medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Performance evaluation of virus concentration methods for implementing SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater based epidemiology emphasizing quick data turnaround.

Md Ariful Islam Juel[1,4], Nicholas Stark[2], Bridgette Nicolosi[2], Jordan Lontai[2], Kevin Lambirth[2], Jessica Schlueter[2,3], Cynthia Gibas[2,3], Mariya Munir[1,3].

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering[1], Department of Bioinformatics and Genomics[2], Bioinformatics Research Center[3], 9201 University City Blvd, Charlotte, NC, 28223. Department of Leather Engineering[4], Khulna University of Engineering and Technology, Khulna, 9203.

Abstract

Wastewater based epidemiology (WBE) has drawn significant attention as an early warning tool to detect and predict the trajectory of COVID-19 cases in a community, in conjunction with public health data. This means of monitoring for outbreaks has been used at municipal wastewater treatment centers to analyze COVID-19 trends in entire communities, as well as by universities and other community living environments to monitor COVID-19 spread in buildings. Sample concentration is crucial, especially when viral abundance in raw wastewater is below the threshold of detection by RT-qPCR analysis. We evaluated the performance of a rapid ultrafiltration-based virus concentration method using InnovaPrep Cp Select pipette tips and compared this to the established electronegative membrane filtration (EMF) method. We evaluated sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 quantification, surrogate virus recovery rate, and sample processing time. Results suggest that the Cp Select concentrator is more efficient at concentrating SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater compared to the EMF method. 30% of samples that tested negative when concentrated with the EMF method produced a positive signal with the Cp Select protocol. Increased recovery of the surrogate virus control using the Cp Select confirms this observation. We optimized the Cp Select protocol by adding AVL lysis buffer and sonication, to increase the recovery of virus. Sonication increased BCoV recovery by 19%, which seems to compensate for viral loss during centrifugation. Filtration time decreases by approximately 30% when using the Cp Select protocol, making this an optimal choice for building surveillance applications where quick turnaround time is necessary.

Key words: SARS-CoV-2, Innovaprep Cp Select, Electronegative Membrane Filtration, Virus concentration, Wastewater based epidemiology (WBE)

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/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

Graphical abstract:



1. Introduction

Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is a widely used approach that has been rapidly adopted by the environmental science and engineering academic community as part of the response to the COVID-19 pandemic. WBE has been demonstrated to be an effective early warning tool for rising case numbers, when combining COVID-19 wastewater surveillance data and public health data. As it can provide evidence of both symptomatic and asymptomatic COVID-19 cases, WBE has been applied to detect COVID-19 cases in college residence halls (Gibas et al., 2021), schools (Gutierrez et al., 2021) nursing homes (Spurbeck et al., 2021) and other group living settings. Precise and accurate quantification of viral copies in wastewater is a prerequisite for a successful WBE surveillance project. Detection sensitivity is dependent on the choice of an effective and reliable virus concentration method prior to RNA extraction and quantification.

Virus concentration is crucial in the wastewater especially when viral titers are very low, as is seen in building-based surveillance. PEG-based precipitation was initially widely used to concentrate the virus with successful signal detection ((La Rosa et al., 2020; F. Wu, Xiao, et al., 2020; Kumar et al., 2020). This method, however, requires a long processing time. Other methods such as Electronegative Membrane Filtration (EMF) and Ultrafiltration have been used successfully to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

concentrate viruses from wastewater prior to RNA extraction in a variety of application contexts worldwide. (Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020); (Medema et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020; F. Wu, Zhang, et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020). Skimmed milk flocculation is suggested as a promising method for resource limited environments based on its detection consistency and simplicity (Philo et al., 2021). Another study focused on a two-step concentration procedure to process large wastewater volumes (McMinn et al., 2021). Among the available methods, the EMF method has previously been reported to be one of the most efficient methods of virus concentration based on surrogate virus recovery rate (Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020). However, Jafferali et al., (2021) recently reported that ultracentrifuge-based methods showed better efficiency in spike recovery and quantification of SARS-CoV-2, citing qPCR inhibition as a potential pitfall of the EMF method.

We previously reported outcomes of building level surveillance WBE for a large urban college campus during Fall 2020 using EMF as the method of concentration (Gibas et al.,2021). However, to shorten the timeline from sample collection to reporting, we have tested and adopted an alternative concentration method using the InnovaPrep Cp Select rapid concentrator. The Cp Select is an automatic system that allows the user to concentrate bacteria or virus particles by passing a liquid sample through either hollow or ultrafiltration based concentrating pipette tips. It can process large volumes (up to 5 L) depending on the turbidity of the sample and can concentrate to volumes as small as 150 uL (https://www.innovaprep.com). Rusiñol et al., (2020) investigated three rapid concentration methods: skimmed milk flocculation (SMF), InnovaPrep Cp Select automated ultrafiltration using (150 kDa) filter tips, and centrifugal-ultrafiltration using the Centricon plus-70 (100 kDa). MS2 was used as the surrogate virus and was spiked into wastewater samples. The highest MS2 recovery in this study was achieved using the InnovaPrep quick concentrating pipette (Cp) after removing debris by centrifugation prior to concentration. Limited replication in that study did not allow for a firm conclusion, and the use of MS2, a non-enveloped virus, as a surrogate was not optimal as a benchmark for recovery of an enveloped virus like SARS-CoV-2. Gonzalez et al., (2020) reported the use of the Cp Select concentrator for COVID-19 surveillance in the southeastern Virginia area, and performed a comparison of viral surrogates from treatment plant influent wastewater, in which the Cp Select also performed well.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

Because our surveillance system relies on raw building-level wastewater, which has different properties and typical viral load than aggregate wastewater collected at treatment plants, we have evaluated the Cp Select specifically in the building surveillance context with a direct comparison to the established EMF method. In addition to assaying the surrogate virus recovery rate, we performed a side-by-side comparison of the capability of each method to detect SARS-CoV-2 from identical wastewater samples. We optimized input volume for both surrogate virus recovery and SARS-CoV-2 virus recovery by using aliquots of the same sample with different sample volumes. We then assayed RT-qPCR inhibition under each concentration protocol. Also, we optimized the Cp Select protocol in the context of raw building-level wastewater. Finally, we analyzed the processing time for each workflow after laboratory members had become familiar with the Cp Select workflow and based on all these factors as well as ease of use, chose to replace the EMF step in our workflow with the Cp Select.

2. Experimental Method

2.1 Sample collection

In conjunction with the COVID-19 Wastewater Surveillance being conducted on the UNC Charlotte campus (Gibas et al., 2021), we collected samples from thirty-seven sites that were used to monitor a combination of dormitories, greek village housing and neighborhood sites consisting of on-campus non-residential buildings. Wastewater samples were collected thrice weekly via HACH AS960 and ISCO GLS Compact autosampler devices which were located at a building plumbing cleanout or at a manhole accessed externally. At each of these sites, an autosampler was placed on flat ground at higher elevation than the sample stream. The autosampler was connected via a ⅜" tubing coupler to HACH silicone rubber pump tubing. At cleanout sites, ISCO Silicone rubber pump tubing was directly connected to a double-sided tubing connector on a cap externally located on the plumbing clean out. Additional tubing was connected to the underside of the cap to reach the sample stream. At manhole sites, tubing was fed through a cut out in the manhole lid, and then through a PVC guide to the sample stream. The end of the tubing that resides in the sample stream was bound to a strainer, designed to filter out large solids and prevent build up in suction lines. Each autosampler is powered by a 12V lead acid battery and contains a 9.46 L Nalgene sample bottle in the HACH AS960 devices, or a 3500 mL sample bottle in the ISCO Compact devices. Autosampler devices were similarly programmed to draw ~20 mL of wastewater

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

every 30 minutes for 24 hours, to generate a composite sample for lab processing. Upon collection, each composite sample was divided into several 50 mL centrifuge tubes to be used in this experiment, for routine surveillance testing, or for archiving. A total of 53 wastewater samples were collected during five separate sampling events between October 2020 and March 2021for this study.

2.2 Sample volume processing/filtration threshold

Ten samples were used to test the impact of turbidity on the sample processing time. VWR/BDH Chemicals pH test strips and the HACH 2100Q Portable Turbidimeter were used to determine pH and turbidity, respectively. The maximum value that can be accurately determined using the HACH 2100Q Portable Turbidimeter is 1000 NTU. Any value that exceeds this limit was listed as >1000 NTU.

EMF (HA filtration) was routinely used as the virus concentration method for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance as previously reported (Gibas et al., 2021). When 40-50 mL wastewater samples were processed, turbid samples require a long processing time, due to clogging of filter pores. In preliminary tests, the InnovaPrep Cp Select concentrator was capable of processing 125-150 mL wastewater samples, regardless of turbidity. We compared filtration capability of both EMF and the Cp Select protocols systematically, by processing 40 - 100 mL volumes of 10 different samples using each method. We chose 5 samples which were turbid and 5 which were visually clear, excluding samples that exceeded the measurement threshold for turbidity. Processing time was recorded for each input volume, and downstream outcomes in viral surrogate recovery as well as in the qPCR detection step were compared.

2.3 Virus concentration and RNA Extraction

Bovine Coronavirus (BOVILIS® Coronavirus, Merck Animal Health, NE, USA), a surrogate of human coronavirus, was spiked into the wastewater as a process control prior to sample concentration. The concentration of Bovine Coronavirus (BCoV) was previously determined (2.2x10^5 copies/mL) using ddPCR and spiked in at a concentration of 1uL per mL of wastewater. Samples were then processed via EMF filtration as previously described (Gibas et al., 2021). Briefly, wastewater samples were acidified to adjust the pH in the range of 3.5 - 4.0 followed by

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 addition of 100X $MgCl_2$, $6H_20$ (2.5M) in a ratio of 1:100 (Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020; Gibas et al., 2021). 40 - 100 mL aliquots of adjusted wastewater were filtered through a 0.45 µm pore size, 47 mm diameter electronegative membrane filter (HA, Millipore) coupled with a disposable filter funnel (Pall corporation, NY, USA) until all liquid appeared to have passed through the filter. After filtration, the membrane filter was folded and resuspended in a 2 mL sterile tube containing 1000 uL of AVL lysis buffer with carrier RNA (Qiagen). The membrane filter suspended in the lysis buffer was incubated at room temperature for 10 minutes followed by vortexing for 15 sec to facilitate the recovery of adsorbed virus particles from the filter.

For sample processing with the Cp Select concentrator, wastewater samples were centrifuged for 10 mins at 10000×*g* to remove solid debris. 10% Tween-20 was added to the supernatant in a ratio of 1:100 before filtration, as recommended by the manufacturer to increase virus recovery. 40 to 150 mL samples were then filtered through a single use 0.05 µm PS Hollow Fiber Filter CP Tips (InnovaPrep) using the automatic C-Select™ (InnovaPrep). Viral particles attached to the filter tips were recovered by eluting with 0.075% Tween-20/Tris elution fluid using Wet Foam Elution™ technology (InnovaPrep) into a final volume ranging from 250 uL to 500 uL. AVL lysis buffer (Qiagen) is added at a ratio of 1:1.

Following the EMF or Cp Select concentration step, we then used the QIAamp viral mini kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA, USA) for RNA extraction from 200 uL of concentrated sample. RNA was extracted following the manufacturer-recommended protocol. Extracted RNA was eluted with AVE buffer into a final volume of 60 uL. All extracted RNA was stored at -80°C until quantification.

2.4 RT-qPCR

Quantitative reverse transcription PCR (RT-qPCR) was used to detect and quantify SARS-CoV-2 and Bovine coronavirus from extracted RNA. The CDC recommended N1 (Nucleocapsid) primer and probe set (Corman et al., 2020) was used for SARS-CoV-2 quantification while a primer/probe set published by Decaro et al., (2008) was used for Bovine coronavirus quantification. All amplification reactions were carried out in one step, with a reaction volume of 20 µL. The SARS-CoV-2 assay consisted of 10 µL iTaq universal one step reaction mix (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA), 0.5 µL iScript reverse transcriptase (Bio-Rad), 500 nM primers along with 125 nM probe (IDT),

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 5.0 µL extracted RNA template. The reaction mix then was amplified using a CFX96 qPCR thermocycler (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA) with the following thermocycling conditions: reverse transcription at 50°C for 15 min with initiation at 25°C for 2 minutes, followed by polymerase activation at 95°C for 2 min and 44 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 3 s, followed by annealing at 55°C for 30 s (CDC, 2020) . Single stranded RNA based SARS-CoV-2 positive control from Twist Bioscience was used to generate a standard curve using a series of ten fold serial dilutions with concentrations ranging 10^5 to 10 copies per reaction. All samples were run in triplicate along with a series of three positive and negative controls. The limit of detection (LoD) of assay was determined following the same protocol as described in Gibas et al., (2021). An extended dilution series of SARS-CoV-2 positive control in a range from 10^5 to 1 copy/reaction in 6 replicates was amplified following the protocol for generating the standard curve as described above. The LoD of the assay is determined at the lowest concentration at which all the replicates were positive with a less than 1 Cq variation among the replicates (Francy et al., 2012). The LoD of the method was then calculated by multiplying the concentration factor considering the sample volume processed for the respective methods. Any samples to be considered as SARS-CoV-2 positive must have the concentration above the limit of detection with a minimum of two replicates agreement.

The BCoV assay was similar to the N1 assay, with the primer and probe concentrations at 600 nM and 200 nM, respectively. Thermal cycling parameters were the same used in the Decora et al. (2008) protocol, except the annealing temperature was set at 55°C instead of 60°C. This change improved primer efficiency from 85% to 102.5%. For BCoV recovery quantification, a standard curve was generated using a serially diluted BCoV vaccine, in the concentration range of 10^5 to 1 copies/reaction. All the primer and probe sequences and the standard curves are included in Supplemental Figure S1. All samples were run in triplicate along with a series of three positive and negative controls.

2.5 Concentrator protocol optimization

We investigated the impact of several concentration protocol modifications on recovery outcomes. The addition of AVL lysis buffer with carrier RNA (Qiagen) following concentration on SARS-CoV-2 detection was investigated. Eluted concentrated samples from the Cp Select concentrator were divided into two parts. AVL lysis buffer with carrier RNA was added into one part at a ratio

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

of 1:1, while the other part was processed without adding the buffer. RNA was extracted from both aliquots using the QIAmp Viral RNA extraction kit, and results were compared with RT-qPCR analysis targeting the N1 gene.

We investigated the possible impact of the centrifugation step on viral recovery. As we separate out solids from the wastewater by centrifugation prior to the filtration with the Cp Select concentrator, it is likely that some fraction of viral components may end up settling with the pellet at the centrifugation step (Forés et al., 2021). To quantify the amount of virus settled with the pellet during centrifugation, pellets generated from 80 mL wastewater samples after centrifugation at $10000 \times g$ for 10 minutes were extracted using an AllPrep PowerViral DNA/RNA Kit (Qiagen, Cat. No. / ID: 28000-50). Both BCoV recovery and SARS-CoV-2 were quantified from both pellet and supernatant extracts, following the same qPCR protocol used for liquid samples.

Finally, to assay for increased virus recovery, we tested the effect of sonication, which is known to improve recovery in municipal wastewater treatment plant samples with the PEG and $AlCl_3$ precipitation method (Strubbia et al., 2019; Q. Wu & Liu, 2009). A separate set of samples (n=10) were subjected to sonication treatment for 1 minute prior to the centrifugation step, and then processed and quantified as previously described. Equal aliquots of the same set of samples without sonication treatment were processed for comparison. Both BCoV recovery and SARS-CoV-2 (N1 gene) quantification results were considered for this comparison.

2.6 RT- qPCR inhibition

RT-qPCR inhibition was assayed by running a VetMAX™ Xeno™ Internal Positive Control - VIC™ Assay (Catalog no. A29767, Applied Biosystems) which has been previously tested with wastewater samples (Greenwald et al., 2021). A known concentration (250 copies/reaction) of VetMAX™ Xeno™ Internal Positive Control (Catalog no-29761, Applied Biosystems) was spiked into RNA extracted from the wastewater and into DNase/RNase free water. VetMAX™ Xeno™ Internal Positive Control - VIC™ Assay was prepared in the same manner as SARS-CoV-2 assay described in section 2.4, only, we added 0.8 uL of premix VetMAX™ Xeno™ - VIC™ Assay instead of N1 primers/probe mix. RT-qPCR was run following the same thermocycling condition as SARS-CoV-2 protocol.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

2.8 Data analysis

All the figures were plotted using Excel 2016 (Microsoft). One-way anova test, t-test and regression analysis were performed using Minitab® 19. P values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant while greater than 0.05 were considered insignificant or alternative hypotheses are valid. All the RT-qPCR data were analyzed using CFX Maestro™ Software (Biorad).

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Time comparison of EMF and Cp Select concentration methods.

A side-by-side comparison of the EMF and the Cp Select methods was designed, as shown below in Table 1, to understand how the choice of virus concentration methods would impact wastewater sample processing time. There are two components to the processing time -- preprocessing and filtration (concentration). Preprocessing consists of sample pH adjustment and $MgCl_2$ addition for the EMF method, while centrifugation is used as a preprocessing step for the Cp Select protocol. The second step in the protocol is filtration (concentration) itself. We found that for filtration of 40 mL samples, which is the typical input for the EMF protocol in our previous work (Gibas et al. 2021), the Cp Select method gave no clear advantage over EMF in filtration time. However, for larger samples of 60 mL and above, the Cp Select outperformed the EMF method significantly. For 60 mL samples, the average time to concentration with the Cp Select was 9.25 minutes, compared to over 30 minutes for the EMF method. For 100 mL samples, the EMF method could not be used to process most samples, while the Cp Select continued to successfully filter samples in under 30 minutes. Overall, when the lab team compared the time required to complete both preprocessing and filtration on a typical day's collection of 20 samples, three hours were required for processing using the vacuum manifold EMF approach, while only two hours were required when using the Cp Select concentrator; this is considering that 6 vacuum manifold stations were available to be used in parallel, and only 4 InnovaPrep stations could be used in parallel. Given this, the Cp Select is the practical choice for larger total input volume in routine processing.

Table 1. Filtering volume time comparison for EMF and Cp Select method.

Sample ID	pH	Turbidity (NTU)	40 mL filtering (min)	60 mL filtering (min)	100 mL filtering (min)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

			EMF	Cp Select	EMF	Cp Select	EMF	Cp Select
S1	7	26.7	1	5	2	10	Over 30	20
S2	7	27.3	1	1	2	1	Over 30	5
S3	7.5	13.2	1	1	1	10	6	10
S4	9	53	1	2	Over 30	10	Over 30	20
S5	7.5	15.6	1	1	1	10	2	30
S6	7	10.1	1	1	2	1	2	5
S7	7.5	11	NC	1	NC	1	NC	14
S8	7	1000	Over 30	2	Over 30	7	Over 30	30
S9	8.5	347	Over 30	1	Over 30	10	Over 30	20
S10	7.5	97.8	7	2	Over 30	10	Over 30	14

**NC = Not Collected

3.2 Surrogate virus recovery for EMF and Cp Select concentration methods.

Surrogate virus recovery data is necessary – either for selecting an effective virus concentration method or as process control for the surveillance system - when RNA of the target organisms cannot be quantified exactly or is difficult to determine. A known concentration of a surrogate virus is spiked into the wastewater before processing and quantified using RT-qPCR following RNA extraction to determine what percentage of the spiked input is recovered from the system, and how much is lost during the sample processing steps. Based on the type of virus concentration method and the RNA extraction process, RNA recovery percentages vary widely. This is often a determining factor for selecting potential virus concentration methods from among different alternatives (LaTurner et al., 2021).

Several different viruses have been used as process controls in WBE studies, including Murine Hepatitis Virus (MHV) (Ahmed, Bertsch, Bibby, et al., 2020), Beta Coronavirus OC43 (Pecson et al., 2021; Sherchan et al., 2020) Feline calicivirus (Barril et al., 2021), Human coronavirus (HCoV 229E) (Betancourt et al., 2021; La Rosa et al., 2020), Bovine respiratory syncytial virus (Gonzalez et al., 2020), Bovine coronavirus or BCoV (Gonzalez et al., 2020; Jafferali et al., 2021), and Phi 6 (Pecson et al., 2021; Sherchan et al., 2020). We selected BCoV as a process control since it is as an enveloped virus similar to SARS-CoV-2, and belonging to the same Coronaviridae family (LaTurner et al., 2021) as recommended by Pecson et al., (2021) and Sherchan et al., (2020). The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

BCoV recovery efficiency was calculated based on the following equation:

$$Recovery\ efficiency(\%) = \left(\frac{Total\ BCoV\ copies\ recovered}{BCoV\ copies\ spiked}\right) \times (100)$$

Figure 1 shows the mean BCoV recovery from wastewater concentrated using EMF and the Cp Select. Both methods showed a wide range of recovery rate, due to high variability of sample characteristics such as turbidity. An average BCoV recovery of 14.09% was observed in our analysis with the EMF method, which is similar to the BCoV recovery rate found by Jafferali et al (2021), and is slightly higher than the reported value of 8-10% by Gonzalez et al (2020); however, this is substantially lower compared with MHV recovery as a surrogate virus (Ahmed et al., 2020). MHV, as an enteric virus, may persist better in wastewater than BCoV or OC43 (Philo et al., 2021). The Cp Select method yielded an average of 29.29% BCoV recovery, which is similar to results reported in other studies using MS2 and OC43 for recovery ((Forés et al., 2021; McMinn et al., 2021). When comparing the BCoV recovery between the two methods under consideration, the Cp Select method outperformed EMF in terms of both median value and average recovery value, as shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Comparison between EMF and Cp Select concentrator based on the BCoV recovery from wastewater and effective volume assayed with RT- qPCR.

The effective volume assayed is the original volume of wastewater assayed prior to concentration per reaction in the RT-qPCR. This volume depends on the initial wastewater volume used in the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

concentration step, the portion of the concentrated sample used in the RNA extraction process, and the volume (uL) of RNA used in the RT-qPCR reaction. The Cp Select method allowed the use of 5 mL equivalent wastewater per reaction, with a minimum of 1.33 mL, while the range of effective volume for the EMF method was 0.66 - 1.67 mL.

3.3 SARS-CoV-2 detection and quantification for EMF and Cp Select concentration methods.

Surrogate virus recovery and natural SARS-CoV-2 detection performance in real wastewater samples may not be the same, so we also compared performance between Cp Select and EMF concentration method using SARS-CoV-2 containing wastewater samples from our routine surveillance operation. We selected 20 samples which were then processed using the two concentration methods side by side, followed by RNA extraction, and quantification following the same protocols. 100-150 mL wastewater was filtered through the Cp-Select concentrator, while 40 mL (the volume routinely used in our surveillance protocol) was filtered through the EMF filter. Volumes higher than 40 mL result in clogging of the EMF filter. Both methods successfully detected naturally occurring SARS-CoV-2 virus, however, the Cp Select method performed better as shown in Figure 2. Out of 20 wastewater samples, SARS-CoV-2 was detected in 8 samples processed with the EMF method, while 13 samples were positive when processed using the Cp Select method. By concentrating viruses from a larger volume of wastewater, the Cp Select method resulted in more sensitive detection overall. Six samples which were reported negative using the routinely followed EMF method were detected as SARS-CoV-2 positive when processed with the Cp Select method, while in only one case did the EMF method detect a positive when the Cp Select did not. SARS-CoV-2 was detected in these samples with higher reported Cq values (i.e at lower viral copy numbers) which indicated that the workflow using the Cp Select concentration step is capable of capturing viruses from low-titer wastewater samples that may be missed using the EMF method.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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: Detection of SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater concentrated using the EMF and the Cp Select method. Out of 20 samples, the EMF method detected natural SARS-CoV-2 in 8 samples while Cp Select detected in 13 samples. Solid **blue square** boxes indicate samples processed with the EMF method while **orange triangle** symbols indicate processing using the Cp Select concentrator. **Open symbols** indicate that the virus is not detected with the corresponding method. Error bars indicate the standard deviation among replicates.

3.4 Performance comparison based on sampling volume size.

Recovery and detection performance was also evaluated considering the sample volume processed. A larger input volume of wastewater will contain more copies of the virus, making it easier to quantitate from low-titer samples. A separate set of wastewater samples (n=10) were processed using the same input volume of wastewater (40 mL, 60 mL, and 100 mL) for both the concentration methods side by side. Table 2 compares results from both methods based on 40 mL and 60 mL input volumes. The EMF approach could not reliably be used to process 100 mL samples as listed in Table 1, and so a direct comparison of outcomes from the two methods for that sample volume was not possible.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

Table 2: SARS-CoV-2 detection from wastewater sample concentrated by EMF and Cp Select concentrator

Sample ID	**40 mL sample**		**60 mL sample**	
	SARS-CoV-2 detection		SARS-CoV-2 detection	
	EMF	**Cp Select**	**EMF**	**Cp Select**
S1	-	-	-	-
S2	-	+	-	+
S3	+++	+++	-	+++
S4	-	-	-	-
S5	+++	+++	+++	+++
S6	-	+	-	+
S7	++	+++	++	+++
S8	-	+	+++	+++
S9	++	+++	+++	+++
S10	+	+		+
SARS-CoV-2 positive	**3 out of 10**	**4 out of 10**	**3 out of 10**	**5 out of 10**

- Not detected
+ SARS-CoV-2 detected in one replicate out of three
++ SARS-CoV-2 detected in two replicates out of three
+++ SARS-CoV-2 detected in three replicates out of three

The overall trend in results for both input volumes was similar to what we observed in the BCoV and wastewater SARS-CoV-2 recovery tests. For the 40 mL sampling volume, three samples were detected as positive for SARS-CoV-2 when the EMF protocol was used, and four when the Cp Select protocol was used. Cp Select derived Cq values were lower, indicating a higher viral titre, for samples that were positive using both methods. When a 60 mL sample volume was used as input, no additional positives were detected using the EMF protocol, but two additional samples were detected as positive with the Cp Select protocol. Detection was also more robust following Cp Select processing with the larger sample; all three qPCR replicates were positive in more samples in contrast to EMF-processed samples not showing detection in all replicates. There was also less variation among Cq values for each sample (See Supplementary Table S3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 3: Effect of sample volume size on the performance of EMF and Cp Select concentrator in terms of SARS-CoV-2 quantification and BCoV recovery.

The limit of detection (LoD) in RT-qPCR is the lowest concentration at which all replicates are positive at 95% confidence interval (CI) (Betancourt et al., 2021). The LoD for the Cp Select assay workflow was in the range of 1.5×10^3 to 3.75×10^3 copies/L for 100 mL to 40 mL wastewater samples processed, respectively, while it was 3.0×10^3 to 7.5×10^3 copies/L for the EMF method; twice the LoD of the Cp Select method. This implies that the Cp Select method is more sensitive in detecting SARS-CoV-2 virus from wastewater compared to the EMF method. This is evident in Figure 3(a) and 3(b) which shows the variability in the viral copy number detected from the same set of samples using the EMF and Cp Select workflows. When a 40 mL sample was processed

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

using the EMF method, SARS-CoV-2 quantification ranged from 10^4 - 4.2×10^5 genome copies/L while it was 1.5×10^3 - 9.3×10^4 genome copies/L using the Cp Select method. The median value of the quantification data falls in the upper end of the range for the Cp Select method and in the lower end for the EMF. The trend was also observed for the 60 mL data set, however, the sensitivity of quantification between the two approaches is not as clear as with the 40 mL data set.

In order to empirically determine if 100 mL is for optimal detection of SARS-CoV-2 with the Cp Select, sample sizes of 60 mL and 80 mL were also assayed. The 60 mL sample size showed significantly better performance in terms of viral detection and quantification as supported by the BCoV recovery result shown in Figure 3(c). No detectable improvement in SARS-CoV-2 or BCoV detection and quantification was observed for the EMF method at 60 mL. This is likely due to larger volume filtration causing the co-concentration of the inhibitors which makes it less efficient (Ahmed, Bertsch, Bivins, et al., 2020).

3.5 Virus attachment to solid debris.

Unlike the EMF method, the Cp Select approach requires a centrifugation step prior to filtration, to remove solids that would otherwise clog the filters. To determine whether a significant amount of virus remained in the pellet material from the centrifugation step, we determined recovery of BCoV and natural SARS-CoV-2 from both the pellet and the supernatant of centrifuged samples (Figure 4). A significantly smaller fraction of BCoV was recovered from the pellet than from the supernatant, which is supported by a t-test P-value of 0.015 ($P < 0.05$) with a 95% confidence interval. SARS-CoV-2 behaved differently from BCoV in centrifugation, with similar recovery fractions in the supernatant and pellet (P value of 0.857). Similar results were reported by Forés et al., (2021) in which 23% SARS-CoV-2 was detected in the pellet , but others have reported no significant difference in SARS-CoV-2 quantification results due to separating solids from the liquid (Pecson et al., 2021). This variation may be due to variability in the wastewater matrix at different collection sites, and also to differences in the methodological approaches, as in the second study only the difference between liquid with and without solid removal was measured, and the pellet material was not directly assayed.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 4: Fraction of viral material partitioned to the supernatant and solid debris fraction for Cp Select processed samples, which are centrifuged prior to concentration to remove debris. Left: BCoV recovery. Right: natural SARS-CoV-2 recovery.

3.6 Optimization of the Cp Select protocol.

The automated Cp Select concentrator is relatively a new method that has only recently begun to be widely adopted for filtration of wastewater samples. Though there are manufacturer-recommended protocols for concentration of virus from wastewater, which we initially followed, we tested several modifications aimed at improving the performance of the overall concentration workflow to increase recovery of SARS-CoV-2. Table 3 summarizes the optimization steps that were tested before adoption of the Cp Select into our standard laboratory operating protocol. Using the manufacturer-recommended protocol we were able to detect SARS-CoV-2 successfully by filtering 100 to 150 mL of wastewater; however, quantification was not as robust as with our established EMF protocol which uses a 40 mL input volume (Supplementary Table S1). We had previously observed improved results with EMF filtration upon addition of AVL lysis buffer to the filtered sample. Therefore, we tested the impact of adding an AVL lysis buffer with carrier RNA to the concentrated samples eluted from the Cp Select pipettes as described in section 2.4 and prior to RNA extraction. This addition to the manufacturer-recommended protocol significantly improved detection. SARS-CoV-2 was detected in all three replicates from the eluent with added lysis buffer, and not detected in the replicates without the lysis buffer (Supplementary

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

Table S2). This optimization was performed prior to comparing performance of the Cp Select and EMF with a larger number of samples as described in section 3.3, in which the modified Cp Select protocol outperformed the EMF method.

Table 3: Summary of method optimization steps for use of the Cp Select concentrator to improve a laboratory operating protocol for SARS-CoV-2 detection from wastewater.

Sampling event	**No. of samples**	**Method optimization steps**	**Purpose of the experiments**	**Comments**
10.14.2020	10	Initial test of Cp Select (100-150 mL) vs. EMF (40 mL)	Initial experiments to compare concentrator results with the EMF method	Cp Select concentrator detection not as good as EMF (Supplementary Table S1)
11.18.2020	03	Test effect of AVL lysis buffer addition	Determine if the Cp Select manufacturer protocol can be improved	SARS-CoV-2 detection was improved (Supplementary Table S2)
11.18.2020 & 11.23.2020	20	Compare modified Cp Select protocol to lab standard EMF protocol	Does the Cp Select protocol with modifications perform as well as or better than EMF	The Cp Select concentrator outperformed EMF, as shown in Figure 2.
12.07.2020	10	Optimize Cp Select input volume (40 mL - 100 mL)	To test the impact of using different input volumes on viral recovery and detection	40 mL input volume found to be better for EMF, while 60 mL is optimal for the Cp Select concentrator. Cp Select protocol results in greater sensitivity for SARS-CoV-2 than EMF as shown in Figure 3
03.12.21	10	Test impact of sonication prior to centrifugation	To determine whether sonication improves viral recovery	BCoV recovery improved (Table 4)

We previously observed that a fraction of viral material is adsorbed by suspended solids and settled with the pellet during the centrifugation step (Section 3.5). To counter this effect, we tested the impact of a very short sonication step (1 minute) prior to centrifugation of wastewater samples. The sonication step should disrupt the attachment of viral material to solids but was kept short in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

order to minimize damage to the viral RNA itself. Sonication treatment has been previously shown to increase viral recovery by causing desorption of viral particles from organic substances and release of viral particles from host cells (Corpuz et al., 2020; Strubbia et al., 2019).

Table 4: The effect of sonication treatment on BCoV recovery and SARS-CoV-2 detection.

Sample ID	pH	Turbidity (NTU)	BCoV recovery				SARS-CoV-2	
			Without Sonication		With Sonication		Without Sonication	With Sonication
			Avg Cq	Recovery (%)	Avg Cq	Recovery (%)	Avg Cq	Avg Cq
S31	7.5	46.5	33.7	3.2	29.8	50.4	36.2*	35.0
S32	7.5	>1000	35.1	1.2	ND	-	35.2*	ND
S33	8	390	33.5	3.8	33.5	3.8	ND	34.9
S34	7.5	338	35.1	1.3	34.5	1.8	ND	40.0
S35	7.5	>1000	35.2	1.1	32.6	7.1	35.5	37.5
S36	8.5	38.2	34.2	2.3	30.0	59.8	34.7	32.3
S37	8	>1000	33.0	5.2	31.6	14.5	36.5	35.7
S38	8	58.2	31.7	12.9	30.6	28.8	35.5	35.9
S39	8	978	ND	-	ND	-	ND	ND

Results of the sonication experiment are shown in Table 4. BCoV recovery improved for most samples after addition of the sonication treatment. Average recovery increased from 3.85% to 23.74%. Due to the variability of material collected in our ongoing sampling operation, the group of samples that were available for this analysis were very turbid (Table 4) compared to some of the samples used previously (Table 1), and initial BCoV recovery from these samples was somewhat lower than typical. Along with improved BCoV recovery from a majority of samples, SARS-CoV-2 detection also improved with sonication treatment, with Cq values being lower in many instances, and detection of the virus in samples which had previously appeared to be negative (Table 4). The sonication step may partly solve a problem common to all ultrafiltration-based concentration methods, in which some part of the virus is lost with the pellet during centrifugation. We subsequently adopted the sonication step as part of our standard operating protocol.

3.7 qPCR inhibition

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

Wastewater is considered as a complex matrix containing a variety of high molecular weight compounds such as humic acids, polysaccharides and proteins that cause interference during RT-qPCR amplification (Schlindwein et al., 2009). This effect may be greater with high concentrations of suspended solids. Though the majority of the inhibitory substances seem to be removed during the RNA extraction process, residual substances may interfere during the amplification reaction. To determine whether qPCR inhibition was more likely in samples processed with the Cp Select than in EMF-processed samples, 10 samples with 60 mL volume were processed using both methods, followed by RT-qPCR using the protocol described in Section 2.5. All samples were processed together in the same plate to avoid introduction of nuisance variables. The Cq value found in the DNase/RNase water acts as a reference standard for the wastewater sample. If a higher Cq value is measured in wastewater samples compared to the reference Cq value, it is assumed that there is some degree of inhibition due to the composition of the wastewater sample. Typically, a delayed Cq of 2 or greater in wastewater samples relative to the reference Cq value is considered to have RT-qPCR inhibition (Staley et al., 2012; Ahmed, Angel, et al., 2020).

RT-qPCR detection of the VetMAX™ Xeno™ Internal Positive Control spiked into the extracted RNA is shown in Figure 5. An average Cq of 8 NTC replicates was used as the reference point (Cq = 32.62). Most samples did not appear to be affected by inhibitors in the RT-qPCR step using either protocol, as nearly all Cq values fall within 2 Cq of the reference line. One sample processed with the Cp Select did show a delayed Cq, which was not replicated when the sample was processed using EMF, but overall the difference between the two methods did not meet a threshold for statistical significance when all values were compared. Cq values for all other samples processed with both of the methods were within the 1 Cq variation of the reference Cq value. This suggests there is no consistent and significant inhibition to RT-qPCR amplification for extracted RNA from samples processed with either of the two filtration methods.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 5: RT-qPCR inhibition test comparing results from samples concentrated with Cp Select and with the EMF method. Across all samples, differences in Cq did not rise to the level of statistical significance.

4. Conclusion

We have developed an optimized protocol for use of a relatively new product, the InnovaPrep Cp Select concentrator, in a routine building wastewater surveillance operation on a university campus. We have considered controlled viral recovery ability, using the enveloped BCoV virus as a process control, and we have also performed a comparative study of naturally occurring SARS-CoV-2 recovery from typical building wastewater samples. The behavior and chemistry of these samples may be somewhat different from highly pooled wastewater collected from primary clarifier water treatment facilities, so this optimized protocol is especially relevant for programs of monitoring in group living scenarios such as universities, prisons, and long term care facilities, or applications to wastewater surveillance to detect illness in known populations at schools and workplaces.

The Cp Select method resulted in a BCoV recovery rate of approximately 30%, which is significantly higher than BCoV recovery from samples processed using an EMF protocol. The Cp Select is capable of processing up to 150 mL of wastewater within 30 minutes, while the EMF

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

method fails at larger volumes and operates optimally with 40 mL input. This allows for a higher effective volume of wastewater to be assayed with the Cp Select relative to EMF, which in turn results in increased sensitivity for detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater. Overall, the processing time for handling a typical day's collected samples in a surveillance scenario was decreased by 33% (from 3 hours to 2 hours). We found that use of a lysis buffer (AVL) significantly improved the performance of the InnovaPrep manufacturer recommended protocol for wastewater and have introduced that modification to our routine work. One observation in use of an ultrafiltration-based protocol was that viral material may be lost with the pellet in the required centrifugation step, however, in combination with a brief sonication treatment, we were able to achieve higher recovery fractions. We did not observe significant differences in qPCR inhibition when the Cp Select protocol was used, relative to the EMF protocol. In general, the Cp Select concentrator is advantageous for concentrating low viral titer wastewater samples, especially when rapid data reporting is necessary, and the use of this protocol can also improve recovery and detection sensitivity.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Richard Tankersley, Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development and his team for supporting this project, and Rachel Noble, Professor at UNC-IMS for sharing knowledge regarding wastewater sample processing protocols that was leveraged in this project, Greg Cole and his team in Facilities Management for plumbing support and rest of members of the UNC Charlotte wastewater monitoring group including Visva B. Barua, Neha Mittal, Lauren R. Brazell, Keshawn Hinton, Isaiah Young.

References

Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J. W., Choi, P. M., Kitajima, M., Simpson, S. L., Li, J., Tscharke, B., Verhagen, R., Smith, W. J. M., Zaugg, J., Dierens, L., Hugenholtz, P., Thomas, K. V., & Mueller, J. F. (2020). First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *728*, 138764.

Ahmed, W., Bertsch, P. M., Bibby, K., Haramoto, E., Hewitt, J., Huygens, F., Gyawali, P., Korajkic, A., Riddell, S., Sherchan, S. P., Simpson, S. L., Sirikanchana, K., Symonds, E. M., Verhagen, R., Vasan, S. S., Kitajima, M., & Bivins, A. (2020). 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.

Ahmed, W., Bertsch, P. M., Bivins, A., Bibby, K., Farkas, K., Gathercole, A., Haramoto, E., Gyawali, P., Korajkic, A., McMinn, B. R., Mueller, J. F., Simpson, S. L., Smith, W. J. M., Symonds, E. M., Thomas, K. V., Verhagen, R., & Kitajima, M. (2020). Comparison of virus concentration methods for the RT-qPCR-based recovery of murine hepatitis virus, a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 from untreated wastewater. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *739*, 139960.

Barril, P. A., Pianciola, L. A., Mazzeo, M., Ousset, M. J., Jaureguiberry, M. V., Alessandrello, M., Sánchez, G., & Oteiza, J. M. (2021). Evaluation of viral concentration methods for SARS-CoV-2 recovery from wastewaters. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *756*, 144105.

Betancourt, W. Q., Schmitz, B. W., Innes, G. K., Prasek, S. M., Pogreba Brown, K. M., Stark, E. R., Foster, A. R., Sprissler, R. S., Harris, D. T., Sherchan, S. P., Gerba, C. P., & Pepper, I. L. (2021). COVID-19 containment on a college campus via wastewater-based epidemiology, targeted clinical testing and an intervention. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *779*, 146408.

CDC. (2020). *CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Corman, V. M., Landt, O., Kaiser, M., Molenkamp, R., Meijer, A., Chu, D. K., Bleicker, T., Brünink, S., Schneider, J., Schmidt, M. L., Mulders, D. G., Haagmans, B. L., van der Veer, B., van den Brink, S., Wijsman, L., Goderski, G., Romette, J.-L., Ellis, J., Zambon, M., … Drosten, C. (2020). Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. *Euro Surveillance: Bulletin Europeen Sur Les Maladies Transmissibles European*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

Communicable Disease Bulletin, *25*(3). https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045

Corpuz, M. V. A., Buonerba, A., Vigliotta, G., Zarra, T., Ballesteros, F., Jr, Campiglia, P., Belgiorno, V., Korshin, G., & Naddeo, V. (2020). Viruses in wastewater: occurrence, abundance and detection methods. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *745*, 140910.

Decaro, N., Elia, G., Campolo, M., Desario, C., Mari, V., Radogna, A., Colaianni, M. L., Cirone, F., Tempesta, M., & Buonavoglia, C. (2008). Detection of bovine coronavirus using a TaqMan-based real-time RT-PCR assay. *Journal of Virological Methods*, *151*(2), 167–171.

Forés, E., Bofill-Mas, S., Itarte, M., Martínez-Puchol, S., Hundesa, A., Calvo, M., Borrego, C. M., Corominas, L. L., Girones, R., & Rusiñol, M. (2021). Evaluation of two rapid ultrafiltration-based methods for SARS-CoV-2 concentration from wastewater. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *768*, 144786.

Francy, D. S., Stelzer, E. A., Bushon, R. N., Brady, A. M. G., Williston, A. G., Riddell, K. R., Borchardt, M. A., Spencer, S. K., & Gellner, T. M. (2012). Comparative effectiveness of membrane bioreactors, conventional secondary treatment, and chlorine and UV disinfection to remove microorganisms from municipal wastewaters. *Water Research*, *46*(13), 4164–4178.

Gibas, C., Lambirth, K., Mittal, N., Juel, M. A. I., Barua, V. B., Roppolo Brazell, L., Hinton, K., Lontai, J., Stark, N., Young, I., Quach, C., Russ, M., Kauer, J., Nicolosi, B., Chen, D., Akella, S., Tang, W., Schlueter, J., & Munir, M. (2021). Implementing building-level SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance on a university campus. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *782*, 146749.

Gonzalez, R., Curtis, K., Bivins, A., Bibby, K., Weir, M. H., Yetka, K., Thompson, H., Keeling, D., Mitchell, J., & Gonzalez, D. (2020). COVID-19 surveillance in Southeastern Virginia using wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Research*, *186*, 116296.

Greenwald, H. D., Kennedy, L. C., Hinkle, A., Whitney, O. N., Fan, V. B., Crits-Christoph, A., Harris-Lovett, S., Flamholz, A. I., Al-Shayeb, B., Liao, L. D., Beyers, M., Brown, D., Chakrabarti, A. R., Dow, J., Frost, D., Koekemoer, M., Lynch, C., Sarkar, P., White, E., … Nelson, K. L. (2021). *Interpretation of temporal and spatial trends of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

San Francisco Bay Area wastewater. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.04.21256418

Gutierrez, V. C., Castro Gutierrez, V., Hassard, F., Vu, M., Leitao, R., Burczynska, B., Wildeboer, D., Stanton, I., Rahimzadeh, S., Baio, G., Garelick, H., Hofman, J., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., Kwiatkowska, R., Majeed, A., Priest, S., Grimsley, J., Lundy, L., Singer, A. C., & Di Cesare, M. (2021). *Monitoring occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 in school populations: a wastewater-based approach*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.25.21254231

Jafferali, M. H., Khatami, K., Atasoy, M., Birgersson, M., Williams, C., & Cetecioglu, Z. (2021). Benchmarking virus concentration methods for quantification of SARS-CoV-2 in raw wastewater. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *755*(Pt 1), 142939.

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. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *746*, 141326.

La Rosa, G., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L., Kenmoe, S., & Suffredini, E. (2020). Coronavirus in water environments: Occurrence, persistence and concentration methods - A scoping review. *Water Research*, *179*, 115899.

LaTurner, Z. W., Zong, D. M., Kalvapalle, P., Gamas, K. R., Terwilliger, A., Crosby, T., Ali, P., Avadhanula, V., Santos, H. H., Weesner, K., Hopkins, L., Piedra, P. A., Maresso, A. W., & Stadler, L. B. (2021). Evaluating recovery, cost, and throughput of different concentration methods for SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Research*, *197*, 117043.

McMinn, B. R., Korajkic, A., Kelleher, J., Herrmann, M. P., Pemberton, A. C., Ahmed, W., Villegas, E. N., & Oshima, K. (2021). Development of a large volume concentration method for recovery of coronavirus from wastewater. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *774*, 145727.

Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., & Brouwer, A. (n.d.). *Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 in sewage*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.29.20045880

Nemudryi, A., Nemudraia, A., Wiegand, T., Surya, K., Buyukyoruk, M., Cicha, C., Vanderwood, K. K., Wilkinson, R., & Wiedenheft, B. (2020). Temporal Detection and Phylogenetic Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Wastewater. *Cell Reports.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

Medicine, *1*(6), 100098.

Pecson, B. M., Darby, E., Haas, C. N., Amha, Y., Bartolo, M., Danielson, R., Dearborn, Y., Di Giovanni, G., Ferguson, C., Fevig, S., Gaddis, E., Gray, D., Lukasik, G., Mull, B., Olivas, L., Olivieri, A., Qu, Y., & SARS-CoV-2 Interlaboratory Consortium. (2021). *Reproducibility and sensitivity of 36 methods to quantify the SARS-CoV-2 genetic signal in raw wastewater: findings from an interlaboratory methods evaluation in the U.S.* https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.20221622

Philo, S. E., Keim, E. K., Swanstrom, R., Ong, A. Q. W., Burnor, E. A., Kossik, A. L., Harrison, J. C., Demeke, B. A., Zhou, N. A., Beck, N. K., Shirai, J. H., & Meschke, J. S. (2021). A comparison of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentration methods for environmental surveillance. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *760*, 144215.

Rusiñol, M., Martínez-Puchol, S., Forés, E., Itarte, M., Girones, R., & Bofill-Mas, S. (2020). Concentration methods for the quantification of coronavirus and other potentially pandemic enveloped virus from wastewater. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health*, *17*, 21–28.

Schlindwein, A. D., Simões, C. M. O., & Barardi, C. R. M. (2009). Comparative study of two extraction methods for enteric virus recovery from sewage sludge by molecular methods. *Memorias Do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz*, *104*(4), 576–579.

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

Spurbeck, R. R., Minard-Smith, A. T., & Catlin, L. A. (n.d.). *Applicability of Neighborhood and Building Scale Wastewater-Based Genomic Epidemiology to Track the SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic and other Pathogens*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.18.21251939

Staley, C., Gordon, K. V., Schoen, M. E., & Harwood, V. J. (2012). Performance of two quantitative PCR methods for microbial source tracking of human sewage and implications for microbial risk assessment in recreational waters. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, *78*(20), 7317–7326.

Strubbia, S., Schaeffer, J., Oude Munnink, B. B., Besnard, A., Phan, M. V. T., Nieuwenhuijse,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.29.21257950; this version posted June 2, 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 .

D. F., de Graaf, M., Schapendonk, C. M. E., Wacrenier, C., Cotten, M., Koopmans, M. P. G., & Le Guyader, F. S. (2019). Metavirome Sequencing to Evaluate Norovirus Diversity in Sewage and Related Bioaccumulated Oysters. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, *10*, 2394.

Wu, F., Xiao, A., Zhang, J., Moniz, K., Endo, N., Armas, F., Bonneau, R., Brown, M. A., Bushman, M., Chai, P. R., Duvallet, C., Erickson, T. B., Foppe, K., Ghaeli, N., Gu, X., Hanage, W. P., Huang, K. H., Lee, W. L., Matus, M., … Alm, E. J. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater foreshadow dynamics and clinical presentation of new COVID-19 cases. *medRxiv : The Preprint Server for Health Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.15.20117747

Wu, F., Zhang, J., Xiao, A., Gu, X., Lee, W. L., Armas, F., Kauffman, K., Hanage, W., Matus, M., Ghaeli, N., Endo, N., Duvallet, C., Poyet, M., Moniz, K., Washburne, A. D., Erickson, T. B., Chai, P. R., Thompson, J., & Alm, E. J. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than Expected from Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems*, *5*(4). https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00614-20

Wu, Q., & Liu, W.-T. (2009). Determination of virus abundance, diversity and distribution in a municipal wastewater treatment plant. *Water Research*, *43*(4), 1101–1109.

Wurtzer, S., Marechal, V., Mouchel, J. M., Maday, Y., Teyssou, R., Richard, E., Almayrac, J. L., & Moulin, L. (2020). Evaluation of lockdown effect on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics through viral genome quantification in waste water, Greater Paris, France, 5 March to 23 April 2020. *Euro Surveillance: Bulletin Europeen Sur Les Maladies Transmissibles = European Communicable Disease Bulletin*, *25*(50). https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.50.2000776


Cp Select Concentration Method
Cp Select Concentration
Reduce filtration time by 30%
Wastewater Sample
RNA Extraction
Positive
Threshold
Negative
Fluorescence
Cycles
RT-qPCR; Results
Electronegative Membrane Filtration (EMF) Method
EMF Filtration