Simultaneous detection and quantification of multiple enteric pathogen targets in wastewater

Gouthami Rao[1], Drew Capone[2], Kevin Zhu[1], Abigail Knoble[1], Yarrow Linden[1], Ryan Clark[1], Amanda Lai[1], Juhee Kim[3], Ching-Hua Huang[3], Aaron Bivins[4], Joe Brown[1]

[1] Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings School of Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA.

[2] Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, School of Public Health, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

[3] School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA

[4] Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

*Corresponding author: Joe Brown, [1]Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. CB7431 Rosenau Hall, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7431, USA. Tel: +1 919 360 8752. Email: joebrown@unc.edu

Keywords: wastewater surveillance, multiplex, pathogen detection

Abstract:

Wastewater-based epidemiology has emerged as a critical tool for public health surveillance, building on decades of environmental surveillance work for pathogens such as poliovirus. Work to date has been limited to monitoring a single pathogen or small numbers of pathogens in targeted studies; however, simultaneous analysis of a wide variety of pathogens would greatly increase the utility of wastewater surveillance. We developed a novel quantitative multi-pathogen surveillance approach (33 pathogen targets including bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and helminths) using TaqMan Array Cards (RT-qPCR) and

applied the method on concentrated wastewater samples collected at four wastewater treatment plants in Atlanta, GA from February to October of 2020. From sewersheds serving approximately 2 million people, we detected a wide range of targets including many we expected to find in wastewater (e.g., enterotoxigenic *E. coli* and *Giardia* in 97% of 29 samples at stable concentrations) as well as unexpected targets including *Strongyloides stercolaris* (i.e., human threadworm, a neglected tropical disease rarely observed in clinical settings in the USA). Other notable detections included SARS-CoV-2, but also several pathogen targets that are not commonly included in wastewater surveillance like *Acanthamoeba* spp., *Balantidium coli*, *Entamoeba histolytica*, astrovirus, norovirus, and sapovirus. Our data suggest broad utility in expanding the scope of enteric pathogen surveillance in wastewaters, with potential for application in a variety of settings where pathogen quantification in fecal waste streams can inform public health surveillance and selection of control measures to limit infections.

Introduction

Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) incorporates a range of tools intended to complement traditional public health surveillance, optimally providing timely and actionable data on pathogens circulating in populations of interest. Historically, wastewater monitoring has been used as a surveillance tool for individual pathogens including poliovirus[1,2], hepatitis A[3], *Vibrio cholerae*[4], *Salmonella enterica* serotype Typhi [5] as well as for chemical analytes (e.g., drug use) [6]. This strategy has gained global prominence in detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater[7–9], specifically focusing on community prevalence[7][10][11], apparent trends in infections over time and space[12], and emerging variants[13,14]. Advantages and limitations of wastewater as a surveillance matrix have been widely discussed since 2020[15–17].

Expanding wastewater monitoring efforts to include and screen multiple pathogens or variants could maximize the potential of using wastewater as a valuable tool. A tool to better understand the possibility of emerging pathogens or circulating strains in a particular population. The need to expand wastewater monitoring to screen multiple pathogens or variants is a valuable tool to better understand the possibility

of emerging pathogens or circulating strains in a particular population. A tool for the simultaneous detection of a broad range of pathogens quickly and accurately could be used for screening followed by confirmatory testing with more sensitive methods. Emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases[18] – including those with pandemic potential[19] – represent ongoing risks to society, and wastewater surveillance can fill critical gaps in data to inform public health responses[20].

Based on the demonstrated potential for WBE to complement traditional diagnostic public health surveillance for a diverse array of pathogens, we developed a customized multi-parallel molecular surveillance tool for simultaneous detection and quantification of 33 common pathogenic bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and helminths in wastewater. Such approaches can expand the existing WBE platform by screening for many more pathogens – including rare or emerging microbes of interest – enhancing monitoring to inform public health response. We demonstrate the utility of this method in an analysis of primary influent samples from four wastewater treatment plants in metro Atlanta, Georgia, USA.

Materials & Methods

Sample Collection

We collected one-liter primary influent grab samples (n=30) in HDPE plastic bottles from four wastewater treatment plants (anonymized as WWTP A, B, C, D) in Atlanta, GA between March 20th, 2020 - November 5th, 2020 between 9:30 AM—11 AM. Flow values from the WWTPs ranged from 14 – 80.2 million gallons per day. All samples were transferred to the laboratory on ice and stored at -80°C until further processing was completed. Initial sample processing began on November 8th, 2021. Frozen samples were thawed in a 5L bucket of water located in a 4°C walk-in fridge for up to 3 days or until thawed. Samples were then recorded for temperature and pH, and a 50 mL aliquot was taken for total suspended solids measurements (Table S1). Each 1L sample was spiked with 10 µL of Calf-Guard (Zoetis) resuspended vaccine, containing attenuated bovine coronavirus (BCoV), and 10 µL of MS2 (10^5/µL), which served as the process recovery controls. A 1:100 ratio of 5% Tween 20 solution was

added to the sample bottle. A graduated 1L bottle was used as a reference for the total volume in each sample bottle. Samples were mixed by inverting the bottle 3-4 times. A subset of samples (n=4) were processed using three different methods to establish a reasonable workflow for the larger scale demonstration: (1) direct extraction, (2) InnovaPrep Concentrating Pipette (CP) Select, and (3) skim milk flocculation (SMF).

Sample Processing

Direct Extraction

We directly extracted 200 µL of wastewater influent into the DNeasy PowerSoil Pro Manual extraction kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germay).

InnovaPrep Concentrating Pipette

150 mL from the wastewater influent sample was transferred into a 500 mL conical centrifuge tube. Samples were centrifuged for 20 minutes at 4800 x g. The 500 mL conical tube was placed under the CP Select, and the fluidics head lowered into the sample. The sample was filtered using a 0.05 µm unirradiated hollow-fiber CP tip and eluted using the InnovaPrep FluidPrep Tris elution canister. Processing times and eluted volumes were recorded. For each day samples were run, one negative control consisting of 100 mL of DI water was also filtered and processed.

Skim Milk Flocculation

With the remaining wastewater sample, we proceeded to use the SMF method[22]. We combined 1 mL of a 5% skimmed milk solution per 100 mL of wastewater sample and adjusted the pH of the skimmed-milk-wastewater solution between 3.0 – 4.0 using 1M HCl. Samples were placed on a shaker plate at room temperature (20-25°C) at 200 RPM for two hours. After shaking, samples were centrifuged at 3500 x g at 4°C for 30 minutes. The supernatant was discarded and the pellet was archived at -80°C until batch extractions were complete within one week.

A subset of 4 samples were directly extracted and the TAC results from CP, SMF, and the direct extractions were compared to determine an optimal concentration method prior to full scale downstream processing. Additional details can be found in **Table S2**. In the methods trial, SMF resulted in greater number of pathogen detections and was therefore used for the subsequent full-scale analyses. In the SMF workflow, skim milk pellets were processed for RNA using the Qiagen DNeasy PowerSoil Pro manual extraction kit. One extraction blank was run using nuclease-free water for each batch of sample extractions. Extracts were placed in the -80°C freezer until RT-qPCR or dPCR processing followed within one week. Skim milk pellets were run on TAC with 7% in duplicate. All CP eluants were extracted for RNA using Qiagen AllPrep PowerViral manual kits following manufacturer instructions to be further processed using digital PCR (dPCR). CP and dPCR were used for process controls and fecal indicators in the full-scale analyses.

Molecular Analysis

Two PCR platforms were used to process extracts, the first was an RT-qPCR QuantStudio (QS) 7 Flex (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) and the second a dPCR QIAcuity Four (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). All skim milk pellets were analyzed using the QS7 Flex. The QS7 works in conjunction with a custom TaqMan Array Card (TAC), which is prespecified with lyophilized primers and probes for 33 enteric pathogen targets (see Table S3). Cq values < 40 were considered positive for the target and confirmed through clear amplification signals in the amplification and multicomponent plots. Additional MIQE details are found in Table S12. All CP eluant samples were analyzed using the digital PCR QIAcuity Four platform (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). On the dPCR platform previously designed and optimized multiplex assays were used for bovine coronavirus (BCoV), pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV), and human mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA)[23] (see Table S4 and Text S1). Gene copy concentration results for PMMoV and mtDNA were used as normalization markers for the TAC pathogen data.

Data Analysis

All project data are available here: https://osf.io/rg36f/. When multiple gene targets for a single microbial taxon was detected, we used the highest concentration gene target to calculate summary statistics and supported figures. We used R Studio version 4.2.1 to complete all data cleaning, analyses and generate graphs. Effective volumes (EV) were calculated using the following equation:

$$EV = \frac{\mu L\ RNA\ template}{PCR\ rxn} * \frac{\mu L\ pellet\ into\ extraction}{\mu L\ extraction\ eluate} * \frac{mL\ WW\ volume\ into\ SMF}{\mu L\ concentrated\ pellet}$$

The 95% LODs were calculated for each assay using probit models[24]. We translated these 95% analytical LODs (aLODs) into a 95% matrix LOD (mLOD) using the following equation and the previously calculated effective volumes for SMF:

$$mLOD = \frac{1}{EV}(aLOD)$$

Results

TAC results were generated using skim milk pellets extracted by the PowerSoil Pro Manual kit to process the influent samples. The average SMF pellet was 2.2 mL and the average wastewater influent processed for SMF was 688 mL. Supplemental data on any other method performed (direct extraction or InnovaPrep CP pellet) is provided in Table S2 and Figure S2.

Enteric Pathogen Measurement by Skim Milk Flocculation

The $\log_{10}$-transformed gene copy concentrations by pathogen class and specific enteric pathogen (Figure 1) demonstrates the wide range of pathogens detected in Atlanta wastewater influent (n=30). Enteric bacteria, specifically enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC), were detected most frequently and at higher gene copy concentrations compared to helminths and viruses. Notable protozoan detections were *Acanthamoeba* spp. (28/30), *Balantidium coli* (29/30), *Entamoeba* spp. (29/30), and *Giardia* spp. (29/30). While virus detections were relatively lower than protozoan detections, astrovirus (26/30), norovirus

147 GI/GII (28/30), and sapovirus (7/30) were detected in the processed samples. Additional comparison of
148 prevalence of pathogens by wastewater treatment plant are detailed in Table 2 with Plant C representing
149 the most samples processed (n=21). Figure S3 demonstrates the $\log_{10}$ gene copies per liter of wastewater
150 influent stratified by gene targets. Interestingly, with the CP samples we detected *Strongyloides*
151 *stercolaris* in one wastewater sample (Figure S2 and Table S5).



152

153 Figure 1. Log_{10} concentrations of enteric pathogens per liter of wastewater influent using the SMF method
154 and PowerSoil Pro Manual extraction.

155

156 Of the SMF samples, the bacterial targets of highest concentration were ETEC and enteropathogenic *E.*
157 *coli* (EPEC - atypical), whereas viral targets were mainly astrovirus and norovirus GI/GII. Somewhat
158 unexpected protozoan targets detected were *Cyclospora cayetanensi* (3/30) and *Entamoeba histolytica*
159 (6/30). Both *Cryptosporidium* spp. and *Giardia* spp. were detected at means of 5.0 $\log_{10}$ and 6.5 $\log_{10}$,
160 respectively. Of the total samples, we detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in 50% of samples (n=15) at
161 concentrations between 3.0 $\log_{10}$—6.0 $\log_{10}$ gene copies per liter of wastewater influent.
162 Table 2. Prevalence of pathogens [n by column (%)] detected in wastewater influent from four treatment
163 plants in Atlanta, Georgia – using SMF method

TARGET	WW Plant A (n=3)	WW Plant B (n=4)	WW Plant C (n=20)	WW Plant D (n=3)
***Acanthamoeba* spp.**	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	19 (95%)	3 (100%)
Ancylostoma duodenale	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
Ascaris lumbricoides	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
astrovirus	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	19 (95%)	2 (67%)
Balantidium coli	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
***Blastocystis* spp.**	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
Campylobacter jejuni/coli	- (0)	1 (25%)	11 (55%)	- (0)
Clostridium difficile	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	15 (75%)	3 (100%)
***Cryptosporidium* spp.**	- (0)	- (0)	8 (40%)	- (0)
Cyclospora cayetanensi	- (0)	- (0)	3 (15%)	- (0)
Cystoisospora belli	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
***E. coli* O157:H7**	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	19 (95%)	3 (100%)
EAEC*	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
Encephalitozoon intestinalis	3 (100%)	1 (25%)	13 (65%)	3 (100%)
Entamoeba histolytica	- (0)	- (0)	6 (30%)	- (0)
***Entamoeba* spp.**	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
Enterobius vermicularis	0% (0)	0% (0)	3 (15%)	- (0)
Enterocytozoon bieneusi	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	75% (12)	1 (33%)
EPEC (atypical)†	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
EPEC (typical)†	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
ETEC*	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
***Giardia* spp.**	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
Helicobacter pylori	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
Hymenolepis nana	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
Necator americanus	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
norovirus GI/GII*	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
Plesiomonas shigelloides	2 (67%)	0% (0)	10 (50%)	2 (67%)
rotavirus	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	15 (75%)	3 (100%)

***Salmonella* spp.**	3 (100%)	1 (25%)	18 (90%)	2 (67%)
sapovirus*	0% (0)	0% (0)	5 (25%)	2 (67%)
SARS-CoV-2	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	9 (45%)	1 (33%)
***Shigella*/EIEC†**	2 (67%)	0% (0)	19 (95%)	3 (100%)
STEC*	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)
Strongyloides stercolaris	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
Trichuris trichiura	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)	- (0)
Yersinia enterocolitica	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	20 (100%)	3 (100%)

*Enteroaggregative *E. coli* (EAEC) combined gene targets aatA and aaiC; enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC) combined targets from gene LT, STh, and STp; norovirus included GI and GII targets; sapovirus combined gene targets for I, II, IV, and V; shiga toxin-producing *E. coli* (STEC) combined gene targets stx1 and stx2.

†Enteropathogenic *E. coli* (EPEC); enteroinvasive *E. coli* (EIEC)

dPCR for Concentrating Pipette and normalization markers

A total of n=30 CP samples were processed for PMMoV, mtDNA, and BCoV. Figure 2 demonstrates the $\log_{10}$ gene copies per liter of wastewater influent and indicates PMMoV concentrations exceed mtDNA concentrations. The average concentrations for BCoV dPCR reactions was 43.3 gc/µL, PMMoV was 1602 gc/µL, and mtDNA was 4.33 gc/µL. The average concentrations of $\log_{10}$ gene copies/liter per reaction of wastewater was 5.2×10^4 for mtDNA and 1.9×10^7 for PMMoV. All positive controls and non-template controls performed without suspicion and additional details on control performance is included in Text S2 and in the dMIQE checklist (Table S11).



Figure 2. Log_{10} gene copies per liter of wastewater influent using the InnovaPrep Concentrating Pipette (CP) method. The dashed line represents the limit of detection when calculated as 3 partitions out of the total valid partitions. Figure includes all technical replicates per sample.

Pathogen concentrations normalized by mtDNA and PMMoV

Quantitative log_{10} gene copies per liter of wastewater influent before (Table S6) and after normalization (Tables S7-8), with mtDNA normalization resulting in overall higher log_{10} ratios. Between Figures 3 and 4, we note a considerably smaller ratio when using PMMoV normalization over mtDNA. These concentrations are caused by increased PMMoV concentrations in wastewater influent compared to mtDNA concentrations.



189

190 Figure 3. Pathogen data normalized by mtDNA. The dashed line represents where pathogen and

191 normalizer count are equivalent. Figure includes all technical replicates per sample for mtDNA marker.

192

193



194

195 Figure 4. Pathogen data normalized by PMMoV. The dashed line represents where pathogen and

196 normalizer count are equivalent. Figure includes all technical replicates per sample for PMMoV marker.

197 *TAC Performance Interpretation*

198 Standard Curves

The standard curves for this custom TAC included two assays (Adenovirus 40/41 and Hepatitis A) with poor standard curve performances and therefore were excluded from all analyses. Of the remaining 40 enteric targets, the DNA control was phocine herpes virus and RNA control was MS2. For performance metrics (Table S9), reasonable linearity was detected for all included assays with an average R^2 value of 0.997 across all assays with the lowest R^2 of 0.967 for STEC (stx2) and the highest R^2 of 1 for *Acanthamoeba* spp., *Balantidium coli*, *E. coli* O157:H7, *Giardia* spp., *Plesiomonas shigelloides*, *Salmonella* spp., and STEC (stx1). The lowest efficiency assay was Astrovirus at 87% while the highest was *Entamoeba* spp. at 104%.

Effective Volume

The effective volume, which does not account for recovery efficiency, is calculated as the proportion of original wastewater sample assayed in a single qPCR reaction. The effective analyzed wastewater volume for InnovaPrep CP was 0.155 mL (SD 0.0605) per reaction and SMF was 0.410 mL of wastewater per reaction (SD 0.121).

Limit of Detection and matrix LOD

The 95% analytical limit of detection (aLOD) was calculated for each assay in Table S9, reported as gene copies per reaction. The lowest detectable target as Cryptosporidium spp. at 0.6 gene copies per reaction and the highest as 291 gene copies per reaction for ETEC (LT), followed by 96 gene copies per reaction for STEC (stx2).

A comprehensive mLOD table for each assay indicates the gene copy per mL of sewage is found in **Table S10** and includes the minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviations, standard error, and confidence intervals. These results indicate average gene copies per mL of wastewater influent as low as 1.591 for Cryptosporidium spp. and 16S marker or as high as 264.668 gc/mL for ETEC (LT & ST). SARS-CoV-2 mLOD was 16.44 gc/mL influent.

Inhibition

We used MS2 as the extraction control and the average Cq for negative extraction controls (n=7) was 17.8 gene copies per reaction [confidence interval 0.821], whereas all SMP samples (n=30) had an average Cq of 19.3 gene copies per reaction [CI 2.04]. With a Cq difference of 1.5, we can reasonably conclude inhibition was not a major issue with our sample matrix since samples and controls had Cq difference less than 2.

Discussion

Wastewater surveillance sampling, processing, storage, and analysis methods have advanced rapidly since the emergence of SARS-CoV-2. Most studies have examined primary influent[25,26] and solids[27,28]. Sampling methods have also varied from grab, composite, and more recently passive techniques[29]. In addition to testing different matrices, many laboratories have implemented various methods to concentrate SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater using ultracentrifugation, polyethylene glycol precipitation, electronegative membrane filtration, and ultrafiltration[22,30], but few have considered a concentration step followed by a simultaneous, multi-parallel quantitative assay or multiple pathogen detection assays. The possibility of high-plex, high throughput platforms are of particular interest to stakeholders looking to expand wastewater monitoring nationally in the US and abroad. For example, the CDC has expanded upon the previously single-plex N1 assay for SARS-CoV-2 to include influenza A and/or B for increased testing capacity.[31]

TAC vs qPCR comparisons

We compared our traditional metrics such as R^2 trends of standard curves and found that our TAC results are within a reasonable R^2 range for almost all assays (R^2>0.96), except for two explicitly excluded due to poor standard curve performance. Our 95% LODs calculated also indicate a broad range of analytical sensitivities across all pathogen targets. With the lowest detections at 0.6 gene copies per reaction, we also have targets on the higher end of 291 gene copies per reaction for ETEC. While other studies indicate a loss of sensitivity when using TAC, there was still an 89% detection rate compared to single-plex assays run.[32]

Prevalence of bacteria, protozoan, and viral targets

Our qPCR data indicated 10^4-10^6 gene copies per liter for SARS-CoV-2 prior to normalization efforts, which is comparable to other studies [33]. Researchers had previously detected *Giardia duodenale*., *Cryptosporidium* spp., and *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* at 82.6%, 56.2% and 87.6%, in combined sewer overflows (CSO) around China.[34] These molecular surveillance findings were also similar to ours at 97% (n=29/30) for *Giardia* spp., not specifically *Giardia duodenale,* and 27% (n=8/30) for *Cryptosporidium* spp., and 53% (n=16/30) for *E. bieneusi*. While we detected *Strongyloides stercolaris*, we cannot interpret viability concerns; however, since the preferred host is humans it is possible this detection was a real and rare example of detecting the unexpected. Recent evidence does suggest that *Strongyloides stercolaris* antibodies remain endemic in some rural communities.[35] For the CP samples, we also had a rare detection of *Helicobacter pylori* (n=1/28) *and Hymelopis nana* (n=3/28) from the same WWTP.

Groundwater and runoff can intrude into wastewater collection systems through inflow and infiltration (I&I), which may be relevant for fungi and a possibility for other microbial species to mix with wastewater flows.[36] Other potential explanations of sources into wastewater may include animal waste, commercial and/or industrial waste. These influent flows and their sources are difficult to determine, but routine surveillance – including with the addition of source-tracking – may provide additional insight into influent pathogens, their possible origins, and their utility in understanding infection transmission and control in the sewershed.

Value of multiple detections on TAC

Multi-parallel detection of pathogens of interest using TAC can be helpful in long-term surveillance or monitoring of pathogens, including in rapid screening programs or where numerous pathogens may be of interest. Apart from known, emerging, or suspected pathogens, antimicrobial resistance genes or other PCR-detectable targets of public health relevance can be included in TAC design. One key premise of wastewater-based epidemiology and monitoring is the potential value of using the method as an early

detection for the onset of a potential outbreak, yet most detection methods have a needle in a haystack approach versus a wider screening that could be especially applicable to state health departments or in routine monitoring.

The customizability of TAC has proven useful in other applications such as surveillance of respiratory illness[37][38], acute-febrile illness for outbreak or surveillance purposes[39], and to improve etiological detection of difficult neonatal infectious diseases for low-resource clinical settings.[40] Some studies have focused on applications of combining nucleic acid detection with quantitative microbial risk assessments[41], but none have considered such a broad set of applications to wastewater monitoring and surveillance, although some have applied these methods qualitatively on fecal sludge samples[21,42]. It is possible to create a multiplex assay for digital PCR, the leading technology for wastewater monitoring, for up to five different genes, but no other platform provides quantitative data on up to 48 gene targets during a single experimental run.

TAC methods can fill a critical gap in existing molecular monitoring tools. As a method yielding quantitative estimates of potentially dozens of targets, it offers complementary advantages over emerging digital PCR platforms (greater sensitivity and lower limits of quantification, but fewer targets) and sequencing methods (many more targets, but high limits of detection and generally not quantitative). TAC should be considered where targets are present in high numbers – like in wastewaters and fecal sludges – and where many pathogens are of interest.

The application of improved methods for the detection and quantification of enteric pathogens in wastewater, in addition to other enteric pathogens of interest, can then be translated into relevant intervention efforts. As SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in wastewater reaches scale [7,25,43], detection and quantification of other pathogens has been proposed. Researchers have expanded on wastewater monitoring to focus increased surveillance on other respiratory viruses such as human influenza and rhinovirus[44], norovirus[45], or as an outbreak detection tool for influenza,[46] and are also considering other emerging infections such as monkeypox.[47]

299

300 *Value of sensitivity of dPCR*

301 The current and suggested methodology to process wastewater samples using a molecular platform is
302 digital PCR due to its low limit of detection and quantification. While these efforts make sense to
303 consider when focused on one particular pathogen, it is not as feasible and consumes several resources if
304 considering a truly practical monitoring system for wastewater. Time, technical staff labor and resources
305 are always a challenge for laboratories and especially public health laboratories that have been tasked
306 with monitoring wastewater for SARS-CoV-2. We can expect enteric targets to be present in wastewater,
307 but to further identify which enteric pathogens are present and their concentrations with respect to each
308 other would be a useful application towards building a wastewater monitoring system.

309 While SARS-CoV-2 was detected through TAC, we were also interested in detecting additionally relevant
310 targets, including BCoV, PMMoV, and mtDNA, which were not previously included on the TAC. The
311 normalization of pathogen concentrations using mtDNA consistently lowered concentrations across
312 samples and may be useful as a normalization variable instead of or in addition to PMMoV. While
313 PMMoV has been widely used for normalization of wastewater data[48,49], we found the normalization
314 efforts did not drastically reduce the noise-to-signal ratio. While several studies have used PMMoV as a
315 normalization marker for SARS-CoV-2[12,50][51], fewer studies have considered human mitochondrial
316 DNA markers and those who have found the marker to have strong correlations to clinical case
317 counts[52]. Additional studies have also considered the use of crAssphage[12][49], HF183[53][54], and
318 *Bacteroides* ribosomal RNA (rRNA) and human 18S rRNA as other normalization markers to explore
319 using for wastewater fecal concentration data[12].

320

321 *Shedding rates/Limitations*

322 Wastewater sample recovery for SARS-CoV-2 has been successful when using fresh samples, but for
323 many WWTP and their partners it may be unrealistic to complete same-day processing for logistical

reasons[55]. This work demonstrated the recovery of pathogen targets using archived grab samples, which makes this approach open to a broader range of applications such as retrospective analyses where clinical data is available or can be linked to these environmental surveillance results. However, more research is needed to understand which recovery methods work best and can be performed efficiently for archived samples.

A major limitation to understanding this work is limited data on fecal shedding rates and their incorporation into predictive models. Researchers have gained interest in calculating community-specific or dorm-specific fecal shedding rates specifically for SARS-CoV-2[56][57], but there was no specific information on the fecal shedding rates for this particular population to consider a modeling approach to relate pathogen concentration and clinical case data for asymptomatic individuals. Additionally, sewersheds of different sizes may have specific challenges in determining accurate shedding rates. Robust data on enteric shedding rates is not widely available for high-income countries, but efforts to estimate these variables and their uncertainties have been attempted.[58]

Another major limitation with TAC methods is the limit of gene target detections one can consider. With the option of detecting many pathogens comes with a need for determining the most relevant genes of interest. While TAC can run up to 48 unique targets, the total amount of template that enters each individual well is ~ 0.6 µL. This low template volume, compared to a 2-5 µL of template included in other molecular assays can affect the overall limits of detection for this platform. While singleplex assays may have lower limits of detection, the likelihood of optimizing a multiplex for up to 46 or more agents is unrealistic; therefore, giving TAC a considerable advantage as a high parallel, multiple detection platform.[32] Additionally, these targets and the QA/QC involved require dedicated time and effort to include relevant targets that may change based on future applications. The need for additional replicates run to produce robust analytical limits of quantification are encouraged for future work. Using this multiple pathogen detection tool does not account for variant changes and may not be suitable for all

applications. Our findings indicate TAC offers a multi-parallel platform for screening wastewater for a diverse array of enteric pathogens of interest to public health with strong potential for screening other targets of interest including respiratory viruses and antibiotic resistance genes.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the wastewater treatment plants that permitted sample collection and the National Science Foundation (NSF 2027752- Collaborative Research- RAPID: Wastewater Informed Epidemiological Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2) for financial support in completing this work. DC was supported in part by T32ES007018, Biostatistics for Research in Environmental Health, funded by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. Specific author contributions were: original draft and data analysis (GR, DC); conceptualization (JB, AB); sample collection and processing (KZ, AK, YL, RC, AL, JK, GR); reviewing and editing (all authors).

References

1. Brouwer AF, Eisenberg JNS, Pomeroy CD, Shulman LM, Hindiyeh M, Manor Y, et al. Epidemiology of the silent polio outbreak in Rahat, Israel, based on modeling of environmental surveillance data. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 2018;115: E10625–E10633. doi:10.1073/pnas.1808798115

2. Lago PM, Gary HE, Pérez LS, Cáceres V, Olivera JB, Puentes RP, et al. Poliovirus detection in wastewater and stools following an immunization campaign in Havana, Cuba. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2003;32: 772–777. doi:10.1093/ije/dyg185

3. La Rosa G, Della Libera S, Iaconelli M, Ciccaglione AR, Bruni R, Taffon S, et al. Surveillance of hepatitis A virus in urban sewages and comparison with cases notified in the course of an outbreak, Italy 2013. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2014. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-14-419

4. Barrett TJ, Blake PA, Morris GK, Puhr ND, Bradford HB, Wells JG. Use of Moore swabs for isolating Vibrio cholerae from sewage. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 1980;11: 385–388. doi:10.1128/JCM.11.4.385-388.1980

5. Moore B, Perry CEL, Chard ST. A survey by the sewage swab method of latent enteric infection in an urban area. Public Health Department. 1950. doi:10.1017/S0022172400019501

6. Feng L, Zhang W, Li X. Monitoring of regional drug abuse through wastewater-based epidemiology—A critical review. Science China Earth Sciences. 2018;61: 239–255. doi:10.1007/s11430-017-9129-x

7. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, Bibby K, Bivins A, O'Brien JW, et al. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. Science of the Total Environment. 2020;728: 138764. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764

8. La Rosa G, Mancini P, Bonanno Ferraro G, Veneri C, Iaconelli M, Bonadonna L, et al. SARS-CoV-2 has been circulating in northern Italy since December 2019: Evidence from environmental monitoring. Science of the Total Environment. 2021;750: 141711. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141711

9. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in the Netherlands. Environmental Science and Technology Letters. 2020;7: 511–516. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357

10. Karthikeyan S, Ronquillo N, Belda-Ferre P, Alvarado D, Javidi T, Longhurst CA, et al. High-Throughput Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Detection Enables Forecasting of Community Infection

Dynamics in San Diego County. Cristea IM, editor. mSystems. 2021;6: e00045-21. doi:10.1128/mSystems.00045-21

11. Morvan M, Jacomo AL, Souque C, Wade MJ, Hoffmann T, Pouwels K, et al. An analysis of 45 large-scale wastewater sites in England to estimate SARS-CoV-2 community prevalence. Nat Commun. 2022;13: 4313. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-31753-y

12. Greenwald HD, Kennedy LC, Hinkle A, Whitney ON, Fan VB, Crits-Christoph A, et al. Tools for interpretation of wastewater SARS-CoV-2 temporal and spatial trends demonstrated with data collected in the San Francisco Bay Area. Water Research X. 2021;12: 100111. doi:10.1016/j.wroa.2021.100111

13. Jahn K, Dreifuss D, Topolsky I, Kull A, Ganesanandamoorthy P, Fernandez-Cassi X, et al. Detection and surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 genomic variants in wastewater. medRxiv. 2021; 2021.01.08.21249379. doi:10.1101/2021.01.08.21249379

14. Fontenele RS, Kraberger S, Hadfield J, Driver EM, Bowes D, Holland LA, et al. High-throughput sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater provides insights into circulating variants. medRxiv : the preprint server for health sciences. 2021; 2021.01.22.21250320. doi:10.1101/2021.01.22.21250320

15. Safford HR, Shapiro K, Bischel HN. Wastewater analysis can be a powerful public health tool—if it's done sensibly. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2022;119: e2119600119. doi:10.1073/pnas.2119600119

16. Naughton CC, Roman FA, Alvarado AGF, Tariqi AQ, Deeming MA, Kadonsky KF, et al. Show us the data: global COVID-19 wastewater monitoring efforts, equity, and gaps. FEMS Microbes. 2023;4: xtad003. doi:10.1093/femsmc/xtad003

17. Medema G, Been F, Heijnen L, Petterson S. Implementation of environmental surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 virus to support public health decisions: Opportunities and challenges. Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health. 2020;17: 49–71. doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.006

18. Nii-Trebi NI. Emerging and Neglected Infectious Diseases: Insights, Advances, and Challenges. BioMed Research International. 2017;2017: 1–15. doi:10.1155/2017/5245021

19. Morens DM, Fauci AS. Emerging Pandemic Diseases: How We Got to COVID-19. Cell. 2020;182: 1077–1092. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.08.021

20. Zhu K, Hill C, Muirhead A, Basu M, Brown J, Brinton MA, et al. Zika Virus RNA Persistence and Recovery in Water and Wastewater: An Approach for Zika Virus Surveillance in Resource-constrained Settings. Water Research. 2023; 120116. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2023.120116

21. Capone D, Berendes D, Cumming O, Knee J, Nalá R, Risk BB, et al. Analysis of Fecal Sludges Reveals Common Enteric Pathogens in Urban Maputo, Mozambique. Environ Sci Technol Lett. 2020;7: 889–895. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00610

22. Philo SE, Keim EK, Swanstrom R, Ong AQW, Burnor EA, Kossik AL, et al. A comparison of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentration methods for environmental surveillance. Science of The Total Environment. 2021;760: 144215. doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2020.144215

23. Zhu K, Suttner B, Pickering A, Konstantinidis KT, Brown J. A novel droplet digital PCR human mtDNA assay for fecal source tracking. Water Research. 2020;183: 116085. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.116085

24. Stokdyk JP, Firnstahl AD, Spencer SK, Burch TR, Borchardt MA. Determining the 95% limit of detection for waterborne pathogen analyses from primary concentration to qPCR. Water Research. 2016;96: 105–113. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2016.03.026

438 25. Randazzo W, Truchado P, Cuevas-Ferrando E, Simón P, Allende A, Sánchez G. SARS-CoV-2
439 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. Water Research.
440 2020;181. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.115942

441 26. Bivins A, North D, Wu Z, Shaffer M, Ahmed W, Bibby K. Within-Day Variability of SARS-CoV-2
442 RNA in Municipal Wastewater Influent During 1 Periods of Varying COVID-19 Prevalence and
443 Positivity 2. medRxiv. 2021; 2021.03.16.21253652. doi:10.1101/2021.03.16.21253652

444 27. Graham KE, Loeb SK, Wolfe MK, Catoe D, Sinnott-Armstrong N, Kim S, et al. SARS-CoV-2
445 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with COVID-19 Cases in a Large Urban
446 Sewershed. Environmental Science and Technology. 2021;55: 488–498.
447 doi:10.1021/ACS.EST.0C06191/SUPPL_FILE/ES0C06191_SI_002.XLSX

448 28. D'Aoust PM, Mercier E, Montpetit D, Jia JJ, Alexandrov I, Neault N, et al. Quantitative analysis of
449 SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and
450 prevalence. Water Research. 2021;188: 116560. doi:10.1016/J.WATRES.2020.116560

451 29. Schang C, Crosbie ND, Nolan M, Poon R, Wang M, Jex A, et al. Passive Sampling of SARS-CoV-2
452 for Wastewater Surveillance. Cite This: Environ Sci Technol. 2021;55. doi:10.1021/acs.est.1c01530

453 30. Ahmed W, Bivins A, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Choi PM, Farkas K, et al. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2
454 RNA in wastewater: Methods optimization and quality control are crucial for generating reliable
455 public health information. Current Opinion in Environmental Science and Health. Elsevier B.V.;
456 2020. pp. 82–93. doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.003

457 31. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC's Influenza SARS-CoV-2 Multiplex Assay. 14
458 Nov 2022. Available: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/multiplex.html

32. Rachwal PA, Rose HL, Cox V, Lukaszewski RA, Murch AL, Weller SA. The Potential of TaqMan Array Cards for Detection of Multiple Biological Agents by Real-Time PCR. Chuang EY, editor. PLoS ONE. 2012;7: e35971. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0035971

33. Gerrity D, Papp K, Stoker M, Sims A, Frehner W. Early-pandemic wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Nevada: Methodology, occurrence, and incidence/prevalence considerations. Water Research X. 2021;10: 100086. doi:10.1016/j.wroa.2020.100086

34. Li N, Xiao L, Wang L, Zhao S, Zhao X, Duan L, et al. Molecular Surveillance of Cryptosporidium spp., Giardia duodenalis, and Enterocytozoon bieneusi by Genotyping and Subtyping Parasites in Wastewater. Walson JL, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2012;6: e1809. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0001809

35. Russell ES, Gray EB, Marshall RE, Davis S, Beaudoin A, Handali S, et al. Prevalence of Strongyloides stercoralis Antibodies among a Rural Appalachian Population—Kentucky, 2013. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2014;91: 1000–1001. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.14-0310

36. Barber C, Crank K, Papp K, Innes GK, Schmitz BW, Chavez J, et al. Community-Scale Wastewater Surveillance of *Candida auris* during an Ongoing Outbreak in Southern Nevada. Environ Sci Technol. 2023;57: 1755–1763. doi:10.1021/acs.est.2c07763

37. Weinberg GA, Schnabel KC, Erdman DD, Prill MM, Iwane MK, Shelley LM, et al. Field evaluation of TaqMan Array Card (TAC) for the simultaneous detection of multiple respiratory viruses in children with acute respiratory infection. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2013;57: 254–260. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2013.03.016

480 38. Kodani M, Yang G, Conklin LM, Travis TC, Whitney CG, Anderson LJ, et al. Application of
481 TaqMan Low-Density Arrays for Simultaneous Detection of Multiple Respiratory Pathogens. J Clin
482 Microbiol. 2011;49: 2175–2182. doi:10.1128/JCM.02270-10

483 39. Liu J, Ochieng C, Wiersma S, Ströher U, Towner JS, Whitmer S, et al. Development of a TaqMan
484 Array Card for Acute-Febrile-Illness Outbreak Investigation and Surveillance of Emerging
485 Pathogens, Including Ebola Virus. McAdam AJ, editor. J Clin Microbiol. 2016;54: 49–58.
486 doi:10.1128/JCM.02257-15

487 40. Diaz MH, Waller JL, Napoliello RA, Islam MdS, Wolff BJ, Burken DJ, et al. Optimization of
488 Multiple Pathogen Detection Using the TaqMan Array Card: Application for a Population-Based
489 Study of Neonatal Infection. Lin B, editor. PLoS ONE. 2013;8: e66183.
490 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066183

491 41. Capone D, Bivins A, Knee J, Cumming O, Nalá R, Brown J. Quantitative Microbial Risk
492 Assessment of Pediatric Infections Attributable to Ingestion of Fecally Contaminated Domestic
493 Soils in Low-Income Urban Maputo, Mozambique. Environ Sci Technol. 2021;55: 1941–1952.
494 doi:10.1021/acs.est.0c06972

495 42. Capone D, Chigwechokha P, de los Reyes FL, Holm RH, Risk BB, Tilley E, et al. Impact of
496 sampling depth on pathogen detection in pit latrines. Lamberton PHL, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis.
497 2021;15: e0009176. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0009176

498 43. Ahmed W, Simpson SL, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Bivins A, Blackall LL, et al. Minimizing errors in
499 RT-PCR detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA for wastewater surveillance. Science of
500 The Total Environment. 2022;805: 149877. doi:10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2021.149877

501 44. Boehm AB, Hughes B, Duong D, Chan-Herur V, Buchman A, Wolfe MK, et al. Wastewater
502 concentrations of human influenza, metapneumovirus, parainfluenza, respiratory syncytial virus,

rhinovirus, and seasonal coronavirus nucleic-acids during the COVID-19 pandemic: a surveillance study. The Lancet Microbe. 2023; S266652472200386X. doi:10.1016/S2666-5247(22)00386-X

45. Markt R, Stillebacher F, Nägele F, Kammerer A, Peer N, Payr M, et al. Expanding the Pathogen Panel in Wastewater Epidemiology to Influenza and Norovirus. Viruses. 2023;15: 263. doi:10.3390/v15020263

46. Wolfe MK, Duong D, Bakker KM, Ammerman M, Mortenson L, Hughes B, et al. Wastewater-Based Detection of Two Influenza Outbreaks. Environ Sci Technol Lett. 2022;9: 687–692. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.2c00350

47. Wolfe MK, Duong D, Hughes B, Chan-Herur V, White BJ, Boehm AB. Detection of monkeypox viral DNA in a routine wastewater monitoring program. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS); 2022 Jul. doi:10.1101/2022.07.25.22278043

48. Rainey AL, Liang S, Bisesi JH, Sabo-Attwood T, Maurelli AT. A multistate assessment of population normalization factors for wastewater-based epidemiology of COVID-19. Sambri V, editor. PLoS ONE. 2023;18: e0284370. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0284370

49. Holm RH, Nagarkar M, Yeager RA, Talley D, Chaney AC, Rai JP, et al. Surveillance of RNase P, PMMoV, and CrAssphage in wastewater as indicators of human fecal concentration across urban sewer neighborhoods, Kentucky. FEMS Microbes. 2022;3: xtac003. doi:10.1093/femsmc/xtac003

50. Zhan Q, Babler KM, Sharkey ME, Amirali A, Beaver CC, Boone MM, et al. Relationships between SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater and COVID-19 Clinical Cases and Hospitalizations, with and without Normalization against Indicators of Human Waste. ACS EST Water. 2022;2: 1992–2003. doi:10.1021/acsestwater.2c00045

524 51. Wolfe MK, Archana A, Catoe D, Coffman MM, Dorevich S, Graham KE, et al. Scaling of SARS-
525 CoV-2 RNA in Settled Solids from Multiple Wastewater Treatment Plants to Compare Incidence
526 Rates of Laboratory-Confirmed COVID-19 in Their Sewersheds. Environ Sci Technol Lett. 2021;8:
527 398–404. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00184

528 52. Hutchison JM, Li Z, Chang C-N, Hiripitiyage Y, Wittman M, Sturm BSM. Improving correlation of
529 wastewater SARS-CoV-2 gene copy numbers with COVID-19 public health cases using readily
530 available biomarkers. FEMS Microbes. 2022;3: xtac010. doi:10.1093/femsmc/xtac010

531 53. Feng S, Roguet A, McClary-Gutierrez JS, Newton RJ, Kloczko N, Meiman JG, et al. Evaluation of
532 Sampling, Analysis, and Normalization Methods for SARS-CoV-2 Concentrations in Wastewater to
533 Assess COVID-19 Burdens in Wisconsin Communities. ACS EST Water. 2021;1: 1955–1965.
534 doi:10.1021/acsestwater.1c00160

535 54. Vadde KK, Al-Duroobi H, Phan DC, Jafarzadeh A, Moghadam SV, Matta A, et al. Assessment of
536 Concentration, Recovery, and Normalization of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from Two Wastewater
537 Treatment Plants in Texas and Correlation with COVID-19 Cases in the Community. ACS EST
538 Water. 2022;2: 2060–2069. doi:10.1021/acsestwater.2c00054

539 55. Kitajima M, Ahmed W, Bibby K, Carducci A, Gerba CP, Hamilton KA, et al. SARS-CoV-2 in
540 wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. Science of the Total Environment. Elsevier
541 B.V.; 2020. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076

542 56. Prasek SM, Pepper IL, Innes GK, Slinski S, Ruedas M, Sanchez A, et al. Population level SARS-
543 CoV-2 fecal shedding rates determined via wastewater-based epidemiology. Science of The Total
544 Environment. 2022;838: 156535. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.156535

545 57. Schmitz BW, Innes GK, Prasek SM, Betancourt WQ, Stark ER, Foster AR, et al. Enumerating
546 asymptomatic COVID-19 cases and estimating SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding rates via wastewater-

based epidemiology. Science of The Total Environment. 2021;801: 149794.
doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149794

58. Li X, Zhang S, Shi J, Luby SP, Jiang G. Uncertainties in estimating SARS-CoV-2 prevalence by wastewater-based epidemiology. Chemical Engineering Journal. 2021;415: 129039.
doi:10.1016/j.cej.2021.129039