

1 **Opinions of Former Jail Residents about Self-collection of**  
2 **SARS-CoV-2 Specimens, Paired with Wastewater Surveillance:**  
3 **A Qualitative Study Rapidly Examining Acceptability of COVID-**  
4 **19 Mitigation Measures**

5  
6  
7 **Running title:** Wastewater surveillance, self-testing, SARS-CoV-2

8  
9 **Keywords:** wastewater, surveillance, jail, covid-19, self-collection, sars-cov-2

10  
11 **Word count:** ABSTRACT 150  
12 Main Body 3355

13  
14 **Authors:**

15 Myrna del Mar González-Montalvo, MPH<sup>1</sup>  
16 Peter F. Dickson, MDiv, MPH<sup>2</sup>  
17 Lindsay B. Saber, MPH<sup>1</sup>  
18 Rachel A. Boehm, MPH<sup>1</sup>  
19 Victoria L. Phillips, PhD<sup>3</sup>  
20 Matthew J. Akiyama, MD, MA<sup>4</sup>  
21 Anne C. Spaulding, MD MPH\*<sup>1,5</sup>

22  
23  
24 \*Corresponding Author: [aspauld@emory.edu](mailto:aspauld@emory.edu)

25 Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta GA 30322

26 ORCID iD Number: 0000-0002-0281-0248

- 27  
28 1. Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University,  
29 Atlanta, Georgia, US  
30 2. Department of Behavioral Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University,  
31 Atlanta, Georgia, US  
32 3. Department of Health Policy and Management, Rollins School of Public Health,  
33 Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, US  
34 4. Department of Medicine, Montefiore Hospital, New York City, New York, US  
35 5. Department of Medicine, Emory School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia, US  
36

37 **Abstract**

38  
39 In year one of the COVID-19 epidemic, the incidence of infection for US carceral populations was 5.5-fold  
40 higher than that in the community. Prior to the rapid roll out of a comprehensive jail surveillance program  
41 of Wastewater-Based Surveillance (WBS) and individual testing for SARS-CoV-2, we sought the  
42 perspectives of formerly incarcerated individuals regarding mitigation strategies against COVID-19 to  
43 inform acceptability of the new program. In focus groups, participants discussed barriers to their receiving  
44 COVID-19 testing and vaccination. We introduced WBS and individual nasal self-testing, then queried if  
45 wastewater testing to improve surveillance of emerging outbreaks before case numbers surged, and  
46 specimen self-collection, would be valued. The participants' input gives insight into ways to improve the  
47 delivery of COVID-19 interventions. Hearing the voices of those with lived experiences of incarceration is  
48 critical to understanding their views on infection control strategies and supports including justice-involved  
49 individuals in decision-making processes regarding jail-based interventions.

50  
51  
52 **Introduction**

53  
54 Strict confinement in high density congregate settings increases the risk of transmission of airborne  
55 pathogens. In 2020, the incidence of infection with the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2  
56 (SARS-CoV-2) in US custody populations was 5.5 times higher than that in the community.(1, 2) Not only  
57 has the ability to distance been limited for persons in jails and prisons during the COVID-19 pandemic,(3,  
58 4) but also the supply of personal protective equipment has been frequently inadequate.(5) Surveillance  
59 and good infection control practices, such as screening, confirmatory testing, isolation and quarantine,  
60 can minimize the impact of COVID-19 on both those who live and work in correctional facilities.(6)

61  
62 In the 1940s, epidemiologists in the United States used wastewater-based surveillance (WBS) to detect  
63 and manage polio outbreaks.(7) The gold standard for wastewater pathogen detection, polymerase chain

64 reaction (PCR), came on line in the 1990s and its use has continued.(8-10) Due to fatigue associated with  
65 the repeated rounds of individual swab testing several months into the COVID-19 pandemic, wastewater  
66 testing represented a way to improve surveillance of emerging outbreaks before case numbers surged.  
67 Innovative PCR-based WBS strategies have been recently emerging to monitor for SARS-CoV-2, both in  
68 private and public settings, such as university campuses,(11) neighborhoods, and now, correctional  
69 facilities.

70

71 WBS will pinpoint where outbreaks are occurring and could prompt individual testing or other mitigation  
72 measures. To decrease discomfort with individual testing, we made a preliminary decision to employ self-  
73 collected nasal swabs for the molecular testing for SARS-CoV-2 in a project planned for a local jail. The  
74 collection kit for molecular diagnostic testing for viruses was manufactured by SteriPack USA [Lakeland  
75 FL, Steripackgroup.com]. These swabs had been used for a validated molecular test with Emergency Use  
76 Authorization. Associated laboratory costs in a public health laboratory were 10%-25% of the cost of  
77 commercial laboratory testing at the time. Quality control for the method could be monitored for  
78 adequacy based on the presence of nasal epithelial cells in self-collected specimens, to ensure that those  
79 tested were cooperating with the collection procedure.

80

81 In 2006, an Institute of Medicine committee published a report on “Ethical Considerations for Research  
82 Involving Prisoners.(12, 13) It added collaboration of relevant stakeholders to the bioethical principles of  
83 justice, beneficence and respect for persons as foundational in studies involving persons in the criminal  
84 legal system. In matters of correctional health, the person with lived experience of incarceration  
85 represents the stakeholder of central importance. The goal of our present study was to understand  
86 perspectives of formerly incarcerated individuals regarding COVID-19 control strategies of jails prior to  
87 the rapid embarkment on a comprehensive surveillance and mitigation program in an Atlanta, Georgia,

88 United States jail. Conducting focus groups to hear the voices of those with lived experiences of being  
89 held in jails and prisons during the COVID-19 pandemic is critical to understanding their views on infection  
90 control strategies.(14) Feedback from participants may inform the design of new interventions to improve  
91 outcomes among this vulnerable population.

92

### 93 **Methods**

94 We employed rapid qualitative analysis, which provides timely results to tailor interventions to the needs  
95 of a target population, support iterative program improvements and provide information to health care  
96 stakeholders on a short timeline.(15-18) Authors (MDG, PFD, LBR, VLP, MJA, ACS) contributed to the  
97 development of a script for the focus group sessions. The script focused on participant experiences with  
98 mitigation measures such as masking, quarantine, isolation, vaccination, and testing in correctional  
99 settings during COVID- 19. Participants were instructed in the use of self-collection of nasal specimens  
100 and swabbed themselves. They were also shown a video explaining water-based surveillance. Questions  
101 about the acceptability and the value of pairing individual testing with SARS-CoV-2 WBS as an integrated  
102 strategy followed.

103

104 Recruitment of a convenience sample of adults with a history of detention or imprisonment began in  
105 September of 2021. We approached staff of a community center established by the Atlanta Police  
106 Foundation in the neighborhood of Fulton County Jail, in northwest Atlanta, to refer persons in the  
107 neighborhood who had been in any US jail or prison at any point between March 2020 and September  
108 2021. The center's staff invited interested individuals who had lived experience of being incarcerated to  
109 attend one of three focus groups.

110

111 The groups convened in a conference room at the community center. Participants sat around a table while  
112 practicing social distancing and wearing masks. The groups were facilitated by Emory staff who obtained

113 formal written consent to participate and have the session recorded. Collection of demographics occurred  
114 before the start of each focus group; participants could opt out of reporting specific personal information.  
115 Participants were compensated with a \$50 gift card at the close of each focus group or when a subject  
116 asked to leave. Facilitators followed the script to elicit perspectives of the participants towards various  
117 mitigation measures. The recording of the session was professionally transcribed.

118

119 As the focus group began, each participant received one SteriPack swab. The kit consists of a 50mm  
120 polypropylene stick and a 100% Polyester bud, as well as a cylinder-like receptacle container. After a  
121 demonstration of using the swabs for specimen self-collection, the participants tried swabbing their  
122 anterior nares with the devices. We then solicited participants' attitudes on its usability and practicality  
123 when coupled with WBS during incarceration.

124

125 To learn about WBS, participants listened to a short video on WBS on college campuses. At the time of  
126 the study, we were unable to locate previously produced videos on WBS in correctional settings. We  
127 solicited participants' opinions on whether they thought such technology was appropriate for correctional  
128 facilities and would protect incarcerated residents.

129

130 After the transcriptions from the three focus groups were completed, we used the Rapid Assessment  
131 Process—an intensive, team-based combination inductive/deductive approach for qualitative data  
132 analysis that employs triangulation and iterative data analysis, and permits more timely delivery of  
133 findings to the field than traditional analysis.<sup>(19)</sup> Two independent coders (MGM and PFD) reviewed and  
134 summarized transcripts using a structured analysis template in Microsoft Word. Templates were  
135 organized around themes selected *a priori* from the interview guide and revised to include emergent  
136 themes as analysis unfolded. Templates, including extracted quotes, were then iteratively reviewed by

137 the qualitative study lead (MJA) and the rest of the team to consolidate and distinguish themes. This  
138 process ensured alignment and resolved discrepancies. Final templates were used to generate and refine  
139 key learnings and identify themes with core qualitative investigators (MGM, PFD, MJA). In the key quotes  
140 presented, we italicize text from the interviewer for clarity.

141

142 The Emory University IRB approved the study protocol.

143

#### 144 **Results**

145 We conducted three focus groups with three, ten, and seven participants, respectively, with 17  
146 participants identifying as men and 3 as women. Ages ranged from 18 to 67 years. All participants  
147 identified as non-Hispanic, and Black or African-American. Educational level attained ranged from tenth  
148 grade to two years of college. Two had been in prison, while the remainder reported time only in jail.  
149 Subjects were held in correctional facilities of the City of Atlanta, three different Georgia counties, one  
150 county in another state, Georgia Department of Corrections and the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Releases  
151 were between March 2020 and August 2021. The longest time spent in custody within the pandemic  
152 period was four months.

153

#### 154 *Attitudes toward and experiences with testing*

155 Attitudes regarding testing were positive overall, as many felt this was a good way to maintain control  
156 and prevent COVID-19 from spreading to other residents within the correctional facility. On many  
157 occasions, residents “guessed” who had tested positive because an individual was moved from their  
158 regular unit to another.

159

160 They said we had COVID, but once they quarantined [you] in isolation by [your] self, [then] they  
161 came in and tested, [if they tested and] you had COVID [they] tested again until we better. I guess

162           they said [they tested] until [they were negative and] they sent [us] back to the general  
163           population.

164

165   In one correctional system, former residents complained of inability to access a test unless symptomatic:

166

167           Because if you're not like literally like on the verge of dying or if it's not [serious]...

168

169   There were, however, comments from participants suggesting mistrust regarding COVID-19 testing and  
170   this being associated with their race.

171

172           But I feel like since y'all are making easier ways, that's going to bring you better progress.... Black  
173           people, we're not going to do it.

174

175   Another participant expressed that many were suspicious about testing due to concerns about swabs  
176   being used to implant microchips.

177

178           A lot of people be thinking that they – they're going some type – some type of chip in it.

179

180   Some participants mentioned hesitancy to be tested because of the stigma associated with testing  
181   positive for COVID-19. However, other participants answered that the possibility of receiving a positive  
182   COVID-19 result would not prevent them from taking the test because they ultimately would like to know  
183   if they had COVID-19 and would not want to spread the infection to those with comorbidities.

184

185 I wouldn't avoid. I would take it, -- You know, because you know, that's life or death. You know, I  
186 wouldn't want to get around no one. I would want them to, you know, put me in, you know,  
187 separate room from someone until I, you know, can get better.

188  
189 Because other people got asthma, you know, heart problems...different kind of...health problems  
190 that they, you know, might harm them or so yeah, I would try to have them removed – have me  
191 separate.

192

193 *Experiences with Mitigation: Masks, Quarantine and Isolation*

194  
195 Some participants shared that if anyone tested positive, they were isolated along with others who had  
196 also tested positive. Once a negative result came back after one or two weeks, they were sent back to the  
197 general population. Regarding experiences with masking, some participants reported significant distress  
198 before distribution of masks was widespread. One participant mentioned that correctional officers were  
199 prioritized to receive masks before residents:

200  
201 At first everybody, they was panicking. They didn't know what to do. You know, eventually they  
202 started getting it from the higher uppers, and then they started like giving us masks. The officers  
203 had masks before we did.

204  
205 Other participants received masks, either when being apprehended or after they arrived at jail intake.  
206 However, one participant noted they received a mask once and no more were received during the  
207 participant's stay at the correctional facility:

208



209           They gave me a mask as they were arresting me. I was in handcuffs... *And they didn't give you*  
210           *another mask after that?...* No.

211  
212       Reported experiences suggested some facilities placed people in quarantine for 2 weeks after intake.  
213       Other jails did not sustain entry cohort quarantining for the full SARS-CoV-2 incubation period  
214       recommended at the time. Instead, participants were separated for the first 3 days with others that  
215       entered the facility at the same time. After 3 days, they were issued jail uniforms and sent to general  
216       population.

217  
218           As soon as I went in the door it was the early state of the pandemic. They put me on lockdown....  
219           Like they put me in lockdown, so I didn't have to be around nobody, no nothing. No nothing.  
220           Because it was coronavirus –

221  
222       In some jails infected persons were not removed from the exposed. Participants reported that  
223       ‘quarantine’ in these facilities consisted of keeping the residents of a housing unit together as one cohort,  
224       with a mix of infected and exposed individuals, to which no others were added. Only if a person was  
225       unstable were they removed:

226  
227           ... So once he finally like fell out, that's when they had let him out of the [block] – somebody had  
228           came and got him.

229  
230       Some participants stated they felt the care they received while in isolation and quarantine was  
231       inadequate. Quarantine resembled punitive solitary confinement, without an effort to cohort individuals  
232       by infection status or similar exposure.

233

234 [They] just kept me in my room...some food. I was dying of thirst [during] lockdown. They didn't  
235 even put me around people.

236

237 Other participants mentioned it felt like a normal housing assignment to be in a quarantined cell block,  
238 just as if they were moved from one general housing unit to another.

239

240 I mean, like where I was quarantined at it didn't feel like a punishment. It just felt like, alright,  
241 now I'm in a new pod, and I've just got to meet new people now.

242

243 *Experiences with COVID-19 vaccine*

244 Attitudes towards vaccines were divided; some opted out of vaccination when offered and others were  
245 not in jail when vaccines became available but decided to pursue vaccination in the outside community.

246 You got to have it. I'm telling you. I watch the news.

247

248 Y'all, I have took the vaccine. Personally, I did not care for it, but I took it [outside]... Because ...  
249 health is my wealth, personally.

250

251 Some participants reported hesitancy toward the COVID-19 vaccine. Reasons for vaccine hesitancy  
252 included mistrust in the speed of vaccine production, concern that vaccine-related protection was not  
253 adequate, and belief in divine protection:

254

255 How they come up with a vaccine in one year – How they going to come up with a vaccine in one  
256 year and now in one month they come up with something 12 under?

257

258 They did at one point offer us vaccines. I specifically didn't take it because I've got my own views  
259 on it. I wouldn't see why – I'm trying to avoid this. Why would I put it in my body? And then on  
260 top of that, people still die with it, and just having the vaccine only lessens the symptoms.

261

262 I ain't getting the vaccine... you feel me? I don't put nobody above but the man up above because  
263 I'm protected by Him.

264

265 Attitudes toward nasal self-collection for COVID-19 testing

266 Attitudes toward nasal self-collection were generally positive. Reasons participants thought self-collection  
267 was advantageous varied, but most centered around allowing a person to test themselves, which may for  
268 some be empowering.

269

270 I mean, I think it'll definitely help... There'll be obvious draw backs, but like still at the same time  
271 I feel like if you put it in somebody's hands it'll make them make that decision for themselves. Like  
272 it'll make the people who are responsible more comfortable doing it.

273

274 One participant also noted that system-wide nasal self-collection represented an opportunity for  
275 correctional officers and incarcerated persons to take action that would protect each other's safety.

276

277 The common denominator with both detainees and jail staff is both are in the facility for a period  
278 of time, and you know, the health hazards of catching COVID. So, you know, I mean, possibly death  
279 or a hospitalization or whatever...coming together collectively.

280

281 Nasal self-collection was also viewed to be acceptable due to the shallower depth the swab needs to be  
282 inserted into the nostril.

283

284 Yeah, because you know how far to go up in your own nose compared to somebody else. I think  
285 that would be better.

286

287 The other thing, it's more like it's going up your brain. Like it's like in your eyeballs or something.

288

289 Additional participants stated there could be harms associated with the particular nasal self-collection kit  
290 proposed for COVID-19 testing. They thought the device could not be weaponized, but, there could be a  
291 possibility of storing small amounts of substances (drugs) or small objects in the device.

292

293 *Looking at the device, do you think someone could do harm with it, turn it into a weapon, store*  
294 *something in it?*

295 ... Store something in it, yeah.

296

297 While attitudes toward nasal self-collection were mixed, some expressed that additional education and  
298 incentives would increase participation.

299

300 I would do it say if you – for the month, if you do it for the four weeks, at the fourth week we'll  
301 give a store bag, a \$5 store bag. So now you got people to do it for four weeks.

302

303 *Acceptability of wastewater testing*

304

305 Participants were shown a video on WBS prior to discussion about the method. Initial participant  
306 responses indicated a lack of understanding of WBS and study staff spent considerable time with verbal  
307 explanations regarding the concept of using wastewater to test for COVID-19. Specifically, the participants  
308 had difficulty understanding what constituted wastewater collection.

309

310 Group members expressed concern about wastewater generally. In Atlanta’s local jails and elsewhere, the  
311 sink and toilet are joined in a single unit. The participants who had been in the correctional facilities  
312 articulated that both use the same source of water, meaning the wastewater, especially since the water  
313 reportedly had an unpleasant taste.

314 After the facilitator addressed knowledge gaps and the participants had a better understanding of  
315 wastewater surveillance, many had expressed a positive attitude toward it. Participants thought  
316 wastewater testing was an attractive surveillance method for COVID-19. Wastewater was generally  
317 endorsed, especially the combination of wastewater and self-testing. Wastewater testing would be  
318 beneficial, easy, and feasible.

319

320 *So then do you think that will work since it will help them maybe target their testing to one specific*  
321 *area? ... 1,000%.*

322

323 Because they can pinpoint whose pod is this coming from. It’ll be easier, and then they can just  
324 give the test, and then it would – they get taken for quarantine and try to treat them.

325

326 It would be an easy process. It could help more people.

327

328 It's like definitely less time consuming, like for sure. And then it's just one surefire way of another  
329 like, okay, every two weeks – if we do this every two weeks like this is the results we're getting.  
330 There's no like other barriers or like – you get what I'm saying? Everybody has the bowel  
331 movements, so you know, -- Yeah.

332

### 333 **Discussion**

334 Our study with individuals who had recently been incarcerated during the COVID-19 pandemic revealed  
335 important themes on mitigation measures and COVID-19 testing and surveillance. Participants had been  
336 incarcerated in multiple facilities and in discussing protocols for masking, isolation, and quarantine, many  
337 participants reported deviations from CDC recommendations, such as quarantining for periods shorter  
338 than specified in the CDC guidance for the time period and difficulties accessing tests if asymptomatic.  
339 Absence of interventions for COVID-19 management early in the epidemic that communicated that their  
340 health was a priority seemed to be at the heart of many themes that emerged. Participants also reported  
341 a lack of confidence regarding vaccine development and its purpose, leading to vaccine hesitancy, which  
342 has been reported in other studies.(20)

343

344 There was an overall acceptance of nasal self-collection as a strategy to control COVID-19 within  
345 correctional facilities. Overall, the specimen collection using the SteriPack kit was perceived to be  
346 convenient and acceptable. Individual autonomy, convenience and confidentiality are all advantages of  
347 self-collection of samples for diagnostic testing,(21) as has been previously demonstrated in jail-based  
348 sexually transmitted infection management programs.(22) Indeed, empowerment of the person through  
349 self-testing emerged as a theme in our study.

350


351 Surveillance via measuring virus in wastewater was a challenging concept for participants to understand,  
352 given they lacked background in this area and the video introduction was short. The term “wastewater”

353 generated confusion. The use of a joint sink-and-toilet configuration in a number of jails (**Figure 1**) may  
354 explain why some participants indicated that they believed “wastewater” was what flowed from the  
355 faucet of the combination fixture. The focus group leader clarified after the video that wastewater was  
356 sewer output and reiterated its meaning in subsequent groups.

357

358

359



360

361

362 **Figure 1.** Combined sink-and-toilet. Source: Photograph of author (23)

363

364

365 Despite the information that was gathered from our focus groups, the study had limitations. We  
366 conducted this study in just one city, Atlanta, Georgia, although subjects had been incarcerated at many  
367 institutions across the state, and also an out-of-state jail. Nonetheless, one study location limits the

368 generalizability of our findings as experiences could vary between counties and states. A second limitation  
369 was the short recruitment period of one month because of the urgency of addressing COVID-19. Either a  
370 longer recruitment period, more focus groups, or both would have led to a larger sample size. The number  
371 of our study subjects was too small to perform deeper analyses such as identify themes by sex, age, and  
372 other key demographic features. A more diverse array of experiences and identities would have increased  
373 the generalizability of the study as it would apply to a wider population.

374

375 Other limitations included recruiting persons formerly detained and incarcerated, rather than currently  
376 in a jail. Because of the lengthy process in obtaining IRB approval for involving currently incarcerated  
377 persons in research, this decision was made for expediency, but opinions of a person during and after  
378 detainment could conceivably change. Also, persons willing to speak with an investigator team may have  
379 had less diverse opinions than those borne by a complete cross-section of persons released, thus  
380 introducing bias. Lastly, because of the ongoing COVID-19 epidemic, participants wore masks and the  
381 interview room doors were left open. This introduced ambient background noise, leading to challenges  
382 with acoustics; difficulties hearing one another created problems with sustaining conversations.

383

384 This study demonstrates the dividends gained when including justice-involved individuals in the decision-  
385 making process regarding interventions for this population. Their input can address factors that could  
386 improve the mitigation strategy acceptability. Regarding WBS and self-collection of nasal specimens,  
387 their input taught us lessons such as the need to explain clearly what wastewater represents. Among  
388 the most compelling findings was the potentially self-empowering role of nasal self-collection. While  
389 incarcerated persons seldom have a chance to contribute to decision-making in matters of correctional  
390 health, we aspired to address this power imbalance with this present research project.

391



392 **Conclusion**

393 We sensed that subjects in this qualitative study found a strategy of pairing wastewater surveillance for  
394 SARS-CoV-2 with self-collection of viral specimens acceptable. We thus proceeded with a project based  
395 on nasal-self collection and wastewater monitoring for COVID-19 at Fulton County Jail soon after the  
396 conclusion of the study, in October 2021.

397

398 **Acknowledgments**

399 We would like to thank the staff members of the center that hosted and facilitated a space for the focus  
400 groups, and the subjects for their participation.

401

402

403

404 **FUNDING:** This project was funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (INV035562)

405 **References:**

- 406 1. Saloner B, Parish K, Ward JA, DiLaura G, Dolovich S. COVID-19 cases and deaths in  
407 federal and state prisons. *Jama*. 2020;324(6):602-3.
- 408 2. UCLA COVID behind bars project. <https://uclacovidbehindbars.org/>. Accessed 6 January  
409 2022.
- 410 3. Hawks L, Woolhandler S, McCormick D. COVID-19 in Prisons and Jails in the United  
411 States. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2020;180(8):1041-2.
- 412 4. Interim Guidance on Management of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in  
413 Correctional and Detention Facilities. URL: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-  
414 ncov/community/correction-detention/guidance-correctional-detention.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/correction-detention/guidance-correctional-detention.html) Accessed 12  
415 February 2022.
- 416 5. Herring T, M S. States of Emergency: The failure of prison system responses to COVID-  
417 19. Available: [https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/states\\_of\\_emergency.html](https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/states_of_emergency.html) Accessed 13  
418 August 2022. 2021.
- 419 6. Epting ME, Pluznik JA, Levano S, Hua X, Fung CH, Jordan B, et al. Aiming forZero:  
420 Reducing Transmission of COVID-19 in the D.C. Department of Corrections. Under review.
- 421 7. Metcalf T, Melnick J, Estes M. Environmental virology: from detection of virus in  
422 sewage and water by isolation to identification by molecular biology-a trip of over 50 years.  
423 *Annual review of microbiology*. 1995;49:461-88.
- 424 8. Toze S. PCR and the detection of microbial pathogens in water and wastewater. *Water*  
425 *Research*. 1999;33(17):3545-56.
- 426 9. Erlich HA, Gelfand D, Sninsky JJ. Recent advances in the polymerase chain reaction.  
427 *Science*. 1991;252(5013):1643-51.
- 428 10. Hellmér M, Paxéus N, Magnius L, Enache L, Arnholm B, Johansson A, et al. Detection  
429 of pathogenic viruses in sewage provided early warnings of hepatitis A virus and norovirus  
430 outbreaks. *Applied and environmental microbiology*. 2014;80(21):6771-81.
- 431 11. Wang Y, Liu P, Zhang H, Ibaraki M, VanTassell J, Geith K, et al. Early warning of a  
432 COVID-19 surge on a university campus based on wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 at  
433 residence halls. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2022;821:153291.
- 434 12. Pope A, Vanchieri C, Gostin LO. Ethical considerations for research involving prisoners.  
435 2007.
- 436 13. Gostin LO. Biomedical research involving prisoners: ethical values and legal regulation.  
437 *Jama*. 2007;297(7):737-40.
- 438 14. Riback LR, Akiyama M, Spaulding AC. qualitative study preprint-- informants  
439 incarcerated during COVID.
- 440 15. Vindrola-Padros C, Johnson GA. Rapid Techniques in Qualitative Research: A Critical  
441 Review of the Literature 2020;30:1596-604. *Qualitative health research*. 2020;30:1596-604.
- 442 16. Burgess-Allen J, Owen-Smith V. Using mind mapping techniques for rapid qualitative  
443 data analysis in public participation processes. *Health expectations: an international journal of*  
444 *public participation in health care and health policy* 2010;13:406-15.
- 445 17. Gale RC, Wu J, Erhardt T, Bounthavong M, Reardon CM, Damschroder LJ, et al.  
446 Comparison of rapid vs in-depth qualitative analytic methods from a process evaluation of  
447 academic detailing in the Veterans Health Administration. *Implementation Science*.  
448 2019;14(1):1-12.

- 449 18. McMullen CK, Ash J, Sittig D, Bunce A, Guappone K, Dykstra R, et al. Rapid  
450 assessment of clinical information systems in the healthcare setting: an efficient method for time-  
451 pressed evaluation. *Methods of information in medicine*. 2011;50(4):299.
- 452 19. Taylor B, Henshall C, Kenyon S, Litchfield I, Greenfield S. Can rapid approaches to  
453 qualitative analysis deliver timely, valid findings to clinical leaders? A mixed methods study  
454 comparing rapid and thematic analysis. *BMJ open*. 2018;8(10):e019993.
- 455 20. Geana MV, Anderson S, Ramaswamy M. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among women  
456 leaving jails: A qualitative study. *Public Health Nursing*. 2021;38(5):892-6.
- 457 21. Ogale Y, Yeh PT, Kennedy CE, Toskin I, Narasimhan M. Self-collection of samples as  
458 an additional approach to deliver testing services for sexually transmitted infections: a systematic  
459 review and meta-analysis. *BMJ global health*. 2019;4(2):e001349.
- 460 22. Newman SB, Nelson MB, Gaydos CA, Friedman HB. Female prisoners' preferences of  
461 collection methods for testing for *Chlamydia trachomatis* and *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* infection.  
462 *Sexually transmitted diseases*. 2003;30(4):306-9.
- 463 23. Graham SE, Clarke SL, Wu KH, Kanoni S, Zajac GJM, Ramdas S, et al. The power of  
464 genetic diversity in genome-wide association studies of lipids. *Nature*. 2021;600(7890):675-9.

465