

# 1 Comparison of RT-qPCR and Digital PCR Methods for Wastewater-Based Testing of 2 SARS-CoV-2

3  
4 Adrian Hinkle<sup>1</sup>, Hannah D. Greenwald<sup>1</sup>, Matthew Metzger<sup>1</sup>, Melissa Thornton<sup>1</sup>, Lauren C.  
5 Kennedy<sup>1</sup>, Kristin Loomis<sup>2</sup>, Monica B Herrera<sup>2</sup>, Raymond-John Abayan<sup>2</sup>, Kara L. Nelson<sup>1</sup>, and  
6 Rose S. Kantor<sup>1\*</sup>

7  
8 1 Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, CA,  
9 USA

10 2 Bio-Rad Laboratories, Pleasanton, California, USA

11 \*Corresponding author: [rkantor@berkeley.edu](mailto:rkantor@berkeley.edu)

## 12 Abstract

13 Wastewater-based epidemiology is an important tool for monitoring SARS-CoV-2 and other  
14 molecular targets in populations, using wastewater as a pooled sample. We compared the  
15 sensitivity, susceptibility to inhibition, and quantification of reverse transcription quantitative PCR  
16 (RT-qPCR), microfluidic well digital RT-PCR (RT-dPCR), and droplet digital RT-PCR (RT-  
17 ddPCR) measurements of SARS-CoV-2 (N1 gene target) and Pepper Mild Mottle Virus  
18 (PMMoV) RNA in 40 wastewater RNA extracts. All three methods were highly sensitive, but  
19 appeared less accurate at very low concentrations. Lower inhibition was observed for RT-  
20 ddPCR than RT-qPCR with both SARS-CoV-2 and PMMoV targets, but inhibition appeared to  
21 be mitigated by dilution of template RNA. The concentrations of N1 and PMMoV from all three  
22 methods were significantly correlated (Pearson's  $r=0.97-0.98$  for N1 and  $r=0.89-0.93$  for  
23 PMMoV), although RT-qPCR reported higher concentrations than digital methods. Taken  
24 together, this study provides support for the application of all three methods in wastewater-  
25 based epidemiology, with additional guidelines for the use of RT-qPCR.

## 26 Impact Statement

27 PCR-based assays are the current standard for sensitive, specific, rapid pathogen quantification  
28 in environmental samples, including wastewater. The increased availability of multiple digital  
29 PCR technologies necessitates side-by-side comparison between platforms, including traditional  
30 qPCR, to guide the application of these methods. Specifically, this work can inform  
31 interpretation of wastewater SARS-CoV-2 PCR data, as reported to public health agencies for  
32 pandemic response.

## 33 1. Introduction

34 SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is now widely applied as a means  
35 to monitor the spread of COVID-19 in communities (1,2). WBE may become more critical for  
36 providing accurate COVID-19 prevalence information as vaccines have become widely available  
37 in the U.S. and at-home testing has replaced clinical testing. WBE for human pathogens

38 typically involves the extraction of nucleic acids from raw wastewater and PCR-based  
39 quantification of an RNA or DNA target. While a national database has been established for  
40 SARS-CoV-2 WBE in the United States (CDC-NWSS), there remains no standardized protocol,  
41 and laboratories are often limited by the equipment already available to them. Interlaboratory  
42 comparisons have shown one or more orders of magnitude differences in results reported by  
43 groups using different methods (3–5). While much work has focused on the comparison of viral  
44 concentration and RNA extraction methods from wastewater, there is limited data to specifically  
45 address differences introduced by the choice of quantification platform.

46 Three commonly-used reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)  
47 methods that have been applied for WBE are quantitative PCR (qPCR), fixed array-based digital  
48 PCR (dPCR), and droplet digital PCR (ddPCR). While qPCR is based on whole-sample real-  
49 time quantification relative to a standard curve, digital PCR methods rely on sample digitization  
50 or partitioning and use end-point detection to determine the number of positive microchambers  
51 or partitions. A Poisson distribution is used to calculate the initial concentration of the target in  
52 the sample based on the fraction of positive microchambers or partitions. Commonly cited  
53 advantages of dPCR and ddPCR include robustness to inhibition, high sensitivity, high  
54 reproducibility, and no need for a standard curve. However, droplet digital and digital PCR have  
55 somewhat more limited ability to measure high-concentration samples, meaning *a priori*  
56 knowledge is required for adequate dilution (5), and manual thresholding is sometimes required  
57 to determine separation between positive and negative droplets (for ddPCR) (6). While digital  
58 PCR is becoming more widespread, it is still out of reach for many laboratories due to the high  
59 initial cost of equipment and longer turnaround time from sample to results. Fixed array plate-  
60 based dPCR is technically more straightforward and faster to perform because it removes the  
61 droplet formation step, but it has lower throughput compared to ddPCR, and few studies have  
62 directly compared this technique to ddPCR and qPCR.

63 With the increased adoption of digital PCR platforms, there have been several extensive  
64 comparisons of ddPCR and qPCR applied for sensitive quantification of microorganisms in the  
65 environment (3–5). As SARS-CoV-2 WBE developed, many researchers performed  
66 methodological comparisons that included side-by-side tests of ddPCR and qPCR for SARS-  
67 CoV-2 gene targets (7–11). Overall, higher quantities were determined by qPCR than ddPCR,  
68 and, when measured, the correlation between results from the two platforms was reasonable  
69 (**Table S1**). However, conclusions were often limited by the small numbers of samples tested.  
70 Several investigations found that ddPCR was more sensitive and less likely to experience  
71 inhibition than qPCR (7,9,12,13), while one study suggested that inhibition of reverse  
72 transcription was greater in ddPCR than qPCR (11). In the most extensive of these studies,  
73 Ciesielski et al. (7) quantified SARS-CoV-2 in 63 wastewater samples with ddPCR and qPCR  
74 using the US CDC N2 assay. Fewer than half of the samples were above the defined limits of  
75 detection, and while inhibition was observed, the extent of inhibition in each platform was not  
76 determined. Just one study compared quantification of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater using qPCR  
77 and fixed array-based dPCR (8). Notably, the N2 assay was previously found to be more  
78 sensitive in ddPCR (14), while the CDC N1 assay was more sensitive for qPCR (15,16).

79 Given the importance of accurate, reproducible WBE data despite differences in  
80 laboratory equipment, we sought to determine the comparability of three quantification  
81 methods—RT-qPCR, RT-ddPCR, and RT-dPCR—with RNA from northern California wastewater

82 samples. We applied SARS-CoV-2 (CDC N1 diagnostic assay) and Pepper Mild Mottle Virus  
83 (PMMoV; fecal strength indicator (17–19)) assays on all three platforms. This study includes a  
84 direct comparison of 40 samples across three PCR platforms and a summary of the  
85 comparisons performed thus far in the literature. Sampling locations ranged from large  
86 treatment plants to residential buildings, allowing testing of a wide range of concentrations,  
87 sensitivity near the limit of detection, and the impact of inhibition.

## 88 2. Methods

### 89 2.1 Sample collection and RNA extraction

90 Forty raw wastewater samples were collected from locations across the San Francisco Bay  
91 Area between December 3rd and December 10th, 2020. In total, 30 unique locations were  
92 represented in the sample set, including wastewater treatment plant influents, subsewersheds,  
93 and residential buildings or campuses. For each sample, 40 mL of raw wastewater from a 24-  
94 hour composite sample was transferred to a 50 mL tube containing 9.35 g sodium chloride and  
95 400  $\mu$ L TE buffer (1 M TRIS, 100 mM EDTA). The sample tubes were shipped overnight with an  
96 ice pack to the University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley), and total nucleic acids were  
97 extracted within 48 hours of sampling. Nucleic acid extraction followed the 4S method (20).  
98 Briefly, the samples were heated at 70°C for 45 minutes, then filtered through 5  $\mu$ m PVDF  
99 filters, mixed 1:1 with 70% vol/vol ethanol, bound to Zymo III-P columns (ZymoResearch),  
100 rinsed with wash buffers, and eluted with 200  $\mu$ L ZymoPURE elution buffer. The resulting 200  
101  $\mu$ L of nucleic acid eluate for each sample was divided into four 50  $\mu$ L aliquots and stored in  
102 LoBind tubes (Eppendorf) at -80°C.

103 Sample collection and extraction complied with the Environmental Microbiology  
104 Minimum Information (EMMI) guidelines (21). Collection was part of routine weekly monitoring  
105 conducted by the UC Berkeley COVID-WEB wastewater surveillance project. There was no  
106 evidence of contamination during sample collection in 10 months of sampling prior to this study.  
107 Therefore, environmental sampling controls were appropriately deemed unnecessary (21). Each  
108 sample was spiked with one of two amounts of the enveloped ssRNA virus Murine Hepatitis  
109 Virus (MHV, ATCC) (to a total spike amount of either  $7.08 \times 10^4$  gene copies or  $7.08 \times 10^5$  gene  
110 copies per 40 mL of raw wastewater) prior to heat inactivation. MHV served as a matrix  
111 recovery proxy to enable estimation of extraction efficiency of SARS-CoV-2. The post-extraction  
112 concentration was quantified using ddPCR to generate an extraction efficiency. A 40-mL  
113 phosphate buffered saline (1x PBS) negative extraction control was included with the batch of  
114 extractions on December 8th, 2020, and was quantified on one N1 plate and one PMMoV plate  
115 using RT-qPCR. No amplification of N1 was detected in the negative control and amplification of  
116 PMMoV was minimal ( $C_q=39.7$ ).

### 117 2.2 RT-qPCR

118 After overnight storage at -80 °C, samples were thawed on ice and processed with RT-qPCR on  
119 a QuantStudio3 Real-Time PCR System qPCR machine (Thermo Fisher) at the University of  
120 California, Berkeley. The *One-Step RT-qPCR for SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater Surveillance*  
121 *protocol* (22) was followed. Briefly, each reaction contained 15  $\mu$ L of reaction mix and 5  $\mu$ L of

122 template. The template consisted of undiluted RNA or five-fold diluted RNA in PCR water. The  
123 reaction mix contained TaqMan Fast Virus 1-Step Master Mix (Thermo Fisher Catalog  
124 #4444434) and primers and probes (Integrated DNA Technologies) in PCR water (see  
125 Greenwald et al. for sequences and concentrations (22). Methods complied with the Minimum  
126 Information for Publication of Quantitative Real-Time PCR Experiments (MIQE) guidelines (23).

127 The CDC N1 diagnostic assay was used for SARS-CoV-2 (24) and the coat protein gene  
128 was used for PMMoV (25). Both were singleplex assays with FAM-labeled probes. The N1  
129 standard was made using the nucleocapsid (N) gene plasmid (Integrated DNA Technologies)  
130 grown in *E. coli*, digested to make a linearized plasmid stock, and quantified via Qubit, and  
131 Absolute Q (dPCR; see below). The PMMoV standard used on the first four plates of this study  
132 was an RNA ultramer (IDT), but it was found to have degraded (**Figure S1**). The standard used  
133 on the fifth plate was a linear DNA fragment (gBlock). For analysis, all PMMoV data were  
134 analyzed by applying the standard curve equation derived from the plate with the DNA standard  
135 (plate 1138; see Data Analysis).

136 Each of the six N1 and five PMMoV RT-qPCR plates contained samples, no-template  
137 controls (PCR water), and a standard curve, in triplicate wells (**Table S2**). All no-template  
138 controls were negative for all plates. The N1 standard plasmid was diluted in TE buffer to a  
139 stock concentration of approximately  $1 \times 10^7$  gene copies per microliter (gc/ $\mu$ L), later quantified  
140 by dPCR (see below). Serial dilutions in PCR water were performed to generate a seven point  
141 standard curve (5, 10, 20, 100, 1000, 10000, and 10000 gc/well, before adjusting based on the  
142 dPCR quantification of the standard). For N1 plates, standard curve efficiency ranged from 85%  
143 to 93% and  $R^2$  ranged from 0.90 to 1.0. A seven point standard curve was also used for PMMoV  
144 ( $10^2$  to  $10^8$  gc/well). For PMMoV plates, the standard curve efficiency ranged from 84% to 122%  
145 and  $R^2$  ranged from 0.92 to 1.0. The concentration for each sample was determined by  
146 averaging the Cq values from all technical replicates that amplified and calculating a  
147 concentration based on the standard curve from each plate. Before averaging, outlier Cq values  
148 were removed from groups of technical triplicates using Grubb's test ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

149 The limit of detection (LOD) for the N1 assay was determined to be 0.49 gc/ $\mu$ L RNA  
150 (2.43 gc per well), the point at which  $\geq 95\%$  of technical replicates were positive on 6 standard  
151 curves each run in triplicate (**Table S3**). The limit of detection for other assays was not  
152 investigated. Samples were called positive if at least 2 of 3 replicate wells amplified and the  
153 average concentration was above the LOD.

### 154 **2.3 RT-dPCR**

155 Extracted RNA samples were stored at  $-80^\circ\text{C}$  at UC Berkeley for one day past the last day of  
156 sampling, then hand-carried on dry ice to Combinati (Palo Alto, California) and stored at  $-80^\circ\text{C}$   
157 for 50 additional days. Samples were thawed on ice and processed using RT-dPCR by  
158 Combinati. Steps complied with the digital MIQE guidelines (26,27). Each 9  $\mu$ L reaction  
159 consisted of 1  $\mu$ L of RNA, 2.25  $\mu$ L of 4X Combinati 1-step RT-dPCR MasterMix, 0.45  $\mu$ L of  
160 SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater Surveillance 4-plex assay (Combinati), and 5.3  $\mu$ L water. Each plate  
161 contained negative controls (PCR water) and a positive control. The positive 4-target PCR  
162 control was made of synthetic single-stranded DNA containing the target N1, N2, and PMMoV  
163 sequences plus extracted Bovine Coronavirus RNA (PBS Animal Health).

164 After preparing the dPCR mix, 9  $\mu\text{L}$  of the reaction mixture was loaded into the MAP16  
165 plate followed by an overlay of 15  $\mu\text{L}$  of isolation buffer. The prepared MAP16 plate was then  
166 loaded on the Absolute Q instrument (Applied Biosystems QuantStudio Absolute Q Digital PCR  
167 system). Thermocycling was performed using Absolute Q with the following program: reverse  
168 transcription at 50  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 10 minutes, preheating (enzyme activation) at 95  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 10 minutes,  
169 and 45 cycles of denaturation at 95  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 5 seconds and annealing/extension at 55  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 30  
170 seconds.

171 The limit of detection and limit of quantification used for the assay were both two positive  
172 microchambers per reaction ( $\sim 0.2$  gc/ $\mu\text{L}$ ). These values are the same because digital PCR  
173 provides absolute quantification without the need for a standard curve. Data analysis was  
174 performed on the Absolute Q Analysis Software (v4.2.1), which reports the concentration of  
175 each reaction in gene copies per microliter (gc/ $\mu\text{L}$ ) (**Table S4**). The initial sample concentration  
176 was manually calculated by adjusting the reported dPCR concentration based on the input  
177 sample volume for each sample. The arithmetic mean concentration of the duplicate  
178 measurements was calculated and reported for each sample. Samples were determined to be  
179 positive if at least 3 total microchambers were positive across duplicate reactions.

## 180 **2.4 RT-ddPCR**

181 Extracted RNA samples were stored at -80  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  at UC Berkeley for 41 days past the last day of  
182 sampling, then hand-carried on dry ice to Bio-Rad (Pleasanton, California) and stored at -80  $^{\circ}\text{C}$   
183 for two additional days. Samples were thawed on ice and processed using the One-Step RT-  
184 ddPCR Advanced Kit for Probes (Bio-Rad); 9  $\mu\text{L}$  was used for a 20  $\mu\text{L}$  reaction volume and  
185 samples were analyzed without technical replicates. Each droplet was 0.85 nL. Steps complied  
186 with the digital MIQE guidelines (26,27). The primer and probe concentration in the reaction was  
187 900 nM and 250 nM, respectively. Assays were purchased from IDT and manufactured under  
188 SARS-CoV-2 template-free conditions. The CDC N1 target for SARS-CoV-2 (HEX-labeled  
189 probe) (24) and PMMoV target (FAM-labeled probe) were run in singleplex reactions. The CDC  
190 N2 (24), E (28), and MHV targets (FAM-, HEX- and FAM- mixture, and HEX-labeled probes,  
191 respectively) were run as a triplex reaction (**Table S5**). Each reaction was dropletized using the  
192 QX200 Auto DG (Bio-Rad). Thermal cycling was performed using a C1000 Touch (Bio-Rad)  
193 with the following program: reverse transcription at 50  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 60 minutes, enzyme activation at  
194 95  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 10 minutes, 40 cycles of denaturation at 94  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 30 seconds and  
195 annealing/extension at 55  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 1 minute, enzyme deactivation at 98  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 10 minutes, and a  
196 final hold at 4  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ . The ramp rate was set to 2  $^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{second}$ .

197 Samples were analyzed without dilution and at a 1:5 dilution (7  $\mu\text{L}$  diluted into a final  
198 volume of 35  $\mu\text{L}$  with nuclease free water). Synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Exact Diagnostics) was  
199 used as a positive control on all runs. Nuclease free water was used as a no-template control on  
200 all runs (1-2 wells per run) and all negative controls were negative.

201 Data were analyzed using the QXManager v1.2. All wells were thresholded manually  
202 and were confirmed to have appropriate droplet counts (**Table S6**). A sample was interpreted as  
203 positive if the ddPCR concentration for N1 was  $\geq 0.1$  gc/ $\mu\text{L}$  (RNA sample concentration of 0.22  
204 gc/ $\mu\text{L}$ ) and there were two or more positive droplets per sample (no technical replicates were

205 performed). This limit of detection was determined using a serially diluted heat-inactivated virus  
206 to establish the lowest detectable concentration of SARS-CoV-2 at which at least 95% of true  
207 positive replicates tested positive.

## 208 **2.5 Quantification of qPCR standards by dPCR**

209 Two aliquots of the RT-qPCR standards for N1 and PMMoV were hand carried on dry ice to  
210 Combinati for quantification. The standards were diluted 1000-fold, 10,000-fold, and 100,000-  
211 fold before quantification using the Absolute Q digital PCR platform. Each dPCR reaction  
212 consisted of 1  $\mu$ L of diluted standard material, 2.25  $\mu$ L of 4X Combinati 1-step RT-dPCR  
213 MasterMix, 0.45  $\mu$ L of 4-plex Wastewater assay, and 5.3  $\mu$ L water. Each dilution point was  
214 quantified in duplicate. After correcting the reported concentration based on the appropriate  
215 dilution factor, the absolute concentration of the standard material was calculated using the  
216 average values of both tubes across the dilution series (**Table S7**). The N1 (linearized plasmid)  
217 and PMMoV (dsDNA gBlock) standard concentrations used in data analysis were based on  
218 quantification of the standards via Absolute Q dPCR (**Table S2**).


## 219 **2.6 Data Analysis**

220 Data analysis was performed using Python (v3.9.5) using modules Pandas (v1.2.5), NumPy  
221 (v1.21.0), SciPy (v1.7.0), and Plotnine (v0.8.0). RT-qPCR analysis of standard curves and  
222 unknowns was performed using custom code as previously described (29)  
223 ([https://github.com/wastewaterlab/data\\_analysis](https://github.com/wastewaterlab/data_analysis)). Pearson correlation coefficients were  
224 determined using SciPy, and linear regressions were conducted using NumPy polyfit. Paired  
225 concentrations of diluted and undiluted samples were compared using the Mann-Whitney U test  
226 (SciPy) to determine whether there was significant inhibition during RT-PCR. All analysis code  
227 can be found at  
228 [https://github.com/wastewaterlab/data\\_analysis/blob/master/notebooks/pcr\\_comparison.ipynb](https://github.com/wastewaterlab/data_analysis/blob/master/notebooks/pcr_comparison.ipynb).

## 229 **3. Results**

230 A total of 40 raw wastewater samples from 30 distinct residential, subsewershed, and treatment  
231 plant influent locations in the San Francisco Bay Area underwent large-volume nucleic acid  
232 extraction at UC Berkeley. Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 (CDC N1 diagnostic assay) and  
233 PMMoV (coat protein gene) RNA was performed by three laboratories using qPCR, dPCR, and  
234 ddPCR, respectively (**Table S8**). Undiluted RNA was quantified for all samples, while five-fold  
235 diluted RNA was also quantified with qPCR and ddPCR to assess inhibition. All three methods  
236 produced similar trends across samples that ranged three orders of magnitude in concentration  
237 (**Figures 1 and S2**).

238




239  
240 **Figure 1.** Comparison of SARS-CoV-2 and PMMoV concentrations in RNA from 40 wastewater samples  
241 from the San Francisco Bay Area. Samples are ordered by average N1 concentration rank for each  
242 method across all methods. Each sample was measured undiluted via dPCR and both undiluted and five-  
243 fold diluted via ddPCR and qPCR. The N1 limit of detection is shown for each method with a dashed line;  
244 all non-detects are plotted as open points at the LOD for each method. Concentrations shown for diluted  
245 qPCR and ddPCR samples are corrected for the dilution factor.

### 246 3.1 Sensitivity

247 The limits of detection for the N1 assay with qPCR, dPCR and ddPCR were found to be 0.5,  
248 0.2, and 0.22 gene copies per microliter (gc/μL) RNA, respectively (see Methods). The  
249 sensitivity of each platform is also impacted by PCR inhibition (see below) and by the volume of  
250 template RNA included in the PCR reaction. For a single reaction well, qPCR used 5 μL, dPCR  
251 used 1 μL, and ddPCR used 9 μL. Additionally, measuring the same sample in technical  
252 replicate wells may allow for improved sensitivity. Here, qPCR utilized 3 wells, dPCR utilized 2  
253 wells, and ddPCR utilized 1 well (no replicates). Of 40 samples compared with the N1 assay  
254 (undiluted), there was total agreement on 2 negatives and 29 positives across all platforms  
255 (**Table S8**). ddPCR and dPCR jointly reported 1 additional negative, qPCR reported 1 additional  
256 negative, and dPCR reported 7 unique negatives (**Figure 2**). All but one of the negatives were  
257 samples from residential sewersheds (buildings or campuses). Notably, the Murine Hepatitis  
258 Virus (MHV) matrix recovery control had >50% calculated recovery efficiency for all but five  
259 samples. Of those five, two were non-detects with N1 in dPCR only. This suggests that, overall,  
260 non-detects were not due to poor extractions.

261



262

263

264

**Figure 2.** Venn diagram of the samples with non-detects in one or more PCR method. Samples are depicted as squares (a single WWTP influent site) or circles (residential sites).

265

### 3.2 Inhibition

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276


277

278

279

Next, we assessed inhibition, which can lead to under-quantification of the molecular target or false negative results (15,30). Inhibition is especially a concern in WBE because of the inhibitory substances found in wastewater and because inhibition impedes comparison between laboratories that use different molecular methods (31). To test for inhibition, we compared the results of qPCR and ddPCR with and without prior dilution of the RNA template (21,32). If inhibitors were present, dilution would decrease their concentration in the PCR reaction, resulting in higher reported concentrations after accounting for the dilution factor. Five-fold dilution was chosen after prior qPCR testing of 5-, and 10-fold dilutions revealed that 10-fold often led to loss of signal (17). We quantified N1 and PMMoV in undiluted and five-fold diluted samples using qPCR and ddPCR (**Figure 1**) and calculated the ratio between diluted and undiluted concentrations (**Figure 3**). Median diluted-to-undiluted ratios for ddPCR and qPCR were 1.15 vs. 1.82 for N1 and 1.17 vs. 1.88 for PMMoV, indicating that qPCR results were significantly more affected by inhibition (two-sided Mann-Whitney U test  $p=1.2 \times 10^{-8}$  for  $n=31$  comparisons of N1 and  $p=3.6 \times 10^{-10}$  for  $n=33$  comparisons of PMMoV).





280  
281 **Figure 3.** Ratio of target quantification in five-fold diluted sample relative to undiluted sample for ddPCR  
282 and qPCR. The concentrations for the diluted samples were corrected for the dilution factor (multiplied by  
283 5) prior to calculating the ratio. Samples with non-detects are not shown. The boxes show the first and  
284 third quartiles and the whiskers extend to the largest value within 1.5 times the interquartile range.  
285 Individual data points are shown in gray and samples are connected by gray lines.

### 286 3.3 Quantification

287 We found that N1 and PMMoV results from all three methods were linearly correlated after  
288 log<sub>10</sub> scaling with significant Pearson correlation coefficients for each pair of methods (**Table 1**,  
289 **Figures S3 and S4**). Correlations were determined using the data from 5-fold dilutions of qPCR  
290 and ddPCR due to the presence of inhibition in some samples (see above). Samples that were  
291 non-detect with any method were removed prior to calculation. Despite the strong correlation,  
292 undiluted qPCR concentrations were higher than dPCR concentrations (median fold difference  
293 = 1.7) and ddPCR concentrations (median fold difference = 1.8). Notably, qPCR standards were  
294 quantified by dPCR, which reported concentrations for N1 and PMMoV that were, respectively,  
295 60.8% and 39.2% lower than those found with Qubit (**Table S7**). This difference was accounted  
296 for during data analysis.

297  
298 **Table 1.** Correlation statistics and linear regressions for log<sub>10</sub>-scaled data from each pair of PCR  
299 methods.

Target	Independent	Dependent	n	Slope	Intercept	Pearson's r*	Spearman r*
N1	qPCR	dPCR	27	1.06	-0.60	0.98	0.97
	qPCR	ddPCR	27	0.93	-0.27	0.97	0.95
	dPCR	qPCR	27	0.90	0.63	0.98	0.97
	dPCR	ddPCR	27	0.86	0.29	0.97	0.97
	ddPCR	qPCR	27	1.02	0.38	0.97	0.95
	ddPCR	dPCR	27	1.11	-0.24	0.97	0.97
PMMoV	qPCR	dPCR	40	1.04	-0.46	0.90	0.90
	qPCR	ddPCR	40	1.03	-0.28	0.93	0.91
	dPCR	qPCR	40	0.78	1.13	0.90	0.90
	dPCR	ddPCR	40	0.85	0.68	0.89	0.94
	ddPCR	qPCR	40	0.84	0.81	0.93	0.91
	ddPCR	dPCR	40	0.93	0.16	0.89	0.94

300 \* All correlations were significant ( $p < 1.5 \times 10^{-12}$ )

#### 301 4. Discussion

302 All three PCR methods produced quantitative measurements of N1 and PMMoV RNA  
 303 concentrations across three orders of magnitude (**Figure 1**), and concentrations were strongly  
 304 correlated between methods (**Table 1**). Despite quantification of the qPCR standards with dPCR  
 305 prior to analysis, measured qPCR concentrations were consistently higher than dPCR and  
 306 ddPCR concentrations, which were in closer agreement. This trend has also been observed in  
 307 previous studies (**Table S1**), indicating a need to normalize concentrations before comparisons  
 308 can be made between measurements using different methods. One possible explanation for this  
 309 discrepancy is that qPCR standard curves may be affected by DNA adherence to the walls of  
 310 plastic tubing or degradation of DNA samples, leading to overestimation of the DNA standard,  
 311 and subsequent over-quantification of the wastewater sample. Conversely, these same factors  
 312 should affect the sample nucleic acids as well, resulting in potential under-quantification of  
 313 samples by ddPCR and dPCR. Another possible explanation is that the reverse transcription  
 314 step in RT-qPCR could have produced more than one cDNA molecule per RNA template,  
 315 resulting in over-quantification of the sample material (RNA) but not the DNA standards.  
 316 Meanwhile, the reverse transcription step in digital PCR methods was conducted within the  
 317 partitions/microchambers, and a proportional increase in cDNA would not affect the readout of  
 318 these endpoint PCR assays.

319 Also consistent with prior work (**Table S1**), inhibition was significantly lower in ddPCR  
 320 than qPCR based on the lower diluted-to-undiluted ratio in ddPCR (**Figure 3**). Nonetheless,  
 321 inhibition in qPCR does not appear to have led to many false negatives relative to digital PCR  
 322 methods (**Figure 2**). Additionally, while inhibition was not measured with dPCR, similar results

323 would be expected given that both digital PCR methods measure the presence or absence of  
324 DNA template in individual microchambers and are therefore less impacted by the decrease in  
325 amplification efficiency caused by PCR inhibitors (12,33).

326 Lastly, limits of detection measurements are a function of the total sample volume  
327 included in the reaction and for digital PCR, the number partitions or microchambers measured,  
328 but these are not standardized across platforms. Additionally, the method for defining the limit of  
329 detection was different for each platform. Thus, conclusions comparing the sensitivity of each  
330 platform based on the defined LoDs should be taken with care.

## 331 **5. Conclusion**

332 All three methods are highly sensitive and quantitative, making them appropriate tools for use in  
333 WBE. However, based on our findings, additional guidelines for RT-qPCR should be followed  
334 when this method is used for WBE. First, to increase the accuracy of RT-qPCR, dilutions should  
335 be performed when there are signs of inhibition. Undiluted samples should also be run in  
336 parallel in case dilution causes the signal to drop below detectable levels. The same should be  
337 performed for digital PCR, if sample volumes and logistical constraints allow. Second, the  
338 differences between Qubit and fixed array-based digital PCR measurements of the DNA  
339 standard in this study (see Methods) point to the importance of the method of quantification for  
340 qPCR standards. We suggest that WBE databases such as CDC-NWSS should track how  
341 qPCR standards are quantified, and this should be reported in all qPCR-based WBE studies.  
342 For internal consistency, long-term monitoring projects should limit changes to standards and  
343 carefully compare new batches of standards as part of quality control.

344 Third, we have found that results of long term-monitoring using RT-qPCR may be  
345 subject to plate-to-plate fluctuations due to differences in standard curve serial dilutions (29).  
346 While standard curve efficiency and  $R^2$  are key components of quality control, the y-intercept  
347 should also be monitored as an indicator of standard degradation or batch differences. Finally,  
348 we note that all methods are less accurate at low concentrations due to stochasticity (whether  
349 the RNA molecules are captured in the subsample that is taken for PCR analysis). Here, testing  
350 more technical replicates may improve accuracy, and replication may be most important for  
351 presence/absence determinations in residential facilities. We also expect that including more  
352 RNA template in the PCR reaction would improve accuracy. The sample volume included in the  
353 PCR reactions was a major difference between the platforms, as ddPCR utilized 9  $\mu$ L, RR-  
354 qPCR utilized 5  $\mu$ L, and dPCR utilized 1  $\mu$ L. This may explain why SARS-CoV-2 was detected  
355 in more samples using RT-qPCR and ddPCR compared to dPCR.

356 Digital PCR methods are advantageous for their ability to rapidly bring online multiplexed  
357 assays for new SARS-CoV-2 mutation detection or other pathogens. Additionally, the absolute  
358 quantification and increased tolerance to inhibition of dPCR and ddPCR allows higher  
359 confidence in the quantitative comparison of assays for multiple targets from the same organism  
360 (e.g. to calculate the percentage of total SARS-CoV-2 corresponding to a variant lineage).  
361 Despite these advantages, qPCR is a familiar, more widely available method for many  
362 researchers globally, and it can be fast, cost-effective, and high-throughput. Overall, the data  
363 presented in this study and summarized from previous work provide evidence that, when used  
364 appropriately, qPCR, dPCR, and ddPCR are all suitable WBE methods that generate highly  
365 correlated results for a wide range of wastewater sources and target concentrations.

366 **5. Acknowledgements**

367 We thank Christina Bouwens and Robert Lin (Thermo Fisher) for their collaboration to run  
368 samples on the Absolute Q. We thank our partners at the following agencies and facilities for  
369 sample collection: Sanitary District No. 5 of Marin County; Central Marin Sanitation Agency;  
370 East Bay Municipal Utility District; San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Las Gallinas  
371 Sanitary District; Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin; Novato Sanitary District; Central Contra  
372 Costa Sanitary District; Delta Diablo; West County Water District; Yountville; American Canyon;  
373 California Medical Facility; and University of California, Berkeley. We also thank volunteers in  
374 the UC Berkeley COVID-WEB wastewater testing laboratory. We gratefully acknowledge  
375 funding from the Catena Foundation. A.W.H., H.D.G., and L.C.K. were supported by the  
376 National Science Foundation (NSF) Graduate Research Fellowship [grant number DGE-  
377 1752814].  
378

379 **6. Conflict of interest**

380 Raymond John Abayan, Kristin Loomis, and Monica Herrera are employees of Bio-Rad  
381 Laboratories, which commercializes equipment and assays for ddPCR.  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386

## 387 References

- 388 1. Bivins A, North D, Ahmad A, Ahmed W, Alm E, Been F, et al. Wastewater-Based  
389 Epidemiology: Global Collaborative to Maximize Contributions in the Fight Against COVID-  
390 19. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2020 Jul 7;54(13):7754–7.
- 391 2. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-  
392 Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the  
393 Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environ Sci Technol Lett*. 2020 Jul  
394 14;7(7):511–6.
- 395 3. Nshimiyimana JP, Cruz MC, Wuertz S, Thompson JR. Variably improved microbial source  
396 tracking with digital droplet PCR. *Water Res*. 2019 Aug 1;159:192–202.
- 397 4. Crain C, Kezer K, Steele S, Owiti J, Rao S, Victorio M, et al. Application of ddPCR for  
398 detection of *Enterococcus* spp. in coastal water quality monitoring. *J Microbiol Methods*.  
399 2021 May;184:106206.
- 400 5. Zhao Y, Xia Q, Yin Y, Wang Z. Comparison of Droplet Digital PCR and Quantitative PCR  
401 Assays for Quantitative Detection of *Xanthomonas citri* Subsp. *citri*. *PLoS ONE*. 2016 Jul  
402 18;11(7):e0159004.
- 403 6. Kokkoris V, Vukicevich E, Richards A, Thomsen C, Hart MM. Challenges Using Droplet  
404 Digital PCR for Environmental Samples. *Appl Microbiol*. 2021 Jun;1(1):74–88.
- 405 7. Ciesielski M, Blackwood D, Clerkin T, Gonzalez R, Thompson H, Larson A, et al.  
406 Assessing sensitivity and reproducibility of RT-ddPCR and RT-qPCR for the quantification  
407 of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater. *J Virol Methods*. 2021 Jul 9;114230.
- 408 8. Boogaerts T, Jacobs L, De Roeck N, Van den Bogaert S, Aertgeerts B, Lahousse L, et al.  
409 An alternative approach for bioanalytical assay optimization for wastewater-based  
410 epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021 Oct 1;789:148043.
- 411 9. Graham KE, Loeb SK, Wolfe MK, Catoe D, Sinnott-Armstrong N, Kim S, et al. SARS-CoV-  
412 2 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Is Associated with COVID-19 Cases in a Large Urban  
413 Sewershed. *Env Sci Technol*. 2021;55(1):488–98.
- 414 10. Steele JA, Zimmer-Faust AG, Griffith JF, Weisberg SB. Sources of variability in methods  
415 for processing, storing, and concentrating SARS-CoV-2 in influent from urban wastewater  
416 treatment plants. *medRxiv*. 2021 Jun 21;2021.06.16.21259063.
- 417 11. D’Aoust PM, Mercier E, Montpetit D, Jia JJ, Alexandrov I, Neault N, et al. Quantitative  
418 analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19  
419 incidence and prevalence. *Water Res*. 2021 Jan 1;188:116560.
- 420 12. Dingle TC, Sedlak RH, Cook L, Jerome KR. Tolerance of Droplet-Digital PCR vs Real-  
421 Time Quantitative PCR to Inhibitory Substances. *Clin Chem*. 2013 Nov 1;59(11):1670–2.
- 422 13. Rački N, Dreo T, Gutierrez-Aguirre I, Blejec A, Ravnikaar M. Reverse transcriptase droplet  
423 digital PCR shows high resilience to PCR inhibitors from plant, soil and water samples.  
424 *Plant Methods*. 2014 Dec 31;10:42.
- 425 14. Gonzalez R, Curtis K, Bivins A, Bibby K, Weir MH, Yetka K, et al. COVID-19 surveillance in  
426 Southeastern Virginia using wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Res*. 2020 Nov  
427 1;186:116296.
- 428 15. Ahmed W, Simpson SL, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Bivins A, Blackall LL, et al. Minimizing errors  
429 in RT-PCR detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA for wastewater surveillance.  
430 *Sci Total Environ*. 2022 Jan 20;805:149877.
- 431 16. Kaya D, Niemeier D, Ahmed W, Kjellerup BV. Evaluation of multiple analytical methods for  
432 SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in wastewater samples. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021 Dec 6;152033.
- 433 17. Greenwald HD, Kennedy LC, Hinkle A, Whitney ON, Fan VB, Crits-Christoph A, et al.  
434 Tools for interpretation of wastewater SARS-CoV-2 temporal and spatial trends  
435 demonstrated with data collected in the San Francisco Bay Area. *Water Res X*. 2021 Aug  
436 1;12:100111.

- 437 18. Feng S, Roguet A, McClary-Gutierrez JS, Newton RJ, Kloczko N, Meiman JG, et al.  
438 Evaluation of Sampling, Analysis, and Normalization Methods for SARS-CoV-2  
439 Concentrations in Wastewater to Assess COVID-19 Burdens in Wisconsin Communities.  
440 ACS EST Water. 2021 Aug 13;1(8):1955–65.
- 441 19. Greaves J, Stone D, Wu Z, Bibby K. Persistence of emerging viral fecal indicators in large-  
442 scale freshwater mesocosms. Water Res X. 2020 Dec 1;9:100067.
- 443 20. Whitney ON, Kennedy LC, Fan VB, Hinkle A, Kantor R, Greenwald H, et al. Sewage, Salt,  
444 Silica, and SARS-CoV-2 (4S): An Economical Kit-Free Method for Direct Capture of SARS-  
445 CoV-2 RNA from Wastewater. Environ Sci Technol [Internet]. 2021 Mar 24 [cited 2021 Apr  
446 6]; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c08129>
- 447 21. Borchardt MA, Boehm AB, Salit M, Spencer SK, Wigginton KR, Noble RT. The  
448 Environmental Microbiology Minimum Information (EMMI) Guidelines: qPCR and dPCR  
449 Quality and Reporting for Environmental Microbiology. Environ Sci Technol. 2021 Aug  
450 3;55(15):10210–23.
- 451 22. Greenwald H, Kennedy LC, Fan VB, Kantor R, Nelson KL. One-Step RT-qPCR for SARS-  
452 CoV-2 Wastewater Surveillance: N1, PMMoV, BCoV, SOC. 2020 Dec 4 [cited 2021 Jul  
453 27]; Available from: [https://www.protocols.io/view/one-step-rt-qpcr-for-sars-cov-2-  
454 wastewater-surveil-bpk3mkyn](https://www.protocols.io/view/one-step-rt-qpcr-for-sars-cov-2-wastewater-surveil-bpk3mkyn)
- 455 23. Bustin SA, Benes V, Garson JA, Hellems J, Huggett J, Kubista M, et al. The MIQE  
456 Guidelines: Minimum Information for Publication of Quantitative Real-Time PCR  
457 Experiments. Clin Chem. 2009 Apr 1;55(4):611–22.
- 458 24. Lu X, Wang L, Sakthivel SK, Whitaker B, Murray J, Kamili S, et al. US CDC Real-Time  
459 Reverse Transcription PCR Panel for Detection of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome  
460 Coronavirus 2. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 Aug;26(8):1654–65.
- 461 25. Haramoto E, Kitajima M, Kishida N, Konno Y, Katayama H, Asami M, et al. Occurrence of  
462 Pepper Mild Mottle Virus in Drinking Water Sources in Japan. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2013  
463 Dec 1;79(23):7413–8.
- 464 26. Huggett JF, Foy CA, Benes V, Emslie K, Garson JA, Haynes R, et al. The Digital MIQE  
465 Guidelines: Minimum Information for Publication of Quantitative Digital PCR Experiments.  
466 Clin Chem. 2013 Jun 1;59(6):892–902.
- 467 27. The dMIQE Group, Huggett JF. The Digital MIQE Guidelines Update: Minimum Information  
468 for Publication of Quantitative Digital PCR Experiments for 2020. Clin Chem. 2020 Aug  
469 1;66(8):1012–29.
- 470 28. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. Detection of 2019  
471 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Eurosurveillance. 2020 Jan  
472 23;25(3):2000045.
- 473 29. Kantor RS, Greenwald HD, Kennedy LC, Hinkle A, Harris-Lovett S, Metzger M, et al.  
474 Operationalizing a routine wastewater monitoring laboratory for SARS-CoV-2. PLOS  
475 Water. 2022 Feb 15;1(2):e0000007.
- 476 30. Gibson KE, Schwab KJ, Spencer SK, Borchardt MA. Measuring and mitigating inhibition  
477 during quantitative real time PCR analysis of viral nucleic acid extracts from large-volume  
478 environmental water samples. Water Res. 2012;46(13):4281–91.
- 479 31. Mao K, Zhang K, Du W, Ali W, Feng X, Zhang H. The potential of wastewater-based  
480 epidemiology as surveillance and early warning of infectious disease outbreaks. Curr Opin  
481 Environ Sci Health. 2020;17:1–7.
- 482 32. Schrader C, Schielke A, Ellerbroek L, Johne R. PCR inhibitors – occurrence, properties  
483 and removal. J Appl Microbiol. 2012;113(5):1014–26.
- 484 33. Sidstedt M, Rådström P, Hedman J. PCR inhibition in qPCR, dPCR and MPS—  
485 mechanisms and solutions. Anal Bioanal Chem. 2020 Apr 1;412(9):2009–23.