Identification of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater in Japan by multiple molecular assays-implication for wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE).

Akihiko Hata[1], Ryo Honda[2,3,*], Hiroe Hara-Yamamura[2], Yuno Meuchi[1]

[1] *Faculty of Engineering, Toyama Prefectural University*

[2] *Faculty of Geosciences and Civil Engineering, Kanazawa University*

[3] *Graduate School of Engineering, Kyoto University*

***Corresponding author:** Ryo Honda

Mailing address: *Faculty of Geosciences and Civil Engineering, Kanazawa University Kakuma-machi, Kanazawa 920-1192, Japan*

Tel: +81-76-264-6393

E-mail: rhonda@se.kanazawa-u.ac.jp

ABSTRACT

Presence of SARS-coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) in wastewater sample has been documented in several countries. Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is potentially effective for early warning of COVID-19 outbreak. The purpose of this study was to verify the detection limit of WBE for COVID-19. In total, 27 influent wastewater samples were collected from four wastewater treatment plants in Ishikawa and Toyama prefectures in Japan. During the study period, numbers of the confirmed COVID-19 cases in these prefectures increased from almost 0 to around 20 per 100,000 peoples. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the samples were identified by several PCR-based assays. Among the 27 samples, 7 were positive for SARS-CoV-2 by at least one out of the three quantitative RT-PCR assays. These samples were also positive by RT-nested PCR assays. The detection frequency became higher when the number of total confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases in 100,000 peoples became above 10 in each prefecture. However, SARS-CoV-2 could also be detected with a low frequency when the number was below 1.0. Considering that the number of the confirmed cases does not necessarily reflect the actual prevalence of the infection at the time point, data on the relationship between the number of infection cases and concentration in wastewater needs to be accumulated further.

1. INTRODUCTION

The recent novel coronavirus pneumonia (COVID-19) pandemic caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection has led to more than 6.8 million of the confirmed cases and nearly 400,000 deaths worldwide, as of June 7, 2020 (WHO, 2020). Currently, this pandemic is likely to be heading for convergence due to world-wide stay-at-home order. However, there are still a concern of re-outbreak after lift of the stay-at-home order for reopening businesses, and also the 2nd pandemic caused by seasonal factors. Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is the effective approach to provide a snapshot of the outbreak situation in the entire catchment by monitoring pathogens and viruses in wastewater (Choi et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2015). The WBE could be an early warning tool for the possible re-outbreaks and seasonal pandemics in the future.

Recently, detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater is reported in Netherlands, Australia, US, China, France, Israel, Italy, Spain, and Japan (Ahmed et al., 2020; Bar-or et al., 2020; Haramoto et al., 2020; La Rosa et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020; Randazzo et al., 2020; Rimoldi et al., 2020; WU et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020a). SARS-CoV-2 are present in wastewater because they are shed from not only in respiratory secretion but also feces of patients (Tang et al., 2020; Wölfel et al., 2020a; J. Zhang et al., 2020; Y. Zhang et al., 2020). Importantly, pre-symptomatic patients and asymptomatic patients also had a viral load in feces as well as symptomatic patients

(Tang et al., 2020; Wölfel et al., 2020a; Y. Zhang et al., 2020). Ratio of asymptomatic infection is estimated as 18% (16-20% as 95%-CI) from the cruise ship passengers in Yokohama (Mizumoto et al., 2020), and 31% (7.7-54% as 95%-CI) from the passengers of evacuation flight from Wuhan to Tokyo (Nishiura et al., 2020). Moreover, a much larger population of asymptomatic and mildly symptomatic infections was implied by the surveillance of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in Santa Clara County, California, in which the estimated number of infection is 50- to 85-fold more than the number of confirmed cases (Bendavid et al., 2020). However, these people with no symptoms and mild symptoms may not be included in clinical surveillance because most of them do not visit clinics or hospitals. Transmission from such asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic patients makes it difficult to enable the initial containment of COVID-19. Moreover, the number of the reported COVID-19 cases is possibly biased by circumstances of medical services in each country, e.g. access to medical services, capacity of PCR tests, stay-at-home policy for mildly symptomatic patients, situation of medical collapse, etc. So far, Japan has unique trend of COVID-19 epidemic. The increasing trend of cases is much slower than other countries in Europe, US and China (Gloeckner et al., 2020). Some paper argues that the number of cases is underestimated in Japan because of low capacity of PCR tests (Omori et al., 2020). WBE is able to cover people with asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infections and to predict the overall epidemic status without such biases of medical situations. Therefore, WBE could be more sensitive and

possibly detect outbreak earlier than clinical surveillance and also effective to verify coverage of clinical surveillance under various medical situations. For application of WBE as an early warning tool of COVID-19 outbreak, it is necessary to verify correlations of SARS-CoV-2 concentration in wastewater and the number of COVID-19 cases in each country.

According the recent studies, SARS-CoV-2 were detected in wastewater when the number of confirmed cases reached 1-100 cases per 100,000 of population (Ahmed et al., 2020; Bar-or et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020; WU et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020a). The sensitivity of WBE depends on viral load in feces of infected people. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater could be less sensitive than norovirus, because the viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in feces is reportedly 1 to 2 logs lower than norovirus (Hata and Honda, 2020). SARS-CoV-2 is an enveloped virus, while typical viral pathogens in water, such as noroviruses, are non-enveloped viruses. Then, commonly used methods for concentrating viruses in water might not be effective to SARS-CoV-2 (Kitajima et al., 2020). Besides, several RT-PCR assays for SARS-CoV-2 are now available but their applicability to wastewater sample has not been well determined. These indicate that detection of SARS-CoV-2 in the wastewater is more challenging than that of norovirus and other enteric viruses. At this time, verifying concentration methods and downstream RT-PCR assays is necessary to make WBE reliable.

The objective of this study is to verify the detection limit of WBE for COVID-19 by comparing the detected concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and the COVID-19 cases reported in clinical surveillance. In this study, wastewater samples were taken in two prefectures, Ishikawa and Toyama, in Japan which had the most reported COVID-19 cases per population except Tokyo Metropolitan. To deal with the methodological issues pointed above, sample processing was validated by assessing virus detection efficiency with process controls. Besides, multiple RT-PCR assays and nucleotide sequencing were applied to improve the reliability of the positive results. At the beginning of the study period, numbers of the confirmed COVID-19 cases in Ishikawa and Toyama prefectures were only 0.3 and 0 per 100,000 peoples (4 and no confirmed cases), respectively. This enabled us to discuss sensitivity of WBE for COVID-19 from the reported COVID-19 cases per population in the target area.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Sample collection.

Influent wastewater samples were collected at four WWTPs, WWTPs A-C and D, in Ishikawa and Toyama prefecture, respectively. These WWTPs were built to treat maximum volumes of 12,800, 53,300, 156,000, and 82,500 m^3/day of wastewater in total and are serving population equivalents of 34,501, 127,100, 153,291, and 169,400, respectively (Table 1). At each WWTP, 100 mL of a grab sample was collected in the morning, during the hour of peak flow, weekly or biweekly from March 5 to April 23, 2020. In total, 27 samples were obtained. The samples were kept cool or frozen until the analysis, which took place within 3 days after the collection. The sample was split into 80 mL and 20 mL of subsamples, which were then subjected to virus concentration process and quantification of F-phages, respectively (Fig. 1). At the beginning of the study period, there were only four and zero COVID-19 confirmed cases in Ishikawa and Toyama prefectures, respectively. However, the numbers increased during the period. At the end of April, Ishikawa and Toyama prefectures were ranked as second and third, respectively, in Japan in the number of infections per 100,000 peoples (21.9 and 18.1 cases, respectively) (Fig. 2).

2.2 Virus concentration by polyethylene glycol precipitation (PEG precipitation).

Prior to the virus concentration, the 80 mL subsample was centrifuged at 5,000×g for 5 minutes. The supernatant was recovered and mixed with 8.0 g of PEG8000 and 4.7

g of sodium chloride to be final concentrations of 10% and 1 M, respectively. The mixture was incubated overnight on a shaker at 4°C. Subsequently, the mixture was centrifuged at 10,000×g for 30 minutes. The supernatant was discarded and the resultant pellet was resuspended in 500 µL of phosphate buffer as a virus concentrate.

2.3 RNA extraction.

Murine norovirus was used as a molecular process control to monitor the inhibitory effects on the RNA extraction-RT-qPCR processes. Briefly, 140 µL of the virus concentrate was spiked with 1.7×10^4 copies of MNV and subjected to RNA extraction using a QIAamp viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen) to obtain a 60 µL of RNA extract, in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. The obtained RNA extract was subjected to qRT-PCR assays and RT-semi nested PCR assays, for quantitative detection of the spiked MNV and indigenous SARS-CoV-2 and for qualitative detection of indigenous SARS-CoV-2, respectively.

2.4 qRT-PCR assay.

TaqMan-based qRT-PCR assays for quantitative detection of spiked MNV and indigenous SARS-CoV-2 were performed with a qTOWER^3 (Analytik Jena). For quantification of MNV RNA, a primer and TaqMan probe set described by Kitajima et al. (2008) was utilized, while for quantification of SARS-CoV-2, two and one primer and TaqMan probe sets described by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in the USA (2020) (CDCN2, and CDCN3 assays, which were originally denoted as

2019-nCoV_N1, 2019-nCoV_N2, and 2019-nCoV_N3, respectively) and Shirato et al. (2020) (NIID assay, which was originally denoted as NIID_2019-nCoV_N), respectively, were separately used (Table 2). Shirato et al. (2020) described two reverse primers for NIID assay. In this study, one of them (NIID_2019-nCoV_N_R2ver3, denoted as NIID-R in Table 2) was used because it does not have mismatch with reference strains (Wuhan-Hu-1 strain, Gen Bank acc. No. of MN908947.3, for example). A reaction mixture (20 μL) was prepared using a One Step PrimeScript™ RT-PCR Kit (Perfect Real Time) (TaKaRa). Briefly, 20 μL of a reaction mixture was prepared by mixing 2 μL or 5 μL of RNA extract with, of 10 μL a 2×One Step RT-PCR Buffer III, 0.4 μL of a TaKaRa Ex Taq HS, 0.4 μL of a PrimeScript RT enzyme Mix II, 400 nM each of forward- and reverse primers, 100 nM of a TaqMan probe, and nuclease-free water. qRT-PCR was performed under the following thermal cycling conditions: RT reaction at 42°C for 5 min, initial denaturation and inactivation of the RT enzyme at 95°C for 10 s, followed by 50 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 5 s and annealing and extension at specific temperatures for each assay (Table 2) for 30 s.

To obtain a calibration curve, a 10-fold serial dilution (concentrations ranged from 1.0×10^{0} to 1.0×10^{6} copies/reaction) of a standard DNA (plasmid DNA or oligo DNA) containing the target sequence was amplified. In each qPCR assay, 1.0×10^{1} copies/reaction of the standard DNA were positive at all times, indicating that the limit of the quantification values for each qPCR assay was below 1.0×10^{1} copies/reaction. If

the resultant Ct value from a sample was corresponding to >1 copy/reaction, the sample was determined to be positive for SARS-CoV-2.

Absence of the positive signal in the no template control was confirmed in every qRT-PCR runs to exclude the potential contamination of the template into the reagents.

2.5 RT-nested PCR assays.

The RT reaction was performed with a high-capacity cDNA reverse transcription kit (Life Technologies, Tokyo, Japan). The obtained cDNA was subjected to nested PCR assays for qualitative gene detection of SARS-CoV-2 (Fig. 1). The first round of PCR amplification was performed in 50 μL of a reaction mixture containing 10.0 μL of cDNA, 2×Premix Taq™ (TaKaRa), 400 nM each of CDCN3-F and NIID-R primers, which are also employed for CDCN3 and NIID qRT-PCR assays, respectively, and expected to amplify 600 bp gene fragment (Fig. 3 and Table 2), and nuclease-free water. The amplification was performed under the following thermal cycling conditions using a Thermal Cycler Dice (TaKaRa): initial denaturation and enzyme activation at 95°C for 10 min, followed by 40 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 10 s, primer annealing at 55°C for 30 s, and an extension reaction at 72°C for 1 min and then a final extension at 72°C for 5 min. The first round PCR product was diluted with nuclease free water by 1,000-fold and then subjected to following PCR assays.

For the second round of PCR, four different assays were conducted, one is a conventional PCR assay (semi-nested PCR assay) followed by gel electrophoresis and

gene sequencing. Others are real-time PCR based on CDCN2, CDCN3, and NIID assays (nested-real time PCR assays). The semi-nested PCR assay was performed in a 20 μL reaction mixture containing 2 μL of the product of the first round of PCR amplification, 2×Premix Taq™ (Takara), and 400 nM each of CDCN3-F and CDCN2-R primers (Fig. 3 and Table 2), which are also employed for CDCN3 and CDCN2 qRT-PCR assays, respectively, and expected to amplify 550 bp gene fragment, and nuclease-free water. PCR amplification was performed under the following thermal cycling conditions using a Thermal Cycler Dice (TaKaRa): initial denaturation at 95°C for 10 min, followed by 40 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 10 s, primer annealing at 55°C for 30 s, and extension reaction at 72°C for 30 sec and then a final extension at 72°C for 5 min. The semi nested PCR product was subjected to electrophoresis on a 1.5% agarose gel and visualized under a UV lamp after being stained with Gel Red™ (FUJIFILM).

For further confirmation of the successful amplification by the first round PCR, the PCR product was subjected to CDCN2, CDCN3, and NIID assays (nested-real time PCR assays) with a qTOWER^3 (Analytik Jena) (Fig. 3 and Table 2). The real time PCR was performed in a 20 μL reaction mixture containing 2 μL of the product of the first round of PCR amplification, 2×Premix Taq™ (TaKaRa), and 400 nM each of primers, 100 nM of a TaqMan probe, and nuclease-free water. PCR amplification was performed under the following thermal cycling conditions: initial denaturation at 95°C for 10 min,

followed by 40 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 10 s, annealing and extension at specific temperatures for each assay for 30 s (Table 2).

2.6 Determining efficiencies of virus concentration and RNA extraction-qRT-PCR.

Indigenous F-phage in the sample before and after the concentration process was quantified by a plate counting assay employing *Salmonella Typhimurium* WG49 as a host strain, as described previously (Mooijman et al., 2002). The efficiency of the virus concentration process was estimated by comparing the F-phage concentration in the sample before the concentration process with that after the concentration process.

The efficiency of RNA extraction-qRT-PCR was estimated by comparing the observed gene concentration of the spiked MNV in nuclease-free water with that in the concentrate.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Efficiency of virus detection.

The recovery efficiency of indigenous F-phage by the concentration process was 57% in geometric mean and was always above 10% (n = 27). RNA extraction-qRT-PCR efficiency determined with the spiked MNV was 66% in geometric mean and was always above 10% (n = 27). These indicate that the virus concentration and following molecular processes were conducted efficiency enough (Haramoto et al., 2018). Presumptive virus detection efficiency, which can be estimated by multiplying these efficiencies, was 38% in geometric mean and below 10% for 5 out of 27 samples (3.7% was the lowest).

3.2 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 by qRT-PCR assays.

In this study, three qRT-PCR assays, CDCN2, CDCN3 and NIID assays, were separately applied. A sample collected at WTTP D on April 3 was positive for SARS-CoV-2 using all the assays with an observed concentration of around 3.0×10^4 copies/L (2.1×10^4 – 4.4×10^4 copies/L) (Fig. 2 and Table 3). The presumptive virus detection efficiency in the sample was relatively high (estimated as 130%). In addition to the sample, CDCN2, CDCN3, and NIID assays showed positive signals in 1 (WWTP B on April 16), 4 (WWTP A on March 19, WWTP B on March 26 and April 23, and WWTP C on April 21), and 1 (WWTP D on April 24) samples. In total, 7 samples were determined to be positive for SARS-CoV-2 by at least one of the assays with observed

concentration of 1.2×10^4 – 4.4×10^4 copies/L. The detection frequency seems to be higher when the number of total confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases in 100,000 peoples became above 10 in each prefecture (Fig. 2 and Table 3). The SARS-CoV-2 detection frequency was 15% (3 positives out of 20 samples) before the number became >10, whereas it reached 57% (4 positives out of 7 samples) after the number became >10.

3.3 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-nested PCR assays and nucleotide sequencing.

The qRT-PCR assays used in this study target a 600 bp fraction of gene coding N-protein. Then, nested PCR assays could be performed using the primers used in the qRT-PCR assays for further confirmation of the positive results obtained by the qRT-PCR assays. A semi-nested PCR assay to amplify 550 bp of a gene fragment showed a band of around 600 bp size in four out of seven samples, which were collected during April (Table 3 and Fig. 4). However, direct Sanger sequencing could not confirm if the amplicon was obtained from SARS-CoV-2 or not, because of too many heterozygous peaks. Application of real-time PCR to the first round PCR products showed ambiguous results. CDCN2 and NIID assay did not show any positive results, while CDCN3 assay showed positive signal from six out of the seven samples. Among them, samples collected during March resulted in relatively high (>35) Ct values, while those collected during April resulted in lower (around 30) Ct values.

4. DISCUSSION

Most of previous studies investigated pathogenic and indicator viruses targeted non-enveloped viruses (Haramoto et al., 2018). Consequently, retrospective virus concentration methods are optimized for non-enveloped viruses and may not be effective to enveloped virus like SARS-CoV-2. For instance, adsorption-elution methods using electropositive or electronegative microfilter and glass wool are surely effective to non-enveloped viruses (Cashdollar et al., 2013) but resulted in inefficient recovery efficiency (consistently less than or around 10%) for at least some of enveloped viruses (Haramoto et al., 2009; Honjo et al., 2010; Deboosere et al., 2011; Francy et al., 2013; Blanco et al., 2019). A size excusive method using ultrafiltration is also widely applied for virus monitoring (Cashdollar et al., 2013). Even though its efficacy in concentrating enveloped viruses has not been fully elucidated yet, some researchers have been succeeded in detecting enveloped viruses, influenza-A virus and SARS-CoV-2 (Heijnen and Medema, 2011; Medema et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020). One of the drawbacks of the ultrafiltration-based method is the cost of the ultrafiltration unit. For example, Centricon plus-70, which can process up to 70 mL of a sample at once, costs approximately 50 USD per unit, and it might not be suitable for frequent use. On the contrary, PEG precipitation is one of the most cost-effective method for concentrating virus in a low volume (around 100 mL) of water sample (Lewis and Metcalf, 1988). The technique is effective not only for viruses but also for variety of

proteins (Atha and Ingham, 1981). Therefore, it might be effective for SARS-CoV-2, even though only a limited number of studies have applied the technique to enveloped viruses, including SARS-CoV-2, in water (Honjo et al., 2010; Deboosere et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2020). For PEG precipitation, several conditions, i.e., concentrations of PEG and NaCl, have been applied (Jones and Johns, 2009). Among them, we selected relatively high concentrations of PEG and NaCl (10% and 1.0 M), in accordance with Jones and Johns (2009). As expected, the method revealed a sufficiently high and stable recovery efficiency of indigenous F-phages (57% in geometric mean), indicating that SARS-CoV-2 was also recovered efficiently. An efficient way for recovering SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and an appropriate recovery control to ascertain the efficient recovery of SARS-CoV-2 should be found in future.

Several molecular assays have been designed for detection of SARS-CoV-2 (CDC2020; Shirato 2020; Corman et al., 2020; Chu et al., 2020). Although some studies revealed effectiveness of these assays in comparative manner (Jung et al., 2020), a gold standard method has not been determined yet. Especially, wastewater contains variety of microbes and free nucleic acids, which might lead to false positive due to non-specific amplification. Therefore, most studies on SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples applied multiple RT-PCR assays, gel electrophoresis, and amplicon sequencing in attempts to improve reliability (Ahmed et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020; Wurtzet et al., 2020). In this study, three qRT-PCR assays and additional

RT-nested PCR assays, to confirm the positive results obtained by the qRT-PCR assays, were applied. Among seven samples positive by at least one of the qRT-PCR assays, one collected at WWTP D on April 3 were consistently positive by all three qRT-PCR assays, while other six samples were positive by one of the assays. Low concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 gene in the concentrates can be one possible reason for the ambiguous results. The observed concentration was at most 8 copies/reaction. In this case, the target gene is occasionally absent in the analyte. It is also possible that some of the positive signals were generated by non-specific amplicons or that some assays failed to amplify specific SARS-CoV-2 strains.

Then, RT-nested PCR assays sharing primers with the qRT-PCR assays were conducted to ascertain the positives obtained by the qRT-PCR assays. Most of the qRT-PCR positive samples again showed positive results by at least one of the RT-nested PCR assays, indicating that the positive signals obtained by the qRT-PCR assays are reliable. Some previous studies revealed that CDCN2 assay seems to be less efficient in detecting SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples than CDCN1 and CDCN3 assays (Medema et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020; Randazzo et al., 2020). Accordingly, CDCN2 assay, as well as NIID assay, seem to be inefficient in this study, showed no positive results after the first round PCR. Similarly, the first round PCR followed by CDCN3 assay seems to be better than that followed by the semi nested PCR assay, in view of the number of positives. These suggest that primers and TaqMan probe

used in CDCN2 and NIID assays might contain mismatches with SARS-CoV-2 strains in wastewater. Notably, one sample (at WWTP B on April 16) failed to confirm the presence of SARS-CoV-2 by the second round CDCN3 assay. This sample was also negative by qRT-PCR with CDCN3 assay. Considering that the sample was positive by the semi nested assay, the first round PCR was successfully conducted. This implies that CDCN3 assay may also not be effective in detecting all the circulating SARS-CoV-2 strains.

Detection frequency of SARS-CoV-2 in our wastewater samples seemed to be in agreement with the numbers of confirmed cases in both prefectures. The detection frequency seems to be higher when it becomes above 10 in 100,000 peoples (Fig. 2 and Table 3) Besides, no positive result was obtained in the samples collected in Toyama prefecture during March, when no confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection cases were reported. Our results also suggest that SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater sample could be identified even when the number of cases per 100,000 peoples is below 1.0, although the detection frequency becomes low (Fig. 2 and Table 3). One SARS-CoV-2 positive sample during March was collected at WWTP A. A relatively low number of populations served by the WWTP (34,501 peoples) might be attributed to the positive result. Smaller WWTP would have a limited dilution effect and can be more sensitive to the presence of the number of infected individuals. Previous studies have suggested that the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater is affected by number of peoples infected

in the catchment area (Medema et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020b). However, there seems to be a discrepancy in the observed relationships between the concentration in wastewater and the number of infected people. Ahmed et al. (2020) could not identify SARS-CoV-2 in a wastewater sample in Queensland until the number of the confirmed cases reached up to around 100 cases per 100,000 peoples. In addition, the observed concentration was below the limit of quantification at that time. In contrast, Wurtzer et al. (2020b) repeatedly obtained positive results in Paris even when the number of the confirmed cases was below 1 case per 100,000 peoples, in accordance with our observation. One of the reasons for this discrepancy might be due to the difference in methods applied; collecting composite samples or grab samples and ways of sample concentration, nucleic acid extraction, and qRT-PCR. Besides, the number of the confirmed cases does not necessarily reflect the actual prevalence of the infection at the time point, which can be better correlated to the concentration in the wastewater. In Japan, it takes a few days to confirm the case by the clinical surveillance since the symptom first appeared or the one become infected. There should be asymptomatic cases, which were not confirmed. In the context of WBE, data on the relationship between the number of infection cases and concentration in wastewater needs to be accumulated further.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by Hiramoto-gumi Inc., the civil construction company in Japan.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J.W., Choi, P.M., Kitajima, M., Simpson, S.L., Li, J., Tscharke, B., Verhagen, R., Smith, W.J.M., Zaugg, J., Dierens, L., Hugenholtz, P., Thomas, K. V., Mueller, J.F., 2020. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. Sci. Total Environ. 138764.
2. Atha, D.H., Ingham, K.C., 1981. Mechanism of precipitation of proteins by polyethylene glycols. Analysis in terms of excluded volume. J. Biol. Chem. 256, 12108–12117
3. Bar-or, I., Yaniv, K., Shagan, M., Ozer, E., Erster, O., Mendelson, E., Shirazi, R., Kramarsky-winter, E., Nir, O., Abu-ali, H., Ronen, Z., Lewis, Y.E., Friedler, E., Bitkover, E., Paitan, Y., Berchenko, Y., Goldstein-goren, S., Science, N., Sheva, B., Saba, K., Boker, S., 2020. Regressing SARS-CoV-2 sewage measurements onto COVID-19 burden in the population: a proof-of-concept for quantitative environmental surveillance. medRxiv 020.04.26.20073569.
4. Bendavid, E., Mulaney, B., Sood, N., Shah, S., Ling, E., Bromley-Dulfano, R., Lai, C., Weissberg, Z., Saavedra, R., Tedrow, J., Tversky, D., Bogan, A., Kupiec, T., Eichner, D., Gupta, R., Ioannidis, J., Bhattacharya, J., 2020. COVID-19 Antibody Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California. medRxiv 2020.04.14.20062463.

5. Blanco, A., Abid, I., Al-Otaibi, N., Pérez-Rodríguez, F.J., Fuentes, C., Guix, S., Pintó, R.M., Bosch, A., 2019. Glass Wool Concentration Optimization for the Detection of Enveloped and Non-enveloped Waterborne Viruses. Food Environ. Virol. 11, 184–192.

6. Cashdollar, J.L., Wymer, L., 2013. Methods for primary concentration of viruses from water samples: A review and meta-analysis of recent studies. J. Appl. Microbiol. 115, 1–11.

7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Respiratory Viruses Branch, Division of Viral Diseases Instructions. 2020. Real-Time RT-PCR Panel for Detection 2019-Novel Coronavirus Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Respiratory Viruses Branch, Division of Viral Diseases, accessed: February 28, 2020.

8. Choi, P.M., Tscharke, B.J., Donner, E., O'Brien, J.W., Grant, S.C., Kaserzon, S.L., Mackie, R., O'Malley, E., Crosbie, N.D., Thomas, K. V., Mueller, J.F., 2018. Wastewater-based epidemiology biomarkers: Past, present and future. TrAC - Trends Anal. Chem.

9. Chu, D.K.W., Pan, Y., Cheng, S.M.S., Hui, K.P.Y., Krishnan, P., Liu, Y., Ng, D.Y.M., Wan, C.K.C., Yang, P., Wang, Q., Peiris, M., Poon, L.L.M., 2020. Molecular Diagnosis of a Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Causing an Outbreak of Pneumonia. Clin. Chem. 7, 1–7.

10. Corman, V.M., Landt, O., Kaiser, M., Molenkamp, R., Meijer, A., Chu, D.K.,

Bleicker, T., Brünink, S., Schneider, J., Luisa Schmidt, M., GJC Mulders, D., Haagmans, B.L., van der Veer, B., van den Brink, S., Wijsman, L., Goderski, G., Romette, J.-L., Ellis, J., Zambon, M., Peiris, M., Goossens, H., Reusken, C., Koopmans, M.P., Drosten, C., Victor, C.M., Olfert, L., Marco, K., Richard, M., Adam, M., Daniel, C.K., Tobias, B., Sebastian, B., Julia, S., Marie Luisa, S., Daphne GJC, M., Bart, H.L., der Veer Bas, V., den Brink Sharon, V., Lisa, W., Gabriel, G., Jean-Louis, R., Joanna, E., Maria, Z., Malik, P., Herman, G., Chantal, R., 2020. Detection of 2019-nCoV by RT-PCR. Euro. Surveill. 25, 1–8.

11. Deboosere, N., Horm, S.V., Pinon, A., Gachet, J., Coldefy, C., Buchy, P., Vialette, M., 2011. Development and validation of a concentration method for the detection of influenza a viruses from large volumes of surface water. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 77, 3802–3808.

12. Francy, D.S., Stelzer, E.A., Brady, A.M.G., Huitger, C., Bushon, R.N., Ip, H.S., Ware, M.W., Villegas, E.N., Gallardo, V., Lindquist, H.D.A., 2013. Comparison of filters for concentrating microbial indicators and pathogens in lake water samples. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 79, 1342–1352.

13. Gloeckner, S., Krause, G., Hoehle, M., 2020. Now-casting the COVID-19 epidemic: The use case of Japan, March 2020. medRxiv 2020.03.18.20037473.

14. Hata, A., Honda, R., 2020. Potential sensitivity of wastewater monitoring for SARS-CoV-2: comparison with norovirus cases. Environ. Sci. Technol. (in press).

15. Haramoto, E., Kitajima, M., Katayama, H., Ito, T., Ohgaki, S., 2009. Development of virus concentration methods for detection of koi herpesvirus in water. J. Fish Dis. 32, 297–300.

16. Haramoto, E., Kitajima, M., Hata, A., Torrey, J.R., Masago, Y., Sano, D., Katayama, H., 2018. A review on recent progress in the detection methods and prevalence of human enteric viruses in water. Water Res. 135. 168-186.

17. Haramoto, E., Malla, B., Thakali, O., Kitajima, M. 2020. First environmental surveillance for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and river water in Japan. medRxiv.

18. Heijnen, L., Medema, G., 2011. Surveillance of influenza A and the pandemic influenza A (H1N1) 2009 in sewage and surface water in the Netherlands. J. Water Health 9, 434–442.

19. Honjo, M.N., Minamoto, T., Matsui, K., Uchii, K., Yamanaka, H., Suzuki, A. a, Kohmatsu, Y., Iida, T., Kawabata, Z., 2010. Quantification of cyprinid herpesvirus 3 in environmental water by using an external standard virus. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 76, 161–8.

20. Jones, T.H., Johns, M.W., 2009. Improved detection of F-specific RNA coliphages in fecal material by extraction and polyethylene glycol precipitation. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 75, 6142–6.

21. Jung, Y.J., Park, G.-S., Moon, J.H., Ku, K., Beak, S.-H., Kim, Seil, Park, E.C., Park,

D., Lee, J.-H., Byeon, C.W., Lee, J.J., Maeng, J., Kim, S.J., Kim, Seung Il, Kim, B.-T., Lee, M.J., Kim, H.G., 2020. Comparative analysis of primer-probe sets for the laboratory confirmation of SARS-CoV-2. BioRxiv 2020.02.25.964775.

22. Kitajima, M., Tohya, Y., Matsubara, K., Haramoto, E., Utagawa, E., Katayama, H., Ohgaki, S. (2008). Use of murine norovirus as a novel surrogate to evaluate resistance of human norovirus to free chlorine disinfection in drinking water supply system. Environ. Eng. Res. 45, 361–370 (in Japanese).

23. Kitajima, M., Ahmed, W., Bibby, K., Carducci, A., Gerba, C.P., Hamilton, A., Haramoto, E., Rose, J.B. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. Science of the Total Environment. (in press).

24. La Rosa, D., Iaconelli, M., Mancini, P., Ferraro, G.B., Veneri, C., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L., Suffredini, E. 2020. First Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Untreated Wastewaters in Italy. medRxiv.

25. Lewis, G.D., Metcalf, T.G., 1988. Polyethylene glycol precipitation for recovery of pathogenic viruses, including hepatitis A virus and human rotavirus, from oyster, water, and sediment samples. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 54, 1983–8.

26. Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., Brouwer, A., 2020. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in sewage and correlation with reported COVID-19 prevalence in the early stage of the epidemic in the Netherlands. Environ. Sci. Technol. (in press).

27. Mizumoto, K., Kagaya, K., Zarebski, A., Chowell, G., 2020. Estimating the asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. Eurosurveillance 25, 1–5.

28. Mooijman, K. a, Bahar, M., Muniesa, M., Havelaar, A.H., 2002. Optimisation of ISO 10705-1 on enumeration of F-specific bacteriophages. J. Virol. Methods 103, 129–36.

29. Nemudryi, A., Nemudraia, A., Surya, K., Wiegand, T., Buyukyoruk, M., Wilkinson, R., Wiedenheft, B., 2020. Temporal detection and phylogenetic assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in municipal wastewater. medRxiv 2020.03.22.20041079.

30. Nishiura, H., Kobayashi, T., Suzuki, A., Jung, S.-M., Hayashi, K., Kinoshita, R., Yang, Y., Yuan, B., Akhmetzhanov, A.R., Linton, N.M., Miyama, T., 2020. Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19). Int. J. Infect. Dis. 94, 154-155.

31. Omori, R., Mizumoto, K., Chowell, G., 2020. Changes in testing rates could mask the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) growth rate. Int. J. Infect. Dis. 94, 116–118.

32. Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Simón, P., Allende, A., Sánchez, G. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Anticipated COVID-19 Occurrence in a Low Prevalence Area. Water Res. (in press)

33. Rimoldi, S.G., Stefani, F., Gigantiello, A., Polesello, S., Comandatore, F., Mileto1, D., Maresca, M., Longobardi, C., Mancon, A., Romeri, F., Pagani, C., Moja, L., Gismondo, M. R., Salerno, F. 2020. Presence and vitality of SARS-CoV-2 virus in wastewaters and rivers. MedRxiv.

34. Shirato, K., Nao, N., Katano, H., Takayama, I., Saito, S., Kato, F., Katoh, H., Sakata, M., Nakatsu, Y., Mori, Y., Kageyama, T., Matsuyama, S., Takeda, M., 2020. Development of Genetic Diagnostic Methods for Novel Coronavirus 2019 (nCoV-2019) in Japan. Jpn. J. Infect. Dis. (in press).

35. World Health Organization, 2020. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports [WWW Document]. URL https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports (accessed 6.8.20).

36. Wu, F., Xiao, A., Zhang, J., GU, X., Lee, W., Kauffman, K., Hanage, W., Matus, M., Ghaeli, N., Endo, N., Duvallet, C., Moniz, K., Erickson, T., Pr, C., Thompson, J., Alm, E., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from clinically confirmed cases. medRxiv 2020.04.05.20051540.

37. Wurtzer, S., Marechal, V., Mouchel, J.M., Moulin, L. 2020a. Time course quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Parisian wastewaters correlates with COVID-19 confirmed cases. medRxiv. 2020.04.12.20062679.

38. Wurtzer, S., Marechal, V., Mouchel, J.M., Maday, Y., Teyssou, R., Richard, E.,

Almayrac, J.L., Moulin L. 2020b. Evaluation of lockdown impact on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics through viral genome quantification in Paris wastewaters.

39. Yang, Z., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., Frost, C.G., Estrela, P., Thomas, K. V., 2015. Community sewage sensors for monitoring public health. Environ. Sci. Technol. 49, 5845–5846.

FIGURES



Figure 1. Flow diagram of sample processing for confirming the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater by RT-PCR assays and for assessing virus detection efficiency with process controls.



Figure 2. Temporal relationship between number of SARS-CoV-2 infection cases and presence of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples in Ishikawa and Toyama prefectures. Number of inpatients was calculated by subtracting numbers of discharged and dead from number of total confirmed cases, which were derived from a databased summarized by Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare in Japan (https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/0000121431_00086.html).



Figure 3. Location of primers and TaqMan probes employed in this study on a referential SARS-CoV-2 strain, Wuhan-Hu-1 (Gen Bank accession no: MN908947). These are localized on a relatively short fraction (600 nt) of N-gene. Therefore, CDCN3-F and NIID-R primers, for example, can be used as outer primers for nested assays.



Figure 4. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples by the RT-semi-nested PCR assay, which is expected to result in a 550 bp of amplicon. Lanes 1-3: Samples collected at WWTPs A, B, and D on March 19, 26, and April 3, which did not show the positive band. Lanes 4-7: Samples collected at WWTPs A, B, C, B, on April 16, 21, 23, and 24, which showed the positive band. Lane 8: Non target control. Lane 9: 100-bp ladder.

TABLES

TABLE 1. Characteristics of WWTPs studied in this study.

WWTP	Prefecture	Population served by WWTP	Treatment capacity (m^3/d)
A	Ishikawa	34,501	12,800
B	Ishikawa	127,100	53,300
C	Ishikawa	153,291	156,000
D	Toyama	169,400	82,500

TABLE 2. Primer and TaqMan probe sequences used for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in this study.

Assay	Name	Function	Sequence (5' → 3')[a]	Location	temperature for annealing/extension	Reference
2019-nCoV_N2	CDCN2-F	Forward primer	TTACAAACATTGGCCGCAAA	29164-29183	55°C	CDC (2020)
	CDCN2-R[b]	Reverse primer	GCGCGACATTCCGAAGAA	29213-29230		
	CDCN2-P	TaqMan Probe	ACAATTTGCCCCCAGCGCTTCAG-	29188-29210		
2019-nCoV_N3	CDCN3-F[b]	Forward primer	GGGAGCCTTGAATACACCAAAA	28681-28702	55°C	CDC (2020)
	CDCN3-R	Reverse primer	TGTAGCACGATTGCAGCATTG	28732-28752		
	CDCN3-P	TaqMan Probe	AYCACATTGGCACCCGCAATCCTG-	28704-28727		
NIID_2019-nCoV_N	NIID-F	Forward primer	AAATTTTGGGGACCAGGAAC	29125-29144	60°C	Shirato et al. (2020)
	NIID-R[b]	Reverse primer	TGGCACCTGTGTAGGTCAAC	29263-29282		
	NIID-P	TaqMan Probe	ATGTCGCGCATTGGCATGGA	29222-29241		

[a]: All TaqMan probes were labeled with 5'-FAM and 3'-TAMRA.
[b]: CDCN3-F, CDCN2-R, NIID-R were also used for nested PCR assays.

TABLE 3. Summary of samples positive for SARS-CoV-2 by qRT-PCR assays.

Date	WWTP[a]	Total confirmed cases in 100,000 peoples		Efficiency of detection process			qRT-PCR			RT-nested PCR			
		Ishikawa	Toyama	Concentration	RNA extraction-qRT-PCR	Total	CDCN2	CDCN3	NIID	semi-nested	CDCN2	CDCN3	NIID
				%	%	%		copies/L			Ct	Ct	Ct
March 19	A	0.4	0.0	263	72	190	Neg.[b]	2.8×10^4	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	35.2	Neg.
March 27	B	0.5	0.0	76	50	38	Neg.	1.7×10^4	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	36.2	Neg.
April 3	D	1.4	0.8	125	102	130	4.4×10^4	1.2×10^4	2.1×10^4	Neg.	Neg.	29.9	Neg.
April 16	B	12.2	5.1	10	49	4.9	1.5×10^4	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.
April 21	C	15.7	10.9	87	41	36	Neg.	1.5×10^4	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	32.1	Neg.
April 23	B	17.4	11.0	36	50	18	Neg.	1.2×10^4	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	31.1	Neg.
April 24	D	18.9	14.3	51	31	16	Neg.	Neg.	1.4×10^4	Pos.	Neg.	30.3	Neg.

[a]: WWTPs A-C and D are located in Ishikawa and Toyama prefecture, respectively.
[b]: Neg.: Negative; Pos.: Positive.