Investigating a multivariate Linear Regression
8 is probably a more successful path and is a promising topic for further research.

9 When case reporting fails to reflect the actual rate of infections, wastewater surveillance can be a
10 surrogate measure, even when observing a slightly higher uncertainty. Wastewater data is easier much
11 less expensive to procure than conducting individual swabs on people, especially on a large scale.
12 When basing pandemic measures on WBE, politics and businesses alike could be using a very robust
13 tool (given further research on uncertainties) that is independent of individual testing motivation, test
14 centre availability or kind of testing procedure (rapid antigen tests vs. PCR). Hospitals could plan their
15 occupation ahead, communities adjust their guidelines and measures and individuals assess their
16 personal risk before meeting anyone. Especially hospitalisation is yet underrepresented in research
17 and should soon be investigated (also see Lünsmann et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2022).

18 Furthermore, further research is needed on virus shedding patterns in faeces, viral load concentration
19 and their development over time (Zhu et al., 2022).

20 5 Limitations

21 In general, due to a lack of standardisation and different population density and different local
22 properties, the results between any two WWTP are not directly comparable. The RKI data source for
23 reported cases only contains locality information on district level (third level territorial units for
24 statistics). Cases are aggregated with a provided district-level code. However, according to the Dresden
25 WWTP, wastewater is collected from twelve municipalities surrounding Dresden area as indicated in
26 the RKI data and amounts for roughly 650k citizens or 613km² (compare Dresden: 556k, 328km²)
27 (Stadtentwässerung Dresden, 2018; Statistisches Bundesamt, 2021). As data for such small entities is
28 not available in the RKI data, it can only be noted as a potential influence factor to explain uncertainties
29 in the model.

30 5.1 Influencing factors on measured virus load in wastewater

31 As Kitajima et al. (2020) point out, many factors can influence wastewater surveillance data, such as
32 “differences in excretion rates of viruses during the course of infection, temporal delays and the
33 inconsistent capture of spatial variability due to travel and use of multiple wastewater systems in time,
34 and dilution due to precipitation” that may limit virus detection rates. A lack of standardisation of the
35 methods used in each WWTP also makes the results less comparable. A recent comparative study of
36 the recovery rates using three commonly used viral concentration methods found little differences
37 between the methods per se, but highlighted sample turbidity, storage temperature and surfactant
38 load as potential major influence factors in UK wastewater samples (Kevill et al., 2022). Bertels et al.
39 (2022) confirm in their literature review that at least 17 factors can influence measured viral loads in
40 wastewater and try to categorise them, such as shedding-related factors, population size, in-sewer
41 factors, as well as sampling strategy.

42 Also, the contributions of different virus variants are found to influence the amount of virus material
43 shed into the wastewater through faeces (Weidhaas et al., 2021), specifically, the Omicron (BA.1)

1 variant appears to expose lower levels of virus shedding (low amounts of virus material contained in
2 bodily fluids) (Yuan et al., 2022). It remains an open question how the new BA.2 fits into this. While
3 there are specific PCR, as well as genome sequencing tests available and widely adopted, to detect
4 specific variants of the virus (Wurtzer et al., 2022), it is less relevant for the envisaged correlation of
5 the reported community transmission levels.

6 As for rain on the sewage systems, Rubio-Acero et al. (2021) found in their data, that precipitation of
7 less than 5mm (in 24h) had no adverse effect on the viral detection performance. They disregarded all
8 days in their data above this threshold and found their data unaffected by rainfall (see also Trottier et
9 al., 2020).

10 5.2 Official case reporting

11 Governmental strategies for testing and reporting official case numbers vary over time depending on
12 epidemical situation and current political agenda. For example, in the beginning of the pandemic in
13 2020, when vaccines were not available yet, measures were very strict on a personal and public level.
14 As soon as rapid antigen tests were available, regular testing was demanded by many businesses (e.g.
15 restaurants) as an entry requirement. Upon a positive rapid testing result, citizens were required to
16 get a PCR test that feeds into the official reports. This strategy led to a high percentage of actual
17 discovered infections (and a low number of undetected infections). An additional direct influence
18 factor on reported cases refers to the varying access to testing (Olesen et al., 2021).

19 The more vaccinations had been administered and hospitalisation rates went down, the less often
20 people had to get themselves tested. Furthermore, some virus variants (e.g. Omicron) cause milder
21 symptoms, which often do not require medical treatment, which leads to more people just staying
22 home instead of going to a test centre (Maisa et al., 2022). On public holidays and in times of high
23 community transmission rates, it can be very challenging to find free capacities in either a test centre
24 or a laboratory or even get the results back on time.

25 All of the earlier mentioned uncertainties in the input data might explain any outliers and diversions,
26 especially in the linear model. With the current knowledge, it is near impossible to quantify any of
27 those effects so that the only option at this point is to accept them as the given approximation.

28 5.3 Computational shortcomings

29 Due to the focus of this work and partly due to the lack of computational resources, intensive
30 hyperparameter tuning has not been done on the deep learning models. It is expected that the efficacy
31 of the models could be enhanced with proper fine-tuning but was simply out of scope in this work.
32 Different model sizes have not been considered systematically.

33 6 Conclusion

34 The use of wastewater-based epidemiology has been evaluated in light of the current SARS-CoV-2
35 pandemic. Input data has been procured and analysed. Virus variant based Linear Regression models
36 and ML models have been built, and their performance compared. Lastly, their use cases, shortcomings
37 and potential fields of further research have been discussed.

38 We hereby conclude that quantified virus particles in the wastewater can be a reasonable
39 approximation for the reported cases. However, the accuracy and detail of the modelled correlation is
40 highly virus variant dependent, which is why a continuous adaptation of the currently most dominant
41 variant in terms of availability and verifiability is essential for our proposed approach. Since it is rather
42 difficult to obtain precise information about the dilution of virus particles of new virus variants, one
43 may use information from other local areas with newly arising variants and parametrize the new model

1 accordingly. The respective variant information could be tested via qPCR or sequencing approaches. In
2 turn, we suggest the incorporation of virus variant information into other related forecasting models,
3 which can be an essential asset because it addresses different existing and novel variants at the same
4 time.

5 The proposed linear model can easily be incorporated into any database or visualisation platform, as
6 well as parameterised and extended. It can be of great use for any authority, clinical, and political
7 decision makers, as well as the public as an indication of the current level of local infections.

8 7 References

- 9 Abadi, M., Barham, P., Chen, J., Chen, Z., Davis, A., Dean, J., Devin, M., Ghemawat, S., Irving, G., Isard,
10 M., Kudlur, M., Levenberg, J., Monga, R., Moore, S., Murray, D. G., Steiner, B., Tucker, P.,
11 Vasudevan, V., Warden, P., ... Zheng, X. (2016). *{TensorFlow}: A System for {Large-Scale}*
12 *Machine Learning*. 265–283. [https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi16/technical-](https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi16/technical-sessions/presentation/abadi)
13 [sessions/presentation/abadi](https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi16/technical-sessions/presentation/abadi)
- 14 Abbott, S., Sherratt, K., Gerstung, M., & Funk, S. (2022). *Estimation of the test to test distribution as a*
15 *proxy for generation interval distribution for the Omicron variant in England* (p.
16 2022.01.08.22268920). medRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.08.22268920>
- 17 Ahmed, W., Bivins, A., Simpson, S. L., Bertsch, P. M., Ehret, J., Hosegood, I., Metcalfe, S. S., Smith, W.
18 J. M., Thomas, K. V., Tynan, J., & Mueller, J. F. (2022). Wastewater surveillance demonstrates
19 high predictive value for COVID-19 infection on board repatriation flights to Australia.
20 *Environment International*, 158, 106938. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106938>
- 21 Ai, Y., Davis, A., Jones, D., Lemeshow, S., Tu, H., He, F., Ru, P., Pan, X., Bohrerova, Z., & Lee, J. (2021).
22 Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 monitoring as a community-level COVID-19 trend tracker and
23 variants in Ohio, United States. *Science of The Total Environment*, 801, 149757.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149757>
- 25 Berndt, D. J., & Clifford, J. (1994). Using dynamic time warping to find patterns in time series. *KDD*
26 *Workshop*, 10(16), 359–370.
- 27 Bertels, X., Demeyer, P., Van den Bogaert, S., Boogaerts, T., van Nuijs, A. L. N., Delputte, P., &
28 Lahousse, L. (2022). Factors influencing SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in wastewater up to

- 1 the sampling stage: A systematic review. *Science of The Total Environment*, 820, 153290.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.153290>
- 3 Bracewell, R. (1965). Pentagon notation for cross correlation. The Fourier transform and its
4 applications. *New York: McGraw-Hill*, 46, 243.
- 5 Chiu, W. A., & Ndeffo-Mbah, M. L. (2021). Using test positivity and reported case rates to estimate
6 state-level COVID-19 prevalence and seroprevalence in the United States. *PLoS*
7 *Computational Biology*, 17(9), e1009374.
- 8 Daughton, C. G. (2020). Wastewater surveillance for population-wide Covid-19: The present and
9 future. *Science of The Total Environment*, 736, 139631.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139631>
- 11 Dumke, R., de la Cruz Barron, M., Oertel, R., Helm, B., Kallies, R., Berendonk, T. U., & Dalpke, A.
12 (2021). Evaluation of Two Methods to Concentrate SARS-CoV-2 from Untreated Wastewater.
13 *Pathogens*, 10(2), 195. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens10020195>
- 14 Ferré, V. M., Peiffer-Smadja, N., Visseaux, B., Descamps, D., Ghosn, J., & Charpentier, C. (2022).
15 Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant: What we know and what we don't. *Anaesthesia, Critical Care &*
16 *Pain Medicine*, 41(1), 100998. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accpm.2021.100998>
- 17 Galani, A., Aalizadeh, R., Kostakis, M., Markou, A., Alygizakis, N., Lytras, T., Adamopoulos, P. G.,
18 Peccia, J., Thompson, D. C., Kontou, A., Karagiannidis, A., Lianidou, E. S., Avgeris, M.,
19 Paraskevis, D., Tsiodras, S., Scorilas, A., Vasiliou, V., Dimopoulos, M.-A., & Thomaidis, N. S.
20 (2022). SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance data can predict hospitalizations and ICU
21 admissions. *Science of The Total Environment*, 804, 150151.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150151>
- 23 Han, A. X., Kozanli, E., Koopsen, J., Vennema, H., RIVM COVID-19 molecular epidemiology group,
24 Hajji, K., Kroneman, A., van Walle, I., Klinkenberg, D., Wallinga, J., Russell, C. A., Eggink, D., &
25 Reusken, C. (2022). Regional importation and asymmetric within-country spread of SARS-

- 1 CoV-2 variants of concern in the Netherlands. *ELife*, *11*, e78770.
- 2 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.78770>
- 3 Hart, W. S., Miller, E., Andrews, N. J., Waight, P., Maini, P. K., Funk, S., & Thompson, R. N. (2022).
4 Generation time of the alpha and delta SARS-CoV-2 variants: An epidemiological analysis. *The*
5 *Lancet Infectious Diseases*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(22\)00001-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00001-9)
- 6 Hochreiter, S., & Schmidhuber, J. (1997). Long Short-Term Memory. *Neural Computation*, *9*(8), 1735–
7 1780. <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735>
- 8 Kevill, J. L., Pellett, C., Farkas, K., Brown, M. R., Bassano, I., Denise, H., McDonald, J. E., Malham, S. K.,
9 Porter, J., Warren, J., Evens, N. P., Paterson, S., Singer, A. C., & Jones, D. L. (2022). A
10 comparison of precipitation and filtration-based SARS-CoV-2 recovery methods and the
11 influence of temperature, turbidity, and surfactant load in urban wastewater. *Science of The*
12 *Total Environment*, *808*, 151916. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151916>
- 13 Kitajima, M., Ahmed, W., Bibby, K., Carducci, A., Gerba, C. P., Hamilton, K. A., Haramoto, E., & Rose, J.
14 B. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. *Science of*
15 *The Total Environment*, *739*, 139076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076>
- 16 Lünsmann, B. J., Polotzek, K., Kleber, C., Gebler, R., Bierbaum, V., Walther, F., Baum, F., Juncken, K.,
17 Forkert, C., Lange, T., Held, H.-C., Mogwitz, A., Weidemann, R. R., Sedlmayr, M., Lakowa, N.,
18 Stehr, S. N., Albrecht, M., Karschau, J., & Schmitt, J. (2022). Regional responsibility and
19 coordination of appropriate inpatient care capacities for patients with COVID-19 – the
20 German DISPENSE model. *PLOS ONE*, *17*(1), e0262491.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0262491>
- 22 Maisa, A., Spaccferri, G., Fournier, L., Schaeffer, J., Deniau, J., Rolland, P., Coignard, B., Andrieu, A.,
23 Broustal, O., Chene, S., Chent, S., Fougère, E., Gbaguidi, G., Hamidouche, M., Lamy, A., Mano,
24 Q., Mastrovito, B., Mercier, A., Modenesi, G., ... Yazdanpanah, Y. (2022). First cases of
25 Omicron in France are exhibiting mild symptoms, November 2021–January 2022. *Infectious*
26 *Diseases Now*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idnow.2022.02.003>

- 1 Manuel, D. G., Delatolla, R., Fisman, D. N., Fuzzen, M., Graber, T., Katz, G. M., Kim, J., Landgraff, C.,
2 MacKenzie, A., Maltsev, A., Majury, A., McKay, R. M., Minnery, J., Servos, M., Weese, J. S.,
3 McGeer, A., Born, K. B., Barrett, K., Schwartz, B., & Jüni, P. (2021). *The Role of Wastewater*
4 *Testing for SARS-CoV-2 Surveillance*. Ontario COVID-19 Science Advisory Table.
5 <https://doi.org/10.47326/ocsat.2021.02.40.1.0>
- 6 Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., & Brouwer, A. (2020). Presence of SARS-
7 Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the
8 Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*,
9 7(7), 511–516. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357>
- 10 Nagura-Ikeda, M., Imai, K., Tabata, S., Miyoshi, K., Murahara, N., Mizuno, T., Horiuchi, M., Kato, K.,
11 Imoto, Y., Iwata, M., Mimura, S., Ito, T., Tamura, K., & Kato, Y. (2020). Clinical Evaluation of
12 Self-Collected Saliva by Quantitative Reverse Transcription-PCR (RT-qPCR), Direct RT-qPCR,
13 Reverse Transcription–Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification, and a Rapid Antigen Test To
14 Diagnose COVID-19. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01438-20>
- 15 Nikparvar, B., Rahman, M. M., Hatami, F., & Thill, J.-C. (2021). Spatio-temporal prediction of the
16 COVID-19 pandemic in US counties: Modeling with a deep LSTM neural network. *Scientific*
17 *Reports*, 11(1), 21715. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-01119-3>
- 18 Olesen, S. W., Imakaev, M., & Duvallet, C. (2021). Making waves: Defining the lead time of
19 wastewater-based epidemiology for COVID-19. *Water Research*, 202, 117433.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117433>
- 21 Pérez-López, B., & Mir, M. (2021). Commercialized diagnostic technologies to combat SARS-CoV2:
22 Advantages and disadvantages. *Talanta*, 225, 121898.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2020.121898>
- 24 Rashed, E. A., Kodera, S., & Hirata, A. (2022). *COVID-19 forecasting using new viral variants and*
25 *vaccination effectiveness models* (arXiv:2201.10356). arXiv.
26 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2201.10356>

- 1 Rubio-Acero, R., Beyerl, J., Muenchhoff, M., Roth, M. S., Castelletti, N., Paunovic, I., Radon, K.,
2 Springer, B., Nagel, C., Boehm, B., Böhmer, M. M., Graf, A., Blum, H., Krebs, S., Keppler, O. T.,
3 Osterman, A., Khan, Z. N., Hoelscher, M., Wieser, A., ... Thorbjörn, Z. (2021). Spatially
4 resolved qualified sewage spot sampling to track SARS-CoV-2 dynamics in Munich—One year
5 of experience. *Science of The Total Environment*, 797, 149031.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149031>
- 7 Sapoval, N., Lou, E., Hopkins, L., Ensor, K. B., Schneider, R., Treangen, T. J., & Stadler, L. B. (2021).
8 *Enhanced Detection of Recently Emerged SARS-CoV-2 Variants of Concern in Wastewater* (p.
9 2021.09.08.21263279). medRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.08.21263279>
- 10 Sinkevicius, V. (2021). Commission Recommendation (EU) 2021/472 of 17 March 2021 on a common
11 approach to establish a systematic surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 and its variants in wastewaters
12 in the EU. In *OJ L* (No. 32021H0472; Vol. 098).
13 <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reco/2021/472/oj/eng>
- 14 Spearman, C. (1961). *The proof and measurement of association between two things*.
15 Stadtentwässerung Dresden. (2018). *ver. ND Faltblatt Fu hrungen 2018_14-Seiter*.
16 <https://www.stadtentwaesserung->
17 [dresden.de/fileadmin/user_upload/downloads/faltblaetter-broschueren/klaeranlage-](https://www.stadtentwaesserung-dresden.de/fileadmin/user_upload/downloads/faltblaetter-broschueren/klaeranlage-)
18 [dresden-kaditz.pdf](https://www.stadtentwaesserung-dresden.de/fileadmin/user_upload/downloads/faltblaetter-broschueren/klaeranlage-dresden-kaditz.pdf)
- 19 Statistisches Bundesamt. (2021, June 30). *Alle politisch selbständigen Gemeinden mit ausgewählten*
20 *Merkmale am 30.06.2021 (2. Quartal 2021)*. Statistisches Bundesamt.
21 <https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Laender->
22 [Regionen/Regionales/Gemeindeverzeichnis/Administrativ/Archiv/GVAuszugQ/AuszugGV2QA](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Laender-Regionen/Regionales/Gemeindeverzeichnis/Administrativ/Archiv/GVAuszugQ/AuszugGV2QA)
23 [ktuell.html](https://www.destatis.de/DE/Themen/Laender-Regionen/Regionales/Gemeindeverzeichnis/Administrativ/Archiv/GVAuszugQ/AuszugGV2QAktuell.html)
- 24 Staudemeyer, R. C., & Morris, E. R. (2019). Understanding LSTM -- a tutorial into Long Short-Term
25 Memory Recurrent Neural Networks. *ArXiv:1909.09586 [Cs]*.
26 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.09586>

- 1 Trottier, J., Darques, R., Ait Mouheb, N., Partiot, E., Bakhache, W., Deffieu, M. S., & Gaudin, R. (2020).
2 Post-lockdown detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the wastewater of Montpellier, France. *One*
3 *Health, 10*, 100157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2020.100157>
- 4 Tsinaslanidis, P., Alexandridis, A., Zapranis, A., & Livanis, E. (2014). *Dynamic time warping as a*
5 *similarity measure: Applications in finance.*
- 6 Weidhaas, J., Aanderud, Z. T., Roper, D. K., VanDerslice, J., Gaddis, E. B., Ostermiller, J., Hoffman, K.,
7 Jamal, R., Heck, P., Zhang, Y., Torgersen, K., Laan, J. V., & LaCross, N. (2021). Correlation of
8 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater with COVID-19 disease burden in sewersheds. *Science of The*
9 *Total Environment, 775*, 145790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145790>
- 10 World Health Organization. (2020). *Estimating mortality from COVID-19: Scientific brief, 4 August*
11 *2020* (WHO/2019-nCoV/Sci_Brief/EnvironmentalSampling/2020.1).
12 [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO-2019-nCoV-sci-brief-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO-2019-nCoV-sci-brief-environmentalSampling-2020-1)
13 [environmentalSampling-2020-1](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO-2019-nCoV-sci-brief-environmentalSampling-2020-1)
- 14 Wurtzer, S., Levert, M., Dhenain, E., Accrombessi, H., Manco, S., Fagour, N., Goulet, M., Boudaud, N.,
15 Gaillard, L., Bertrand, I., Challant, J., Masnada, S., Azimi, S., Guillon-Ritz, M., Robin, A.,
16 Mouchel, J.-M., Sig, O., & Moulin, L. (2022). *Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 variant dynamics in*
17 *wastewater by digital RT-PCR: From Alpha to Omicron BA.2 VOC* (p. 2022.04.04.22273320).
18 medRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.04.22273320>
- 19 Xiao, A., Wu, F., Bushman, M., Zhang, J., Imakaev, M., Chai, P. R., Duvallet, C., Endo, N., Erickson, T.
20 B., & Armas, F. (2022). Metrics to relate COVID-19 wastewater data to clinical testing
21 dynamics. *Water Research, 212*, 118070.
- 22 Yuan, S., Ye, Z.-W., Liang, R., Tang, K., Zhang, A. J., Lu, G., Ong, C. P., Poon, V. K.-M., Chan, C. C.-S.,
23 Mok, B. W.-Y., Qin, Z., Xie, Y., Sun, H., Tsang, J. O.-L., Yuen, T. T.-T., Chik, K. K.-H., Chan, C. C.-
24 Y., Cai, J.-P., Luo, C., ... Chan, J. F.-W. (2022). *The SARS-CoV-2 Omicron (B.1.1.529) variant*
25 *exhibits altered pathogenicity, transmissibility, and fitness in the golden Syrian hamster*
26 *model* (p. 2022.01.12.476031). bioRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.12.476031>

1 Zhu, Y., Oishi, W., Maruo, C., Bandara, S., Lin, M., Saito, M., Kitajima, M., & Sano, D. (2022). COVID-19
2 case prediction via wastewater surveillance in a low-prevalence urban community: A
3 modeling approach. *Journal of Water and Health*, 20(2), 459–470.
4 <https://doi.org/10.2166/wh.2022.183>

6 8 Acknowledgements

7 This work was in part supported by a grant of the State Ministry of Science and Cultural Affairs of
8 Saxony (SMWK). The authors thank the employees of the wastewater treatment plant Dresden for
9 their collaboration and Miss Dipl.Biol. Sara Schubert for the preparation of the ethics application.

10 9 Author contributions

11 M. Lehmann was responsible for the study design; M. Geissler, R. Dumke, and A. Dalpke conducted the
12 experiments; M. Lehmann, W. Hahn, R. Gebler, B. Helm and M. Wolfien analysed and interpreted the
13 data; M. Lehmann and W. Hahn were involved in image generation; M. Lehmann drafted the first
14 version of the manuscript; M. Lehmann, M. Geissler, W. Hahn, R. Dumke, A. Dalpke, and M. Wolfien
15 carefully revised the final version of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of
16 the manuscript.

17 10 Conflict of Interest

18 The authors declare that no conflict of interest exists.

19 11 Ethical considerations

20 Ethics application (BO-EK-383072021) has been confirmed by the Ethic Committee of Technische
21 Universität Dresden, which is registered as institutional review board (IRB00001473) at the Office of
22 Human Research Protection.

23 12 Data Availability


24 All used scripts and raw data are available online at [https://github.com/MM-Lehmann/Wastewater-](https://github.com/MM-Lehmann/Wastewater-modelling-Dresden)
25 [modelling-Dresden](https://github.com/MM-Lehmann/Wastewater-modelling-Dresden) publicly.

26 13 Supplements - ML model architecture

27 *Table 4 Machine Learning specific details about layer sizes and architecture*

Model		Layer (type)	Output shape	Param #	Properties
simple		LSTM	(None, 16)	4928	Recurrent dropout=0.1 L1 regularizer=0.01 L2 regularizer=0.01

		Dropout	(None, 16)	0	Chance=0.3
		Dense	(None, 1)	17	
deep		LSTM	(None, 7, 64)	32000	
		LSTM	(None, 7, 128)	98816	
		Dropout	(None, 7, 128)	0	Chance=0.3
		LSTM	(None, 7, 128)	131584	
		Dropout	(None, 7, 128)	0	Chance=0.3
		LSTM	(None, 64)	49408	Recurrent dropout=0.1 L1 regularizer=0.01 L2 regularizer=0.01
		Dropout	(None, 64)	0	Chance=0.3
		Dense	(None, 1)	65	



1
 2 *Figure 5 Raw wastewater data and reported cases with different accumulation periods (cases_xdays: reported cases*
 3 *(dashed), WW_xdays: Aggregated wastewater (WW) concentration (each accumulated over $x \in [7, 14, 28]$ days)). Color*
 4 *shades represent local dominance of virus variants. Blue: Alpha, Orange: Delta, Green: BA.1, Red: BA.2*