

1 **Tracking community infection dynamics of COVID-19 by monitoring** 2 **SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater, counting positive reactions by qPCR**

3 Bo Zhao^a, Zaizhi Yu^a, Tomonori Fujita^a, Yoshiaki Nihei^{a,b}, Hiroaki Tanaka^a,
4 Masaru Ihara^{a,c,*}

5 ^a *Research Center for Environmental Quality Management, Graduate School of*
6 *Engineering, Kyoto University, 1-2 Yumihama, Otsu, Shiga 520-0811, Japan*

7 ^b *Water Agency Inc. 3-25 Higashi-Goken-cho, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-0813, Japan*

8 ^c *Faculty of Agriculture and Marine Science, Graduate School of Integrated Arts and*
9 *Sciences, Kochi University, 200 Otsu, Monobe, Nankoku city, Kochi 783-8502, Japan*

10 ***Corresponding author:** Masaru Ihara, Faculty of Agriculture and Marine Science, Graduate
11 School of Integrated Arts and Sciences, Kochi University, 200 Otsu, Monobe, Nankoku
12 city, Kochi 783-8502, Japan. E-mail address: ihara.masaru@kochi-u.ac.jp

13 **Abstract**

14 Wastewater-based epidemiology has proved useful for monitoring the COVID-19 infection
15 dynamics in communities. However, in some countries, low concentrations of SARS-CoV-2
16 RNA in wastewater make this difficult. Getting meaningful information from wastewater-
17 based epidemiology in regions of low prevalence remains a key challenge. Here we used real-
18 time reverse-transcription PCR (RT-qPCR) to monitor SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater
19 from October 2020 to February 2021 during the third wave of the COVID-19 outbreak in
20 Japan. Viral RNA was below the limit of quantification in all samples. However, by counting
21 the positive reactions in repeated qPCR of each sample, we found that the ratio of positive
22 reactions to all tests in wastewater was significantly correlated with the number of clinically
23 confirmed cases by the date of symptom onset during periods of both increasing and
24 decreasing infection. Time-step analysis indicated that COVID-19 patients excreted large
25 amounts of virus in their feces 2 days either side of symptom onset, which wastewater
26 surveillance could detect. The positive count method is thus useful for tracing COVID-19
27 dynamics in regions of low prevalence.

28 **Highlights**

- 29 • Positive ratio by repeated qPCR of low target-molecule numbers correlated with
30 number expected from Poisson distribution.

- 31 • Positive ratio by repeated RT-qPCR of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracked the
32 infection dynamics of COVID-19 in a region of low prevalence.
- 33 • Positive ratios correlated with number of new cases by date of symptom onset.
- 34 • COVID-19 patients might excrete more virus in their feces in the period from 2 days
35 before to 2 days after symptom onset.

36 **Keywords:** Wastewater-based epidemiology, SARS-CoV-2, Poisson distribution, Positive
37 ratio, qPCR, Low prevalence

38 **Introduction**

39 A novel coronavirus—severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)—was
40 identified in Wuhan in late December 2019,¹ and has since caused a global pandemic of
41 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) owing to its fast spread. The progression of the
42 COVID-19 pandemic has been monitored primarily by clinical testing of symptomatic
43 individuals for the presence of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA by polymerase chain reaction (PCR)
44 analysis. However, in many countries, the spread of the virus has exceeded testing capacity,
45 precluding real-time monitoring of the pandemic. Instead, wastewater-based epidemiology
46 (WBE) has been considered as an effective approach for monitoring the presence of SARS-
47 CoV-2 in the community.²

48 Increases and decreases of viral RNA concentrations measured by real-time reverse-
49 transcription PCR (RT-qPCR) in raw influent or its solid fraction have been associated with
50 those of COVID-19 cases in Australia³, the Netherlands⁴, the USA⁵⁻⁸, and Canada^{9,10}. In
51 Japan, some studies have detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater when cases were
52 diagnosed by clinical testing in the community.¹¹⁻¹⁴ Concentrations in the solid fraction of raw
53 influent were quantifiable,¹¹ but the supernatant fraction had high PCR threshold cycle (Ct)
54 values, and most data were unquantifiable owing to low concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
55 in the wastewater.¹²⁻¹⁴ Getting meaningful information from WBE in regions of low
56 prevalence remains a key challenge.

57 In general, the limit of quantification (LOQ) of qPCR for the virus in wastewater is
58 based on the fewest copies of the control molecule in a reaction volume that can be
59 quantitatively determined with a stated probability; e.g., 5 or 10 copies per reaction. For
60 wastewater with Ct smaller than those of 5 or 10 copies, the virus RNA copy number is
61 titrated. These wastewater is rated either positive or negative for the virus RNA relative to the

62 LOQ. In qPCR, when the number of initial target molecules is <10 , the probability that an
63 aliquot contains a given number of target molecules is given by a Poisson distribution, with
64 which the pattern of positive and negative results is consistent.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ In this range, the chance of
65 a positive increases with the number of initial target molecules in the solution. Thus, we
66 hypothesized that by calculating the positive ratio (the ratio of positive reactions to all tests)
67 in repeated qPCR analysis of wastewater, we might track the infection dynamics even in
68 regions of low prevalence.

69 The purpose of this study was to verify the effectiveness of calculating the positive ratio
70 for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater to track the infection dynamics of COVID-19 in the
71 community. First, we tested the pattern of positive and negative results in qPCR in the range
72 of 0.1 to 20 initial copies of oligo DNA including the CDC-N1 target per reaction, and
73 confirmed that empirical data obtained by qPCR of these samples followed a Poisson
74 distribution. Then we took raw or primary effluent from wastewater treatment plant (WWTP)
75 A in city B in the Kansai region of Japan almost every day from October 2020 to February
76 2021, during the third wave of COVID-19 in Japan. After polyethylene glycol (PEG)
77 precipitation to concentrate the virus, we analyzed SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the wastewater by
78 RT-qPCR. The positive ratio for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in technically repeated qPCR was
79 compared with epidemiological data in the community reported by the public health system.
80 In most samples, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was below the LOQ, but the positive ratio in repeated
81 qPCR for N1 and N2 assays in wastewater was significantly correlated with the number of
82 daily confirmed cases by the date of symptom onset. Time-step analysis indicates that
83 COVID-19 patients excreted a large amount of virus in their feces during the period from 2
84 days before to 2 days after symptom onset, which wastewater surveillance could detect.

85 **Materials and Methods**

86 *Verification of concordance between positive counts in qPCR of low-target-copy-number* 87 *samples and Poisson distribution*

88 The Poisson distribution for PCR is defined as:¹⁵

$$89 \quad P(X = k) = \frac{C^k}{(k! \times e^C)}$$

90 where e is the base of the natural logarithm, C is the average initial target molecule number
91 (ITMN) per qPCR sample (expected ITMN), and k is the actual number (actual ITMN) in a
92 sample. P is the probability that a volume (sample) contains k copies of ITMN. SI Figure S1

93 shows the probabilities of obtaining a certain number of target molecules in a given volume,
94 where the sample average concentration ranges from 10 to 0.01 copies per volume.

95 qPCR assays for low target copy number were performed. Oligo DNA including the
96 SARS-CoV-2 sequence (Thermo Scientific) was diluted to prepare different ITMN samples
97 ($C = 0.01, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 2, 4, 6, 8,$ or 10 copies per reaction), and
98 the CDC 2019-nCoV_N1 assay¹⁸ was performed 12 times for each ITMN sample. Details of
99 the qPCR for SARS-CoV-2 are described below under “qPCR for SARS-CoV-2”. We
100 counted the positives in the 12 qPCR reactions for each ITMN sample, and then compared the
101 resulting “positive ratios” with those expected from the Poisson distribution. These
102 experiments were performed three times (three batches).

103 ***Wastewater sample collection***

104 Influent or primary effluent (PE) was collected at WWTP A in city B. PE was collected two
105 times (Tuesday and Friday) a week from 20 October to 14 December 2020, and five times
106 (Monday to Friday) a week from 15 December 2020 to 14 January 2021. Influent was
107 collected five times (Monday to Friday) a week from 15 January to 15 February. In total, 60
108 samples (39 PE and 21 influent) were collected in the morning (09:00–10:00).

109 In October 2020, clinical testing in city B confirmed few to no daily COVID-19 cases.
110 From November 2020 to February 2021, city B experienced an increase followed by a
111 decrease in the number of cases, during the third wave of infection in Japan.

112 Wastewater was collected in a sterilized 250-mL plastic bottle, immediately transported
113 to the laboratory, and then heat-treated in water bath (60 °C, 90 min) to inactivate the
114 coronavirus.^{19,20} The heat-treated samples were stored at –30 °C. Within a week after
115 collection, they were analyzed for SARS-CoV-2 RNA by RT-qPCR.

116 ***Virus concentration in wastewater, RNA extraction, and reverse transcription***

117 Virus in each sample was concentrated by PEG precipitation¹³ with a slight modification.
118 First, 120 mL of PE was centrifuged at 4500× g for 10 min, and the supernatant was
119 transferred to a fresh centrifuge tube. Then, PEG 8000 (Molecular Biology Grade, average
120 mol wt 8000; Sigma-Aldrich) and NaCl were added to final concentrations of 10% and 1 M,
121 respectively. The samples were incubated at 4 °C overnight with gentle agitation. After
122 centrifugation at 10,000× g for 30 min, the PEG precipitate, containing the virus, was
123 dissolved in 500 μ L of phosphate buffer solution (for biochemistry, 0.1 M, pH 8.0, Wako) to
124 give a total volume of ~700 μ L. From 140 μ L of the virus concentrate, RNA was extracted

125 with a QIAamp Viral RNA Mini kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) as per the manufacturer's
126 instructions to obtain an 80- μ L RNA extract. For the RNA extraction step, PCR-grade water
127 (Roche Molecular Systems, Inc., Switzerland) was included as a negative control every time.

128 For reverse transcription (RT), a High-Capacity cDNA Reverse Transcription Kit
129 (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA) was used to obtain 70 μ L of cDNA from 35 μ L
130 of viral RNA as per the manufacturer's protocol. cDNA was amplified by qPCR to detect
131 SARS-CoV-2 and Pepper Mild Mottle Virus (PMMoV). For the RT step, PCR-grade water
132 was included as a negative control every time.

133 ***qPCR for SARS-CoV-2***

134 The SARS-CoV-2 RNA was assayed by the CDC 2019-nCoV_N1 and CDC 2019-nCoV_N2
135 qPCR assays¹⁸ in all samples with the primers and probes listed in Table S1. qPCR assays in
136 96-well plates were conducted in a 25- μ L qPCR reaction volume, which included 12.5 μ L of
137 Gene Expression Master Mix (Applied Biosystems), 1.0 μ L of 10 μ M forward and reverse
138 primers (10 pmol each), 0.5 μ L of 5 μ M TaqMan probe (2.5 pmol), 5 μ L of nuclease-free
139 water, and 5 μ L of template cDNA.

140 qPCR was performed in a Thermal Cycler Dice (Takara Bio Inc., Real Time System III,
141 Kusatsu, Shiga, Japan). The thermal cycling conditions for both assays consisted of pre-
142 heating at 50 °C for 2 min and pre-denaturation at 95 °C for 10 min, followed by 50 cycles of
143 amplification at 95 °C for 15 s, and annealing and extension at 60 °C for 1 min. For each
144 sample, qPCR was performed in technical triplicate for each primer set, and each test was
145 performed twice. Therefore, 6 reactions were obtained for each N1 and N2 assay of each
146 sample.

147 Every qPCR assay included a negative control (PCR-grade water), and no amplification
148 was observed in either assay. There was no amplification in the negative controls for either
149 the RNA extraction step or the RT step.

150 As a positive control, a 10-fold serial dilution of double-stranded oligo DNA including
151 both CDC 2019-nCoV_N1 and CDC 2019-nCoV_N2 targets (GeneArt Strings DNA
152 Fragments; Thermo Scientific) was used to generate standard curves (from 10^1 to 10^4 copies
153 per 5 μ L). The LOQ was 10 copies per reaction with Ct values of 37.7 ± 1.83 for N1 and 38.6
154 ± 2.28 for N2 primer sets. The theoretical LOQ of the overall method was 4.0 \log_{10} copies/L
155 for N1 and N2. The N1 primer set generated a standard curve with $R^2 = 0.98 \pm 0.04$ ($n = 27$
156 reactions) with an efficiency (mean \pm SD) of $106\% \pm 13.4\%$ (slope = -3.22 ± 0.274 ; y
157 intercept = $40.9\% \pm 2.01\%$). The N2 primer set generated a standard curve with $R^2 = 0.97 \pm$

158 0.05 ($n = 27$ reactions) with an efficiency of $97.7\% \pm 14.7\%$ (slope = -3.43 ± 0.373 ; y
159 intercept = $42.0\% \pm 2.54\%$).

160 ***Counting the positives in repeated qPCR tests***

161 SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in many samples in both N1 and N2 qPCR assays, always
162 below the LOQ (see Results and Discussion). Therefore, instead of quantification for SARS-
163 CoV-2 RNA genome copy number, we counted the number of positives in 6 repeated qPCR
164 reactions for each assay. Maximum Ct values were 45 or 46 (Results and Discussion).

165 ***Quality control of the wastewater RT-qPCR assays***

166 PMMoV is the most abundant human fecal RNA virus,²¹ and has recently been used as an
167 internal control for SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater.^{7,9-11,20} When fluorescence reached the
168 threshold during 50 cycles of qPCR in each well of the 96-well plate, we counted it as a
169 positive. We also tested PMMoV RNA by RT-qPCR in the same samples, using 5 μ L of
170 template cDNA for all samples, in duplicate, with the primers and probes shown in Table S1
171 and the same thermal cycling conditions as for SARS-CoV-2 qPCR. We monitored Ct values
172 in each sample to check any loss of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection.

173 ***Gel electrophoresis and PCR amplicon sequencing***

174 Agarose gel electrophoresis of some samples confirmed the qPCR amplicon sizes: 72 bp for
175 CDC 2019-nCoV_N1 and 67 bp for N2. In addition, qPCR products of N1 and N2 assays of
176 samples 25 and 33 were sequenced by the Molecular Biology Laboratory (Unitech Co., Ltd.;
177 Kashiwa, Chiba, Japan) to confirm whether the qPCR amplified target sites of SARS-CoV-2
178 RNA. The genome sequence of SARS-CoV-2 Wuhan-Hu-1 strain (GenBank accession No.
179 MN908947.3) was used as a reference.

180 ***COVID-19 Epidemiological data***

181 All patients confirmed positive for COVID-19 by clinical testing in city B were
182 retrospectively interviewed by local public health officers to complete contact tracing.
183 Officers collected recorded symptoms, symptom onset date, contact with other known
184 clinically confirmed cases, and the date of reporting clinical test result (i.e., the date
185 confirmed positive). These data are publicly available. We counted the daily number of cases
186 by the date of symptom onset and by the date reported, from October 2020 to February 2021
187 (see Results and discussion). For positive asymptomatic cases, the date on which the test
188 result was reported was used as the estimated date of symptom onset.

189 ***Statistical analysis***


190 We investigated whether the SARS-CoV-2 RNA signals in wastewater samples correlated
191 with the epidemiological data. For each wastewater sampling day from October 2020 to
192 February 2021, we compared the number of positives in SARS-CoV-2 RNA PCR reactions
193 and the number of cases who developed symptoms on the same day. We also compared the
194 number of positives in wastewater with the number of cases in clinical testing reported on the
195 same day. Spearman's rank correlation test was performed in GraphPad Prism 5 software. All
196 statistical tests were two-tailed, with $P < 0.05$ considered as statistically significant.

197 To evaluate any lag between the SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in wastewater and the
198 epidemiological data, we performed time-step analyses; we compared the number of positives
199 in wastewater with the number of cases who developed symptoms from 10 days before to 10
200 days after the wastewater sampling day (i.e., time lag = -10 to +10).

201 **Results and Discussion**

202 ***Concordance between positive counts in qPCR of low-copy-number samples and Poisson***
203 ***distribution***

204 qPCR assays of low-copy-number samples revealed positive reactions in the 12 technical
205 replicates of each ITMN sample ($n = 12$), and positive ratios for each ITMN sample were
206 calculated (Figure 1). Ct values gradually increased as the initial copy number of oligo DNA
207 of SARS-CoV-2 decreased (Figure 1, left). At the same time, the positive ratio decreased. All
208 reactions were positive ($n = 12$, 100%) in all 3 batches when ITMN was ≥ 6 copies per
209 reaction; around 90% were positive when ITMN was 2 copies; and around 0% to 17% when it
210 was 0.2 copies (Table S2). These positive ratios for each ITMN agree well with those
211 expected from a Poisson distribution (Table S3; Figure 1, right). Similar results were reported
212 in previous studies.¹⁵ From these results, we conclude that by counting the number of positive
213 reactions in repeated qPCR assay, we could trace the dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
214 wastewater in the range of 0.1 to 4 copies per reaction of ITMN, which is usually below the
215 LOQ in qPCR and is thus regarded as negative.



216 **Figure 1. qPCR threshold cycle (Ct) values for low copy numbers of oligo DNA and positive**
217 **ratios in repeated reactions.**

218 N1 assays were performed for oligo DNA, including the target sequence of SARS-CoV-2. Mean \pm
219 SEM of the Ct values is shown for each initial target molecular number (ITMN) (0.1–20 copies
220 per reaction) for data sets 1 (\square , $n = 12$), 2 (\bullet , $n = 12$), and 3 (\triangle , $n = 12$) (left panel). Mean is
221 calculated for Ct values for which amplification was observed in each batch. Detailed Ct values
222 are shown in SI Table S2. Black plots indicate the average positive ratio of data sets 1, 2, and 3
223 (Table S3) for each ITMN ($n = 36$) (right panel).


224 *Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater by CDC-N1 and N2 assays*

225 PMMoV was tested as an internal control in all 60 wastewater samples. It was detectable and
226 stable between daily samples, with Ct ranging from 25 to 29 (Figure 2, top; SI Table S4). This
227 result indicates that sample collection, PEG precipitation, RNA extraction, and qPCR
228 processes were not exceptional throughout the sampling campaign.

229 Maximum Ct values were around 45 in the N1 assay and 46 in the N2 assay (Figure 2,
230 bottom; Table S5). There was no positive detection on the first 3 sample collection days (20,
231 23, and 27 October). The first positive was detected on 30 October, when the N1 assay ($n = 6$)
232 gave 1 positive and the N2 assay ($n = 6$) gave all negatives.

233 During early to mid November, both assays gave several positives in repeated PCR
234 reactions on all sampling days, with Ct values of 40 to 45 in the N1 assay and 42 to 45 in the
235 N2 assay (Figure 2, bottom). In late November, the number of positives decreased. But from
236 December, it then increased until mid January 2021, and then again decreased until 15
237 February. During this period, Ct values were 38 to 45 in the N1 assay and 39 to 46 in the N2

238 assay. As Ct values of PMMoV were stably detected on all days, fluctuations in the N1 and
239 N2 assays are specific to the SARS-CoV-2 RNA.



240


241 **Figure 2. qPCR threshold cycle (Ct) values of PMMoV and SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples**
242 **collected from October 2020 to February 2021.**

243 **In each sample, PMMoV was tested in duplicate ($n = 2$) and SARS-CoV-2 was tested six times (n**
244 **= 6) with each primer set (CDC-N1 and N2). Each plot indicates the Ct value in each PCR. ND:**
245 **the sample showed at least 1 negative ($n = 6$). Ct values are shown in SI Table S5.**

246 Gel electrophoresis confirmed the sizes of the PCR products to be identical to the target
247 sizes (72 bp by N1, 67 bp by N2) by (data not shown). Partial nucleotide sequences of qPCR
248 products from samples 25 and 33 (Table S4) were sequenced and confirmed to be 100%
249 identical to those of the nucleocapsid phosphoprotein of the SARS-CoV-2 genome (GenBank
250 Acc. No. MN908947.3) (SI Figure S2). These results confirm that the target sites of the
251 SARS-CoV-2 genome were amplified by qPCR in this study.

252 The numbers of positive reactions of the N1 and N2 assays of each wastewater sample
253 are shown in SI Table S5 and Figure 3 (top and middle panels). The numbers of positives for
254 each sample in N1 and N2 assays show a significant positive correlation (SI Figure S3,
255 Spearman $r = 0.8225$; $P < 0.0001$).

256 The sum of the numbers of positive reactions in N1 and N2 assays of each sample
257 fluctuated during the study period (Table S5; Figure 3, bottom panel, N1 + N2). It showed a
258 small peak in November 2020 and a bigger and more persistent peak from December to
259 January (Figure 3), when it sometimes reached the maximum number of positives, i.e., 12. In
260 February, it decreased to as low as 0.




261

262 **Figure 3. Number of positive reactions by CDC-N1 and N2 assays for SARS-CoV-2 RNA**
263 **detection in wastewater from WWTP A from October 2020 to February 2021 ($n = 60$).**

264 **qPCR assay of each sample was performed 6 times with each primer set. Colored plots represent**
265 **numbers of positive reactions: red, CDC-N1 assay; blue, N2 assay. Green plots: totals in N1 and**
266 **N2 assays, with a maximum of 12 positives. Positive ratios are also shown.**

267 ***Correlation between viral signals in wastewater and the number of new cases of COVID-19***
268 ***in the community***

269 Comparison of viral signals in wastewater with the number of new cases (Table S6) by the
270 date of symptom onset (Figure 4a) and the date reported (Figure 4b) shows clear correlations,
271 with a higher correlation by the former (Fig. 4c: Spearman's $r = 0.7538$; $P < 0.0001$) than by
272 the latter (Fig. 4d: $r = 0.5781$; $P < 0.0001$). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first
273 study to demonstrate that SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks the daily number of new
274 cases by the date of symptom onset in the community across periods of both increasing and
275 decreasing infection.



276

277 **Figure 4. Comparisons between SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in wastewater and epidemiological data.**

278 **Comparison between the positive ratio in wastewater (N1 + N2, green plots) and the number of**
 279 **new COVID-19 cases (bars) by (a, c) date of symptom onset and (b, d) date reported.**

280 **Correlation analysis (Spearman's r) shows a better correlation with (c) the date of symptom**
 281 **onset than (d) with the date reported. Positive ratios in wastewater are taken from Figure 2.**


282 **Numbers of new cases are detailed in SI Table S6.**

283 ***Time-step analysis of correlations between SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in wastewater and***
 284 ***epidemiological data***

285 To evaluate any lag between the SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in wastewater and the
 286 epidemiological data, we performed time-step analyses, comparing the number of positives in
 287 wastewater in repeated qPCR reactions on each sampling day with the number of new cases
 288 by the date of symptom onset from 10 days before to 10 days after the wastewater sampling
 289 day (Figure S4). The number of new cases 2 days before (Figure 5, time lag = -2 days,
 290 Spearman's $r = 0.7753$) and 1 day before (-1, $r = 0.7279$) the sampling day had higher

291 correlations than earlier days (from -10 to -3). And the number of new cases 1 day after (+1,
292 $r = 0.7177$) and 2 days after (+2: $r = 0.7283$) the sampling day had higher correlations than
293 later days (from +3 to +10, $r < 0.7$). These results indicate that COVID-19 patients excreted
294 more virus in their feces in the period from 2 days before to 2 days after symptom onset than
295 on other days, which wastewater surveillance could detect.

296 Previous studies have reported that SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in wastewater
297 were correlated with epidemiological data such as the number of clinically confirmed cases
298 by the date of specimen collection or of test result reporting,^{4-8,10} but did not investigate the
299 correlation with the number of cases by the date of symptom onset. So far, only one study has
300 investigated this correlation, and reported that wastewater detection of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA
301 trailed symptom onset by 5 days.⁵ Here, in contrast, the number of positives in repeated PCR
302 reactions in wastewater was significantly correlated with the new cases at the date of
303 symptom onset within 2 days before to 2 days after. The difference in results might be
304 explained by the fact that we started sampling before the third wave of the pandemic began,
305 and captured the initial phase of the wave, while Nemudryi et al. (2020) started sampling after
306 the peak of the infection, so they missed the chance to detect the viral RNA signal in
307 wastewater in the initial increasing phase of infection.⁵




308

309 **Figure 5. Time-step analysis of correlation between SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in wastewater and**
310 **epidemiological data.**

311 **Viral RNA signals in wastewater are compared with numbers of new COVID-19 cases by the**
312 **date of symptom onset from 10 days before (-10) to 10 days after (+10) the wastewater sampling**
313 **day (0). Spearman's r values are plotted with 95% confidence interval.**

314 ***How much faster can WBE track COVID-19 in the community than clinical testing?***

315 How much sooner did the SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration in wastewater than the date of
316 result reporting or specimen collection in the public health system? On average, a person
317 develops symptoms 4 to 5 days after infection.²² Our results indicate that SARS-CoV-2 RNA
318 concentrations in feces are highest during 2 days either side of symptom onset (Figure 6). In
319 regions where the time lag between the date of symptom onset and the date of clinical test
320 result reporting is large, WBE, if analyzed and reported on the same day as sampling, will
321 give the earliest estimate of viral spread in the community. This is why WBE has an
322 advantage over clinical testing in the public health system.



323

324 **Figure 6. Timeline of clinical testing and wastewater surveillance.**

325 ***Sensitivity of the positive count for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in wastewater***

326 Throughout the sampling period, N1 and N2 assays in wastewater samples showed significant
327 correlation with the number of new cases in the range of 0 to 30 (Figure 4). The population of
328 city B is about 300,000, and WWTP A serves about one-third of it. This means that SARS-
329 CoV-2 RNA in wastewater could track the infection dynamics in the community even when
330 the number of new cases ranges from 0 to 10 per 100,000 population. However, the
331 possibility of asymptomatic patients means that the actual number of cases might be larger.

332 ***Implications of viral shedding in feces***

333 These results indicate that COVID-19 patients excrete more virus in their feces during 2 days
334 either side of symptom onset than earlier or later (Figure 5). Clinical studies have reported
335 virus concentrations in feces several days after symptom onset²³ or after admission to
336 hospital^{24,25}. Under the assumption that virus shedding in feces starts from the time of
337 symptom onset, re-analysis of patient data using a shedding dynamics model indicated that
338 the SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration in feces increases rapidly after symptom onset.²⁶
339 However, no clinical data on viral shedding in feces from infection to symptom onset are
340 reported. Still, it is possible that the peak occurs before symptom onset. To understand what

341 the viral RNA signal in wastewater represents, the peak timing of viral shedding in feces is
342 essential information. More fecal shedding data are needed.

343 As patients likely shed SARS-CoV-2 in feces for weeks,^{24,26,27} it is somewhat surprising
344 that SARS-CoV-2 RNA signals in wastewater significantly correlated with daily confirmed
345 new cases in this study. But these results indicate that the magnitude of fecal shedding might
346 be substantially higher around the day of symptom onset. Another possibility is that the virus
347 RNA in wastewater is derived not only from feces, but also from the respiratory system and
348 saliva: virus excreted during brushing the teeth, gargling, and rinsing could mix with virus in
349 feces and travel to the WWTP. Viral concentrations in throat swabs from patients were
350 highest immediately after onset, and therefore it is estimated that infectiousness is highest
351 from 2 to 1 day before the onset date.²⁸ The period of highest infectiousness might also be the
352 period of highly detectable virus RNA in wastewater.

353 *Usefulness and limitation of the positive count method*

354 Although SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in wastewater were lower than the LOQ, the
355 number of positives in repeated RT-qPCR reactions could trace the prevalence of COVID-19
356 in the community. In conventional qPCR testing, the limit of quantification is usually 5 to 10
357 copies per reaction. In contrast, the positive count method could distinguish lower copy
358 numbers, i.e., 0.1 to 4 copies per reaction, which means that it increases the sensitivity of
359 qPCR by 50 to 100 times to reveal the trend of viral RNA concentrations in wastewater. For
360 the purpose of tracking the virus infection dynamics in the community, exact values of virus
361 concentrations are not always necessary; it is enough to see the change of viral RNA levels in
362 wastewater, for which the positive count method is useful.

363 We used the positive count method with RT-qPCR of the supernatant fraction of
364 wastewater. This method can also be used with the solid fraction of wastewater. Recent
365 studies have improved the sensitivity of viral RNA detection in wastewater by RT-qPCR by
366 concentrating virus from the solid fraction of raw influent or primary sludge rather than the
367 water fraction.^{6,8-11} However, in regions where the virus concentration in wastewater is not
368 high enough for quantification from the solid fraction, the positive count methods might be
369 useful to reveal changes in viral RNA levels in wastewater.

370 The idea of the positive count method is the same as that for the quantification of droplet
371 digital PCR. Therefore, we expect to see use of the droplet digital PCR in future studies to
372 show the trend of SARS-CoV-2 RNA at low copy numbers in wastewater, as the positive
373 count method has done here.

374 **Acknowledgments**

375 This work was supported by grants from the GAP Fund Program of Kyoto University; the
376 Keihanshin Consortium for Fostering the Next Generation of Global Leaders in Research (K-
377 CONNEX), established by Human Resource Development Program for Science and
378 Technology, MEXT; JST-Mirai Program Grant Number JPMJMI18DA, from the Japan
379 Science and Technology Agency; and JST Adaptable and Seamless Technology transfer
380 Program through Target-driven R&D (A-STEP) Grant Number JPMJTM20Y5, from the
381 Japan Science and Technology Agency. We thank all staff of local wastewater bureaus for
382 providing meteorological data, helping with the sampling, and providing water quality and
383 quantity data. We also thank Dr. Akihiko Hata for technical support on pretreatment of
384 samples.

385 **References**

- 386 (1) Lu, R.; Zhao, X.; Li, J.; Niu, P.; Yang, B.; Wu, H.; Wang, W.; Song, H.; Huang, B.; Zhu,
387 N.; Bi, Y.; Ma, X.; Zhan, F.; Liang, W.; Hu, T.; Zhou, H.; Hu, Z.; Zhou, W.; Tan, W.
388 Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for
389 virus origins and receptor binding. *The lancet*. **2020**, 395, 10224, 565–574.
- 390 (2) Kitajima, M.; Ahmed, W.; Bibby, K.; Carducci, A.; Gerba, C. P.; Hamilton, K. A.;
391 Haramoto, E.; Rose, J. B. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and research
392 needs. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, 739, 139076.
- 393 (3) Ahmed, W., Tschärke, B., Bertsch, P. M., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., Choi, P., Clarke, L.,
394 Dwyer, J.; Edson, J.; Nguyen, T.M.H.; O'Brien, J.W.; Simpson, S.L.; Sherman, P.; Thomas,
395 K.V.; Verhagen, R.; Zaugg, J.; Mueller, J. F. SARS-CoV-2 RNA monitoring in wastewater as
396 a potential early warning system for COVID-19 transmission in the community: A temporal
397 case study. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 761, 144216.
- 398 (4) Medema, G.; Heijnen, L.; Elsinga, G.; Italiaander, R.; Brouwer, A. Presence of SARS-
399 Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the
400 Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2020**, 7, 511–
401 516.
- 402 (5) Nemudryi, A.; Nemudraia, A.; Surya, K.; Wiegand, T.; Buyukyoruk, M.; Wilkinson, R.;
403 Wiedenheft, B. Temporal detection and phylogenetic assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in
404 municipal wastewater. *Cell Rep Med.* **2020**, 1 (6), 100098.

- 405 (6) Peccia, J.; Zulli, A.; Brackney, D. E.; Grubaugh, N. D.; Kaplan, E. H.; Casanovas-
406 Massana, A.; Ko, A. I.; Malik, A. A.; Wang, D.; Wang, M.; Warren, J. L.; Weinberger, D. M.;
407 Arnold, W.; Omer, S. B. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks
408 community infection dynamics. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **2020**, 38, 1164–1167.
- 409 (7) Wu, F.; Xiao, A.; Zhang, J.; Moniz, K.; Endo, N.; Armas, F.; Bonneau, R.; Brown, M. A.;
410 Bushman, M.; Chai, P. R.; Duvallet, C.; Erickson, T. B.; Foppe, K.; Ghaeli, N.; Gu, X. G.;
411 Hanage, W. P.; Huang, K. H.; Lee, W. L.; Matus, M.; McElroy, K. A.; Nagler, J.; Rhode, S.
412 F.; Santillana, M.; Tucker, J. A.; Wuertz, S.; Zhao, S.; Thompson, J.; Alm, E. J. SARS-CoV-2
413 RNA concentrations in wastewater foreshadow dynamics and clinical presentation of new
414 COVID-19 cases. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2022**, 805, 150121.
- 415 (8) Graham, K. E.; Loeb, S. K.; Wolfe, M. K.; Catoe, D.; Sinnott-Armstrong, N.; Kim, S.;
416 Yamahara, K. M.; Sassoubre, L. M.; Mendoza Grijalva, L. M.; Roldan-Hernandez, L.;
417 Langenfeld, K.; Wigginton, K. R.; Boehm, A. B. SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater Settled Solids
418 Is Associated with COVID-19 Cases in a Large Urban Sewershed. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*
419 **2021**, 55, 488.
- 420 (9) D’Aoust, P. M.; Mercier, E.; Montpetit, D.; Jia, J.-J.; Alexandrov, I.; Neault, N.; Baig, A.
421 T.; Mayne, J.; Zhang, X.; Alain, T.; Langlois, M.-A.; Servos, M. R.; MacKenzie, M.; Figeys,
422 D.; MacKenzie, A. E.; Graber, T. E.; Delatolla, R. Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2
423 RNA from wastewater solids in communities with Low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence.
424 *Water Res.* **2021**, 188, 116560.
- 425 (10) D’Aoust, P. M.; Graber, T. E.; Montpetit, E. M. D.; Alexandrov, I.; Neault, N.; Baig, A.
426 T.; Mayne, J.; Zhang, X.; Alain, T.; Servos, M. R.; Srikanthan, N.; MacKenzie, M.; Figeys,
427 D.; Manuel, D.; Jün, P.; MacKenzie, A. E.; Delatolla, R. Catching a resurgence: Increase in
428 SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA identified in wastewater 48 h before COVID-19 clinical tests and 96
429 h before hospitalizations. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 770, 145319.
- 430 (11) Kitamura, K.; Sadamasu, K.; Muramatsu, M.; Yoshida, H. Efficient detection of SARS-
431 CoV-2 RNA in the solid fraction of wastewater. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 763, 144587.
- 432 (12) Haramoto, E.; Malla, B.; Thakali, O.; Kitajima, M. First environmental surveillance for
433 the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and river water in Japan. *Sci. Total Environ.*
434 **2020**, 737, 140405.
- 435 (13) Hata, A.; Hara-Yamamura, H.; Meuchi, Y.; Imai, S.; Honda, R. Detection of SARS-
436 CoV-2 in wastewater in Japan during a COVID-19 outbreak. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 758,
437 143578.

- 438 (14) Torii, S.; Furumai, H.; Katayama, H. Applicability of polyethylene glycol precipitation
439 followed by acid guanidinium thiocyanate-phenol-chloroform extraction for the detection of
440 SARS-CoV-2 RNA from municipal wastewater. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 756, 143067.
- 441 (15) Rossmanith, P.; Wagner, M. A Novel Poisson Distribution-Based Approach for Testing
442 Boundaries of Real-Time PCR Assays for Food Pathogen Quantification. *J. Food Prot.* **2011**,
443 74 (9), 1404–1412.
- 444 (16) Forootan, A.; Sjöback, R.; Björkman, J.; Sjögreen, B.; Linz, L.; Kubista, M. Methods to
445 determine limit of detection and limit of quantification in quantitative real-time PCR (qPCR).
446 *Biomol Detect Quantif.* **2017**, 12, 1–6.
- 447 (17) Ståhlberg, A.; Kubista, M. The workflow of single-cell expression profiling using
448 quantitative real-time PCR. *Expert Rev. Mol. Diagn.* **2014**, 14 (3), 323–331.
- 449 (18) CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). 2019-novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV)
450 real-time rRT-PCR panel primers and probes. U.S. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.html)
451 [ncov/lab/rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.html). **2020**. (accessed December 17, 2021).
- 452 (19) Biobot. [https://www.scribd.com/document/474550901/2020-03-31-Biobot-COVID19-](https://www.scribd.com/document/474550901/2020-03-31-Biobot-COVID19-Sewage-For-Distribution)
453 [Sewage-For-Distribution](https://www.scribd.com/document/474550901/2020-03-31-Biobot-COVID19-Sewage-For-Distribution). **2020**. (accessed December 17, 2021).
- 454 (20) Wu, F.; Zhang, J.; Xiao, A.; Gu, X.; Lee, W. L.; Kauffman, K.; Hanage, W.; Matus, M.;
455 Ghaeli, N.; Endo, N.; Duvallet, C.; Poyet, M.; Moniz, K.; Washburne, A. D.; Erickson, T. B.;
456 Chai, P. R.; Thompson, J.; Alm, E. J. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than
457 expected from clinically confirmed cases. *Msystems*, **2020**, 5 (4), e00614–20.
- 458 (21) Kitajima, M.; Sassi, H. P.; Torrey, J. R. Pepper mild mottle virus as a water quality
459 indicator. *npj Clean Water*, **2018**, 1, 19.
- 460 (22) Lauer, S. A.; Grantz, K. H.; Bi, Q.; Jones, F. K.; Zheng, Q.; Meredith, H. R.; Azman, A.
461 S.; Reich, N. G.; Lessler, J. The incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)
462 from publicly reported confirmed cases: estimation and application. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **2020**,
463 172 (9), 577–582.
- 464 (23) Wölfel, R.; Corman, V. M.; Guggemos, W.; Seilmaier, M.; Zange, S.; Mueller, M. A.;
465 Niemeyer, D.; Vollmar, P.; Rothe, C.; Hoelscher, M.; Bleicker, T.; Bruenink, S.; Schneider, J.;
466 Ehmann, R.; Zwirgmaier, K.; Drosten, C.; Wendtner, C. Virological assessment of
467 hospitalized cases of coronavirus disease 2019. *Nature* **2020**, 581, 465–469.
- 468 (24) Xu, Y.; Li, X.; Zhu, B.; Liang, H.; Fang, C.; Gong, Y.; Guo, Q.; Sun, X.; Zhao, D.; Shen,
469 J.; Zhang, H.; Liu, H.; Xia, H.; Tang, J.; Zhang, K.; Gong, S. Characteristics of pediatric
470 SARS-CoV-2 infection and potential evidence for persistent fecal viral shedding. *Nat. Med.*
471 **2020**, 26, 502–505.

- 472 (25) Wu, Y.; Guo, C.; Tang, L.; Hong, Z.; Zhou, J.; Dong, X.; Yin, H.; Xiao, Q.; Tang, Y.;
473 Qu, X.; Kuang, L.; Fang, X.; Mishra, N.; Lu, J.; Shan, H.; Jiang, G.; Huang, X. Prolonged
474 presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in faecal samples. *Lancet Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **2020**,
475 5 (5), 434–435.
- 476 (26) Miura, F.; Kitajima, M.; Omori, R. Duration of SARS-CoV-2 viral shedding in faeces as
477 a parameter for wastewater-based epidemiology: Re-analysis of patient data using a shedding
478 dynamics model. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2021**, 769, 144549.
- 479 (27) Chen, C.; Gao, G.; Xu, Y.; Pu, L.; Wang, Q.; Wang, L.; Wang, W.; Song, Y.; Chen, M.;
480 Wang, L.; Yu, F.; Yang, S.; Tang, Y.; Zhao, L.; Wang, H.; Wang, Y.; Zeng, H.; Zhang, F.
481 SARS-CoV-2-Positive Sputum and Feces After Conversion of Pharyngeal Samples in
482 Patients With COVID-19. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **2020**, 172, 832–834.
- 483 (28) He, X.; Lau, E. H. Y.; Wu, P.; Deng, X.; Wang, J.; Hao, X.; Lau, Y. C.; Wong, J. Y.;
484 Guan, Y.; Tan, X.; Mo, X.; Chen, Y.; Liao, B.; Chen, W.; Hu, F.; Zhang, Q.; Zhong, M.; Wu,
485 Y.; Zhao, L.; Zhang, F.; Cowling, B. J.; Li, F.; Leung, G. M. Temporal dynamics in viral
486 shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat. Med.* **2020**, 26, 672–675.