

1 **Quantifying the relationship between SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentrations and**
2 **building-level COVID-19 prevalence at an isolation residence using a passive sampling**
3 **approach**

4 Patrick T. Acer^b, Lauren M. Kelly^a, Andrew A. Lover^b, Caitlyn S. Butler^a

5 ^a *Department of Environmental and Water Resources Engineering, University of Massachusetts*
6 *Amherst, Engineering Lab II, 101 N Service Rd, Amherst MA 01003, U.S.*

7 ^b *Department of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Arnold*
8 *House, 715 North Pleasant Street, Amherst MA 01003, U.S.*

9 Corresponding author: pacer@umass.edu

10 **Abstract**

11 SARS-CoV-2 RNA can be detected in the excreta of individuals with COVID-19 and has
12 demonstrated a positive correlation with various clinical parameters. Consequently, wastewater-
13 based epidemiology (WBE) approaches have been implemented globally as a public health
14 surveillance tool to monitor the community-level prevalence of infections. Over 270 higher
15 education campuses monitor wastewater for SARS-CoV-2, with most gathering either composite
16 samples via automatic samplers (autosamplers) or grab samples. However, autosamplers are
17 expensive and challenging to manage with seasonal variability, while grab samples are
18 particularly susceptible to temporal variation when sampling sewage directly from complex
19 matrices outside residential buildings. Prior studies have demonstrated encouraging results
20 utilizing passive sampling swabs. Such methods can offer affordable, practical, and scalable
21 alternatives to traditional methods while maintaining a reproducible SARS-CoV-2 signal. In this
22 regard, we deployed tampons as passive samplers outside of a COVID-19 isolation unit (a
23 segregated residence hall) at a university campus from February 1, 2021 – May 21, 2021.
24 Samples were collected several times weekly and remained within the sewer for a minimum of
25 24 hours (n = 64). SARS-CoV-2 RNA was quantified using reverse transcription-quantitative

26 polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) targeting the viral N1 and N2 gene fragments. We
27 quantified the mean viral load captured per individual and the association between the daily viral
28 load and total persons, adjusting for covariates using multivariable models to provide a baseline
29 estimate of viral shedding. Samples were processed through two distinct laboratory pipelines on
30 campus, yielding highly correlated N2 concentrations. Data obtained here highlight the success
31 of passive sampling utilizing tampons to capture SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater coming from a
32 COVID-19 isolation residence, indicating that this method can help inform public health
33 responses in a range of settings.

34 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2; college campus monitoring; passive sampling; wastewater-based
35 epidemiology; fecal shedding; COVID-19

36 Highlights

37

- 38 • Daily SARS-CoV-2 RNA loads in building-level wastewater were positively associated
39 with the total number of COVID-19 positive individuals in the residence
- 40 • The variation in individual fecal shedding rates of SARS-CoV-2 extended four orders of
41 magnitude
- 42 • Wastewater sample replicates were highly correlated using distinct processing pipelines
43 in two independent laboratories
- 44 • While the isolation residence was occupied, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in all
45 passive samples

46 1. Introduction

47 Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is the seventh
48 coronavirus known to infect human beings and the causative agent for the COVID-19 pandemic
49 (Andersen et al., 2020; Nalbandian et al., 2021). While COVID-19 is most notably known for

50 causing respiratory illness, more recently, it is being recognized as a multi-organ disease with a
51 broad range of extrapulmonary manifestations, including gastrointestinal symptoms (Gupta et al.,
52 2020). The pooled prevalence of gastrointestinal symptoms in COVID-19 patients is about 15%,
53 with diarrhea, loss of appetite, and nausea/vomiting being the most common symptoms (Ren et
54 al., 2020). The mean duration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding in stool is estimated to be roughly
55 17 days (Cevik et al., 2021). However, prolonged fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 RNA has been
56 documented up to 47 days following symptom onset, sometimes persisting in stool for more than
57 two weeks after negative oropharyngeal swabs (Cheung et al., 2020; Fei Xiao et al., 2020; Ling
58 et al., 2020; Y. Wu et al., 2020; Cevik et al., 2021; Nalbandian et al., 2021). It has been
59 estimated that SARS-CoV-2 RNA in stool is detected in nearly 66% of infected patients and can
60 be measured in feces as soon as two days after symptom onset (Lo et al., 2020; Chan et al.,
61 2021). Evidence suggests that both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals shed SARS-
62 CoV-2 in both respiratory and stool specimens, highlighting the critical role WBE can play in
63 capturing asymptomatic or subclinical cases that may otherwise not be identified (Wu et al.,
64 2020; Xiao et al., 2020; Han et al., 2020; Lo et al., 2020; Wölfel et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020;
65 Zhou et al., 2020). Yet, differences in viral shedding rates based on symptom status and disease
66 time course have been detailed, making it difficult to quantitatively interpret SARS-CoV-2
67 wastewater concentrations, especially to estimate infection prevalence (Zheng et al., 2020).
68 Moreover, additional predictor variables capturing community infection dynamics, disease
69 progression, temporal variations, and fecal shedding kinetics are likely important to consider if
70 possible when estimating caseloads based on SARS-CoV-2 wastewater signatures (Mcmahan et
71 al., 2020; Karthikeyan, et al., 2021; Miura et al., 2021; Proverbio et al., 2021).

72 Many higher educational institutions and municipalities globally have recognized the
73 utility of wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) as a surveillance tool for monitoring infection
74 trends and identifying potential case clusters promptly. Several studies have demonstrated a
75 positive correlation between SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations in influent wastewater/solids
76 and COVID-19 case metrics, demonstrating the utility of this approach in complementing
77 clinical reporting, particularly in settings where distinct buildings can be isolated (Peccia et al.,
78 2020; D'aoust et al., 2021; Feng et al., 2021). Additionally, in the absence of widespread clinical
79 testing, WBE can act as a passive health surveillance tool to monitor viral dynamics, as it has
80 been shown to presage new case and subsequent hospitalization rates (Peccia et al., 2020;
81 Karthikeyan et al., 2021). Accordingly, numerous higher educational institutions have adopted
82 building-level wastewater testing in combination with contact tracing and isolation/quarantine
83 protocols to support campus public health and guide clinical testing resources to “hotspot”
84 locations (Barich and Slonczewski, 2021; Betancourt et al., 2021; Gibas et al., 2021; Karthikeyan
85 et al., 2021; Reeves et al., 2021; Travis et al., 2021). Due to the population-level and non-
86 intrusive nature of WBE, it will continue to serve as a valuable means to monitor and inform
87 public health programming and response.

88 Sewage surveillance is ideally suited to complement widespread clinical testing
89 campaigns. Within WBE, sample collection strategies vary with three predominant
90 methodologies emerging: composite sampling, grab sampling and passive sampling.
91 Autosamplers can mechanically pull wastewater samples routinely with defined time or flow
92 intervals to create representative composite aliquots; however, these instruments are expensive
93 and challenging to maintain in certain environments (Bivins et al., 2021). Grab samples are
94 generally an operationally straightforward option, collecting a volume of wastewater at a single

95 timepoint. However, such samples are susceptible to fecal shedding and flow fluctuations,
96 particularly outside buildings with limited drainage areas, and may provide a biased sample of
97 the wastewater stream (Bivins et al., 2021; Rafiee et al., 2021). Several universities have trialed
98 the use of passive samplers in place of traditional composite or grab sampling methods due to
99 additional cost-effectiveness and ease of deployment (Bivins et al., 2021; Brizee, 2021; Corchis-
100 Scott et al., 2021; Severance, 2021). Schang et al. demonstrated that the concentration of SARS-
101 CoV-2 RNA recovered from passive samplers was positively correlated with the viral
102 wastewater concentrations obtained using traditional sampling methods in communities with low
103 caseloads (Schang et al., 2021). Habtewold et al. demonstrated linear uptake of SARS-CoV-2
104 virus utilizing gauze and membrane passive devices when deployed between 4 and 48 hours,
105 indicating that passive sampling methods can accumulate SARS-CoV-2 viral fragments over
106 time (Habtewold et al., 2022). In addition, Rafiee et al. demonstrated that Moore swabs (gauze
107 pads with string) performed as well as composite samples over 16 hours and were more sensitive
108 than grab samples (Rafiee et al., 2021). A passive sampling approach may be the only practical
109 option for capturing a representative wastewater sample in resource-constrained settings.
110 However, questions still remain on the viral loading dynamics (sorption-desorption rates) with
111 such sampling methods. The passive sampling technique has demonstrated its utility in
112 qualitatively assessing the presence of SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater. Still, rigorous
113 evaluation of the relationship between passive probe samples and epidemiological metrics is
114 urgently needed to ensure optimal use of limited health resources.

115 To address this gap, we provide the results of 64 independent wastewater samples
116 obtained between February 1, 2021 – May 21, 2021, from a COVID-19 isolation residence. All
117 samples were collected through a passive sampling method using tampons that were placed in

118 the sewer for at least 24 hours. The sampling site was isolated in the sewer shed such that the
119 only waste stream inputs came from infected individuals within the SARS-CoV-2 isolation unit.
120 The primary aims of this study were to: (i) demonstrate that a passive sampling approach yields
121 consistent positive SARS-CoV-2 signals coming from building-level wastewater monitoring
122 with a known number of infected persons, (ii) describe the variability in individual fecal
123 shedding rates quantified through this sampling method, (iii) investigate the associations between
124 the SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations extracted from the probes and the corresponding caseload
125 in the building, (iv) compare two independent methods for concentrating wastewater samples
126 and subsequent analysis.

127 2. Materials and methods

128 2.1 Study site

129 During the course of this study, wastewater samples were collected at an access manhole
130 location roughly 190 feet from a COVID-19 isolation residence. The isolation residence served
131 as a temporary living space for students who tested positive for COVID-19. On-campus students
132 relocated to this space after receiving positive test results and were instructed to remain in
133 isolation for 14 days. The wastewater influent at this sampling location was restricted to the
134 isolation building such that the only inputs in the sewer system came from either infected
135 individuals residing within the building or potentially a small number of staff supporting the
136 students in isolation. Sample collection occurred throughout the Spring 2021 academic semester;
137 samplers were deployed for a minimum of 24 hours. Nearly 90% of samples were deployed for
138 roughly 24 hours; however, a minority were deployed for extended periods (weekend). Three to

139 four separate sampling rounds occurred weekly from February 1, 2021 – May 21, 2021.

140 Immediately following collection, all samples were stored at +4 °C until further processing.

141 *2.2 Passive swabs and wastewater processing*

142 We utilized tampons made from two types of rayon with a polyester string (OB
143 Applicator Free Tampons, Ultra Absorbency). Two tampons were tied onto separate lengths of
144 1/8-inch nylon paracord and deployed concurrently at the collection site. After 24 hours, both
145 tampons were collected and transferred to sterile 500mL high-density polyethylene (HDPE)
146 wide-mouth bottles (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). Both tampons were mixed
147 with a total of 200mL of Milli-Q water, vortexed for 1 minute at 3,200 RPM, and pressed
148 utilizing a citrus squeezer to remove maximum liquid from swabs. The volume obtained from
149 each sampling event ranged from 52mL to 80mL, resulting in a total sample volume ranging
150 from 252mL to 280mL after the addition of Milli-Q water. Bovine Respiratory Syncytial Virus
151 (BRSV) was spiked into each sample in a 1:10,000 volume ratio resulting in 1,000 BRSV gene
152 copies per mL in the wastewater sample matrix (Inforce 3 Cattle Vaccine, Zoetis). BRSV was
153 introduced as a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2, functioning as a matrix recovery control for all
154 samples. Following the BRSV spike, samples were homogenized using a vortex mixer (3,200
155 RPM) and left to incubate at room temperature (RT) for 30 minutes. Samples were then
156 immediately frozen at -80 °C for future processing.

157 *2.3 Protocol 1: SARS-CoV-2 concentration and quantification*

158 In June 2021, all samples were removed from -80 °C and thawed over five days at +4 °C
159 prior to processing. Once thawed, samples were centrifuged at 5,500 RPM in 250mL HDPE
160 bottles for 10 minutes at +4 °C. The sample supernatant was decanted into sterile 250mL HDPE

161 bottles for filtration; the remaining pellet was discarded. We utilized a vacuum filtration
162 assembly and generally followed the concentration procedure outlined in detail by Bivins et al. in
163 their protocol (<https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bhiuj4ew>). Briefly, we used one vacuum
164 filtration assembly and filtered 50mL of the sample through 0.45 μ M mixed-cellulose ester
165 membrane filters in duplicate (Pall Corporation, Port Washington, NY, USA). Following
166 filtration, the filter was halved and transferred aseptically into a 0.70mm garnet bead tube in
167 preparation for RNA extraction (Qiagen, Germantown, MD, USA).

168 Before extraction, 500 μ L of Buffer AVL (Qiagen, Germantown, MD, USA) and 6.5 μ L of
169 β -mercaptoethanol (MP Biomedicals, Irvine, CA, USA) were added to the garnet bead tubes.
170 Tubes were bead beat for 60 seconds at 3,200 RPM for four cycles and centrifuged for 30
171 seconds between each homogenization cycle at 5,000 x g. After completion of bead beating,
172 tubes were centrifuged for a final time at 16,000 x g for 3 minutes, and 140 μ L of sample was
173 transferred into a 1.5mL microcentrifuge tube in preparation for extraction. RNA was then
174 extracted using Qiagen's protocol utilizing the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (Qiagen,
175 Germantown, MD, USA). Purified RNA concentrate was eluted with 80 μ L of Buffer AVE
176 (Qiagen, Germantown, MD, USA) and held at +4 °C briefly. Total RNA in each sample was
177 measured using an RNA high sensitivity assay kit on the Qubit 4.0 prior to RT-qPCR
178 quantification (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA).

179 SARS-CoV-2 was quantified using real-time qPCR, applying SYBR chemistry
180 (Luna[®] Universal One-Step qPCR Master Mix, Cat No. E3005E). The N1 and N2 genes unique
181 to SARS-CoV-2 were quantified using the 2019-nCoV N1 forward (Cat No. 10006830) and
182 reverse (Cat No. 10006831) primers and the 2019-nCoV N2 forward (Cat No. 10006833) and
183 reverse (Cat No. 10006824) primers synthesized by Integrated DNA Technologies (IDT).

184 Standard curves for the N1 and N2 analyses were generated by quantifying a synthesized SARS-
185 CoV-2 plasmid manufactured by IDT (Cat No. 10006625). The standard was assayed in
186 triplicate following a 10-fold serial dilution from 2,000 gene copies/ μL to 0.2 gene copies/ μL .
187 All RNA samples were assayed in triplicate. Samples were processed in biological replicates,
188 generating six RT-qPCR data points per individual sample. Each 20 μL reaction mix contained
189 the following: 4 μL of template RNA; 10 μL of 2X Luna Universal One-Step Reaction Mix; 1 μL
190 of 20X Luna WarmStart[®] RT Enzyme Mix; 1.6 μL of primers; and 3.4 μL of PCR-grade water.
191 PCR analysis was conducted using a BioRad 96-well real-time PCR system, with the following
192 cycle parameters: 55 °C for 10 min; 95 °C for 1 min; 40 cycles x (95 °C for 10 sec, 62 °C for 30
193 sec); 60-95 °C in 5 second increasing increments of 0.5 °C. Melt curves were analyzed to ensure
194 the amplification of a single target PCR amplicon. No-template controls (NTCs) were assayed in
195 triplicate for all PCR runs for quality control. Following successful sample quantification, all
196 wastewater samples were again stored at -80 °C. Standard curves were used to quantify N1 and
197 N2 gene copies in the polymerase chain reaction, which were converted to gene copies/L of raw
198 wastewater captured by our passive samplers (Supplemental Document). All samples that failed
199 to meet the following criteria were re-assayed: i) standard curves with $R^2 > 0.985$, ii) primer
200 efficiency between 90%-120%, iii) no signs of PCR inhibition or non-specific amplification. The
201 y-intercept value for all runs ranged from (35.1, 36.6), and the slope values ranged from (-3.33, -
202 2.93). The level of detection (LOD) for this assay was estimated to be 1.6×10^4 SARS-CoV-2
203 gene copies/L of wastewater. BRSV quantification occurred using an identical RT-qPCR
204 procedure but with custom BRSV primers (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA).
205 *2.4 Protocol 2: SARS-CoV-2 concentration and quantification*

206 In October 2021, all 64 raw wastewater samples were removed from -80 °C and thawed
207 over five days at +4 °C. These samples were quantified for a second time using a unique
208 concentration method through a separate RNA extraction and RT-qPCR pipeline. We followed
209 an adapted version of the SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater RNA Concentration Protocol written at the
210 University of Connecticut (<https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bn58mg9w>). Once raw
211 wastewater samples were thawed, 40 mL of sample was added to a 50mL conical tube. 600µL of
212 affinity-capture magnetic hydrogel nanoparticles in solution at a 5 mg/mL concentration was
213 spiked into the sample (Ceres Nanosciences, Manassas, VA, USA). Samples were homogenized
214 and incubated at RT for 20 minutes. After incubation, samples were placed on custom-built
215 magnetic racks for 30 minutes at RT for viral concentration. This magnetic separation protocol
216 allowed for the easy removal of supernatant while retaining a pellet of nanoparticles with the
217 entrapped viral fragments. 1.2mL of DNA/RNA Shield (Zymo Research, Irvine CA, USA) was
218 added to each pellet. Samples were briefly homogenized and incubated at 56 °C (ten minutes) to
219 release the viral fragments from the nanoparticle matrices. Samples were returned to the
220 magnetic racks for 10 minutes to separate the sample lysate from the nanoparticles. 500µL of the
221 sample was aliquoted into technical replicate test tubes to be further processed at the Institute for
222 Applied Life Sciences Clinical Testing Center (ICTC), which obtained its state clinical
223 laboratory license (CLIA) in October 2020. Briefly, ICTC utilized an automated RNA extraction
224 platform (Hamilton Company, Reno, NV, USA) using the MagMax Viral/Pathogen II Nucleic
225 Acid Isolation Kit (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) to isolate and purify nucleic acid.
226 SARS-CoV-2 was quantified targeting the N2 gene with real-time qPCR, applying TaqMan
227 chemistry (Luna® Universal Probe One-Step RT-qPCR Kit, E3006E) using a BioRad 384-well
228 real-time PCR system. Data was reported as extracted gene copies/mL from our concentrated

229 samples, which we converted to gene copies/L of wastewater by using the known dilution factor
230 from the original sample.

231 *2.5 Isolation residence case data and clinical surveillance*

232 Aggregated and de-identified COVID-19 case data were obtained from administrative
233 records for the isolation residence on campus during the Spring 2021 academic year. These data
234 consisted of the total number of individuals present in the isolation facility, including sex and
235 self-reported symptoms. The public health surveillance program was approved by the
236 Institutional Review Board (#20-258); this research protocol had a separate filing (approval #21-
237 140). Data were processed by HIPAA-trained staff at the Public Health Promotion Center
238 (PHPC) and were acquired on university-administered systems and HIPAA-compliant platforms.
239 During this timeframe of wastewater testing, all on-campus students were required to be tested
240 twice weekly via nasal swab PCR tests. All off-campus students, faculty, and staff that came to
241 campus were required to be tested once weekly during the semester. On-campus students with a
242 positive SARS-CoV-2 test were required to isolate in the designated isolation residence hall. Off-
243 campus students were provided the option to isolate themselves on campus.

244 *2.6 Data analysis*

245 Statistical analyses were performed using SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA), and
246 visualizations were created using RStudio (ver. 1.4.1103) with ggplot2 (ver. 3.3.5). Slopes and y-
247 intercepts from RT-qPCR were used to quantify copies of SARS-CoV-2 in each reaction using
248 the instrument's recorded C_q value. This SARS-CoV-2 copy number value was then transformed
249 into a gene copies/L of extracted wastewater value through a series of unit conversions and
250 dilution factors based on our wastewater processing methods (Supplementary Document).

251 Building-level volumetric water metering provided 24-hour building-level water use totals for
252 the isolation residence, which were utilized as a proxy for daily wastewater flow. The flow
253 values were converted from cubic feet to liters. Daily viral loads at the isolation residence were
254 estimated by multiplying [(SARS-CoV-2 gene copies/L of wastewater) X (L of wastewater
255 influent/day)] to provide an aggregate SARS-CoV-2 gene copies/day measurement. Wilcoxon-
256 Mann-Whitney (WMW) tests were utilized to test for statistical differences between the N1 and
257 N2 gene copy concentrations due to the paired comparisons and non-normal distribution of these
258 data. This test was also employed to assess statistical differences between N2 gene
259 concentrations quantified through two separate sample processing and analysis pipelines. We
260 employed multivariable negative binomial models to quantify the relationship between the
261 wastewater viral load and the accompanying building caseload, adjusting for significant
262 covariates. We also evaluated the performance of the negative binomial model utilizing
263 McFadden's pseudo- R^2 statistic. All tests were two-sided, with $\alpha = 0.05$ for hypothesis testing.

264 3. Results and discussion

265 3.1 Student characteristics & performance of passive samples

266 During the Spring 2021 academic term, individuals in the isolation residence ranged from
267 17–25 years of age with females making up 40.6% of total cases and males making up 59.4% of
268 cases on wastewater collection days (Supplemental Document). During this time, 92.3% of
269 COVID-19 cases reported having at least one illness-related symptom. A global meta-analysis
270 including nearly 30 million individuals undergoing COVID-19 testing found that 40.5% (95%
271 CI, 33.50%–47.50%) of laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases were asymptomatic (Ma et al.,
272 2021). Patient symptom reports occurred at multiple timepoints along the care cascade possibly

273 resulting in the misclassification of cases captured prior to symptom onset. In contrast, cases in
274 the isolation residence were asked to report symptoms daily throughout their illness, which may
275 partially explain the discordance between the high proportion of symptomatic individuals in the
276 isolation residence compared with estimates of symptomatic prevalence found in the general
277 population.

278 Overall, the tampon swabs consistently captured the SARS-CoV-2 molecular signature
279 from the waste stream. Each sample contained liquid from two tampons yielding between 52mL
280 and 80mL of raw sewage. Total RNA mass extracted from each sample ranged from 1.31 ng/ μ L
281 to 35.5 ng/ μ L with a mean concentration of 7.0 ng/ μ L \pm 5.14, indicating that our passive swabs
282 captured fluctuating amounts of RNA in the sewer. Over the 16-week study period, all passive
283 samples captured SARS-CoV-2, demonstrating consistency in tampons amassing detectable
284 amounts of virus. The mean N1 Cq value was 32.84 \pm 2.35, and the mean N2 Cq value was
285 32.37 \pm 2.57 for all datapoints obtained using Protocol 1. A Wilcoxon rank-sum test showed no
286 evidence of a statistically significant difference between the median N1 and N2 signals within
287 this study ($p = 0.69$). Additionally, the mean N2 Cq value provided by ICTC on identical raw
288 wastewater samples processed through Protocol 2 was 26.53 \pm 2.63. The increased N2 Cq
289 sensitivity observed using Protocol 2 is likely due to a greater proportion of template RNA in the
290 PCR compared with Protocol 1. Overall, the variability of SARS-CoV-2 viral loads across
291 sample replicates was often larger at lower concentrations, sometimes extending over an order of
292 magnitude (Fig. 1). Inconsistencies seen here across biological and technical replicates have
293 previously been reported when quantifying SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater (D'aoust et al.,
294 2021; Graham et al., 2021; Pecson et al., 2021). Throughout the study period, the median N2
295 load was 1.29×10^9 gene copies per day and the median N1 daily load came in slightly lower at

296 1.04×10^9 gene copies (Table 1). A general decrease in the day-to-day viral load from February
297 to May is apparent throughout the semester (Fig. 1).

298 *3.2 Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 detection*

299 A statistically significant correlation between mean N1 and N2 wastewater
300 concentrations was observed throughout the study period ($r = 0.96$), and comparable longitudinal
301 wastewater trends are apparent (Fig. 1). These data suggest that either gene may be utilized to
302 quantify SARS-CoV-2 to develop trends when using passive probes. Additionally, a strong
303 positive association was noted between independent N2 wastewater concentrations on identical
304 samples processed through distinct concentration, extraction, and RT-qPCR methods ($r = 0.87$)
305 (Fig. 2). The average raw N2 wastewater concentration quantified in our lab with Protocol 1 was
306 $3,873 \pm 10,330$ N2 gene copies/mL of wastewater. In comparison, Protocol 2 yielded an average
307 of $3,661 \pm 6,883$ N2 gene copies/mL of wastewater. A Wilcoxon rank-sum test found no
308 statistically significant difference between the average N2 concentrations quantified through
309 these separate methods ($p = 0.17$). A high degree of reproducibility in SARS-CoV-2
310 quantification was evident between the two laboratories suggesting that a standardized method
311 for processing wastewater samples may not be overly critical for obtaining valuable data to
312 support public health decision-making. Similar conclusions were noted when 32 independent
313 laboratories processed replicate wastewater samples from two major wastewater treatment plants
314 in Los Angeles County to quantify SARS-CoV-2 using independent SOPs (Pecson et al., 2021).
315 After correcting for recovery rates, 80% of the SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentration data fell
316 within a range of approximately $\pm 1 \log$ GC/L coming from groups utilizing eight distinct
317 methods (Pecson et al., 2021).

318 *3.3 Variability in SARS-CoV-2 signal*

319 Variation in daily N1 and N2 viral loads per individual in isolation throughout the study
320 duration extended greater than four orders of magnitude based on results from our passive swabs
321 (Fig. 3). The median N2 load throughout the study was measured at 1.01×10^8 gene copies per
322 individual per day while the median N1 load per individual was 6.87×10^7 gene copies per day
323 (Table 1). The observed variation in fecal shedding rates is consistent with several studies
324 reporting levels of SARS-CoV-2 in stool ranging from $5.5 \times 10^2 - 1 \times 10^7$ gene copies/mL,
325 which translates to $5.3 \times 10^7 - 9.61 \times 10^{11}$ expected daily gene copies per infected individual
326 in isolation when accounting for the mean individual daily building-level water use production
327 (96 liters) at the isolation building (Han et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2020; Wölfel et al., 2020; Zhang
328 et al., 2020). Since we could not obtain data on the temporal complexities of disease progression
329 for each infected individual, fecal shedding rates were assumed constant for the above
330 calculation. Differences in building-level water use indicate significant variation in personal
331 hygiene habits and bathroom behaviors between students (Fig. 4). Therefore, substantial
332 variation in individual viral loads per day was expected in this study due to discrepancies in viral
333 shedding, temporal disease dynamics, and water use behavior.

334 Current campus-wide wastewater surveillance activities demonstrate that this passive
335 sampling approach is consistently capturing human RNase P as our fecal content biomarker as
336 well as the N2 gene in those catchments where students have a positive laboratory-based
337 COVID-19 test. Our initial observations across campus sampling indicate that tampons
338 effectively capture SARS-CoV-2 viral particles in diverse sewer catchment areas with
339 fluctuating proportions of non-infected and infected individuals; still, additional work is being
340 conducted to explore the quantitative utility of this approach at unique sampling locations.

341 *3.4 Relationships between passive samplers and epidemiological reporting*

342 It has been demonstrated that the quantification of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in wastewater
343 is a useful epidemiological tool to develop and complement longitudinal infection trends when
344 using active sampling approaches (Castro Gutierrez et al., 2021; Graham et al., 2021). However,
345 questions remain on whether passive swabs are limited to providing binary positive/negative
346 SARS-CoV-2 wastewater results, or if there is utility in quantification and correlation to clinical
347 testing metrics over time. The SARS-CoV-2 wastewater load in the isolation residence peaked
348 on February 8, 2021, at 4.53×10^{11} N1 gene copies/day, which was coincident with the isolation
349 residence occupancy peak of 222 students (Fig. 5). We evaluated the association between the
350 building occupancy and the 24-hour SARS-CoV-2 load using negative binomial models,
351 adjusting for the mean BRSV recovery (mean \pm SD, 14.0% \pm 14.1) and the daily percentage of
352 female occupants in the building as these covariates were significantly associated with
353 occupancy (Table 2). The model was evaluated using McFadden's pseudo R^2 as a goodness-of-
354 fit measure (Supplemental Document).

355 A one unit increase in the log-transformed wastewater SARS-CoV-2 daily load was
356 associated with a 47% increase in the total building occupancy, adjusting for BRSV recovery and
357 the percentage of females in the building (Incidence Rate Ratio (IRR)= 1.47 (95% CI: 1.27–1.71,
358 $p < 0.001$). After adjustment for BRSV recovery and the daily SARS-CoV-2 load, we found a 5%
359 increase in occupancy count for each one percentage increase in females occupying the isolation
360 residence (IRR = 1.05; 95% CI: 1.04–1.06, $p < 0.001$). Several factors may have contributed to
361 this observation, including but not limited to differences in fecal shedding intensity between
362 females and males as a result of disease severity or time course of illness. A meta-analysis on
363 SARS-CoV-2 RNA fecal shedding revealed that patients with gastrointestinal (GI) symptoms
364 had a 2.4-fold increased likelihood of excreting detectable levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in their

365 stool compared with those with no GI symptoms (Odds Ratio (OR)= 2.4, 95% CI: 1.2–4.7)
366 (Zhang et al., 2021). Moreover, a cross-sectional study conducted in Poland examining sex
367 differences in COVID-19 symptoms found that self-reported gastrointestinal symptoms among
368 non-hospitalized patients were significantly higher in females than men (Sierpiński et al., 2020).
369 Together, these suggest that on average, a greater proportion of females in the isolation residence
370 were shedding detectable levels of virus compared to men as a result of sex-linked differences in
371 the prevalence of GI symptoms from COVID-19. We used our final model to predict the Spring
372 2021 occupancy in the isolation residence and compared these results with actual case numbers.
373 The results suggest that utilizing tampons for passive sampling in wastewater is a viable option
374 to predict building-level caseloads (Fig. 6).

375 It is possible that incorporating additional covariates such as time since symptoms or
376 diagnosis, sample fecal load, or obtaining more time-resolved flow data could help improve the
377 model by capturing additional changes associated with viral shedding dynamics and SARS-CoV-
378 2 loading onto passive samplers. Additionally, it is important to note that we captured several
379 detectable SARS-CoV-2 signals in the sewer spanning ten days (May 11, 2021–May 21, 2021)
380 after the last individual had exited the isolation residence (Fig. 1). This observation strongly
381 suggests that viral fragments can remain in sewer systems for an extended period despite no
382 active cases in a catchment and that SARS-CoV-2 decay in low-flow environments can occur
383 over a timeframe of weeks. It has been demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 RNA can accumulate in
384 sewer biofilms which could have served as the primary source of viral RNA during this
385 timeframe (Morales Medina et al., 2021). SARS-CoV-2 persistence in the sewer may have
386 important implications for signal interpretation as positive cases move from their regular living

387 quarters to isolation on college campuses or as students return to college campuses after break
388 periods.

389 *3.5 Limitations*

390 Several characteristics relating to this research need to be further explored, and various
391 limitations should be considered in generalizing the findings outlined above. First, most passive
392 samples (nearly 90%) remained in the sewer for 24 hours; however, some were left at the
393 isolation residence for more than one day. A sensitivity analysis excluding these samples left in
394 the sewer for an extended period shows a 44% increase in the occupancy count for each one unit
395 increase in the log-transformed wastewater SARS-CoV-2 daily load, adjusting for BRSV
396 recovery and the percentage of females in the building (IRR 1.44, 95% CI 1.22-1.70). Though
397 only students with a positive COVID-19 clinical test resided in the isolation building, we cannot
398 exclude the possibility of staff members contributing to the building-level water use, which could
399 bias results. Also, it is necessary to note that the quantification of SARS-CoV-2 gene copies/L of
400 wastewater, as measured using the raw influent sewage captured by our passive samplers, may
401 not precisely represent the actual composition of sewage throughout the 24-hour sampling
402 period. Instead, our quantification of SARS-CoV-2 gene copies in the wastewater comes from
403 the “extracted” wastewater over the 24-hour time span, which was required to normalize the N1
404 and N2 signals to daily flow conveniently. Moreover, hourly flow data and bathroom-level flush
405 counts may have provided more information on day-to-day student behavior. All samples were
406 frozen at -80 °C for differing periods of time prior to quantification which could have resulted in
407 differential SARS-CoV-2 signal degradation. Lastly, incorporating normalization parameters to
408 account for changes in the daily wastewater contributions could be important to include in future
409 models (e.g., human fecal normalization marker). Still, it remains unclear if the addition of other

410 covariates could better elucidate complex viral shedding dynamics to accurately estimate
411 building-level caseloads. Even so, data presented here indicate that the duration and direction of
412 trend classification is a practicable surveillance application using a passive sampling approach.
413 Our data indicate a clear relationship between daily viral wastewater concentrations and
414 building-level infection prevalence. We provide a proof of concept that increased SARS-CoV-2
415 concentrations in sewage, indicated by a greater number of infected individuals, yield an
416 increased accumulation of viral fragments on our passive samplers over 24 hours (Fig. 4).

417 4. Conclusions

418 This study investigated the functionality of tampons as passive samplers in capturing
419 SARS-CoV-2 viral fragments in building-level raw sewage. Passive swabs consistently captured
420 virus at a COVID-19 isolation residence over 16 weeks, indicating that this method is a feasible
421 option to identify residential halls with infected individuals shedding SARS-CoV-2. Data here
422 also shed light on the quantitative potential of the captured daily wastewater viral load with 24-
423 hour passive probes and its relation to building-level COVID-19 prevalence as measured via
424 self-administered nasal swabs. The positive association found between the daily viral wastewater
425 load and the isolation building occupancy demonstrates the ability of passive samplers to capture
426 increased SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in influent sewage. Again, additional normalization
427 parameters, including human fecal indicators, could be explored to illustrate building-level
428 COVID-19 caseloads from the captured SARS-CoV-2 wastewater signal. Furthermore, the
429 considerable variability observed in individual viral fecal shedding rates should be considered in
430 future work if accurately predicting the prevalence of COVID-19 in a residential building is a
431 primary goal.

432 We demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 quantification was highly correlated between the N1
433 and N2 gene and N2 wastewater concentrations measured through different processing pipelines.
434 Here, we provide evidence that universities can use either gene to develop and complement
435 existing COVID-19 trends. We demonstrate that independent wastewater processing and
436 quantification methods provide statistically similar and equally useful wastewater data. The
437 prevailing method for obtaining wastewater samples in WBE involves autosamplers collecting
438 liquid composite samples. However, passive samplers not only ease the burden of deployment
439 efforts and sampling expenses, but such samplers may capture variabilities in the wastewater
440 stream missed by time-weighted autosamplers through continuous exposure to raw influent
441 sewage. Given the sensitivity, low cost, and practicality of deploying tampons as passive
442 samplers coupled with the significant positive correlation observed between the daily wastewater
443 viral load and the caseload in the isolation residence over time, we consider this method to be a
444 valuable public health tool for COVID-19 surveillance. In conclusion, this paper provides
445 evidence that tampons can provide a reproducible and informative SARS-CoV-2 signal from
446 wastewater which is particularly relevant for resource-limited communities interested in
447 conducting and operationalizing building-level COVID-19 wastewater surveillance.

448 [Credit authorship contribution statement](#)

449 P. Acer conceptualized the study design, collected the data, conducted laboratory-based analysis,
450 performed data analysis/visualization and was the original draft writer of this manuscript. C.
451 Butler was the supervising principal investigator on this work and supported P. Acer in the
452 design and execution of the experiment and supported the writing, reviewing, and editing of this
453 manuscript. A. Lover supported the collection of public health data and supported data analysis

454 efforts as well as the writing, reviewing, and editing of this manuscript. L. Kelly supported the
455 data acquisition and contributed to the writing and editing of the manuscript.

456 Declaration of Competing Interest

457 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

458 Acknowledgements

459 This research was supported with special funds from the Office of Research & Engagement at
460 the University of Massachusetts and by Mike Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research &
461 Engagement. As well, this research was supported with funds from The Environmental Health
462 Science Summer Research Fellowship supported by the National Institute of Environmental
463 Health Sciences (#R25ES031498). The Institute for Applied Life Sciences Clinical Testing
464 Center was integral in performing the sample analysis reported in this work as part of their
465 clinical testing operations, notably acknowledging Ashley Eaton and Peter Reinhart. This
466 research was also funded by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation Highway Division
467 (MassDOT) under Interagency Service Agreement No. 106059. The views, opinions, and
468 findings contained in this paper are those of its Authors, and do not necessarily reflect the
469 official view or policies of the MassDOT. This paper does not constitute a standard,
470 specification, or regulation.

471 References

472 Andersen, K. G., Ramabaut, A., Lipkin I. W., Holmes, E. C. and Garry, R. F., 2020. The
473 proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2. *Nature Medicine*, 26(4), pp. 450–452. doi: 10.1038/s41591-
474 020-0820-9.

- 475 Barich, D. and Slonczewski, J. L., 2021. Wastewater Virus Detection Complements Clinical
476 COVID-19 Testing to Limit Spread of Infection at Kenyon College. *medRxiv*. doi:
477 10.1101/2021.01.09.21249505.
- 478 Betancourt, W. Q., Schmitz, B. W., Innes, G. K., Prasek, S. M., Pogreba Brown, K. M., Stark, E.
479 R., et al., 2021. COVID-19 containment on a college campus via wastewater-based
480 epidemiology, targeted clinical testing and an intervention. *Science of the Total Environment*,
481 779. doi: 10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2021.146408.
- 482 Bivins, A., Lott, M., Shaffer, M., Wu, Z., North, D., Lipp, E., et al., 2021. Building-Level
483 Wastewater Monitoring for COVID-19 Using Tampon Swabs and RT-LAMP for Rapid SARS-
484 Cov-2 RNA Detection. *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology*. doi:
485 10.1039/D1EW00496D.
- 486 Brizee, A., 2021. How ASU, NAU and UA are testing wastewater for COVID-19, azcentral.
487 Available at: [https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-education/2021/01/13/how-](https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-education/2021/01/13/how-asu-nau-and-ua-testing-wastewater-covid-19/6340627002/)
488 [asu-nau-and-ua-testing-wastewater-covid-19/6340627002/](https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-education/2021/01/13/how-asu-nau-and-ua-testing-wastewater-covid-19/6340627002/).
- 489 Castro Gutierrez, V., Hassard, F., Rodrigo Leitao, M. V., Burczynska, B., Wildeboer, D.,
490 Stanton, I., et al., 2021. Monitoring occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 in school populations: a
491 wastewater-based approach. *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2021.03.25.21254231.
- 492 Cevik, M., Tate, M., Lloyd, O., Enrico Maraolo, A., Schafers, J., Ho, A., 2021. SARS-CoV-2,
493 SARS-CoV, and MERS-CoV viral load dynamics, duration of viral shedding, and infectiousness:
494 a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Microbe*, 2(1), pp. e13–e22. doi:
495 10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30172-5.
- 496 Chan, V. W., Ka-Fung Chiu, P., Yee, C., Yuan, Y., Ng, C. and Yuen-Chun Teoh, J., 2021. A
497 systematic review on COVID-19: urological manifestations, viral RNA detection and special
498 considerations in urological conditions. *World Journal of Urology*, 39(9), p. 1. doi:
499 10.1007/s00345-020-03246-4.
- 500 Cheung, K. S., Hung, I. F. N., Chan, P. P. Y., Lung, K. C., Tso, E., Liu, R., et al., 2020.
501 Gastrointestinal Manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Virus Load in Fecal Samples

- 502 From a Hong Kong Cohort: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology*, 159(1),
503 pp. 81–95. doi: 10.1053/J.GASTRO.2020.03.065.
- 504 Corchis-Scott, R., Geng, Q., Seth, R., Ray, R., Beg, M., Biswas, N., et al., 2021. Averting an
505 Outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 in a University Residence Hall through Wastewater Surveillance.
506 *Microbiology Spectrum*, 9(2). doi: 10.1128/Spectrum.00792-21.
- 507 D'aoust, P. M., Mercier, E., Montpetit, D., Jia, J., Alexandrov, I., Neault, N., et al., 2021.
508 Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids in communities with low
509 COVID-19 incidence and prevalence. *Water Research*, 188, p. 116560. doi:
510 10.1016/j.watres.2020.116560.
- 511 Feng, S., Roguet, A., McClary-Gutierrez, J. S., Newton, R. J., Kloczko, N., Meiman, J. G., et al.,
512 2021. Evaluation of sampling frequency and normalization of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater
513 concentrations for capturing COVID-19 burdens in the community. *Environmental Science &*
514 *Technology*, 8(1), pp. 1955–1965. doi: 10.1101/2021.02.17.21251867.
- 515 Gibas, C., Lambirth, K., Mittal, N., Juel, M. A. I., Barua, V. B., Roppolo Brazell, L., et al., 2021.
516 Implementing building-level SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance on a university campus.
517 *Science of the Total Environment*, 782. doi: 10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2021.146749.
- 518 Graham, K. E., Loeb, S. K., Wolfe, M. K., Catoe, D., Sinnott-Armstrong, N., Kim, S., et al.,
519 2021. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with COVID-19 Cases in a
520 Large Urban Sewershed. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 55(1), pp. 488–498. doi:
521 10.1021/acs.est.0c06191.
- 522 Gupta, A., Madhavan, M. V., Sehgal, K., Nair, N., Mahajan, S. Sehrawat, T. S., et al., 2020.
523 Extrapulmonary manifestations of COVID-19. *Nature Medicine*, 26(7), pp. 1017–1032. doi:
524 10.1038/s41591-020-0968-3.
- 525 Habtewold, J., McCarthy, D., McBean, E., Law, I., Goodridge, L., Habash, M., et al., 2022.
526 Passive sampling, a practical method for wastewater-based surveillance of SARS-CoV-2.
527 *Environmental Research*, 204, p. 112058. doi: 10.1016/J.ENVRES.2021.112058.

- 528 Han, M., Seong, M., Kim, N., Shin, S., Cho, S. I., Park, H., et al., 2020. Viral RNA load in
529 mildly symptomatic and asymptomatic children with COVID-19, Seoul, South Korea. *Emerging*
530 *Infectious Diseases*, 26, pp. 2497–2499. doi: 10.3201/eid2610.202449.
- 531 Karthikeyan, S., Ronquillo, N., Belda-Ferre, P., Alvarado, D., Javidi, T., Longhurst, C. A., et al.,
532 2021. High-Throughput Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Detection Enables Forecasting of Community
533 Infection Dynamics in San Diego County, *American Society for Microbiology*, 6(2). doi:
534 10.1128/MSYSTEMS.00045-21.
- 535 Karthikeyan, S., Nguyen, A., McDonald, D., Zong, Y., Ronquillo, N., Ren, J., et al., 2021.
536 Rapid, large-scale wastewater surveillance and automated COVID-19 cases on a university
537 campus. *American Society for Microbiology*, 6(4), pp. e00793-21. doi:
538 10.1128/mSystems.00793-21.
- 539 Ling, Y., Xu, S., Lin, Y., Tian, D., Zhu, Z., Dai, F., et al., 2020. Persistence and clearance of
540 viral RNA in 2019 novel coronavirus disease rehabilitation patients. *Chinese Medical Journal*,
541 133(9), pp. 1039–1043. doi: 10.1097/CM9.0000000000000774.
- 542 Lo, I. L., Lio, C. F., Cheong, H. H., Lei, C. I., Cheong, T. H., Zhong, X., et al., 2020. Evaluation
543 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding in clinical specimens and clinical characteristics of 10 patients
544 with COVID-19 in Macau. *International Journal of Biological Sciences*, 16(10), pp. 1698–1707.
545 doi: 10.7150/IJBS.45357.
- 546 Ma, Q., Liu, J., Liu, Q., Kang, L., Liu, R., Jing, W., et al., 2021. Global Percentage of
547 Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections Among the Tested Population and Individuals With
548 Confirmed COVID-19 Diagnosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Network*
549 *Open*, 4(12), pp. e2137257–e2137257. doi: 10.1001/JAMANETWORKOPEN.2021.37257.
- 550 Mao, R., Qiu, Y., He, J., Tan, J., Li, X., Liang, J., et al., 2020. Manifestations and prognosis of
551 gastrointestinal and liver involvement in patients with COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-
552 analysis. *The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology*, 5(7), pp. 667–678. doi: 10.1016/S2468-
553 1253(20)30126-6.

- 554 McFadden, D., 1977. Quantitative Methods for Analyzing Travel Behaviour of Individuals:
555 Some Recent Developments. *Cowles Foundation for Research in Economics, Yale University*.
556 Available at: <https://ideas.repec.org/p/cwl/cwldpp/474.html>.
- 557 McMahan, C. S., Self, S., Rennert, L., Kalbaugh, C., Kriebel, D., Graves, D., et al., 2020.
558 COVID-19 wastewater epidemiology: A model to estimate infected populations. *The Lancet*
559 *Planetary Health*, 5(12), pp. e874–e881. doi: 10.1016/S2542-5196(21)00230-8.
- 560 Miura, F., Kitajima, M. and Ryosuke, O., 2021. Duration of SARS-CoV-2 viral shedding in
561 faeces as a parameter for wastewater-based epidemiology: Re-analysis of patient data using a
562 shedding dynamics model. *Science of the Total Environment*, 769, p. 144549. doi:
563 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144549.
- 564 Morales Medina, W. R., D’Elia, S. and Fahrenfeld, N. L., 2021. Accumulation of SARS-CoV-2
565 RNA in Sewer Biofilms. *Environmental Science and Technology*. doi:
566 10.1021/acsestwater.1c00345.
- 567 Nalbandian, A., Sehgal, K., Gupta, A., Madhavan, M. V., McGroder, C., Stevens, J. S., et al.,
568 2021. Post-acute COVID-19 syndrome. *Nature Medicine*. doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-01283-z.
- 569 Pan, Y., Zhang, D., Yang, P., Poon, L. L. M. and Wang, Q., 2020. Viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in
570 clinical samples. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 20(4), pp. 411–412. doi: 10.1016/S1473-
571 3099(20)30113-4.
- 572 Peccia, J., Zulli, A., Brackney, D. E., Grubaugh, N. D., Kaplan, E. H., Casanovas-Massana, A.,
573 et al., 2020. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection
574 dynamics. *Nature Biotechnology*. doi: 10.1038/s41587-020-0684-z.
- 575 Pecson, B. M., Darby, E., Haas, C. N., Amha, Y. M., Bartolo, M., Danielson, R., et al., 2021.
576 Reproducibility and sensitivity of 36 methods to quantify the SARS-CoV-2 genetic signal in raw
577 wastewater: findings from an interlaboratory methods evaluation in the U.S. *Environmental*
578 *Science: Water Research & Technology*, 7(3), pp. 504–520. doi: 10.1039/D0EW00946F.

- 579 Proverbio, D., Kemp, F., Magni, S., Orgorzaly, L., Cauchie, H., Gonçalves, J., et al., 2021.
580 CoWWAn: Model-based assessment of COVID-19 epidemic dynamics by wastewater analysis.
581 *medRxiv*. doi: 10.1101/2021.10.15.21265059.
- 582 Rafiee, M., Isazadeh, S., Mohseni-Bandpei, A., Mohebbi, S. R., Jahangiri-rad, M., Eslami, A., et
583 al., 2021. Moore swab performs equal to composite and outperforms grab sampling for SARS-
584 CoV-2 monitoring in wastewater. *Science of the Total Environment*, 790, p. 148205. doi:
585 10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2021.148205.
- 586 Reeves, K., Liebig, J., Feula, A., Saldi, T., Lasda, E., Johnson, W., et al., 2021. High-resolution
587 within-sewer SARS-CoV-2 surveillance facilitates informed intervention. *Water Research*, 204.
588 doi: 10.1016/J.WATRES.2021.117613.
- 589 Schang, C., Crosbie, N. D., Nolan, M., Poon, R., Wang, M., Jex, A., et al., 2021. Passive
590 Sampling of SARS-CoV-2 for Wastewater Surveillance. *Environmental Science & Technology*,
591 55. doi: 10.1021/acs.est.1c01530.
- 592 Severance, J., 2021. COVID Wastewater Testing Continuing this Spring – with an Absorbent
593 New Twist. *UConn Today*. Available at: [https://today.uconn.edu/2021/01/covid-wastewater-
594 testing-continuing-spring-absorbent-new-twist/](https://today.uconn.edu/2021/01/covid-wastewater-testing-continuing-spring-absorbent-new-twist/).
- 595 Sierpiński, R., Pinkas, J., Jankowski, M., Zgliczyński, W. S., Wierzba, W., Gujski, M., et al.,
596 2020. Sex differences in the frequency of gastrointestinal symptoms and olfactory or taste
597 disorders in 1942 nonhospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Polish
598 Archives of Internal Medicine*, 130(6), pp. 501–505. doi: 10.20452/PAMW.15414.
- 599 Travis, S. A., Best, A. A., Bochniak, K.S., Dunteman, N. D., Fellingner, J., Folkert, P. D., et al.,
600 2021. Providing a safe, in-person, residential college experience during the COVID-19
601 pandemic. *Frontiers in Public Health*. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2021.672344.
- 602 Wölfel, R., Corman, V. M., Guggemos, W., Seilmaier, M., Zange, S., Müller, M. A., et al., 2020.
603 Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*, 581, pp. 465–469.
604 doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x.

- 605 Wu, B., Lei, Z., Wu, K., He, J., Cao, J, Fu, J., et al., 2020. Epidemiological and Clinical Features
606 of Imported and Local Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Hainan, China.
607 *SSRN*. doi: 10.2139/SSRN.3555222.
- 608 Wu, Y., Guo, C., Tang, L., Hong, Z., Zhou, J., Dong, X., et al., 2020. Prolonged presence of
609 SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in faecal samples. *The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology*, 5, pp.
610 434–435. doi: 10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30083-2.
- 611 Xiao, F., Tang, M., Zheng, X., Liu, X., Li, X. and Shan, H., 2020. Evidence for Gastrointestinal
612 Infection of SARS-CoV-2. *Gastroenterology*, 158(6), p. 1831. doi:
613 10.1053/J.GASTRO.2020.02.055.
- 614 Xiao, F, Sun, J., Xu, Y., Li, F., Huang, X., Li, H., et al., 2020. Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in feces
615 of patient with severe COVID-19. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 26(8), pp. 1920–1922. doi:
616 10.3201/eid2608.200681.
- 617 Zhang, N., Gong, Y., Meng, F., Shi, Y., Wang, J., Mao, P., et al., 2020. Comparative study on
618 virus shedding patterns in nasopharyngeal and fecal specimens of COVID-19 patients. *Science*
619 *China Life Sciences*. doi: 10.1007/s11427-020-1783-9.
- 620 Zhang, Y., Cen, M., Hu, M., Du, L., Hu, W., Kim, J., et al., 2021. Prevalence and Persistent
621 Shedding of Fecal SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Patients With COVID-19 Infection: A Systematic
622 Review and Meta-analysis. *Clinical and translational gastroenterology*, 12(4), p. e00343. doi:
623 10.14309/CTG.0000000000000343.
- 624 Zheng, S., Fan, J., Yu, F., Feng, B., Lou, B., Zou, Q., et al., 2020. Viral load dynamics and
625 disease severity in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in Zhejiang province, China, January-
626 March 2020: retrospective cohort study. *The BMJ*, 369. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1443.
- 627 Zhou, R., Li, F., Chen, F., Liu, H., Zheng, J., Lei, C., et al., 2020. Viral dynamics in
628 asymptomatic patients with COVID-19. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 96, pp.
629 288–290. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.030.




Fig 1. N1 and N2 daily viral loads from the COVID-19 isolation residence, February 1, 2021 – May 21, 2021 (n=64).

Table 1. Quantification of viral loads and viral loads per population in the isolation residence

Characteristic	Value
<i><u>Viral gene copies per day</u></i>	
Median, N2	1.29 x 10 ⁹
Range (min/max), N2	1.38 x 10 ⁶ , 4.53 x 10 ¹¹
Median, N1	1.04 x 10 ⁹
Range (min/max), N1	1.11 x 10 ⁶ , 4.27 x 10 ¹¹
<i><u>Viral gene copies per person per day</u></i>	
Median, N2	1.01 x 10 ⁸
Range (min/max), N2	4.29 x 10 ⁵ , 4.86 x 10 ⁹
Median, N1	6.87 x 10 ⁷
Range (min/max), N1	5.70 x 10 ⁵ , 4.41 x 10 ⁹
<i><u>Water usage per person per day (L)</u></i>	
Median	83.4
Range (min/max)	20.3, 479.7




Fig 2. Correlation between independent average N2 log-transformed viral concentrations on identical samples utilizing separate processing and analysis pipelines (n = 64).




Fig 3. Violin plot showing distributions of N1 and N2 average daily wastewater viral loads per individual in isolation from February 1, 2021 – May 21, 2021. Note: Markers shown are median, 25th and 75th quantiles.




Fig 4. Violin plot showing distribution of average daily building-level water use per individual in isolation from February 1, 2021 – May 21, 2021. Note: Markers shown are median, 25th and 75th quantiles.

Table 2. Time series negative binomial models to quantify associations between captured viral loads and defined patient populations, Massachusetts 2021. Note: IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio.

Factor	Univariate IRR	Univariate p-value	Adjusted IRR	Adjusted p-value
BRSV Recovery	0.99	0.40	0.99	0.02
% Female Occupants	1.05	<0.001	1.05	<0.001
Log Viral Gene Copies	2.08	<0.001	1.47	<0.001




Fig 5. Total daily isolation building occupancy (line) plotted with N1 and N2 gene copies/day (bars) during the Spring 2021 academic semester. Note: Both SARS-CoV-2 daily wastewater viral loads and daily isolation residence occupancy totals are reported on linear y-axes (n=64).




Fig 6. Observed COVID-19 isolation residence occupancy plotted against predicted COVID-19 isolation residence occupancy using negative binomial modeling with Spring 2021 data.