

444 **Supplementary Material 1 Relationship Between SARS-CoV-2 RNA Wastewater**  
 445 **Concentrations and Prevalence**

Table SI 1: **Correlation analysis for wastewater concentrations and prevalence.** Spearman’s correlation ( $r$ ) is measured across each study period, where  $n$  is the number of observations at each spatial resolution and a 95% CI is approximated using a paired bootstrap of 1000 replicates. Among LTLAs which report at least three wastewater concentration measurements across rounds 3 to 11 (24 July 2020 to 3 May 2021), the median LTLA-level correlation is 0.72, calculated as the median of each LTLA’s individual correlation between wastewater concentrations and prevalence levels across the rounds. The corresponding median LTLA correlation between concentration-vaccination interaction and SARS-CoV-2 prevalence is 0.79 across rounds 12 to 19 (20 May 2021 to 31 March 2022).

<b>Rounds</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>Spatial Resolution</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>r (95% CI)</b>
3-11	Concentration	LTLA	1572	0.62 (0.59, 0.65)
3-11	Concentration	Regional	81	0.83 (0.75, 0.89)
3-11	Concentration	National	9	0.98 (0.82, 1.00)
12-19	Concentration-Vaccination Interaction	LTLA	2461	0.71 (0.69, 0.73)
12-19	Concentration-Vaccination Interaction	Regional	72	0.89 (0.79, 0.94)
12-19	Concentration-Vaccination Interaction	National	8	0.93 (0.41, 1.00)

446 **Supplementary Material 2 Wastewater-Based Model Covariates**

Table SI 2: **Covariates used in wastewater-based models for estimating SARS-CoV-2 prevalence.** Unless otherwise stated, all covariates are at an LTLA level. Data originate from the REACT-1 study and the EMHP surveillance programme, aside from the LTLA population estimates (provided by the ONS) which are used as weights for regional and national predictors.

Variable	Units	Description
Wastewater Concentration	Gene copies per litre (gc/l)	Estimated LTLA-level wastewater viral concentrations per round. Concentrations are obtained via the weighted contribution of each treatment plant's average (normalised) concentration for the round (described in Materials and Methods).
Neighbour-Averaged Concentration	Gene copies per litre (gc/l)	A spatial weights matrix (with row standardisation) is computed based on the neighbourhood structure of LTLAs, using queen contiguity criterion. The weights of this sparse matrix are multiplied by the LTLAs' concentrations for each round to yield a weighted average of the neighbouring areas' concentrations.
Vaccination-Log Concentration Interaction	Gene copies per litre (gc/l)	(Fully Vaccinated Proportion) × (Estimated Concentration). Fully vaccinated proportions are the proportion of the LTLA population estimated (by the REACT-1 study) to have received 2 or more vaccination doses, whilst concentrations are the estimated LTLA-level concentration.
Regional Average Concentration	Gene copies per litre (gc/l)	Average of a region's wastewater concentrations for a round, weighted by the underlying LTLA populations (for whom measurements were available in that round).
National Average Concentration	Gene copies per litre (gc/l)	National average of wastewater concentrations for a round, weighted by the underlying LTLA populations (for whom measurements were available in that round).
Concentration Difference	Gene copies per litre (gc/l)	The change in an LTLA's wastewater concentration from one round to the next.
National Concentration Difference	Gene copies per litre (gc/l)	The change in the national average wastewater concentration from one round to the next.
Regional Prevalence per Log Concentration	% per gc/l	For each LTLA, prevalence per log concentration is calculated, and the corresponding regional average is the weighted average of the LTLA-level values for that round (where the weights are the LTLA populations). The regional average across the training period is used as the predictor for the testing set. Region-level prevalence per log concentration is used due to the noisiness of the LTLA-level estimates. Prevalence per log concentration can be interpreted as a proxy for population-level faecal shedding dynamics. Hence, greater values of the prevalence-to-wastewater variable implies a reduced level of faecal shedding per positive individual.

447 **Supplementary Material 3 Out-of-Sample Wastewater-Model-Based Estimates of**  
 448 **Prevalence**




Figure SI 1: **Iteratively-updated model-based national prevalence estimates in rounds 7-11 (13 November 2020 to 3 May 2021).** Visualisation of national-level gradient boosting model predictions (green) alongside REACT-1 prevalence (blue), for five rounds of REACT-1 study.

Table SI 3: **Regional wastewater-model-based estimates for REACT-1 rounds 9-11 (4 February 2021 to 3 May 2021).** Summary of accuracy metrics for regional estimates, drawing comparison across out-of-sample estimates for individual rounds for a model i) which is trained iteratively and ii) which makes multi-step estimates without any model updating/calibration. Accuracy measures maintain the same interpretation as Table SI 4, albeit now at a regional level. Average Prevalence is 0.31%, calculated as the mean regional prevalence across rounds 9-11. \* The iterative training method involves updating the wastewater model using data from the additional training round which precedes the testing round.

Training Method	Testing Rounds	Training Rounds	n	MAE	r	Change Detection (95% CI)
Iterative	9-11	3-10*	27	0.20%	0.93	85.2% (66.3%, 95.8%)
Multi-Step	9-11	3-8	27	0.26%	0.84	70.4% (49.9%, 86.3%)

Table SI 4: **Out-of-sample LTLA-level predictive performance for REACT-1 rounds 7-11 (13 November 2020 to 3 May 2021).** Out-of-sample estimates are based on a wastewater-based gradient boosting model trained iteratively, including for the regional (\*) wastewater-based estimates. *n* is the total number of LTLAs in an individual testing round and in the regional (\*\*) case, the total number of regional observations from rounds 7-11. *MAE* is the Mean Absolute Error between model-based estimates and REACT-1 prevalence. *r* represents the Pearson's correlation between the prevalence and our estimates. *Top 25 Common* is the number of LTLAs common to the highest predicted prevalence levels and REACT-1 prevalence levels. *Change Detection* indicates the mean directional accuracy, whilst the corresponding 95% CI is attained by the so-called Clopper-Pearson method, otherwise known as the Exact Confidence Interval [32]. *Mean Prevalence* is the mean average of LTLA-level REACT-1 prevalence estimates (for LTLAs in the wastewater surveillance programme), and is cited as a guide for appraisal of MAE within rounds. We provide the individual round analysis of *regional* model-based estimates performance in Table SI 9

Test Round	Training Rounds	n	MAE	r	Top 25 Common	Change Detection (95% CI)	Mean Prevalence
7	3-6	146	0.7%	0.08	4	66.4% (58.2%, 74.0%)	1.0%
8	3-7	146	1.0%	0.07	4	69.9% (61.7%, 77.2%)	1.8%
9	3-8	233	0.5%	0.27	8	76.0% (70.0%, 81.3%)	0.5%
10	3-9	299	0.3%	0.23	4	69.2% (63.7%, 74.4%)	0.2%
11	3-10	301	0.2%	0.08	1	57.9% (52.0%, 63.5%)	0.1%
Regional: 7-11	3-10*	45 **	0.3%	0.76	-	86.7% (76.7%, 96.6%)	0.7%




Figure SI 2: **Wastewater-based prevalence estimates using varying training set sizes.** From plots a) to d), across rounds 12 to 19 (from 20 May 2021 to 31 March 2022), training set sizes are 40%, 60%, 80%, and 90% respectively per each round’s total number of LTLAs. The plot above is for a randomly-selected fold amongst the 50 folds considered in our replicated procedure for training-testing split proportions, and model-based prevalence estimates of a fixed test set improve marginally as more training observations are used to calibrate the model. Nevertheless, with just 40% survey coverage, wastewater-model-based estimates remain largely representative of underlying prevalence.

Table SI 5: **Comparison of wastewater-based prevalence estimates in the early period of rounds 3 to 11 (24 July 2020 to 3 May 2021) using varying training test set sizes.** Wastewater-based gradient boosting models are trained using 40%-90% of each round’s observations and a fixed 10% of observations per round are used for test set prevalence estimation. The average prevalence across the 50 folds of test sets is 0.54%.

Training-Testing	MAE	r	Change Detection
40% - 10%	0.34 %	0.74	74.57%
60% - 10%	0.33 %	0.74	75.14%
80% - 10%	0.32 %	0.76	76.30%
90% - 10%	0.32 %	0.75	74.57%

450 **Supplementary Material 5 Population-level faecal shedding**




Figure SI 3: **Spatial variability of faecal shedding by round.** Visualisations demonstrate the spatial consistency of the prevalence-to-wastewater relationship, particularly during enhanced wastewater surveillance in the later rounds of the REACT study. The histogram (left) of the coefficient of variation (CV) values demonstrate that extreme large values of the measure of dispersion are not common, whilst the plot over time (right) captures that the larger values occur during early rounds with low wastewater surveillance coverage and/or rounds of low prevalence.

## Supplementary Material 6 Geospatial Population Estimates (GPEs)

The following section provides further detail regarding the derivation and uncertainty of the GPEs used for our geospatial framework and associated analyses.

Let  $a_{ij}$  be the intersection area between the catchment area of STW  $i$  and LSOA  $j$ . Then, the LSOA area serviced by any of the STWs  $i$  is:

$$A_j = \bigcup_i a_{ij}$$

Let  $p_j$  be the Office for National Statistics (ONS) 2019 mid-year population estimate for LSOA  $j$ . Our geospatial population estimate (GPE) for the intersection area between the catchment area of STW  $i$  and the area of LSOA  $j$  is

$$\widehat{g}_{ij} = \frac{a_{ij}}{A_j} p_j$$

Thus, for LSOA  $j$ , our estimate of the LSOA population serviced is:

$$\widehat{p}_j = \sum_i \widehat{g}_{ij}$$

Summing over all LSOA geographies within an LTLA  $k$ , we attain our GPE  $\widehat{P}_k$  for each LTLA:

$$\widehat{P}_k = \sum_{j=1}^J \widehat{p}_j$$

The GPE for each LTLA enables our mapping of concentrations from an STW level to an LTLA level.

Our approach of using GPEs represents a predictive approach for aligning WBE with the geographies commonly used by public health authorities [28]. Consistent with the reported EMHP population coverage estimates [14], we estimate that the wastewater programme had an estimated 74% nationwide testing coverage by its conclusion in March 2022, with a median percentage (of population) sampled for LTLAs of 76%.

The developed approach could, in theory, be applicable to further population-level wastewater monitoring and analyses which require alignment of wastewater catchments to geographies used by public health authorities and community studies. Nevertheless, limitations exist with our geospatial approach. First, the GPEs do not account for the presence of transient and non-resident LTLA populations, which could impact on the wastewater concentrations measured. The transience issue is likely to be more pronounced in the late rounds of the REACT-1 analysis, where community lockdowns and other non-pharmaceutical interventions are relaxed. Second, we recognise the uncertainty surrounding the mid-year population estimates reported by the ONS for LSOAs, which are made for small geographic areas.

Furthermore, potential limitations may yield unrepresentative population estimates for urban centres and/or for geographies which are influenced by time-varying factors such as transient/commuting populations or industrial and agricultural discharges. In theory, such factors are controlled via our flow-normalised wastewater concentrations yet cannot be taken into account when we weight the contribution of each STW to an LTLA based on time-invariant population estimates). The issue of time-varying relationships is likely to depend upon the type and stringency level of simultaneously active non-pharmaceutical interventions. Further challenges imposed by the EMHP wastewater surveillance programme include the locations of the 302 STWs. Whilst the sampled treatment plants were selected to maximise nationwide coverage and representativeness across England, our GPEs (for each LTLA) indicate a highly positively skewed distribution for the estimated proportions of individual LTLA populations that are sampled within the EMHP programme (Figure SI 4). The skewness in the distribution of estimated proportions of populations sampled is a likely consequence of the usage of intersection areas in our GPEs. We estimate the median LTLA-level proportion of population sampled to be approximately 76%, yet Horesham LTLA, for instance, has an estimated testing coverage of only 2.9% based on the GPE, consistent with the EMHP testing coverage estimate for Horesham. These few outliers can potentially impact on how representative our wastewater concentrations are when mapped to LTLAs with such low testing coverage, and hence, when relating our wastewater data to LTLA-level survey-based prevalence estimates.




Figure SI 4: **LTLA-level wastewater sampling coverage estimates.** The estimated proportions of LTLA populations that are covered by the EMHP wastewater surveillance programme. The proportions are attained by dividing the LTLA-level GPE by the corresponding ONS LTLA population approximation.

## 480 **Supplementary Material 7 Wastewater Sources of Uncertainty**

481 Sources of wastewater measurement uncertainty include the sample volume being too low to enable adequate analysis,  
 482 temperature and time-induced decay, inherent variability of wastewater (possibly due to dilution effects of precipitation), and  
 483 usage of the Theoretical Limit of Detection (TL<sub>oD</sub>), below which the concentration cannot be reliably measured. The EMHP  
 484 surveillance programme aimed to address several of these measurement uncertainties via the adjustment/normalisation of  
 485 concentrations to account for flow, and by sampling mid-stream during peak load times. Similarly, 3 to 4 samples were taken  
 486 weekly (at each STW) due to the variability and presence of outliers in detected wastewater signals [14, 22].

487 **Supplementary Material 8 Sensitivity of Geospatial Mapping Approach**

Table SI 6: **Sensitivity analysis for geospatial mapping.** Table depicts a diminished relationship between wastewater concentrations and SARS-CoV-2 prevalence, when concentrations from rounds of the REACT-1 are shifted by a lead times of up to six days. Overall correlation measures the correlation between LTLA-level estimated wastewater concentrations and SARS-CoV-2 prevalence. Mean LTLA concentration correlation is the mean of all the LTLA's individual correlations between estimated wastewater concentrations and SARS-CoV-2, whilst the mean LTLA interaction correlation (applicable for rounds 12 to 19) is the average of the LTLA's individual correlation between our proposed vaccination-log concentration interaction and SARS-CoV-2 prevalence.

Lead Time (Days)	Overall Correlation	Mean LTLA Concentration Correlation	Mean LTLA Interaction Concentration Correlation
0	0.35	0.39	0.75
1	0.32	0.33	0.75
2	0.29	0.31	0.75
3	0.28	0.30	0.75
4	0.28	0.25	0.74
5	0.27	0.25	0.74
6	0.19	0.16	0.66



## Supplementary Material 9 Bayesian Hierarchical Modelling

To ensure robustness of inferences and extend our analysis beyond a discriminative model, within the Bayesian modelling paradigm, we fitted a hierarchical model, which is a generative model type which enables regularisation and spatial effects. Our hierarchical model is fit to training periods using Stan v2.31, which employs Hamiltonian Monte Carlo sampling, a variant of Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) [33].

Let  $y_{it}$  be the REACT-1 weighted prevalence estimate for LTLA  $i$  at time/round  $t$ . Then, our varying effects Bayesian hierarchical model is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}y_{it} &\sim \text{Normal}(\mu_{it}, \sigma^2) \\ \mu_{it} &= \beta_0 + \beta_{LTLA[i]} * C_{it} + \beta_R[i] * C_{it} + \beta_{NN[i]} * NC_{it} \\ \beta_0 &\sim \text{Normal}(0, 5) \\ \beta_{LTLA} &\sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_{LTLA}^2) \\ \sigma_{LTLA} &\sim \text{InvGamma}(5, 5) \\ \beta_R &\sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_R^2) \\ \sigma_R &\sim \text{InvGamma}(5, 5) \\ \beta_{NN} &\sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_{NN}) \\ \sigma_{NN} &\sim \text{InvGamma}(5, 5) \\ \sigma &\sim \text{Half-Cauchy}(0, 1)\end{aligned}$$

where  $C_{it}$  denotes the concentration of LTLA  $i$  at time/round  $t$ , and  $NC_{it}$  denotes the weighted average concentration for the neighbours of LTLA  $i$  at time/round  $t$ .  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  represent the mean and standard deviation of the assumed Normal distribution.  $\beta_0$  is the baseline prevalence.  $\beta_{LTLA}$ ,  $\beta_R$ , and  $\beta_{NN}$ , are parameter vectors corresponding to the LTLA-specific, region-specific, and nearest-neighbour specific effects of concentration on the response of prevalence.  $\sigma_{LTLA}$ ,  $\sigma_R$ , and  $\sigma_{NN}$  represent the corresponding standard deviations. Above, we employ an index-variable approach within the linear predictor. For example  $\beta_R[i]$  maps the LTLA  $i$  to its corresponding parameter within the region-effect concentration vector. The intuition for spatially-varying effects is that in-sewer network characteristics, treatment plant-level, and spatial correlations between geographies could influence similarities and differences of both concentrations and prevalence levels. For the *late* period of the REACT-1 analysis, the vaccination-log concentration interaction (described in Table SI 2) takes the place of each of the unadjusted wastewater concentrations.

Throughout the analysis, all covariates are standardised such that they take values in  $[-1, 1]$ . Standardisation facilitates the above usage of conventional, weakly informative prior distributions throughout our model fitting, and assists in ensuring efficient HMC sampling.

Similar to the gradient boosting setup, the model was trained using several calibration rounds from REACT-1, and its predictive performance was estimated out-of-sample using one or more rounds of REACT-1. Our model selection procedure involved consideration of the scientific model's structure, posterior predictive checks, model convergence diagnostics, and estimated out-of-sample predictive accuracy (via the ELPD, expected log pointwise predictive density, from the `loo` package).

In terms of comparing predictive performance to our gradient boosting model, we generate posterior predictions of the response  $y_{it}$ . In particular, we use the posterior samples for each observation, and we adopt a conventional approach of using the posterior median of these samples as our best estimate (for each observation). We quantify the uncertainty in our inferences by deriving credible intervals (by taking specified upper and lower quantiles of these samples). Subsequently, metrics such as MAE, for example, are computed as the average absolute difference between the observed prevalence levels and the posterior median estimates.

Throughout both study periods, our best-performing Bayesian hierarchical model did not provide additional predictive accuracy in terms of out-of-sample predictive accuracy. Superior accuracy of the gradient boosting model may be a consequence of the highly flexible and predictive nature of the modern gradient boosting algorithm (of `xgboost`) which readily handles time-varying non-linearities. Nevertheless, the additional modelling investigation enabled a further robustness check of the inferences drawn regarding the reliability of wastewater-based modelling.

## Supplementary Material 10 Vaccination-Log Concentration Interaction Variable

521

522

523 In terms of the statistical controls in our analysis, there exist obvious limitations with our proposed usage of a simple  
524 vaccination-concentration interaction. Aside from the potential differential impacts of vaccination on distinct demographics,  
525 the proposed interaction variable would only remain (possibly) valid for a restricted time period due to impacts of waning  
526 vaccine-induced immunity. We further do not account for the highly complex nature of naturally-acquired immunity. The  
527 interaction variable's usage is additionally challenged by the disparate impact of different variants (and sub-variants) on the  
528 likelihood of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection. Importantly, we do not draw *any causal conclusions* regarding the impact of vaccination  
529 on faecal shedding due to the potential presence of confounding. Indeed, we emphasise, that strong temporal correlation is  
530 not necessarily indicative of a direct (or causal) relationship with prevalence, as the directional association may be an  
531 artefact of numerous epidemic conditions. Complex, concurrent epidemic characteristics include a monotonically increasing  
532 vaccination proportion, similarly rising prevalence levels, waning immunity (either vaccine-induced or naturally-acquired),  
533 reduced immunity to particular new variants, and other possibly unobserved confounders.

Table SI 7: Acronyms used throughout this paper.

Variable	Meaning	Details
95% CrI	95% Credible Interval	An unobserved parameter lies in this interval with a specified 95% probability.
EMHP	Environmental Monitoring for Health Protection	The EMHP wastewater surveillance programme tested untreated sewage across England for fragments of SARS-CoV-2. The objectives of the programme were to monitor wastewater viral concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA, variants of concern (VOC), and variants under investigation (VUI).
gc/l	Gene copies per litre (gc/l)	The reported measurements of wastewater concentrations obtained via RT-qPCR and flow normalisation.
GPE	Geospatial population estimate	Our population estimates for geographies based on a combination of intersection (spatial) areas and reported population estimates for small geographies.
LSOA	Lower Layer Super Output Area	Small regional geographies in England which combine to form an LTLA.
LTLA	Lower Tier Local Authority	LTLA-level wastewater measurements per round. These are obtained via the weighted contribution of each treatment plant's average concentration for the round (described in Materials and Methods).
MAE	Mean Absolute Error	The mean average of the absolute difference between the model-based estimates and the REACT-1 prevalence levels.
MCMC	Markov Chain Monte Carlo	A family of sampling algorithms which employs the theory of Markov Chains to sample a random variable.
NPI	Non-pharmaceutical intervention	In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, these are public health measures, excluding medication-based measures, taken to control transmission of the SARS-CoV-2.
ONS	Office for National Statistics	An independent producer of national statistics across the UK.
REACT-1	Real-time Assessment of Community Transmission	The REACT-1 programme was initiated in May 2020 with an objective of tracking the spread of SARS-CoV-2 across communities in England. Across 19 distinct rounds of cross-sectional surveys, random samples of the English population (over 5 years of age) were taken. Rounds lasted between 15 and 31 days, and the programme concluded in March 2022.
RNA	Ribonucleic acid	RNA is a nucleic acid present in all living cells.
RT-PCR	Gene copies per litre (gc/l)	LTLA-level wastewater measurements per round. These are obtained via the weighted contribution of each treatment plant's average concentration for the round (described in Materials and Methods).
RT-qPCR	Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-qPCR)	The quantification method is described in [7]. Briefly, RT-qPCR combines reverse transcription and quantitative PCR, with the aim of reducing inhibition in RNA.
STW	Sewage treatment works	STWs are treatment plants which typically service extensive urban areas (like towns and cities).
TLoD	Theoretical limit of detection	The wastewater concentration (160 gc/l) below which the EMHP estimate that concentration cannot be reliably estimated.
UKHSA	United Kingdom Health Security Agency	A nationwide organisation in the United Kingdom which assumes responsibility for public health protection.
VOC	Variants of Concern	SARS-CoV-2 variants that were highlighted by the World Health Organisation (WHO) to be particularly dangerous in terms of increased transmissibility.
VUI	Variants under investigation	SARS-CoV-2 variants were being tracked by the EMHP wastewater surveillance programme.
WBE	Wastewater-based epidemiology	WBE involves collection of urine and stool samples from sewage treatment works (STWs). By subsequently incorporating factors such as daily flow rates, human excretion rates, and STW catchment population sizes, per-capita consumption, use, or exposure can be obtained.
WHO	World Health Organisation	An agency of the United Nations which aims to improve international public health.

535 **Supplementary Material 12 Timeline of REACT-1 and Estimated Number of LT-**  
 536 **LAs in EMHP Programme**

Table SI 8: Dates (DD/MM/YYYY) for individual rounds of the REACT-1 study and the corresponding estimated number of LTLAs which were mapped to STWs which reported measurements within the corresponding time intervals. Our overall studied period, where the EMHP wastewater surveillance programme coincides with the REACT-1 study, covers from rounds 3 to 19 (from 24 July 2020 to 31 March 2022).

Round Number	Round Start Date	Round End Date	Number of LTLAs
1	01/05/2020	01/06/2020	-
2	19/06/2020	07/07/2020	-
3	24/07/2020	11/08/2020	145
4	20/08/2020	08/09/2020	145
5	18/09/2020	05/10/2020	146
6	16/10/2020	02/11/2020	146
7	13/11/2020	03/12/2020	146
8	06/01/2021	22/01/2021	146
9	04/02/2021	23/02/2021	233
10	11/03/2021	30/03/2021	299
11	15/04/2021	03/05/2021	301
12	20/05/2021	07/06/2021	303
13	24/06/2021	12/07/2021	306
14	09/09/2021	27/09/2021	307
15	19/10/2021	05/11/2021	309
16	23/11/2021	14/12/2021	309
17	05/01/2022	20/01/2022	309
18	08/02/2022	01/03/2022	309
19	08/03/2022	31/03/2022	309

## 537 **Supplementary Material 13 Wastewater Variant Detections**

538 From a public health perspective and for our analysis, the ability to track variants is important to understand the relationship  
539 between wastewater concentrations and our community prevalence estimates. Specifically, the EMHP programme raised the  
540 conjecture of an Omicron effect which results in lower viral faecal shedding and substantially alters the relationship between  
541 wastewater signals and clinical measures [14]. The variant detections were attained via genomic sequencing of wastewater  
542 samples from both STWs and sewer network sites across England, and detections were reported as either a confirmed or  
543 a possible status. More recently, the importance of accounting for the predominant variant was demonstrated by research  
544 of clinical cases showing that Omicron infections yielded the lowest community-level SARS-CoV-2 waste shedding rates,  
545 compared to the early/parental SARS-CoV-2 and Delta variant [20]. Within our analysis, we have documented the apparent  
546 reduced population-level faecal shedding induced by the onset of the Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 sub-variants.




Figure SI 5: **Iteratively-updated wastewater-model-based prevalence estimates for rounds 7 to 11 (13 November 2020 to 3 May 2021)**. Visualisation depicts REACT-1 prevalence versus wastewater-model-based estimates for the corresponding round.

Table SI 9: **Regional out-of-sample predictive performance by round**. Summary of regional out-of-sample wastewater-based predictive performance by round for REACT-1 rounds 7 to 11 (13 November 2020 to 3 May 2021) and rounds 15 to 19 (19 October 2021 to 31 March 2022), where out-of-sample wastewater-based estimates were obtained based on a gradient boosting model trained iteratively at an LTLA level. Measures of accuracy have the same interpretation as Table SI 4, albeit now at a regional level. Average regional prevalence is provided as a reference for accuracy measures.

Testing Round	Training Rounds	n	MAE	Change Detection (95% CI)	Average Prevalence
7	3-6	9	0.37%	66.7% (29.9%, 92.5%)	1.0%
8	3-7	9	0.70%	88.9% (51.8%, 99.7%)	1.6%
9	3-8	9	0.37%	88.9% (51.8%, 99.7%)	0.5%
10	3-9	9	0.17%	88.9% (51.8%, 99.7%)	0.2%
11	3-10	9	0.05%	77.8% (40.0%, 97.2%)	0.1%
15	12-14	9	0.47%	100.0% (66.4%, 100.0%)	1.6%
16	12-15	9	0.50%	55.6% (21.2%, 86.3%)	1.4%
17	12-16	9	2.88%	100.0% (66.4%, 100.0%)	4.7%
18	12-17	9	1.21%	77.8% (40.0%, 97.2%)	2.8%
19	12-18	9	1.63%	100.0% (66.4%, 100.0%)	6.3%




Figure SI 6: **Iteratively-updated wastewater-model-based prevalence estimates for rounds 15 to 19 (19 October 2021 to 31 March 2022).** Visualisation depicts REACT-1 prevalence versus wastewater-model-based estimates for the corresponding round.




Figure SI 7: **Iteratively-trained wastewater model’s prevalence estimates in rounds 15 to 19 (19 October 2021 to 31 March 2022).** Gradient Boosting model’s regional estimates are shown (green), alongside REACT-1 prevalence (blue). All out-of-sample estimates are made iteratively for individual (single round) test sets. The key insights are i) the Omicron BA.1 peak (round 17) is undetected by the calibrated wastewater model and its concentrations, and ii) re-calibration during the Omicron wave enables identification of rises in regional prevalence in the Omicron BA.2 peak (Round 19).

Table SI 10: **Out-of-sample predictive performance for REACT-1 rounds 15-19 (19 October 2021 to 31 March 2022).** LTLA-level predictions are made based on a gradient boosting model trained iteratively. All accuracy measures are defined as reported in Table SI 4.

Testing Round	Training Rounds	n	MAE	r	Top 25 Common	Change Detection (95% CI)	Average Prevalence
15	12-14	309	0.9%	0.02	2	79.0% (74.3%, 83.7%)	1.6%
16	12-15	309	1.0%	0.09	0	68.9% (62.8%, 73.4%)	1.4%
17	12-16	309	2.5%	0.04	3	68.6% (63.1%, 73.7%)	4.2%
18	12-17	309	1.5%	0.03	2	75.7% (70.6%, 80.4%)	2.8%
19	12-18	309	2.2%	-0.02	1	86.0% (81.7%, 89.7%)	6.5%