

1 **A simplified approach to monitoring the COVID-19** 2 **epidemiologic situation using waste water analysis** 3 **and its application in Russia**

4
5
6 Polina Alexandrovna Kuryntseva¹, Kamalya Oktay Karamova¹, Valentin Petrovich Fomin¹,
7 Svetlana Yurevna Selivanovskaya¹, Polina Yurevna Galitskaya¹

8
9 ¹ Department of Applied Ecology, Institute of Environmental Sciences, Kazan Federal
10 University, Kazan, Tatarstan, Russia

11
12 Corresponding Author:
13 Polina Alexandrovna Kuryntseva¹
14 P.Lumumbi str. 26-8, Kazan, Tatarstan, 420081, Russia
15 Email address: polinazwerewa@yandex.ru

17 **Abstract**

18 The number of registered cases of COVID-19 is increasing in the world, and some countries are
19 reporting a second wave of the pandemic. Accurate and real time information about
20 epidemiological situation is therefore urgently needed for managing decisions in the countries,
21 regions and municipalities which are affected. Massive testing of viral presence in people's
22 saliva, a smear from the nose, nasopharynx and / or oropharynx, bronchial lavage water obtained
23 by fibrobronchoscopy (bronchoalveolar lavage), as well as from (endo) tracheal, nasopharyngeal
24 aspirate, sputum, biopsy or autopsy material of the lungs, whole blood, serum or antibodies
25 presence in blood cannot give relevant information about the COVID-19 infection rate in the
26 community since simultaneous testing of the whole community is not technically possible, the
27 information obtained in testing of specific groups is retarded and, in addition, such testing is
28 expensive. The alternative to mass testing of the population is the testing of wastewater that
29 could contain SARS-CoV-2 particles originating from excreta. Such testing has several
30 limitations connected with the particularities of the testing procedure.

31 In the present study, a modified approach for detection of COVID-19 infection rate using
32 wastewater analysis has been developed. The approach includes i) the creation of a calibration
33 curve on the basis of the serial dilution of excreta collected from people who are infected with
34 COVID-19 and ii) the analysis of the wastewater samples and their serial dilutions, the approach
35 excludes usage of concentrating techniques before wastewater sample analysis as well as usage
36 of external control in RT-PCR reactions for calculation of numbers of viral particles. The
37 minimum infection rate that can be detected using this approach is 10-2%. The approach
38 developed was used to investigate wastewater from eleven sewage inspection chambers in the

39 city of Kazan (Russia). It was demonstrated that the average infection rate of people using these
40 sewers was over 0.4% in July 2020.

41

42 **Introduction**

43 The WHO announced that the COVID-19 outbreak had become a pandemic on 12th March 2020
44 WHO 2020). COVID-19 is caused by the respiratory SARS-CoV-2 virus with a long incubation
45 period, and very different courses of disease – from severe to asymptomatic. To the 15th of
46 September 2020, over 29 million coronavirus cases have been reported in the world, and over 1
47 million of them in Russia, which has 4th highest amount of cases in the world
48 (<https://www.worldometers.info>).

49 Currently, the basic mechanism for determination of the COVID-19 epidemiological situation in
50 countries is testing symptomatic cases using the PCR (polymerase chain reaction) technique and
51 evaluating the number of positive tests over time. Additional mechanisms include analysis of
52 symptoms such as those which are most common (fever, dry cough, tiredness) and less common
53 symptoms (aches and pains, sore throat, diarrhea, conjunctivitis, headache, loss of taste or smell,
54 a skin rash, or discoloration of fingers or toes) and also serious symptoms (breathing difficulty or
55 shortness of breath, chest pain or pressure, loss of speech or movement) (“Coronavirus”; La Rosa
56 et al., 2020; Mao et al., 2020). These techniques can be characterized as biased and displaying
57 both resource insensitivity and detection blindness as well as having a high cost. As a result, all
58 countries may have a delayed view of the real epidemiological picture, and less wealthy
59 countries may receive underestimated data. Besides, the production capacity of laboratories at
60 the peak of the epidemic cannot cope with mass testing of people in a short time. Precise and
61 real-time information about the COVID-19 epidemiological situation is, however, extremely
62 important for decision makers in municipalities, regions and countries.

63 A WBE (water-based epidemiology) approach that is based on pathogen determination in the
64 wastewater of whole settlements or districts is a cheap and relevant alternative to this challenge.
65 WBE assumes that the identification and quantification of pathogens in community wastewater
66 reflects the health status of the community population in real time (WHO “Water, sanitation...”;
67 Mao et al., 2020). It was demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 viral particles are present in the feces
68 of infected people, including those who are asymptomatic, in quantities up to 10^{10} copies·g⁻¹
69 (Wu et al., 2020; La Rosa et al., 2020; Kitajima et al., 2020). Furthermore, it was shown that
70 viral particles are present in the community’s wastewater. Thus, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was found
71 in wastewater in the Netherlands, the USA, Australia and Italy, even before intensive growth of
72 reported coronavirus cases numbers (Wu et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020;
73 La Rosa et al., 2020). The numbers of viral particles in the wastewater is reported to be 10^2 - 10^4
74 copies·l⁻¹ (Wu et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020;
75 Haramoto et al., 2020), and indirectly these numbers compared with those in the initial feces
76 samples allow us to calculate the ratio of people in the community infected by the virus. This
77 approach has, however, several limitations. The procedure of viral gene copy number estimation
78 includes sample concentrating with different efficacy depending on the method and matrix (feces

79 or wastewater), RNA extraction from different matrices containing different PCR and RT
80 (reverse transcription) reaction inhibitors, RT and PCR reactions, both with their own efficacy
81 depending on reagents, protocols and external controls used, and on RNA purity. Therefore, the
82 results obtained may contain significant discrepancies. Some authors suggest relying only on
83 qualitative (yes/no), but not on quantitative, information while analyzing COVID-19
84 epidemiological situation using WBE approach (Wu et al., 2020; Haramoto et al., 2020).
85 Besides, the procedure of SARS-CoV-2 gene copy number estimation described above has
86 limitations in terms of equipment and consumables requirements, which means that the WBE
87 approach cannot be implemented in a daily routine immediately.

88 In Russia, pathogens are checked in cleaned wastewater in order to estimate the efficacy of a
89 wastewater plant's functioning, but not in the initial wastewater in the framework of WBE
90 monitoring. Consequently, no information is available about the presence of SARS-CoV-2
91 particles in the wastewater. However, this information is of great importance not only because of
92 WBE advantages described above but also because the number of coronavirus cases in Russia
93 might be underestimated ("COVID-19 Situation Reports"). As well as the presence of
94 asymptomatic cases and the shortage of testing facilities at the peak of the epidemic that are
95 equally responsible for underestimations in other countries, it may also be connected with the
96 local mentality. Except for severe cases, people prefer to stay home, to take several days off and
97 not to appeal to the doctor. Together with the lifting of quarantine, this habit may cause the
98 second wave of COVID-19 to spread; especially in the areas with high population density such
99 as the major Russian cities: Moscow (4949 people·km⁻²), Saint-Petersburg (3847 people·km⁻²),
100 Nizhniy Novgorod (3049 people·km⁻²), Novosibirsk (3215 people·km⁻²), Samara (2136
101 people·km⁻²) and Kazan (2135 people·km⁻²).

102 For detection of SARS-CoV-2 particles in saliva, a smear from the nose, nasopharynx and / or
103 oropharynx, bronchial lavage water obtained by fibrobronchoscopy (bronchoalveolar lavage), as
104 well as from (endo) tracheal, nasopharyngeal aspirate, sputum, biopsy or autopsy material of the
105 lungs, whole blood, serum as well as in feces RT-PCR based methods are used. They are based
106 on determination of RNA sequence encoding N gene, E gene, Orf1ab gene, RdRp gene or their
107 parts. Among commercial kits, TaqMan 2019-nCoV Assay Kit v1 (Thermo Fisher Scientific,
108 USA), Coronavirus (COVID-19) CE IVD (Primerdesign Ltd, UK), GSD NovaPrime® SARS-
109 CoV-2 (COVID-19) (Gold Standard Diagnostics Corp, USA) and many others are available
110 across the globe. Besides, countries are developing their own local solutions to provide
111 permanent work for testing laboratories and to be independent of import processes (Labotaq SL,
112 Spain; Biosan, Latvia; GeneProod, Czech Republic). In Russia, commercial tests based on
113 Orf1ab gene fragment detection have been officially registered and are used in laboratory
114 routines (Kuzubov, 2020).

115 The objectives of this study were i) to simplify and to improve the WBE approach for SARS-
116 CoV-2 gene copy number estimations to enable utilization in daily routines; and ii) to test this
117 approach by monitoring the epidemiological situation in a typical large Russian city. For the first
118 objective, the steps of sample concentrating and obtaining of qualitative information about viral

119 particles were excluded from the analysis procedure. In addition, a locally produced and easily
120 available commercial medical kit (Kuzubov, 2020) was used for RT and PCR reactions. We
121 hypothesized that the approach of finding the lowest dilution that can be qualified as coronavirus
122 positive, without sample concentrating would be more relevant and equally sensitive in terms of
123 the determination of the COVID-19 epidemiological situation as compared to other WBE
124 approaches used nowadays. For the second objective, samples were collected from 11 sewage
125 inspection chambers in the city of Kazan which has 1.17 million citizens. The results obtained
126 represent the first report about wastewater SARS-CoV-2 viral load in Russia.

127

128 **Materials & Methods**

129 Two groups of samples were used in this study: i) feces and urine from ten COVID-19 patients
130 from Kazan (Tatarstan, Russia) collected for 24 h, on the 5th-8th day after registration of the first
131 symptoms (Table 1); and ii) wastewater samples sampled in the sewage inspection chambers in
132 Kazan (Tatarstan, Russia) on March 30th and July 30th 2020. The first group of samples was
133 further used for the modelling experiment, and the second one was analyzed for SARS-CoV-2
134 particle presence.

135 **2.1.1 Design of the modelling experiment**

136 For the model experiment, feces and urine were collected separately from infected people during
137 a 24 h period. After registration of mass and volume of excreta and sampling 1 g each for further
138 RNA analysis, feces and urine were put into a 10 l plastic container with 5 l of model
139 wastewater. The model wastewater contained (in 1 l): 0,05 g tooth paste, 0,25 g meat soup, 0,5 g
140 of vegetable salad, 0,08 g of shower gel, 0,08 g of sand, 0,03 g of soil, 0,08 g of liquid soap, 0,08
141 g of dish soap and 0,03 g of washing powder. The excreta were thoroughly mixed with model
142 wastewater using an electric drill with mixing bit at 1000 rpm. Furthermore, a 50 ml aliquot of
143 the mixture was diluted 40 times to simulate the average daily volume of wastewater produced
144 by a person living in a block of flats in Russia which is 200 l (model sample 1). Furthermore,
145 serial dilution of the model sample was conducted to reach the final concentrations of model
146 sample 1 from 25% to 0.005%. All the dilutions were prepared using model wastewater. Each
147 sample and dilution was analyzed for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 particles using PCR based
148 tests immediately after preparation. The analyses were conducted in triplicate.

149 **2.2.2 Wastewater samples**

150 Wastewater was sampled in Kazan on the 30th of March and 30th of July 2020 in 11 sewage
151 inspection chambers, 10 of them were situated in the city's residential areas and one in the city
152 center (Figure 1).

153 Samples from each inspection chamber were collected during a 24 hour period, 200 ml each
154 hour, mixed together in 5 l sterile plastic bottles. Between the collections, the bottles were stored
155 at 4 °C. After finishing the sampling, the bottles were transported to the lab on ice and analyzed
156 immediately. Each sample was analyzed in its initial state, as well as being diluted by 5, 25, 50,
157 75, 100, 150, 200 and 250 times with model wastewater if the initial sample was SARS-CoV-2
158 positive. Each initial and diluted sample was analyzed three times.

159 **2.2. SARS-CoV detection**

160 RNA was directly extracted from the samples using the viral RNA mini kit (QIAGEN,
161 Germany). Detection of nucleic acid fragments of the coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 RNA was
162 performed by the RT method combined with RT (RT-qPCR) using RNA SARS-CoV-2 by RT-
163 qPCR Kit “OM-Screen-2019-nCoV-RT” (Syntol LLC, CEO, Russia). The amplification in this
164 commercial kit uses two oligonucleotide primers flanking the Orf1ab gene fragment of the
165 genome SARS-CoV-2. The kit contains 0.2 ml stripped PCR tubes with lyophilized reaction
166 mixture. The kit allows simultaneous detection of the coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 RNA (R6G
167 detection channel) and checking of the efficiency of nucleic acid extraction, the degree of
168 inhibition of the reverse transcription and amplification reactions (FAM and Cy5 detection
169 channels respectively). The RT-PCR reaction was conducted using the following temperature
170 program on CFX-96 thermal cycler (Bio-Rad, USA): reverse transcription at 50°C for 15 min,
171 inactivation at 95°C for 5 min followed by 50 three-step cycles of 95°C for 10 s, 58°C for 10 s,
172 and 72°C for 20 s. According to the “OM-Screen-2019-nCoV-RT” Kit instructions, the
173 wastewater samples were registered as positive when Ct in the R6G detection channel was less
174 than 30. For feces and urine, the number of viral particles was calculated using an external
175 control. For that, mouse hepatitis virus was used.

176

177 **Results**

178 In this study, we aimed to develop a simplified approach for WBE of COVID-19 that can be
179 applied in Russian cities. In order to do this, modelling with feces and urine of coronavirus
180 infected people was conducted. 10 patients with differing ages and symptoms participated in the
181 modelling experiment (Table 2). It was found that their urine did not contain virus particles while
182 feces did. This observation is in line with results published by other researchers (Wölfel et al.,
183 2020; Kitajima et al., 2020; Bhowmick et al., 2020). It should be noted that no dependence
184 between viral RNA copy numbers and age of patients as well as duration and severity of their
185 symptoms was found (Supplement Table S1).

186 In addition, feces and urine of each patient collected during 24 h were mixed with model
187 wastewater, to simulate the dilution of excretions up to the final volume 200 l per day per person.
188 This volume corresponds to average amount of waste water produced by residents of blocks of
189 flats in central Russia (SNiP 2.04.01-85). The viral load in the resulting mixture theoretically
190 should correspond to the wastewater from settlements with 100% infection rate. The resulting
191 mixture was further diluted by model wastewater to simulate lower infection rates in the
192 community. In both the mixture and in its solutions viral RNA was detected using RT-PCR
193 method (Table 2).

194 Modelling presented in Table 2 demonstrates that the method of WBE used can detect a minimal
195 rate of 10-2% of COVID-19 infection in the community. In contrast to the procedures of SARS-
196 CoV-2 viral particles detection used by other authors, the modelling approach used in this study
197 excludes the procedure of sample concentrating, the need and meaning of chosen external
198 controls in RT-PCR (whole process control, molecular process control), and the recalculations of

199 the viral particle numbers and of the infection rate (Wurtzer et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020;
200 Ahmed et al., 2020; Kitajima et al., 2020).
201 Using the results of modelling, SARS-CoV-2 viral load in the wastewater was analyzed in the
202 city of Kazan, which is a typical million-citizen city in central Russia. Wastewater was sampled
203 twice, at the beginning and at the peak of the epidemic, in ten sewage inspection chambers
204 situated in residential areas as well as in one inspection chamber in the city center collecting
205 wastewater from Kazan Federal University campus. The samples were characterized only
206 qualitatively (coronavirus positive or negative), and if the SARS-CoV-2 particles were registered
207 in the initial samples, they were diluted 5-200 times by model wastewater and reanalyzed
208 (Supplement Table S2). The infection rate of people whose excreta are collected in the “positive”
209 inspection chamber was then calculated from the lowest dilution found to be virus positive.
210 The results are presented in Table 3. As follows from the table, no SARS-CoV-2 particles were
211 found in the Kazan wastewater in March while some were found in July. Four out of eleven
212 initial wastewater samples taken in July were characterized as coronavirus positive. The lowest
213 dilutions of these samples that were also found to be positive were 1:100, 1:150, 1:75 and 1:150
214 for samples 6, 7, 10 and 11, respectively, that corresponds to the 1.00%, 1.50%, 0.75% and 1.5%
215 sickness rate in the residences that use the sewage inspection chamber. Taking into account the
216 number of apartments in the blocks presented in Table 3 and the average number of people per
217 apartment (3 people) (Draft master plan..., 2019) for the inspection chambers No 1-10, as well
218 as the number of people that were present in the buildings using inspection chamber No 11, it
219 can be calculated that the total number of people whose excreta were analyzed in the
220 investigation was 1790, and the number of infected people was 8. That corresponds to 0.44%
221 infection rate in the community.
222 Interestingly, the 11th sample was taken from the sewage inspection chamber that collects
223 wastewater from 3 buildings of the Kazan Federal University campus in the center of Kazan. On
224 the date of investigation, 65 people were present in the buildings, and all of them were
225 interviewed for coronavirus symptoms and checked for body temperature. Despite the presence
226 of viral particles in the wastewater, none of people reported feeling sick or having a fever. In the
227 5 days after this investigation, 1 case of COVID-19 was registered in one of these three Kazan
228 Federal University buildings, and in the 7 days after investigation - 3 more new cases. The
229 prognostic ability of WBE for COVID-19 investigations has been described by other authors.
230 SARS-CoV-2 particles were found in the wastewater of Amersfoort in Netherlands on the 5th
231 March 2020, while the first cases were registered only 6 days later (Medema et al., 2020).

232

233 **Discussion**

234 In this study, the approach of serial dilution preparation for wastewater investigation for SARS-
235 CoV-2 viral load was suggested. In the modelling experiment with the excreta of ten COVID-19
236 patients, it was demonstrated that the minimal rate of infected people in the community that can
237 be detected by this method is 10-2%. This rate is in range of results presented in the literature.
238 Thus, it was demonstrated that the number of SARS-CoV-2 virus particles in wastewater ranges

239 between 10^2 - 10^4 copies·l⁻¹, and in feces from 10^5 - 10^{10} copies·g⁻¹ (Wu et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al.,
240 2020; Wölfel et al., 2020; La Rosa et al., 2020; Farkas et al., 2020; Haramoto et al., 2020;
241 Kitajima et al., 2020; Bhowmick et al., 2020). Taking into account the reported volume of
242 wastewater produced by citizens (from 200 to 600 l), it can be calculated that the lowest
243 detectable infection rate using WBE methods ranges between 10^{-1} and 10^{-4} % (Hata et al.;
244 Wurtzer et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020).

245 However, the classical WBE approach that includes concentration of the sample, PCR based
246 detection and calculation of the viral particle numbers has several limitations. There are
247 additional limitations especially for SARS-CoV-2 viral particle determination, since this virus is
248 an RNA-based one, and therefore RT reaction is included in the determination procedure, and the
249 probability of RT efficiency may also differ depending on many factors. Thus, it has been shown
250 that the detection efficiency of SARS-CoV-2 viral particles ranges from 8.5 to 71.6% depending
251 on the concentration method and the volume of the concentrated sample (Hata et al.; Medema et
252 al., 2020; Haramoto et al., 2020; Kitajima et al., 2020). The results obtained may be dependent
253 on molecular process control that can strongly vary in different lab protocols and influence the
254 final results. As such, a control of other coronaviruses as well as mouse hepatitis virus, coliphage
255 MS2 (ATCC 15597-B1), tobacco mosaic virus, Pseudomonas phage Φ 6 and Murine norovirus
256 have been used in different studies (Hata et al.; Medema et al., 2020; Haramoto et al., 2020;
257 Kitajima et al., 2020). The complexity of the wastewater matrix also limits the detection
258 accuracy SARS-CoV-2. For example, organic components like fat, protein or humic substances
259 are reported to influence the efficiency of RT and PCR reaction. Besides, viruses of the same
260 family or genus can interfere during RT-PCR reaction (Sims & Kasprzyk-Hordern, 2020; Farkas
261 et al., 2020; Mao et al., 2020). It can be concluded that the results expressed in viral particle
262 numbers found in the wastewater being compared with the viral particle numbers in feces may
263 give incorrect information about the sickness rate in the community. Indeed, authors report
264 controversial data about minimal number of COVID-19 infected people that can be detected
265 using WBE – ranging from 1 to 100 cases per 100000 people (Wurtzer et al., 2020; Ahmed et al.,
266 2020).

267 The “calibration table” obtained in the modeling experiment as well as the principle of samples’
268 serial dilution down to the lowest level where viral particles can be detected were used to
269 investigate the wastewater produced in the city of Kazan situated in the European part of Russia.
270 The residential districts of this city are typical for Russian cities of around one million
271 population such as Nizhniy Novgorod, Novosibirsk, Volgograd and Samara as well as for larger
272 cities Saint-Petersburg and Moscow. The procedure of SARS-CoV-2 particles’ detection in the
273 wastewater included RNA extraction using viral RNA mini kit (QIAGEN, Germany), without
274 the step of concentration, and RT-PCR reactions using widely available, locally produced kit for
275 investigations of patient saliva and throat swabs (Kuzubov, 2020). These kits and simplifications
276 were used in order to enable the easy inclusion of WBE of COVID-19 in the daily routine of
277 wastewater plants and municipalities. The total duration of the detection procedure was about 2.5
278 h for 30-50 samples. Dilution of the samples was done using the model wastewater that was used

279 to create the “calibration curve”, there was no need to use the external controls, which made the
280 probability of obtaining the relevant results higher. Using the serial dilution approach, eleven
281 wastewater samples were investigated twice, in March and July 2020. It was found that the level
282 of viral particles in March was not detectable, while that in July was positive in four of eleven
283 samples. This corresponds to the growth in numbers of registered COVID-19 cases in the city
284 according to the official statistics (“Covid-19 official statistic,” 2020). After dilution of the
285 positive samples, it was calculated that the average sickness rate of people connected to the
286 inspection chambers under investigation was about 0.4%. This rate is much higher than that of
287 officially registered cases which is 0.09% (“Covid-19 official statistic,” 2020). It could be
288 explained by the statistical error due to the small number of inspection chambers investigated, by
289 the high percentage of asymptomatic cases (Haramoto et al., 2020; Mao et al., 2020) especially
290 in the Russian Federation (up to 70%) (Sharov, 2020) as well as by a special mentality. Usually,
291 in Russia people report that they are ill only in cases of emergency, in other cases they prefer to
292 stay home trying to take care of themselves. Further investigations that include more people
293 taking part in a modeling experiment as well as more sampling of sewage inspection chambers
294 are needed to obtain relevant information about the COVID-19 epidemiological situation in
295 Russian cities using WBE. However, this study demonstrates the potential of the new approach
296 based on serial dilutions for SARS-CoV-2 detection in wastewater.

297

298 **Conclusions**

299 This is the first study that reports the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater in Russia using
300 RT-PCR assay. The proposed approach to determining the presence of viral particles in
301 wastewater makes it possible to detect more than 1 COVID-19 infected person per 10000 people
302 with sufficient ease of analysis. The developed approach of detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
303 wastewater due to dilution of model wastewater can be adapted for any types of wastewater
304 collection, climatic conditions, commercial kits for DNA/RNA extraction and commercial kits
305 for RT-PCR reaction.

306

307 **Acknowledgements**

308 Pavel Perfilov is acknowledged for inspiring this research.

309

310 **References**

311 Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, Bibby K, Bivins A, O’Brien JW, Choi PM, Kitajima M,
312 Simpson SL, Li J, Tscharke B, Verhagen R, Smith WJM, Zaugg J, Dierens L, Hugenholtz P,
313 Thomas K V., Mueller JF. 2020. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated
314 wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the
315 community. *Science of the Total Environment* 728:138764. DOI:
316 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764.

- 317 Bhowmick GD, Dhar D, Nath D, Ghangrekar MM, Banerjee R, Das S, Chatterjee J. 2020.
318 Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak: some serious consequences with urban and
319 rural water cycle. *npj Clean Water* 3:1–8. DOI: 10.1038/s41545-020-0079-1.
- 320 Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW, Bleicker T,
321 Brünink S, Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders DGJC, Haagmans BL, Van Der Veer B, Van Den
322 Brink S, Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette JL, Ellis J, Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H,
323 Reusken C, Koopmans MPG, Drosten C. 2020. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-
324 nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Eurosurveillance* 25. DOI: 10.2807/1560-
325 7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045.
- 326 WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March
327 2020. Available at <https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020> (accessed September 15, 2020).
- 329 Covid-19 official statistic. 2020. Available at <https://coronavirus-monitor.ru/coronavirus-v-tatarstane/> (accessed September 15, 2020).
- 331 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Situation Reports. Available at
332 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports/>
333 (accessed September 4, 2020).
- 334 Covid-19: Coronavirus pandemic. Available at
335 <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/> (accessed September 15, 2020).
- 336 Farkas K, Hillary LS, Malham SK, McDonald JE, Jones DL. 2020. Wastewater and public
337 health: the potential of wastewater surveillance for monitoring COVID-19. *Current Opinion in*
338 *Environmental Science and Health* 17:14–20. DOI: 10.1016/j.coesh.2020.06.001.
- 339 Haramoto E, Malla B, Thakali O, Kitajima M. 2020. First environmental surveillance for
340 the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and river water in Japan. *Science of the Total*
341 *Environment* 737:140405. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140405.
- 342 Hata A, Honda R, Hara-Yamamura H, Meuchi Y. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
343 wastewater in Japan by multiple molecular assays-1 implication for wastewater-based
344 epidemiology (WBE). 2. DOI: 10.1101/2020.06.09.20126417.
- 345 Kitajima M, Ahmed W, Bibby K, Carducci A, Gerba CP, Hamilton KA, Haramoto E, Rose
346 JB. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. *Science of*
347 *the Total Environment* 739:139076. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076.
- 348 Kuzubov A. 2020. Instruction for medical use of the reagent kit for detection of
349 coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 RNA by real-time polymerase chain reaction.
- 350 Mao K, Zhang K, Du W, Ali W, Feng X, Zhang H. 2020. The potential of wastewater-
351 based epidemiology as surveillance and early warning of infectious disease outbreaks. *Current*
352 *Opinion in Environmental Science and Health* 17:1–7. DOI: 10.1016/j.coesh.2020.04.006.
- 353 Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. 2020. Presence of SARS-
354 Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the
355 Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*.
356 DOI: 10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357.

357 La Rosa G, Iaconelli M, Mancini P, Bonanno Ferraro G, Veneri C, Bonadonna L,
358 Lucentini L, Suffredini E. 2020. First detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewaters in
359 Italy. *Science of the Total Environment* 736. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139652.
360 Sharov KS. 2020. Adaptation of Russian population to SARS-CoV-2: Asymptomatic
361 course, comorbidities, mortality, and other respiratory viruses - A reply to Fear versus Data:
362 Short Communication to *International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents*. *International journal of*
363 *antimicrobial agents*:106093. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.106093.
364 Sims N, Kasprzyk-Hordern B. 2020. Future perspectives of wastewater-based
365 epidemiology: Monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level.
366 *Environment International* 139:105689. DOI: 10.1016/j.envint.2020.105689.
367 Water, sanitation, hygiene, and waste management for SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes
368 COVID-19. Available at [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/water-sanitation-hygiene-and-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/water-sanitation-hygiene-and-waste-management-for-the-covid-19-virus-interim-guidance)
369 [waste-management-for-the-covid-19-virus-interim-guidance](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/water-sanitation-hygiene-and-waste-management-for-the-covid-19-virus-interim-guidance) (accessed August 12, 2020).
370 Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, Niemeyer D,
371 Jones TC, Vollmar P, Rothe C, Hoelscher M, Bleicker T, Brünink S, Schneider J, Ehmann R,
372 Zwirgmaier K, Drosten C, Wendtner C. 2020. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients
373 with COVID-2019. *Nature* 581:465–469. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x.
374 Wu F, Xiao A, Zhang J, Gu X, Lee WL, Kauffman K, Hanage W, Matus M, Ghaeli N,
375 Endo N, Duvallet C, Moniz K, Erickson T, Chai P, Thompson J, Alm E. 2020. SARS-CoV-2
376 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from clinically confirmed cases.
377 medRxiv:2020.04.05.20051540. DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.05.20051540.
378 Wurtzer S, Marechal V, Mouchel J-M, Maday Y, Teyssou R, Richard E, Almayrac JL,
379 Moulin L. 2020. Evaluation of lockdown impact on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics through viral
380 genome quantification in Paris wastewaters. medRxiv:2020.04.12.20062679. DOI:
381 10.1101/2020.04.12.20062679.
382 Draft master plan for the city district of Kazan. 2019. Moscow, Russia (in Russian).
383 SNiP 2.04.01-85 Internal water supply and sewerage of buildings. 1985. Russia (in
384 Russian).
385
386
387

Figure 1

Location of wastewater sampling points in the city of Kazan (Russia)

