Detection 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.

33 **1. INTRODUCTION**

34 The recent novel coronavirus pneumonia (COVID-19) pandemic caused by the
35 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection has led to
36 more than 6.8 million of the confirmed cases and nearly 400,000 deaths worldwide, as of
37 June 7, 2020 (WHO, 2020). Currently, this pandemic is likely to be heading for
38 convergence due to world-wide stay-at-home order. However, there are still a concern of
39 re-outbreak after lift of the stay-at-home order for reopening businesses, and also the
40 2nd pandemic caused by seasonal factors. Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is the
41 effective approach to provide a snapshot of the outbreak situation in the entire catchment
42 by monitoring pathogens and viruses in wastewater (Choi et al., 2018; Yang et al.,
43 2015). The WBE could be an early warning tool for the possible re-outbreaks and
44 seasonal pandemics in the future.

45 Recently, detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater is reported in Netherlands,
46 Australia, US, China, France, Israel, Italy, Spain, and Japan (Ahmed et al., 2020; Bar-or
47 et al., 2020; Haramoto et al., 2020; La Rosa et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Nemudryi
48 et al., 2020; Randazzo et al., 2020; Rimoldi et al., 2020; WU et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al.,
49 2020a). SARS-CoV-2 are present in wastewater because they are shed from not only in
50 respiratory secretion but also feces of patients (Tang et al., 2020; Wölfel et al., 2020a; J.
51 Zhang et al., 2020; Y. Zhang et al., 2020). Importantly, pre-symptomatic patients and
52 asymptomatic patients also had a viral load in feces as well as symptomatic patients

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

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

78 According the recent studies, SARS-CoV-2 were detected in wastewater when the
79 number of confirmed cases reached 1-100 cases per 100,000 of population (Ahmed et
80 al., 2020; Bar-or et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020; WU et al.,
81 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020a). The sensitivity of WBE depends on viral load in feces of
82 infected people. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater could be less sensitive than
83 norovirus, because the viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in feces is reportedly 1 to 2 logs lower
84 than norovirus (Hata and Honda, 2020). SARS-CoV-2 is an enveloped virus, while
85 typical viral pathogens in water, such as noroviruses, are non-enveloped viruses. Then,
86 commonly used methods for concentrating viruses in water might not be effective to
87 SARS-CoV-2 (Kitajima et al., 2020). Besides, several RT-PCR assays for SARS-CoV-2
88 are now available but their applicability to wastewater sample has not been well
89 determined. These indicate that detection of SARS-CoV-2 in the wastewater is more
90 challenging than that of norovirus and other enteric viruses. At this time, verifying
91 concentration methods and downstream RT-PCR assays is necessary to make WBE
92 reliable.

93 The objective of this study is to verify the detection limit of WBE for COVID-19 by
94 comparing the detected concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and the COVID-19
95 cases reported in clinical surveillance. In this study, wastewater samples were taken in
96 two prefectures, Ishikawa and Toyama, in Japan which had the most reported COVID-
97 19 cases per population except Tokyo Metropolitan. To deal with the methodological
98 issues pointed above, sample processing was validated by assessing virus detection
99 efficiency with process controls. Besides, multiple RT-PCR assays and nucleotide
100 sequencing were applied to improve the reliability of the positive results. At the
101 beginning of the study period, numbers of the confirmed COVID-19 cases in Ishikawa
102 and Toyama prefectures were only 0.3 and 0 per 100,000 peoples (4 and no confirmed
103 cases), respectively. This enabled us to discuss sensitivity of WBE for COVID-19 from
104 the reported COVID-19 cases per population in the target area.
105
106
107

108 ## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

109 **2.1 Sample collection.**

110 Influent wastewater samples were collected at four WWTPs, WWTPs A-C and D, in
111 Ishikawa and Toyama prefecture, respectively. These WWTPs were built to treat
112 maximum volumes of 12,800, 53,300, 156,000, and 82,500 m^3/day of wastewater in
113 total and are serving population equivalents of 31,510, 112,396, 151,937, and 169,400,
114 respectively (Table 1). At each WWTP, 100 mL of a grab sample was collected in the
115 morning, during the hour of peak flow, weekly or biweekly from March 5 to April 23,
116 2020. In total, 27 samples were obtained. The samples were kept cool or frozen until
117 the analysis, which took place within 3 days after the collection. The sample was split
118 into 80 mL and 20 mL of subsamples, which were then subjected to virus concentration
119 process and quantification of F-phages, respectively (Fig. 1). At the beginning of the
120 study period, there were only four and zero COVID-19 confirmed cases in Ishikawa
121 and Toyama prefectures, respectively. However, the numbers increased during the
122 period. At the end of April, Ishikawa and Toyama prefectures were ranked as second
123 and third, respectively, in Japan in the number of infections per 100,000 peoples (21.9
124 and 18.1 cases, respectively) (Fig. 2).

125 **2.2 Virus concentration by polyethylene glycol precipitation (PEG precipitation).**

126 Prior to the virus concentration, the 80 mL subsample was centrifuged at 5,000×g for
127 5 minutes. The supernatant was recovered and mixed with 8.0 g of PEG8000 and 4.7 g

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

132 **2.3 RNA extraction.**

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

141 **2.4 qRT-PCR assay.**

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

148 2019-nCoV_N1, 2019-nCoV_N2, and 2019-nCoV_N3, respectively) and Shirato et al.
149 (2020) (NIID assay, which was originally denoted as NIID_2019-nCoV_N),
150 respectively, were separately used (Table 2). Shirato et al. (2020) described two reverse
151 primers for NIID assay. In this study, one of them (NIID_2019-nCoV_N_R2ver3,
152 denoted as NIID-R in Table 2) was used because it does not have mismatch with
153 reference strains (Wuhan-Hu-1 strain, Gen Bank acc. No. of MN908947.3, for example).
154 A reaction mixture (20 μL) was prepared using a One Step PrimeScript™ RT-PCR Kit
155 (Perfect Real Time) (TaKaRa). Briefly, 20 μL of a reaction mixture was prepared by
156 mixing 2 μL or 5 μL of RNA extract with, of 10 μL a 2×One Step RT-PCR Buffer III,
157 0.4 μL of a TaKaRa Ex Taq HS, 0.4 μL of a PrimeScript RT enzyme Mix II, 400 nM
158 each of forward- and reverse primers, 100 nM of a TaqMan probe, and nuclease-free
159 water. qRT-PCR was performed under the following thermal cycling conditions: RT
160 reaction at 42°C for 5 min, initial denaturation and inactivation of the RT enzyme at
161 95°C for 10 s, followed by 50 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 5 s
162 and annealing and extension at specific temperatures for each assay (Table 2) for 30 s.
163 To obtain a calibration curve, a 10-fold serial dilution (concentrations ranged from
164 1.0×10^{0} to 1.0×10^{6} copies/reaction) of a standard DNA (plasmid DNA or oligo DNA)
165 containing the target sequence was amplified. In each qPCR assay, 1.0×10^{1}
166 copies/reaction of the standard DNA were positive at all times, indicating that the limit
167 of the quantification values for each qPCR assay was below 1.0×10^{1} copies/reaction. If

168 the resultant Ct value from a sample was corresponding to >1 copy/reaction, the sample
169 was determined to be positive for SARS-CoV-2.
170 Absence of the positive signal in the no template control was confirmed in every
171 qRT-PCR runs to exclude the potential contamination of the template into the reagents.
172 **2.5 RT-nested PCR assays.**
173 The RT reaction was performed with a high-capacity cDNA reverse transcription kit
174 (Life Technologies, Tokyo, Japan). The obtained cDNA was subjected to nested PCR
175 assays for qualitative gene detection of SARS-CoV-2 (Fig. 1). The first round of PCR
176 amplification was performed in 50 μL of a reaction mixture containing 10.0 μL of
177 cDNA, 2×Premix Taq™ (TaKaRa), 400 nM each of CDCN3-F and NIID-R primers,
178 which are also employed for CDCN3 and NIID qRT-PCR assays, respectively, and
179 expected to amplify 600 bp gene fragment (Fig. 3 and Table 2), and nuclease-free water.
180 The amplification was performed under the following thermal cycling conditions using a
181 Thermal Cycler Dice (TaKaRa): initial denaturation and enzyme activation at 95°C for
182 10 min, followed by 40 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 10 s,
183 primer annealing at 55°C for 30 s, and an extension reaction at 72°C for 1 min and then
184 a final extension at 72°C for 5 min. The first round PCR product was diluted with
185 nuclease free water by 1,000-fold and then subjected to following PCR assays.
186 For the second round of PCR, four different assays were conducted, one is a
187 conventional PCR assay (semi-nested PCR assay) followed by gel electrophoresis and

188 gene sequencing. Others are real-time PCR based on CDCN2, CDCN3, and NIID assays
189 (nested-real time PCR assays). The semi-nested PCR assay was performed in a 20 μL
190 reaction mixture containing 2 μL of the product of the first round of PCR amplification,
191 2×Premix Taq™ (Takara), and 400 nM each of CDCN3-F and CDCN2-R primers (Fig.
192 3 and Table 2), which are also employed for CDCN3 and CDCN2 qRT-PCR assays,
193 respectively, and expected to amplify 550 bp gene fragment, and nuclease-free water.
194 PCR amplification was performed under the following thermal cycling conditions using
195 a Thermal Cycler Dice (TaKaRa): initial denaturation at 95°C for 10 min, followed by
196 40 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 10 s, primer annealing at 55°C
197 for 30 s, and extension reaction at 72°C for 30 sec and then a final extension at 72°C for
198 5 min. The semi nested PCR product was subjected to electrophoresis on a 1.5% agarose
199 gel and visualized under a UV lamp after being stained with Gel Red™ (FUJIFILM).
200 For further confirmation of the successful amplification by the first round PCR, the
201 PCR product was subjected to CDCN2, CDCN3, and NIID assays (nested-real time PCR
202 assays) with a qTOWER^3 (Analytik Jena) (Fig. 3 and Table 2). The real time PCR was
203 performed in a 20 μL reaction mixture containing 2 μL of the product of the first round
204 of PCR amplification, 2×Premix Taq™ (TaKaRa), and 400 nM each of primers, 100 nM
205 of a TaqMan probe, and nuclease-free water. PCR amplification was performed under
206 the following thermal cycling conditions: initial denaturation at 95°C for 10 min,

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

209 **2.6 Determining efficiencies of virus concentration and RNA extraction-qRT-PCR.**

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

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

218

219 # 3. RESULTS

220 **3.1 Efficiency of virus detection.**

221 The recovery efficiency of indigenous F-phage by the concentration process was
222 57% in geometric mean and was always above 10% (n = 27). RNA extraction-qRT-PCR
223 efficiency determined with the spiked MNV was 66% in geometric mean and was
224 always above 10% (n = 27). These indicate that the virus concentration and following
225 molecular processes were conducted efficiency enough (Haramoto et al., 2018).
226 Presumptive virus detection efficiency, which can be estimated by multiplying these
227 efficiencies, was 38% in geometric mean and below 10% for 5 out of 27 samples (3.7%
228 was the lowest).

229 **3.2 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 by qRT-PCR assays.**

230 In this study, three qRT-PCR assays, CDCN2, CDCN3 and NIID assays, were
231 separately applied. A sample collected at WTTP D on April 3 was positive for SARS-
232 CoV-2 using all the assays with an observed concentration of around 3.0×10^4 copies/L
233 (2.1×10^4 – 4.4×10^4 copies/L) (Fig. 2 and Table 3). The presumptive virus detection
234 efficiency in the sample was relatively high (estimated as 130%). In addition to the
235 sample, CDCN2, CDCN3, and NIID assays showed positive signals in 1 (WWTP B on
236 April 16), 4 (WWTP A on March 19, WWTP B on March 26 and April 23, and WWTP
237 C on April 21), and 1 (WWTP D on April 24) samples. In total, 7 samples were
238 determined to be positive for SARS-CoV-2 by at least one of the assays with observed

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

244 **3.3 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-nested PCR assays and nucleotide sequencing.**

245 The qRT-PCR assays used in this study target a 600 bp fraction of gene coding N-
246 protein. Then, nested PCR assays could be performed using the primers used in the qRT-
247 PCR assays for further confirmation of the positive results obtained by the qRT-PCR
248 assays. A semi-nested PCR assay to amplify 550 bp of a gene fragment showed a band
249 of around 600 bp size in four out of seven samples, which were collected during April
250 (Table 3 and Fig. 4). However, direct Sanger sequencing could not confirm if the
251 amplicon was obtained from SARS-CoV-2 or not, because of too many heterozygous
252 peaks. Application of real-time PCR to the first round PCR products showed ambiguous
253 results. CDCN2 and NIID assay did not show any positive results, while CDCN3 assay
254 showed positive signal from six out of the seven samples. Among them, samples
255 collected during March resulted in relatively high (>35) Ct values, while those collected
256 during April resulted in lower (around 30) Ct values.
257

258 ## 4. DISCUSSION

259 Most of previous studies investigated pathogenic and indicator viruses targeted non-
260 enveloped viruses (Haramoto et al., 2018). Consequently, retrospective virus
261 concentration methods are optimized for non-enveloped viruses and may not be effective
262 to enveloped virus like SARS-CoV-2. For instance, adsorption-elution methods using
263 electropositive or electronegative microfilter and glass wool are surely effective to non-
264 enveloped viruses (Cashdollar et al., 2013) but resulted in inefficient recovery efficiency
265 (consistently less than or around 10%) for at least some of enveloped viruses (Haramoto
266 et al., 2009; Honjo et al., 2010; Deboosere et al., 2011; Francy et al., 2013; Blanco et al.,
267 2019). A size excusive method using ultrafiltration is also widely applied for virus
268 monitoring (Cashdollar et al., 2013). Even though its efficacy in concentrating
269 enveloped viruses has not been fully elucidated yet, some researchers have been
270 succeeded in detecting enveloped viruses, influenza-A virus and SARS-CoV-2 (Heijnen
271 and Medema, 2011; Medema et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020).
272 One of the drawbacks of the ultrafiltration-based method is the cost of the ultrafiltration
273 unit. For example, Centricon plus-70, which can process up to 70 mL of a sample at
274 once, costs approximately 50 USD per unit, and it might not be suitable for frequent use.
275 On the contrary, PEG precipitation is one of the most cost-effective method for
276 concentrating virus in a low volume (around 100 mL) of water sample (Lewis and
277 Metcalf, 1988). The technique is effective not only for viruses but also for variety of

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

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

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

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

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

325 Detection frequency of SARS-CoV-2 in our wastewater samples seemed to be in
326 agreement with the numbers of confirmed cases in both prefectures. The detection
327 frequency seems to be higher when it becomes above 10 in 100,000 peoples (Fig. 2 and
328 Table 3) Besides, no positive result was obtained in the samples collected in Toyama
329 prefecture during March, when no confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection cases were
330 reported. Our results also suggest that SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater sample could be
331 identified even when the number of cases per 100,000 peoples is below 1.0, although the
332 detection frequency becomes low (Fig. 2 and Table 3). One SARS-CoV-2 positive
333 sample during March was collected at WWTP A. A relatively low number of populations
334 served by the WWTP (31,510 peoples) might be attributed to the positive result. Smaller
335 WWTP would have a limited dilution effect and can be more sensitive to the presence of
336 the number of infected individuals. Previous studies have suggested that the
337 concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater is affected by number of peoples infected

338 in the catchment area (Medema et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020b).
339 However, there seems to be a discrepancy in the observed relationships between the
340 concentration in wastewater and the number of infected people. Ahmed et al. (2020)
341 could not identify SARS-CoV-2 in a wastewater sample in Queensland until the number
342 of the confirmed cases reached up to around 100 cases per 100,000 peoples. In addition,
343 the observed concentration was below the limit of quantification at that time. In contrast,
344 Wurtzer et al. (2020b) repeatedly obtained positive results in Paris even when the
345 number of the confirmed cases was below 1 case per 100,000 peoples, in accordance
346 with our observation. One of the reasons for this discrepancy might be due to the
347 difference in methods applied; collecting composite samples or grab samples and ways
348 of sample concentration, nucleic acid extraction, and qRT-PCR. Besides, the number of
349 the confirmed cases does not necessarily reflect the actual prevalence of the infection at
350 the time point, which can be better correlated to the concentration in the wastewater. In
351 Japan, it takes a few days to confirm the case by the clinical surveillance since the
352 symptom first appeared or the one become infected. There should be asymptomatic
353 cases, which were not confirmed. In the context of WBE, data on the relationship
354 between the number of infection cases and concentration in wastewater needs to be
355 accumulated further.
356
357

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.

382 5. Blanco, A., Abid, I., Al-Otaibi, N., Pérez-Rodríguez, F.J., Fuentes, C., Guix, S.,
383 Pintó, R.M., Bosch, A., 2019. Glass Wool Concentration Optimization for the
384 Detection of Enveloped and Non-enveloped Waterborne Viruses. Food Environ.
385 Virol. 11, 184–192.
386 6. Cashdollar, J.L., Wymer, L., 2013. Methods for primary concentration of viruses
387 from water samples: A review and meta-analysis of recent studies. J. Appl.
388 Microbiol. 115, 1–11.
389 7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Respiratory Viruses Branch, Division
390 of Viral Diseases Instructions. 2020. Real-Time RT-PCR Panel for Detection 2019-
391 Novel Coronavirus Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Respiratory Viruses
392 Branch, Division of Viral Diseases, accessed: February 28, 2020.
393 8. Choi, P.M., Tscharke, B.J., Donner, E., O'Brien, J.W., Grant, S.C., Kaserzon, S.L.,
394 Mackie, R., O'Malley, E., Crosbie, N.D., Thomas, K. V., Mueller, J.F., 2018.
395 Wastewater-based epidemiology biomarkers: Past, present and future. TrAC -
396 Trends Anal. Chem.
397 9. Chu, D.K.W., Pan, Y., Cheng, S.M.S., Hui, K.P.Y., Krishnan, P., Liu, Y., Ng,
398 D.Y.M., Wan, C.K.C., Yang, P., Wang, Q., Peiris, M., Poon, L.L.M., 2020.
399 Molecular Diagnosis of a Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Causing an Outbreak of
400 Pneumonia. Clin. Chem. 7, 1–7.
401 10. Corman, V.M., Landt, O., Kaiser, M., Molenkamp, R., Meijer, A., Chu, D.K.,

402 Bleicker, T., Brünink, S., Schneider, J., Luisa Schmidt, M., GJC Mulders, D.,
403 Haagmans, B.L., van der Veer, B., van den Brink, S., Wijsman, L., Goderski, G.,
404 Romette, J.-L., Ellis, J., Zambon, M., Peiris, M., Goossens, H., Reusken, C.,
405 Koopmans, M.P., Drosten, C., Victor, C.M., Olfert, L., Marco, K., Richard, M.,
406 Adam, M., Daniel, C.K., Tobias, B., Sebastian, B., Julia, S., Marie Luisa, S.,
407 Daphne GJC, M., Bart, H.L., der Veer Bas, V., den Brink Sharon, V., Lisa, W.,
408 Gabriel, G., Jean-Louis, R., Joanna, E., Maria, Z., Malik, P., Herman, G., Chantal,
409 R., 2020. Detection of 2019-nCoV by RT-PCR. Euro. Surveill. 25, 1–8.
410 11. Deboosere, N., Horm, S.V., Pinon, A., Gachet, J., Coldefy, C., Buchy, P., Vialette,
411 M., 2011. Development and validation of a concentration method for the detection
412 of influenza a viruses from large volumes of surface water. Appl. Environ.
413 Microbiol. 77, 3802–3808.
414 12. Francy, D.S., Stelzer, E.A., Brady, A.M.G., Huitger, C., Bushon, R.N., Ip, H.S.,
415 Ware, M.W., Villegas, E.N., Gallardo, V., Lindquist, H.D.A., 2013. Comparison of
416 filters for concentrating microbial indicators and pathogens in lake water samples.
417 Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 79, 1342–1352.
418 13. Gloeckner, S., Krause, G., Hoehle, M., 2020. Now-casting the COVID-19 epidemic:
419 The use case of Japan, March 2020. medRxiv 2020.03.18.20037473.
420 14. Hata, A., Honda, R., 2020. Potential sensitivity of wastewater monitoring for SARS-
421 CoV-2: comparison with norovirus cases. Environ. Sci. Technol. (in press).

422 15. Haramoto, E., Kitajima, M., Katayama, H., Ito, T., Ohgaki, S., 2009. Development
423 of virus concentration methods for detection of koi herpesvirus in water. J. Fish Dis.
424 32, 297–300.
425 16. Haramoto, E., Kitajima, M., Hata, A., Torrey, J.R., Masago, Y., Sano, D.,
426 Katayama, H., 2018. A review on recent progress in the detection methods and
427 prevalence of human enteric viruses in water. Water Res. 135. 168-186.
428 17. Haramoto, E., Malla, B., Thakali, O., Kitajima, M. 2020. First environmental
429 surveillance for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and river water in
430 Japan. medRxiv.
431 18. Heijnen, L., Medema, G., 2011. Surveillance of influenza A and the pandemic
432 influenza A (H1N1) 2009 in sewage and surface water in the Netherlands. J. Water
433 Health 9, 434–442.
434 19. Honjo, M.N., Minamoto, T., Matsui, K., Uchii, K., Yamanaka, H., Suzuki, A. a,
435 Kohmatsu, Y., Iida, T., Kawabata, Z., 2010. Quantification of cyprinid herpesvirus
436 3 in environmental water by using an external standard virus. Appl. Environ.
437 Microbiol. 76, 161–8.
438 20. Jones, T.H., Johns, M.W., 2009. Improved detection of F-specific RNA coliphages
439 in fecal material by extraction and polyethylene glycol precipitation. Appl. Environ.
440 Microbiol. 75, 6142–6.
441 21. Jung, Y.J., Park, G.-S., Moon, J.H., Ku, K., Beak, S.-H., Kim, Seil, Park, E.C., Park,

442 D., Lee, J.-H., Byeon, C.W., Lee, J.J., Maeng, J., Kim, S.J., Kim, Seung Il, Kim, B.-
443 T., Lee, M.J., Kim, H.G., 2020. Comparative analysis of primer-probe sets for the
444 laboratory confirmation of SARS-CoV-2. BioRxiv 2020.02.25.964775.
445 22. Kitajima, M., Tohya, Y., Matsubara, K., Haramoto, E., Utagawa, E., Katayama, H.,
446 Ohgaki, S. (2008). Use of murine norovirus as a novel surrogate to evaluate
447 resistance of human norovirus to free chlorine disinfection in drinking water supply
448 system. Environ. Eng. Res. 45, 361–370 (in Japanese).
449 23. Kitajima, M., Ahmed, W., Bibby, K., Carducci, A., Gerba, C.P., Hamilton, A.,
450 Haramoto, E., Rose, J.B. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge
451 and research needs. Science of the Total Environment. (in press).
452 24. La Rosa, D., Iaconelli, M., Mancini, P., Ferraro, G.B., Veneri, C., Bonadonna, L.,
453 Lucentini, L., Suffredini, E. 2020. First Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Untreated
454 Wastewaters in Italy. medRxiv.
455 25. Lewis, G.D., Metcalf, T.G., 1988. Polyethylene glycol precipitation for recovery of
456 pathogenic viruses, including hepatitis A virus and human rotavirus, from oyster,
457 water, and sediment samples. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 54, 1983–8.
458 26. Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., Brouwer, A., 2020. Presence
459 of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in sewage and correlation with reported COVID-19
460 prevalence in the early stage of the epidemic in the Netherlands. Environ. Sci.
461 Technol. (in press).

462 27. Mizumoto, K., Kagaya, K., Zarebski, A., Chowell, G., 2020. Estimating the
463 asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board
464 the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. Eurosurveillance 25, 1–
465 5.
466 28. Mooijman, K. a, Bahar, M., Muniesa, M., Havelaar, A.H., 2002. Optimisation of
467 ISO 10705-1 on enumeration of F-specific bacteriophages. J. Virol. Methods 103,
468 129–36.
469 29. Nemudryi, A., Nemudraia, A., Surya, K., Wiegand, T., Buyukyoruk, M., Wilkinson,
470 R., Wiedenheft, B., 2020. Temporal detection and phylogenetic assessment of
471 SARS-CoV-2 in municipal wastewater. medRxiv 2020.03.22.20041079.
472 30. Nishiura, H., Kobayashi, T., Suzuki, A., Jung, S.-M., Hayashi, K., Kinoshita, R.,
473 Yang, Y., Yuan, B., Akhmetzhanov, A.R., Linton, N.M., Miyama, T., 2020.
474 Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19).
475 Int. J. Infect. Dis. 94, 154-155.
476 31. Omori, R., Mizumoto, K., Chowell, G., 2020. Changes in testing rates could mask
477 the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) growth rate. Int. J. Infect. Dis. 94, 116–
478 118.
479 32. Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Simón, P., Allende, A., Sánchez,
480 G. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Anticipated COVID-19 Occurrence in a
481 Low Prevalence Area. Water Res. (in press)

482 33. Rimoldi, S.G., Stefani, F., Gigantiello, A., Polesello, S., Comandatore, F., Mileto1, D.,
483 Maresca, M., Longobardi, C., Mancon, A., Romeri, F., Pagani, C., Moja, L.,
484 Gismondo, M. R., Salerno, F. 2020. Presence and vitality of SARS-CoV-2 virus in
485 wastewaters and rivers. MedRxiv.
486 34. Shirato, K., Nao, N., Katano, H., Takayama, I., Saito, S., Kato, F., Katoh, H.,
487 Sakata, M., Nakatsu, Y., Mori, Y., Kageyama, T., Matsuyama, S., Takeda, M.,
488 2020. Development of Genetic Diagnostic Methods for Novel Coronavirus 2019
489 (nCoV-2019) in Japan. Jpn. J. Infect. Dis. (in press).
490 35. World Health Organization, 2020. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation
491 reports [WWW Document]. URL https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-
492 coronavirus-2019/situation-reports (accessed 6.8.20).
493 36. Wu, F., Xiao, A., Zhang, J., GU, X., Lee, W., Kauffman, K., Hanage, W., Matus, M.,
494 Ghaeli, N., Endo, N., Duvallet, C., Moniz, K., Erickson, T., Pr, C., Thompson, J.,
495 Alm, E., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from
496 clinically confirmed cases. medRxiv 2020.04.05.20051540.
497 37. Wurtzer, S., Marechal, V., Mouchel, J.M., Moulin, L. 2020a. Time course
498 quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Parisian wastewaters correlates with
499 COVID-19 confirmed cases. medRxiv. 2020.04.12.20062679.
500 38. Wurtzer, S., Marechal, V., Mouchel, J.M., Maday, Y., Teyssou, R., Richard, E.,
501 Almayrac, J.L., Moulin L. 2020b. Evaluation of lockdown impact on SARS-CoV-2

502 dynamics through viral genome quantification in Paris wastewaters.

503 39. Yang, Z., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., Frost, C.G., Estrela, P., Thomas, K. V., 2015.

504 Community sewage sensors for monitoring public health. Environ. Sci. Technol. 49,

505 5845–5846.

506

507 **FIGURES**



508

509 **Figure 1.** Flow diagram of sample processing for confirming the presence of SARS-

510 CoV-2 in wastewater by RT-PCR assays and for assessing virus detection efficiency

511 with process controls.

512



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).



521

522 **Figure 3.** Location of primers and TaqMan probes employed in this study on a

523 referential SARS-CoV-2 strain, Wuhan-Hu-1 (Gen Bank accession no: MN908947).

524 These are localized on a relatively short fraction (600 nt) of N-gene. Therefore, CDCN3-

525 F and NIID-R primers, for example, can be used as outer primers for nested assays.

526

527



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	Sewered population rate (%)	Maximum treatment capacity (m^3/d)	Actual treatment capacity (m^3/d)
A	Ishikawa	31,510	91.0	12,800	9,366
B	Ishikawa	112,396	91.4	53,300	37,106
C	Ishikawa	151,937	97.2	156,000	86,446
D	Toyama	169,400	91.1	82,500	55,639

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.