

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

The role of wastewater-based epidemiology for SARS-CoV-2 in developing countries: cumulative evidence from South Africa supports sentinel site surveillance to guide public health decision-making

Chinwe Iwu-Jaja^{1*}, Nkosenhle Lindo Ndlovu^{1*}, Said Rachida¹, Mukhlid Yousif^{1,2}, Setshaba Taukobong¹, Mokgaetji Macheke¹, Laurette Mhlanga³, Cari van Schalkwyk³, Juliet Pulliam³, Tom Moultrie⁴, Wouter le Roux⁵, Lisa Schaefer⁶, Gina Pockock⁷, Leanne Coetzee⁷, Janet Mans⁸, Faizal Bux⁹, Leanne Pillay⁹, Dariah de Villiers¹⁰, AP du Toit¹⁰, Don Jambo¹¹, Annancietar Gomba¹¹, Shaun Groenink¹², Neil Madgewick¹³, Martie van der Walt¹⁴, Awelani Mutshembele¹⁴, Natascha Berkowitz¹⁵, Melinda Suchard¹, Kerrigan McCarthy^{1,2,5} for the SACCESS network

1. Centre for Vaccines and Immunology, National Institute for Communicable Diseases, South Africa
2. Department of Virology, School of Pathology, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
3. South African Centre for Epidemiological Modelling and Analysis, Stellenbosch University, Cape Town, South Africa
4. Centre for Actuarial Research, University of Cape Town, South Africa
5. School of Public Health, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
6. Water Centre, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Pretoria, South Africa
7. Waterlab (Pty) Ltd, Pretoria, South Africa
8. University of Pretoria, Department of Medical Virology, Pretoria, South Africa
9. Institute for Water and Wastewater Technology, Durban University of Technology, Durban, South Africa
10. Lumegen Laboratories (Pty) Ltd, Potchefstroom, South Africa
11. National Institute for Occupational Health, South Africa
12. Greenhill Laboratories, South Africa
13. Praecautio, South Africa
14. South African Medical Research Council –Tuberculosis Platform
15. City of Cape Town, South Africa

*joint first authors

Corresponding authors: Chinwe Iwu-Jaja chinwei@nicd.ac.za; Nkosenhle Lindo Ndlovu nkosenhlen@nicd.ac.za

44

45 **Research in Context**

46

47 **Evidence before this study**

48 Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) has long been used to track community disease burden within
49 communities. This approach has become increasingly popular for monitoring the SARS-CoV-2 virus since the
50 beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. We searched PubMed up until May 2022 using these keywords “SARS-
51 CoV-2”, “COVID”, “wastewater-based epidemiology”, “WBE”, combining them with relevant Boolean
52 operators. We found that majority studies were mostly conducted in high income settings. Huge gap exists for
53 such studies in low and middle income countries, particularly, sub-Saharan Africa. Furthermore, given that
54 WBE of COVID-19 is still in its early stages, more studies are required not only quantify SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
55 wastewater but to also assess the relationship between SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and clinical case load. Such
56 studies are required to showcase the usefulness of WBE, strengthen the surveillance of COVID-19 and also to
57 improve uptake of these findings by public health officials for decision making.

58 **Added value of this study**

59 This is the first study to test a large number of (87) wastewater treatment plants across major cities on a
60 national scale in an African country. Our study not only demonstrates the added value of wastewater-based
61 epidemiology as a great surveillance tool to aid disease control in our setting and similar settings, but it also
62 demonstrates the feasibility of this type of testing. Our research findings are critical for policymakers in South
63 Africa and other low and middle-income countries.

64

65 **Implications of all the available evidence**

66 This study shows that indeed wastewater surveillance can be used to assess the level of disease burden within
67 populations in developing country, especially where there are little or no clinical testing which in turn can
68 inform prompt public health decision. This finding also implies that other infectious diseases which
69 disproportionately affect many low and middle income countries can be monitored using the same approach.

70

71

72

73

74

75 **Summary**

76 Background: The World Health Organisation recommends wastewater based epidemiology (WBE) for SARS-
77 CoV-2 as a complementary tool for monitoring population-level epidemiological features of the COVID-19
78 pandemic. Yet, uptake of WBE in low-to-middle income countries (LMIC) is low. We report on findings from
79 SARS-CoV-2 WBE surveillance network in South Africa, and make recommendations regarding implementation
80 of WBE in LMICs

81 Methods: Seven laboratories using different test methodology, quantified influent wastewater collected from
82 87 wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) located in all nine South African provinces for SARS-CoV-2 from 01
83 June 2021 – 31 May 2022 inclusive, during the 3rd and 4th waves of COVID-19. Regression analysis with
84 district laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 case loads, controlling for district, size of plant and testing frequency
85 was determined. The sensitivity and specificity of ‘rules’ based on WBE data to predict an epidemic wave
86 based on SARS-CoV-2 wastewater levels were determined.

87 Findings: Among 2158 wastewater samples, 543/648 (85%) samples taken during a wave tested positive for
88 SARS-CoV-2 compared with 842 positive tests from 1512 (55%) samples taken during the interwave period.
89 Overall, the regression-co-efficient was 0,66 (95% confidence interval=0,6-0,72, $R^2=0.59$), but ranged from
90 0.14-0.87 by testing laboratory. Early warning of the 4th wave of SARS-CoV-2 in Gauteng Province in
91 November-December 2021 was demonstrated. A 50% increase in log-copies SARS-CoV-2 compared with a
92 rolling mean over the previous 5 weeks was the most sensitive predictive rule (58%) to predict a new wave.

93 Interpretation: Variation in the strength of correlation across testing laboratories, and redundancy of findings
94 across co-located testing plants, suggests that test methodology should be standardised and that surveillance
95 networks may utilise a sentinel site model without compromising the value of WBE findings for public health
96 decision-making. Further research is needed to identify optimal test frequency and the need for normalisation
97 to population size, so as to identify predictive and interpretive rules to support early warning and public health
98 action. Our findings support investment in WBE for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in low and middle-income
99 countries.

100

101 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, wastewater based epidemiology, Surveillance, South Africa

102

103 **Background**

104 The World Health Organisation (WHO) recommends wastewater based epidemiology (WBE) for SARS-CoV-2 as
105 a complementary tool for monitoring population-level epidemiological features of the COVID-19 pandemic
106 including the presence or absence of infection, changing trends over time and variant monitoring.[1]
107 Wastewater based epidemiology provides certain advantages over case-based surveillance.[2] These include
108 the ability to monitor large numbers of persons by testing single samples and the potential to estimate the
109 burden of disease in that community from quantitative data.[3–5] WBE eliminates inherent biases in disease
110 burden estimation arising through differential health seeking by infected persons, variable access to clinical
111 laboratory testing and variation in health care practitioner’s propensity to test.[1] WBE may provide early
112 warning of increases in case-incidence [6, 7] enabling prompt public health action to be taken to prevent
113 outbreaks and their consequences.[5] Furthermore, WBE is inherently cost-saving relative to patient-based
114 surveillance systems. Most likely, as a consequence of these advantages, many countries are implementing
115 WBE for SARS-CoV-2. Only one year into the pandemic, a scoping review of the literature showed that 26
116 countries had already reported the presence of SARS CoV-2 in wastewater including countries in Europe,
117 Americas, Asia, Oceania, and Africa,[8] and by January 2023, 72 countries regularly publish results of SARS-
118 CoV-2 testing in wastewater on 164 dashboards across the world.[9] It is clear that WBE for SARS-CoV-2
119 contributes to the epidemiological knowledge base that supports individual and public health decision making
120 regarding SARS-CoV-2 prevention, detection and response.

121 Despite these benefits, and recommendations from developing countries researchers, few African countries
122 have adopted WBE surveillance. Of 164 SARS-CoV-2 WBE dashboards, only two are found in Africa (both in
123 South Africa).[9] In developing countries, structural challenges such as low number of wastewater treatment
124 facilities, low service levels or non-functionality of plants and absent or limited testing resources stand in the
125 way of WBE implementation.[10] Challenges shared with developed countries such as uncertainty regarding
126 how to integrate WBE findings into existing surveillance programmes [11] and how to interpret WBE results
127 with regard to actionable thresholds,[12] have most likely contributed to reluctance to invest in WBE
128 surveillance programmes.

129 Against this backdrop, the South African Collaborative COVID-19 Surveillance System (SACCESS) network was
130 established in 2021, with the aim of developing standard test methodology, identifying and addressing
131 challenges in qualitative, quantitative detection and RNA sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater'. [13] Sites
132 for testing were identified on pragmatic and logistical considerations, and included testing of influent
133 wastewater from almost all treatment plants in densely populated urban metropolitan areas, and single plants
134 in central cities or towns in rural provinces. The SACCESS network actively monitored SARSCoV-2 in
135 wastewater across the country from the third wave of the pandemic in South Africa, where four distinct waves
136 of COVID-19 pandemic have occurred, peaking in June 2020, December 2020, July 2021, and December 2021
137 respectively[14].

138 In this paper, we describe the detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater treatment plants
139 (WWTP) across larger South African metropolitan areas and in single plants from rural provinces from June
140 2021 to May 2022 (spanning the third and fourth COVID-19 waves). We further explored the relationship
141 between SARS-CoV-2 levels, and district laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 case load, while adjusting for
142 laboratory test method, geographical location, WWTP plant size, testing frequency and timing of testing during
143 or between SARS-CoV-2 waves. We determined the ability of SARS-CoV-2 levels in wastewater to predict a new
144 wave of COVID-19. We reflect on lessons learned to strengthen implementation and design of WBE
145 surveillance networks in middle and low-income countries.

146 **Methods**

147 *Development of the SACCESS network and extent of surveillance*

148 Commencing in 2018, the NICD tests wastewater for poliovirus as part of the National Department of Health's
149 polio surveillance programme in accordance with WHO guidance.[15] In 2020, the NICD, and a number of
150 other research, academic and private laboratories commenced with independent projects involving qualitative
151 and quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 in local WWTPs. A proof of concept was published by the SAMRC in
152 2021.[16]

153 In August 2020, laboratories doing this work collectively established the SACCESS network to support
154 communication of challenges and sharing best practice.[13] Through funding and partnership with the Water
155 Research Commission (WRC), the NICD and partners identified WWTPs for sampling and SARS-CoV-2 testing to

156 maximise coverage across metros and sentinel sites in provinces with smaller populations. A number of
157 webinars were held to share methodologies for concentration, extraction and PCR detection of SARS-CoV-2.
158 [17, 18] Testing of WWTPs commenced between June 2020 and March 2021 as funding became available.
159 Overall, 87 wastewater treatment sites across nine provinces in SA were tested by the SACCESS network in
160 2021 (Table S1). This included 40 treatment sites in Gauteng, 5 in Eastern Cape, 5 in Western Cape, 9 in Free
161 State, 12 in KwaZulu-Natal, 2 in Limpopo, 3 in Mpumalanga, 2 in Northern Cape province, and 3 in Northwest
162 province. WWTPs were assigned to specific laboratories, and these laboratories consistently tested the same
163 plants over time.

164 *Laboratory test methods*

165 Each of seven participating laboratories collected samples, concentrated and extracted nucleic acid, and
166 amplified and quantified SARS-CoV-2 RNA using the general principles followed by the NICD methodology,
167 which is fully described here, but using their own RNA extraction and PCR detection methods listed in Table 1.
168 This approach was chosen on account of the number of laboratories participating in the network, the number
169 of plants we wished to test, the different SARS-CoV-2 test kits already used by laboratories, and stock
170 shortages during COVID. The NICD sample collection and processing is as follows: Influent grab samples of one
171 litre volume were collected at treatment facilities during morning peak hours and maintained below 5°C
172 during transportation to the testing facility. No data on flow rate nor volume were collected. At the NICD, 200
173 mL of sewage sample was centrifuged at 4650 x g (4°C) for 30 minutes. Without disturbing the pellet, 70mL of
174 the supernatant was centrifuged at 3500g for 15 min through the Centricon® Plus-70 centrifugal ultra-filter.
175 The 70mL supernatant was concentrated into a final volume of approximately 1mL. A sewage concentrate
176 volume of 140uL was spiked with 5µL of the commercial internal control (IC) from the Allplex™ 2019-nCoV
177 (Seegene) to monitor RNA inhibitory effects during RNA extraction and RT-qPCR processes. Spiked
178 concentrates plus IC underwent RNA extraction using the QIAmp® viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen) according to the
179 manufacturer's instructions. Extracted RNA was eluted into 50µL of AVE buffer and tested immediately or
180 stored at -20°C.

181 To prepare for quantification the RNA EDX standard® (Bio-Rad) was double extracted (150 µL and 200 µL) using
182 the QIAmp® viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen) according to manufacturer's instructions. These extracts were filtered
183 through 1 spin column and eluted into 50µL of AVE buffer. Serial dilutions of the standard were performed at

184 1:4096, 1:1024, 1:256, 1:64, 1:16, and 1:4. Absolute genome copies for each dilution were calculated as: 2.34,
185 9.38, 37.50, 150, 600, and 2400 respectively. Four 8.5 µL triplicate sets of the standard RNA were prepared for
186 each dilution and stored at -20 °C for simultaneous use with extracted samples.

187 Finally, viral RNA was detected and quantified in samples using Taqman-based RT-PCR on the 7500 real-time
188 PCR system (Applied Bio systems) using the commercial Allplex™ 2019-nCoV (Seegene) with EDX standard RNA
189 included in each testing run. The PCR reaction mix consisted of 5 µL 2019-nCoV MOM, 5 µL RNase-free H2O, 5
190 µL 5X Real-time One-step Buffer, 2 µL Real-time One-step Enzyme. Cycling conditions were as follows: preheat
191 at 50 °C for 20 min, denature at 95 °C for 15 min, 45 cycles of amplification with 95 °C for 15s and 58 °C for
192 30s. To increase confidence samples were tested in triplicate, and mean values determined. No participating
193 laboratory normalised for population size.

194 *Inter-laboratory comparisons and quality assurance*

195 Viral concentrates of 10 samples were randomly selected from the database of each participating laboratory.
196 The concentrates were transported at -20°C to the NICD laboratory where nucleic acid was extracted and
197 SARS-CoV-2 detection was carried out in triplicate. All laboratories achieved the target concordance of 80%
198 with NICD results. In quantification quality assessment panels comprising spiked and unspiked raw wastewater
199 samples and concentrates prepared by the NICD, four of seven laboratories achieved 80% extraction efficiency

200 *Statistical analysis*

201 We determined the relationship between SARS-CoV-2 case load and SARS-CoV-2 levels in wastewater through
202 correlation and regression analyses as follows. We used the NICD anonymised line list of laboratory-confirmed
203 SARS-CoV-2 cases geo-located to district or sub-district of South Africa. We allocated cumulative case-counts
204 by epi-week and district (or sub-district where available) to corresponding log-transformed weekly SARS-CoV-2
205 levels (in genome copies per millilitre) from samples obtained from WWTP situated in that district (or sub-
206 district). Where quantification results were below the level of quantification of the test methodology used by
207 each laboratory, we omitted these values from correlation and regression analyses. We conducted correlation
208 and regression analyses for results tested by different laboratories together and independently (Table 2).
209 Regarding correlation, we used Spearman's correlation test for linear correlations due to the non-normality of
210 data. We conducted simple regression using the case loads of laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 as the

211 independent variable and multiple regression analyses adjusting for testing laboratory, plant size, frequency of
212 testing (weekly, fortnightly or monthly) and location of plant (by district). We excluded results where
213 wastewater tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 and where the levels of SARS-CoV-2 in genome copies per millilitre
214 were less than the laboratory's reported level of quantification. For all analyses, a p value <0.05 was
215 considered to be statistically significant. All analyses and graphs were done using Stata (StataCorp, LLC, USA, v
216 17).

217 To investigate the potential that quantitative changes in SARS-CoV-2 wastewater levels could predict a new
218 wave of infection, we identified wastewater results in log-copies of SARS-CoV-2 from samples obtained from
219 13 WWTP tested by laboratory 1 only. We selected laboratory 1 only to eliminate the impact of variation in
220 test methodology on genome copies/ml and because it had representative sites across South Africa. We paired
221 these by epidemiological week with the positivity rates of SARS-CoV-2 tests performed on persons presenting
222 for COVID-19 investigations in the health districts where these plants are located. We calculated the sensitivity
223 and specificity of a 'wastewater test' to detect a new wave as defined by the 'gold-standard', which we defined
224 as a positivity rate amongst clinical PCR tests exceeding 10% on the upward trajectory of a wave. We chose to
225 utilise the clinical positivity rate to define our gold standard, rather than the National Department of Health's
226 (NDoH) definition of a wave based on incidence rates [14], as positivity rate may more sensitively detect a rise
227 in population burden of disease and is more robust in changes to testing behaviour. We defined the
228 wastewater 'test' as a Y% increase in log-gene copies in the week of interest, compared to the average of the
229 last Z weeks, where Z = 1 to 6 weeks and Y varied from 5% to 200%. In the main analyses of predictive
230 indicators, we calculated the sensitivity of the 'test' as the fraction of times our 'wastewater test' in the
231 epidemiological week of interest, detected the crossing of the 10% threshold X= 1-, 2-, 3- or 4-weeks' ahead. In
232 supplementary analyses (see supplementary material), we also investigated tests based on any of the N
233 previous weeks. The downward trajectory of a wave defines the 'gold-standard' for the specificity calculation.
234 Regarding specificity, our 'test' should not predict a wave of new infection between the time points that
235 positivity drops below 10% for the first time and the lowest positivity rate between two waves. Sensitivity
236 calculations were based on as many available data points as possible (between 9 and 22 data points). Each of
237 the 15 sites contributed at most one data point for each of two waves. Specificity calculations were based on
238 between 103 and 123 data points, since more than one-time point in the downward trajectory was

239 considered. However, data was missing during some weeks, which reduced the number of data points
 240 available for calculations. These methods are further described in the Supplemental Methods for details.

241 **Table 1: Laboratory methods used for sampling, concentration, RNA extraction volume and method SARS-**
 242 **CoV-2 amplification and detection by partner laboratories**

| Name of laboratory | Sampling method | Virus concentration | Nucleic acid extraction (volume of concentrate used for extraction) | SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR & amplification (volume of RNA extract used for PCR) | Molecular analysis platform | Level (lower limit) of quantification (genome copies/ml) |
|--------------------|-----------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| Lab 1 | Grab | Polyethylene Glycol precipitation | Omega Bio-tek ENZA total RNA Kit II (50 µL) | 2019-nCoV CDC EUA Kit (4 µL) | Qiagen Rotor-Gene 6000 (5-plex) (Qiagen) | 2,06 |
| Lab 2 | Grab | Ultrafiltration (Centricon® Plus-70 centrifugal ultra-filter device) | QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit, Qiagen (140 µL) | RT-ddPCR ^b using CDC 2019-nCoV_N2 Primers, Fam Labelled, double quenched probes (5 µL) | QX200 AutoDG Droplet Digital PCR System (Bio-rad) | 200 |
| Lab 3 | Grab | Ultrafiltration (Amicon® Ultra-15 Centrifugal Filter Unit) | Omega Bio-Tek Mag-Bind® Viral DNA/RNA 96 Kit (50 µL) | CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel (2,5 µL) | Rotor-Gene Q (Qiagen) | 64 |
| Lab 4 | Passive | Passive sampler and resuspension in phosphate buffered saline | MN DNA/RNA pathogen extraction Kit (VNP) | TaqPath COVID-19 CE-IVD RT-PCR Kit (Thermo Fisher) (VNP) | QuantStudio 5 (Applied Biosystems) | 40 |
| Lab 5 | Grab | Ultrafiltration (Centricon® Plus-70 centrifugal ultra-filter device) | QIAamp® viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen) (140 µL) | Allplex™ 2019-nCoV (Seegene) and the RNA EDX standard (Bio-Rad) (8 µL) | 7500 real-time PCR system (Applied Bio systems) | 1,49 |
| Lab 6 | Grab | Skimmed milk flocculation | MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Nucleic Acid Isolation Kit (200 µL) | TaqPath COVID-19 CE-IVD RT-PCR Kit (Thermo Fisher) (2 µL) | QuantStudio™ 5 Real-Time PCR System 96-well, 0.1 mL, desktop (Applied Biosystems) | 2,33 |
| Lab 7 | Grab | None – sample is centrifuged then supernatant analysed | ZymoBiomics RNA Extraction Kit (1000 µL) | Allplex™ 2019-nCoV Assay and the EDX SARS-CoV-2 standard (Bio-Rad) (8 µL) | QuantStudio 5 (Applied Biosystems) | Not provided |
| Lab 8 | Grab | Skimmed milk flocculation | QIAamp® Ultrasens® Virus kit (1000 µL) | Allplex™ 2019-nCoV Assay and 2019_nCoV_N positive | QuantStudio™ 5 Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems) | 16 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | control plasmid (Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc, Coralville, IA) (8 µL) | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|

243 VNP=volume used for reaction not provided

244 **Results**

245 A total of 2,158 wastewater samples were tested by the SACCESS network between 01 June 2021 – 31 May
 246 2022 inclusive, coinciding with the 3rd and 4th waves of the COVID-19 pandemic. Of these, 1388 (64%) tested
 247 positive for SARS-CoV-2. During the 3rd and 4th waves, 638 tests were conducted and 543 (85%) were positive.
 248 During the interwave periods, 1,512 samples were tested and of these, 842 (55%) were positive. Amongst all
 249 positive tests 207/1,388 were below the limit of quantification of the test method used by the testing
 250 laboratory and were excluded from correlation and regression analyses.

251 Figures 1A-F show the times series of laboratory confirmed cases by district and log genome copies of SARS-
 252 CoV-2/mL of wastewater- for WWTPs across all study metros for the entire review period, excluding those
 253 WWTPs with three or fewer data points after elimination of results below the level of quantification. On visual
 254 inspection of time series graphs, high concentrations were mostly seen during the waves of the pandemic, and
 255 low concentrations during the interwave period. The levels of SARS-CoV-2 from sentinel plants in Gauteng
 256 subdistricts that were tested by the NICD from epidemiological week 40 (just before the onset of fourth wave)
 257 are illustrated in Figure 2 and demonstrate a rise in levels which precede the increase in cases.

258 Table 2 lists the correlation and multivariable regression coefficients (adjusted for location, size of plant and
 259 testing frequency) between SARS-CoV-2 levels (in genome copies/ml) and weekly laboratory-confirmed case
 260 loads in the corresponding district/sub-district by testing laboratory. Table 3 presents results of the identical
 261 analyses but conducted for plants located in Gauteng Province only, where the clinical epidemiology of SARS-
 262 CoV-2 and case loads to which wastewater levels of SARS-CoV-2 were compared were similar by district in
 263 Gauteng. Correlation co-efficient between SARS-CoV-2 genome copies/ml wastewater and laboratory-
 264 confirmed cases by district for each specific plant are shown in the Supplement Table S1.

265
 266
 267

268 **Table 2. Correlation coefficients and multivariable regression analyses (adjusted for location, size of plant**
 269 **and testing frequency) between SARS-CoV-2 levels (in genome copies/ml) in wastewater and weekly**
 270 **laboratory-confirmed clinical case load of SARS-CoV-2 from 01 June 2021 until 31 May 2022 from 87 plants**
 271 **across all nine South African provinces, for all samples and by testing laboratory.**

| Testing laboratory | # samples tested | # positive (%) | Range (log genome copies/mL wastewater) | LOQ (Log genome copies/ml) | # below LOQ / # positive (%) | Correlation coefficient with lab-confirmed cases ¹ (*=p-value <0.001) | Multivariable variate regression with case load ³ | |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | Co-efficient (95% confidence interval) | Adjusted R-squared ³ (*p-value<0.001) |
| All | 2158 | 1388 (64) | -1.84 - 9.5 | various | 207/1388 | 0.36 | 0.66 (0.60 - 0.72) | 0.59* |
| Lab 1 | 199 | 148 (74) | -0.12 - 3.27 | 0.31 | 7/148 | 0.64* | 0.87 (0.73 - 1.01) | 0.45* |
| Lab 2 | 82 | 82 (100) | 3.01 - 6.47 | 2.30 | 0/82 (0) | 0.78* | 0.73 (0.59 - 0.87) | 0.57* |
| Lab 3 | 230 | 80 (34) | 0- 3.12 | 1.81 | 42/80 | 0.53* | 0.68 (0.52 - 0.85) | 0.36* |
| Lab 4 | 296 | 210 (71) | -0.47-5.52 | 1.60 | 32/210 | 0.41* | 1.23 (0.97 - 1.50) | 0.33* |
| Lab 5 | 621 | 572 (92) | -0.54-3.43 | 1.52 | 27/572 | 0.68* | 0.73 (0.66 - 0.80) | 0.53* |
| Lab 6 | 168 | 133 (79) | -0.84-3.94 | 0.37 | 6/133 | 0.42* | 0.53 (0.37 - 0.70) | 0.24* |
| Lab 7 | 54 | 36 (67) | -0.33-9.5 | NA | NA | NA | NA [#] | NA [#] |
| Lab 8 | 508 | 127 (25) | -1.84-4.32 | 1.20 | 93/127 | 0.19* | 0.14 (0.06 - 0.21) | 0.13 |

272 LOQ = Level of quantification. ¹excluding cases below level of quantification; ²Lab 7 was excluded from correlation and regression due to
 273 the absence of LOQ; ³adjusted for district, plant size and wastewater sampling frequency

274 **Table 3. Correlation coefficients and multivariable regression analyses (adjusted for location, size of plant**
 275 **and testing frequency) between SARS-CoV-2 levels (in genome copies/ml) in wastewater and weekly**
 276 **laboratory-confirmed clinical case load of SARS-CoV-2 from 44 wastewater treatment plants in Gauteng**
 277 **Province from 01 June 2021 until 31 May 2022.**

| Testing laboratory- in Gauteng | # samples tested | # positive (%) | Range (log genome copies/mL wastewater) | Level of Quantification (Log genome copies/ml) | # below LOQ / # positive (%) | Correlation with lab-confirmed cases by district (*=p-value <0.05) | multivariable regression with case load ¹ | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | Co-efficient (95% confidence interval) | Adjusted R ² (*p-value<0.001) |
| All | 1050 | 670 (64) | -1.84 - 9.5 | | 94/670 | 0.50* | 0.54 (0.46 - 0.62) | 0.39 |
| Lab 1 | 199 | 148 (74) | -0.12 - 3.27 | 0.31 | 7/148 | 0.64* | 0.87 (0.73 - 1.01) | 0.45* |
| Lab 5 | 260 | 250 (96) | -0.54-3.2 | 1.52 | 9/572 | 0.70* | 0.68 (0.58 - 0.78) | 0.52* |
| Lab 6 | 168 | 133 (79) | -0.84-3.04 | 0.37 | 6/133 | 0.42* | 0.53 (0.37 - 0.70) | 0.24* |
| Lab 8 | 369 | 103 (28) | -1.84-4.33 | 1.20 | 72/127 | 0.25* | 0.18 (0.08 - 0.29) | 0.13* |

278 ¹Adjusted for district, sampling frequency, testing lab, and plant size

279

280


281

282


283

284


A. City of Tshwane




B. City of Johannesburg




C. City of Ekurhuleni




D. Mangaung




E. Ethekwini



F. Nelson Mandela Metro (left) and Buffalo City Metro (right)





285

286 Figure 1A-F. Laboratory-confirmed cases (left axis, grey bars) and log genome copies SARS-CoV-2 per millilitre
 287 of wastewater (right axis, lines), by epidemiological week. Colors represent different wastewater testing
 288 plants. Results below the level of quantification of each laboratory are omitted, as are wastewater treatment
 289 plants with 3 or fewer results. The testing laboratory (1-7) is indicated in the key.

290

291

292

293


294

295

296

297

298




299 Figure 2. SARS-CoV-2 levels in wastewater (genome copies/ml) for four wastewater treatment plants in
 300 Gauteng (see inset map) and case load of laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases in Gauteng Province by
 301 epidemiological week 2021

302 There was a significant association between wastewater levels and case load in the multivariate linear
 303 regression after adjusting for testing laboratory, district, sampling frequency, and plantsize ($p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.6$).
 304 Similarly, a significant association was seen when the sample regression model was restricted to the Gauteng
 305 province where the clinical epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 and case load to which wastewater levels of SARS-
 306 CoV-2 were compared were similar by district in Gauteng ($p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.4$).

307 Regarding a predictive rule, sensitivity was highest for the lead period of one and two weeks, and when the
 308 average log genome copies/ml included values up to six preceding weeks from the point of measurement. The
 309 time points at which the rule was generated that were further from the point of declaration of a wave (a
 310 clinical positivity rate of $> 10\%$) were generally less sensitive. None of the tests with specified lead times had
 311 sufficiently high sensitivity and specificity to be provide robust indicators of the start of a new wave (Figure 3).
 312 The most informative indicator we identified was whether or not the wastewater level in any of the previous 5
 313 weeks was at least 100% (2X) higher than the average of the previous 5 weeks; this indicator had a sensitivity
 314 of 79% and a specificity of 78% (Figure S1).

315



316

317

318 **Figure 3:** True positive rate (sensitivity) and false positive rate (1-specificity) measures of a defined
319 rule vs gold standard to establish the ability of wastewater levels of SARS-CoV-2 to predict an
320 epidemic wave. The 'gold-standard' for sensitivity is defined by the epidemiological week when the
321 positivity rate of clinical testing exceeds 10% on the upward trajectory of a wave. The 'gold-
322 standard' for specificity is defined on the downward trajectory of a wave, at the time point when the
323 positivity rate drops below 10% for the first time and the lowest positivity rate between two waves.
324 The test used in this figure is defined as whether or not the SARS-CoV-2 log-gene copies in
325 wastewater X weeks ago exceeded the average log-gene copies of the previous Z weeks by a
326 percentage varied from 5% to 200%.

327

328

329 Discussion

330 Results of quantitative SARS-CoV-2 testing across South African wastewater treatment plants have
331 demonstrated good correlation with district laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 case load, and provided early
332 warning of the 4th wave of SARS-CoV-2 in Gauteng Province in November-December 2021. Our results
333 demonstrated variation in the strength of correlation across testing laboratories, and redundancy of findings
334 across co-located testing plants, suggesting that test methodology should be standardised and that
335 surveillance networks may utilise a sentinel site model without compromising the value of WBE findings for
336 public health decision-making. Further research is needed to identify optimal test frequency so as to identify
337 predictive and interpretive rules to support early warning and public health action. Our findings support
338 investment in WBE for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in low and middle-income countries.

339 Our data series, comprising 1388 observations over 2 waves of COVID-19, illustrate that the levels of SARS-
340 CoV-2 in wastewater follow trends in laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 case load, and demonstrate high
341 correlation and strong regression analysis indicators between case load and genome copies/ml from single
342 WWTPs over time (Supplementary table). These findings concur with global observations regarding the
343 usefulness of WBE of SARS-CoV-2 as an indirect measure of population burden of disease [7] and support the
344 recommendations of the WHO interim guidance on Environmental surveillance for SARS-CoV-2, that WBE
345 provides insight into the distribution and time trends in SARS-CoV-2 levels at community level.[1] Our findings,
346 generated at a time when SARS-CoV-2 clinical testing was widespread and accessible, point to the usefulness
347 of WBE to provide insight into the distribution of cases and relative burden of disease as clinical testing rates
348 decline and hospitalisation rates decrease with subsequent waves of infection.[19]

349 The variation in the strength of correlation between wastewater levels of SARS-CoV-2 and laboratory-
350 confirmed case load between plants tested by different laboratories, even when plants were co-located in the
351 same health district where timing of the wave and burden of clinical disease to which the wastewater levels
352 were compared, were constant. It is important to understand and address variation in SARS-CoV-2 levels, as
353 variation may contribute to weaker correlation with clinical burden of disease and may therefore undermine
354 the potential usefulness of WBE data.

355 A key source of variation in our context arose from the different sample collection, extraction and detection
356 methods, and different wastewater sample volumes used by participating laboratories to determine
357 quantitative SARS-CoV-2 levels. Passive sampling, as utilised by one of our laboratories, will trap particulate
358 matter, and will report consistently higher wastewater levels compared with grab samples, the method
359 preferred by most of our laboratories, as RNA seems to concentrate more in solid phase of the wastewater
360 matrix [20, 21]. Differences in concentration and RNA extraction techniques and the volume of concentrate
361 that undergoes RNA extraction will retain more or less template RNA for detection.[22] Finally, the different
362 genes of SARS-CoV-2 that are detected and amplified by different RT-PCR detection kits, may be present at
363 variable amounts in wastewater because of differential decay of viral fragments in a hostile environment.[23]
364 We also observed variable extraction efficiencies in the quality assessment panels (data not shown),
365 suggesting that some methodologies are more sensitive and precise than others, a finding observed
366 elsewhere.[24] Special attention should be given to digital PCR technologies, as we observed higher levels,

367 stronger correlation and closer tracking of clinical cases with results from the laboratory using this technology
368 [24].

369 Sources of variation in SARS-CoV-2 levels in wastewater other than those that may be ascribed to test
370 methodology [25, 26] may also have accounted for variation in strength of correlation with clinical case load.
371 In our network, these may include the following: Firstly, the district boundaries to which laboratory-confirmed
372 case loads were allocated, do not correspond with sewage reticulation networks. We were unable to
373 reconfigure cases to provide data from populations resident within the sewage catchment areas. If different
374 districts reported different case loads correlation of results from a single plant serving populations across
375 district boundaries may be weaker. Secondly, the WWTPs from where samples were taken were large, serving
376 a median of 100,000 persons (range 4,000-1,200,000). The geographical areas served by these WWTPS were
377 socio-economically diverse. It is well established that high population density and poorer socio-economic
378 conditions are associated with higher SARS-CoV-2 transmission and therefore higher disease burden,
379 hospitalisation and mortality rates.[27] Yet these areas may be under-represented in sewage networks
380 because of informal settlements, or dilution with effluent from more well-resourced areas may artificially
381 lower SARS-CoV-2 levels. Thirdly, the high proportion of asymptomatic disease [28], and differential access to
382 SARS-CoV-2 testing may have led to discontinuity between wastewater levels and clinical cases [29]. Fourthly,
383 and particularly problematic in larger networks, differential SARS-CoV-2 RNA decay rates within the sewage
384 network [27], destruction of RNA through mixing with industrial effluent [19], and dilution of RNA through
385 environmental sources such as rain-water may alter the relationship to clinical case load. Finally, but less likely
386 in large wastewater treatment plants, variation in population size over time through in-and outward migration
387 may artificially change SARS-CoV-2 levels in wastewater. These sources of variation may explain why some
388 testing laboratories, particularly those testing plants in the rural provinces with smaller and less well-resourced
389 communities demonstrated lower correlation with case load. These sources of variation may also explain why
390 our data did not support our attempt to create a highly sensitive and generalizable predictive rule for a new
391 clinical wave.

392 We chose not to obtain additional contextual data pertaining to wastewater flow rates and volumes, nor did
393 we attempt to normalise data to population load, all of which would have allowed us to estimate burden of
394 disease due to COVID-19 in sewer catchment areas. This is a key differentiating factor in our approach

395 compared with well-resourced contexts. The Netherlands, for example, publishes the number of SARS-CoV-2
396 particles per 100,000 persons by health district.[30] Our decision was based on a number of factors, most
397 notably that only 60% of South African population is served by waterborne sewage, and a smaller proportion
398 of that served by wastewater treatment networks, the balance using septic tanks.[31] Other factors include
399 the difficulty of standardising PCR methods to support normalisation, unavailability of sewage reticulation
400 network maps and therefore uncertainties regarding precise geographical areas being tested, and
401 uncertainties regarding decay rates and degradation of RNA within complex industrial and residential sewage
402 networks.

403 Under the current circumstances, and with experience learned from our network, we reflect on the suitability
404 of the current configuration of wastewater testing SARS-CoV-2 for surveillance purposes. The sources of
405 variation (including laboratory test methodology) that lead to differing correlation and regression indicators
406 between levels and case-load , and the relatively high proportion of that is not served by wastewater
407 treatment plants, suggest as we anticipated, that estimation of precise population burden of disease in our
408 context is presently unattainable. Further, testing large numbers of samples from geographically disparate
409 plants creates high workloads and sample transport costs. Regarding SARS-CoV-2 levels, we observed that
410 plants co-located in the same district revealed similar temporal trends, suggesting redundancy in the data to
411 support public health decision-making authorities. It is our opinion therefore, that extensive networks that test
412 influent from large wastewater treatment plants across entire geographical areas may not be useful in low and
413 middle income settings from a public health perspective.

414 Therefore, given these limitations in our middle-income context, we propose a sentinel site WBE surveillance
415 model with centralised testing to eliminate variation due to different laboratory test methods. Such a network
416 serves public health decision-making needs by providing relative population burden, temporal trends and
417 geographic distribution of viral infection and variants. These data may be triangulated with results from clinical
418 testing to provide a fuller picture of disease epidemiology. In the context of a such a model, with carefully
419 chosen sites that ensure maximal population representativeness (including wastewater treatment plants,
420 environmental sources, rivers downstream of informal settlements) it may be possible with further research,
421 to determine of the population burden of disease. Key research questions include the added value of more
422 frequent testing normalising for population size, measuring wastewater flow-rates, and correcting for

423 environmental factors such as ambient temperature and dilution with rainfall in defined sewage reticulation
424 networks where populations are well characterised. These findings may serve public health decision-making at
425 a local level, and may inform generalisability of results from sentinel surveillance sites. Presently, despite its
426 many advantages and potential, WBE cannot suffice as a stand-alone surveillance methodology in our or any
427 context. Its key limitation is the inability to provide insight into disease severity. Therefore, WBE findings
428 should always be interpreted with other measures of population health, including hospitalisation and mortality
429 data.

430 **Conclusion**

431 We have presented findings from the wastewater-based surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 during the 3rd and 4th
432 waves of SARS-CoV-2 in South Africa which demonstrate both the value and limitations of wastewater-based
433 epidemiology in low and middle income countries. Further, our work has highlighted key areas for
434 investigation to support interpretability of quantitative SARS-CoV-2 levels in wastewater with reference to
435 burden of disease, and provided evidence to support the optimal configuration of WBE surveillance networks.
436 Given trends in viral evolution and immune evasion, SARS-CoV-2 will remain a concern for population health.
437 Investment in WBE as a surveillance tool will continue to support provision of data to address key
438 uncertainties in decision-making aimed at preserving population health.

439 **Declarations**

440 ***Ethics approval and consent to participate***

441 Not applicable

442 ***Data sharing***

443 Data used for this study is available on request

444 ***Competing interests***

445 All authors declare no competing interests

446 ***Funding***

447 This study was funded by the Water Research Commission and National Institute for Communicable Diseases

448 **Authors' contributions**

449 Study was conceived by KM, MS and the SACCESS network; sample collection, processing, laboratory testing
450 and generation of results were done by NN, SR, MY, WL, LS, GP, LC, JM, FB, LP, DV, AD, DJ, AG, SG, NM, MV,
451 AM, NB; data visualisation and analyses were done by CI, NN, KM, LM, CS, JP and TM; all authors contributed
452 to the writing of various sections of the manuscript; CI, NN and KM compiled the first draft of the manuscript;
453 all authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript

454 **Acknowledgements:**

455 We wish to acknowledge the following in no particular order:

- 456 • The NICD Centre for Respiratory Disease and Meningitis are thanked for their assistance in setting up
457 and troubleshooting PCR testing, and ongoing supportive collaboration
- 458 • The staff from participating labs
- 459 • The contributions of local government and wastewater treatment staff to sample collection and
460 transport is acknowledged and appreciated.
- 461 • Students who supported with sample collections and processing the samples: Mr Thoriso Mooa, Ms
462 Unarine Matodzi, Ms Phiwinhlanhla Nkosi – SAMRC-TB Platform
- 463 • The Water Research Commission, for their vision and support
- 464 • The NICD SARS-CoV-2 epidemiology and IT team members for sharing district and sub-district case
465 burdens in order to generate graphs. These team members include Andronica Moipone Shonhiwa,
466 Genevieve Ntshoe, Joy Ebonwu, Lactatia Motsuku, Liliwe Shuping, Mazvita Muchengeti, Jackie
467 Kleynhans, Gillian Hunt, Victor Odhiambo Olago, Husna Ismail, Nevashan Govender, Ann Mathews,
468 Vivien Essel, Veerle Msimang, Tendesayi Kufa-Chakezha, Nkengafac Villyen Motaze, Natalie Mayet,
469 Tebogo Mmaborwa Matjokotja, Mzimasi Neti, Tracy Arendse, Teresa Lamola, Itumeleng Matiea,
470 Darren Muganhiri, Babongile Ndlovu, Khuliso Ravhuhali, Emelda Ramutshila, Salaminah Mhlanga,
471 Akhona Mzoneli, Nimesh Naran, Trisha Whitbread, Mpho Moeti, Chidozie Iwu, Eva Mathatha,
472 Fhatuwani Gavhi, Masingita Makamu, Matimba Makhubele, Simbulele Mdleleni, Tsumbedzo
473 Mukange, Trevor Bell, Lincoln Darwin, Fazil McKenna, Ndivhuwo Munava, Muzammil Raza Bano,
474 Themba Ngobeni
- 475 • The Staff of SACCESS network laboratories, for their assistance in generating these results

476

477 **References**

- 478 1. World Health Organization. Environmental surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 to complement public health
479 surveillance - Interim Guidance. 2022; April:1–47. [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-HEP-ECH-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-HEP-ECH-WSH-2022.1)
480 [WSH-2022.1](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-HEP-ECH-WSH-2022.1). Accessed 15 Sep 2022.
- 481 2. Radu E, Masseron A, Amman F, Schedl A, Agerer B, Endler L, et al. Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 Alpha lineage
482 and its correlation with quantitative wastewater-based epidemiology data. *Water Res.* 2022;215
483 March:118257.
- 484 3. Claro ICM, Cabral AD, Augusto MR, Duran AFA, Graciosa MCP, Fonseca FLA, et al. Long-term monitoring of
485 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in Brazil: A more responsive and economical approach. *Water Res.* 2021;203
486 July:117534.
- 487 4. Weidhaas J, Aanderud ZT, Roper DK, VanDerslice J, Gaddis EB, Ostermiller J, et al. Correlation of SARS-CoV-2
488 RNA in wastewater with COVID-19 disease burden in sewersheds. *Sci Total Environ.* 2021;775:145790.
- 489 5. Fazli M, Sklar S, Porter MD, French BA, Shakeri H. Wastewater-Based Epidemiological Modeling for
490 Continuous Surveillance of COVID-19 Outbreak. *medRxiv.* 2021;:2021.10.19.21265221.
- 491 6. Radu E, Masseron A, Amman F, Schedl A, Agerer B, Endler L, et al. Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 Alpha lineage
492 and its correlation with quantitative wastewater-based epidemiology data. *Water Res.* 2022;215 January.
- 493 7. Shah S, Gwee SXW, Ng JQX, Lau N, Koh J, Pang J. Wastewater surveillance to infer COVID-19 transmission: A
494 systematic review. *Science of the Total Environment.* 2022;804:150060.
- 495 8. Bonanno Ferraro G, Veneri C, Mancini P, Iaconelli M, Suffredini E, Bonadonna L, et al. A State-of-the-Art
496 Scoping Review on SARS-CoV-2 in Sewage Focusing on the Potential of Wastewater Surveillance for the
497 Monitoring of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Food and Environmental Virology.* 2021;1:3.
- 498 9. COVIDPoops19 Dashboard. 2021. <https://www.covid19wbec.org/covidpoops19>. Accessed 15 Sep 2022.
- 499 10. Panchal D, Tripathy P, Prakash O, Sharma A, Pal S. SARS-CoV-2: Fate in water environments and sewage
500 surveillance as an early warning system. *Water Sci Technol.* 2021;84:1–15.
- 501 11. Robins K, Leonard AFC, Farkas K, Graham DW, Jones DL, Kasprzyk-Hordern B, et al. Research needs for
502 optimising wastewater-based epidemiology monitoring for public health protection. *J Water Health.*
503 2022;20:1284–313.
- 504 12. Safford HR, Shapiro K, Bischel HN. Wastewater analysis can be a powerful public health tool—if it’s done
505 sensibly. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2022;119:1–5.
- 506 13. Archer E, Preiser W, Suchard M. The SACCESS network for COVID-19 wastewater surveillance: a national
507 collaboration for public health responsiveness. *South African Heal Rev.* 2021;:215–23.
- 508 14. National Institute for Communicable Diseases. Proposed definition of COVID-19 wave in South Africa.
509 Communicable Diseases Communiqué . 2021. [https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Proposed-definition-of-COVID-19-wave-in-South-Africa.pdf)
510 [content/uploads/2021/11/Proposed-definition-of-COVID-19-wave-in-South-Africa.pdf](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Proposed-definition-of-COVID-19-wave-in-South-Africa.pdf). Accessed 21 Mar 2022.
- 511 15. WHO. Guidelines for environmental surveillance of poliovirus circulation. *Vaccine and Biologicals.*
512 2003;03:28. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/67854>. Accessed 27 Jan 2023.
- 513 16. Johnson R, Muller CJF, Ghoor S, Louw J, Archer E, Surujlal-Naicker S, et al. Qualitative and quantitative
514 detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in untreated wastewater in Western Cape Province, South Africa. *South African*
515 *Med J.* 2021;111:198–202.
- 516 17. SAMRC COVID-19 prevention research programme: wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2. Wastewater
517 sampling guide (1 February 2021). [https://www.samrc.ac.za/wbe/SARS-CoV-](https://www.samrc.ac.za/wbe/SARS-CoV-2WastewaterCollectionManual.pdf)
518 [2WastewaterCollectionManual.pdf](https://www.samrc.ac.za/wbe/SARS-CoV-2WastewaterCollectionManual.pdf). Accessed 15 Sep 2022.

- 519 18. Bhagwan J. A compendium of emerging South African testing methodologies for detecting of SARS-CoV-2
520 RNA in wastewater surveillance. 2020. www.wrc.org.za. Accessed 15 Sep 2022.
- 521 19. Amoah ID, Abunama T, Awolusi OO, Pillay L, Pillay K, Kumari S, et al. Effect of selected wastewater
522 characteristics on estimation of SARS-CoV-2 viral load in wastewater. *Environ Res.* 2022;203 August
523 2021:111877.
- 524 20. Gholipour S, Ghalhari MR, Nikaeen M, Rabbani D, Pakzad P, Miranzadeh MB. Occurrence of viruses in
525 sewage sludge: A systematic review. *Sci Diabetes Self-Management Care.* 2022;824:153886.
- 526 21. Bivins A, Kaya D, Ahmed W, Brown J, Butler C, Greaves J, et al. Passive sampling to scale wastewater
527 surveillance of infectious disease: Lessons learned from COVID-19. *Sci Total Environ.* 2022;835:155347.
- 528 22. Bolanaki E, Kottaridi C, Dedepsidis E, Kyriakopoulou Z, Pliaka V, Pratti A, et al. Direct extraction and
529 molecular characterization of enteroviruses genomes from human faecal samples. *Mol Cell Probes.*
530 2008;22:156–61.
- 531 23. Frigon D. Personal Communication. McGill University, Canada. 2022.
- 532 24. Flood MT, D'Souza N, Rose JB, Aw TG. Methods Evaluation for Rapid Concentration and Quantification of
533 SARS-CoV-2 in Raw Wastewater Using Droplet Digital and Quantitative RT-PCR. *Food Environ Virol.*
534 2021;13:303–15.
- 535 25. Wade MJ, Lo Jacomo A, Armenise E, Brown MR, Bunce JT, Cameron GJ, et al. Understanding and managing
536 uncertainty and variability for wastewater monitoring beyond the pandemic: Lessons learned from the United
537 Kingdom national COVID-19 surveillance programmes. *J Hazard Mater.* 2022;424 August 2021.
- 538 26. Ahmed W, Simpson SL, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Bivins A, Blackall LL, et al. Minimizing errors in RT-PCR
539 detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA for wastewater surveillance. *Sci Total Environ.* 2022;805.
- 540 27. Ghosh AK, Venkatraman S, Soroka O, Reshetnyak E, Rajan M, An A, et al. Association between overcrowded
541 households, multigenerational households, and COVID-19: a cohort study. *Public Health.* 2021;198:273–9.
- 542 28. Paleker M, Tembo Y, Davies M-A, Mahomed H, Pienaar D, Madhi SA, et al. Public health action. *Public Heal*
543 *Action.* 2021;11:58–60.
- 544 29. Lancaster E, Byrd K, Ai Y, Lee J. Socioeconomic status correlations with confirmed COVID-19 cases and
545 SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentrations in small-medium sized communities. *Environ Res.* 2022;215:114290.
- 546 30. Virus particles in wastewater. Coronavirus Dashboard. Netherlands.
547 <https://coronadashboard.government.nl/landelijk/rioolwater>. Accessed 27 Jan 2023.
- 548 31. Overview of wastewater treatment in South Africa. Association for Water and Rural Development
549 (AWARD). <https://award.org.za/>. Accessed 27 Jan 2023.
- 550