

SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater treatment plants

Maria Cristina Collivignarelli, Carlo Collivignarelli, Marco Carnevale Miino, Alessandro Abbà, Roberta Pedrazzani,
Giorgio Bertanza

Maria Cristina Collivignarelli

Department of Civil Engineering and Architecture

University of Pavia

via Ferrata 1, 27100 Pavia, Italy

Interdepartmental Centre for Water Research

University of Pavia

Via Ferrata 3, 27100 Pavia, Italy

mcristina.collivignarelli@unipv.it

Carlo Collivignarelli

Department of Civil, Environmental, Architectural Engineering and Mathematics

University of Brescia

Via Branze 43, 25123 Brescia, Italy

carlo.collivignarelli@unibs.it

Marco Carnevale Miino

(*) Corresponding author

Department of Civil Engineering and Architecture

University of Pavia

via Ferrata 1, 27100 Pavia, Italy

marco.carnevalemiino01@universitadipavia.it

+39 0382 98 5311

Alessandro Abbà

Department of Civil, Environmental, Architectural Engineering and Mathematics

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

University of Brescia

31 Via Branze 43, 25123 Brescia, Italy

32 alessandro.abba@unibs.it

33

34 **Roberta Pedrazzani**

35 Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering

36 University of Brescia

37 via Branze 38, 25123 Brescia, Italy

38 roberta.pedrazzani@unibs.it

39

40 **Giorgio Bertanza**

41 Department of Civil, Environmental, Architectural Engineering and Mathematics

42 University of Brescia

43 Via Branze 43, 25123 Brescia, Italy

44 giorgio.bertanza@unibs.it

45

46 **ORCID:**

47 M. C. Collivignarelli (0000-0002-0497-9354)

48 M. Carnevale Miino (0000-0003-3669-1635)

49 A. Abbà (0000-0002-1377-9741)

50 R. Pedrazzani (0000-0003-2796-1517)

51 G. Bertanza (0000-0002-2965-023X)

52

SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater treatment plants

53 Maria Cristina Collivignarelli ^{1,2}, Carlo Collivignarelli ³, Marco Carnevale Miino ^{1,*}, Alessandro Abbà ³, Roberta
54 Pedrazzani ⁴, Giorgio Bertanza ³

55 ¹ Department of Civil Engineering and Architecture, University of Pavia, via Ferrata 1, 27100 Pavia, Italy

56 ² Interdepartmental Centre for Water Research, University of Pavia, Via Ferrata 3, 27100 Pavia, Italy

57 ³ Department of Civil, Environmental, Architectural Engineering and Mathematics, University of Brescia, Via Branze
58 43, 25123 Brescia, Italy

59 ⁴ Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, University of Brescia, via Branze 38, I-25123 Brescia, Italy

60 (*) Corresponding author (M. Carnevale Miino): marco.carnevalemiino01@universitadipavia.it; +39 0382 98 5311

61 Abstract

62 As for the SARS coronavirus in the 2003 epidemic, the presence of SARS-CoV-2 has been demonstrated in faeces and,
63 in some cases, urine of infected people, as well as in wastewater. This paper proposes a critical review of the state of the
64 art regarding studies on the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and sewage sludge, the factors affecting its
65 inactivation and the main proposed treatments, with the aim to provide useful information at operative level in order to
66 better and safer manage wastewater and sewage sludge. Given the lack of literature on SARS-CoV-2, studies involving
67 other HCoV-229E have been also considered. In wastewater, the resistance of SARS-
68 CoV has proven to be very limited, especially at temperatures above 20 °C, and the virus has been easily removed with
69 the use of chlorine (> 0.5 mg L⁻¹ for 30 min). For sewage sludge, based on in vitro experiments, it is suggested to
70 increase the retention times before a possible reuse in agriculture only for precautionary purposes, since SARS-CoV-2
71 is unlikely to occur in the sludge. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater might track the epidemic trends: although being
72 extremely promising, an effective and wide application of this approach requires a deeper knowledge of the amounts of
73 viruses excreted through the faeces and the actual detectability of viral RNA in sewage.

74 **Keywords:** Coronavirus removal; CoViD; Human health; SARS; Sewage sludge; Wastewater

75 1. Introduction

76 The coronavirus disease 2019 (CoViD-19) is caused by the virus capable of causing Severe Acute Respiratory
77 Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), previously provisionally named 2019 novel coronavirus or 2019-nCoV
78 (Gorbalenya, Alexander et al., 2020; Lai et al., 2020; Pal et al., 2020; X.-W. Xu et al., 2020). SARS-CoV-2 was
79 discovered in December 2019 in Wuhan (Hubei, China) (Huang et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2020) and quickly spread

80 worldwide thanks to the high rate of infectivity (Remuzzi and Remuzzi, 2020) and the presence of a huge number of
81 asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic patients, hardly identifiable (Zou et al., 2020). In March 2020, the World
82 Health Organization declared a pandemic state (WHO, 2020a) and, despite in many countries total lockdown was
83 imposed (Collivignarelli et al., 2020; Lau et al., 2020), CoViD-19 spread in more than 240 countries (25th May, 2020),
84 millions of people got infected and hundreds of thousands died (WHO, 2020b).

85 The transmission of SARS-CoV-2 person-to-person has been found to be due to its presence in the respiratory tract of
86 infected people (Ghinai et al., 2020). SARS-CoV-2, however, has been also found in the faeces and urine of infected
87 people, thus raising the questions about a possible oral/faecal transmission. This finding represents the starting point of
88 two main fields of investigations: 1) the need of detecting and quantifying the number of viral particles and the actual
89 pathogenicity in wastewater (WW) and sewage sludge (SS) produced by hospitals and houses with infected people,
90 being a possible source of contamination (Núñez-Delgado, 2020); 2) the need of identifying the best strategies for
91 treating/managing wastewater and residues; 3) the possible application of the waste based epidemiology (WBE)
92 approach, in order to track the spatial and temporal dynamics of the epidemic and to get an early warning in case of
93 future outbreaks (Daughton, 2020; Sims and Kasprzyk-Hordern, 2020). Since SARS-CoV-2 appeared recently, research
94 in this field is in its infancy and the position of the scientific community is still uncertain. However, some studies on the
95 behaviour of SARS-CoV and other coronaviruses conducted in recent years (Casanova et al., 2009; Gundy et al., 2009;
96 Wang et al., 2005), may help to understand and predict the potential problems due by the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in
97 the faeces and urine of infected subjects.

98 This paper reviews the available data about the presence of SARS-CoV-2 (together with other viruses, as indicators) in
99 faeces and urine, wastewater and sewage sludge, factors promoting its inactivation and possible treatments.

100 **2. Bibliometric research and literature trends**

101 At first, the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in faeces and urine was studied based on the very recent literature in this field.
102 Since there are still few results published in the literature to ascertain the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in WW and there
103 are no results on SS, the knowledge acquired so far for other types of coronavirus has been reviewed and discussed.

104 In order to carry out the review according to the objectives described above, a multi-step methodology has been adopted
105 as reported by other authors (Collivignarelli et al., 2019; Kable et al., 2012; Martínez Fernández et al., 2019). Scopus®
106 database has been used to search relevant literature research papers, reviews, books and conference proceedings. The
107 keywords are “coronavirus”, “coronavirus AND faeces”, “coronavirus AND urine”, and “coronavirus AND
108 wastewater”. The analysis has been carried out searching the keywords in the fields “Article title, Abstract, Keywords”.

109 These papers have been checked in order to eliminate duplicates and out-of-scope documents. These data were also
110 used to provide a chronological and spatial bibliometric analysis.

111 In recent years, while the number of publications related to coronaviruses reached significant levels thanks to the
112 increased interest following the SARS and, in particular, CoViD-19 epidemic (more than 4900 in the first 4 months of
113 2020 only), the number of published studies on the presence and resistance of coronaviruses in WW is currently almost
114 limited (only 13 from 2000 till now) (Fig.1). This shortage becomes even more evident if studies on the presence of
115 coronavirus in SS are quantified. Using "coronavirus AND sludge" in Scopus®, only 4 results were identified. The
116 limited amount of studies contrasts with the collection of publications relating to the presence of Coronavirus in faeces
117 and urine, for which greater interest has been shown (in the last 5 years there have been 353 and 52, respectively).

118 The USA and China have a prominent position in the list, followed by the United Kingdom and Germany. Italy,
119 Canada, Japan, Hong Kong and Saudi Arabia, which appear among the most prolific nations in terms of publications in
120 this field. Regarding the distribution of papers in the world, in case of co-authoring from institutions of different
121 Countries, a ranking has been drawn up, considering the origin of the first author. The research paper category is always
122 the most represented, with peaks of 76% -90% for publications about the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in faeces and urine.

123

124

FIGURE 1

125

3. Presence of SARS-CoV-2 in faeces and urine

127 Several studies have shown the presence of the SARS-CoV-2 in faeces and urine of infected patients (Chen et al., 2020;
128 Gu et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2020; Y. Wu et al., 2020; Xiao et al., 2020). In Table 1, the results of
129 recent clinical studies are reported. There is literature agreement about the possible finding in faeces of infected
130 subjects, while the occurrence in the urine has not been always confirmed. For instance, Lescure et al. (2020) followed
131 five patients admitted to French hospitals. In this case, the virus was detected in the faeces of two patients while no
132 urine samples appeared positive.

133 From a critical analysis of literature, some fundamental aspects can be highlighted. The first concerns the low level of
134 SARS-CoV-2 RNA shed in the first phase, after illness onset, demonstrated by a rRT-PCR (Real-Time Reverse
135 Transcriptase-Polymerase Chain Reaction) cycle (C_t) value generally in a range between 30 and 40 (considering 40 as
136 positivity threshold) (Wang et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020), quite higher than that deriving from swabs of the
137 respiratory tract (> 20) (Zou et al., 2020). While the viral load in the respiratory tract tends to run out more quickly,

138 several studies have demonstrated that the virus can be found in the stool of an infected subject even after a prolonged
139 period (Cai et al., 2020; Lescure et al., 2020). Zhang et al. (2020) observed that the median duration of virus emission
140 was 10 days in swabs from respiratory tracts and up to 22 days in faeces. Despite the negativity of respiratory swabs, in
141 5% of cases, the faeces were tested positive also 26 days after discharge. Gupta et al. (2020) examined 26 articles on the
142 presence of SARS-CoV-2 in faeces and revealed its occurrence up to 30 days after the onset of the first symptoms in
143 infected patients (in a low number of cases, up to 47 days).

144 Although, at the moment, a path of oral-faecal contamination has not been demonstrated yet and further studies are
145 required, this aspect is still very important because it could determine a greater probability of the presence of viral
146 fragments in WW, also in areas where the infection is still in its early stages, thus allowing to follow the approach of the
147 wastewater based epidemiology.

148

149

TABLE 1

150

4.1. SARS-CoV 2 and wastewater

4.1.1. Is the presence of the virus in wastewater possible?

153 The answer entails the availability of a standard technique for extract and quantify the virus in such a complex matrix,
154 and, in particular, to assess its pathogenicity. As reported above, SARS-CoV-2 can reach the sewerage via faeces, and,
155 possibly, urine, beside other human excreta (Table 2). However, the survival capacity of the virus in WW remains very
156 uncertain and, to date, the results available on the SARS-CoV-2 are limited. Ahmed et al. (2020) researched the
157 presence of the virus in the WW of the city of Brisbane (Australia) in the period at the time of the epidemic peak.

158 Although it was detected in two samples, the quantification cycle (C_q) values were very high (37.5 and 39, respectively)
159 and comparable to those that the virus has in the faeces and urine. F. Wu et al. (2020) monitored a WWTP in

160 Massachusetts determining the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in an order of magnitude estimate of approximately 100
161 viral particles mL^{-1} of WW. In the Netherlands, Medema et al. (2020) studied the WW entering 8 different wastewater
162 treatment plants (WWTPs), finding viral fragments of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. During the epidemic peak, Wurtzer et al.

163 (2020) measured to $10^6 - 10^7$ units_{SARS-CoV-2 RNA} mL^{-1} in French sewage, while Randazzo et al. (2020b, 2020a) monitored

164 the viral RNA in WW collected from two Spanish regions. The latter, quantified SARS-CoV-2 (5.38 ± 0.21 log

165 genomic copies L^{-1}) also in samples collected in La Murgia, an area, where CoViD-19 had a very low impact. Between

166 February and April, in Milan and Rome 12 samples were collected from WWTPs and analysed by La Rosa et al.
167 (2020b). SARS-CoV-2 RNA was evidenced in 50% of samples. Two aspects are particularly noteworthy in study: first,
168 viral fragments were detected in Milan only few days after the first Italian case, was officially released (in the town of
169 Codogno, about 60 km South of Milan). As suggested by La Rosa et al. (2020b) this means that the analysis of WW
170 may lead to a more accurate estimation of the actual period of CoViD-19 onset. Secondly, they started from the
171 standard WHO procedure for Poliovirus surveillance (WHO, 2003) and designed a new SARS-CoV-2 specific primer
172 set for molecular analysis, in order to search the SARS-CoV-2. The development of a standardized procedure of SARS-
173 CoV-2 RNA detection in WW is a crucial aspect in order to obtain reliable and comparable results. However, to date
174 there is no a univocal method, and this represents a significant gap in the research, regarding both the phases of
175 extraction (from such a complex matrix) and quantification.

176 These studies clearly confirm that the virus can therefore be present in WW, but many points remain uncertain. For
177 instance, it is mandatory to investigate the impact of external conditions, such as temperature, pH and retention time, on
178 the survival of SARS-CoV-2 in the aquatic environment. This requires the execution of tests aimed at assessing the
179 virus vitality, practically almost never performed, until now.

180 However, some preliminary considerations about the environmental behaviour of the virus can be advanced. For
181 example, Hart and Halden (2020) have quantitatively estimated the presence of the virus in the WW of infected areas
182 starting from epidemiological data and assuming an exponential decay rate, substantially influenced by temperature,
183 although its actual role, as well as possible synergistic effects with other factors should be further explored. Anyhow,
184 this study shows a singular and innovative approach, which allows to predict the entity of WW contamination on a large
185 scale, in areas, where the epidemics occurs with varying intensity.

186 Another interesting aspect is that SARS-CoV-2 belongs to the coronavirus family exactly like SARS-CoV. After the
187 SARS epidemic of 2003-2004, some tests were conducted for assessing the virus survival in hostile environments.
188 Wang et al. (2005) investigated the inactivation time in urban and hospital WW under different temperature conditions.
189 In both cases at low temperatures (4 °C) the virus maintained its vitality up to 14 d, while it was inactivated only after
190 2d at higher temperatures (20 °C). The coronaviruses reduced survival at temperatures higher than 20 °C was also
191 demonstrated by Gundy et al. (2009), who observed 99% HCoV-229E inactivation (23 °C) after 2.36 days and 1.85
192 days in urban WW after primary and secondary treatment, respectively. For SARS-CoV-2, some preliminary results
193 were published by Rimoldi et al. (2020) which revealed that virus present in WW and river water collected in Milan did
194 not exhibit cytopathic effect. In this case, only a limited number of samples was examined in a very short period of
195 pandemic disease, therefore further research is required.

196

197

TABLE 2

198

199 4.1.2. How to remove it?

200 Although the coronaviruses survival in the environment can differ according to the specific type (Casanova et al., 2009;
201 Wigginton et al., 2015), these indications allow to formulate some preliminary considerations. Based on the above-
202 mentioned findings (Section 4.1.1.), SARS-CoV-2 might be present in WW, but its survival is likely extremely low,
203 especially when the temperature of the WW remains stably above 20 °C. To date, the real influence of other parameters,
204 like pH, sunlight and disinfectant agents, on survival time is still uncertain. Nonetheless, presuming a behaviour similar
205 to that of other coronaviruses, this pathogen should rapidly be inactivated (WHO, 2020c).

206 Wang et al. (2005) observed that SARS-CoV can be completely inactivated in 30 minutes in the presence of residual
207 chlorine greater than 0.5 mg L⁻¹ or concentrations of chlorine dioxide equal to 2.19 mg L⁻¹, resulting in an increased
208 sensitivity of SARS-CoV towards chlorine in comparison to other pathogens such as *E.coli* and f2 phage. These results
209 are confirmed by some preliminary tests on SARS-CoV-2 conducted *in vitro* by Chin et al. (2020) using 1:99 diluted
210 household bleach. They observed that the virus was completely undetectable after 5 minutes of contact time.

211 This could suggest that the use of chlorine in plants would yield the complete inactivation of SARS-CoV-2. Although to
212 date there is no evidence of COVID-19 transmission through sewage, either raw or treated (Lodder and de Roda
213 Husman, 2020; WHO, 2020c), the WHO has recommended a disinfection stage in order to prevent any virus release
214 into the receiving aquatic bodies (WHO, 2020c). Randazzo et al. (2020b) published a preliminary study on SARS-CoV-
215 2 presence in WW after secondary and tertiary treatment. 11% of samples after conventional activated sludge resulted
216 positive to SARS-CoV-2 RNA and 100% got negative after tertiary treatments (disinfection with NaClO, in some cases
217 coupled with UV). Although this research does not clarify the influence of disinfectant dosage and contact time on virus
218 survival and presents some limits such as the low number of samples, it shows that tertiary treatments already present in
219 the majority of WWTPs could be enough to remove SARS-CoV-2. Besides, membrane bioreactors have shown
220 promising results in virus removal, although the role of membrane materials and properties, of suspended solids and
221 cake layers, of electrostatic interactions has to be further investigated (Gentile et al., 2018; Miura et al., 2015; Purnell et
222 al., 2016).

223

224 4.2. SARS-CoV 2 and sewage sludge

225 4.2.1. Is the presence of the virus in sewage sludge possible?

226 Given the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in the faeces and in the WW, the possible presence of the virus in the SS is
227 arousing considerable interest (NEWEA, 2020; Núñez-Delgado, 2020). In particular, the attention concerns the
228 possibility that the virus can survive the treatment phases and, when the SS is spread in agriculture, these could be a
229 vehicle of contagion for the population. However, the search for SARS-CoV-2 RNA alone is not sufficient to determine
230 any risk situations due to the spreading of the SS on the soil. The discovery of the nucleotide sequences of the virus is
231 not in itself indicative of the virulence of the virus itself.

232 Although to date there are no a detailed literature on the presence of the virus in the SS, some preliminary results are
233 available. Recently, during CoViD-19 outbreak in Turkey, Kocamemi et al. (2020) analysed primary and secondary
234 sludge of 2 and 7 WWTPs, respectively. They found SARS-CoV-2 RNA in both types of sludge with comparable C_q
235 (from 33.52 to 35.86). Although the results presented are very interesting since represent the first confirmation of
236 presence of SARS-CoV-2 in SS, two main aspects still to be clarified. Firstly, the presence of the virus is not
237 necessarily a prove that could be infective creating a risk for people. Secondly, in this study samples were taken
238 immediately after the extraction from settling tanks and therefore the effect of treatments in the sludge line on SARS-
239 CoV-2 presence and virulence were not considered. Peccia et al. (2020) analysed more than 40 samples taken daily
240 during CoViD-19 outbreak and peak in Connecticut (U.S.A.). The most interesting point is that they not only tested the
241 presence of SARS-CoV-2 in SS but also highlighted that RNA concentration can be used as indicator for the prediction
242 of CoViD-19 spread evolution. It should be noted that in this experimentation the samples were taken immediately after
243 the thickening phase, therefore the results shown do not necessarily imply that SARS-CoV-2 may be present in the SS
244 at the time of the spread in agriculture. However, there are several aspects that the literature is not yet able to clarify,
245 namely: (i) the impact of conventional and advanced treatments of the WWTPs sludge lines on the presence of SARS-
246 CoV-2, (ii) the possible presence in the SS spread in agriculture (to date not demonstrated), and (iii) the virulence of
247 SARS-CoV-2 in these contexts.

248 Even considering the other HCoVs, the literature data are extremely reduced to date. Bibby et al. (2011) found the
249 presence of HCoV-229E and HCoV-HKU1 in SS even after the anaerobic digestion phase (35-37 °C, hydraulic
250 retention time equals to 15 d) and mechanical dehydration. This study highlights the possibility that HCoVs can survive
251 digestive phases in the mesophilic field, but it does not determine the virulence capacity of the viruses present in the SS.
252 The samples were taken immediately after the treatment phases and therefore other factors that could accelerate the
253 disappearance of the virus in the hypothesis in which they are spread on the soil such as for example pH variations,

254 solar irradiation, and heat were not taken into consideration. HCoV-HKU1 was again identified by Bibby and Peccia
255 (2013) in anaerobically digested SS. They expressed concern due to the high load of virus in treated SS that could be
256 transmitted by the aerosols emitted during the land application. However, also in this case, the infectivity of the viruses,
257 the influence of the anaerobic digestion temperature and meteorological conditions on the resistance of the virus were
258 not defined.

259 As also recognized by U.S. National Research Council and Italian National Institute of Health (INIH, 2020; USNRC,
260 2002), the presence of the viruses in the SS is not directly indicative of a potential hazard of the matrix as an effective
261 transmission capacity of the pathogen is not proven. Moreover, SARS-CoV manages to resist in the external
262 environment for a limited time if subjected to heat and solar radiation (Darnell et al., 2004) and there are currently no
263 studies on its possible survival on soil.

264 **4.2.2. How to remove it?**

265 Generally, there are three main aspects that can improve the removal of viruses: (i) high retention time, (ii) high values
266 of temperature and (iii) high/low values of pH. Recent studies show that also SARS-CoV-2 is particularly sensitive to
267 these three aspects. Chin et al. (2020) have demonstrated how the resistance of the virus from 22 °C to 70 °C dropped
268 from 7 d to 1 min, highlighting its sensitivity of this virus towards high values of temperature. This result is very similar
269 to the previous findings in case of SARS-CoV by Rabenau et al. (2005), who observed greater stability compared to
270 HCoV-229E in the external environment, but a rapid inactivation under temperature conditions of 56-60 °C. On the
271 other hand, it has been shown that even significant changes in pH (from 3 to 10) would not seem to determine the
272 disappearance of SARS-CoV-2 (Chin et al., 2020).

273 Although the studies on SARS-CoV-2 must be considered preliminary, as they are carried out only in vitro, they
274 provide interesting insights that can enable the selection of the most appropriate treatments, in order to ensure complete
275 inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 in the SS. Taking into account its sensitivity for temperature values greater than 50 °C,
276 conventional and advanced biological thermophilic processes (e.g. anaerobic digestion (Leite et al., 2017) and
277 aerobic/anaerobic membrane bioreactors (Collivignarelli et al., 2017), respectively), and thermal drying treatments
278 (Richard, 2019) might presumably ensure the complete virus inactivation. Based on these first results, the use of
279 mesophilic treatments could also be enough to determine the viral disappearance if associated with longer retention
280 times.

281 However, none of the aforementioned studies on the influence of the different parameters on the inactivation of SARS-
282 CoV-2 and SARS-CoV focus specifically on SS but it is very likely that, beside temperature (responsible for protein

283 inactivation and extracellular enzymes activity increase), also the presence of bacteria, protozoa, metazoa, and, more
284 generally, organic matter affect the virus survival (Gundy et al., 2009; Pinon and Vialette, 2018; Rzeżutka and Cook,
285 2004). Therefore, an increase in retention time might be proficuous. Anyway, owing to the total absence of literature
286 regarding the presence and the influence of temperature, pH and retention time on the inactivation of SARS-CoV-2 in
287 SS, further studies are recommended.

288 Despite the absence of literature on this topic, health authorities have issued precautionary guidelines. For example, to
289 minimize any risk situations of reuse in agriculture, the Italian National Institute of Health (INIH, 2020) proposes "good
290 practices" which provide for a minimum time of SS retention before reuse in agriculture inversely proportional to the
291 temperature (Eq.1):

$$292 \quad \text{MRT} = 0.4 * T^2 - 55 * T + 1800 \quad (1)$$

293 Where MRT is the minimum retention time (including treatment and storage times) in hours and T is the operating
294 temperature (°C) (INIH, 2020). It should be noted that satisfying the MRT does not necessarily require significant
295 changes in current sludge treatment and management practices. In fact, applying the formula in mesophilic conditions
296 (30 - 35 ° C), it can be seen how the suggested precautionary MRT, before reuse in agriculture, is 15 - 21 days,
297 therefore guaranteed by the retention time of an anaerobic digester for SS.

298 **5. Tips and ideas for future research**

299 From the analysis of the literature, the lack of data about the influence of parameters like temperature, pH and retention
300 time on the survival of the virus in WW and SS is evident. Since *ad hoc* studies on SARS-CoV-2 are currently scarcely
301 available, information can be inferred from experiments conducted in the past years on SARS-CoV, mostly *in vitro*. As
302 confirmed by several authors (Carducci et al., 2020; Kitajima et al., 2020; La Rosa et al., 2020a), part of the lack of
303 results on this issue is attributable to the difficulty in finding SARS-CoV-2 RNA within these particular matrices, as
304 there is currently no officially recognized univocal method. Sewage and sludge contain hundreds of molecules (namely,
305 fulvic and humic acids, fats, proteins, metal ions, detergents), liable to interfere with polymerase chain reaction: new
306 techniques of molecular biology, such as the digital PCR and the next generation sequencing, might allow overcoming
307 this issue. Furthermore, the adoption of different commercial kits for performing the PCR leads to the obtainment of
308 results only partially comparable, owing to the variability of extraction efficiency (Mao et al., 2020; Sims and
309 Kasprzyk-Hordern, 2020). Moreover, La Rosa et al. (2020b), regarding the monitoring of wastewater, highlight the
310 inadequacy of the current techniques for concentrating and recovering non-enveloped enteric viruses. Therefore,

311 identifying and sharing protocols from sample pre-treatment to viral particles quantification would allow simplifying,
312 accelerating and stimulating the analysis of these matrices, before the issuing of a standardized technique.
313 The authors suggest evaluating the effect of the different parameters, possibly simultaneously, on the inactivation of
314 SARS-CoV-2 in real matrices, like sewage, sludge, soil, freshwater (both surface and groundwater). A deeper
315 knowledge of the actual occurrence and persistence of the infectious virus is mandatory. These aspects would also allow
316 predict the behaviour of SARS-CoV-2 in the different phases of the WWTP, to identify possible exposure risks for
317 workers. Furthermore, the possibility to track precisely the virus vitality (if any) from sewers to the WWTPs throughout
318 the subsequent phases of treatment efficacy will help to optimize process conditions and to select more adequate
319 technologies (with particular focus on disinfection).
320 Although WBE might reveal a precious tool for the early warning of future outbreaks and tracking the epidemic
321 geographically and over time (Barcelo, 2020; Kitajima et al., 2020; Lodder and de Roda Husman, 2020; Sims and
322 Kasprzyk-Hordern, 2020; F. Wu et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020) (Fig. 2) its thorough and diffused application still
323 requires the acquisition of further information on crucial elements, which represent the input data of possible
324 simulations. It is worth underlining the need of deeper studies about the virus shedding by infected asymptomatic and
325 paucisymptomatic people, the actual stability of viruses and virions in sewage and, definitely, the possibility to exploit,
326 in parallel, other biomarkers/pharmaceuticals to track the outbreak, in order to integrate the available information and
327 obtain a more precise assessment for surveillance purposes.

328 **FIGURE 2**

329 **Declaration of competing interest**

330 The authors declare no conflicts of interest

331 **CRediT author statement**

332 **Maria Cristina Collivignarelli:** Methodology, Writing, Supervision. **Carlo Collivignarelli:** Methodology, Writing.

333 **Marco Carnevale Miino:** Methodology, Writing, Visualization. **Alessandro Abbà:** Methodology, Writing,

334 Visualization. **Roberta Pedrazzani:** Methodology, Writing, Validation. **Giorgio Bertanza:** Methodology, Writing,

335 Supervision.

336 **References**

- 339 Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J.W., Choi, P.M., Kitajima, M., Simpson, S.L., Li, J.,
340 Tschärke, B., Verhagen, R., Smith, W.J.M., Zaugg, J., Dierens, L., Hugenholtz, P., Thomas, K. V., Mueller, J.F.,
341 2020. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the
342 wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Sci. Total Environ.* 728, 138764.
343 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764>
- 344 Barcelo, D., 2020. Environmental and Health Perspective for COVID-19 OAn environmental and health perspective for
345 COVID-19 outbreak: Meteorology and air quality influence, sewage epidemiology indicator, hospitals
346 disinfection, drug therapies and recommendations. *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.* 8, 104006.
347 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2020.104006>
- 348 Bibby, K., Peccia, J., 2013. Identification of Viral Pathogen Diversity in Sewage Sludge by Metagenome Analysis.
349 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 47, 1945–1951. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es305181x>
- 350 Bibby, K., Viau, E., Peccia, J., 2011. Viral metagenome analysis to guide human pathogen monitoring in environmental
351 samples. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* 52, 386–392. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765X.2011.03014.x>
- 352 Cai, J., Xu, J., Lin, D., Yang, Z., Xu, L., Qu, Z., Zhang, Y., Zhang, H., Jia, R., Liu, P., Wang, X., Ge, Y., Xia, A., Tian,
353 H., Chang, H., Wang, C., Li, J., Wang, J., Zeng, M., 2020. A Case Series of children with 2019 novel coronavirus
354 infection: clinical and epidemiological features. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa198>
- 355 Carducci, A., Federigi, I., Liu, D., Thompson, J.R., Verani, M., 2020. Making Waves: Coronavirus detection, presence
356 and persistence in the water environment: State of the art and knowledge needs for public health. *Water Res.* 179,
357 115907. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.115907>
- 358 Casanova, L., Rutala, W.A., Weber, D.J., Sobsey, M.D., 2009. Survival of surrogate coronaviruses in water. *Water Res.*
359 43, 1893–1898. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2009.02.002>
- 360 Chen, N., Zhou, M., Dong, X., Qu, J., Gong, F., Han, Y., Qiu, Y., Wang, J., Liu, Y., Wei, Y., Xia, J., Yu, T., Zhang, X.,
361 Zhang, L., 2020. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in
362 Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet* 395, 507–513. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30211-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30211-7)
- 363 Chin, A.W.H., Chu, J.T.S., Perera, M.R.A., Hui, K.P.Y., Yen, H.-L., Chan, M.C.W., Peiris, M., Poon, L.L.M., 2020.
364 Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. *The Lancet Microbe* 1, e10.
365 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247\(20\)30003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30003-3)
- 366 Collivignarelli, M.C., Abbà, A., Bertanza, G., Pedrazzani, R., Ricciardi, P., Carnevale Miino, M., 2020. Lockdown for

- 367 CoViD-2019 in Milan: What are the effects on air quality? *Sci. Total Environ.* 732, 139280.
368 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139280>
- 369 Collivignarelli, M.C., Abbà, A., Castagnola, F., Bertanza, G., 2017. Minimization of municipal sewage sludge by means
370 of a thermophilic membrane bioreactor with intermittent aeration. *J. Clean. Prod.* 143, 369–376.
371 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.101>
- 372 Collivignarelli, M.C., Canato, M., Abbà, A., Carnevale Miino, M., 2019. Biosolids: what are the different types of
373 reuse? *J. Clean. Prod.* 117844. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.117844>
- 374 Darnell, M.E.R., Subbarao, K., Feinstone, S.M., Taylor, D.R., 2004. Inactivation of the coronavirus that induces severe
375 acute respiratory syndrome, SARS-CoV. *J. Virol. Methods* 121, 85–91.
376 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2004.06.006>
- 377 Daughton, C.G., 2020. Wastewater surveillance for population-wide Covid-19: The present and future. *Sci. Total*
378 *Environ.* 139631. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139631>
- 379 Gentile, G.J., Cruz, M.C., Rajal, V.B., Fidalgo de Cortalezzi, M.M., 2018. Electrostatic interactions in virus removal by
380 ultrafiltration membranes. *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.* 6, 1314–1321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2017.11.041>
- 381 Ghinai, I., McPherson, T.D., Hunter, J.C., Kirking, H.L., Christiansen, D., Joshi, K., Rubin, R., Morales-Estrada, S.,
382 Black, S.R., Pacilli, M., Fricchione, M.J., Chugh, R.K., Walblay, K.A., Ahmed, N.S., Stoecker, W.C., Hasan,
383 N.F., Burdsall, D.P., Reese, H.E., Wallace, M., Wang, C., Moeller, D., Korpics, J., Novosad, S.A., Benowitz, I.,
384 Jacobs, M.W., Dasari, V.S., Patel, M.T., Kauerauf, J., Charles, E.M., Ezike, N.O., Chu, V., Midgley, C.M.,
385 Rolfes, M.A., Gerber, S.I., Lu, X., Lindstrom, S., Verani, J.R., Layden, J.E., Brister, S., Goldesberry, K., Hoferka,
386 S., Jovanov, D., Nims, D., Saathoff-Huber, L., Hoskin Snelling, C., Adil, H., Ali, R., Andreychak, E., Bemis, K.,
387 Frias, M., Quartey-Kumapley, P., Baskerville, K., Murphy, E., Murskyj, E., Noffsinger, Z., Vercillo, J., Elliott,
388 A., Onwuta, U.S., Burck, D., Abedi, G., Burke, R.M., Fagan, R., Farrar, J., Fry, A.M., Hall, A.J., Haynes, A.,
389 Hoff, C., Kamili, S., Killerby, M.E., Kim, L., Kujawski, S.A., Kuhar, D.T., Lynch, B., Malapati, L., Marlow, M.,
390 Murray, J.R., Rha, B., Sakthivel, S.K.K., Smith-Jeffcoat, S.E., Soda, E., Wang, L., Whitaker, B.L., Uyeki, T.M.,
391 2020. First known person-to-person transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-
392 CoV-2) in the USA. *Lancet* 395, 1137–1144. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30607-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30607-3)
- 393 Gorbalenya, Alexander, E., Baker, S.C., Baric, R.S., de Groot, R.J., Drosten, C., Gulyaeva, A.A., Haagmans, B.L.,
394 Lauber, C., Leontovich, A.M., Neuman, B.W., Penzar, D., Perlman, S., Poon, L.L.M., Samborskiy, D. V.,
395 Sidorov, I.A., Sola, I., Ziebuhr, J., 2020. The species Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus:

- 396 classifying 2019-nCoV and naming it SARS-CoV-2. *Nat. Microbiol.* 5, 536–544. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-020-0695-z)
397 020-0695-z
- 398 Gu, J., Han, B., Wang, J., 2020. COVID-19: Gastrointestinal Manifestations and Potential Fecal–Oral Transmission.
399 *Gastroenterology*. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.02.054>
- 400 Gundy, P.M., Gerba, C.P., Pepper, I.L., 2009. Survival of Coronaviruses in Water and Wastewater. *Food Environ.*
401 *Virol.* 1, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-008-9001-6>
- 402 Gupta, S., Parker, J., Smits, S., Underwood, J., Dolwani, S., 2020. Persistent viral shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in faeces -
403 a rapid review. *Color. Dis. codi.15138*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.15138>
- 404 Hart, O.E., Halden, R.U., 2020. Computational analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 surveillance by wastewater-based
405 epidemiology locally and globally: Feasibility, economy, opportunities and challenges. *Sci. Total Environ.* 730,
406 138875. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138875>
- 407 Holshue, M.L., DeBolt, C., Lindquist, S., Lofy, K.H., Wiesman, J., Bruce, H., Spitters, C., Ericson, K., Wilkerson, S.,
408 Tural, A., Diaz, G., Cohn, A., Fox, L., Patel, A., Gerber, S.I., Kim, L., Tong, S., Lu, X., Lindstrom, S., Pallansch,
409 M.A., Weldon, W.C., Biggs, H.M., Uyeki, T.M., Pillai, S.K., 2020. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the
410 United States. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 382, 929–936. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001191>
- 411 Huang, C., Wang, Y., Li, X., Ren, L., Zhao, J., Hu, Y., Zhang, L., Fan, G., Xu, J., Gu, X., Cheng, Z., Yu, T., Xia, J.,
412 Wei, Y., Wu, W., Xie, X., Yin, W., Li, H., Liu, M., Xiao, Y., Gao, H., Guo, L., Xie, J., Wang, G., Jiang, R., Gao,
413 Z., Jin, Q., Wang, J., Cao, B., 2020. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan,
414 China. *Lancet* 395, 497–506. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30183-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30183-5)
- 415 INIH, 2020. Interim indications on the management of sewage sludge for the prevention of the spread of the SARS-
416 CoV-2 virus (In Italian). Rome, Italy.
- 417 Jin, X., Lian, J.-S., Hu, J.-H., Gao, J., Zheng, L., Zhang, Y.-M., Hao, S.-R., Jia, H.-Y., Cai, H., Zhang, X.-L., Yu, G.-D.,
418 Xu, K.-J., Wang, X.-Y., Gu, J.-Q., Zhang, S.-Y., Ye, C.-Y., Jin, C.-L., Lu, Y.-F., Yu, X., Yu, X.-P., Huang, J.-R.,
419 Xu, K.-L., Ni, Q., Yu, C.-B., Zhu, B., Li, Y.-T., Liu, J., Zhao, H., Zhang, X., Yu, L., Guo, Y.-Z., Su, J.-W., Tao,
420 J.-J., Lang, G.-J., Wu, X.-X., Wu, W.-R., Qv, T.-T., Xiang, D.-R., Yi, P., Shi, D., Chen, Y., Ren, Y., Qiu, Y.-Q.,
421 Li, L.-J., Sheng, J., Yang, Y., 2020. Epidemiological, clinical and virological characteristics of 74 cases of
422 coronavirus-infected disease 2019 (COVID-19) with gastrointestinal symptoms. *Gut* [gutjnl-2020-320926](https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2020-320926).
423 <https://doi.org/10.1136/gutjnl-2020-320926>

- 424 Kable, A.K., Pich, J., Maslin-Prothero, S.E., 2012. A structured approach to documenting a search strategy for
425 publication: A 12 step guideline for authors. *Nurse Educ. Today* 32, 878–886.
426 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2012.02.022>
- 427 Kitajima, M., Ahmed, W., Bibby, K., Carducci, A., Gerba, C.P., Hamilton, K.A., Haramoto, E., Rose, J.B., 2020.
428 SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. *Sci. Total Environ.* 139076.
429 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076>
- 430 Kocamemi, B.A., Kurt, H., Hacıoglu, S., Yarali, C., Saatci, A.M., Pakdemirli, B., 2020a. First Data-Set on SARS-CoV-
431 2 Detection for Istanbul Wastewaters in Turkey. *MedRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.03.20089417>
- 432 Kocamemi, B.A., Kurt, H., Sait, A., Sarac, F., Saatci, A.M., Pakdemirli, B., 2020b. SARS-CoV-2 Detection in Istanbul
433 Wastewater Treatment Plant Sludges. *MedRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.12.20099358>
- 434 La Rosa, G., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L., Kenmoe, S., Suffredini, E., 2020a. Coronavirus in water environments:
435 Occurrence, persistence and concentration methods - A scoping review. *Water Res.* 179, 115899.
436 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.115899>
- 437 La Rosa, G., Iaconelli, M., Mancini, P., Bonanno Ferraro, G., Veneri, C., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L., Suffredini, E.,
438 2020b. First detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewaters in Italy. *Sci. Total Environ.* 736, 139652.
439 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139652>
- 440 Lai, C.-C., Shih, T.-P., Ko, W.-C., Tang, H.-J., Hsueh, P.-R., 2020. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
441 (SARS-CoV-2) and coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19): The epidemic and the challenges. *Int. J. Antimicrob.*
442 *Agents* 55, 105924. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105924>
- 443 Lau, H., Khosrawipour, V., Kocbach, P., Mikolajczyk, A., Schubert, J., Bania, J., Khosrawipour, T., 2020. The positive
444 impact of lockdown in Wuhan on containing the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *J. Travel Med.* 27.
445 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa037>
- 446 Leite, W., Magnus, B.S., Guimarães, L.B., Gottardo, M., Belli Filho, P., 2017. Feasibility of thermophilic anaerobic
447 processes for treating waste activated sludge under low HRT and intermittent mixing. *J. Environ. Manage.* 201,
448 335–344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.06.069>
- 449 Lescure, F.-X., Bouadma, L., Nguyen, D., Parisey, M., Wicky, P.-H., Behillil, S., Gaymard, A., Bouscambert-
450 Duchamp, M., Donati, F., Le Hingrat, Q., Enouf, V., Houhou-Fidouh, N., Valette, M., Mailles, A., Lucet, J.-C.,
451 Mentre, F., Duval, X., Descamps, D., Malvy, D., Timsit, J.-F., Lina, B., Van-der-Werf, S., Yazdanpanah, Y.,

- 452 2020. Clinical and virological data of the first cases of COVID-19 in Europe: a case series. *Lancet Infect. Dis.*
453 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30200-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30200-0)
- 454 Ling, Y., Xu, S.-B., Lin, Y.-X., Tian, D., Zhu, Z.-Q., Dai, F.-H., Wu, F., Song, Z.-G., Huang, W., Chen, J., Hu, B.-J.,
455 Wang, S., Mao, E.-Q., Zhu, L., Zhang, W.-H., Lu, H.-Z., 2020. Persistence and clearance of viral RNA in 2019
456 novel coronavirus disease rehabilitation patients. *Chin. Med. J. (Engl.)*. 1.
457 <https://doi.org/10.1097/CM9.0000000000000774>
- 458 Lo, I.L., Lio, C.F., Cheong, H.H., Lei, C.I., Cheong, T.H., Zhong, X., Tian, Y., Sin, N.N., 2020. Evaluation of SARS-
459 CoV-2 RNA shedding in clinical specimens and clinical characteristics of 10 patients with COVID-19 in Macau.
460 *Int. J. Biol. Sci.* 16, 1698–1707. <https://doi.org/10.7150/ijbs.45357>
- 461 Lodder, W., de Roda Husman, A.M., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: potential health risk, but also data source.
462 *Lancet Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253\(20\)30087-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30087-X)
- 463 Mao, K., Zhang, K., Du, W., Ali, W., Feng, X., Zhang, H., 2020. The potential of wastewater-based epidemiology as
464 surveillance and early warning of infectious disease outbreaks. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sci. Heal.* 17, 1–7.
465 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.04.006>
- 466 Martínez Fernández, P., Villalba Sanchís, I., Yepes, V., Insa Franco, R., 2019. A review of modelling and optimisation
467 methods applied to railways energy consumption. *J. Clean. Prod.* 222, 153–162.
468 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.03.037>
- 469 Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., Brouwer, A., 2020. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 in sewage
470 [WWW Document]. *MedRxiv.* <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.29.20045880>
- 471 Miura, T., Okabe, S., Nakahara, Y., Sano, D., 2015. Removal properties of human enteric viruses in a pilot-scale
472 membrane bioreactor (MBR) process. *Water Res.* 75, 282–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2015.02.046>
- 473 NEWEA, 2020. COVID-19: Implications for the Water and Wastewater Industry [WWW Document]. *New Engl. Water*
474 *Environ. Assoc.* URL [https://www.newea.org/2020/04/06/covid-19-implications-for-the-water-and-wastewater-](https://www.newea.org/2020/04/06/covid-19-implications-for-the-water-and-wastewater-industry/)
475 [industry/](https://www.newea.org/2020/04/06/covid-19-implications-for-the-water-and-wastewater-industry/) (accessed 5.12.20).
- 476 Núñez-Delgado, A., 2020. What do we know about the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus in the environment? *Sci. Total*
477 *Environ.* 727, 138647. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138647>
- 478 Or, I.B., Yaniv, K., Shagan, M., Ozer, E., Erster, O., Mendelson, E., Mannasse, B., Shirazi, R., Kramarsky-Winter, E.,
479 Nir, O., Abu-Ali, H., Ronen, Z., Rinott, E., Lewis, Y.E., Friedler, E.F., Paitan, Y., Bitkover, E., Berchenko, Y.,

- 480 Kushmaro, A., 2020. Regressing SARS-CoV-2 sewage measurements onto COVID-19 burden in the population:
481 a proof-of-concept for quantitative environmental surveillance. MedRxiv.
482 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.26.20073569>
- 483 Pal, M., Berhanu, G., Desalegn, C., Kandi, V., 2020. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-
484 2): An Update. Cureus. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.7423>
- 485 Peccia, J., Zulli, A., Brackney, D.E., Grubaugh, N.D., Kaplan, E.H., Casanovas-Massana, A., Ko, A.I., Malik, A.A.,
486 Wang, D., Wang, M., Weinberger, D.M., Omer, S.B., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in primary
487 municipal sewage sludge as a leading indicator of COVID-19 outbreak dynamics. MedRxiv.
488 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.19.20105999>
- 489 Pinon, A., Vialette, M., 2018. Survival of Viruses in Water. *Intervirology* 61, 214–222.
490 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000484899>
- 491 Purnell, S., Ebdon, J., Buck, A., Tupper, M., Taylor, H., 2016. Removal of phages and viral pathogens in a full-scale
492 MBR: Implications for wastewater reuse and potable water. *Water Res.* 100, 20–27.
493 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2016.05.013>
- 494 Rabenau, H.F., Cinatl, J., Morgenstern, B., Bauer, G., Preiser, W., Doerr, H.W., 2005. Stability and inactivation of
495 SARS coronavirus. *Med. Microbiol. Immunol.* 194, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00430-004-0219-0>
- 496 Randazzo, W., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Sanjuan, R., Domingo-Calap, P., Sanchez, G., 2020a. Metropolitan Wastewater
497 Analysis for COVID-19 Epidemiological Surveillance. MedRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.23.20076679>
- 498 Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Ferrando, E.C., Simon, P., Allende, A., Sanchez, G., 2020b. SARS-CoV-2 RNA titers in
499 wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. MedRxiv.
500 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.22.20075200>
- 501 Remuzzi, A., Remuzzi, G., 2020. COVID-19 and Italy: what next? *Lancet* 395, 1225–1228.
502 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30627-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30627-9)
- 503 Richard, L.W., 2019. Mechanism of virus inactivation in wastewater sludges., in: *Human Viruses In Sediments Sludges*
504 & Soils. CRC Press.
- 505 Rimoldi, S.G., Stefani, F., Gigantiello, A., Polesello, S., Comandatore, F., Mileto, D., Maresca, M., Longobardi, C.,
506 Mancon, A., Romeri, F., Pagani, C., Moja, L., Gismondo, M.R., Salerno, F., 2020. Presence and vitality of SARS-
507 CoV-2 virus in wastewaters and rivers. MedRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.01.20086009>

- 508 Rzeżutka, A., Cook, N., 2004. Survival of human enteric viruses in the environment and food. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.*
509 28, 441–453. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.femsre.2004.02.001>
- 510 Sims, N., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., 2020. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology: Monitoring infectious
511 disease spread and resistance to the community level. *Environ. Int.* 139, 105689.
512 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105689>
- 513 Tian, Y., Rong, L., Nian, W., He, Y., 2020. Review article: gastrointestinal features in COVID-19 and the possibility of
514 faecal transmission. *Aliment. Pharmacol. Ther.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/apt.15731>
- 515 USNRC, 2002. *Biosolids Applied to Land*. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.
516 <https://doi.org/10.17226/10426>
- 517 Wang, W., Xu, Y., Gao, R., Lu, R., Han, K., Wu, G., Tan, W., 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of
518 Clinical Specimens. *JAMA*. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.3786>
- 519 Wang, X.-W., Li, J.-S., Jin, M., Zhen, B., Kong, Q.-X., Song, N., Xiao, W.-J., Yin, J., Wei, W., Wang, G.-J., Si, B.,
520 Guo, B.-Z., Liu, C., Ou, G.-R., Wang, M.-N., Fang, T.-Y., Chao, F.-H., Li, J.-W., 2005. Study on the resistance of
521 severe acute respiratory syndrome-associated coronavirus. *J. Virol. Methods* 126, 171–177.
522 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2005.02.005>
- 523 WHO, 2020a. WHO Director-General’s opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020 [WWW
524 Document]. *World Heal. Organ.* URL <https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020> (accessed 5.20.20).
- 526 WHO, 2020b. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) - Dashboard [WWW Document]. *World Heal. Organ.* URL
527 <https://covid19.who.int/> (accessed 5.20.20).
- 528 WHO, 2020c. Water, sanitation, hygiene and waste management for COVID-19: Technical brief (No. WHO/2019-
529 nCoV/IPC_WASH/2020.2).
- 530 WHO, 2003. Guidelines for environmental surveillance of poliovirus circulation (No. WHO/V&B/03.03).
- 531 Wigginton, K.R., Ye, Y., Ellenberg, R.M., 2015. Emerging investigators series: the source and fate of pandemic viruses
532 in the urban water cycle. *Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol.* 1, 735–746. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C5EW00125K>
- 533 Wu, F., Xiao, A., Zhang, J., Gu, X., Lee, W.L., Kathryn Kauffman, W.H., Matus, M., Ghaeli, N., Endo, N., Duvall,
534 C., Moniz, K., Erickson, T., Peter Chai, Janelle Thompson, E.A., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are

- 535 higher than expected from clinically confirmed cases [WWW Document]. MedRxiv. URL
536 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.05.20051540> (accessed 5.12.20).
- 537 Wu, Y., Guo, C., Tang, L., Hong, Z., Zhou, J., Dong, X., Yin, H., Xiao, Q., Tang, Y., Qu, X., Kuang, L., Fang, X.,
538 Mishra, N., Lu, J., Shan, H., Jiang, G., Huang, X., 2020. Prolonged presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in faecal
539 samples. *Lancet Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253\(20\)30083-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30083-2)
- 540 Wurtzer, S., Marechal, V., Mouchel, J.-M., Maday, Y., Teyssou, R., Richard, E., Almayrac, J.L., Moulin, L., 2020.
541 Evaluation of lockdown impact on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics through viral genome quantification in Paris
542 wastewaters. MedRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.12.20062679>
- 543 Xiao, F., Tang, M., Zheng, X., Liu, Y., Li, X., Shan, H., 2020. Evidence for Gastrointestinal Infection of SARS-CoV-2.
544 *Gastroenterology.* <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.02.055>
- 545 Xu, X.-W., Wu, X.-X., Jiang, X.-G., Xu, K.-J., Ying, L.-J., Ma, C.-L., Li, S.-B., Wang, H.-Y., Zhang, S., Gao, H.-N.,
546 Sheng, J.-F., Cai, H.-L., Qiu, Y.-Q., Li, L.-J., 2020. Clinical findings in a group of patients infected with the 2019
547 novel coronavirus (SARS-Cov-2) outside of Wuhan, China: retrospective case series. *BMJ* m606.
548 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m606>
- 549 Xu, Y., Li, X., Zhu, B., Liang, H., Fang, C., Gong, Y., Guo, Q., Sun, X., Zhao, D., Shen, J., Zhang, H., Liu, H., Xia, H.,
550 Tang, J., Zhang, K., Gong, S., 2020. Characteristics of pediatric SARS-CoV-2 infection and potential evidence
551 for persistent fecal viral shedding. *Nat. Med.* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0817-4>
- 552 Zhang, N., Gong, Y., Meng, F., Bi, Y., Yang, P., Wang, F., 2020. Virus shedding patterns in nasopharyngeal and fecal
553 specimens of COVID-19 patients. MedRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.28.20043059>
- 554 Zhu, N., Zhang, D., Wang, W., Li, X., Yang, B., Song, J., Zhao, X., Huang, B., Shi, W., Lu, R., Niu, P., Zhan, F., Ma,
555 X., Wang, D., Xu, W., Wu, G., Gao, G.F., Tan, W., 2020. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in
556 China, 2019. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 382, 727–733. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001017>
- 557 Zou, L., Ruan, F., Huang, M., Liang, L., Huang, H., Hong, Z., Yu, J., Kang, M., Song, Y., Xia, J., Guo, Q., Song, T.,
558 He, J., Yen, H.-L., Peiris, M., Wu, J., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 Viral Load in Upper Respiratory Specimens of Infected
559 Patients. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 382, 1177–1179. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2001737>
- 560

561 **Table 1:** Literature results on presence of SARS-CoV-2 in faeces and urine. N.T.: not tested [two-column fitting table]

References	Number of tested patients	Tested samples		Main findings
		Faeces	Urine	
Wang et al. (2020)	153	●	N.T.	From 153 patients (68% male) with COVID-19, faeces show positivity in 44 cases (29 %). C_t value of faeces excreted by patients was higher than 30 ($< 2.6 \times 10^4$ copies/mL)
Xu et al. (2020)	10	●	N.T.	Viral shedding from the digestive system might be greater and last longer than that from the respiratory tract. C_t value of faeces excreted by patients was in the range 22-40
Xiao et al. (2020)	73	●	●	Faeces and urine were tested positive. The test result for SARS-CoV-2 RNA remained positive in faeces, even after test results for the respiratory tract converted to negative. Potential faecal-oral transmission can last even after viral clearance in the respiratory tract.
Ling et al. (2020)	55 (faeces) 58 (urine)	●	●	The positivity of urine samples was low with only 4 positive results (6.9%), viral RNA in urine samples from 3 patients remained tested positive after throat swabs turned negative. In 43 cases (78.2%) had longer duration for faeces specimens detected negative for viral RNA than throat swabs, with median delay of 2.0 days.
Lo et al. (2020)	10	●	●	There were positive SARS-CoV-2 RNA signals in all faeces specimens (100%) but negative in all urine specimens (0%). The assessment of both faecal and respiratory specimen is recommended
Jin et al. (2020)	9	●	●	Relatively low detection rate for virus in the faeces (3 of 9 patients). The Authors


				suggested further investigation
Cai et al. (2020)	6	•	•	Urine from 100% of patient were tested negative. 83% of faeces analysed showed the presence of the virus. In 50% of cases the duration of virus shedding in faeces was higher than 20 days
Holshue et al. (2020)	1	•	•	C_t value of faeces excreted by patient on illness day 7 was in the range 36-38. Urine was tested negative No urine samples were tested positive. In 40% of
Lescure et al. (2020)	5	•	•	patients, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in the faeces up to 19 days after onset symptoms All urine samples were negative except for two severe cases. The median duration of virus
Zhang et al. (2020)	23	•	•	shedding was 22 d for the faeces (with peak of 26 d), more than double with respect to nasal-throat mixed swabs (10 d).

563 **Table 2:** Literature results on presence of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater. a: total number of samples not available, b:
564 expressed as C_q . n.a.: not available. [two-column fitting table]

References	Location	Number of points examined	Period of examination	Samples	
				Positive (total number of samples)	C_t value
Or et al. (2020)	Israel	17	10/03/2010 - 21/04/2020	10 (26)	32.76 - 38.5
F. Wu et al. (2020)	U.S.A. (Massachusetts)	2	08/01/2020 - 25/03/2020	10 (14)	33.87 - 38.39
Rimoldi et al. (2020)	Italy	3	14/04/2020 - 22/04/2020	4 (12)	n.a.
Ahmed et al. (2020)	Australia	3	20/03/2020 - 01/04/2020	2 (9)	37.5 - 39
Medema et al. (2020)	Netherlands	7	05/02/2020 - 16/03/2020	14 (24)	n.a.
Randazzo et al., (2020a)	Spain	3	12/02/2020 - 14/04/2020	13 (15)	34.00 - 37.84
Randazzo et al. (2020b)	Spain	6	12/03/2020 - 14/04/2020	37 (72)	34.00 - 40.00
Wurtzer et al. (2020)	France	3	05/03/2020 - 23/04/2020	100 % of samples positive ^a	n.a.
La Rosa et al. (2020b)	Italy	4	03/02/2020 - 02/04/2020	6 (12)	n.a.
Kocamemi et al. (2020a)	Turkey	9	21/04/2020 - 25/04/2020	7 (9)	34.67 - 39.54 b


565

566



567

568 **Fig. 1:** Comparison of the trends of research papers, reviews, books and conference proceedings published up to 20th
 569 May 2020 and their distribution in the world. All data were obtained introducing the words “coronavirus”,
 570 “coronavirus AND wastewater”, “coronavirus AND faeces”, and “coronavirus AND urine” in Scopus® [two-column
 571 fitting image]



572

573 **Fig. 2:** Proposed scheme for monitoring the infection status of urban areas. [two-column fitting image]

574

575