

1 **Predicting COVID-19 cases across a large university campus using**
2 **complementary built environment and wastewater surveillance approaches**

3

4 Aaron Hinz^{1,10*}, Jason A. Moggridge², Hanna Ke², Alexandra M. A. Hicks¹, Evgueni
5 Doukhanine³, Michael Fralick⁴, Laura Hug⁵, Derek MacFadden^{6,7}, Hebah Mejbel¹, Caroline
6 Nott^{6,7}, Ashley Raudanskis⁴, Nisha Thampi⁸, Alex Wong⁹, and Rees Kassen^{1,10}

7

8 [1] Department of Biology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

9 [2] Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute, Sinai Health System, Toronto

10 [3] DNA Genotek Incorporated, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

11 [4] Division of General Internal Medicine, Sinai Health System, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

12 [5] Department of Biology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

13 [6] Department of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

14 [7] The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

15 [8] Department of Pediatrics, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

16 [9] Department of Biology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

17 [10] Department of Biology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

18

19 * Correspondence: aaron.hinz@mcgill.ca

20

21 **ABSTRACT**

22 **Background**

23 Environmental surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 via wastewater has become an invaluable tool for
24 population-level surveillance. Built environment sampling may provide complementary
25 spatially-refined detection for viral surveillance in congregate settings such as universities.

26 **Methods**

27 We conducted a prospective environmental surveillance study at the University of Ottawa
28 between September 2021 and April 2022. Floor surface samples were collected twice weekly
29 from six university buildings. Samples were analyzed for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 using
30 RT-qPCR. A Poisson regression was used to model the campus-wide COVID-19 cases predicted
31 from the fraction of floor swabs positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA, building CO₂ levels, Wi-Fi
32 usage, and SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in regional wastewater. We used a mixed-effects Poisson
33 regression analysis to model building-level cases using viral copies detected in floor samples as a
34 predictor. A random intercepts logistic regression model tested whether floor samples collected
35 in high-traffic areas were more likely to have SARS-CoV-2 present than low-traffic areas.

36 **Results**

37 Over the 32-week study period, we collected 554 floor swabs at six university buildings. Overall,
38 13% of swabs were PCR-positive for SARS-CoV-2, with positivity ranging between 4.8% and
39 32.7% among university buildings. Both floor swab positivity (Spearman $r = 0.74$, 95% CI: 0.53-
40 0.87) and regional wastewater signal (Spearman $r = 0.50$, 95% CI: 0.18-0.73) were positively
41 correlated with on-campus COVID-19 cases. In addition, built environment detection was a

42 predictor of cases linked to individual university buildings ($IR_{\log_{10}(\text{copies}) + 1} = 17$, 95% CI: 7-44).
43 There was no significant difference in detection between floors sampled in high-traffic versus
44 low-traffic areas (OR = 1.3, 95% CI: 0.8-2.1).

45 **Conclusions**

46 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA on floors and viral RNA levels found in wastewater were
47 strongly associated with the incidence of COVID-19 cases on a university campus. These data
48 suggest a potential role for institutional built environment sampling, used together with
49 wastewater surveillance, for predicting COVID-19 cases at both campus-wide and building level
50 scales.

51 INTRODUCTION

52 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic was caused by the emergence of the severe
53 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), a highly transmissible and pathogenic
54 coronavirus¹. Population-scale diagnostic testing and contact tracing have been crucial tools to
55 inform public health responses². In addition, environmental surveillance strategies based on
56 shedding of the virus in wastewater and on built environment surfaces provide information on
57 disease burden at community and building-level scales³⁻⁵. These non-invasive monitoring
58 approaches can fill the information gap left by the decline of mass individual testing and provide
59 continual monitoring of community-wide prevalence of infections.

60 Wastewater-based epidemiology has successfully been used to detect the spread of SARS-CoV-2
61 by quantifying viral RNA levels in wastewater over time^{6,3,7,8}. Wastewater-focused surveillance
62 programs have previously been implemented on university buildings and dormitories, and have
63 been shown to be a successful proactive tool for outbreak monitoring on university campuses^{9,10}.
64 However, correlating virus levels in wastewater with epidemiologically identified cases may be
65 challenging due to inconsistent spatial variability and resolution¹¹. Although wastewater
66 sampling can be used to monitor individual buildings, demonstrated by its use on university
67 campuses, there is still a gap between community- and individual-level surveillance methods.

68 Built environment sampling could complement these approaches by providing evidence on the
69 presence of infected individuals at more spatially resolved scales (i.e., buildings or locations
70 within buildings). SARS-CoV-2 transmission occurs through respiratory droplets and aerosols
71 expelled by infected individuals, and viral particles and RNA exhibit a prolonged presence on
72 built environment surfaces^{1,12}. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from surface samples of the built

73 environment, particularly from floor swabs^{13,14}, has shown potential as a spatially resolved
74 COVID-19 surveillance strategy^{15,16}. In hospitals, significant correlations have been observed
75 between viral loads from clinical samples and positive detection of environmental samples taken
76 from patient rooms^{17,18}. Furthermore, we have demonstrated that detection of SARS-CoV-2 on
77 floors in long-term care facilities is strongly associated with, and may even anticipate, COVID-
78 19 outbreaks, suggesting that floor-based sampling can play a valuable role in improving early
79 outbreak identification⁴.

80 As a novel tool, the integrated use of wastewater detection with surface surveillance of the built
81 environment may thus provide an opportunity for improved SARS-CoV-2 infection prevention
82 and control, bridging the gap between community-scale and individual-level surveillance
83 methods. To further evaluate this idea, we performed surface sampling at six buildings at the
84 University of Ottawa and compared the findings to publicly available wastewater data. Our
85 objective was to quantify the association between ambient SARS-CoV-2 in the built
86 environment, regional wastewater signal, and near real-time COVID-19 case identifications on a
87 university campus, a setting in which surface sampling has not been fully explored.

88

89

90 **METHODS**

91 **Built environment sampling**

92 Built environment sampling was performed in six buildings on the main campus of the
93 University of Ottawa (uOttawa), selected with input from the uOttawa COVID-19 Recovery
94 Task Force, a multi-stakeholder committee composed of representatives from across the
95 university charged with maintaining health and safety of the university community during the
96 COVID-19 pandemic. ([https://www.uottawa.ca/about-us/sites/g/files/bhrskd3336/files/2022-
97 05/COVID%2019%20Recovery%20Taskforce%20TOR%20v.7.pdf](https://www.uottawa.ca/about-us/sites/g/files/bhrskd3336/files/2022-05/COVID%2019%20Recovery%20Taskforce%20TOR%20v.7.pdf)). Floor surfaces were
98 swabbed due to the reliable recovery of SARS-CoV-2 RNA compared to other built environment
99 surfaces^{4,16}. Buildings and sites were chosen to provide representative sampling of areas visited
100 by student and staff populations and include a student residence hall (RES), the main library
101 (LIB), and buildings hosting sports facilities (GYM), the school of management (FAC), central
102 administration and infoservices (ADM1), and campus protection and postal services (ADM2).
103 Two sites within each building were sampled: a high traffic site located at a main entrance or
104 corridor, and a low traffic site at a more remote location (i.e., typically on a different level). The
105 designation of high and low traffic site was made on the advice of building and facilities
106 management prior to the start of sample collection. Individual classrooms were not sampled, but
107 hallway floors outside of classrooms were swabbed in several buildings (GYM, FAC, ADM1).

108 Floor samples were collected twice weekly (Tuesdays and Thursdays) from September 21, 2021
109 to April 5, 2022. Sampling was paused after December 9, 2021, and resumed for the winter term
110 on January 11, 2022 when the campus re-opened. To reduce the spread of the Omicron variant of
111 COVID-19, the return to campus for the winter term was postponed from January 4 to January

112 31, 2022. As a result, five sampling sites at ADM1, FAC, and LIB were inaccessible until
113 February 1, 2022.

114 **SARS-CoV-2 detection from floor swabs**

115 Floor swabs were collected as previously described using a P-208 Environmental Surface
116 Collection Prototype kit from DNA Genotek^{4,16}. An approximate 2-inch by 2-inch area of floor
117 was swabbed for 30 seconds, and swabs were immersed in nucleic acid stabilization solution and
118 stored at room temperature until processing. Nucleic acid extractions were performed using the
119 MagMAX Viral/ Pathogen II (MVP II) Nucleic Acid Isolation Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific,
120 Waltham, MA), and SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected by RT-qPCR amplification of the N1 gene
121 as described^{4,16}. Viral copies were estimated from quantification cycle (Cq) values using the
122 virus standard curve reported in our previous study¹⁶.

123 **University CO₂ and Wi-Fi measurements and regional wastewater data**

124 Carbon dioxide and Wi-Fi usage data were collected during the sampling period as proxy
125 measures of ventilation and building occupancy. Carbon dioxide measurements were taken
126 concurrently with each floor swab sample using a handheld digital CO₂ sensor (Gain Express
127 Model AZ 7755). Campus Wi-Fi activity was collected by the university as daily peak (number
128 of simultaneously-connected) wireless devices per building. Wi-Fi data was collected for 5 of the
129 6 buildings sampled, excluding the residence hall (RES). Regional waste-water data were
130 obtained from The Public Health Environmental Surveillance Database github repository
131 (<https://github.com/Big-Life-Lab/PHESD/>).

132

133 **Reported cases on campus**

134 The university administration recorded 217 self-reported COVID-19 cases between July 2020
135 and early February 2022. These records include one or more dates (with data missing for a subset
136 of cases), describing the onset of symptoms (53% missing), the test date (77% missing), the
137 positive test result date (13.5% missing), or the date when the isolation period ended (3%
138 missing). We used the test result dates as index dates for cases. For cases where test result dates
139 were unavailable, we filled in values using the isolation-end date minus five days, or if
140 unavailable, then we used the symptoms onset date plus three days. These corrections were based
141 on the mean differences between the various events where multiple events were recorded and
142 reflect reasonable estimates of the onset of infection given data on the reported events².

143

144 **Statistical analysis**

145 Statistical analysis was performed using R version 4.2.2 (2022-10-31)¹⁹. Graphics were created
146 with ggplot2 (v3.4.1). Code and data are available from our GitHub repository:
147 <https://github.com/CUBE-Ontario/UOttawa-Analysis> (*to be made public upon publication*).

148 To examine the relationship between the university case burden and environmental surveillance
149 variables, we fit Poisson regression models with the number of cases as the outcome. We
150 employed backward elimination to select predictors from the aggregated results (means) of
151 surface swabbing, waste-water testing, CO₂, and Wi-Fi user counts. Predictors were centered and
152 scaled to facilitate comparison of regression coefficients. Models were fit using `glm` in R. The

153 assumption of equidispersion was tested and multicollinearity was evaluated through generalized
154 variance inflation factors.

155 To investigate the relationship between case incidence and surface swab results on a per-building
156 basis, we used mixed-effects models with a random intercept for each building. First, we
157 evaluated a logistic regression model with the presence of SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals as a
158 binary outcome (i.e., positive event: one or more cases occurring during a week), with surface
159 swab PCR-positivity as a fixed-effect, and with a random intercept for each building. We fit a
160 second logistic regression model to test whether high-traffic locations contained greater
161 quantities of viral RNA than low-traffic locations. Mixed-effects models were created using the
162 `glmer` function from the `lme4` package²⁰.

163 To model case counts at the building level, we fit a Poisson regression with a random intercept
164 for each site, using the quantity of SARS-CoV-2 RNA recovered by PCR as a predictor. For this
165 model, our predictor was the log-transformed mean number of viral copies (plus one) per-
166 building during weekly intervals. Our model formula was: $cases \sim \log_{10}(copies + 1) +$
167 $(1|site)$. This random effects model was created using the `glmer` function from the `lme4`
168 package. From the fitted model, we computed incidence ratios and Wald-type 95% Confidence
169 Intervals (CIs).

170 **RESULTS**

171 **Environmental detection of SARS-CoV-2 correlates with COVID-19 cases on campus**

172 There were 116 reported cases of COVID-19 among students and staff on campus during
173 the study period, with case reporting ending in February 2022. Low numbers of cases were
174 reported in the fall term, and the highest numbers reported in January, coinciding with a campus-
175 wide closure in response to the Omicron variant (Fig. 1). The aggregate built environment
176 surveillance trends broadly paralleled case incidence, with low SARS-CoV-2 detection during
177 the fall term (September to December) and a spike in floor swab positivity in January (Fig. 1). A
178 decline after the January peak preceded a second increase in environmental SARS-CoV-2 signal
179 observed in late March (Fig. 1). These university case and built environment detection trends
180 correspond with two increases in COVID-19 prevalence reported in Ottawa city-wide
181 wastewater data (Fig. 1).

182 We observed positive correlations between university cases, swab positivity, and City of
183 Ottawa wastewater signal (Fig. 2). The strongest correlations were between cases and swab
184 positivity (Spearman $r = 0.74$, 95% CI: 0.53-0.87) and Ottawa wastewater and swab positivity
185 (Spearman $r = 0.68$, 95% CI: 0.5-0.81). Neither of the building occupancy proxies (i.e., CO₂
186 levels or Wi-Fi usage) correlated with campus COVID-19 cases or floor swab detection during
187 the study period (Fig. 2). CO₂ concentrations were stable across buildings and time (Fig. 1), at
188 levels indicating high indoor air quality (median: 531 ppm, range: 418 - 905 ppm). Wi-fi usage,
189 on the other hand, fluctuated during the term, with expected drops during reading week, winter
190 break, and individual building closures (Figs. 1, 3). These results suggest that built environment

191 surveillance could serve as a predictor for estimating active campus cases and that environmental
192 detection of SARS-CoV-2 at the university paralleled city-wide trends.

193 **Predictive modeling of campus-wide cases based on environmental detection and building** 194 **occupancy estimates**

195 Non-invasive approaches to monitoring SARS-CoV-2 levels such as environmental sampling are
196 valuable when systematic testing of individuals is not feasible. We evaluated predictors of the
197 campus-wide case burden using Poisson regression models selected by backward elimination.
198 Predictors specified in the full model included surface swab positivity (across 6 buildings), CO₂
199 concentrations (at the time of swab collection), regional wastewater metrics, and Wi-Fi user
200 counts. Backward elimination dropped the CO₂ and Wi-Fi terms and indicated swab positivity
201 and regional waste-water signals as significant, positive predictors of case counts (Table 1). The
202 regional wastewater signal and swab positivity terms had similar incidence rate ratios in the final
203 model (Table 1). The selected model did not violate the assumption of equidispersion (dispersion
204 = 1.35, $p > 0.05$).

205 **Modeling cases in individual buildings from built environment detection**

206 Campus buildings visited by individuals infected with COVID-19 were self-reported during
207 collection of campus-wide case data. We, therefore, leveraged the spatial resolution of our built
208 environment sampling to determine whether cases in individual buildings were associated with
209 higher levels of SARS-CoV-2 detection from floor swabs collected from the same buildings.
210 Indeed, two sites with high positivity in January 2022 at the university residence (RES) and an
211 administrative building (ADM2), were associated with clusters of reported cases in students and
212 staff, respectively (Fig. 3).

213 We sought to evaluate surface detection of SARS-CoV-2 as a predictor of case burden at the
214 building level. We applied a mixed-effects Poisson regression analysis; random intercepts were
215 specified for buildings to account for repeated measurements. The incidence ratio, relating a 10-
216 fold increase in the number of viral copies (plus one) to the total number of reported cases, was
217 large and significant with a high level of certainty (IR = 17, 95% CI 7-44). IRs for individual
218 sites ranged from 0.57 (ADM2) to 2.3 (FAC) with moderate variance among sites overall (SD =
219 0.62), but differences between sites were small relative to the uncertainty on their intercepts
220 (Table S1).

221 **Surface detection of SARS-CoV-2 was not greater in high-traffic areas**

222 At each building where environmental surveillance by surface swabbing was performed, we
223 selected one high-traffic area where people often travel or congregate and a second low-traffic
224 area for contrast. We hypothesized that the floors in commonly frequented locations would have
225 greater rates of SARS-CoV-2 detection. However, positivity rates were similar across high-
226 traffic (14.3%, N=280) and low-traffic sites (11.7%, N=274). To confirm this, we fit a mixed-
227 effects logistic regression model, with the surface swab result as a binary outcome, the traffic
228 level as a fixed effect, and specified random intercepts for each building to account for the
229 clustering of sites. This model indicated that higher-traffic locations did not have significantly
230 greater positivity rates than low-traffic locations ($OR = 1.3$, 95% CI: 0.77 - 2.1).

231 **DISCUSSION**

232 In this study, we performed longitudinal environmental surveillance of SARS-CoV-2
233 across a university campus. We found that over the course of an academic year, detection of
234 SARS-CoV-2 from built environment sampling sites across the campus correlated with reported
235 campus-associated COVID-19 cases. Environmental detection of SARS-CoV-2 at university
236 sites and regional SARS-CoV-2 wastewater signal were associated with an increase in campus-
237 wide cases, according to a Poisson regression analysis. These results support other studies
238 demonstrating that environmental sampling of SARS-CoV-2 RNA can be used to monitor
239 COVID-19 cases at university campuses^{9,10,21}.

240 The university setting provided a convenient test case for comparing the different scales
241 of environmental testing. Built environment detection varied by building, with the residence hall
242 associated with the highest burden (Fig. 3). Importantly, SARS-CoV-2 detection at two sites in
243 January correlated with clusters of cases, indicating the usefulness of this method at identifying
244 building-level case incidence. In contrast, a high built environment signal in the main library in
245 January was not reflected in the case data, which could be an example of environmental
246 surveillance identifying a location with unknown or unreported cases.

247 Despite evidence validating the use of environmental surveillance approaches, it is
248 important to consider that factors specific to the study period may affect the accuracy of case
249 trend projections. First, infection control measures were in place to reduce COVID-19 infections
250 at the university including mandatory vaccination and masking for students, staff, and visitors to
251 the University of Ottawa (Policy 129; <https://www.uottawa.ca/about-us/policies-regulations>),
252 along with fewer campus in-person activities, smaller class sizes, and more on-line courses than

253 in typical years. These mitigation measures likely contributed to the low COVID-19 case counts
254 and low environmental detection observed in the Fall term. Second, the study period occurred
255 during the global spread of the highly transmissible Omicron variant of SARS-CoV-2, which
256 was likely responsible for the relatively large number of cases identified in January. The campus
257 was closed for in-person learning in January 2022 to reduce spread of the Omicron variant. This
258 would have limited the spatial distribution of cases on campus to buildings accessible to
259 university members, such as the residence halls and administrative buildings.

260 For the above reasons, the specific trends in viral prevalence observed during the study
261 period may be affected by pandemic-era mitigation measures and a unique episode of SARS-
262 CoV-2 evolution. Future surveillance efforts can thus show what campus-wide trends occur after
263 infection control measures are removed. In conclusion, our study validates the effectiveness of
264 built environment surveillance to track SARS-CoV-2 prevalence in congregate settings, from
265 university campuses to hospitals and long-term care homes^{16,4}. At a practical level,
266 environmental surveillance trends can be communicated to university community members to
267 provide awareness of infectious disease risk on campus. Furthermore, as demonstrated for
268 wastewater surveillance²², monitoring can be extended to other relevant infectious diseases (e.g.,
269 influenza), to provide a more complete picture of pathogen prevalence.

270

271 **REFERENCES**

- 272 1. Hu, B., Guo, H., Zhou, P. & Shi, Z.-L. Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19. *Nat*
273 *Rev Microbiol* **19**, 141–154 (2021).
- 274 2. Mercer, T. R. & Salit, M. Testing at scale during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nat Rev Genet*
275 **22**, 415–426 (2021).
- 276 3. Hegazy, N. *et al.* Understanding the dynamic relation between wastewater SARS-CoV-2
277 signal and clinical metrics throughout the pandemic. *Science of The Total Environment* **853**,
278 158458 (2022).
- 279 4. Fralick, M. *et al.* Detection of Covid-19 Outbreaks Using Built Environment Testing for
280 SARS-CoV-2. *NEJM Evidence* **2**, EVIDoa2200203 (2023).
- 281 5. Shah, S. *et al.* Wastewater surveillance to infer COVID-19 transmission: A systematic
282 review. *Science of The Total Environment* **804**, 150060 (2022).
- 283 6. D'Aoust, P. M. *et al.* Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids in
284 communities with low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence. *Water Research* **188**, 116560
285 (2021).
- 286 7. Peng, K. K. *et al.* An exploration of the relationship between wastewater viral signals and
287 COVID-19 hospitalizations in Ottawa, Canada. *Infectious Disease Modelling* (2023)
288 doi:10.1016/j.idm.2023.05.011.
- 289 8. Li, X. *et al.* Correlation between SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration in wastewater and
290 COVID-19 cases in community: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of*
291 *Hazardous Materials* **441**, 129848 (2023).
- 292 9. Gibas, C. *et al.* Implementing building-level SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance on a
293 university campus. *Science of The Total Environment* **782**, 146749 (2021).

- 294 10. Scott, L. C. *et al.* Targeted wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 on a university campus
295 for COVID-19 outbreak detection and mitigation. *Environmental Research* **200**, 111374
296 (2021).
- 297 11. Kitajima, M. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs.
298 *Science of The Total Environment* **739**, 139076 (2020).
- 299 12. Sharma, A., Ahmad Farouk, I. & Lal, S. K. COVID-19: A Review on the Novel Coronavirus
300 Disease Evolution, Transmission, Detection, Control and Prevention. *Viruses* **13**, 202 (2021).
- 301 13. Guo, Z.-D. *et al.* Aerosol and Surface Distribution of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
302 Coronavirus 2 in Hospital Wards, Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* **26**, 1586–1591
303 (2020).
- 304 14. Renninger, N. *et al.* Indoor Dust as a Matrix for Surveillance of COVID-19. *mSystems* **6**,
305 e01350-20 (2021).
- 306 15. Coil, D. A. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 detection and genomic sequencing from hospital surface
307 samples collected at UC Davis. *PLOS ONE* **16**, e0253578 (2021).
- 308 16. Hinz, A. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Detection from the Built Environment and Wastewater and Its
309 Use for Hospital Surveillance. *medRxiv* 2021.04.09.21255159 (2021)
310 doi:10.1101/2021.04.09.21255159.
- 311 17. Cheng, V. C.-C. *et al.* Air and environmental sampling for SARS-CoV-2 around hospitalized
312 patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Infection Control & Hospital*
313 *Epidemiology* **41**, 1258–1265 (2020).
- 314 18. Piana, A. *et al.* Monitoring COVID-19 Transmission Risks by Quantitative Real-Time PCR
315 Tracing of Droplets in Hospital and Living Environments. *mSphere* **6**, e01070-20 (2021).

- 316 19. Ihaka, R. & Gentleman, R. R: A Language for Data Analysis and Graphics. *Journal of*
317 *Computational and Graphical Statistics* **5**, 299–314 (1996).
- 318 20. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using
319 lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* **67**, 1–48 (2015).
- 320 21. Wang, Y. *et al.* Early warning of a COVID-19 surge on a university campus based on
321 wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 at residence halls. *Science of The Total*
322 *Environment* **821**, 153291 (2022).
- 323 22. Mercier, E. *et al.* Municipal and neighbourhood level wastewater surveillance and subtyping
324 of an influenza virus outbreak. *Sci Rep* **12**, 15777 (2022).

325


326 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

327 This study was funded by grants to RK from the University of Ottawa’s COVID-19 Recovery
328 Task Force and the NSERC Alliance and Discovery Grants programs. We thank members of the
329 Kassen lab, who generously volunteered to collect the swab samples over the course of the
330 academic year.

331

332 **FIGURES**

333




334

335 **Figure 1. Time-series of (top to bottom):** important events at the university, university
336 COVID-19 cases, proportion of PCR-positive floor swabs, biweekly mean ambient CO₂ (across
337 collection sites), biweekly mean peak number of Wi-Fi connections (across 5 buildings),
338 biweekly mean regional waste-water detection (relative to PPMoV). Points show biweekly
339 means. Trend lines fit with the Loess method.

340


341



342

343 **Figure 2. Spearman correlation between biweekly campus-wide variables:** self-reported
344 cases, floor swab positivity (Swab PCR), mean CO₂, mean daily peak Wi-Fi connections, waste-
345 water signal at the regional level (Ottawa WW),

346



347

348 **Figure 3.** Campus COVID-19 cases, swab results, and daily peak Wi-Fi connections by building.

349 Cases plots show counts of self-reported cases as bars and fitted values from the poisson mixed

350 model as blue points. Case data collection was abandoned in early February 2022 (shaded area).

351 Swab plots show results at two locations within each building, with one sample collected in a

352 high-traffic area (blue) and the other in a low-traffic area (red). Swab PCR results are expressed

353 as the number of SARS-CoV-2 viral copies plus one, on a log-scale. Points represent the result

354 for a single swab. Wi-fi plots show the peak daily number of simultaneous connections per
355 building. No Wi-Fi data was available for the RES building. Shaded areas on the ‘copies’ and
356 ‘wifi’ panels indicate university closures and study breaks.

357

358 **TABLES**

359

360 **Table 1.** Summary of the Poisson regression model selected by backward elimination,
361 considering main effects only (n=29).

	Incidence Rate	
Term	Ratio	95% CI
Intercept	1.4	0.9 - 1.9
Swab Positivity	1.7	1.2 - 2.3
Regional WW	1.7	1.2 - 2.4

362

363

364 **APPENDIX**

365

366 **Table S1.** Summary of the random intercepts logistic regression model used for testing the effect
367 of traffic-level (high vs. low traffic) on detection of SARS-CoV-2 in surface swabs by PCR.

effect	group	term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value	conf.low	conf.high
fixed		Intercept	0.11	0.04	-6.31	< 0.0001	0.05	0.21
fixed		traffic:high	1.28	0.33	0.95	0.34	0.77	2.13
ran_pars	site	SD (Intercept)	0.71					

368