

Tracking SARS-CoV-2 RNA through the wastewater treatment process

Hala Abu Ali^{1§}, Karin Yaniv^{2§}, Edo Bar-Zeev¹, Sanhita Chaudhury¹, Marilou Shaga², Satish Lakkakula², Zeev Ronen¹, Ariel Kushmaro^{2*} and Oded Nir^{1*}

¹Blaustein Institutes for Desert Research, Zuckerberg Institute for Water Research, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Sede Boqer Campus 8499000, Israel

²Department of Biotechnology Engineering, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva 8410501, Israel

* Corresponding authors E-mail:

A. Kushmaro arielkus@bgu.ac.il

O. Nir odni@bgu.ac.il

[§]H.A. and K.Y contributed equally to this paper

ABSTRACT

The municipal sewage carries the new coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2), shed by COVID-19 patients, to wastewater treatment plants. Proper wastewater treatment can provide an important barrier for preventing uncontrolled discharged of the virus into the environment. However, the role of the different wastewater treatment stages in reducing virus concentrations was, thus far, unknown. In this work, we quantified SARS-CoV-RNA in the raw sewage and along the main stages of the wastewater process from two different plants in Israel during this COVID-19 outbreak. We found that ca. 2 Log removal could be attained after primary and secondary treatment. Despite this removal, significant concentrations of SARS-CoV-RNA (>100 copies per mL) could still be detected in the treated wastewater. However, after treatment by chlorination, SARS-CoV-RNA was detected only once, likely due to insufficient chlorine dose. Our results highlight the need to protect wastewater treatment plants operators, as well as populations living near areas of wastewater discharge, from the risk of infection. In addition, our results emphasize the capabilities and limitations of the conventional wastewater treatment process in reducing SARS-CoV-RNA concentration, and present preliminary evidence for the importance of tertiary treatment and chlorination in reducing SARA-CoV-2 dissemination.

35 **KEYWORDS:** virus preconcentration; virus removal; SARS-CoV-2 in sewage; faecal-oral
36 transmission; coronavirus; COVID-19; Occupational Health.

37 INTRODUCTION

38 The new human coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2), was found in urine and feces¹⁻⁹ of
39 infected individuals, as well as in various wastewater systems.^{6,10-14} Consequently, there has
40 been a recent global interest in monitoring the dissemination of SARS-CoV-2 in municipal
41 sewages, mainly for wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE).^{3,15-20} The implication that
42 wastewater is a potential dissemination and infection route, has been also discussed,^{13,21-}
43²³ however, empirical evidences are still scarce. This is partially due to the current challenge
44 of sample concentration and extraction methods,²⁴ required for precise virus quantification.

45 Recent studies have shown that SARS-CoV-2 RNA could be found in the outlet of
46 wastewater treatment plants (WWTP), as well as in water bodies receiving the treated
47 WW,^{12,16,25} indicating a public health risk via the faecal-oral or faecal-aerosol infection
48 routes.^{2,26-28} Indeed, a recent study showed 90% removal of SARS-CoV-2 infectivity only
49 after 1.5 days in wastewater.²⁹ This is longer than the hydraulic residence time in many urban
50 pipelines³⁰ and longer than typical hydraulic residence time (HRT) in WWTPs. Therefore the
51 risk of infection through contact (direct or through aerosols) with conventionally treated
52 wastewater, cannot be dismissed at this point, especially where treated wastewater is reused
53 for agriculture, or recreation near urban areas.³¹ Although the extent of infectivity associated
54 with SARS-CoV-2 RNA in treated WW is not yet clear,^{11,31} this unnecessary risk can be
55 minimized by ensuring an almost complete viral RNA removal by the WWTP.

56 The fate of SARA-CoV-2in WWTPs, similarly to other viruses,⁸ is expected to be
57 influenced by various operational and environmental factors. Conventional WWTP includes
58 several steps in series (Figure 1),⁸ each step contributing to the removal of the virus from the
59 water through physical, biological or chemical mechanisms.³¹ The virus removal rate or the
60 neutralization of its infectivity at each step depends on the plant's operating conditions such
61 as wastewater and biomass residence times,³² as well as on environmental factors such as
62 temperature, pH and organic matter.^{26,31,32} Therefore, it is hard to rule out the risk of infection
63 via WW, even though recent preliminary tests suggest that SARS-CoV-2 particles in treated
64 WW are not infective.¹¹ Given this uncertainty and the extent of the pandemic, it is critical to
65 determine the fate of the virus at the outlets, as well as in the different treatment stages of
66 WWTP's. This information may be crucial for regulating and adapting the WW treatment

67 sector to the COVID-19 pandemic, mainly with respect to: (1) assessing the risk of viral
68 dissemination by treated WW. (2) Recognizing the critical treatment stages required for
69 preventing viral dissemination – with implications on maintenance and future development of
70 WWTP's. (3) Ensuring the health and safety of plant workers, and the general population
71 exposed to the treated WW.

72 Nevertheless, to-date there is no information (to the best of our knowledge) on the
73 presence of SARS-CoV-2 along the treatment stages, while data on the virus presence at the
74 outlet is scarce. Therefore, in the present study, we present the first dataset on SARS-CoV-2
75 (RNA) presence along the different treatment stages, from inlet to outlet, in two different
76 WWTPs in Israel. Our results highlight the importance of proper WWTP operation for
77 obtaining high virus removal rate and stress the need for more research and better risk
78 assessments to protect WWTP workers and prevent dissemination through WW.

79

80 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

81 The details of all the materials used in this work, are given in the supporting
82 information (SI, section A). Most relevant protocols are shortly described herein, while more
83 details are given in the SI when needed. For all the protocols, whenever needed, appropriate
84 protection gear (masks, hands protection, coveralls) was used while handling the samples in a
85 biosafety level 2 (BSL-2) biological hood.

86

87 **2.1. Sewage Sampling and further processing**

88 Grab samples were collected from two different WWTPs in Israel - Sorek and Shoket,
89 treating WW from the areas of Jerusalem and Hura respectively. The WW samples (volumes
90 in SI, section C1) were collected in a sanitized and sterilized disposable plastic sampling
91 container. Post sample collection, the containers were externally sprayed with 2% sodium
92 hypochlorite and 70% ethanol, inserted into pre-labelled biohazard bags. After sealing, these
93 biohazard bags were sprayed with disinfectants for further sterilization. The WW samples
94 were then transported in an ice cooler to the laboratory. Upon arrival, the samples were re-
95 sterilized using the previous methodology. Immediately after collection, the samples were
96 stored at 4 °C for no longer than 24 h.³³

97 Apart from the raw WW, samples (initial volumes in SI, section C1) were
98 concentrated to 200 mL by ultrafiltration using sterile dialysis filters with an average pore
99 size of 3.3 nm and an active surface area of 2.2 m² (Fresenius, Bud Hamburg, Germany)^{34,35}
100 and a peristaltic pump with new cleaned tubing that was replaced every time. A similar
101 method was previously described in Obayomi et al., 2019.³⁶ After concentrating, the
102 accumulated particles in the filter were eluted with Phosphate Buffered Saline (PBS). More
103 details can be found in the SI (section A).

104 **2.2 RNA extraction and detection/quantification of SARS-CoV**

105 RNA extractions were performed using 200 µL of raw or concentrated WW samples
106 using NucleoSpin RNA (Macherey Nagel, Germany). RNA was eluted with 50 µL of RNase
107 free water and kept at -80°C. For SARS-CoV-2 detection, we used One Step PrimeScript III
108 RT-qPCR mix (TAKARA, Japan) with CDC's primers and probe N1 together with 5 µL of
109 eluted RNA. RT-qPCR amplification was executed using Step One Plus real-time PCR
110 system (Applied Biosystems, Thermo Scientific). For quality control in each RT-PCR run,
111 positive (N gene plasmid, IDT) and non-template control (NTC) were performed. Copy
112 number calculation was done according to standard calibration curve as detailed in SI
113 (section C2).

114


115 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

116

117 We tracked the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on three different dates and in two
118 separate wastewater treatment plants (Figure1). Samples were collected twice during April
119 2020, in the midst of the 'first wave' of the COVID19 outbreak in Israel;³⁷ and once in July
120 2020, at the beginning of Israel's 'second wave'. Sorek WWTP treats the sewage of west
121 Jerusalem municipality, a densely populated area of the city that experienced similar trend of
122 infection as observed in Israel in March to July (Figure 1A). Shoket WWTP, (Figure 1B) —
123 the 2nd sampling site mainly treats sewage originating from *Hebron* city in the *West Bank*.
124 The sewage is discharged in the Hebron ephemeral stream and makes up ca. two thirds of the
125 inflow to Shoket WWTP. In addition, Shoket treats the sewage of a rural area in the southern
126 part of Israel that includes Hura, Meitar and other small municipalities. Specifically, Hura
127 suffered from high infection rates during the 1st COVID-19 wave in Israel and a lower one in
128 the second wave, whereas the West Bank suffered from a surge of confirmed COVID-19

129 cases during July.³⁸ Both WWTPs operate a conventional activated sludge process^{39–}
 130⁴¹(Figure 1), with a primary settler followed by a secondary treatment that includes an aerobic
 131 biological reactor and a secondary settler to separate the biomass. Overall, the data (Figure 1
 132 and Table S1) provided by the plant’s operator indicate a proper and stable performance of
 133 the secondary treatment with COD/BOD average removal rates (%) of 80/92 and 91/99 for
 134 Sorek and Shoket, respectively. In addition, at both plants the final effluent is disinfected by
 135 applying hypochlorite, before it is discharged to irrigation water reservoirs.

136



137

138 **Figure 1.** Illustration of the different stages involved in the WW treatment process in A) Sorek and B) Shoket
 139 WWTP. The time dependent active cases of covid-19 cases per 100 K residents in the Jerusalem and the Hura
 140 region are also shown to highlight the variability between different times (twice in April end and once in July)
 141 and locations in the context of WW sampling. The TSS, COD and BOD data (corresponding to different
 142 treatment stages) are shown to indicate on the process performances of the WWTPs. In the activated sludge
 143 process, the primary effluent is collected after the 1st step, *i.e.*, the sedimentation step, where the raw WW is
 144 settled to remove large solids. This is followed by aerobic biological treatment that reduces organic content and
 145 a secondary sedimentation step that separate the secondary (activated) sludge from the secondary effluent. Sand
 146 filtration is applied as a tertiary treatment in Shoket WWTP only. Before exiting the WWTP the effluent in both
 147 locations is subjected to disinfection through chlorination. The disinfected effluent is collected in irrigation
 148 reservoirs and then reused in agriculture.


149

150 The two WWTP sampled in this work differ in several aspects that may influence the
 151 fate of SARS-CoV-2 particles or RNA. The amount of incoming bio-solids (according to raw
 152 sewage TSS in Fig. 1) differs between the WWTP’s, which may have affected the viral load
 153 due to interactions of the virus with the biosolids. The organic loading also differs, possibly

154 affecting viral RNA stability and the reduction of infectivity. The average removal rates of
155 TSS (73), COD (51) and BOD (47) measured in Sorek's primary settler were higher than
156 those measured in Shoket's (34, 18, 8 respectively), could affect the removal rate and
157 detection limit of the virus at this step. Moreover, the steps in the WWT process differ
158 between the two plants, as tertiary treatment comprising low-rate sand filtration operates only
159 in the Shoket WWTP (Figure 1B). This step reduced TSS by ca. 50% in Shoket and could
160 have contributed to the removal of virus particles / viral RNA attached to suspended material.
161 Finally, operation of the chlorination step also differs between plants. In Sorek (Fig. 1A), a
162 constant dose of hypochlorite was added ($1.5 \text{ mg}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ as Cl_2), while in Shoket the dose was
163 adjusted to maintain the *residual* chlorine level required by the Israeli regulations ($1 \text{ mg}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$
164 as Cl_2). Indeed, the similarities and differences the plants are reflected in the concentration of
165 SARS-CoV-2 copies that we measured in the different treatment steps.

166 SARS-CoV-2 RNA (translated to CoV-2 copies per ml; see calibration curve in SI,
167 section C2) was detected in all WW treatment stages (Figure 2). This finding has important
168 implications regarding the safety of plant operators, since human infectivity through the WW
169 route, e.g. by liquid aerosols, has not as yet been ruled out.^{6,29} To increase the sensitivity of
170 the analysis, we concentrated the water samples using ultrafiltration with sterile dialysis
171 membranes, thus lowering the effective detection limit ($2000 \text{ copies}\cdot\text{mL}^{-1}$ for non-
172 concentrated samples) by a factor of 17-96. This pre-concentration technique, however, was
173 not applied to the raw sewage due to the high concentration of bio-solids. Therefore, we were
174 able to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA after the primary settler for all samples, while the
175 concentration of CoV-2 copies in the raw sewage entering Sorek WWTP (Figure 2A) during
176 April was below the detection limit ($2000 \text{ copies}\cdot\text{mL}^{-1}$). This increased detection sensitivity
177 has implications towards monitoring viral RNA in WW for setting up an early warning
178 system. In Shoket WWTP, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in all samples both in the raw
179 sewage and after primary settling (Figure 2B). Unexpectedly, the number of CoV-2 copies
180 sampled on April 27th was higher than that sampled on July 14th for the raw sewage, but
181 lower for the primary effluent. This discrepancy is likely due to the variability in both the
182 amount and type of bio-solids in the raw sewage, which can in turn affect the extent of
183 SARS-CoV-2 attachment to the bio-solids and removal through sedimentation thereof.^{7,22,42}
184 Thereby, when setting up a WBE study targeting SARS-CoV-2, one should consider
185 sampling both the raw sewage and the primary effluent, which can be pre-concentrated to
186 increase the sensitivity.

187 The ultrafiltration pre-concentration approach (see methods and SI) enabled us to
188 detect low concentrations of CoV-2 copies along the treatment process and assess the virus
189 removal rate in the different WWTP stages (Figure 2). Approximately 1 Log removal was
190 observed after primary sedimentation in all cases, indicating that most of the shed CoV-2
191 RNA was attached to large bio-solids. This is similar to observations^{7,22,42} for other viruses in
192 USA, where, the settled sludge (instead of the treated effluent) was reported to contain most
193 of the viral loads. Organic matter degradation in the biological treatment step and the
194 subsequent secondary settling provided further ~1 Log removal in most cases. In most
195 WWTP's worldwide, the second settler is the final treatment step, following which the
196 secondary WW effluent is discharged to the environment. Our results indicate that this
197 process can achieve an overall ~2-Log removal of CoV-2 RNA, however the virus could still
198 be detected in the secondary effluent.



199 **Figure 2.** Number of CoV2-copies (N1 gene identified by RT-PCR) in the different process stages in (A) Sorek;
200 and (B) Shoket wastewater treatment plants, at three different dates. Datapoints below detection limit (<DL) are
201 shown at the average between 1 copy to the number of copies marking the detection limit. The dashed line is an
202 average between 3 dates (including the <DL datapoints) to guide the eye.

203

204 Therefore, tertiary treatment (e.g. sand filtration) and disinfection may be needed for
205 ensuring virus-free effluent. In Shoket WWTP (Figure 2B), sand filtration further reduced
206 CoV-2 concentrations, once from ~100 copies·mL⁻¹ to below detection limit (April 21st); and
207 once from ~300 to ~100 copies·mL⁻¹ (Figure 1B). Virus removal in this case could be
208 facilitated by adsorption to retained (larger) suspended particles (>10 μm) or by adsorption to
209 the sand particles as illustrated in Fig. 1. It is noted that flocculation prior to filtration – not
210 currently applied in Shoket – could potentially achieve higher TSS and virus removal. The

211 subsequent addition of hypochlorite can inactivate coronaviruses⁴³ and significantly reduce
212 the amount of SARS-CoV-2 RNA.⁴⁴ Indeed, in Shoket WWTP (Figure 2B), the chlorination
213 step reduced the CoV-2 copies below the detection limit, i.e. < 40 copies·mL⁻¹ in the two
214 samples collected on April and < 10 copies·mL⁻¹ in the one collected on July (lower detection
215 limit stems from a higher sample pre-concentration factor). A reduction of the virus to below
216 detection limit after chlorination was also recorded in Sorek WWTP for samples collected in
217 April (Figure 2A). However, in July low concentration of CoV-2 RNA was detected even
218 after chlorine application. It is possible that SARS-CoV-2 was detected after chlorination
219 since the Shoket WWTP control hypochlorite dosage to achieve a target residual chlorine of
220 0.5-1 mg·mL⁻¹, while the Sorek WWTP simply dose 1.5 mg·mL⁻¹ hypochlorite with no
221 consideration of residual chlorine. This approach can lead to incomplete oxidation, especially
222 when COD is high compared to the amount of hypochlorite dosed, as in this case. These
223 results indicate that although chlorination is effective in removing the virus, proper operation
224 of this step, i.e. sufficient dosing to meet chlorine demand are required to ensure complete
225 removal of SARS-CoV-2 traces.

226

227 **IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

228 The results presented in this work have several significant consequences towards WW
229 monitoring, and operating for the prevention of COVID-19 spread through WW effluents. At
230 two different occasions we found that sampling and concentrating the primary effluent, rather
231 than the raw sewage, increase the sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection, due to pre-
232 concentration by ultrafiltration. Therefore, sampling large volumes of the primary effluent
233 and applying pre-concentration should be considered when setting up early warning
234 monitoring systems in WWTPs. We also note that due to the high variability of bio-solids in
235 sewages, public health risk assessments may benefit from analysing both the raw sewage and
236 the primary effluent. We stress that more research is needed to support these preliminary
237 results and that improvements in the extraction and quantification methods may also
238 contribute to advance early warning and WBE.

239 The detection of SARS-CoV-2 through the primary and secondary treatment calls for
240 reinforcement of suitable safety measures to protect WWTP operators. Exposure to the virus
241 can occur in many ways, for example through aerosols released due to the active aeration in
242 the biological treatment reactors. Handling samples in indoors field labs for routine

243 wastewater testing may also promote exposure. Since aerosols were shown to likely be the
244 major infection route,^{28,45} particle filtering masks such as N95 would minimize the risk
245 substantially. We stress that an infectivity study for the different treatment stages, not
246 performed in this work, is needed for supporting these conclusions. Until then however,
247 proper protection and routine testing of workers in the entire WW sector is recommended.

248 Furthermore, our results indicate that secondary treatment alone, as applied in most of
249 the world today, is not sufficient for preventing the dissemination of SARS-CoV-2 to the
250 environment through the secondary effluent. Such dissemination can lead to increased risk of
251 infection when the water is discharged in populated areas or reused e.g. for spray irrigation.
252 Perhaps more importantly, uncontrolled discharge of SARS-CoV-2 to the environment may
253 increase virus accumulation in animal reservoirs (reverse zoonosis),⁴⁶ thus impede epidemic
254 control efforts through secondary zoonosis.⁴⁷ Moreover, simultaneous exposure of animals to
255 virus particles and anti-viral drugs may trigger the development of drug-resistant mutated
256 virus.⁴⁸ It is therefore essential to provide tighter control of SARS-CoV-2 dissemination into
257 the environment and to further study its impact. According to our findings, tertiary treatment
258 adds an additional barrier, and disinfection of secondary or tertiary effluents by chlorine
259 provides an additional effective control measure. However, to ensure the effectivity of
260 chlorination, meeting chlorine dosage demand and monitoring residual chlorine are likely to
261 be critical. Overall, our results highlight the need for further research on the occurrence and
262 infectivity of SARA-CoV-2 in wastewater effluent and calls for a more cautious WW
263 management approach in these times of pandemic.

264

265

266 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

267 We would like to thank funding from Ben Gurion University, The Corona Challenge Covid-
268 19 (<https://in.bgu.ac.il/en/corona-challenge/Pages/default.aspx>) and funding from the Israeli
269 ministry of Health. We thank the personnel of the Sorek and Shoket wastewater treatment
270 plants for their support.

271

272

273 **REFERENCES**

274 (1) Paris, E. De; Saint-antoine, C. D. R.; Lions, L. J. Evaluation of Lockdown Impact on SARS-CoV-2
275 Dynamics through Viral Genome Quantification in Paris Wastewaters. **2020**.

- 276 (2) Naddeo, V. Editorial Perspectives: 2019 Novel Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2): What Is Its Fate in
277 Urban Water Cycle and How Can the Water Research Community Respond? **2020**, 1213–
278 1216. <https://doi.org/10.1039/d0ew90015j>.
- 279 (3) Wu, Y.; Guo, C.; Tang, L.; Hong, Z.; Zhou, J.; Dong, X.; Yin, H.; Xiao, Q.; Tang, Y.; Qu, X.; Kuang,
280 L.; Fang, X.; Mishra, N.; Lu, J.; Shan, H.; Jiang, G.; Huang, X. Prolonged Presence of SARS-CoV-2
281 Viral RNA in Faecal Samples. *Lancet Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **2020**, 5 (5), 434–435.
282 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253\(20\)30083-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30083-2).
- 283 (4) Wang, D.; Hu, B.; Hu, C.; Zhu, F.; Liu, X.; Zhang, J.; Wang, B.; Xiang, H.; Cheng, Z.; Xiong, Y.;
284 Zhao, Y.; Li, Y.; Wang, X.; Peng, Z. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients with
285 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA - J. Am. Med. Assoc.*
286 **2020**, 323 (11), 1061–1069. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.1585>.
- 287 (5) Ahmed, W.; Bertsch, P. M.; Bivins, A.; Bibby, K.; Farkas, K.; Gathercole, A.; Haramoto, E.;
288 Gyawali, P.; Korajkic, A.; Mcminn, B. R.; Mueller, J. F.; Simpson, S. L.; Smith, W. J. M.;
289 Symonds, E. M.; Thomas, K. V.; Verhagen, R.; Kitajima, M. Comparison of Virus Concentration
290 Methods for the RT-QPCR-Based Recovery of Murine Hepatitis Virus, a Surrogate for SARS-
291 CoV-2 from Untreated Wastewater. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 739 (June), 139960.
292 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139960>.
- 293 (6) Amoah, I. D.; Kumari, S.; Bux, F. Coronaviruses in Wastewater Processes: Source, Fate and
294 Potential Risks. *Environ. Int.* **2020**, 143 (July), 105962.
295 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105962>.
- 296 (7) Peccia, J.; Zulli, A.; Brackney, D. E.; Grubaugh, N. D.; Kaplan, E. H.; Casanovas-Massana, A.; Ko,
297 A. I.; Malik, A. A.; Wang, D.; Wang, M.; Warren, J. L.; Weinberger, D. M.; Arnold, W.; Omer, S.
298 B. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Tracks Community Infection Dynamics.
299 *Nat. Biotechnol.* **2020**, 38 (October). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0684-z>.
- 300 (8) Westhaus, S.; Weber, F.; Schiwy, S.; Linnemann, V.; Brinkmann, M.; Widera, M.; Greve, C.;
301 Janke, A.; Hollert, H.; Wintgens, T.; Ciesek, S. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Raw and Treated
302 Wastewater in Germany – Suitability for COVID-19 Surveillance and Potential Transmission
303 Risks. **2021**, 751, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141750>.
- 304 (9) Heller, L.; Mota, C. R.; Greco, D. B. COVID-19 Faecal-Oral Transmission: Are We Asking the
305 Right Questions? *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 729, 138919.
306 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138919>.
- 307 (10) Bhowmick, G. D.; Dhar, D. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak: Some Serious
308 Consequences with Urban and Rural Water Cycle. *npj Clean Water* **2019**, 2019.
309 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41545-020-0079-1>.
- 310 (11) Rimoldi, S.; Mileto, D.; Maresca, M.; Longobardi, C.; Mancon, A. Presence and Infectivity of
311 SARS-CoV-2 Virus in Wastewaters and Rivers. **2020**.
- 312 (12) Wurtzer, S.; Marechal, V.; Jm, M.; Moulin, L.; Université, S.; Metis, U. M. R.; Atelier, Z. Time
313 Course Quantitative Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Parisian Wastewaters Correlates with COVID-
314 19 Confirmed Cases. *medRxiv* **2020**, No. 6, 10–13.
- 315 (13) Shutler, J.; Zaraska, K.; Holding, T. M.; Machnik, M.; Uppuluri, K.; Ashton, I.; Migdal, L.;
316 Dahiya, R. Risk of SARS-CoV-2 Infection from Contaminated Water Systems. *medRxiv* **2020**,
317 2020.06.17.20133504.
- 318 (14) Haramoto, E.; Malla, B.; Thakali, O.; Kitajima, M. First Environmental Surveillance for the

- 319 Presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater and River Water in Japan. *Sci. Total Environ.*
320 **2020**, 737, 140405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140405>.
- 321 (15) Choi, P. M.; Tscharke, B. J.; Donner, E.; Brien, J. W. O.; Grant, S. C.; Kaserzon, S. L.; Mackie, R.;
322 Malley, E. O.; Crosbie, N. D.; Thomas, K. V.; Mueller, J. F. Trends in Analytical Chemistry
323 Wastewater-Based Epidemiology Biomarkers: Past, Present and Future. **2018**, 105.
324 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2018.06.004>.
- 325 (16) Mohan, S. V.; Hemalatha, M.; Kopperi, H.; Ranjith, I.; Kumar, A. K. SARS-CoV-2 in
326 Environmental Perspective: Occurrence, Persistence, Surveillance, Inactivation and
327 Challenges. *Chem. Eng. J.* **2021**, 405 (July 2020), 126893.
328 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2020.126893>.
- 329 (17) Orive, G.; Lertxundi, U.; Barcelo, D. Early SARS-CoV-2 Outbreak Detection by Sewage-Based
330 Epidemiology. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 732, 139298.
331 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139298>.
- 332 (18) S. Arora, A. Nag, J. Sethi, J. Rajvanshi, S. Saxena, S. Shrivastava, A. B. G. Sewage Surveillance
333 for the Presence of SARS-CoV-2 Genome as a Useful Wastewater Based Epidemiology (WBE)
334 Tracking Tool in India. *Handb. Med. Image Comput. Comput. Assist. Interv.* **2020**, 8 (5), 55.
- 335 (19) A.Hata, R.Honda, H.Hara-Yamamura, Y. M. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater in Japan
336 by Multiple Molecular Assays- Implication for Wastewater-Based Epidemiology (WBE). **2020**,
337 1–35.
- 338 (20) Street, R.; Malema, S.; Mahlangeni, N.; Mathee, A. Wastewater Surveillance for Covid-19: An
339 African Perspective. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 743, 140719.
340 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140719>.
- 341 (21) Md. Moinul Hosain Oliver, G. A. Hewa, D. Pezzaniti, Md Ariful Haque, K M Shamsul Haque,
342 Md. Manjurul Haque, Md. Moniruzzaman, Md. Mostafizar Rahman, Khokan Kumar Saha, M.
343 N. K. COVID-19 and Recycled Wastewater Irrigation: A Review of Implications. **2020**, No. June,
344 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202006.0105.v1>.
- 345 (22) Bibby, K.; Peccia, J. Identification of Viral Pathogen Diversity in Sewage Sludge by
346 Metagenome Analysis. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2013**, 47 (4), 1945–1951.
347 <https://doi.org/10.1021/es305181x>.
- 348 (23) Ghernaout, D.; Elboughdiri, N. Urgent Proposals for Disinfecting Hospital Wastewaters during
349 COVID-19 Pandemic. *OALib* **2020**, 07 (05), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1106373>.
- 350 (24) Lu, D.; Huang, Z.; Luo, J.; Zhang, X.; Sha, S. Primary Concentration – The Critical Step in
351 Implementing the Wastewater Based Epidemiology for the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Mini-
352 Review. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 747, 141245.
353 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141245>.
- 354 (25) Kumar, M.; Kumar, A.; Shah, A. V.; Raval, J.; Rajpara, N. First Proof of the Capability of
355 Wastewater Surveillance for COVID-19 in India through Detection of Genetic Material of
356 SARS-CoV-2. **2020**, No. January.
- 357 (26) Wigginton, K. R.; Ellenberg, R. M. Emerging Investigators Series: The Source and Fate of
358 Pandemic Viruses in the Urban Water Cycle. **2015**, 1 (6).
359 <https://doi.org/10.1039/c5ew00125k>.
- 360 (27) Kitajima, M.; Ahmed, W.; Bibby, K.; Carducci, A.; Gerba, C. P.; Hamilton, K. A.; Haramoto, E.;

- 361 Rose, J. B. SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater: State of the Knowledge and Research Needs. **2020**,
362 739. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076>.
- 363 (28) Lewis, D. Mounting Evidence Suggests Coronavirus Is Airborne - but Health Advice Has Not
364 Caught Up. *Nature* **2020**, 583 (7817), 510–513. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-02058-1>.
- 365 (29) Bivins, A.; Greaves, J.; Fischer, R.; Yinda, K. C.; Ahmed, W.; Kitajima, M.; Munster, V.; Bibby, K.
366 Persistence of SARS-CoV 2 in Water and Wastewater. **2020**, 1–6.
367 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00730>.
- 368 (30) Xing, Y.; Chen, X. du; Wang, S. ping; Zhang, Z. qiang; Liu, X.; Lu, J. suo. Effect of Minocycline on
369 the Changes in the Sewage Chemical Index and Microbial Communities in Sewage Pipes. *J.*
370 *Hazard. Mater.* **2021**, 402 (May 2020), 123792.
371 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.123792>.
- 372 (31) Bogler, A.; Packman, A.; Furman, A.; Gross, A.; Kushmaro, A.; Ronen, A.; Dagot, C.; Hill, C.;
373 Vaizel-ohayon, D.; Morgenroth, E.; Bertuzzo, E.; Wells, G.; Kiperwas, H. R.; Horn, H.; Negev, I.;
374 Zucker, I.; Bar-or, I.; Moran-gilad, J.; Balcazar, J. L.; Bibby, K. Rethinking Wastewater Risks and
375 Monitoring in Light of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Nat. Sustain.* [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00605-2)
376 [020-00605-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00605-2).
- 377 (32) Pepper, I. L. Survival of Coronaviruses in Water and Wastewater. **2009**, 10–14.
378 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-008-9001-6>.
- 379 (33) Bar-or, I.; Yaniv, K.; Shagan, M.; Ozer, E.; Erster, O.; Mendelson, E.; Shirazi, R.; Kramarsky-
380 winter, E.; Nir, O.; Abu-ali, H.; Ronen, Z.; Lewis, Y. E.; Friedler, E.; Bitkover, E.; Paitan, Y.;
381 Berchenko, Y.; Goldstein-goren, S.; Science, N.; Sheva, B.; Saba, K.; Boker, S. Regressing SARS-
382 CoV-2 Sewage Measurements onto COVID-19 Burden in the Population: A Proof-of-Concept
383 for Quantitative Environmental Surveillance. **2020**, 1–11.
- 384 (34) Bowry, S. Nano-Controlled Membrane Spinning Technology: Regulation of Pore Size,
385 Distribution and Morphology of a New Polysulfone Dialysis Membrane. *Contrib. Nephrol.*
386 **2002**, 137, 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000060234>.
- 387 (35) Fresenius Medical Care. FX high-flux and FX low-flux dialyzers
388 [https://www.freseniusmedicalcare.asia/en/healthcare-](https://www.freseniusmedicalcare.asia/en/healthcare-professionals/hemodialysis/dialyzers/fx-high-and-low-flux-dialyzers/)
389 [professionals/hemodialysis/dialyzers/fx-high-and-low-flux-dialyzers/](https://www.freseniusmedicalcare.asia/en/healthcare-professionals/hemodialysis/dialyzers/fx-high-and-low-flux-dialyzers/).
- 390 (36) Obayomi, O.; Nirit, B.; Edelstein, M.; Ghazaryan, L. Importance of Soil Texture to the Fate of
391 Pathogens Introduced by Irrigation with Treated Wastewater. **2018**, No. November.
392 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.10.378>.
- 393 (37) Taub Center. Three sectoral differences between the first and second wave of morbidity
394 [http://taubcenter.org.il/he/blog/heb-three-sectoral-differences-between-the-first-and-](http://taubcenter.org.il/he/blog/heb-three-sectoral-differences-between-the-first-and-second-waves/)
395 [second-waves/](http://taubcenter.org.il/he/blog/heb-three-sectoral-differences-between-the-first-and-second-waves/).
- 396 (38) OCHA. Occupied Palestinian Territory: COVID-19 Emergency. **2020**, 1 (March), 1–10.
- 397 (39) Wang, X.; Li, J.; Liu, R.; Hai, R.; Zou, D.; Zhu, X.; Luo, N. Responses of Bacterial Communities to
398 CuO Nanoparticles in Activated Sludge System. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2017**, 51 (10), 5368–
399 5376. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b06137>.
- 400 (40) Hu, H.; Liao, K.; Shi, Y.; Ding, L.; Zhang, Y.; Ren, H. Effect of Solids Retention Time on Effluent
401 Dissolved Organic Nitrogen in the Activated Sludge Process: Studies on Bioavailability,
402 Fluorescent Components, and Molecular Characteristics. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2018**, 52 (6),

- 403 3449–3455. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b05309>.
- 404 (41) Yu, H. Q. Molecular Insights into Extracellular Polymeric Substances in Activated Sludge.
405 *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2020**, *54* (13), 7742–7750. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c00850>.
- 406 (42) Graham, K. E.; Loeb, S. K.; Wolfe, M. K.; Catoe, D.; Sinnott, N.; Kim, S.; Yamahara, K. M.;
407 Sassoubre, L. M.; Mendoza, L. M.; Roldan-hernandez, L.; Li, L.; Wigginton, K. R.; Boehm, A. B.;
408 Landing, M.; Francisco, S.; Arbor, A. SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated
409 with COVID-19 Cases in a Large Urban Sewershed. **2020**, No. 734, 1–23.
- 410 (43) Wang, X. W.; Li, J. S.; Jin, M.; Zhen, B.; Kong, Q. X.; Song, N.; Xiao, W. J.; Yin, J.; Wei, W.; Wang,
411 G. J.; Si, B. Y.; Guo, B. Z.; Liu, C.; Ou, G. R.; Wang, M. N.; Fang, T. Y.; Chao, F. H.; Li, J. W. Study
412 on the Resistance of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome-Associated Coronavirus. *J. Virol.*
413 *Methods* **2005**, *126* (1–2), 171–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2005.02.005>.
- 414 (44) Zhang, D.; Ling, H.; Huang, X.; Li, J.; Li, W.; Yi, C.; Zhang, T.; Jiang, Y.; He, Y.; Deng, S.; Zhang, X.;
415 Wang, X.; Liu, Y.; Li, G.; Qu, J. Potential Spreading Risks and Disinfection Challenges of Medical
416 Wastewater by the Presence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-
417 CoV-2) Viral RNA in Septic Tanks of Fangcang Hospital. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *741*, 140445.
418 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140445>.
- 419 (45) Morawska, L.; Cao, J. Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: The World Should Face the
420 Reality. *Environ. Int.* **2020**, *139* (April), 105730. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105730>.
- 421 (46) Olival, K. J.; Cryan, P. M.; Amman, B. R.; Baric, R. S.; Blehert, D. S.; Brook, C. E.; Calisher, C. H.;
422 Castle, K. T.; Coleman, J. T. H.; Daszak, P.; Epstein, J. H.; Field, H.; Frick, W. F.; Gilbert, A. T.;
423 Hayman, D. T. S.; Ip, H. S.; Karesh, W. B.; Johnson, C. K.; Kading, R. C.; Kingston, T.; Lorch, J.
424 M.; Mendenhall, I. H.; Peel, A. J.; Phelps, K. L.; Plowright, R. K.; Reeder, D. A. M.; Reichard, J.
425 D.; Sleeman, J. M.; Streicker, D. G.; Towner, J. S.; Wang, L. F. Possibility for Reverse Zoonotic
426 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to Free-Ranging Wildlife: A Case Study of Bats. *PLoS Pathog.*
427 **2020**, *16* (9), e1008758. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1008758>.
- 428 (47) Munir, K.; Ashraf, S.; Munir, I.; Khalid, H.; Muneer, M. A.; Mukhtar, N.; Amin, S.; Ashraf, S.;
429 Imran, M. A.; Chaudhry, U.; Zaheer, M. U.; Arshad, M.; Munir, R.; Ahmad, A.; Zhao, X.
430 Zoonotic and Reverse Zoonotic Events of SARS-CoV-2 and Their Impact on Global Health.
431 *Emerg. Microbes Infect.* **2020**, No. 0, 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2020.1827984>.
- 432 (48) Kumar, M.; Kuroda, K.; Dhangar, K.; Mazumder, P.; Sonne, C.; Rinklebe, J.; Kitajima, M.
433 Potential Emergence of Antiviral-Resistant Pandemic Viruses via Environmental Drug
434 Exposure of Animal Reservoirs. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2020**, *54* (14), 8503–8505.
435 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c03105>.

436

437