

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^{1*}

¹*Civil, Mining, & Environmental Engineering, University of Wollongong, Wollongong NSW
2522, Australia, jongerth@uow.edu.au; +61 0408548427*

Richard E. Danielson²

²*Danielson Applied Consulting, LLC, 105 Mulberry Loop, Pleasant Hill, CA, 94523,
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 4th 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	AGAGTAAACGTAAAAAGAAGGTT	23
E	FIP	ACCTGTCTCTTCCGAAACGAATTTGTAAGCACAAGCTGAT	41
E	BIP	CTAGCCATCCTTACTGCGCTACTCAGTTAACAATATTGCA	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 ₄
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 ₂ 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.




163

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 μ L raw sewage component of
175 the 25 μ 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. 2.5×10^5 /L or ca. 1.5 in a 5 μ L template volume for a 25 μ 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/ μ 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 μ L reaction mix for example, i.e. 5-10
258 μ 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 μ 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
- 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