

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## RT qLAMP--Direct Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Raw Sewage

Jerry E. Ongerth<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Civil, Mining, & Environmental Engineering, University of Wollongong, Wollongong NSW  
2522, Australia, [jongerth@uow.edu.au](mailto:jongerth@uow.edu.au); +61 0408548427*

Richard E. Danielson<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>*Danielson Applied Consulting, LLC, 105 Mulberry Loop, Pleasant Hill, CA, 94523,  
[drred1856@danielsonappliedconsulting.com](mailto:drred1856@danielsonappliedconsulting.com) +1 925 698 3770*

September 30, 2020

\* Corresponding Author

## 28 **Introduction.**

29 The purpose of this report is to describe the ability of loop-mediated isothermal  
30 amplification, LAMP, in the form of RT qLAMP to detect and quantify SARS-CoV-2 in raw  
31 sewage, directly...i.e. without sample processing for virus concentration or RNA extraction.  
32 We provide information on the routine application, equipment, and facilities used to illustrate  
33 the feasibility of RT qLAMP application for detailed monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 for  
34 wastewater based epidemiology (WBE). The most important and novel aspect of this report  
35 is demonstration that even at low reported case rates e.g. 1-10/100,000, in a community,  
36 SARS-CoV-2 virus is present in raw sewage at concentrations  $> 1\text{-}5/\mu\text{L}$ , sufficient for  
37 LAMP-based detection directly avoiding the qPCR need for cumbersome time-consuming  
38 concentration and RNA extraction. Incorporation of this analytical approach will facilitate  
39 development of data supporting wastewater-based epidemiology as an important  
40 component of policy advice directed to COVID-19 control.

41 Loop-mediated isothermal amplification, LAMP, is not novel and it is not new. It is a  
42 thoroughly demonstrated and well-understood nucleic acid amplification procedure, first  
43 described 20 years ago, Notomi, 2000, since developed for largely clinical applications but  
44 equally demonstrated for detection of DNA or RNA in a wide variety of viral, microbial, and  
45 protozoan pathogens as well as identifying gene-specific targets in plants and animals, e.g.,  
46 Salar et al, 2013; Becherer et al, 2020. The principal characteristics of LAMP include the  
47 use of four to six primers annealing to initially four then six target sites selected to meet well  
48 established criteria, e.g., Eiken, 2018. The amplification mechanism is strand extension with  
49 loop formation producing what is often described as a cauliflower-like product, and a  
50 characteristic ladder band appearance on confirming gels. The multiple primer-target  
51 combination gives the process a very high degree of specificity, enabling target detection in  
52 crude preparations containing extraneous nucleic acids. The specificity also permits  
53 effective multiplex applications. The process uses a polymerase having strand extension

54 activity, typically Bst, acting at constant temperature in the 60-70°C range. Operation at  
55 constant temperature permits amplification with simple means of maintaining constant  
56 temperature such as a water bath facilitating application in areas of limited laboratory  
57 facilities. The process has been found insensitive to interferences common to conventional  
58 PCR processes applied to analysis of environmental samples. Furthermore, the process is  
59 fully as sensitive as conventional PCR and amplification times, e.g. Ct, are typically short,  
60 i.e., 30-60 min, Broughton et al, 2020.

61 The relatively slow adoption of LAMP procedure for environmental monitoring specifically to  
62 water and wastewater is partly characteristic of processes having few detailed published  
63 reports to stimulate the interest of other investigators. Two features of LAMP may be  
64 described as disadvantages: 1) the rather intricate process of primer design, testing, and  
65 optimization needed to permit routine application; and 2) the very high sensitivity would  
66 permit cross contamination if not recognized and precluded by proper laboratory procedure  
67 and careful technique.

68 As a product of the world-wide spread of SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 disease  
69 throughout the human population has stimulated massive effort to develop and improve  
70 ability to detect and to monitor the virus e.g. Color, 2020. The standard method being  
71 applied at the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2020 both to clinical detection and  
72 environmental monitoring, sewage, is PCR, typically RT qPCR, CDC, 2020; WHO, 2020.  
73 However, building on previous clinical applications many variations of LAMP-based  
74 procedure have been reported, Becherer et al, 2020. Not requiring a thermocycler, the  
75 process lends itself to both scale up and miniaturization, and can be combined with  
76 increasingly sophisticated technology and downstream refinements including sequencing.

77 The potential for successful application of LAMP to SARS-CoV-2 monitoring in raw sewage  
78 was a product of our previous experience applying a multiplex LAMP to detection of  
79 *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in surface water samples (Ongerth and Saaed, 2020). In that

80 work we found: 1) that a LAMP for each organism could be multiplexed for detection of both  
81 simultaneously; 2) the organisms were detectable at low concentration, 1-5 oocysts/cysts,  
82 concentrated from 10 L samples only by filtration and centrifuging to form a crude particle  
83 pellet subject to 10 freeze-thaw (f-t) cycles; 3) detection was not affected by extraneous  
84 components in the f-t processed pellet; and 4) quantification using a qPCR instrument  
85 (Roche Light Cycler 480) was possible. From early reports on monitoring SARS-CoV-2 in  
86 raw sewage, Ahmed et al, 2020; Wurtzer et al, 2020; Wu et al 2020, calculation of likely  
87 virus concentrations at a sewage treatment plant serving a population having COVID-19  
88 daily reported cases in the range 5-10/100,000, suggested that the virus would be  
89 detectable without concentration and that LAMP would not be affected by extraneous  
90 sewage components. To test the potential, taking advantage of many well-described LAMP  
91 primer sets reported for clinical application since April, 2020, Dong et al, 2020, we selected  
92 primers for three potential targets, ORF-1a (Lamb et al, 2020) E-gene and N-gene  
93 (Broughton et al, 2020), assembled essential materials, and arranged to obtain raw sewage




Figure 1. SARS-CoV-2 genome and subunit arrangement with primer locations

96 samples with the local wastewater agency, East Bay Municipal Utility District Special  
97 District 1 (EBMUD SD1).

## 98 **Methods.**

99 Development, selection, and optimization of amplification conditions for each set of primers,  
100 ORF-1a, E-gene, and N-gene, was described in the original references, Lamb et al 2020,  
101 and Broughton et al, 2020. Primers were applied here using all of the concentration and  
102 amplification conditions established in the original references, (ORF1a, Lamb et al 2020; E-

103 gene and N-gene, Broughton et al, 2020). To facilitate testing the approach we used off-the  
 104 shelf materials where possible. Materials used included:

- 105 • Primers prepared with standard desalting, IDT, Coralville, IA
- 106 • Master mix: WarmStart LAMP Kit E1700, E2019, New England BioLabs, Ipswich, MA
- 107 • Control: Synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA, Control 6 (MT118835), Twist Bioscience, S. San  
 108 Francisco, CA.
- 109 • Raw sewage: East Bay Municipal Utility District SD1 (EBMUD), Oakland, CA

110 Table 1. Primer sequences used for direct raw sewage RT qLAMP

Gene	Primer	Sequence	No. of Bases
(Ref. Lamb et al. 2020, 63 °C; Color, 2020, 65 °C)			
ORF 1a	F3	TCCAGATGAGGATGAAGAAGA	21
ORF 1a	B3	AGTCTGAACAACTGGTGTAAAG	21
ORF 1a	FIP	AGAGCAGCAGAAGTGGCAGAGGTGATTGTGAAGAAGAAGA	41
ORF 1a	BIP	TCAACCTGAAGAAGAGCAAGAAGTATTGTCCTCACTGCC	40
ORF 1a	LF	CTCATATTGAGTTGATGGCTCA	22
ORF 1a	LB	ACAAACTGTTGGTCAACAAGAC	22
(Ref. Broughton et al, 2020, 62 °C; Color, 2020, 65 °C)			
N	F3	AACACAAGCTTTCGGCAG	18
N	B3	GAAATTTGGATCCTTTGTCATCC	22
N	FIP	TGCGGCCAATGTTTGTAAATCAGCCAAGGAAATTTGGGGAC	41
N	BIP	CGCATTGGCATGGAAGTCACTTTGATGGCACCTGTGTAG	39
N	LF	TCCTTGTCTGATTAGTTC	19
N	LB	ACCTTCGGGAACGTGGTT	18
(Ref. Broughton et al, 2020, 62 °C; Color, 2020, 65 °C)			
E	F3	CCGACGACGACTACTAGC	18
E	B3	AGAGTAAACGTAAAAAGAAGTT	23
E	FIP	ACCTGTCTCTTCCGAAACGAATTTGTAAGCACAAGCTGAT	41
E	BIP	CTAGCCATCCTTACTGCGCTACTCAGTTAACAAATATTGCA	41
E	LF	TCGATTGTGTGCGTACTGC	19
E	LB	TGAGTACATAAGTTCGTAC	19

111  
 112 Reactions for RT-qLAMP were prepared using 25 µL total volume, according to proportions  
 113 listed in Table 2.


114 Table 2: Direct raw sewage RT qLAMP reaction mix components

Reaction Mix Component	Volume
WarmStart master mix (1700 or 2019)	12.5 µL, includes dNTPs at 1.4 mM; RTx, 8 mM MgSO <sub>4</sub>
10X Primers	2.5 µL (1.6 µM FIP/BIP, 0.2 µM F3/B3, 0.4 µM Loop F/B)
NEB green fluorescent w/ E1700 kit	0.5 µL (@ 0.5 µM)
Nuclease free H <sub>2</sub> O	4.5 - 0 µL (adjust with template to 25 µL total rxn volume)
Template: Control or Raw sewage	5 - 9.5 µL
Total Reaction Mix	25 µL

115  
 116 Upon receiving fresh sewage samples, reaction components were distributed into 0.2 mL  
 117 PCR reaction tubes on ice during preparation. Reactions were prepared in a PCR hood

118 using routine lab technique designed to preclude potential cross contamination.  
119 Amplifications were conducted using a Rotor-Gene Q programmed according to Qiagen  
120 protocol for constant temperature, 65°C (63°C after initial runs) , for 30-40 minutes followed  
121 by high resolution melting. All reactions were conducted in triplicate. Reaction tubes were  
122 not opened after run completion and were frozen to permit future analysis.

123 Raw sewage was obtained from the EBMUD Special District 1 (SD1) serving a population  
124 of ca. 650,000 largely in Alameda County, Figure 2. Separate regions of the service area  
125 contribute flows to the three interceptor sewers, North (N), Adeline (ADA), and South (S)  
126 terminating at the single treatment plant. Samples of 1L total volume were collected from  
127 each interceptor individually at a point just before the treatment plant. Samples were 24-  
128 hour composites representative of the period 9:00 am to 9:00 am, Figure 2c. Samples were  
129 transported on ice to the laboratory for processing and analysis, kept refrigerated w/o  
130 preservative until analysis. Sampling dates were July 29, Sept. 9, and Sept. 22.




131  
132 Figure 2. Left: EBMUD SD1 service area (mauve) with North (blue), Adeline (Red),  
133 and South (green) interceptors; Center: Alameda County Health District COVID-19  
134 monitoring by zipcode; Right: EBMUD SD1 staff retrieving 24 hour samples for  
135 compositing.

## 136 **Results**


137 Initial testing of RT LAMP to determine basic performance characteristics was begun using  
138 primers to the ORF1a gene. Testing consisted of 5-logs reference standard dilution from  
139  $10^4$ - $10^0$ , including raw sewage. No acceptable standard curve could be obtained although  
140 raw sewage produced consistent amplification with Ct ca. 20-35, details below.  
141 Performance of RT qLAMP was then compared for E-gene and N-gene primers, Figure 3a-

142 f. Standard curve quality was improved but remained low and significant differences in  
143 synthetic control amplification were apparent between E-gene and N-gene amplifications.  
144 We continued to include raw sewage with continued apparent amplification. Using melt  
145 curves as indicator, raw sewage SARS-CoV-2 RNA amplification appears specific. Not all  
146 replicates of either standards or sewage produced product, generally, standards at < 100  
147 copies gave inconsistent reproducibility.




148  
149 Figures 3a-f (left to right): E-gene amplification, melt, and standard curve; N-gene  
150 amplification, melt, and standard curve.

151 Further comparison of E-gene and N-gene performance was made examining the effect of  
152 reaction mix components, continuing to include raw sewage in amplification runs. Direct  
153 comparison between the previous run, September 9, without alteration of conditions was  
154 made on September 23. Standard curve quality for both E and N primers was improved.  
155 Amplification of synthetic RNA standards was less consistent although more consistent  
156 amplification from sewage was observed, Figures 4a-f.



157  
158 Figure 4a-f (left to right): E-gene amplification, melt, and standard curve; N-gene  
159 amplification, melt, and standard curve.


161 In companion runs on the same day, different mix components were used; NEB reaction  
162 mix 2019 was used instead of NEB reaction mix 1700.



164 Figure 5a-f (left to right): E-gene amplification, melt, and standard curve; N-gene  
165 amplification, melt, and standard curve.

166

167 As noted above, detection of SARS-CoV-2 in raw sewage was apparent throughout testing  
168 of RT LAMP and RT qLAMP performance. Analysis includes three sets of raw sewage  
169 samples from each of the three EBMUD SD1 interceptor sewers. Samples from July 29  
170 produced only qualitative results due to inability to produce a standard curve using the  
171 ORF1a primers. Accordingly, all raw sewage amplification results are summarized in terms  
172 of Average Ct for each of the three sampling dates (7.29, 9.9, and 9.22), Figure 6a. Based  
173 on more acceptable performance resulting from amplifications summarized above, Figures  
174 3, 4, and 5, quantitative product was determined based on 7 $\mu$ L raw sewage component of  
175 the 25  $\mu$ L reaction mix, expressed as SARS-CoV-2/L, Figure 6b.



176

6a

6b

177 Figure 6a. Raw sewage amplification product, Average Ct, samples July 29, September 9,  
178 and September 22. Raw sewage amplification product, SARS-CoV-2/L, samples  
179 September 9 and September 22. Symbol Key: **Site**: N=Blue; ADA=Red; S=Green; **Gene**:  
180 ORF1a=triangle, N=circle; E =square; **Mix**: 1700=filled; 2019=open.

## 181 Discussion

182 Finding that RNA from SARS-CoV-2 in raw sewage can be amplified directly without  
183 pretreatment of concentration using RT LAMP may seem surprising. However, several  
184 carefully considered factors support the strength of the findings. First, the RT LAMP  
185 process has been widely and successfully applied to detection of SARS-CoV-2 in clinical  
186 samples beginning early this year, 2020, in response to COVID-19 monitoring needs,  
187 Thompson et al, 2020. The specific primers used in the work described here were selected  
188 from recent and thorough work to develop effective diagnostic tools. Second, accumulating

189 information from both clinical assays and wastewater monitoring, e.g., Wu et al, July 2020,  
190 indicate that early COVID-19 infection, likely preceding onset of symptoms, results in fecal  
191 shedding bursts, estimated in the  $10^{12}$ /day range. Based on this level, shedding by a single  
192 individual in 100,000 would contribute to a SARS-CoV-2 concentration at the sewage  
193 treatment plant of ca.  $2.5 \times 10^5$ /L or ca. 1.5 in a 5  $\mu$ L template volume for a 25  $\mu$ L LAMP  
194 reaction. And, third, LAMP as a process has been widely demonstrated to be sufficiently  
195 sensitive to amplify template at this level, i.e., 1-10 target copies/ $\mu$ L. Finally, and equally  
196 important, due to the multiple primer design and isothermal action polymerase, the LAMP  
197 process has selectivity permitting specific amplification in the presence of extraneous  
198 nucleic acids and other components of environmental media, sewage specifically that  
199 interfere with more common PCR analytical methods.


200 The work described here should be considered preliminary although providing clear  
201 evidence of SARS-CoV-2 detection. The poor performance of the ORF1a primers limiting  
202 quantification may have been partly due to its timing early in the sequence of testing.  
203 Although we made no procedural changes in succeeding runs, the quality of LAMP  
204 performance does appear to improve over the course of the six-week testing period.  
205 Continuing work is in progress to retest ORF1a performance.

206 Amplification characteristics observed differed between E-gene and N-gene primers,  
207 Figures 4 and 5. Initiation of amplification appeared somewhat earlier with E-gene primers  
208 and appreciably more product resulted. Variation in melt curve peaks was observed with E-  
209 gene amplifications less apparent in N-gene results. The peak melting temperature for N-  
210 gene product was 2-3° higher than for E-gene product.

211 The reactions in Figure 5 were conducted using the NEB E2019 reaction mix. It differs from  
212 the E1700 mix used in Figure 4 reactions by inclusion of dTTP, dUTP, and a thermolabile  
213 uracil DNA glycosylase (UDG). With consistent use in a sequence of amplification runs and  
214 incorporation of dU into amplification products, the presence of UDG will prevent potential

215 carryover from previous reactions but will not affect amplification of the subsequent run due  
216 to complete inactivation at 65 °C. Our reactions had no predecessors using the E2019 mix  
217 so that effects observed would have been due to action of the additional mix components  
218 on amplification of both control synthetic RNA and components in the raw sewage.  
219 Whatever the mechanism, use of the mix increased product formation from both E and N  
220 gene primers, and appreciably improved the efficiency of N-gene reactions. It is important  
221 to note that although the NEB E2019 kit is supplied with E-gene and N-gene primers (both  
222 sets different from the E and N-gene primers used in our work (Table 1), we did not use the  
223 NEB primers. All our reactions used only the Table 1 primers.

224 Ability to detect SARS-CoV-2 in sewage is fundamentally dependent on the extent of  
225 COVID-19 infection in the community. A reasonably detailed record of infection history in  
226 the EBMUD SD1 service area is maintained by the Alameda County Health Department  
227 (ACHD), ACHD, 2020. From the end of July through September corresponding to the  
228 period of our sewage analysis, the daily reported cases averaged ca. 150/day or for a  
229 population of just over 150,000, ca. 10/100,000 per day, Figure 7. The data show highly  
230 differentiated rates of infection among areas of the County and sewerage service area,  
231 cataloged according to zipcode.



232  
233 Figure 7. COVID-19 cases reported daily, March-September, 2020, and cumulative  
234 cases/100,000 by postal code, Alameda County, California.

235 The total cases reported, March 15 to September 30 (200 days) is 21,240, an average of  
236 100 per day or 6.3/100,000 per day. Cumulative case rates among post code areas range  
237 from ca. 300/100,000 to nearly 2000/100,000. Understanding approximate incidence rates  
238 is important to the utility of monitoring sewage for understanding COVID-19 dynamics.

239 Considering how monitoring for SARS-CoV-2 in sewage may be of use in control of  
240 transmission several factors must be taken into account. These considerations have a  
241 direct bearing on the LAMP method described here and on needs for its refinement. A  
242 critical factor is the shedding rate in early, perhaps pre-symptomatic infections. Calculations  
243 described above indicate that detectable virus would be present in sewage for shedding at  
244  $10^{12}$  per day for a single infection/100,000 population. But, detection at this level is not a  
245 challenge to current detection methods. Many reports have shown that ample SARS-CoV-2  
246 can be measured at the sewage treatment plant indicating only that infection is amply  
247 distributed in the community. To be useful for infection control the need is to be able to  
248 identify and if possible to isolate and trace contacts of the small number of early,  
249 high...perhaps super spreading...infections. Accordingly, monitoring focused on population  
250 concentrations of 100-1000 such as in institutions, hotels, multistory apartment building,  
251 industrial sites, will increase the sensitivity to detect by factors of 100 to 1000 in relation to  
252 the original assumption of 1 infection/100,000.

253 Recognizing that the real value of a method is ability to apply it to focused upstream  
254 sampling serves as a guide to features of the analytical method needing refinement and  
255 optimization. The most challenging problem of an RT qLAMP is refinement at minimal  
256 target concentration. While theoretically capable of amplification from a single copy...i.e. a  
257 single SARS-CoV-2 in a volume compatible with a 25  $\mu$ L reaction mix for example, i.e. 5-10  
258  $\mu$ L, if the concentration in the sewage being sampled is that low, Poisson statistics dictate  
259 that a single copy will be present in only a minor proportion of replicated 5-10  $\mu$ L aliquots  
260 analyzed. However, as suggested above, upstream sampling magnifies the concentration  
261 from a single shedder in direct proportion to the reduced population in the target sewage  
262 source. Thus, refinement of a RT qLAMP procedure for lowest limit of detection would not  
263 be important. Demonstration of consistently reproducible amplification at moderate  
264 concentrations is essential. Such demonstration should be readily achievable. Additional

265 features require further attention including treatment of samples to make viral RNA  
266 available for amplification. We used freeze-thaw cycles and have no indication of adverse  
267 effects. The  $Mg^{++}$  concentration is a reaction mix component important to optimize. The  
268 primer-polymerase combination is sensitive to the total  $Mg^{++}$  concentration, optimized for  
269 our primers at 8 mM. Raw sewage includes  $Mg^{++}$ ; in our raw sewage samples ca. 33 mg/L.  
270 We did not adjust or re optimize to take this into account for the work described here.  
271 Future work must account for this component, likely to vary widely from among  
272 communities. Finally, the samples prepared by EBMUD SD1 staff were 24-hour composite  
273 samples. Samples collected at upstream sources are more likely to be grab samples and  
274 may be subject to variation over the typical 24-hour cycle of human activities that affect  
275 sewage composition around the clock.

276 Features of an RT qLAMP that are attractive for the type of application outlined above are  
277 those referenced in virtually all publications describing its advantages: LAMP is faster,  
278 cheaper, and more flexible than the RT qPCR procedure, currently the most widely applied  
279 method for sewage monitoring of SARS-CoV-2, CDC, 2020; WHO 2020. Sewage samples  
280 collected in the morning, returned to the lab can be combined with reaction mix components  
281 immediately and amplified...using the same thermocycler (or simple water bath)  
282 programmed for constant temperature...producing interpretable results in less than an hour.  
283 No preprocessing for virus concentration, RNA extraction, and interference mitigation is  
284 needed saving time, effort, and materials.

## 285 **Acknowledgment**

286 This work was made possible using the facilities of Cel Analytical Inc, San Francisco CA,  
287 ELAP# 2647, EPA ID CA 01529, and with the advice and consultation of Dr. Yeggi  
288 Dearborn, Cel Analytical owner.

289 **Funding.** This project was conducted without external funding, promises, or commitments.

## 290 **References**

- 291 1. Notomi, T., Okayama, H., Masubuchi, H., Yonekawa, T., Watanabe, K., Amino, N.,  
292 Hase, T., 2000. Loop-mediated isothermal amplification of DNA. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 28,  
293 E63.
- 294 2. Salar, R, Gahlawat, S, Siwach, P, Duhan, J, Sharan, P, Khatri, P, Dingolia, S, Duhan, J,  
295 and Gahlawat, S, 2013. Rapid detection of viruses using LAMP: a review. *Biotechnology:  
296 Prospects and Applications*, 04:287-306. [http://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-1683-4\\_21](http://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-1683-4_21)
- 297 3. Becherer, L, Borst, N, Bakheit, M, Frischmann, S, Zengerle, R, and vln Stetten, F. 2020.  
298 Loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP) - review and classification of methods  
299 for sequence specific detection. *Anal. Methods.* 12: 717-746.  
300 <https://doi.org/10.1039/C9AY02246E>
- 301 4. Eiken Chemical, 2005. Primer Design, Eiken, <http://loopamp.eiken.co.jp/e/lamp/primer.html>
- 302 5. Broughton, JP, Deng, X, Yu, G, Fasching, CL, Singh, J, Chiu, CY, and Chen, JS, 2020.  
303 A protocol for rapid detection of the 2019 novel coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 using CRISPR  
304 diagnostics: SARS-CoV-2 DETECTR. Mammoth Bioscience, February 18, 2020.  
305 <https://mammoth.bio/publications/>
- 306 6. Color, 2020. SARS-CoV-2 LAMP Diagnostic assay. V1.0 5.19.20. Color, San Francisco.  
307 <https://www.color.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/LAMP-Diagnostic-Assay.pdf>
- 308 7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2020 Research Use Only 2019-Novel  
309 Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-time RT-PCR Primers and Probes.  
310 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.html> .
- 311 8. WHO, 2020. Protocol: Real-time RT-PCR assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2.  
312 [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/real-time-rt-pcr-assays-for-the-detection-  
313 of-sars-cov-2-institut-pasteur-paris.pdf?sfvrsn=3662fcb6\\_2](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/real-time-rt-pcr-assays-for-the-detection-of-sars-cov-2-institut-pasteur-paris.pdf?sfvrsn=3662fcb6_2) .
- 314 9. Ongerth, J.E., and FMA Saaed, 2020. Multiplex loop-mediated isothermal amplification  
315 (LAMP) for simplified monitoring of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in surface water.  
316 *bioRxiv* 2020.08.18.256826; <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.18.256826>.

- 317 10. Ahmed, W, Bertsch, PM, Bivins, A, Bibby, K, Farkas, K, Gathercole, A, Haramoto,, E,  
318 Gyawali, P, Korajic, A, MicMinn, BR, Mueller, JF, Simpson, SL, Smith WJM, Symonds,  
319 EM, Thomas, KV, Verhagen, R, and Kitajima M, 2020. First confirmed detection of  
320 SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia. *Sci Total Environ.* 728: 138764.  
321 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764>
- 322 11. Wurtzer, S, Marechal, V, Mouchel, JM, Maday, Y, Teyssou, R, Richard, E, Almayrac, JL,  
323 and Moulin, L, June 2020. Evaluation of lockdown impact on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics  
324 through viral genome quantification in Paris wastewaters.  
325 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.12.20062679>
- 326 12. Wu, F, Xiao, A., Zhang, J, Moniz, K, Endo, N, Armas, F, Bonneau R, Brown,  
327 MA, Bushman, M. Chai, PR, Duvallet, C, Erickson, TB, Foppe, K, Ghaeli, N, Gu, X, Han  
328 age, WP, Huang, KH, Lee WL, Matus, M, McElroy, KA, Nagler, J, Rhode, SF,  
329 Santillana, M, Tucker, JA, Wuertz, S, Zhao, S, Thompson, J, and EJ. *Alm. SARS-CoV-2*  
330 *titers in wastewater foreshadow dynamics and clinical presentation of COVID-19 cases.*  
331 *medRxiv*, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20117747>. June 23, 2020.
- 332 13. Dong, Y, Wu, X, Li, S, Lu, R, Wan, Z, Qin, J, Yu, G, Jin, X, and Zhang, C., 2020.  
333 Comparative evaluation of 19 reverse transcriptase loop-mediated isothermal  
334 amplification assays for detection of SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv*  
335 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.22.20159525>. July 24, 2020
- 336 14. Lamb, LE, Bartlone, SN, Ward, E, and Chancellor, MB, 2020. Rapid detection of novel  
337 Coronavirus (COVID-19) by reverse transcription loop-mediated isothermal amplification.  
338 *medRxiv*, Feb 24, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.19.20025155>
- 339 15. Broughton, JP, Deng, X, Yu, G, Fasching, CL, Servellita, V, Singh, J, Miao, X,  
340 Streithorst, JA, Granados, A, Sotomayor-Gonza, A, Zorn, K, Gopez, A, Hsu, E, Guy W,  
341 Miller, S, Pan, C-Y, Guevara, H, Wadford, DA, Chen, JS, and Chiu, CY, 2020. CRISPR-  
342 Cas12-based detection of SARS-CoV-2. *Nature Biotechnol. Letters.* 38: 860-674.  
343 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0513-4>

- 344 16. Thompson, D, and Lei, Y, 2020. Mini review: Recent progress in RT-LAMP enabled  
345 COVID-19 detection. Sensors and Actuators Reports, Aug. 2020: 2-10.  
346 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snr.2020.100017>
- 347 17. ACHD, 2020. Alameda County COVID-19 Dashboard. [https://covid-](https://covid-19.acgov.org/data.page?)  
348 [19.acgov.org/data.page?](https://covid-19.acgov.org/data.page?)
- 349
- 350
- 351