

1 **Long-term monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater of the Frankfurt**
2 **metropolitan area in Southern Germany**

3
4
5 Shelesh Agrawal¹, Laura Orschler¹, Susanne Lackner^{1,*}

6
7 ¹ *Technische Universität Darmstadt, Institute IWAR, Chair of Wastewater Engineering,*
8 *Franziska-Braun-Straße 7, 64287 Darmstadt, Germany*

9 * *E-mail: s.lackner@iwar.tu-darmstadt.de, Phone: +49 615 116 20309, Fax: +49 615*
10 *116 20305.*

11
12
13 **Abstract**

14
15 Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is a great approach that enables us to
16 comprehensively monitor the community to determine the scale and dynamics of
17 infections in a city, particularly in metropolitan cities with a high population density.
18 Therefore, we monitored the time course of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration in
19 raw sewage in the Frankfurt metropolitan area, the European financial center. To
20 determine the SARS-CoV-2 concentration in sewage, we continuously collected
21 samples from two wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) influents (Niederrad and
22 Sindlingen) serving the Frankfurt metropolitan area and performed RT-qPCR analysis
23 targeting three genes (N gene, S gene, and ORF1ab gene). In August, a resurgence
24 in the SARS-CoV-2 RNA load was observed, reaching 3×10^{13} copies/day, which
25 represents similar levels compared to April with approx. 2×10^{14} copies/day. This

26 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
corresponds to an also continuous increase again in COVID-19 cases in Frankfurt

27 since August, with an average of 28.6 incidences, compared to 28.7 incidences in April.
28 Different temporal dynamics were observed between different sampling points,
29 indicating local dynamics in COVID-19 cases within the Frankfurt metropolitan area.
30 The SARS-CoV-2 load to the WWTP Niederrad ranged from approx. 4×10^{11} to $1 \times$
31 10^{15} copies/day, the load to the WWTP Sindlingen from approx. 1×10^{11} to 2×10^{14}
32 copies/day, which resulted in a preceding increase in these loading in July ahead of
33 the weekly averaged incidences. The study shows that WBE has the potential as early
34 warning system for SARS-CoV-2 infections and as monitoring system to identify global
35 hotspots of COVID-19.

36 **Introduction**

37 The ongoing pandemic of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is a public health
38 emergency of global concern and is expressed by symptoms like fever, myalgia,
39 fatigue, dry cough. The disease, caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome
40 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), emerged in China in December 2019 and the World
41 Health Organization (WHO) declared it as pandemic on March 11th, 2020 due to its
42 worldwide spread ¹. The disease has now been reported in over 213 countries with
43 more than 30 million confirmed cases. The pandemic has caused nationwide
44 lockdowns in many countries and contact restrictions as a prevention for the spread of
45 the disease ².

46 In the last couple of month, wastewater epidemiology (WBE) has emerged as a
47 promising approach for early warning of disease outbreaks and providing information
48 for the public especially if patients are asymptomatic. Recent studies confirmed the
49 detection of SARS-CoV-2 in feces and urine from positive tested patients ^{3,4}, which
50 implies, that SARS-CoV-2 is present in the influent of wastewater treatment plants
51 (WWTPs) ⁵.

52 The potential advantage of environmental surveillance in WBE is to enable prediction
53 of the overall status of a given catchment area with much less effort than clinical
54 surveillance. WBE can give an insight of the outbreak situation in the entire catchment
55 area by testing wastewater sample over time. In contrast, clinical surveillance requires
56 more time and cost for sample collection and testing. An additional big advantage of
57 WBE is also capturing people with asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infections, who
58 may not be included in clinical surveillance. Several studies have already proved that
59 wastewater monitoring can detect outbreaks of norovirus and poliovirus earlier than
60 clinical surveys ⁶⁻⁹.

61 Preliminary studies have reported the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in
62 the Netherlands ¹⁰, USA ¹¹, Australia ¹² and Italy ¹³. One of the first studies based on
63 surveillance of COVID-19 in wastewater was performed in Australia and SARS-CoV-2
64 was detected in two samples within a six day period of the same WWTP with both
65 qPCR and sequencing ¹². In the Netherlands, researchers tested sewage of six cities
66 and the airport for SARS-CoV-2, targeting either the nucleocapsid (N) gene or the
67 envelope (E) gene ¹⁰. The results showed that the sewage samples were tested
68 positive for the N gene in March 2020. Whereas in Italy, a research group studied
69 twelve influent sewage samples from the WWTPs in Milan and Rome between
70 February and April with the result that 6 out of 12 samples were positive ¹³.
71 In this study, the goal was to establish a WBE surveillance system for SARS-CoV-2 in
72 a metropolitan area in Southern Germany (Frankfurt am Main) and to use this data as
73 warning system in the future. WWTP data can add valuable information and thus aid
74 decision making on further public and societal restrictions or easings with increasing
75 or decreasing virus concentration.

76

77 **Material and Methods**

78 **Sewage Samples**

79 24h flow-proportional samples were collected between April 2020 and August 2020 at
80 three different sampling points from two wastewater treatment plants (WWTP), located
81 in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. The WWTP Niederrad/Griesheim is designed for a
82 population equivalent (PE) of 1.350.000, the WWTP Sindlingen for 470.000 PE. These
83 two WWTPs receive the sewage of approximately 1.200.000 people, the remaining PE
84 can be allocated to commercial and industrial discharges. Table 1 also includes the
85 85 % percentiles of the influent volumes. Daily readings of the respective flow volume's
86 were used to calculate SARS-CoV-2 loadings. In this study, we processed 44

87 samples, which include 17 samples from Niederrad sampling point, 14 from Sindlingen
88 sampling point, and 13 samples from Griesheim sampling point.

89 For each sampling location, one liter of the untreated wastewater was spiked with
90 200 μ L MS2 phage (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and filtered through a 0.45 μ m
91 electronegative membrane filter. The filters were divided and stored at minus 80°C
92 prior to further downstream analysis.

93 RNA was extracted from the filter samples using the Fast RNA Blue Kit (MP
94 Biomedicals) according to the manufacturer's protocol and eluted with 100 μ L of
95 RNase free buffer. This RNA was used as a template for RT-qPCR. The concentration
96 was measured using a Qubit 3.0 Fluorometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific).

97

98 **qPCR analysis**

99 The RNA was analyzed using the Taq Path COVID-19 RT-PCR Kit (Thermo Fisher
100 Scientific) with a Quant Studio 3 Thermal Cycler. This kit includes primer pairs targeting
101 the N-, S- and ORF1ab genes were used as a multiplex assay. Details about the kit
102 are provided in the supplementary information. Each qPCR run was performed in
103 triplicates with 50 μ L volume, with 12.5 μ L TaqPath™ 1-Step Multiplex Master Mix (4X),
104 2.5 μ L COVID-19 Real Time PCR Assay Multiplex and 25 μ L nuclease free water. To
105 the reaction mix, 10 μ L of purified and extracted viral RNA were added. Thermal
106 profiles are provided in the supplementary information (Table 1). Reactions were
107 considered positive if the cycle threshold was below 40 cycles. In each qPCR run,
108 multiple SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive control, MS2 phage control (to determine the RNA
109 recovery efficiency) of different known concentration and negative control were
110 included, further details are provided in the supplementary information. The RT-qPCR
111 abundance data were analyzed in R, using ggplot2 (v0.9.3.1), further details about the

112 PCR efficiencies, threshold and baseline setting are provided in the supplementary
113 information.

114

115 **Results and Discussion**

116 **Epidemiological surveillance**

117 We investigated the largest metropolitan region in southern Germany (Frankfurt am
118 Main) using three separate sampling points in the catchment of the two large WWTPs
119 (Table 1) and this data was compared to the COVID-19 cases in the area.

120 Epidemiological data on COVID-19 in the studied area was retrieved from the publicly
121 available repository of the Robert Koch Institute (<https://survstat.rki.de/Default.aspx>).

122 Figure 1 shows the positive COVID-19 cases in Germany compared to the positive
123 cases of the city of Frankfurt am Main as reported weekly. The black line indicates the
124 numbers in Germany with a high peak in March 2020 and the subsequent decline after
125 the contact restrictions were imposed on the 22nd of March. The blue line represents
126 the COVID-19 cases of the city of Frankfurt am Main with 150 to 200 cases per week
127 during the first peak in March and an increase of COVID-19 cases end of July.
128 Frankfurt did not have a severe outbreak in spring with incidences not higher than 36
129 per 100.000 people the first week of April. The grey bar symbolizes the summer
130 vacation of all schools in Hesse starting on the 06th of July until the 14th of August and
131 marks a time period with increased travelling within Germany and Europe. This
132 resulted in similarly or even slightly higher numbers of COVID-19 cases in the middle
133 of August compared to April, whereas the overall trend for Germany only saw a slight
134 increase in cases during that time. Additionally, it is necessary to mention, that during
135 July and August the German government started free-of-cost testing for people
136 returning from other countries as well as risk regions to control returnees from holiday.

137 This may have also led to an increase in the reported positive COVID-19 case in the
138 summer months.

139

140 **Comparison of the results from April and August**

141 The highest numbers of COVID-19 cases in the city of Frankfurt am Main occurred in
142 April and August 2020, with 28 cases per 100.000 people as three-week average. In
143 contrast, the trend throughout Germany showed a much higher first peak in April with
144 44 cases per 100.000 people at the maximum and only 10 in August. Therefore, we
145 used the COVID-19 cases and the corresponding SARS-CoV-2 loads to the WWTPs
146 both in April and August to compare both time points of the pandemic (Figure 2A).

147 Our results revealed, that the load of SARS-CoV-2 virus in the wastewater samples
148 was only slightly higher in April with a maximum of 1.4×10^{15} copies/d compared to a
149 maximum of 5.37×10^{14} copies/d in August for individual influent wastewater samples.
150 Additionally, we evaluated the correlation between the incidences reported against the
151 sum of the SARS-CoV-2 load measured in all the samples (Figure 2B). It is clearly
152 visible that with the increase in incidences, a corresponding increase in the viral load
153 was observed as also shown in the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient r_s of 0.7464
154 (p (2-tailed) = 0.00217). However, there is a certain scattering in the data, which might
155 be due to the variance in the measured viral load for different sampling points, as
156 previously reported (Medema *et al.*, 2020; Westhaus *et al.*, 2020).

157

158 **SARS-CoV-2 in Sewage Samples**

159 The sum of the SARS-CoV-2 mean loads based on the concentrations of the three
160 different target genes (N-, S- and ORF1ab gene) in the sewage samples from two
161 WWTPs was compared to the reported positive tested COVID-19 cases in Frankfurt
162 am Main (Figure 3). In the study period we observed that the SARS-CoV-2 loads

163 ranged between 1.29×10^{12} copies/d on the 06.07.2020 as lowest and 1.63×10^{15}
164 copies/d on the 21.04.2020 as highest. In June and July, the incidences were less than
165 ten COVID-cases per 100.000 persons per week and the load ranged between
166 1.29×10^{12} and 1.91×10^{13} copies/d. The comparison with the COVID-19 cases
167 revealed that the increase in the SARS-CoV-2 load clearly preceded the reported
168 cases with the first step-increase in the middle of July 2020.

169

170 **Multiple WWTPs in the same metropolitan area**

171 The Frankfurt metropolitan area has two main WWTPs, each receiving wastewater
172 from different parts of the city and some neighboring communities. We monitored the
173 influent of both the WWTPs to determine whether there is a significant difference in the
174 viral load in the sewage or its dynamic. After the first peak period of reported positive
175 cases during March and April (Figure 1), the daily load of SARS-CoV-2 to the WWTP
176 Niederrad indicated a slow increase of SARS-CoV-2 over time, with two distinct peaks
177 on the 13th of July (i.e. 6.16×10^{14} copies/day) and the 17th of August (i.e. 1.36×10^{15}
178 copies/day) (Figure 4). The increase in load in August is in line with the increase of
179 COVID-19 cases in the studied area. However, the daily load of SARS-CoV-2 in the
180 influent of the WWTP Sindlingen was lower than the one in the influent of the WWTP
181 Niederrad, remaining very similar until the middle of August with values between 1.20
182 $\times 10^{11}$ copies/day and 3.17×10^{12} copies/day. The values increased by a factor of 10 in
183 August to a maximum value of 3.59×10^{13} copies/day when the COVID-19 cases also
184 increased (Figure 4). The results of the measurements in the influent to the WWTP
185 Sindlingen also revealed a drop in virus load after the peak value of 3.59×10^{13}
186 copies/day on the 13th of August 2020. We detected a certain SARS-CoV-2 virus load
187 in all the studied samples during this 2-months period for both WWTP influents, with

188 the highest load in the middle of August. The highest detected load also coincided with
189 the end of the summer vacation season in the State of Hesse.

190 Additionally, to the reported loads, the concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in the influents
191 to the WWTPs are provided in the Supplementary Material in Figures S.2 and S.3. The
192 concentration of SARS-CoV-2 ranged from 2.0×10^3 copies/L to 3.0×10^6 copies/L in
193 the influent of the WWTP Niederrad and 3.0×10^3 copies/L to 3.0×10^5 copies/L in the
194 influent of the WWTP Sindlingen. The concentrations showed very similar trends in
195 comparison the loads. Even though, load based data is always preferred when dealing
196 with wastewater, for SARS-CoV-2 the measured concentrations were able to already
197 provide good approximations of the relative trends given that enough data points are
198 available and no comparison with other samples is required.

199 The WWTP Niederrad also receives sewage from Griesheim, a part of the Frankfurt
200 metropolitan area, through a separate canal where sampling was possible. Therefore,
201 to generate more localized information, we separately monitored sewage from
202 Griesheim as well. Interestingly, we did not detect any SARS-CoV-2 in a few of the
203 samples from Griesheim during the study period. From the 14 sampling days, six
204 samples showed results of SARS-CoV-2 below the limit of detection (LOD), especially
205 at the beginning of the study in June and July 2020, which corresponds well with the
206 low number of COVID-19 cases reported during this time. Like other sampling points,
207 a moderate increase of virus load in the wastewater from Griesheim was observed,
208 with a specific peak in August when the load was as high as 6.48×10^{13} copies/day
209 (see Figure 5).

210 Our results exhibit the epidemiological patterns in the Frankfurt metropolitan area,
211 where WBE indicated an increase of COVID-19 cases through an increase in the virus
212 load to the WWTPs two weeks earlier than the case reports. This result underlines that
213 when cases resurged in August, our WBE analysis could have foreshadowed the

214 increase in positive cases by 10 to 14 days. Similar observations have been reported
215 in other studies ^{10,13,14}, showing temporal alignment between the COVID-19 cases and
216 the measured concentrations of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in wastewater. Previous
217 studies of WBE SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in Europe focused on a random sampling
218 of different WWTPs, but similar long-term studies of WBE of SARS-CoV-2 in Europe
219 indicated similar virus concentrations in the wastewater ^{10,13}. There is only one known
220 study conducted for German WWTPs ¹⁵. In this study, the authors measured the
221 SARS-CoV-2 concentration in nine WWTPs in western Germany and reported a load
222 of 1×10^{11} to 1×10^{13} SARS-CoV-2 copies/day in each of these WWTPs. However,
223 this study reports only one time-point sample.

224 It is important to note that previous studies vary not only in the sample volume, but
225 also in the protocol of concentration of the virus and as well as the chosen target genes
226 for analysis, which also comprises the use of different primer sets. For this reason, a
227 comparison of SARS-CoV-2 virus loads and concentrations from other WWTPs with
228 the ones reported in this study is not recommended, and preferably, the focus should
229 lie on evaluating the trend of the virus load over time as the more significant and striking
230 information.

231 Due to the rapid development of the pandemic and the need for testing, several
232 companies have designed qRT-PCR assays for the detection of SARS-CoV-2, but the
233 performance of these assays may vary, esp. since they are designed for medical
234 diagnostics and not for the use with environmental samples such as wastewaters ^{16,17}.
235 The results for the different target genes used in this study underlines (Supplementary
236 Figure) the necessity to analyze more than one target gene for better confidence and
237 reliable results. Other studies have also reported variation in the results due to choose
238 target genes and primers ^{10,12,15}.

239 Previously, studies have reported that wastewater with higher density of particles
240 generally yielded lower virus loads, especially with focus on enveloped viruses as they
241 have greater adsorption capabilities to the solid fraction in the wastewater ^{18,19}.
242 Therefore, it is important to estimate the viral recovery efficiency, as also suggested in
243 other studies ^{17,20}. In our work, wastewater samples were spiked with MS2 phages as
244 a positive control and the recovery efficiency varied between 12 to 89% without
245 significant differences between the recovery efficiency across the different sampling
246 points. Lu et al. (2020) investigated various methods for concentration of the viral RNA
247 in relation to the recovery efficiency. In general, Enterobacteria phages T3 and MS2
248 demonstrated higher mean recoveries compared to murine hepatitis viruses, spiked
249 porcine epidemic diarrhea viruses and mengoviruses ²¹. The recovery rates reported
250 in the literature varied between 0-21.4 % ²² as lowest for SARS-CoV-1 and 85.5 ± 24.5
251 for Enterobacteria phages MS2 ¹⁹.
252 Our study showed, that WBE with the detection of SARS-CoV-2 is a promising method
253 for monitoring local developments. However, there is still the need for more long-term
254 studies to understand and improve the sensitive steps of the analytical methods and
255 gain more knowledge about the reliability of the trends in wastewater samples. The
256 investigated samples in this study included almost exclusively dry weather samples,
257 as the summer month July and August 2020 in Germany were hot and dry without
258 heavy rain events. In future studies, it is thus also necessary to further consider the
259 impact of sewer retention times, stormwater runoff events and the influence of wash-
260 out on SARS-CoV-2 virus loads.

261

262 **Acknowledgment**

263 This work was funded by the Hessian Ministry of Economics, Energy, Transport and
264 Housing within the framework of the IWB-EFRE program for knowledge and

265 technology transfer. We would also like to thank the employees of the
266 Stadtentwässerung Frankfurt (SEF) for their support with sample collection.

267

268

269 References

- 270 (1) WHO. Naming the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) and the Virus That Causes It.
271 2020. URL [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it)
272 [2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-\(covid-2019\)-and-the-virus-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it)
273 [that-causes-it](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it) **2020**.
- 274 (2) Kataki, S.; Chatterjee, S.; Vairale, M. G.; Sharma, S.; Dwivedi, S. K. Concerns and
275 Strategies for Wastewater Treatment during COVID-19 Pandemic to Stop Plausible
276 Transmission. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* **2021**, *164*, 105156.
277 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.105156>.
- 278 (3) Chen, Y.; Chen, L.; Deng, Q.; Zhang, G.; Wu, K.; Ni, L.; Yang, Y.; Liu, B.; Wang, W.;
279 Wei, C.; Yang, J.; Ye, G.; Cheng, Z. The Presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the Feces
280 of COVID-19 Patients. *J Med Virol* **2020**, *92* (7), 833–840.
281 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25825>.
- 282 (4) Ren, J.; Li, D.; Wang, C.; Wu, J.; Wang, Y.; Sun, Y.; Zhang, Q.; Wang, Y.; Chang, X.
283 Positive RT-PCR in Urine from an Asymptomatic Patient with Novel Coronavirus
284 2019 Infection: A Case Report. *Infectious Diseases* **2020**, *52* (8), 571–574.
285 <https://doi.org/10.1080/23744235.2020.1766105>.
- 286 (5) Foladori, P.; Cutrupi, F.; Segata, N.; Manara, S.; Pinto, F.; Malpei, F.; Bruni, L.; La
287 Rosa, G. SARS-CoV-2 from Faeces to Wastewater Treatment: What Do We Know? A
288 Review. *Science of the Total Environment* **2020**, 140444.
- 289 (6) Hovi, T.; Shulman, L. M.; Van Der Avoort, H.; Deshpande, J.; Roivainen, M.; De
290 Gourville, E. M. Role of Environmental Poliovirus Surveillance in Global Polio
291 Eradication and Beyond. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **2012**, *140* (1), 1–13.
292 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095026881000316X>.
- 293 (7) Hellmér, M.; Paxéus, N.; Magnius, L.; Enache, L.; Arnholm, B.; Johansson, A.;
294 Bergström, T.; Norder, H. Detection of Pathogenic Viruses in Sewage Provided Early
295 Warnings of Hepatitis A Virus and Norovirus Outbreaks. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*
296 **2014**, *80* (21), 6771–6781. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01981-14>.
- 297 (8) Daughton, C. G. Wastewater Surveillance for Population-Wide Covid-19: The Present
298 and Future. *Science of The Total Environment* **2020**, *736*, 139631.
299 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139631>.
- 300 (9) Hata, A.; Honda, R. Potential Sensitivity of Wastewater Monitoring for SARS-CoV-2:
301 Comparison with Norovirus Cases. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2020**, *54* (11), 6451–6452.
302 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c02271>.
- 303 (10) Medema, G.; Heijnen, L.; Elsinga, G.; Italiaander, R.; Brouwer, A. Presence of SARS-
304 Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence
305 in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.*
306 **2020**, *7* (7), 511–516. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357>.
- 307 (11) Sherchan, S. P.; Shahin, S.; Ward, L. M.; Tandukar, S.; Aw, T. G.; Schmitz, B.;
308 Ahmed, W.; Kitajima, M. First Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater in
309 North America: A Study in Louisiana, USA. *Science of The Total Environment* **2020**,
310 *743*, 140621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140621>.
- 311 (12) Ahmed, W.; Angel, N.; Edson, J.; Bibby, K.; Bivins, A.; O'Brien, J. W.; Choi, P. M.;
312 Kitajima, M.; Simpson, S. L.; Li, J.; Tschärke, B.; Verhagen, R.; Smith, W. J. M.;
313 Zaugg, J.; Dierens, L.; Hugenholtz, P.; Thomas, K. V.; Mueller, J. F. First Confirmed
314 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Untreated Wastewater in Australia: A Proof of Concept
315 for the Wastewater Surveillance of COVID-19 in the Community. *Science of The Total*
316 *Environment* **2020**, *728*, 138764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764>.
- 317 (13) La Rosa, G.; Iaconelli, M.; Mancini, P.; Bonanno Ferraro, G.; Veneri, C.; Bonadonna,
318 L.; Lucentini, L.; Suffredini, E. First Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Untreated

- 319 Wastewaters in Italy. *Science of The Total Environment* **2020**, 736, 139652.
320 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139652>.
- 321 (14) Nemudryi, A.; Nemudraia, A.; Surya, K.; Wiegand, T.; Buyukyoruk, M.; Wilkinson,
322 R.; Wiedenheft, B. *Temporal Detection and Phylogenetic Assessment of SARS-CoV-2*
323 *in Municipal Wastewater*; preprint; *Epidemiology*, 2020.
324 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.15.20066746>.
- 325 (15) Westhaus, S.; Weber, F.-A.; Schiwy, S.; Linnemann, V.; Brinkmann, M.; Widera, M.;
326 Greve, C.; Janke, A.; Hollert, H.; Wintgens, T. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Raw and
327 Treated Wastewater in Germany–Suitability for COVID-19 Surveillance and Potential
328 Transmission Risks. *Science of The Total Environment* **2020**, 141750.
- 329 (16) Farkas, K.; Hillary, L. S.; Malham, S. K.; McDonald, J. E.; Jones, D. L. Wastewater
330 and Public Health: The Potential of Wastewater Surveillance for Monitoring COVID-
331 19. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health* **2020**, 17, 14–20.
332 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.06.001>.
- 333 (17) Kitajima, M.; Ahmed, W.; Bibby, K.; Carducci, A.; Gerba, C. P.; Hamilton, K. A.;
334 Haramoto, E.; Rose, J. B. SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater: State of the Knowledge and
335 Research Needs. *Science of The Total Environment* **2020**, 739, 139076.
336 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076>.
- 337 (18) Nordgren, J.; Matussek, A.; Mattsson, A.; Svensson, L.; Lindgren, P.-E. Prevalence of
338 Norovirus and Factors Influencing Virus Concentrations during One Year in a Full-
339 Scale Wastewater Treatment Plant. *Water Research* **2009**, 43 (4), 1117–1125.
340 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2008.11.053>.
- 341 (19) Ye, Y.; Ellenberg, R. M.; Graham, K. E.; Wigginton, K. R. Survivability, Partitioning,
342 and Recovery of Enveloped Viruses in Untreated Municipal Wastewater. *Environ. Sci.*
343 *Technol.* **2016**, 50 (10), 5077–5085. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b00876>.
- 344 (20) Thompson, J. R.; Nancharaiyah, Y. V.; Gu, X.; Lee, W. L.; Rajal, V. B.; Haines, M. B.;
345 Girones, R.; Ng, L. C.; Alm, E. J.; Wuertz, S. Making Waves: Wastewater Surveillance
346 of SARS-CoV-2 for Population-Based Health Management. *Water Research* **2020**,
347 184, 116181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116181>.
- 348 (21) Lu, D.; Huang, Z.; Luo, J.; Zhang, X.; Sha, S. Primary Concentration – The Critical
349 Step in Implementing the Wastewater Based Epidemiology for the COVID-19
350 Pandemic: A Mini-Review. *Science of The Total Environment* **2020**, 747, 141245.
351 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141245>.
- 352 (22) Wang, X.-W.; Li, J.-S.; Guo, T.-K.; Zhen, B.; Kong, Q.-X.; Yi, B.; Li, Z.; Song, N.;
353 Jin, M.; Xiao, W.-J. Concentration and Detection of SARS Coronavirus in Sewage
354 from Xiao Tang Shan Hospital and the 309th Hospital. *Journal of virological methods*
355 **2005**, 128 (1–2), 156–161.
356

357

358


359

360 **Tables and Figures**

361
362 Table 1: Overview of the studied WWTPs in the city of Frankfurt am Main with the 85
363 % percentile influent volume per day for the period 15.06. – 31.08.2020 and population
364 equivalents (PE).


Location	PE	85 % percentile influent volume [m ³ /d]
Frankfurt am Main, Niederrad/Griesheim	1.350.000	121.875 / 152.030
Frankfurt am Main, Sindlingen	470.000	64.085

365
366
367




368
369 Figure 1: Graphical representation of the epidemiological data of COVID-19 cases in
370 Germany (black line) and the city of Frankfurt am Main (blue line). The grey area
371 indicates the time of the summer school vacation in the State of Hesse.

372
373



374
 375 Figure 2: A: Comparison of the results from April and August 2020, bars represent a
 376 three week average around the maximum number of cases per 100.000 persons (P),
 377 symbols refer to the respective SARS-CoV-2 loads; B: Correlation between the total
 378 load of SARS-CoV-2 gene copies (sum of the loads to both WWTPs) and incidences
 379 in Frankfurt am Main (local)


380
 381



382
 383 Figure 3: SARS-CoV-2 load as sum of the two WWTP influents as analyzed with RT-
 384 qPCR in comparison to the positive tested COVID-19 cases in the city of Frankfurt am
 385 Main.

386

387




388

389 Figure 4: SARS-CoV-2 loads analyzed with RT-qPCR in the influent of the two WWTP,
390 i.e. Niederrad and Sindlingen, and the count of registered COVID-19 cases in the city
391 of Frankfurt (top).

392

393

394



395

396 Figure 5: Load of SARS-CoV-2 target genes observed at the sampling point Griesheim

397 and the WWTP Niederrad, respective concentrations of these two sampling points are

398 provided in the supplementary information in Figures S.2 and S.4.

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412 **Supplementary Information**

413

414

415 **Methods**

416 **qPCR analysis**

417 We performed qPCR analysis using the Taq Path COVID-19 RT-PCR Kit (Thermo
418 Fisher Scientific) which includes¹: (1) TaqPath™ COVID-19 Assay Multiplex, which
419 contain three primer/probe sets specific to different SARS-CoV-2 genomic regions (i.e.
420 N gene, S gene and Orf1ab gene) and primers/probes for bacteriophage MS2. (2) MS2
421 Phage Control – RNA control, having a concentration of 10⁶ copies per µl, to verify the
422 efficacy of the RNA extraction and the absence of inhibitors in the PCR reaction. (3)
423 TaqPath™ COVID-19 Control – Positive SARS-COV2 RNA control that contains
424 targets specific to the SARS-CoV-2 genomic regions targeted by the assays. The
425 manufacturer (Thermo Fisher Scientific) has not publicly released the primers/probe
426 sets sequences, therefore, we do not have access to the information related the
427 primers/probe sets sequences and the length of the PCR products.

428 *Table 2: Information about dyes corresponding to each target gene.*

Gene	Dye	Quencher
ORF1ab	FAM	QSY
N Protein	VIC	QSY
S Protein	ABY	QSY
MS2 (Internal Positive Control)	JUN	QSY

429

430 In case of the positive control, we included for each qPCR run triplicates of the four
431 different concentration (i.e. 1x10¹, 2x10¹, 2x10², 2x10³ copies per reaction) of the
432 TaqPath™ COVID-19 positive control. For MS2 phage positive control in each qPCR
433 run triplicates of the three different concentration (i.e. 2x10², 2x10³, 2x10⁴ copies per
434 reaction) were also included. For SARS-Cov-2 positive control and MS2 phage positive

435 control, each reaction contained 12.5 μ L TaqPath™ 1-Step Multiplex Master Mix (4X),
436 2.5 μ L COVID-19 Real Time PCR Assay Multiplex, 33 μ L nuclease free water, and 2
437 μ L of positive control. Triplicate of negative controls were also included in each run,
438 each reaction contained 12.5 μ L TaqPath™ 1-Step Multiplex Master Mix (4X), 2.5 μ L
439 COVID-19 Real Time PCR Assay Multiplex, and 35 μ L nuclease free water.
440 Ct values of positive control dilutions were plotted against known concentration of the
441 SARS-CoV-2 positive control and MS2 phage positive control, to generate standard
442 curves. Start baseline value was set at 5 and Threshold cycle (Ct) values were
443 determined manually while adjusting the threshold to be above any background signal
444 and within exponential phase of the fluorescence curves. Primer efficiencies were
445 $95.32 \pm 9.09\%$ for $91.09 \pm 13.84\%$ for S, $86.75 \pm 1.8\%$ for Orf1ab, and $95.92 \pm 17.16\%$
446 for MS2 phage (n = 8 runs, mean \pm sd).

447 *Table 3: PCR protocol*

Step		Temperature	Duration
Hold-Stage		25 °C	2 min
Hold-Stage		53 °C	10 min
		95 °C	2 min
PCR-Stage	45 cycles	95 °C	15 s
		60 °C	1 min

448

449

450

451 **Results**

452 **Recovery efficiency of the MS2 phages results**

453 The recovery efficiency of the concentration and extraction procedure performed in
454 triplicates, was determined by using the non-enveloped *Enterobacteria* MS2 phage. It


455 showed an average recovery in the range of 11.53 - 89.11 %, with a median value of
456 42.40%.

457

458 **Impact of chosen target genes**

459 S.figure 1 shows that different target genes performed differently, especially until the
460 middle of July, when less COVID-19 positive cases were reported. Moreover, variation
461 in the performance of target genes differed with different samples. For example, in
462 initial Niederrad samples, we detected SARS-CoV-2 ORF1ab gene copies only.
463 Whereas, for Sindlingen samples ORF1ab and S gene copies were detected. Based
464 on the results, we recommend targeting multiple genes for SARS-CoV-2 monitoring in
465 wastewater.


466



467 *S.figure 1: Heatmap showing the SARS-CoV-2 concentration measured for each sample from each sampling point based on*
468 *three different target genes (S gene, ORF1ab gene, and N gene).NA: Not detected.*
469


470

471 **Concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in the untreated wastewaters**



472

473 *S*.figure 2: Concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 in the influent of the WWTP Niederrad as determined by real-time qPCR




474

475 *S*.figure 3: Concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in influent of the WWTP Sindlingen as determined by real-time qPCR

476

477



478

479 *S*figure 4: Concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in the wastewater at sampling point Griesheim as determined by real-time qPCR

480

481 References

482 (1) *TaqPath™ COVID-19 CE-IVD RT-PCR Kit Instruction for Use*; MAN0019215;
483 ThermoFisher Scientific.

484

485