medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in different freshwaters of urban settings determined by RT-qPCR: implications for water safety

Jurgen Mahlknecht[a,*], Diego Alonso-Padilla[a], Edrick Ramos[a], Luisa Ma. Reyes[b], Mario Moises Álvaro[b,*]

[a]Centro de Estudios del Agua para América Latina y el Caribe, Escuela de Ingeniería y Ciencias, Tecnologico de Monterrey, Monterrey, Nuevo Leon CP, 64849, Mexico

[b]Centro de Biotecnología-FEMSA, Escuela de Ingeniería y Ciencias, Tecnologico de Monterrey, Monterrey, Nuevo Leon CP, 64849, Mexico

Abstract

This is the first study focused on the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in different freshwater environments of an urban setting. Groundwater and surface water reservoirs for drinking water as well as water from receiving rivers of Monterrey Metropolitan Area were sampled repeatedly during a peak phase between October 2020 and January 2021, and the virus RNA was measured by quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction. Forty-four percent of groundwater samples demonstrated detectable virus loads between 2.9 and 5.6 copies/ml. A significant correlation with sucralose concentration in groundwater reaffirmed the hypothesis of leaching and infiltration of effluents from surface and/or failing sewage pipes, and emphases the importance of water disinfection. Thirteen percent of surface water dam samples tested positive, with values varying between 3.3 and 3.8 copies/ml. Finally, 21% of river samples marked positive for viral RNA, with concentrations ranging from 0.3 to 7.0 copies/ml. Raw wastewater samples taken in the same period show viral loads of up to 3535 copies/ml, demonstrating a dilution effect and/or efficiency of wastewater facilities. Variations of viral loads over time and at sub-metropolitan level in groundwater and surface water in general reflects the reported variation of infections for Monterrey.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, freshwater, RT-qPCR, sucralose, Escherichia coli, Mexico

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Corresponding authors: Jurgen Mahlknecht (jurgen@tec.mx). Mario M. Álvarez (mario.alvarez@tec.mx)

1. Introduction

Since the outbreak of the COVID-19 disease, various routes of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 have been verified, and others hypothesized. The current knowledge is that the main transmission between people occurs though respiratory droplets (diameter >5-10 µm) produced by infected individuals when coughing or sneezing (Chan, Yuan et al. 2020; Li et al. 2020; WHO, 2020b). Regarding the presence and persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater, there is sufficient evidence that indicates that wastewaters may contain both RNA fragments and viable particles of SARS-CoV-2 (Langone et al., 2020; Ihsanullah et al., 2021). A study in stool samples suggests that the SARS-CoV-2 may replicate for 11 days in the gastrointestinal tract of patients even after samples from the respiratory tract are becoming negative (Wu et al. 2020a). According to another experiment, SARS-CoV-2 remained viable for 2 to 6 h in adult's feces and up to 2 days in children's feces (Liu 2020b) Several studies have reported the new coronavirus in raw wastewater in Netherlands (Medema et al., 2020), Italy (La Rosa et al., 2020a; Rimoldi et al., 2020); USA (Wu et al., 2020b); France (Wurtzer et al., 2020); Australia (Ahmed et al., 2020a); Spain (Randazzo et al., 2020). Wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) with tertiary disinfection have been found negative for SARS-CoV-2 (Rimoldi et al., 2020), while effluents from secondary treatments has been found positive (Randazzo et al., 2020; Rimoldi et al., 2020). The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in sewage sludge was reported in a 10-week monitoring study in New Haven, Connecticut, USA (Peccia et al., 2020). These reports show the utility of viral RNA monitoring in municipal wastewater for SARS-CoV-2 infection surveillance at a population-wide level.

Although several authors have hypothesized potential routes in water environments, so far there exists little evidence of the presence of SARS-CoV-2 virus in freshwaters (La Rosa et al. 2020b; Ihsanullah et al. (2021). Water safety starts with the protection of water resources in the catchment, therefore it is mandatory to prevent surface and groundwaters from coming

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

into contact with fecal material. It is expected that groundwater benefits from the pathogens removal due to soil filtration, adsorption on sediment grains and progressive inactivation, and viruses in surface waters are exposed to several potentially inactivating stressors, including sunlight, oxidants, and predation by microorganisms (Langone et al., 2021). Rimoldi et al. (2020) detected viral RNA in three receiving rivers in the Milan area indicating the partial efficiency of the sewage system of the metropolitan area. Haramoto et al. (2020) collected three river samples between March and May 2020 in Japan and reported that none tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA. Guerrero-Latorre et al. (2021) reported virus loads during a peak of the outbreak from three different sites of a river receiving untreated sewage from Quito, Ecuador. To our knowledge, so far there is no evidence of the presence of the virus in surface water reservoirs and aquifers reported.

Considering the rigorous biosafety requirements necessary for working with infectious coronavirus, surrogate markers are useful for assessing method performance and for quality assurance and control during monitoring campaigns (Casanova et al., 2009; Ye et al., 2016; Ahmed et al., 2020b). Similarly, markers of human input in sewer systems could be used as an alternative to trace the presence of SARS-CoV-2 virus. Sucralose is one of the most popular artificial sweeteners and serves as tracer of human wastewater (Kokotou et al., 2012; Voss et al., 2019), and its concentration is correlated with people connected to the sewage system. It is stable at a broad pH range, is heat stable, non-volatile, highly polar and chiral. It is also strongly recalcitrant, only degrading under strongly oxidizing conditions, and is not metabolized by animals or microbes (Soh et al. 2011).

In the present study we evaluated the presence of genetic material from SARS-CoV-2 RNA in different freshwater environments of the Monterrey Metropolitan Area (5.3 million inhabitants) in Northern Mexico. The aim of the study was to perform a survey of viral dispersion and potential implications in the aquatic environment during a peak phase of the epidemic. To that end, we collected groundwater, river water and water from drinking water reservoirs repeatedly between October 2020 and January 2021, and measured SARS-CoV-2 RNA by quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (qRT–PCR). Regarding groundwater, we also measured the concentration of artificial sweetener sucralose.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

2. Material and Methods

2.1 Study area

The Monterrey Metropolitan Area (MMA) is the second important city in Mexico in terms of population and economy (INEGI, 2021). It comprises 12 municipalities with a total population of approximately 5.3 million inhabitants. The climate is semi-arid with a mean annual temperature and rainfall of 22.3 °C and 622 mm, respectively, with a dry (November-April) and rain season (May-October). Maximum rainfall values occur at mountain flanks while minimum occur at the valley and lower elevations. The urban area is bordered at west and south by mountain ranges varying in composition from clastic marine to carbonate sedimentary rocks reaching elevations up to 2100 m above sea level (masl) (**Fig. 1**). These mountain ranges, the Sierra Madre Oriental, represents a Mesozoic sedimentary belt that expose sequences of limestones, lutites, with minor sandstones of Late Jurassic to late Cretaceous periods (Santiago Carrasco et al., 2008).



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1: (a) Location of study area, (b) regional view showing surface water reservoirs with sampling points, (c) urban area with main features and groundwater/river sampling points.

The MMA sits in a valley at 580 masl on Quaternary alluvial deposits eroded from the surrounding mountain ranges. The valley is mostly composed of fluvial and alluvial sedimentary deposits as terraces that occurred during accumulation-erosion cycles on the early Quaternary (Martinez and Werner, 1997). Most of these recent deposits can be found as riverbeds in La Silla, Santa Catarina and Pesquería rivers, which flow eastward through the city towards the Gulf Coastal Plain.

Water for MMA is supplied from surface water (58%) and groundwater (42%) reservoirs (SADM, 2021). Surface water is extracted from El Cuchillo dam (4.69 m^3/s), Cerro Prieto dam (2.83 m^3/s), and La Boca dam (0.45 m^3/s). Water from El Cuchillo dam and Cerro Prieto dam is conveyed 108 km and 133 km to MMA, respectively, while La Boca dam connects to the Cerro Prieto aqueduct (**Fig. 1b**). Raw water from all three dams is purified in the San Roque and La Boca treatment plants before distribution in the city through two water supply pipelines with over 70 km length each (**Fig. 1c**).

Groundwater is extracted from several aquifer units and wellfields and disinfected locally before introducing into the supply network (Torres-Martinez et al. 2020) (**Fig 1a**): Buenos Aires (BA) well field (2.11 m^3/s) located in a side valley close to the city consists of La Huasteca horizontal filtrating gallery and 23 deep wells with water table depths between 20 and 120 m below ground, extracting water from Early Cretaceous limestone formations; the Santiago (SA) Groundwater System (1.27 m^3/s) consists of La Estanzuela spring and three horizontal filtrating gallery´s: San Francisco, Cola de Caballo I and II; the Monterrey Metropolitan Zone (ZM) aquifer (1.08 m^3/s) includes wells throughout the metropolitan area, providing water from an unconfined aquifer which consists of altered lutites, conglomerates, gravel, sand and clay, with an average depth to groundwater of 20 m; finally the Mina well field (1.20 m^3/s) located about 35 km northwest from MMA.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Used water is treated to over 90% by public wastewater facilities that includes primary and secondary stages in the treatment process. The most important wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) are Dulces Nombres (7.5 m3/s), Norte (4.0 m3/s), Noreste (1.9 m3/s) and Cadereyta (0.25 m3/s) (**Fig 1c**). All the mentioned WWTPs discharge the treated water directly or indirectly to Pesquería river, with the exception of Cadereyta WWTP that discharges to the Santa Catarina river. Both rivers are tributaries of San Juan river which in turn flows into the Rio Bravo/Rio Grande. Pesquería and Santa Catarina rivers had a discharge decreasing from 5.5 to 4.4 m3/s at Pesquería hydrometric station, and from 5.6 to 2.5 m3/s at Cadereyta hydrometric station between October 2020 and December 2020, respectively (SMN, 2021).

2.2 Field methods

Groundwater and surface water grab samples were collected in different sites and occasions between October 2020 and January 2021. For groundwater, 42 sites corresponding to production wells of supplying aquifer units of Monterrey (BA well field, ST system and ZM aquifer) were sampled initially between October 29 and November 3, 2020. Of these, 37 wells were public drinking water supply wells and five wells were for industrial purposes. A subset of wells (n=10) was re-sampled two more times in cycles of approximately one month to observe changes over time.

Similarly, samples were taken from three sites of three surface water reservoirs supplying Monterrey (El Cuchillo, Cerro Prieto and La Boca) in October 22-23, 2020, and repeated two more times. Finally, a total of 12 river water grab samples were taken along the three urban rivers Pesquería, Santa Catarina and La Silla in December 10-11,2020, and repeated in January 5-6, 2021. The river sites were selected strategically upstream and downstream of WWTPs discharges to the rivers. For reference, 24-h composite samples of influent of a Dulces Nombres WWTP were taken weekly during the same period.

All samples were collected in sterile 125 ml-HDPE bottles and stored at 4 °C and analyzed within 48 hours. It is known that SARS-CoV-2 is highly stable at 4 °C (Chin et al.; 2020). Groundwater included samples for analysis of sucralose, using 125 ml-HDPE bottles.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

2.3 Laboratory methods

2.3.1 RNA and DNA Extraction – QIAamp® Viral RNA Mini

We followed standard procedures to extract and purify nucleic acids from the water samples. Briefly, after viral thermal inactivation (95 °C; 5 minutes), a volume of 500 µl of the water sample were centrifuged for 10 minutes at 1500 G. Then, a volume of 140 µl of the supernatant was added to a mix containing 0.56 µL of Buffer AVL solution (Qiagen, USA) and 5.6 µL of carrier RNA-AVE solution (Qiagen, USA) in a 1.5 mL microcentrifuge tube. This mix was vortexed for 15 seconds and incubated at room temperature (15–25°C) for 10 min and briefly centrifuged to remove drops from the interior surface of the lid. A volume of 560 µl ethanol (96–100%) was added to the sample, and mixed by pulse-vortexing for 15 s.

After mixing, the tube was briefly centrifuged to remove drops from interior surface of the lid. Then, this solution (~630 µL) was filtered through a QIAamp Mini column (Qiagen, USA) to retain the nucleic acids originally present in the sample. The retained was repeatedly washed with different buffer solutions to elute contaminants and purify the nucleic acids. To this aim, the solution was loaded into the column contained in a 2 mL collection tube, the cap of the tube was closed, and the tube with the column was centrifuged at 6000 x g (8000 rpm) for 1 min.

After centrifugation, the QIAamp Mini column was placed into a clean 2 ml collection tube, and the filtrate was discarded. In a first raising step, 500 µL of 96% ethanol were loaded into the column contained in the 2 mL collection tube, the cap of the tube was closed, and the tube with the column was centrifuged at 6000 x g (8000 rpm) for 1 min. Following these two centrifugation stages, 500 µl of Buffer AW1 (Qiagen, USA) were added into the QIAamp Mini column, the cap of the container tube was closed, and the tube with the column was centrifuged at 6000 x g (8000 rpm) for 1 min. As before, the QIAamp Mini column was placed into a clean 2 ml collection tube, and the filtrate was discarded. In a fourth centrifugation cycle, the QIAamp Mini column was added with 500 µl Buffer AW2 (Qiagen, USA), the cap of the container tube was closed, and the tube with the column was centrifuged at high speed (20,000 x g; 14,000 rpm) for 3 min.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Afterwards, the QIAamp Mini column was placed in a clean 1.5 ml microcentrifuge tube and the filtrate was discarded. In a fifth centrifugation cycle, the QIAamp Mini column was added with 60 µl Buffer AVE (Qiagen, USA) equilibrated to room temperature, the cap of the container tube was closed, and the tube with the column was centrifuged at high speed (6,000 x g; 8,000 rpm) for 1 min.

For DNA extraction, 500 µl of water sample were centrifuged for 5 minutes at 5000 G; 400 µl of the centrifuge supernatant were discarded. The remaining 100 µl were added with 20 µl of proteinase K solution and 80 µl of Buffer ATL (Qiagen, USA), vortexed, and incubated at 56°C for at least 1 hour. The rest of the extraction protocol is analogous to that previously described.

2.3.2 RNA and DNA amplification

We amplified RNA segments of SARS-CoV-2 using two sets of primers (commonly referred as N1 and N2) in each amplification reaction. Both of these primers directed to sequences that encode the N protein of SARS-CoV-2. These primer sets have been recommended and extensively used for the diagnostic of COVID-19 in human samples (Gonzalez-Gonzalez et al., 2020; Nalia et al., 2020) and wastewaters (Medema et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020; Randazzo et al., 2020; Haramoto et al., 2020; Scherchan et al., 2020; Peccia et al., 2020).

Similarly, we used two sets of primers to amplify the LAC and LAM regions of the genome of *Escherichia coli* in the same reaction. *E. coli* is used as biological indicator of the presence of fecal content in water (Bej et al. 1990; Mo et al., 2002; Reza et al. 2014). The sequences of both the forward and reverse primers used are shown in **Table S1**.

The quantitative amplification was conducted in a quantitative PCR thermal cycle (Rotor gene Q 5plex, Qiagen, Germany). For the amplification of RNA of SARS-CoV-2 sequences, the amplification mix (final volume of 20 µL) consisted in 10 µL of 2X QuantiNova Syber Green RT-Master Mix, 0.2 µL of QN SYBR Green RT-Mix, 1µL of 10x primer mix (0.5 µM final concentration), and 8.8 µL of RNA extract. For the amplification of DNA sequences of *E. coli*, the amplification mix (final volume of 20 µL) consisted in 10 µL of 2X QuantiNova Syber Green RT-Master Mix, 1µL of 10x primer mix (0.5 µM final concentration), and 9.0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

µL of DNA extract. The amplification cycle consisted in 10 minutes of reverse transcription at 50 °C and 2 minutes of amplification activation at 95 C, followed by 40 iterative cycles of denaturation for 5 seconds at 95 °C and combined annealing and extension for 10 s at 60 °C.

A calibration curve was built to establish the conversion between CT values and equivalent gene copies per milliliter (GC/ml). For this purpose, we used commercial synthetic genetic material that contained the complete N gene from SARS-CoV-2 (Integrated DNA Technologies, IA, USA). Samples containing different concentrations of synthetic nucleic acids of SARS-CoV-2 (in the range of 10 to 100,000 copies mL^{-1}) were prepared by successive dilutions from stocks. This plasmid has been used before as a positive control in amplification assays of SARS-CoV-2 genetic material (González-Gonzalez et al., 2021).

2.3.3 Sucralose quantification

Sucralose is used as artificial sweetener and useful tracer for evidencing the presence of human wastewater in groundwater (Kokotou et al., 2012; Voss et al., 2019). Sucralose was determined using high performance liquid chromatography and mass spectrometric detection (HPLC-MS/MS) after solid-phase extraction (SOE). Isotope-labelled internal standards and an external calibration in tap water were used for quantification. Details of the analytical method are given in the **Table S2**. The analysis was performed at DVGW-Technologiezentrum Wasser, Karlsruhe, Germany.

2.4 Monitoring of COVID-19 Cases in Monterrey Metropolitan Area

To get an indication of the sensitivity of the monitoring of urban water cycle, a proxy for the period prevalence of COVID-19 in the MMA was created using the reported number of COVID-19 cases per day and the normalized cumulative number of reported COVID-19 cases per day for the year 2020. The normalization was performed by dividing the cumulative number of reported cases by the population size.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

3. Results

3.1 Reported cases

The number of reported COVID-19 cases in each of the 12 municipalities and MMA shows that the pandemics evolved at different rates in each of the municipalities as the epidemic spread during 2020 (**Fig. 2a**). The first infection was reported on March 10, and the number of cases remained relatively low until mid-May, when another increase occurred, and from June 10, the infection maintains a constant increase in the MMA, with exception of November, when the number of cases dropped. Santiago and Monterrey municipalities reported the most cases, followed by Santa Catarina, Guadalupe and San Nicolas.

However, it is worth to mention that these numbers are not directly comparable to other countries or regions because the collection method is not necessarily standardized, and probably the sampling efforts are unequal and asynchrony respect to the real infection dates (Sims and Kasprzyk-Hordern, 2020). As can be observed, the freshwater sampling for this report was performed during the second peak of the outbreak of the epidemic: end of October, end of November 2020, mid-December 2020 and beginning January 2021 (**Fig. 2ab**).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: Reported cases for MMA and its 12 municipalities: (a) Reported daily cases of infection; and (b) normalized cumulative cases. Note: Date obtained from CONACyT (2021). The vertical blue shades indicate the sampling periods.

3.2 Groundwater

Two field campaigns were performed for groundwater. Regarding the first campaign, the qRT–PCR concentration threshold (Ct) average values for SARS-CoV-2 ranged from 30.2 to over 40 (**Table 1**). Interestingly, near half of them (19 of 40) were positive, and 38% of the positives were below the value of 33. In this study, a sample was arbitrarily defined "positive"

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

when a Ct value was detected in at least two of three replicates. Two of seven cases in BA well field were detected positive with Ct values of 30.2 and 32.4. Galeria 4 is a well at the entrance to the Huasteca highway, with a high urban development in the area prior to the entrance, while Pozo 39 is in the lower area of the Sierra Madre close to ranches and houses. Five out of eight cases in SA system were reported positive with a Ct value between 32.5 and 36.3. Estanzuela, constructed in 1910 as one of the first groundwater sources for Monterrey water supply system, is in a woodland-rural environment, while Cola de Caballo Tunnels and San Francisco Tunnel represent horizontal galleries in piedmont shrubland. Finally, Margarita is a well located in an environment of urban development. Thirteen out of 26 production wells in ZM aquifer indicate positive Ct's, with values between 30.3 and 34.2. These sites are dispersed in the urbanized MMA. A trend shows a higher proportion of sites affected in the downstream area in the northeastern portion (Apodaca) and no positive sites in the southeastern portion (Contry) of ZM aquifer.

Sucralose was detected in 22 out of 40 samples (55%) (**Table 1**), and its concentrations varied between 0.07 and 2.9 µg/l. In the BA well field, which represents dessert and piedmont shrubland with low population density, none of the samples showed detectable levels. In the SA system, one site (Andares) showed concentrations of sucralose close to the detection limit and one site (Margaritas) one of the highest concentrations. These sites represent residential areas. In the ZM aquifer, 20 out of 25 well sites (80%) had detectable concentrations of sucralose, whose values ranged between 0.1 and 2.7 µg/l. These results are in general consistent with the land use distribution, all except one site with detected sucralose lie in urbanized or industrial plots. In addition, we found a significant correlation between sucralose and Ct values (r2=0.62, n=0.043), but no correlation between Ct values and depth to groundwater.

Those cases which were positive in the first sampling campaign and not close to each other were repeated for a second campaign (**Table 1**). In the second sampling campaign only 3 out of 10 sites tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. This suggests that groundwater was less affected in the second date, and only three sites are consistently positive in both dates, namely California 2, Lincoln 2 and Puentes 1 in the Monterrey municipality. It is notable that the depth-to-water table of these sites was less than 22 m.

Table 1. Summary of the results of determination of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and sucralose for groundwater of Monterrey. Note: The Ct value represents the average of triplicate analysis for each sample (**Table S3 and S4**), 'n.d.' indicates not detected and '-' indicates not measured.

Code	Site	Municipality	Geology	Land use	Groundwater level (m below ground)	Campaign 1 29 Oct - 4 Nov 2020		Campaign 2 26 - 30 Nov 2020
						Ct (cycles)	Sucralose (µg/L)	Ct (cycles)
BA1	Galeria 4	Santa Catarina	Limestone	Urban Area	0.0	30.2	n.d.	n.d.
BA2	Pozo 39	Santa Catarina	Limestone	Desert Shrubland	43.0	32.3	n.d.	n.d.
BA3	Pozo 28	Santa Catarina	Limestone	Desert Shrubland	43.0	n.d.	n.d.	-
BA4	Pozo 1	Santa Catarina	Alluvial Deposits	Piedmont Shrubland	40.7	n.d.	n.d.	-
BA5	Pozo 4	Santa Catarina	Alluvial Deposits	Piedmont Shrubland	43.1	n.d.	n.d.	-
BA6	Pozo 14	Santa Catarina	Alluvial Deposits	Desert Shrubland	75.0	n.d.	n.d.	-
BA7	Pozo 2	Santa Catarina	Alluvial Deposits	Desert Shrubland	0.0	n.d.	n.d.	-
SA1	Estanzuela	Santiago	Shale	Urban Area	0.0	32.5	n.d.	-
SA2	Tunel 1 Cola de Caballo	Santiago	Limestone	Piedmont Shrubland	0.0	32.6	n.d.	-
SA3	Tunel 2 Cola de Caballo	Santiago	Shale	Mixed woodland	0.0	33.9	n.d.	-
SA4	Tunel San Francisco	Santiago	Shale	Piedmont Shrubland	0.0	32.8	n.d.	-
SA5	Andares	Santiago	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	11.8	n.d.	0.07	-
SA6	Condado de Asturias	Santiago	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	12.3	n.d.	n.d.	-
SA7	Pozo Rodriguez	Santiago	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	15.9	n.d.	n.d.	-
SA8	Pozo Margaritas	Santiago	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	11.3	36.3	2.90	-
ZM1	Auditorio San Pedro	San Pedro	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	21.2	30.5	0.54	n.d.
ZM2	Humberto Lobo	San Pedro	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	14.4	n.d.	1.80	-
ZM3	Suchiate II	San Pedro	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	10.9	n.d.	0.51	-
ZM4	Pozo Profundo Monterrey I	Monterrey	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	20.9	30.3	n.d.	-
ZM5	Pozo Profundo Monterrey II	Monterrey	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	20.1	31.2	n.d.	n.d.
ZM6	San Jerónimo II	Monterrey	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	26.1	n.d.	2.70	-
ZM7	Pozo Profundo Monterrey III	Monterrey	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	17.4	n.d.	n.d.	-

ZM8	Pozo Profundo Monterrey VI	Monterrey	Shale	Urban Area	9.8	n.d.	n.d.	-
ZM9	Hospital Civil Norte	Monterrey	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	115.0	n.d.	1.20	-
ZM10	Lincoln II	Monterrey	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	22.2	33.2	0.67	34.0
ZM11	Monterrey V	Guadalupe	Limestone	Urban Area	69.1	n.d.	n.d.	-
ZM12	Metro Rey Oriente	Monterrey	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	6.2	n.d.	0.44	-
ZM13	Metro Rey Poniente	Monterrey	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	7.9	n.d.	0.46	-
ZM14	Macro Plaza II	Monterrey	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	3.9	31.5	0.46	n.d.
ZM15	Plaza Hidalgo	Monterrey	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	12.3	34.2	0.46	-
ZM16	Somero California II	San Nicolás	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	14.8	30.8	1.00	33.1
ZM17	Estadio Beisbol	San Nicolás	Alluvial Deposits	Mixed woodland	14.2	n.d.	0.43	-
ZM18	Somero El Roble	San Nicolás	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	22.9	n.d.	0.49	-
ZM19	Somero Puentes Avenida	San Nicolás	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	44.0	n.d.	1.40	-
ZM20	Somero Puentes II	San Nicolás	Alluvial Deposits	Urban Area	11.2	31.5	1.30	33.1
ZM21	Tecno Centro I	San Nicolás	Conglomerate	Urban/Industrial	10.3	30.7	0.77	-
ZM22	Papa 02	Apodaca	Alluvial Deposits	Urban	13.3	30.9	0.20	n.d.
ZM23	Papa 03	Apodaca	Alluvial Deposits	Urban	13.5	30.7	0.16	n.d.
ZM24	Pozo PIMSA II	Apodaca	Alluvial Deposits	Urban/Industrial	7.4	n.d.	0.97	-
ZM25	Topo Chico III	Monterrey	Limestone	Urban Area	25.8	33.0	0.10	-

4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

3.3 Surface water

Two sampling campaigns were performed in surface water reservoirs between the end of October and mid-December 2020 (**Table 2**). For the first period in October 2020 none of the samples were detected positive. For the second sampling period two sites were found positive, one in La Boca dam (33.8) and another in Cerro Prieto dam (33.6). It was not possible to analyze the correlation between Ct values of SARS-CoV-2 and *E. coli* because only two pairs have quantitative data.

Table 2. Results of determination of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and *E. coli* for surface water reservoirs. Note: The Ct value represents the average of triplicate analysis for each sample (**Table S5**), 'n.d.' indicates not detected, and '-' indicates not measured.

ID	Site	Campaign 1 22 - 23 Oct 2020		Campaign 2 14 - 15 Dec 2020	
		Ct (SARS-CoV-2) (cycles)	Ct (E. coli) (cycles)	Ct (SARS-CoV-2) (cycles)	Ct (E. coli) (cycles)
BO1	La Boca 1	n.d.	31.3	n.d.	34.5
BO2	La Boca 2	-	-	n.d.	33.9
BO3	La Boca 3	-	-	33.8	32.4
CP1	Cerro Prieto 1	n.d.	29.7	n.d.	32.5
CP2	Cerro Prieto 2	n.d.	30.6	n.d.	32.2
CP3	Cerro Prieto 3	n.d.	30.7	33.6	33.2
CU1	El Cuchillo 1	n.d.	31.5	n.d.	31.5
CU2	El Cuchillo 2	n.d.	30.8	n.d.	31.4
CU3	El Cuchillo 3	n.d.	30.8	n.d.	33.0

With respect to rivers waters, two sampling campaigns were performed in December 2020 and in January 2021 respectively. In December, three out of twelve samples were tested positive, with Ct values ranging from 32.7 to 34.2. The sites with positive values are Pesqueria river downstream of WWTP Norte, Santa Catarina river upstream of WWTP Cadereyta, and La Silla river upstream of Tolteca Park. For the second sampling period, two out of twelve samples were positive, namely Pesquería river upstream WWTP Norte and La Silla river at upstream of Tolteca Park (**Table 3**). The result for La Silla river is notable because this river

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

receives no treated wastewaters of domestic origin. The Ct values of SARS-CoV-2 correlated with those of E. coli (r2=0.75, n=0.088), however the correlation is weak due the low number of pairs.

Table 3. Results of the determination of SARS-CoV-2 RNA for rivers in MMA. Note: The Ct value represents the average of triplicate analysis for each sample (**Table S6**) and 'n.d.' means not detected.

ID	Site	Campaign 1 10 - 11 Dic 2020		Campaign 2 5-6 Jan 2021	
		Ct SARS-CoV-2 (cycles)	Ct E. Coli (cycles)	Ct SARS-CoV-2 (cycles)	Ct E. Coli (cycles)
R1	Pesquería River upstream WWTP Norte	n.d.	31.7	35.9	33.8
R2	Pesquería River downstream WWTP Norte	34.2	28.9	n.d.	31.5
R3	Channel upstream WWTP Noreste	n.d.	31.0	n.d.	31.0
R4	Pesquería River upstream WWTP Noreste	n.d.	30.9	n.d.	30.9
R5	Pesquería River downstream WWTP Noreste	n.d.	31.4	n.d.	31.4
R6	Channel upstream WWTP Dulces Nombres	n.d.	29.5	n.d.	29.5
R7	Channel downstream WWTP Dulces Nombres	n.d.	29.1	n.d.	29.1
R8	Santa Catarina River downtown	n.d.	32.5	n.d.	32.5
R9	Santa Catarina River after downtown	n.d.	33.1	n.d.	33.1
R10	La Silla River	33.9	32.2	37.5	34.5
R11	Santa Catarina River upstream WWTP Cadereyta	32.7	29.4	n.d.	31.1
R12	Santa Catarina River downstream WWTP Cadereyta	n.d.	30.4	n.d.	30.4

3.4 Wastewater

For reference, raw wastewater from influent of Dulces Nombres WWTP was measured for SARS-CoV-2. Between October 25, 2020, and December 13, 2020, 3 out of 8 samples (38%) were positive. The Ct value of positive samples ranged from 23.5 to 31.2 (**Table S7**).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

4 Discussion

4.1 Contextualization of findings in freshwater environments

This is the first study that quantifies the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in different freshwater environments of an urban setting. Previous studies aimed to detect the virus in freshwater focused on receiving rivers (**Table 4**). For example, Rimoldi et al. (2020) collected grab samples in three sites of receptor rivers of the Milan area on April 14 and 22, 2020. In a first sampling round, all three samples were positive, while in a second round only one out of three was positive. A quantitative analysis was not performed. Similarly, Haramoto et al. (2020) collected grab water samples in a river in Yamanashi Prefecture, Japan, on three different occasions between April 22 and May 7, 2020; they reported that none tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA.

Guerrero-Latorre et al. (2020) reported virus loads during a peak of the outbreak (June 5, 2020) from three different sites of a river receiving untreated sewage from Quito city. The authors used RT-qPCR for these determinations and used two different primer sets, namely N1 and N2. All samples were found positive, and the values ranged from 284 to 3190 GC/ml and from 207 to 2230 GC/ml in assays using the N1 and N2 target region, respectively. These values could be related clearly to COVID-19 cases reported in the contributing areas.

Table 4. Selected studies on municipal wastewater/sludge and receiving river waters. Note: 'NA' means not applied and 'WW' indicates wastewater.

Study region	Period / sampling rounds	Study object	Sample size and type	Sample storage/treatment before analysis	Genetic traces/genes analyzed	Results	Concentrations (GC/ml)	Reference
Paris (France)	5 March - 23 April 2020 / 7 rounds	raw WW from 3 WWTPs	27 grab samples (?)	4°C; <24h	RdRp	All samples positive between 5th March and 23th April	50 (5th March) - 3000 (23th April)	Wurtzer et al., 2020
Milan and Rome (Italy)	2 February - 2 April 2020 / 8 rounds	raw WW from 3 WWTPs	12 24-h composite samples	-20°C; <24h / thermal treated (30min@56°C)	ORF1ab, S	6 out of 12 samples positive in raw WW	NA	La Rosa et al., 2020a
Netherlands (different places)	5 February - 25 March 2020 / 4 rounds	WWTPs of 5 cities and 1 airport	30 24-h composite samples	melting ice; <24h	N1, N2, N3, E	No sample positive on 5-7 February; 3 out of 7 WW samples positive on March 4/5; 9 out 9 WW samples positive in the middle of March	5-7th February: n.d.; 4/5th March: 2.6–30 GC/ml; 14-16th March: 8-2200 GC/ml; 25th March: 26-1800 GC/ml	Medema et al., 2020
Milan and Monza (Italy)	14 and 22 April 2020	raw and treated WW from 3 WWTPs and receiving rivers	18 grab samples (8 raw WW, 4 treated WW, 6 river water)	no information	ORF1ab, N, E	Raw WW: First sampling with 3 out of 4 samples positive; second sampling with 1 out of 4 positive Treated WW: first sampling with 2 out of 2 negative; second sampling with 2 out of 2 negative River W: first sampling with 3 out of 3 positive; second sampling with 1 out of 3 positive	NA	Rimoldi et al., 2020
Southeast Queensland (Australia)	20 March - 1 April 2020	raw WW from pumping station and 2 WWTP	9 composite samples	-80°C; <24h	N and confirmation via Sanger and MiSeq Illumina sequencing	2 out of 9 samples positive in raw WW	ND, 0.019 and 0.12	Ahmed et al., 2020a
Massachusetts (USA)	18 - 25 March 2020	raw WW from 1 WWTP	12 24-h composite samples	4°C / 30min@90°C	N1, N2, N3,	10 out of 10 raw WW samples positive	57 to 303 / 21 to 506 after normalization of variations	Wu et al., 2020
Israel (different cities and facilities)	10 March - 21 April 2020	raw WW from different WWTPs	32 24-h composite samples (6 Tel Aviv, 26 different cities)	-80°C or -20°C	E	3 out of 6 WW samples in Tel Aviv positive; 2 out of 15 positive in different cities in March 2020; 8 out of 11 positive in	NA	Or et al., 2020

						different cities in April 2020; several cities demonstrate a correlation of the Ct values with dynamic of outbreak		
Bozeman, Montana (USA)	30 March - 12 June 2020	raw WW from 1 WWTP	17 24-h composite samples	no information	N1, N2	13 out of 17 positive (1 out of 1 positive in March; 7 out of 7 positive in April; 0 out of 4 positive in May; 5 out of 5 positive in June)	ND to 5600	Nemudryi et al., 2020
Istanbul (Turkey)	8 April 2020 (?)	raw WW from 7 WWTPs and 2 manholes near hospitals	9 samples	no information	RdRp	9 out of 9 sludge samples positive	ND to 18 in WWTPs; 45 and 93 in manholes	Kocamemi et al., 2020
Murcia region (Spain)	12 March - 14 April 2020	Raw and treated WW from 6 WWTPs	72 samples (42 raw, 18 secondary and 12 tertiary treated WW samples)	4°C; <24h	N1, N2, N3	35 out of 42 influent samples positive; 2 out of 18 secondary samples positive; None of 12 tertiary treated samples positive	ND to 5000 in raw WW	Randazzo et al., 2020
Yamanashi Prefecture, Japan	17 March - 7 May 2020	Raw and treated WW from 1 WWTP, river water	13 samples (5 raw and 5 treated samples from 5 rounds, 3 river samples from 3 rounds)	ice; <6h	N1, N2	None of 5 raw samples positive; 1 out of 5 secondary treated samples positive; none out of 3 river water samples positive	240 (1 treated WW sample)	Haramoto et al., 2020
Ahmedabad, Gujara, India	8 - 27 May, 2020; 2 rounds	Raw and treated WW from 1 WWTP	4 composite samples (2 raw and 2 treated WW)	4°C; 19 days for first sampling campaign, < 24h for second campaign	ORF1ab, N and S	2 out of 2 influent samples positive; 2 out 2 effluent samples negative	<0.35	Kumar et al., 2020
Louisiana (USA)	13 January - 29 April 2020	Raw WW, secondary treated WW and chlorine desinfected WW from 2 WWTP	15 samples (9 composite samples and 6 grab samples: 7 influent, 4 secondary treated effluent, 4 chlorine desinfected effluent)	−80 °C ; <4 months	N1 and N2	2 out of 15 raw wastewater samples positive; all efluent samples negative	ND; 3.1 and 4.3 (raw)	Sherchan et al., 2020
Quito (Ecuador)	5 June 2020	River water	3 samples from 3 locations	4°C; <6h	N1 and N2	3 out of 3 river water samples positive	284 to 3190 (N1)	Guerrero-Latorre et al., 2020

North-Rhine Westphalia (Germany)	8 April 2020	Raw and treated WW	13 samples (9 inflow, 2 secondary treated efluents, 2 desinfected efluents)	no information	N, M, E, RdRp	All samples positive	3.0 and 20 (untreated sewage); 2.7 to 37 (treated sewage)	Westhaus et al., 2020
Montpellier (France)	7 May - 20 June 2020 / 7 rounds	Raw WW from 1 WWTP	7 24-h composite samples	4°C; inmediately	N1, N3, Ebo Std	All samples positive	200 - 4000 (aprox.)	Torttier et al., 2020
Czech Repulic (different places)	April to June 2020	Raw WW from 33 WWTPs	112 24-h composite samples	5±3°C; <48h		13 out of 112 positive (12%)	NA	Mlejnkova et al., 2020
Onondaga County, NY (USA)	6 - 13 May 2020 / 2 rounds	11 access points of WW facilities	22 24-h composite samples	4°C; <24h		18 out of 22 positive; 13 out of 22 in quantifiable range	<112	Green et al., 2020
Pakistan (different places)	20 March - 28 April 2020	Raw WW from 38 open drains and pumping stations	78 grab samples	< 48h	ORF1ab, N, E	21 out of 78 samples (27%) positive	NA	Sharif et al., 2020
Ourense (Spain)	6 - 21 April 2020	Raw and treated WW from 1 WWTP	39 24-h composite samples (15 WW and 24 sludge)	NA	RdRP, N, E	Influent systematically positive; none of treated WW positive; primary and secondary sludge mainly positive	Influent: 7.5 - 15; Primary sludge: 10-40; biological sludge 7.5 - 10	Balboa et al., 2020
Prefectures of Ishikawa and Toyama (Japan)	5 March - 29 May 2020	Raw WW from 5 WWTPs	45 grab samples	-80°C (initial samples) & ice / <72h	N2, N3, NIID	7 out of 45 positive in ≥2 assays	120 - 350	Hata et al., 2020
New Haven, Connecticut (USA)	19 March – 1 June 2020	Primary sewage sludge from 1 WWTP	73 samples	−80 °C	N1, N2	All samples positive	Primary sludge: 17000 - 460000	Peccia et al., 2020
Monterrey (Mexico)	29 October - 6 January 2021	Groundwater from 3 aquifer units, 3 rivers and 3 dams, raw WW	92 freshwater samples (50 groundwater, 24 river water, 18 dam waters) and 8 24-h raw WW samples	4°C / <48h (5min@95°C)	N1, N2	5 out of 24 river water samples positive, 2 out of 18 dam water samples positive, 3 out of 8 raw WW samples positive	Groundwater < 5.6; River water < 7; Dam water <3.8; Raw WW < 3600	This study

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

4.2 Explanation of viral loads in receiving waters

In the present study, 21% of all river water samples (5 out of 24) were positive regarding viral RNA, and the positive tested samples varied between 2.5 to 7.0 GC/ml, and between 0.3 to 0.8 GC/ml for the first (10-11 December 2020) and second campaign (5-6 January 2021), respectively. Importantly, during this period no significant rainfall was recorded in the Monterrey area that could have had an impact on virus concentration in waters (**Tables S8** and **S9**). These loads are two to three orders of magnitude lower than those reported by Guerrero-Latorre et al. (2020) for Quito's river. This could be because Monterrey treats more than 90% of its municipal wastewater, while the urban rivers of Quito are impacted by the direct discharge of sewage water from the city (3 million inhabitants). Similarly, the negative results derived from the analysis of river water samples from Yamanashi Prefecture, Japan (Haramoto et al. 2020) and Milan, Italy (Rimoldi et al. 2020) could be possibly attributed to the fact that both studies collected water from rivers receiving treated wastewater.

It is expected that wastewaters from WWTPs with a complete treatment were tested as negative. Thus, the occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in a few samples in La Silla and Pesquería river water could stem from different sources coexisting in the same basin. For example, aliquots of non-treated sewage can be present because of illicit discharges, malfunction of sewerage systems, and their increased relative contribution during dry periods (Mosley et al. 2015). The lack of separation of the urban runoff waters from the domestic effluents, which causes combined sewer overflows (CSOs), could also be a reason (Rimoldi et al. 2020). CSOs occur usually during high rainfall events. However, the accumulated rainfall between December 2020 and January 2021 in Monterrey was only in the order of 3 mm.

Another reason of high aliquots of untreated sewage in river water could be the organization of local football derbies whose high loads in short time periods may be overburden the capacity of WWTPs releasing untreated wastewater to Pesquería river (SADM, 2020). The case of La Silla river is notable because it receives no relevant treated municipal wastewater due to the sanitary drainage to the other two rivers, therefore illicit discharges or sewerage system malfunction is a plausible explanation for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 genetic material in this water course.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Regarding dam water, only 12% of the samples (2 out of 16) were tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA, with no positive result in the first campaign (22-23 October 2020). The positive samples (which contain 3.3 and 3.8 viral copies/ml) occurred during the second campaign (14-15 December 2020) and only in one site of La Boca and in one site of Cerro Prieto dam, respectively. In both cases urbanization is observed nearby, which suggests that the presence of the virus might be due to failure in the local sewerage system. The observed values are comparable to the range of the urban rivers in Monterrey. The lack of virus loads in the first campaign and the presence in two of the nine sites may reflect the increasing trend of reported cases of infection in the corresponding municipalities during the same period (**Fig 1a**).

4.3 Viral loads in groundwater reaffirming human sewage impact

The share of groundwater samples containing detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA was surprisingly high. Twenty-two out of 50 samples (44%) showed viral loads between 2.9 and 5.6 GC/ml. This finding suggests that a fraction of untreated sewage has entered the groundwater system. The origin of the untreated sewerage may be from the surface or from a leaky sewerage system. Torres-Hernández et al. (2020) used isotopic and chemical evidence to determine that nitrate pollution in groundwater from Monterrey was mainly derived from sewage leaks in the urban area. It is evident that organic and viral loads could have been entered to the groundwater system using the same pathway. The significant correlation between SARS-CoV-2 concentrations and sucralose at 0.05 level is another remarkable confirmation of the contribution of raw wastewater to the groundwater and reaffirms possible leaching and infiltrations of effluents from health care facilities, sewage, solid landfill, and drainage water as well as failing sewage pipes in the MMA.

The observed viral load may not be higher than detected in rivers and dams of Monterrey, but it represents certain concern regarding the vulnerability of local groundwater systems to the coronavirus. From the three aquifer units used for water supply, the SA system (63%) is most affected, followed by the ZM aquifer (54%), and the BA well field (22%). Nevertheless, the viral loads observed in wells of the first sampling campaign (29 October 2020 - 4 November 2020) could only partly be reproduced one month later (26-30 November 2020), indicating a decrease in the viral load. This demonstrates how dynamic is the groundwater

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

system in relation to the presence of the coronavirus; this decrease in viral load in groundwater appears to follow the decreasing trend of reported cases of infection during the month of November 2020 (**Fig 2a**).

From the sampled municipalities of MMA during the first campaign, Apodaca leads with 63% positive samples, followed by Monterrey (50%), and San Nicolas (50%). Coincidently, these are the most affected municipalities considering the officially reported daily cases of infection in **Fig. 2a**. Guadalupe is also among the most affected municipalities; however, it only is represented by one sampled well. Santiago, the southernmost municipality is the exception as it shows a relatively lower number of cases of infection, but a high incidence of positive cases (63%). This could indicate a different dynamic. Indistinctly, the high level of positive samples in municipalities with highest COVID infections suggests that groundwater samples approximately mirror the infection situation at municipality level.

4.4 Environmental and public health implications

This study is the first evidence that SARS-CoV-2 may find its ways to groundwater through possible leaching and infiltrations of effluents from health care facilities, sewage, solid landfill and drainage water, as well as leakages from sewage pipes, as hypothesized by Ihsanullah et al. (2021). This finding derives in two different lectures. First, groundwater in MMA is currently disinfected by gas chlorination removing pathogenic viruses and bacteria. Since coronaviruses are sensitive to oxidants like chlorine (La Rosa et al., 2020b), it is important to continue strengthening and advancing treatment processes of groundwater, especially in wells located in shallow aquifers in combination with places where sewage effluents from health care facilities, sewage, solid landfill and drainage water are not treated or treated inefficiently (Guerrero-Latorre et al. 2020) and expected to infiltrate, or where sewage pipes could be leaky (Torres-Hernandez et al., 2020). Second, the correlation of the Covid-19 cases with SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR results in groundwater (and surface water) has quite potential for verifying the reported number of Covid-19 cases with the real situation.

The concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in untreated wastewater from selected studies worldwide was in the range of not detected to 5600 GC/ml (**Table 4**). In our study, the monitoring of the influent of Dulces Nombres WWTP showed that between October 25, 2020,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

and December 13, 2020, 3 out of 8 samples (38%) were positive to SARS-CoV-2, and that the maximum load was 3535 GC/ml (**Table S7**). This number is quite comparable to other studies of raw WW during outbreaks (Nemudryi et al., 2020; Randazzo et al. 2020; Torttier et al, 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020). This shows that the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in surface (<5.6 GC/ml) and groundwater (<7 GC/ml) in MMA is approximately three orders of magnitude lower than in raw wastewater. This means that the viral load could not be eradicated completed as observed in Haramoto et al. (2020), however the result is similar to Rimoldi et al. (2020).

Importantly, the presence of genetic material of SARS-CoV-2 in freshwater should not be considered as direct indicator of the presence of infective viral particles. Establishing infectivity requires the successful isolation and culture of actual viral particles from water samples (Giacobbo et al., 2021). However, the presence of detectable amounts of genetic material from SARS-CoV-2 in freshwater should not be taken lightly.

4.5 Future directions

This study shows the importance of monitoring programs to determine the fate of SARS-CoV-2 in the urban water cycle. Until now, there is no evidence and enough data to confirm if the water or wastewater containing SARS-CoV-2 could be the potential source of its transmission. Some studies predicted a low risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission via wastewater (Chin et al., 2020; Rimoldi et al., 2020; Ihsanullah et al., 2021), but the investigations in this topic are still in an early phase. Future research should be oriented towards the understanding of the fate of the virus in different water environments, factors which are favorable and unfavorable for its development, and the potential exposure risk of water contaminated with this virus in its different variants. Experimental research must go hand in hand with the development of conceptual and computational analysis.

A look on studies performed so far shows that there is a lack of standardized protocols for the sampling, detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 in water and wastewater (**Table 4**). For example, in some studies grab samples were taken, while in others 24-hour composite samples were collected. There are significant differences not only in the sample collection, but also in sample storage and treatment, and use (or not) of genetic or chemical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

traces (i.e., chemical agents indicating human activity or viral tracers used for normalization purposes) among others. This may lead to discrepancies in the results. Currently, the RT-qPCR has been employed widely for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in water samples, however it is imperative to develop standard sampling procedure for accurately extraction, isolation, detection and quantification of the virus.

4 Conclusions

This study evaluated the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the urban water cycle of a metropolitan area. The aim of the study was to perform a survey of viral dispersion and potential implications in the aquatic environment during a peak phase of the epidemic between October 2020 and January 2021.

Twenty-one percent of all river water samples were positive regarding viral RNA, and the positive tested samples varied between 2.5 to 7.0 GC/ml, and between 0.3 to 0.8 GC/ml for the first and second campaign. These low viral loads demonstrate the dilution effect and/or efficiency of wastewater treatment facilities in MMA. Raw wastewater measured during the same period shows viral loads of up to 3535 GC/ml. Some samples that tested positive in the river stem possibly from aliquots of non-treated sewage due to illicit discharges, malfunction of sewerage system and their relative contribution during the dry period. A further indication of water aliquots of fecal origin of water is a weak correlation with *E. coli* bacteria. These findings highlight the importance of a good coverage of wastewater treatment facilities such as in MMA. The low degree of wastewater treatment coverage might be a factor of increased risk for COVID-19 pandemic.

Two out of 16 samples from 3 different surface water reservoirs tested positive to SARS-CoV-2, with differences between the first and second campaign. The lack of the presence of the virus in the first campaign is related to a decrease in the reported cases of infection during November due to lockdown measures. With values of 3.3 and 3.8 GC/ml, the viral load is a bit lower than in urban rivers.

Twenty-two out of 50 groundwater samples exhibited detectable viral loads that varied between 2.9 and 5.6 GC/ml. This share is unexpected high and can be attributed to a contribution from untreated sewage and/or leaky sewage pipes to the groundwater system.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

The significant correlation between SARS-CoV-2 loads and sucralose concentration in groundwater reaffirms the possibility of leaching and infiltrations of effluents from surface and/or failing sewage pipes. These findings highlight the importance of water disinfection processes in drinking water facilities. Even if it is not probable that freshwater sources may be highly viable for transmission of SARS-CoV-2, the possibility via fecal-oral transmission cannot be discarded at this point. Moreover, differences of viral loads in groundwater between the municipalities inside the metropolitan area are observed; they appear to be consistent with the trends of reported daily cases of infections in each municipality. This shows that groundwater has potential for epidemic surveillance and should be considered as an alternative.

Future investigations should be oriented to the understanding of the fate of the virus in different water environments, factors which are favorable and unfavorable for its development, and the potential exposure risk of water contaminated with this virus in its different variants. Experimental research must go hand in hand with the development of conceptual and computational analysis. It is imperative to develop standard sampling, extraction, isolation, detection, and quantification procedures of the virus in aquatic environments to avoid discrepancies in the results.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the financial support received from Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (CONACyT) through the Fondo Desarrollo Tecnológico e Innovación COVID-19 grant No. 312558. Thanks to A. Torres-Hernandez and Christian F. Narváez-Montoya for assisting in the field work. Korine M. S. assisted with the graphical design.

References

Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J. W., ... & Mueller, J. F. (2020a). First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: a proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. Science of the Total Environment, 728, 138764.

Ahmed, W., Bertsch, P. M., Bibby, K., Haramoto, E., Hewitt, J., Huygens, F., ... & Bivins, A. (2020b). Decay of SARS-CoV-2 and surrogate murine hepatitis virus RNA in untreated wastewater to inform application in wastewater-based epidemiology. Environmental Research, 191, 110092.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Amirian, E. S. (2020). Potential fecal transmission of SARS-CoV-2: Current evidence and implications for public health. International Journal of Infectious Diseases.

Balboa, S., Mauricio-Iglesias, M., Rodríguez, S., Martínez-Lamas, L., Vasallo, F. J., Regueiro, B., & Lema, J. M. (2020). The fate of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater treatment plants points out the sludge line as a suitable spot for incidence monitoring. MedRxiv.

Bej, A. K., Mahbubani, M. H., Miller, R., DiCesare, J. L., Haff, L., & Atlas, R. M. (1990). Multiplex PCR amplification and immobilized capture probes for detection of bacterial pathogens and indicators in water. Molecular and Cellular Probes, 4(5), 353-365.

Carducci, A., Federigi, I., & Verani, M. (2020). Covid-19 airborne transmission and its prevention: Waiting for evidence or applying the precautionary principle? Atmosphere, 11(7), 710.

Casanova, L., Rutala, W. A., Weber, D. J., & Sobsey, M. D. (2009). Survival of surrogate coronaviruses in water. Water research, 43(7), 1893-1898.

Chan, J. F. W., Yuan, S., Kok, K. H., To, K. K. W., Chu, H., Yang, J., ... & Yuen, K. Y. (2020). A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. The Lancet, 395(10223), 514-523.

Chia, P. Y., Coleman, K. K., Tan, Y. K., Ong, S. W. X., Gum, M., Lau, S. K., ... & Marimuthu, K. (2020). Detection of air and surface contamination by SARS-CoV-2 in hospital rooms of infected patients. Nature Communications, 11(1), 1-7.

Chin, A., Chu, J., Perera, M., Hui, K., Yen, H. L., Chan, M., ... & Poon, L. (2020). Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. MedRxiv.

CONACyT-Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnologia. (2021). Tablero de datos Coronavirus. Retrieved from: https://datos.covid-19.conacyt.mx/

Contini, D., & Costabile, F. (2020). Does Air Pollution Influence COVID-19 Outbreaks? Atmosphere, 11(4), 377

Giacobbo, A., Rodrigues, M. A. S., Ferreira, J. Z., Bernardes, A. M., & de Pinho, M. N. (2021). A critical review on SARS-CoV-2 infectivity in water and wastewater. What do we know? Science of The Total Environment, 145721.

González-González, E., Trujillo-de Santiago, G., Lara-Mayorga, I. M., Martinez-Chapa, S. O., & Alvarez, M. M. (2020). Portable and accurate diagnostics for COVID-19: Combined use of the miniPCR thermocycler and a well-plate reader for SARS-CoV-2 virus detection. PloS One, 15(8), e0237418.

González-González, E., Lara-Mayorga, I. M., Rodríguez-Sánchez, I. P., Zhang, Y. S., Martínez-Chapa, S. O., Trujillo-de Santiago, G., & Alvarez, M. M. (2021). Colorimetric loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP) for cost-effective and quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2: the change in color in LAMP-based assays quantitatively correlates with viral copy number. Analytical Methods.

Green, H., Wilder, M., Middleton, F. A., Collins, M., Fenty, A., Gentile, K., ... & Larsen, D. A. (2020). Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 and cross-assembly phage (crAssphage) from wastewater to monitor coronavirus transmission within communities. MedRxiv.

Guerrero-Latorre, L., Ballesteros, I., Villacrés-Granda, I., Granda, M. G., Freire-Paspuel, B., & Ríos-Touma, B. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 in river water: Implications in low sanitation countries. Science of the Total Environment, 743, 140832.

Han, J., Zhang, X., He, S., & Jia, P. (2020). Can the coronavirus disease be transmitted from food? A review of evidence, risks, policies and knowledge gaps. Environmental Chemistry Letters, 1-12.

Haramoto, E., Malla, B., Thakali, O., & Kitajima, M. (2020). First environmental surveillance for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and river water in Japan. Science of The Total Environment, 737, 140405.

Hata, A., Honda, R., Hara-Yamamura, H., & Meuchi, Y. (2020). Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater in Japan by multiple molecular assays-implication for wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE). MedRxiv.

Ihsanullah, I., Bilal, M., & Naushad, M. (2021). Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in water environments: Current status, challenges and research opportunities. Journal of Water Process Engineering, 39, 101735.

INEGI - Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. (2020). Censo de población y vivienda 2020. Retrieved from: https://censo2020.mx/

Kang, M., Wei, J., Yuan, J., Guo, J., Zhang, Y., Hang, J., ... & Zhong, N. (2020). Probable evidence of fecal aerosol transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in a high-rise building. Annals of Internal Medicine, 173(12), 974-980.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Kocamemi, B. A., Kurt, H., Hacioglu, S., Yarali, C., Saatci, A. M., & Pakdemirli, B. (2020). First data-set on SARS-CoV-2 detection for Istanbul wastewaters in Turkey. MedRxiv.

Kokotou, M. G., Asimakopoulos, A. G., & Thomaidis, N. S. (2012). Artificial sweeteners as emerging pollutants in the environment: analytical methodologies and environmental impact. Analytical Methods, 4(10), 3057-3070.

Kumar, M., Patel, A. K., Shah, A. V., Raval, J., Rajpara, N., Joshi, M., & Joshi, C. G. (2020). First proof of the capability of wastewater surveillance for COVID-19 in India through detection of genetic material of SARS-CoV-2. Science of The Total Environment, 746, 141326.

Langone, M., Petta, L., Cellamare, C. M., Ferraris, M., Guzzinati, R., Mattioli, D., & Sabia, G. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 in water services: presence and impacts. Environmental Pollution, 115806.

La Rosa, G., Iaconelli, M., Mancini, P., Ferraro, G. B., Veneri, C., Bonadonna, L., ... & Suffredini, E. (2020a). First detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewaters in Italy. Science of the Total Environment, 736, 139652.

La Rosa, G., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L., Kenmoe, S., & Suffredini, E. (2020b). Coronavirus in water environments: Occurrence, persistence and concentration methods-A scoping review. Water research, 115899.

Li, Q., Guan, X., Wu, P., Wang, X., Zhou, L., Tong, Y., ... & Feng, Z. (2020). Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus–infected pneumonia. New England Journal of Medicine.

Liu, Y., Ning, Z., Chen, Y., Guo, M., Liu, Y., Gali, N. K., ... & Lan, K. (2020). Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in two Wuhan hospitals. Nature, 582(7813), 557-560.

Liu, J., Liao, X., Qian, S., Yuan, J., Wang, F., Liu, Y., ... & Zhang, Z. (2020b). Community transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, Shenzhen, China, 2020. Emerging Infectious Diseases, 26(6), 1320.

Martinez, M. A. R., & Werner, J. (1997). Research into the Quaternary sediments and climatic variations in NE Mexico. Quaternary International, 43, 145-151.

Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., & Brouwer, A. (2020). Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in sewage and correlation with reported COVID-19 prevalence in the early stage of the epidemic in the Netherlands. Environmental Science & Technology Letters, 7(7), 511-516.

Mlejnkova, H., Sovova, K., Vasickova, P., Ocenaskova, V., Jasikova, L., & Juranova, E. (2020). Preliminary study of Sars-Cov-2 occurrence in wastewater in the Czech Republic. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(15), 5508.

Mo, X. T., Zhou, Y. P., Lei, H., & Deng, L. (2002). Microbalance-DNA probe method for the detection of specific bacteria in water. Enzyme and Microbial Technology, 30(5), 583-589.

Mondelli, M. U., Colaneri, M., Seminari, E. M., Baldanti, F., & Bruno, R. (2020). Low risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission by fomites in real-life conditions. The Lancet Infectious Diseases.

Mosley, L. M. (2015). Drought impacts on the water quality of freshwater systems; review and integration. Earth-Science Reviews, 140, 203-214.

Nalla, A. K., Casto, A. M., Huang, M. L. W., Perchetti, G. A., Sampoleo, R., Shrestha, L., ... & Greninger, A. L. (2020). Comparative performance of SARS-CoV-2 detection assays using seven different primer-probe sets and one assay kit. Journal of Clinical Microbiology, 58(6).

Nemudryi, A., Nemudraia, A., Wiegand, T., Surya, K., Buyukyoruk, M., Cicha, C., ... & Wiedenheft, B. (2020). Temporal detection and phylogenetic assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in municipal wastewater. Cell Reports Medicine, 1(6), 100098.

Or, I. B., Yaniv, K., Shagan, M., Ozer, E., Erster, O., Mendelson, E., ... & Kushmaro, A. (2020). Regressing SARS-CoV-2 sewage measurements onto COVID-19 burden in the population: a proof-of-concept for quantitative environmental surveillance. MedRxiv.

Peccia, J., Zulli, A., Brackney, D. E., Grubaugh, N. D., Kaplan, E. H., Casanovas-Massana, A., ... & Omer, S. B. (2020). Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics. Nature Biotechnology, 38(10), 1164-1167.

Peccia, J., Zulli, A., Brackney, D. E., Grubaugh, N. D., Kaplan, E. H., Casanovas-Massana, A., ... & Omer, S. B. (2020). Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics. Nature Biotechnology, 38(10), 1164-1167.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Simón, P., Allende, A., & Sánchez, G. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. Water Research, 181, 115942.

Reza, Z. M., Mohammad, A., Salomeh, K., Reza, A. G., Hossein, S., Maryam, S., ... & Saeed, F. (2014). Rapid detection of coliforms in drinking water of Arak city using multiplex PCR method in comparison with the standard method of culture (Most Probably Number). Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine, 4(5), 404-409.

Rimoldi, S. G., Stefani, F., Gigantiello, A., Polesello, S., Comandatore, F., Mileto, D., ... & Salerno, F. (2020). Presence and infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 virus in wastewaters and rivers. Science of the Total Environment, 744, 140911.

Santiago Carrasco, B., Martínez Ramos, C. J., Sánchez Bermeo, G., Palacios García, R., & Chiapa García, R. (2008). Carta Geológico-Minera. Monterrey G14-7, Nuevo León y Coahuila: Servicio Geológico Mexicano, escala, 1, 250000.

SADM - Servicios de Agua y Drenaje de Monterrey. (2020). Personal communication, 21 August 2020

SADM - Servicios de Agua y Drenaje de Monterrey. (2021). Personal communication, 28 January 2021

SMN - Servicio Meteorológico Nacional, Comisión Nacional del Agua (2020). Personal communication, 2021 January 28

Sharif, S., Ikram, A., Khurshid, A., Salman, M., Mehmood, N., Arshad, Y., ... & Ali, N. (2020). Detection of SARS-Coronavirus-2 in wastewater, using the existing environmental surveillance network: An epidemiological gateway to an early warning for COVID-19 in communities. MedRxiv.

Sherchan, S. P., Shahin, S., Ward, L. M., Tandukar, S., Aw, T. G., Schmitz, B., ... & Kitajima, M. (2020). First detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in North America: a study in Louisiana, USA. Science of The Total Environment, 743, 140621.

Sims, N., & Kasprzyk-Hordern, B. (2020). Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology: monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level. Environment International, 139, 105689.

Soh, L., Connors, K. A., Brooks, B. W., & Zimmerman, J. (2011). Fate of sucralose through environmental and water treatment processes and impact on plant indicator species. Environmental Science & Technology, 45(4), 1363-1369.

Tian, Y., Rong, L., Nian, W., & He, Y. (2020). Gastrointestinal features in COVID-19 and the possibility of faecal transmission. Alimentary Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 51(9), 843-851.

Torres-Martínez, J. A., Mora, A., Knappett, P. S., Ornelas-Soto, N., & Mahlknecht, J. (2020). Tracking nitrate and sulfate sources in groundwater of an urbanized valley using a multi-tracer approach combined with a Bayesian isotope mixing model. Water Research, 182, 115962.

Trottier, J., Darques, R., Mouheb, N. A., Partiot, E., Bakhache, W., Deffieu, M. S., & Gaudin, R. (2020). Post-lockdown detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the wastewater of Montpellier, France. One Health, 10, 100157.

Voss, S., Newman, E., & Miller-Schulze, J. P. (2019). Quantification of sucralose in groundwater well drinking water by silylation derivatization and gas chromatography-mass spectrometry. Analytical Methods, 11(21), 2790-2799.

Wang, X., Zheng, J., Guo, L., Yao, H., Wang, L., Xia, X., & Zhang, W. (2020). Fecal viral shedding in COVID-19 patients: clinical significance, viral load dynamics and survival analysis. Virus Research, 289, 198147.

Westhaus, S., Weber, F. A., Schiwy, S., Linnemann, V., Brinkmann, M., Widera, M., ... & Ciesek, S. (2021). Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in raw and treated wastewater in Germany–suitability for COVID-19 surveillance and potential transmission risks. Science of The Total Environment, 751, 141750.

World Health Organization. (2020a). Water, sanitation, hygiene and waste management for COVID-19: technical brief, 03 March 2020 (No. WHO/2019-NcOV/IPC_WASH/2020.1). World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2020b). Modes of transmission of virus causing COVID-19: implications for IPC precaution recommendations: scientific brief, 29 March 2020 (WHO/2019-nCoV/Sci_Brief/Transmission_modes/2020.2). World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2021). WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. Retrieved on February 13, 2021 from: https://covid19.who.int/table

Wu, Y., Guo, C., Tang, L., Hong, Z., Zhou, J., Dong, X., ... & Huang, X. (2020a). Prolonged presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in faecal samples. The Lancet Gastroenterology & hepatology, 5(5), 434-435.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.19.21253987; this version posted March 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Wu, F., Zhang, J., Xiao, A., Gu, X., Lee, W. L., Armas, F., ... & Alm, E. J. (2020b). SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from clinically confirmed cases. Msystems, 5(4).

Wurtzer, S., Marechal, V., Mouchel, J. M., & Moulin, L. (2020). Time course quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Parisian wastewaters correlates with COVID-19 confirmed cases. MedRxiv.

Xiao, Y., Huang, S., Yan, L., Wang, H., Wang, F., Zhou, T., ... & He, M. (2020). Clinical characteristics of diarrhea in 90 cases with COVID-19: A descriptive study. International emergency nursing, 52, 100912.

Ye, Y., Ellenberg, R. M., Graham, K. E., & Wigginton, K. R. (2016). Survivability, partitioning, and recovery of enveloped viruses in untreated municipal wastewater. Environmental science & technology, 50(10), 5077-5085.

Zhang, H., Kang, Z., Gong, H., Xu, D., Wang, J., Li, Z., Cui, X., Xiao, J., Zhan, J., Meng, T., Zhou, W., Liu, J. & Xu, H. (2020). Digestive system is a potential route of COVID-19: an analysis of single-cell coexpression pattern of key proteins in viral entry process. Gut, 69(6), 1010-1018.