

1                                    **SARS-CoV-2 RNA titers in wastewater anticipated**

2                                    **COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area**

3

4    Walter Randazzo<sup>1,2</sup>, Pilar Truchado<sup>3</sup>, Enric Cuevas-Ferrando<sup>2</sup>, Pedro Simón<sup>4</sup>, Ana  
5    Allende<sup>3</sup>, Gloria Sánchez<sup>2\*</sup>

6

7    <sup>1</sup>Department of Microbiology and Ecology, University of Valencia, Av. Dr. Moliner,  
8    50, Burjassot, 46100 Valencia, Spain;

9    <sup>2</sup>Department of Preservation and Food Safety Technologies, Institute of Agrochemistry  
10    and Food Technology, IATA-CSIC, Av. Agustín Escardino 7, Paterna, 46980, Valencia,  
11    Spain;

12    <sup>3</sup>Research Group on Quality, Safety and Bioactivity of Plant Foods, Department of  
13    Food Science and Technology, CEBAS-CSIC, Campus Universitario de Espinardo, 25,  
14    30100, Murcia, Spain;

15    <sup>5</sup>ESAMUR, Avenida Juan Carlos, s/n - Edificio Torre Jemeca, Murcia, Spain.

16

17    **Running title:** First detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Spain.

18

19    \*Correspondence to: Gloria Sánchez, [gloriasanchez@iata.csic.es](mailto:gloriasanchez@iata.csic.es).

20 **Abstract**

21 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has caused more than  
22 200,000 reported COVID-19 cases in Spain resulting in more than 20,800 deaths as of  
23 April 21, 2020. Faecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from COVID-19 patients has  
24 extensively been reported. Therefore, we investigated the occurrence of SARS-CoV-2  
25 RNA in six wastewater treatments plants (WWTPs) serving the major municipalities  
26 within the Region of Murcia (Spain), a low prevalence area. Firstly, an aluminum  
27 hydroxide adsorption-precipitation concentration method was tested using a porcine  
28 coronavirus (Porcine Epidemic Diarrhea Virus, PEDV) and mengovirus (MgV). The  
29 procedure resulted in average recoveries of  $10.90 \pm 3.54\%$  and  $10.85 \pm 2.11\%$  in influent  
30 water and  $3.29 \pm 1.58\%$  and  $6.19 \pm 1.00\%$  in effluent water samples for PEDV and MgV,  
31 respectively. Then, the method was used to monitor the occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 from  
32 March 12 to April 14, 2020 in influent, secondary and tertiary effluent water samples. By  
33 using the real-time RT-PCR (RT-qPCR) Diagnostic Panel validated by US CDC that  
34 targets three regions of the virus nucleocapsid (N) gene, we estimated quantification of  
35 SARS-CoV-2 RNA titers in untreated wastewater waters of  $5.29 \log$  genomic copies/L  
36 on average. Moreover, we tested as negative all secondary and tertiary treated water  
37 samples, highlighting that current water disinfection treatments applied in the analyzed  
38 WWTP are able to remove SARS-CoV-2 RNA.

39 This environmental surveillance data were compared to declared COVID-19 cases at  
40 municipality level, revealing that SARS-CoV-2 was circulating among the population  
41 even before the first cases were reported by local or national authorities in many of the  
42 cities where wastewaters have been sampled. The detection of SARS-CoV-2 in  
43 wastewater in early stages of the spread of COVID-19 highlights the relevance of this  
44 strategy as an early indicator of the infection within a specific population. At this point,

45 this environmental surveillance could be implemented by municipalities right away as a  
46 tool, designed to help authorities to coordinate the exit strategy to gradually lift its  
47 coronavirus lockdown.

48

49 **Keywords:** environmental surveillance, influent water, effluent water, reclaimed water,  
50 concentration protocol, RNA virus.

## 51        **1. Introduction**

52    Coronaviruses (CoVs) are a family of viruses pathogenic for humans and animals  
53    associated to respiratory and gastro-intestinal infections. CoVs used to be considered as  
54    minor pathogens for humans as they were responsible of common cold or mild respiratory  
55    infections in immunocompetent people. Nonetheless, the emergence of novel and highly  
56    pathogenic zoonotic diseases caused by CoVs such as Severe Acute Respiratory  
57    Syndrome (SARS), Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) and most recently  
58    SARS-CoV-2 arises questions to be addressed to guide public health response.

59    CoVs are mainly transmitted through respiratory droplets. However, as for SARS and  
60    MERS, SARS-CoV-2 RNA has been detected in stool samples from patients suffering  
61    COVID-19 and from asymptomatic carriers (1–5). The duration of viral shedding has  
62    been observed to vary among patients with means of 14-21 days (6, 7), as well as the  
63    magnitude of shedding varies from  $10^2$  up to  $10^8$  RNA copies per gram (1, 2, 8).

64    Infectious viruses deriving from fecal specimen have been cultured in Vero E6 cells and  
65    observed by electron microscopy (9). In addition, gastric, duodenal, and rectal epithelial  
66    cells are infected by SARS-CoV-2 and the release of the infectious virions to the  
67    gastrointestinal tract supports the possible fecal-oral transmission route (10). Even though  
68    the possibility of faecal-oral transmission has been hypothesized, the role of secretions in  
69    the spreading of the disease is not clarified yet (6, 7, 9, 11).

70    Wastewater monitoring has been a successful strategy pursued to track chemical and  
71    biological markers of human activity including illicit drugs consumption,  
72    pharmaceuticals use/abuse, water pollution, and occurrence of antimicrobial resistance  
73    genes (12–15). Viral diseases have been also surveilled by the detection of genetic  
74    material into wastewater as for enteric viruses (16–18), re-emerging zoonotic hepatitis E  
75    virus (19, 20), and poliovirus during the global eradication programme (21).

76 Currently, various studies detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater worldwide (22–  
77 26), and wastewater testing has been suggested as a non-invasive early-warning tool for  
78 monitoring the status and trend of COVID-19 infection and as an instrument for tuning  
79 public health response (27–29). Under current circumstance, this environmental  
80 surveillance could be implemented in wastewater treatment plants as a tool, designed to  
81 help authorities to coordinate the exit strategy to gradually lift its coronavirus lockdown.  
82 Here, we report the first detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in untreated wastewater samples  
83 in Spain collected from six different wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) in Murcia,  
84 the lowest prevalence area in Iberian Peninsula. Additionally, the efficacy of the  
85 secondary and tertiary treatments implemented in the WWTPs against SARS-CoV-2 has  
86 been confirmed. The outcomes of the environmental surveillance reflect the  
87 epidemiological data in a low COVID-19 diagnosed cases setting, thus supporting the  
88 need of developing and implementing advanced models for wastewater-based  
89 epidemiology (WBE).

## 90        **2. Material and methods**

### 91        **2.1. Sampling sites and samples collection**

92        Influent and effluent water samples were collected from six WWTPs located in the main  
93        cities of the Region of Murcia, Spain (Figure 1). Technical data on WWTPs are  
94        provided in Table 1.

95        A total of 42 influent, and 18 secondary and 12 tertiary treated effluent water samples  
96        were collected from 12 March to 14 April 2020 and investigated for the occurrence of  
97        SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Collected samples were transferred on ice to the laboratory and  
98        concentrated on the same day of sampling or the day after.

99

### 100       **2.2. Wastewater and effluent water concentration**

101        The porcine epidemic diarrhea virus (PEDV) strain CV777 and the mengovirus (MgV)  
102        vMC0 (CECT 100000) were preliminary used to evaluate the aluminum hydroxide  
103        adsorption-precipitation method previously described for concentrating enteric viruses  
104        from wastewater and effluent water (30, 31). In brief, 200 mL of biobanked influent (n=2)  
105        and effluent water samples (n=2) were artificially inoculated with PEDV and MgV. Then  
106        pH was adjusted to 6.0 and Al(OH)<sub>3</sub> precipitate formed by adding 1 part 0.9N AlCl<sub>3</sub>  
107        (Acros organics, Geel, Belgium) solution to 100 parts of sample. The pH was readjusted  
108        to 6.0 and sample mixed using an orbital shaker at 150 rpm for 15 min at room  
109        temperature. Then, viruses were concentrated by centrifugation at 1,700 × g for 20 min.  
110        The pellet was resuspended in 10 mL of 3% beef extract pH 7.4, and samples were shaken  
111        for 10 min at 150 rpm. Concentrate was recovered by centrifugation at 1,900 × g for 30  
112        min and pellet resuspended in 1 mL of PBS.  
113        All wastewater and effluent water samples included in this study were processed as  
114        described and MgV (5 log PCRU) was spiked as process control.

115

### 116 **2.3. Viral extraction, detection and quantification**

117 Viral RNA was extracted from concentrates using the NucleoSpin RNA virus kit  
118 (Macherey-Nagel GmbH & Co., Düren, Germany) according to the manufacturer's  
119 instructions with some modifications. Briefly, 150  $\mu$ L of the concentrated sample was  
120 mixed with 25  $\mu$ L of Plant RNA Isolation Aid (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Vilnius,  
121 Lithuania) and 600  $\mu$ L of lysis buffer from the NucleoSpin virus kit and subjected to  
122 pulse-vortexing for 1 min. Then, the homogenate was centrifuged for 5 min at 10,000  $\times$   
123 g to remove the debris. The supernatant was subsequently processed according to the  
124 manufacturer's instructions.

125 Viral RNA was detected by TaqMan real-time RT-PCR (RT-qPCR) on LightCycler 480  
126 instrument (Roche Diagnostics, Germany). MgV RNA was detected by using UltraSense  
127 One-Step kit (Invitrogen, SA, US) and the RT-qPCR assay as in ISO 15216-1:2017 (32,  
128 33). Undiluted and ten-fold diluted MgV RNA was tested to check for RT-qPCR  
129 inhibitors.

130 PEDV RNA was detected by using PrimeScript™ One Step RT-PCR Kit (Takara Bio,  
131 USA) and the TaqMan RT-qPCR assay described by (34).

132 SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected by using PrimeScript™ One Step RT-PCR Kit and the  
133 RT-qPCR diagnostic panel assays validated by the US Centers for Disease Control and  
134 Prevention (35). The first version of the kit with three sets of oligonucleotide primers and  
135 probes was used to target three different SARS-CoV-2 regions of the nucleocapsid (N)  
136 gene. The sets of primer and probes (2019-nCoV RUO Kit) as well as the positive control  
137 (2019-nCoV\_N\_Positive Control) were provided by IDT (Integrated DNA Technologies,  
138 Leuven, Belgium). Each RNA was analyzed in duplicate and every RT-qPCR assay  
139 included negative (nuclease-free water) and positive controls.

140 Biobanked samples (n=4) collected in October 2019, before the first COVID-19 case was  
141 documented, were used as relevant negative control to exclude false positive reactions.  
142 SARS-CoV-2 RNA was quantified as genome copies (gc) by plotting the quantification  
143 cycles (Ct) to an external standard curve built with 10-fold serial dilution of a quantified  
144 plasmid control (IDT). MgV and PEDV RNA were quantified by plotting the Cts to an  
145 external standard curve generated by serial end-point dilution method.  
146 MgV recovery rates were calculated and used as quality assurance parameters according  
147 to ISO 15216-1:2017 (33).

148

### 149 **3. Results and Discussion**

#### 150 **3.1. Performance of the concentration method**

151 The aluminum hydroxide adsorption-precipitation method was tested by spiking influent  
152 and effluent samples with MgV and PEDV. On average, MgV was recovered at ranges  
153 of  $10.85 \pm 2.11\%$  in influent and  $6.19 \pm 1.00\%$  in effluent water. PEDV was recovered at  
154 ranges of  $10.90 \pm 3.54\%$  in influent and  $3.29 \pm 1.58\%$  in effluent water. These results are  
155 in line with the MgV recoveries reported for enteric viruses concentration in water  
156 samples by the same aluminum-based method (19, 30) and higher than the 1% as the  
157 quality assurance parameter indicated for bottled water into ISO 15216-1:2017 (33).

158 Similarly, MgV was successfully used as recovery control for hepatitis E virus  
159 concentration from influent and effluent water samples (5-13%) by applying a  
160 polyethylene glycol (PEG) precipitation method (20). A similar PEG-based protocol was  
161 recently used to recover SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater, although recovery control was  
162 not included in the study (23).

163 Moreover, filtration through 10 kDa Centricon<sup>®</sup> Plus-70 centrifugal device successfully  
164 recovered SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater with recovery efficiencies of F-specific RNA



165 phages of 73% (22). However, concentration by electropositive membrane should be  
166 further evaluated given a SARS-CoV recovery from wastewater of 1% (36).  
167 Rigorous limits of detection should be established by spiking SARS-CoV-2 cell-culture  
168 adapted strain or positive COVID-19 fecal samples in influent and effluent wastewater  
169 samples to be concentrated following the aluminum hydroxide adsorption-precipitation  
170 method. Nonetheless, the need of a BSL3 laboratory facility to handle SARS-CoV-2  
171 represents the main limitation of this experiment.

172

### 173 **3.2. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater and effluent water**

174 A total of 42 influent, and 18 secondary and 12 tertiary treated effluent water samples  
175 were collected from 12 March to 14 April 2020 and investigated for the occurrence of  
176 SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Samples were considered positive for Ct below 40 (as in Medema et  
177 al., 2020 and F. Wu et al., 2020) and titrated by using the quantified plasmid control for  
178 each of the RT-qPCR targets.

179 The 85.7% (36 positive samples out of 42) influent samples were tested positive for at  
180 least one SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR target. None (0 out of 30) of the secondary and tertiary  
181 effluent samples tested positive for any of the SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR target (Figure 2).  
182 A relevant number of influent water samples (12%) showed Ct ranging between 37 and  
183 40, even though lower Ct of 34-37 were observed (29%). In all samples, MgV recoveries  
184 were above 1% ( $10.05 \pm 14.10\%$ ). Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in influent water has  
185 been reported worldwide (22–24, 26), and only one study tested treated wastewater that  
186 resulted positive (Paris) (25).

187 On average, SARS-CoV-2 RNA titers of  $5.15 \pm 0.25$ ,  $5.53 \pm 0.24$ , and  $5.49 \pm 0.27$  log  
188 gc/L were quantified in wastewater by using N1, N2 and N3 primer/probe mixes,

189 respectively. Titer of 4 and 5 to more than 6 log gc/L have been reported in Massachusetts  
190 and France, respectively (23, 25).

191 We observed discrepancies among RT-qPCR N1, N2 and N3 assays for several water  
192 samples in agreement to a previous report (22). This could be due to the different  
193 analytical sensitivity among the assays as well as the detection of possible false positive  
194 samples by RT-qPCR N3 in low concentrated samples (37, 38). The latter possibility has  
195 been solved by excluding the N3 primers/probe set from the US CDC 2019-nCoV RT-  
196 qPCR diagnostic panel in its last revision (March, 30) (39). In addition, a partial inhibitory  
197 effect of the matrix is not to be completely excluded despite the controls included in the  
198 assays. A more sensitive estimation of SARS-CoV-2 loads in wastewater should be  
199 studied by digital RT-qPCR (dRT-qPCR). dRT-qPCR could be used to quantify samples  
200 with low viral loads, even though it may not be the best practical and economically  
201 sustainable option for environmental surveillance.

202 Even though the SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in wastewater is functional for WBE  
203 purposes, the risk for human health associated to the water cycle is still under debate as  
204 infectivity of viral particles remain to be confirmed as well as its potential fecal-oral  
205 transmission.

206 In spite of the high concentration of viral RNA in specimen and the evidence of  
207 gastrointestinal infection (10), infectious viruses from stools have been isolated in one  
208 study (9) while another attempt resulted without success (2).

209 The potential transmission of SARS-CoV-2 via wastewater has not been proven (40, 41)  
210 and it seems unlikely given the poor viral stability in environmental conditions and its  
211 elevated sensitivity to disinfectants (26, 42, 43).

212

213 **3.3. Environmental surveillance**

214 Epidemiological data on COVID-19 in the Murcia Region have been retrieved from the  
215 publically available repository of the “Servicio de epidemiología” of the “Consejería de  
216 Salud de la Región de Murcia” (available at <http://www.murciasalud.es/principal.php>)  
217 (Table 3) and plotted to the SARS-CoV-2 RNA mean loads as detected by three RT-  
218 qPCR assays (Figure 2).

219 In general, RT-qPCR amplification signals have been detected in wastewaters when cases  
220 were diagnosed within the municipality. Positive wastewater samples have been detected  
221 with at least two out of three RT-qPCR assays in low prevalence municipalities as in  
222 Murcia (96 cases, 21.18 cases per 100,000 inhabitants), Cartagena (36 cases, 16.76) and  
223 Molina de Segura (12 cases, 16.69). Of note, positive wastewater samples were detected  
224 12-16 days before COVID-19 cases were declared in Lorca, Cieza and Totana  
225 municipalities.

226 A similar study conducted in Paris (France) demonstrated the detection of viral genome  
227 before the exponential phase of the epidemic (25). However, our results indicate that  
228 SARS-CoV-2 can be detected weeks before the first confirmed case. The early detection  
229 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater could have alerted about the imminent danger,  
230 giving a valuable time to the managers to coordinate and implement actions to slow the  
231 spread of the disease. Therefore, our outcomes support that WBE could be used as an  
232 early warning tool to monitor the status and the trend of COVID-19 infection within a  
233 community.

234 On the other hand, we believe that this environmental surveillance could be used as an  
235 instrument to drive the right decisions to reduce the risk of lifting restrictions too early.  
236 In fact, a very important question is to determine what needs to be implemented to have  
237 reliable data to reduce the risk of a “second wave”. Massive population tests are the first  
238 choice, but in their absence, wastewater monitorization of SARS-CoV-2 RNA can give a

239 reliable picture of the current situation. Our wastewater data do not quantitatively  
240 resemble the prevalence of COVID-19 confirmed cases. To this end, a quantitative model  
241 that includes and corrects all the variables affecting these wastewater surveillance data  
242 would be useful for a better interpretation. For instance, not all COVID-19 positive  
243 patients excrete SARS-CoV-2 RNA in faeces, and when it occurs, the titers and the  
244 duration of shedding vary among individuals and across time (1, 2, 5, 7). On the other  
245 hand, the real number of positive cases within the Murcia Region remains unknown  
246 because of the large number of mild or asymptomatic carriers that have not been included  
247 in epidemiological statistics.

248 These aspects together with environmental variables (e.g., rainfall events, temperature)  
249 increase the uncertainties linked to the correlation between SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection  
250 in wastewater samples and the prevalence of COVID-19 that could be explored by using  
251 complex models.

252 In conclusions, wastewater surveillance and WBE may represent a complementary  
253 approach to estimate the presence and even the prevalence of COVID-19 in communities.  
254 This represents an effective tool that needs to be further explored in order to direct public  
255 health response, especially in cases of limited capacity for clinical testing.

256

## 257 **Funding**

258 The study was funded by the projects 20180705 of ESAMUR, 202070E101 of CSIC and  
259 “VIRIDIANA” AGL2017-82909 (AEI/FEDER, UE) of MICIU. WR is supported by  
260 APOSTD/2018/150 postdoctoral fellowship of Generalitat Valenciana. EC-F is recipient  
261 of a predoctoral contract from the MICINN, Call 2018. PT is holder of the RYC2018-  
262 025510-I Ramón y Cajal contract from the MICIU.

263

264 **Acknowledgments**

265 The authors acknowledge the “Entidad Regional de Saneamiento y Depuración de Aguas

266 Residuales (ESAMUR)” for authorizing the sampling and Prof. Ana Carvajal (Faculty of

267 Veterinary Medicine, University of Leon, Spain) for kindly providing PEDV.

268

269 **References**

- 270 1. Pan Y, Zhang D, Yang P, Poon LLM, Wang Q. 2020. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2  
271 in clinical samples. *Lancet Infect Dis* 20:411–412.
- 272 2. Woelfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Mueller MA,  
273 Niemeyer D, Vollmar P, Rothe C, Hoelscher M, Bleicker T, Bruenink S,  
274 Schneider J, Ehmann R, Zwirgmaier K, Drosten C, Wendtner C. 2020. Clinical  
275 presentation and virological assessment of hospitalized cases of coronavirus  
276 disease 2019 in a travel-associated transmission cluster. *medRxiv*  
277 2020.03.05.20030502.
- 278 3. Young BE, Ong SWX, Kalimuddin S, Low JG, Tan SY, Loh J, Ng O-T,  
279 Marimuthu K, Ang LW, Mak TM, Lau SK, Anderson DE, Chan KS, Tan TY, Ng  
280 TY, Cui L, Said Z, Kurupatham L, Chen MI-C, Chan M, Vasoo S, Wang L-F,  
281 Tan BH, Lin RTP, Lee VJM, Leo Y-S, Lye DC, Team for the S 2019 NCOR.  
282 2020. Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected With  
283 SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore. *JAMA*.
- 284 4. Zhang W, Du R-H, Li B, Zheng X-S, Yang X-L, Hu B, Wang Y-Y, Xiao G-F,  
285 Yan B, Shi Z-L, Zhou P. 2020. Molecular and serological investigation of 2019-  
286 nCoV infected patients: implication of multiple shedding routes. *Emerg Microbes*  
287 *Infect* 9:386–389.
- 288 5. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, Lau YC, Wong JY, Guan Y,  
289 Tan X, Mo X, Chen Y, Liao B, Chen W, Hu F, Zhang Q, Zhong M, Wu Y, Zhao  
290 L, Zhang F, Cowling BJ, Li F, Leung GM. 2020. Temporal dynamics in viral  
291 shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med*.
- 292 6. Wu Y, Guo C, Tang L, Hong Z, Zhou J, Dong X, Yin H, Xiao Q, Tang Y, Qu X,  
293 Kuang L, Fang X, Mishra N, Lu J, Shan H, Jiang G, Huang X. 2020. Prolonged  
294 presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in faecal samples. *Lancet Gastroenterol*  
295 *Hepatol* 5:434–435.
- 296 7. Xu Y, Li X, Zhu B, Liang H, Fang C, Gong Y, Guo Q, Sun X, Zhao D, Shen J,  
297 Zhang H, Liu H, Xia H, Tang J, Zhang K, Gong S. 2020. Characteristics of  
298 pediatric SARS-CoV-2 infection and potential evidence for persistent fecal viral  
299 shedding. *Nat Med* 26:502–505.
- 300 8. Lescure F-X, Bouadma L, Nguyen D, Parisey M, Wicky P-H, Behillil S,  
301 Gaymard A, Bouscambert-Duchamp M, Donati F, Le Hingrat Q, Enouf V,  
302 Houhou-Fidouh N, Valette M, Mailles A, Lucet J-C, Mentre F, Duval X,  
303 Descamps D, Malvy D, Timsit J-F, Lina B, van-der-Werf S, Yazdanpanah Y.  
304 2020. Clinical and virological data of the first cases of COVID-19 in Europe: a  
305 case series. *Lancet Infect Dis*.
- 306 9. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, Tan W. 2020. Detection of SARS-  
307 CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA*.
- 308 10. Xiao F, Tang M, Zheng X, Li C, He J, Hong Z, Huang S, Zhang Z, Lin X, Fang  
309 Z, Lai R, Chen S, Liu J, Huang J, Xia J, Li Z, Jiang G, Liu Y, Li X, Shan H.  
310 2020. Evidence for gastrointestinal infection of SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv*  
311 2020.02.17.20023721.

- 312 11. Yeo C, Kaushal S, Yeo D. 2020. Enteric involvement of coronaviruses: is  
313 faecal-oral transmission of SARS-CoV-2 possible? *Lancet*  
314 *Gastroenterol Hepatol* 5:335–337.
- 315 12. Choi PM, Tschärke BJ, Donner E, O’Brien JW, Grant SC, Kaserzon SL, Mackie  
316 R, O’Malley E, Crosbie ND, Thomas K V, Mueller JF. 2018. Wastewater-based  
317 epidemiology biomarkers: Past, present and future. *TrAC - Trends Anal Chem*.
- 318 13. Lorenzo M, Picó Y. 2019. Wastewater-based epidemiology: current status and  
319 future prospects. *Curr Opin Environ Sci Heal*.
- 320 14. Mercan S, Kuloglu M, Ascioglu F. 2019. Monitoring of illicit drug consumption  
321 via wastewater: development, challenges, and future aspects. *Curr Opin Environ*  
322 *Sci Heal*.
- 323 15. de Oliveira M, Frihling BEF, Velasques J, Filho FJCM, Cavalheri PS, Migliolo  
324 L. 2020. Pharmaceuticals residues and xenobiotics contaminants: Occurrence,  
325 analytical techniques and sustainable alternatives for wastewater treatment. *Sci*  
326 *Total Environ*.
- 327 16. Prevost B, Lucas FS, Goncalves A, Richard F, Moulin L, Wurtzer S. 2015. Large  
328 scale survey of enteric viruses in river and waste water underlines the health  
329 status of the local population. *Environ Int* 79:42–50.
- 330 17. Santiso-Bellón C, Randazzo W, Pérez-Cataluña A, Vila-Vicent S, Gozalbo-  
331 Rovira R, Muñoz C, Buesa J, Sanchez G, Díaz JR. 2020. Epidemiological  
332 surveillance of norovirus and rotavirus in sewage (2016–2017) in Valencia  
333 (Spain). *Microorganisms*.
- 334 18. Hellmer M, Paxeus N, Magnus L, Enache L, Arnholm B, Johansson A,  
335 Bergstrom T, Norder H. 2014. Detection of pathogenic viruses in sewage  
336 provided early warnings of hepatitis A virus and norovirus outbreaks. *Appl*  
337 *Environ Microbiol* 80:6771–6781.
- 338 19. Cuevas-Ferrando E, Randazzo W, Pérez-Cataluña A, Sánchez G. 2020. HEV  
339 Occurrence in Waste and Drinking Water Treatment Plants . *Front Microbiol* .
- 340 20. Miura T, Lhomme S, Le Saux J-C, Le Mehaute P, Guillois Y, Couturier E, Izopet  
341 J, Abranavel F, Le Guyader FS. 2016. Detection of Hepatitis E Virus in Sewage  
342 After an Outbreak on a French Island. *Food Environ Virol* 8:194–9.
- 343 21. Asghar H, Diop OM, Weldegebriel G, Malik F, Shetty S, El Bassioni L, Akande  
344 AO, Al Maamoun E, Zaidi S, Adeniji AJ, Burns CC, Deshpande J, Oberste MS,  
345 Lowther SA. 2014. Environmental surveillance for polioviruses in the Global  
346 Polio Eradication Initiative. *J Infect Dis* 210 Suppl:S294-303.
- 347 22. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. 2020. Presence of  
348 SARS-Coronavirus-2 in sewage. medRxiv 2020.03.29.20045880.
- 349 23. Wu F, Xiao A, Zhang J, Gu X, Lee WL, Kauffman K, Hanage W, Matus M,  
350 Ghaeli N, Endo N, Duvallet C, Moniz K, Erickson T, Chai P, Thompson J, Alm  
351 E. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from  
352 clinically confirmed cases. medRxiv 2020.04.05.20051540.
- 353 24. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, Bibby K, Bivins A, O’Brien JW, Choi PM,  
354 Kitajima M, Simpson SL, Li J, Tschärke B, Verhagen R, Smith WJM, Zaugg J,



- 355 Dierens L, Hugenholtz P, Thomas K V, Mueller JF. 2020. First confirmed  
356 detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of  
357 concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Sci*  
358 *Total Environ* 138764.
- 359 25. Wurtzer S, Marechal V, Mouchel J-M, Moulin L. 2020. Time course quantitative  
360 detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Parisian wastewaters correlates with COVID-19  
361 confirmed cases. *medRxiv* 2020.04.12.20062679.
- 362 26. Lodder W, de Roda Husman AM. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: potential  
363 health risk, but also data source. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol*.
- 364 27. Daughton C. 2020. The international imperative to rapidly and inexpensively  
365 monitor community-wide Covid-19 infection status and trends. *Sci Total Environ*  
366 138149.
- 367 28. Mallapaty S. 2020. How sewage could reveal true scale of coronavirus outbreak.  
368 *Nature*.
- 369 29. Naddeo V, Liu H. 2020. Editorial Perspectives: 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-  
370 CoV-2): what is its fate in urban water cycle and how can the water research  
371 community respond? *Environ Sci Water Res Technol*.
- 372 30. Randazzo W, Piqueras J, Evtoski Z, Sastre G, Sancho R, Gonzalez C, Sanchez G.  
373 2019. Interlaboratory Comparative Study to Detect Potentially Infectious Human  
374 Enteric Viruses in Influent and Effluent Waters. *Food Environ Virol*.
- 375 31. AAVV. 2011. Standard Methods For the Examination of Water and Wastewater  
376 (9510)Detection of enteric viruses. American Public Health Association.
- 377 32. Costafreda MI, Bosch A, Pintó RM. 2006. Development, evaluation, and  
378 standardization of a real-time TaqMan reverse transcription-PCR assay for  
379 quantification of hepatitis A virus in clinical and shellfish samples. *Appl Environ*  
380 *Microbiol* 72:3846–3855.
- 381 33. ISO 15216-1. 2017. Microbiology of the Food Chain – Horizontal Method for  
382 Determination of Hepatitis A Virus and Norovirus Using Real-Time RT-PCR –  
383 Part 1: Method for Quantification. ISO 15216-1:2017.
- 384 34. Zhou X, Zhang T, Song D, Huang T, Peng Q, Chen Y, Li A, Zhang F, Wu Q, Ye  
385 Y, Tang Y. 2017. Comparison and evaluation of conventional RT-PCR, SYBR  
386 green I and TaqMan real-time RT-PCR assays for the detection of porcine  
387 epidemic diarrhea virus. *Mol Cell Probes* 33:36–41.
- 388 35. CDC. 2020. CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR  
389 Diagnostic Panel.
- 390 36. Wang X-W, Li J-S, Jin M, Zhen B, Kong Q-X, Song N, Xiao W-J, Yin J, Wei W,  
391 Wang G-J, Si B-Y, Guo B-Z, Liu C, Ou G-R, Wang M-N, Fang T-Y, Chao F-H,  
392 Li J-W. 2005. Study on the resistance of severe acute respiratory syndrome-  
393 associated coronavirus. *J Virol Methods* 126:171–177.
- 394 37. Jung YJ, Park G-S, Moon JH, Ku K, Beak S-H, Kim S, Park EC, Park D, Lee J-  
395 H, Byeon CW, Lee JJ, Maeng J-S, Kim SJ, Kim S Il, Kim B-T, Lee MJ, Kim  
396 HG. 2020. Comparative analysis of primer-probe sets for the laboratory  
397 confirmation of SARS-CoV-2. *bioRxiv* 2020.02.25.964775.



- 398 38. Vogels CBF, Brito AF, Wyllie AL, Fauver JR, Ott IM, Kalinich CC, Petrone  
399 ME, Casanovas-Massana A, Muenker MC, Moore AJ, Klein J, Lu P, Lu-Culligan  
400 A, Jiang X, Kim DJ, Kudo E, Mao T, Moriyama M, Oh JE, Park A, Silva J, Song  
401 E, Takehashi T, Taura M, Tokuyama M, Venkataraman A, Weizman O-E, Wong  
402 P, Yang Y, Cheemarla NR, White E, Lapidus S, Earnest R, Geng B, Vijayakumar  
403 P, Odio C, Fournier J, Bermejo S, Farhadian S, Dela Cruz C, Iwasaki A, Ko AI,  
404 Landry M-L, Foxman EF, Grubaugh ND. 2020. Analytical sensitivity and  
405 efficiency comparisons of SARS-COV-2 qRT-PCR assays. medRxiv  
406 2020.03.30.20048108.
- 407 39. CDC. CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR  
408 Diagnostic Panel.
- 409 40. WHO WHO. 2020. Water, sanitation, hygiene and waste management for  
410 COVID-19.
- 411 41. CDC. Water Transmission and COVID-19: Questions and Answers.
- 412 42. Chin AWH, Chu JTS, Perera MRA, Hui KPY, Yen H-L, Chan MCW, Peiris M,  
413 Poon LLM. 2020. Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental  
414 conditions. *The Lancet Microbe*.
- 415 43. Haas C. 2020. Coronavirus and Risk Analysis. *Risk Anal* 40:660–661.  
416

417 **Figure 1.** Maps of the sampling location. Symbols represents WWTPs and are sized  
418 according to the number of equivalent inhabitants.



419

420 **Table 1.** Operating characteristics of WWTPs.

|                         | Population |            | Capacity (m <sup>3</sup> /a) |            | Reclamation processes  | Reuse         |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------------------------|------------|--|---------------|
|                         | Connected  | Equivalent | Designed                     | Current    |  |               |
| <b>Murcia</b>           | 370,893    | 530,499    | 36,500,000                   | 36,952,999 | Activated sludge (A2O process), Disinfection, NaClO  | Public domain |
| <b>Cartagena</b>        | 175,870    | 163,969    | 12,775,000                   | 8,625,103  | Activated sludge, Disinfection   | Irrigation    |
| <b>Molina de Segura</b> | 67,455     | 150,545    | 9,125,000                    | 5,699,930  | Activated sludge, Decantation, Coagulation, Flocculation, Sand filtration, Disinfection, UV, NaClO               | Irrigation    |
| <b>Lorca</b>            | 73,057     | 101,161    | 7,300,000                    | 3,366,919  | Activated sludge, Coagulation, Flocculation, Sand filtration, Disinfection, UV, NaClO                            | Irrigation    |
| <b>Cieza</b>            | 33,744     | 69,502     | 3,650,000                    | 2,338,673  | Activated sludge (Extended aeration), Disinfection, Coagulation, Flocculation, Sand filtration, Disinfection, UV | Irrigation    |
| <b>Totana</b>           | 29,113     | 28,289     | 2,190,000                    | 1,440,463  | Activated sludge (Extended aeration), Disinfection, UV   | Irrigation    |

422 **Figure 2.** Mean amplification cycles of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in influent, secondary and  
 423 tertiary effluent waters in monitored WWTPs within Murcia Region (Spain).  
 424 Results are reported for each of the three regions of the virus nucleocapsid (N) gene  
 425 according to the first version of the Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel by US CDC.  
 426 Abbreviations: -, negative; white boxes, not tested.

| Sampling site    | Water sample      | Molecular Target | 12 March | 16 March | 18 March | 26 March | 02 April | 07 April | 14 April |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Murcia           | Influent          | N1               | -        | 34       | -        | 36       | 38       | 39       | 36       |
|                  | Influent          | N2               | -        | 38       | -        | 36       | -        | 36       | -        |
|                  | Influent          | N3               | -        | -        | 38       | 34       | -        | 36       | 39       |
|                  | Secondary treated | N1, N2, N3       |          |          |          |          | -        | -        | -        |
|                  | Tertiary treated  | N1, N2, N3       |          |          |          |          | -        | -        | -        |
| Cartagena        | Influent          | N1               | -        | -        | -        | 38       | 36       | -        | 39       |
|                  | Influent          | N2               | -        | -        | -        | 38       | 38       | -        | 39       |
|                  | Influent          | N3               | -        | 38       | 36       | -        | 36       | 38       | 36       |
|                  | Secondary treated | N1, N2, N3       |          |          |          |          | -        | -        | -        |
| Molina de Segura | Influent          | N1               | -        | -        | -        | -        | 38       | 34       | 39       |
|                  | Influent          | N2               | 38       | 38       | -        | -        | 38       | 36       | 39       |
|                  | Influent          | N3               | 36       | -        | 36       | 36       | 38       | 36       | 39       |
|                  | Secondary treated | N1, N2, N3       |          |          |          |          | -        | -        | -        |
|                  | Tertiary treated  | N1, N2, N3       |          |          |          |          | -        | -        | -        |
| Lorca            | Influent          | N1               | -        | -        | 36       | -        | 38       | 36       | 39       |
|                  | Influent          | N2               | 36       | -        | -        | 34       | 38       | -        | 38       |
|                  | Influent          | N3               | 34       | -        | 36       | -        | 36       | 36       | 38       |
|                  | Secondary treated | N1, N2, N3       |          |          |          |          | -        | -        | -        |
|                  | Tertiary treated  | N1, N2, N3       |          |          |          |          | -        | -        | -        |
| Cieza            | Influent          | N1               | -        | 34       | 36       | -        | -        | -        | -        |
|                  | Influent          | N2               | -        | 36       | 38       | 38       | 38       | 34       | 36       |
|                  | Influent          | N3               | -        | 36       | 38       | 36       | -        | 36       | -        |
|                  | Secondary treated | N1, N2, N3       |          |          |          |          | -        | -        | -        |
|                  | Tertiary treated  | N1, N2, N3       |          |          |          |          | -        | -        | -        |
| Totana           | Influent          | N1               | -        | 36       | -        | 36       | 38       | 38       | -        |
|                  | Influent          | N2               | -        | 38       | -        | -        | 36       | -        | -        |
|                  | Influent          | N3               | -        | 36       | -        | 38       | 36       | -        | -        |
|                  | Secondary treated | N1, N2, N3       |          |          |          |          | -        | -        | -        |

Ct scale: 

|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

428 **Table 2.** Epidemiological data<sup>1</sup> summary of COVID-19 cases in the area of study.


|                         | 20/03/2020 |                         | 25/03/2020 |            | 30/03/2020 |            | 08/04/2020 |            | 15/04/2020 |            |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                         | Cases      | Prevalence <sup>2</sup> | Cases      | Prevalence | Cases      | Prevalence | Cases      | Prevalence | Cases      | Prevalence |
| <b>Murcia</b>           | 96         | 21.18                   | 210        | 46.33      | 332        | 73.2       | 551        | 121.6      | 622        | 137.2      |
| <b>Cartagena</b>        | 36         | 16.76                   | 64         | 29.79      | 111        | 51.7       | 163        | 75.9       | 190        | 88.5       |
| <b>Molina de Segura</b> | 12         | 16.69                   | 26         | 36.17      | 40         | 55.6       | 60         | 83.5       | 70         | 97.4       |
| <b>Lorca</b>            | -          | -                       | 8          | 8.47       | 18         | 19.1       | 29         | 30.7       | 31         | 32.8       |
| <b>Cieza</b>            | -          | -                       | 12         | 34.30      | 22         | 62.9       | 45         | 128.6      | 49         | 140.0      |
| <b>Totana</b>           | -          | -                       | -          | -          | 7          | 21.9       | 13         | 40.6       | 14         | 43.7       |

429

430 <sup>1</sup>. Data retrieved from the public repository of the “Servicio de epidemiología” of the “Consejería de Salud de la Región de Murcia” (available at  
431 <http://www.murciasalud.es/principal.php>).

432 <sup>2</sup>. Prevalence, percentage of diagnosed cases per 100.000 inhabitants.

433 **Figure 3.** COVID-19 prevalence and SARS-CoV-2 RNA loads in wastewater per  
434 sampling date and municipalities.



435

436