

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

1 A Comparison of Four Commercially Available RNA Extraction Kits for Wastewater

2 Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in a College Population

3

4 Authors: Megan O'Brien^{1*}, Zachary C. Rundell^{2*}, Michelle D. Nemecek¹, Laura M. Langan³,

5 Jeffrey A. Back², Joaquin N. Lugo⁴. ¹ Molecular Biosciences Center, ²Center for Reservoir and

6 Aquatic Systems, ³Department of Environmental Sciences, ⁴Department of Psychology and

7 Neuroscience, Baylor University, Waco, TX 76798, USA.

8

9

10 Keywords: wastewater-based epidemiology; WBE, sewage, COVID-19

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 Corresponding author

20

21 Dr. Joaquin N. Lugo

22 Department of Psychology and Neuroscience

23 One Bear Place 97334

24 Baylor University

25 Waco, TX 76798

26 Tel: 254-71-2389

27 Email: Joaquin_lugo@baylor.edu

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

28 *Abstract*

29 Localized wastewater surveillance has allowed for public health officials to gain a broader
30 understanding of SARS-CoV-2 viral prevalence in the community allowing public health
31 officials time to prepare for impending outbreaks. Given variable levels of virus in the
32 population through public health interventions, proper concentration and extraction of viral RNA
33 is a key step in ensuring accurate detections. With many commercial RNA extraction kits and
34 methodologies available, the performance of 4 different kits were evaluated for SARS-CoV-2
35 RNA detection in wastewater, specifically focusing on their applicability to lower population
36 densities such as those at university campus dorms. Raw wastewater samples were collected at 4
37 sites on a college campus over a 24 hour period as a composite sample. Included in these sites
38 was an isolation site that housed students that tested positive for Covid-19 via nasopharyngeal
39 swabs. These samples were analyzed using the following kits: Qiagen All Prep PowerViral
40 DNA/RNA kit, New England BioLabs Monarch RNA MiniPrep Kit, and Zymo Quick RNA-
41 Viral Kit, and the Zymo Quick-RNA Fecal/Soil Microbe MicroPrep Kit. All four sites were
42 processed according to the manufacturer's guidelines. Extractions were then quantified with RT-
43 qPCR one-step reactions using an N2 primer and a linearized plasmid standard. While the Zymo
44 Quick-RNA Fecal/Soil Microbe MicroPrep Kit (also known as the Zymo Environ Water RNA
45 Kit) only recovered approximately 73% (+/- 38%) SARS-CoV-2 RNA compared to the Zymo
46 Quick-RNA Viral kit, it was the most time efficient kit to yield comparable results. This
47 extraction kit had a cumulative processing time of approximately five hours compared, while the
48 other three kits had processing times between approximately 9 and 9.5 hours. Based on the
49 current research, the most effective kits for smaller population densities are pellet based and
50 include a homogenization, inhibitor removal, and RNA preservation step.

51

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

52 *1. Introduction*

53 On January 31, 2020, the WHO declared COVID-19 a Public Health Emergency of
54 International Concern (Jee, WHO, 2020). Widespread testing of those with and without COVID-
55 19 symptoms, in combination with the numerous vaccine roll outs is vital to curtailing the
56 current pandemic and future outbreaks. The current estimate of infected individuals is believed to
57 be underestimated worldwide, with numerous nations initially encouraging testing for those only
58 with symptoms. Therefore, those who are presymptomatic or asymptomatic are often less likely
59 to be identified, thus posing a significant potential for transmission, with studies estimating that
60 asymptomatic or presymptomatic transmission could be responsible for up to 50% of new cases
61 (Ghandi et. al 2020, Moghadas et. al 2020).

62 A variety of diagnostic testing methods are available to determine if individuals are
63 infected with COVID-19. Current diagnostic testing involves the collection and PCR analysis of
64 infected cells and bodily fluids for the SARS-CoV-2 virus by drawing blood or collecting
65 samples from the nose, mouth, throat, or lungs (Ravi et. al 2020). While useful, these testing
66 methods are hazardous, resource-intensive, and invasive. Ongoing shortages and supply chain
67 disruptions have been a major challenge in implementing diagnostic PCR tests (Binnicker 2020).
68 Furthermore, diagnostic PCR tests may be insensitive for the first 5-7 days following infection
69 (Binnicker 2020). Pooled testing of samples may offer a potential solution to supply chain issues,
70 but pooled testing increases the likelihood of false negatives in low-level positive samples and
71 sample contamination (Binnicker 2020).

72 Wastewater based epidemiology offers a promising method of Covid-19 surveillance that
73 may solve some of these pressing issues. Although a relatively new field, it has conventionally
74 been successfully used to estimate use of legal and illegal drugs of abuse and to evaluate human

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

75 exposure to contaminants and pathogens as summarized in Lorenzo et al. (2019). Active
76 monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater can be a useful tool for identifying hotspots and
77 has been demonstrated to serve as an early warning system for new outbreaks (Xagorarki et. al
78 2019, Venugopal et. al 2020, Betancourt et. al 2020). This method is unique as it allows
79 researchers to survey large groups of people quickly with fewer resources and staff. Wastewater
80 based epidemiology is also less intrusive compared to nasal swabs and reduces occupational
81 exposure to SARS-CoV-2. Perhaps the largest benefit of wastewater surveillance is its efficiency
82 and ability to view community prevalence. Thus, areas with higher viral copies may be focused
83 on for individual testing efforts and public health interventions. Wastewater surveillance works
84 due to SARS-CoV-2 RNA being detectable in the feces of both symptomatic and asymptomatic
85 individuals (Hart et. al 2020, Mizumoto et. al 2020, Treibel et. al 2020), even after the
86 individuals no longer had respiratory symptoms (Zheng et. al 2020, Mesoraca et. al 2020, Jones
87 et. al 2020). This method of detection is exceptionally sensitive, with one modeling exercise
88 suggesting that wastewater surveillance could theoretically be able to detect one SARS-CoV-2
89 infection among 2,000,000 individuals (Hart et. al 2020). Although there is some contrasting
90 information, when levels go below 25 cases per 100,000 (as is likely), the methodology has to be
91 adjusted as outlined in D'Aoust, 2020 in which was measured and then estimated, rather than
92 modelled (D'Aoust et al. 2021).

93 Wastewater based epidemiology is a powerful tool that can provide vital information
94 about the spread of Covid-19 and can be useful in prioritizing diagnostic PCR testing. It has
95 demonstrated its ability to effectively aide in detecting affected individuals so students could be
96 tested or isolated to prevent further spread on a college campus (Betancourt et. al 2020).
97 Unfortunately, a need exists for standardized techniques in applying this method to Covid-19

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

98 surveillance (Ahmed et. al 2020). As populations contributing to the wastewater vary in their
99 characteristics, so does the overall matrix of the wastewater sample (Kitajima et. al 2020).
100 Consequently, numerous methods of sample processing exist, which can make it difficult for
101 researchers to choose an optimal method for accurate detection. Furthermore, sampling in small
102 population densities adds another layer of complexity to detection due to a potential for lower
103 viral loads than typical in municipalities. Monitoring in communities with low incidence has
104 previously demonstrated high PCR Ct values and hence variable or unquantifiable data being
105 collected due to very low concentrations of the viral fragment in the collected samples (D'Aoust
106 et al. 2021).

107 The selection of an appropriate RNA isolation kit is a key component of processing
108 samples that can have a major impact on the results yielded. This study aims to provide an
109 overview of the efficacy and efficiency of four common RNA isolation kits produced by Zymo,
110 Qiagen, and New England Biolabs when surveilling a small population for SARS-CoV-2 in
111 wastewater. The endpoints examined in this study include a comparison of viral detection across
112 all four kits as well as a qualitative description of each method.

113 *2. Materials and Methods*

114 *2.1 Sample Collection*

115 Wastewater was collected from 4 buildings in Waco, Texas on Baylor University's
116 campus. Sites A-C were collected from 3 dormitories and with a total, combined population of
117 approximately 850 students at time of collection. Included in these sites was a dormitory that
118 consistently yielded non-detectable values (site B). An additional isolation site, (Site I) was also

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

119 included, this site housed an unknown number of students who were isolated due to active
120 SARS-CoV-2 infections.

121 Composite 8.64-liters samples were collected over a 24-hr period in polypropylene
122 bottles from 11:00 am on 10/6/2020 to 10:45 am on 10/7/2020. ISCO model 6712 automatic
123 samplers were programmed to collect composite samples in 90 mL increments every 15 minutes.
124 The sample bottle chamber was filled with ice to keep the samples cold. Upon collection, each
125 composite sample was mixed by hand and an aliquot was poured into a 250 mL polypropylene
126 centrifuge bottle (Fisherbrand, catalog # 14-375-352) and stored on ice. Samples were processed
127 approximately 1 hour after collection.

128 *2.2 RNA Concentration and Extraction*

129 Following collection, samples were concentrated by centrifuging each 250 mL sample in
130 the original bottle at 4°C for 45 minutes on a coast deceleration setting so as not to disturb the
131 pellet (AVANTI JXN 26, JS-7.5 rotor, 4700 RCF). Supernatant (150 mL) was collected and
132 aliquoted for use in three of the extraction kits. The remaining 100 mL pellet was resuspended
133 and used for the pellet-based extraction kit.

134 The resulting 150 mL filtrate was further concentrated using ultrafiltration with
135 AMICON 15 mL conical filtration tubes (Sigma Aldrich; UFC901024). Filtrate was loaded in
136 increments of 15 mL until the total collection volume had been reduced to~ 1000 μ L (5000 RCF,
137 Eppendorf A-4-62 swing-bucket rotor with adaptors). In some cases, the filters became clogged
138 and a new ultrafilter was required and when necessary the sample was transferred to a new
139 filtration tube. Concentrate was then aliquoted (~250 μ) and RNA exactions carried out using
140 extraction kits 1-3: Qiagen All Prep PowerViral DNA/RNA kit (80244), New England BioLabs

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

141 Monarch RNA MiniPrep Kit (T2010S) and Zymo Quick RNA-Viral (R1034) following
142 manufacturer instructions.

143 For the pellet, 45 out of the 100 mL of the resuspended pellet was collected into 50 mL conical
144 tubes. Urine conditioning buffer (3.150 mL, D3061-1-140) was added thoroughly mixed, then
145 centrifuged (5000 RCF x 15 min, RT; Eppendorf FA-45-6-30 fixed rotor). Following
146 centrifugation, the remaining filtrate was removed (~47.9 mL) leaving ~ 250 μ L concentrated
147 pellet composite. To this, 750 μ L of RNA/DNA shield (Zymo, R1100-250) was then added to
148 the sample and held at 4°C until extraction. All extractions took place in an RNase, DNase-free
149 hood environment, following manufacturers guidelines. A true blank site was run for primary
150 concentration/processing integrity. RNA extraction blanks were included with each extraction
151 batch and kit.

152 *2.3 PCR Analysis*

153 Quantification of viral load was determined via RT-qPCR (QuantStudios 6 Flex) using
154 New England BioLabs Enzyme and Probe Master kit (New England Biolabs, Catalog E3006X)
155 with IDT N2 RUO primers (IDT, catalog #10006713). Each plate contained triplicates of each
156 condition; whose CT's were averaged to get the mean CT for each sample for each extraction
157 method. The standards used contained a linearized 200,000 cp/uL N plasmid standard (IDT,
158 catalog #10006625) which was diluted into a 10,000 copies/ μ L stock. Each plate's standard
159 curve was conducted using an 8 series dilution, starting with 10,000 copies/ μ L to 2.441
160 copies/ μ L. In order to accurately assess whether inhibitors are acting upon collected samples, 1:2
161 dilutions were made from the RNA extract directly prior to plate analysis. Non-template controls
162 confirmed PCR integrity. More information on PCR analysis can be found in the Supplemental
163 Information.

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

164 *3. Results*

165 To benchmark the performance of the kits, the controls (viz. field blanks, extraction
166 blanks and PCR blanks, and no template controls) were first all confirmed to be non-detectable
167 for SARS-CoV-2. Thereafter, the individual sites were examined. Site B acts as a control for the
168 methodology, with consistency low incidence levels historically recorded. For this sampling
169 location, Site B resulted in a non-detectable sample across all RNA extraction kits evaluated
170 (Table 1), with contrastingly high viral loads identified at the isolation site. In contrast, Site A
171 and C both tested positive, with detectable levels consistent even between dilutions, with the
172 exception of the Monarch RNA Cleanup Kit, which saw a non-detected value for the original
173 sample, yet when diluted yielded a highly positive value. There were differences between each of
174 the kits' amplifications, of which the Qiagen kit performed consistently between dilutions,
175 potentially indicating adequate inhibitor removal, but yielded lower values compared to the other
176 kits.

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

188 **Table 1: Campus sites and SARS-CoV-2 detection in Copies/L with 4 different commercial RNA**
 189 **extraction kits.**

Copies/Liter + Coefficient of Variation (CV)				
	New England Biolabs Monarch RNA MiniPrep Kit	Qiagen AllPrep PowerViral DNA/RNA Kit	Zymo Quick RNA-Viral Fecal/Soil Microbe Microprep Kit	Zymo Quick RNA-Viral with Inhibitor Removal
Site A				
undiluted	Not detected	6.2E+03 (19% CV)	1.3E+04 (20% CV)	3.9E+04 (11% CV)
1:2	1.6E+04 (8% CV)	5.3E+03 (38% CV)	1.1E+04 (12% CV)	4.0E+04 (16% CV)
Site B				
undiluted	Not detected	Not detected	Not detected	Not detected
1:2	Not detected	Not detected	Not detected	Not detected
Site C				
undiluted	1.2E+04 (29% CV)	5.7E+02 (87% CV)	1.2E+04 (38% CV)	1.0E+04 (21% CV)
1:2	1.0E+04 (12% CV)	2.5E+02 (74% CV)	7.3E+03 (7% CV)	9.8E+03 (10% CV)
Site Isolation				
undiluted	4.5E+07 (5% CV)	2.1E+06 (17% CV)	1.7E+07 (26% CV)	2.3E+07 (8% CV)
1:2	2.9E+07 (21% CV)	1.2E+06 (5% CV)	1.7E+07 (4% CV)	1.6E+07 (9% CV)

190

191 Between the kits, the Zymo Quick RNA-Viral with Inhibitor Removal consistently

192 yielded the highest resulting viral loads. There were similarities between the Zymo Fecal Kit and

193 the Quick-Viral RNA kit processes, including inhibitor removal steps. On average, the Zymo

194 Fecal Kit values ranging from approximately 7,300 to 17,000,000 copies/L whereas the Zymo

195 Quick-Viral RNA kit ranged from 9,800 to 23,000,000 copies/L. The Zymo Fecal Kit recovered

196 approximately 73% (+/- 38%) more SARS-CoV-2 RNA than the Zymo Quick-Viral RNA kit per

197 site. Examining the % Coefficients of variation between each site, each method, and each

198 dilution factor was between 4%-87%. The Zymo Quick-Viral RNA kit had the lowest


Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

199 Coefficients of variations, whereas Qiagen’s kit had some of the higher values. The Zymo Fecal
200 Kit pellet showed dilutions may improve Coefficients of variation values.

201 In regards to the isolation site, the New England BioLabs kit obtained the highest viral
202 load at 45,000,000 copies/L in the original sample, and 28,000,000 copies/L in the diluted
203 sample. However, New England BioLabs kit was the most variable in terms of consistency
204 between dilutions. Here, the original sample carried a higher load (45.3%) than the diluted
205 sample. The Zymo Fecal kit had the least variation between the dilution series (0.99%), as we
206 saw with the site comparisons.

207 The Impact of PCR inhibitors was examined using the isolation location (Site I), with
208 little difference observed in the Zymo Fecal kit between concentrate and diluted sample in
209 comparison to other kits. Interestingly, cp/L at the isolation site is markedly lower in the Qiagen
210 kit compared to others which is surprisingly considering that this kit has been used heavily in
211 wastewater testing of large municipalities.

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2



212


213 **Figure 1: Investigating impacts of dilutions between the four kits for a known positive**

214 **isolation site.** Impact of PCR inhibitors were examined using the isolation location (Site I), with
215 little difference observed in the Zymo Fecal kit between concentrate and diluted sample in
216 comparison to other kits. Interestingly, cp/L at the isolation site is markedly lower in the Qiagen
217 kit compared to others which is surprisingly considering that this kit has been used heavily in
218 wastewater testing of large municipalities..

219 3.2 Population Normalization

220 Normalizing the data by population is another key in determining hotspots for potential
221 outbreaks. If the viral load per resident is high relative to the surrounding sites, this could be a
222 potential indicator of an upcoming outbreak. Following normalizing to population size, Site A
223 population (539) and Site C population (153), there is consistent differences in viral loads
224 between extraction kits and between sites, with the Qiagen kit reporting markedly lower viral
225 levels than the other kits examined. (Figure 2).

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2



226

227 **Figure 2: Average Copies/L normalized by population.** Average Copies/L was calculated by
228 dividing the number of residents for a specific site.

229 *3.3 Qualitative Results*

230 Previous work has found that there is a lack of qualitative information for wastewater
231 concentration and RNA extraction methodologies (Ahmed et. al 2020). Therefore, we have
232 provided qualitative information based on previous experiments. All times are approximate, and
233 prices are listed as current for time of publication (Table 2). Footnotes can be found in
234 Supplemental Information.

235

236

237

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

238 **Table 2: Qualitative descriptions for each RNA extraction kit used.**

<i>Qualitative Table for Extraction Methods</i>	New England Biolabs Monarch RNA MiniPrep	Qiagen AllPrep PowerViral DNA/RNA Kit	Zymo Quick-RNA Fecal/Soil Microbe MicroPrep	Zymo Quick-RNA Viral with Inhibitor Removal
Time of Kit	30 mins	1 hour	1.5 Hours	20 mins + 20 mins for Inhibitor Removal
Price (at time of publication)	\$17.9/sample	\$24.47/sample	\$10.44/sample	\$24.23/sample
Extra Equipment	Floor Centrifuge	Floor Centrifuge		Floor Centrifuge
Consumables	AMICON Ultrafilters	AMICON Ultrafilters	Nuclease Free Tubes (2 mL)	AMICON Ultrafilters; Nuclease Free Tubes (2mL)
Type of Wastewater concentrate	Filtrate	Filtrate	Pellet	Filtrate
Extra Reagents	100% Ethanol	B-Mercaptoethanol	100% Ethanol	100% Ethanol
Extra Supplies	RNAse-free Tubes	No	RNAse-free Tubes	RNAse-free Tubes
Effectiveness	Lower	Lower	Higher	Higher
Overall Turn-around Time for 4 Samples	9 hours	9.5 hours	5 hours	9 hours
Qualitative Thoughts	If using this kit, we would suggest also using the DNase I treatment recommended by representatives from New England Biolabs	Lost a significant amount of RNA sample compared to other kits	Kit is tedious with larger sample volumes, but overall gave best results	Especially with Inhibitor Removal step, could provide a comparative alternative for Fecal Kit, but longer processing times

239

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

240 These times are total working hours and assume no breaks in between each section of
241 processing, for only four samples. There is also the assumption that the technician has conducted
242 the protocols prior to beginning the process. It should be noted that at the time of publication, the
243 Zymo Quick-RNA Fecal/Soil Microbe MicroPrep Kit has been renamed as the Zymo Environ
244 Water RNA Kit (Zymo Research, catalog #R2042), in which the only difference is that the urine
245 conditioning buffer and DNA/RNA shield are included with the kit purchase.

246 Filtrate-based methods that use ultrafiltration considerably increased processing times
247 due to long centrifuge runs and the potential for clogging filters (Table 2). The Zymo Quick-
248 RNA Fecal/Soil MicroPrep kit required the most time, but yielded results more consistently
249 across the board. This methodology also does not require the use of a floor centrifuge, meaning it
250 may be available to a wider audience looking to start local surveillance.

251 *4. Discussion*

252 The ongoing pandemic of SARS-CoV-2 has allowed for greater expansion of wastewater based
253 epidemiology (WBE) as a tool for public health surveillance. Recent testing conducted at the
254 University of Arizona demonstrated the ability for campus wastewater surveillance to be used as
255 an early detection system to pinpoint potential hot spots and isolate individuals, even before
256 symptoms show (Betancourt et. al 2021). Historically, WBE has focused mostly on enteric
257 viruses, where many of these viruses are non-enveloped. Since SARS-CoV-2 is an enveloped
258 virus, this provides additional challenges for its concentration and detection in wastewater (Ye
259 et. al 2016, Polo et. al 2020, Torii et. al 2021). Traditional methods of RNA extraction, such as
260 polyethylene glycol precipitation (PEG) are not as effective at concentrating enveloped viruses
261 since the lipid membrane more sensitive and possibly degraded by organic solvents like
262 chloroform (Polo et. al 2020) and in past publications for SARS-CoV-2 have returned lower

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

263 recovery efficiencies (Ahmed et. al 2020, Torii et. al 2021). The current study populations varied
264 from 140-540 persons per site, compared with upwards of 10,000 or more for a municipal
265 wastewater treatment plant. Since PEG precipitations require small initial volumes, low
266 concentration/high volume samples are at a disadvantage and rely heavily on primary
267 concentration methods to be effective (Lu et. al 2020). The Qiagen AllPrep PowerViral
268 DNA/RNA kit has been used frequently in testing municipal wastewater for SARS-CoV-2 RNA,
269 where a higher population density is contributing to the collection sample. When considering
270 smaller populations and thus smaller RNA inputs, the Qiagen kit did not perform as well in our
271 study. This could be due to the selectivity of combined RNA/DNA columns, or the lack of
272 DNA/RNA preservation (such as DNA/RNA shield or urine conditioning buffer) throughout the
273 long filtration steps.

274 Primary concentration from raw wastewater samples has been demonstrated as an
275 obstacle in effectively concentrating viral loads (Hamouda et. al 2021, Ahmed et. al 2020).
276 Pellet-based methods have gained traction recently for higher quality and higher quantity of viral
277 copies per sample (Kitamura et. al 2021, Perez-Cataluna et. al 2020, D'Aoust et. al 2020,
278 Graham et. al 2021). The filtrate based kits used in this study required larger sample volumes
279 compared to the pellet-based kits, and the filtrate based kits also require an additional
280 ultracentrifugation step. Ultrafilter clogging was an issue with ultracentrifugation, and loss of
281 viral load is assumed with each tube transfer.

282 Finding effective methods to accurately identify low SARS-CoV-2 viral loads in
283 wastewater are important for sectors such as hospitals, nursing homes, or schools, which have a
284 lower flow rates than municipal wastewater treatment plants that are normally investigated
285 during broad surveillances. The Qiagen All Prep PowerViral kit columns select for both DNA

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

286 and RNA, where RNA could be potentially lost. New England BioLabs suggests the use of their
287 DNASE 1 treatment to aide in better recovery and prevent RNA degradation. The Zymo Quick-
288 RNA Fecal/Soil MicroPrep Kit included two forms of RNA preservation (DNA/RNA shield and
289 urine conditioning buffer) which may have aided in its higher recoveries. Based on these results,
290 we would recommend choosing a kit that specifically targets RNA extraction, and not a
291 combined kit. This would allow for DNA removal as well, with which we saw increased
292 detection in RNA viral loads. Homogenization of samples prior to extraction can aide in
293 breaking viral capsids and releasing viral RNA. The Qiagen kit did not include filtrate
294 homogenization steps, which could have affected its lower detection values. A kit that includes
295 an inhibitor removal component is also vital, even in samples with low population density. The
296 Monarch Kit did not include an inhibitor removal step during the extraction process, whereas the
297 other kits involved at least one inhibitor removal step. This would indicate that inhibitor removal
298 was indeed necessary to see higher amplifications in CT values, since diluting inhibited samples
299 is known to increase the efficiency of primer binding to cDNA, where inhibitors themselves are
300 then diluted (Hata et. al 2015). Dilutions could be conducted in the instance that a kit with
301 inhibitor removal is unavailable.

302 A greater need for surveillance raises questions with cost and accessibility. For smaller
303 sampling canvases, such as hospitals or nursing homes, a kit that can quantify smaller amount of
304 the virus accurately is important. Further, the ability to conduct in house processing would
305 greatly alleviate the expenditures of sending samples out to another lab. Time is also an
306 important factor to consider while choosing an extraction method. Depending on the number of
307 samples, as well as sample composition, time can vary greatly.

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

308 Since viral shedding through feces can be seen in both symptomatic and
309 asymptomatic/presymptomatic patients, health officials can see larger trends in community
310 prevalence than through nasal swabbing alone (Hart et. al 2020, Mizumoto et. al 2020, Treibel et.
311 al 2020). Duration of viral shedding in symptomatic patients can vary anywhere from a matter
312 14-21 days (Wu et. al 2021). It is indicated that viral shedding through feces precedes symptoms
313 of COVID-19, and thus is imperative that precautionary measures be taken as soon as possible to
314 prevent widespread contagion throughout the sample population, even in low prevalence areas
315 (Randazzo et. al 2020).

316 *5. Conclusion*

317 The results of this study show that a pellet-based RNA extraction kit that includes an
318 inhibitor removal and RNA preservation step may yield the most consistent, timely, and accurate
319 results. These additional steps may be why the Zymo Quick-RNA Fecal/Soil Microbe MicroPrep
320 (also called the Zymo Environ Water RNA kit) was the most effective and efficient kit with the
321 samples we used in the study. In contrast, the least effective kit was the Qiagen All Prep
322 PowerViral DNA/RNA Kit. This was likely due to the absences of a preservation step and
323 inefficiencies stemming from the kit selecting for both DNA and RNA. For filtrate based
324 methods, we recommend using the Zymo Quick-RNA Viral kit as an effective and efficient
325 method of wastewater based epidemiological analysis in concentrated wastewater samples,
326 especially in smaller population densities.

327

328

329

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

330 *Acknowledgements*

331 We would like to acknowledge the financial support from Baylor University and for support
332 from Dr. Bryan Brooks and Dr. Kevin Chambliss.

333 CRediT roles: **Megan O'Brien**: Conceptualization, Investigation, Visualization, Writing -
334 original draft; Writing - review & editing. **Zachary Rundell**: Conceptualization, Investigation,
335 Writing - original draft; Writing - review & editing. **Michelle Nemec**: Conceptualization,
336 Investigation, Writing- Reviewing and Editing. **Laura Langan**: Conceptualization,
337 Methodology, Writing- Reviewing and Editing. **Jeffrey Back**: Conceptualization, Methodology,
338 Writing- Reviewing and Editing.: **Joaquin Lugo**: Conceptualization, Writing- Reviewing and
339 Editing, Supervision.

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

350 **References**

- 351 Ahmed, Warish, et al. “Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater: Methods
352 Optimization and Quality Control Are Crucial for Generating Reliable Public Health
353 Information.” *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health*, vol. 17, 2020, pp. 82–
354 93., doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.003.
- 355 Betancourt, Walter Q., et al. “COVID-19 Containment on a College Campus via Wastewater-
356 Based Epidemiology, Targeted Clinical Testing and an Intervention.” *Science of The Total
357 Environment*, vol. 779, 2021, p. 146408., doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146408.
- 358 Binnicker, Matthew J. “Challenges and Controversies to Testing for COVID-19.” *Journal of
359 Clinical Microbiology*, vol. 58, no. 11, 2020, doi:10.1128/jcm.01695-20.
- 360 D’Aoust, Patrick M., et al. “Quantitative Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from Wastewater
361 Solids in Communities with Low COVID-19 Incidence and Prevalence.” 2020,
362 doi:10.1101/2020.08.11.20173062.
- 363 Gandhi, Monica, et al. “Asymptomatic Transmission, the Achilles’ Heel of Current Strategies to
364 Control Covid-19.” *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 382, no. 22, 2020, pp. 2158–
365 2160., doi:10.1056/nejme2009758.
- 366 Graham, Katherine E., et al. “SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with
367 COVID-19 Cases in a Large Urban Sewershed.” *Environmental Science and Technology*,
368 2020, doi:10.1101/2020.09.14.20194472.

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

- 369 Hamouda, Mohamed, et al. “Wastewater Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2: Lessons Learnt from
370 Recent Studies to Define Future Applications.” *Science of The Total Environment*, vol.
371 759, 2021, p. 143493., doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143493.
- 372 Hart, Olga E., and Rolf U. Halden. “Computational Analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19
373 Surveillance by Wastewater-Based Epidemiology Locally and Globally: Feasibility,
374 Economy, Opportunities and Challenges.” *Science of The Total Environment*, vol. 730,
375 2020, p. 138875., doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138875.
- 376 Hata, Akihiko, et al. “Organic Substances Interfere with Reverse Transcription-Quantitative
377 PCR-Based Virus Detection in Water Samples.” *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*,
378 vol. 81, no. 5, 2014, pp. 1585–1593., doi:10.1128/aem.03082-14.
- 379 Jee, Youngmee. “WHO International Health Regulations Emergency Committee for the COVID-
380 19 Outbreak.” *Epidemiology and Health*, vol. 42, 2020, doi:10.4178/epih.e2020013.
- 381 Jones, Davey, et al. “Fecal Shedding of SARS-CoV-2 and Its Potential Role in Person-To-Person
382 Transmission and the Environment-Based Spread of COVID-19.” 2020,
383 doi:10.20944/preprints202007.0471.v1.
- 384 Kitajima, Masaaki, et al. “SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater: State of the Knowledge and Research
385 Needs.” *Science of The Total Environment*, vol. 739, 2020, p. 139076.,
386 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076.

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

- 387 Kitamura, Kouichi, et al. “Efficient Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the Solid Fraction of
388 Wastewater.” *Science of The Total Environment*, vol. 763, 2021, p. 144587.,
389 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144587.
- 390 Lorenzo, M., & Picó, Y. (2019). Wastewater-based epidemiology: Current status and future
391 prospects. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health*, 9, 77–84.
392 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2019.05.007>
- 393 Lu, Dingnan, et al. “Primary Concentration – The Critical Step in Implementing the Wastewater
394 Based Epidemiology for the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Mini-Review.” *Science of The Total
395 Environment*, vol. 747, 2020, p. 141245., doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141245.
- 396 Mesoraca, Alvaro, et al. “Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 Viral RNA in Fecal Samples.” *Virology
397 Journal*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2020, doi:10.1186/s12985-020-01359-1.
- 398 Mizumoto, Kenji, et al. “Estimating the Asymptomatic Proportion of Coronavirus Disease 2019
399 (COVID-19) Cases on Board the Diamond Princess Cruise Ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020.”
400 *Eurosurveillance*, vol. 25, no. 10, 2020, doi:10.2807/1560-7917.es.2020.25.10.2000180.
- 401 Moghadas, Seyed M., et al. “The Implications of Silent Transmission for the Control of COVID-
402 19 Outbreaks.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 117, no. 30, 2020,
403 pp. 17513–17515., doi:10.1073/pnas.2008373117.
- 404 Polo, David, et al. “Making Waves: Wastewater-Based Epidemiology for COVID-19 –
405 Approaches and Challenges for Surveillance and Prediction.” *Water Research*, vol. 186,
406 2020, p. 116404., doi:10.1016/j.watres.2020.116404.

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

- 407 Pérez-Cataluña, Alba, et al. “Comparing Analytical Methods to Detect SARS-CoV-2 in
408 Wastewater.” *Science of The Total Environment*, vol. 758, 2021, p. 143870.,
409 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143870.
- 410 Randazzo, Walter, et al. “SARS-CoV-2 RNA Titers in Wastewater Anticipated COVID-19
411 Occurrence in a Low Prevalence Area.” *Water Research*, 2020,
412 doi:10.1101/2020.04.22.20075200.
- 413 Ravi, Neeraja, et al. “Diagnostics for SARS-CoV-2 Detection: A Comprehensive Review of the
414 FDA-EUA COVID-19 Testing Landscape.” *Biosensors and Bioelectronics*, vol. 165, 2020,
415 p. 112454., doi:10.1016/j.bios.2020.112454.
- 416 Torii, Shotaro, et al. “Applicability of Polyethylene Glycol Precipitation Followed by Acid
417 Guanidinium Thiocyanate-Phenol-Chloroform Extraction for the Detection of SARS-CoV-
418 2 RNA from Municipal Wastewater.” *Science of The Total Environment*, vol. 756, 2021, p.
419 143067., doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143067.
- 420 Treibel, Thomas A, et al. “COVID-19: PCR Screening of Asymptomatic Health-Care Workers at
421 London Hospital.” *The Lancet*, vol. 395, no. 10237, 2020, pp. 1608–1610.,
422 doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)31100-4.
- 423 Venugopal, Anila, et al. “Novel Wastewater Surveillance Strategy for Early Detection of
424 Coronavirus Disease 2019 Hotspots.” *Current Opinion in Environmental Science &
425 Health*, vol. 17, 2020, pp. 8–13., doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2020.05.003.

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

- 426 Wu, Jia-Rui. “SARS-CoV-2 and Its Infected World.” *Journal of Molecular Cell Biology*, 2021,
427 doi:10.1093/jmcb/mjaa078.
- 428 Xagorarakis, Irene, and Evan O’Brien. “Wastewater-Based Epidemiology for Early Detection of
429 Viral Outbreaks.” *Women in Water Quality*, 2019, pp. 75–97., doi:10.1007/978-3-030-
430 17819-2_5.
- 431 Ye, Yinyin, et al. “Survivability Partitioning, and Recovery of Enveloped Viruses in Untreated
432 Municipal Wastewater.” *Environmental Science and Technology*, 2016,
433 doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b00876.s001.
- 434 Zheng, Shufa, et al. “Viral Load Dynamics and Disease Severity in Patients Infected with SARS-
435 CoV-2 in Zhejiang Province, China, January-March 2020: Retrospective Cohort Study.”
436 *BMJ*, 2020, p. m1443., doi:10.1136/bmj.m1443.
- 437
- 438
- 439
- 440
- 441
- 442
- 443
- 444

Running head: RNA extraction and Sars-CoV-2

445 **Highlights**

446 - Samples from smaller population densities make concentrating RNA vital for detection

447 - Pelleting may provide for more timely concentration and extraction of SARS-CoV-2

448 RNA

449 - RNA shields and PCR inhibitor removal may increase detection of RNA during RT-

450 qPCR

451

