

Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

**Title:** Evaluation of Molecular-based Methods for the Detection and Quantification of *Cryptosporidium* spp. in Wastewater

**Authors:** Oumaima Hachimi<sup>1</sup>, Rebecca Falender<sup>2</sup>, Gabriel Davis<sup>1</sup>, Rispa Vranka Wafula<sup>1</sup>, Melissa Sutton<sup>2</sup>, June Bancroft<sup>2</sup>, Paul Cieslak<sup>2</sup>, Noah Lininger<sup>2</sup>, Christine Kelly<sup>1</sup>, Devrim Kaya<sup>1,3</sup>, Tyler S. Radniecki<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Chemical, Biological, and Environmental Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA.

<sup>2</sup> Oregon Health Authority, Portland, Oregon, USA.

<sup>3</sup> School of Public Health, San Diego State University, San Diego, California, USA

**Abstract**

*Cryptosporidium*, a eukaryotic protozoan parasite, poses a significant public health risk as a cause of waterborne disease worldwide. Clinical surveillance of cryptosporidiosis is estimated to be largely underreported due to the asymptomatic and mildly symptomatic infections, clinical misdiagnoses, and barriers to access testing. Unlike clinical surveillance, wastewater surveillance overcomes these limitations and could serve as an effective tool for identifying cryptosporidiosis at the population level. Despite its potential, the lack of standardized methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection in wastewater challenges the comparability of studies. Additionally, the use of standard methods for the detection and quantification of *Cryptosporidium* spp. in surface waters may not be appropriate for wastewater samples due to the more complex composition of the wastewater matrix. Thus, in this study, we evaluated methods for concentrating *Cryptosporidium* oocysts from wastewater, extracting DNA, and detecting its genetic markers, using wastewater seeded with *C. parvum* oocysts. The evaluated concentration methods included electronegative membrane filtration, Envirocheck HV capsule filtration, centrifugation, and Nanotrap Microbiome particles. All methods except the Nanotrap Microbiome particles were conducted with or without additional purification via immunomagnetic separation. For DNA extractions, we tested the DNeasy Powersoil Pro kit and the QIAamp DNA Mini kit, while assessing the impact of bead beating and freeze-thaw cycles on DNA yield. Genetic detection was performed using qPCR targeting the *Cryptosporidium* 18S rRNA gene. Our results indicated that centrifugation yielded the highest oocyst recoveries (39-77%), followed by the Nanotrap Microbiome particles (24%), electronegative filtration with a phosphate buffered saline with 20% Tween 80 elution (22%), and Envirocheck HV capsule filtration (13%). IMS was found to be unsuitable due to interference

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

33 from the wastewater matrix, significantly reducing recovery rates to 0.03 to 4%. DNA yields were  
34 highest with bead-beating pretreatment with either the DNeasy Powersoil Pro kit (314 gc/μL  
35 DNA) or the QIAamp DNA Mini kit (238 gc/μL DNA). In contrast, freeze-thaw pretreatment  
36 reduced DNA yields to under 92 gc/μL DNA, likely through DNA degradation. This study is  
37 amongst the first to compare different concentration methods, including Nanotrap Microbiome  
38 particles, and DNA extraction methods that can be utilized for *Cryptosporidium* spp. wastewater  
39 surveillance, highlighting the importance of method selection for accurate detection and  
40 quantification.

41

### 42 **1. Introduction**

43 *Cryptosporidium* spp. are eukaryotic protozoan parasites within the phylum Apicomplexa and  
44 subgroup coccidia (O'Donoghue, 1995). Unlike other parasites, *Cryptosporidium* spp. are  
45 intracellular and extracytoplasmic, undergoing a monoxenous life cycle where they complete their  
46 entire life cycle, both sexual and asexual stages, within a single host (Ghazy et al., 2015). They  
47 are distinguished by other several features including their small spherical size (diameter typically  
48 around 4 – 6 μm), minimal mitochondrial genome (~9.2 Mbp), the ability to initiate self-infection  
49 in both zoonotic and anthroponotic potentials, their high resistance to disinfectants (up to 15,300  
50 mg-min/L), and the ability to retain infectivity potential for up to several months outside of their  
51 hosts (CDC, 2021; Ghazy et al., 2015; Helmy & Hafez, 2022; Khan et al., 2018; King & Monis,  
52 2007; Shields et al., 2008). To date, around 44 *Cryptosporidium* species have been identified, some  
53 of which are host-specific while others are ubiquitous in terms of host infectivity (Ryan et al.,  
54 2021).

55 *Cryptosporidium* stands as one of the most prominent waterborne enteric pathogens with  
56 substantial public health implications (Efstratiou et al., 2017; Gururajan et al., 2021)). After  
57 retroviruses, cryptosporidiosis infection is the second leading cause of both diarrhea and death  
58 (Khalil et al., 2018). Additionally, cryptosporidiosis ranks as the fourth leading cause of death  
59 from gastrointestinal diseases among young children under the age of five (Kotloff et al., 2013;  
60 Troeger et al., 2017). Consequently, *Cryptosporidium* has emerged as a significant etiology of  
61 long-term health issues, including malnutrition, stunted growth, and cognitive deficits in young

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

62 children, as well as colon cancer in immunocompromised patients (Kotloff et al., 2019; Osman et  
63 al., 2017; Shirley et al., 2012).

64 Despite being a substantial public health concern and a nationally reportable disease, the CDC  
65 estimates that cryptosporidiosis routine clinical-based surveillance reports less than 2% of cases  
66 in the United States (CDC, 2021). Similar patterns are seen globally with cryptosporidiosis cases  
67 being underreported by an estimated two orders of magnitude or more (HALL et al., 2006; Zahedi  
68 et al., 2021). The underreporting of cryptosporidiosis cases and the underestimation of  
69 cryptosporidiosis prevalence have been attributed to asymptomatic and mildly symptomatic  
70 infections, barriers in access to testing, limited and voluntary testing by clinicians, as well as  
71 misdiagnosis due to symptoms resembling other gastrointestinal illnesses (O’Leary et al., 2021;  
72 Painter et al., 2015).

73 Additionally, stool microscopy, the golden standard method, is typically characterized by poor  
74 sensitivity and limited capacity to distinguish between *Cryptosporidium* species (O’Leary et al.,  
75 2021; van Lieshout & Roestenberg, 2015). In contrast, immunoassays exhibit high antigenic  
76 variation leading to inaccuracy in detecting all infecting *Cryptosporidium* species and genotypes  
77 (Danišová et al., 2018; Helmy et al., 2014; Uppal et al., 2014; Weitzel et al., 2006). Molecular  
78 techniques, on the other hand, offer a good alternative to both microscopy and antigen testing,  
79 however, they require specialized high-throughput laboratories and skilled technicians, resources  
80 that may not be available, particularly in cryptosporidiosis endemic countries (Meurs et al., 2017).

81 Given the documented underreporting of cryptosporidiosis, wastewater surveillance of  
82 *Cryptosporidium* spp. may provide an important supplemental surveillance technique to identify  
83 and monitor potential cryptosporidiosis outbreaks at the population level. Wastewater  
84 surveillance, also known as wastewater-based epidemiology, is the quantification of pathogens in  
85 wastewater to monitor disease burden in a community. It has been successfully applied as a  
86 reliable and non-invasive epidemiological tool for various pathogens including SARS-CoV-2,  
87 influenza, and RSV (Hughes et al., 2022; Layton et al., 2022; Wolfe et al., 2022).  
88 Cryptosporidiosis is another potential candidate for successful wastewater surveillance as  
89 symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals can excrete up to  $10^{10}$  *Cryptosporidium* oocysts per  
90 bowl movement into wastewater, leading to wastewater concentrations as high as 60,000 oocysts  
91 per L being reported (Hamilton et al., 2018; Helmy & Hafez, 2022; Zahedi et al., 2021).  
92 Additionally, *Cryptosporidium* oocysts neither replicate nor decay rapidly in wastewater, leading

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

93 to a reliable signal in the wastewater (Chalmers & Davies, 2010; B. J. King & Monis, 2007; Walker  
94 et al., 1998).

95 In general, the molecular detection and quantification of *Cryptosporidium* spp. in wastewater  
96 is a complex process that typically involves four steps: 1) representative sampling, 2) concentration  
97 of the oocysts, 3) extraction of DNA from the oocysts, and 4) quantification of the oocysts DNA  
98 by a PCR-based method. However, while *Cryptosporidium* has been detected in wastewater across  
99 the globe, there are currently no standardized concentration methods or molecular techniques to  
100 detect and quantify *Cryptosporidium* in wastewater (Zahedi et al., 2021).

101 For example, a variety of oocyst concentration methods have been used with filtration and  
102 centrifugation being the most common (Huang et al., 2017; L. Ma et al., 2019; Schmitz et al.,  
103 2018; Zahedi et al., 2018). Other less commonly used methods include polyethylene glycol  
104 precipitation (PEG) (Pecson et al., 2022), calcium carbonate flocculation (Ma et al., 2016),  
105 aluminum sulfate flocculation (Gallas-Lindemann et al., 2013), skimmed milk flocculation  
106 (Gonzales-Gustavson et al., 2017), glucose flotation (Lonigro et al., 2006), salt flotation (Wells et  
107 al., 2016), as well as formol-ether concentration (Lora-Suarez et al., 2016). Additionally, new  
108 wastewater concentration techniques, such as Nanotrap Microbiome particles, are entering the  
109 marketplace and offer the potential for rapid workflow and increased automation and throughput  
110 (Ceres Nanosciences, Inc. | United States, 2024). To date, there have been limited comparison  
111 studies as to how these different concentration methods, including the wastewater volumes used,  
112 affect oocyst recovery from wastewater (Montemayor et al., 2005).

113 Similarly, DNA extraction protocols can differ widely, especially in terms of different  
114 pretreatments to effectively disrupt the thick and robust *Cryptosporidium* oocyst wall along with  
115 commercial DNA extraction protocols. Pretreatments can either be mechanical such as bead-  
116 beating (Elwin et al., 2012; Valeix et al., 2020), freeze-thawing (Nichols et al., 2004; Lindergard  
117 et al., 2012), and sonication (Anceno et al., 2007; Adamska et al., 2011), or chemical using  
118 different lysis buffers (Paulos et al., 2016). Thus far, there have been limited comparison studies  
119 on how these different DNA extraction techniques affect *Cryptosporidium* gDNA recovery from  
120 wastewater samples (Mthethwa et al., 2022).

121 Molecular detection methods can also vary widely from qualitative methods of endpoint  
122 polymerase chain reaction (PCR), restriction fragment length polymorphism, and nested PCR, to  
123 quantitative methods of quantitative PCR (qPCR), droplet digital PCR (ddPCR), and digital PCR

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

124 (dPCR) (Amar et al., 2004; Kitajima et al., 2014; Mthethwa et al., 2022; Pomari et al., 2019;  
125 Wiedenmann et al., 1998; Yang et al., 2014). Finally, the target gene for the molecular detection  
126 methods can vary from 18S small subunit ribosomal RNA (18S rRNA), actin gene, 60-kDa  
127 glycoprotein gene (GP60), 70-kDa heat shock protein (HSP70) to *Cryptosporidium* outer wall  
128 protein (COWP) gene (Gobet & Toze, 2001; Mthethwa et al., 2022; Shin et al., 2018; Yang et al.,  
129 2014; Zahedi et al., 2018). These differences in sample concentration, DNA extraction, and  
130 molecular detection methods for the detection of *Cryptosporidium* in wastewater result in highly  
131 variable detection limits, specificity, and recovery, making it difficult to compare between studies  
132 (King et al., 2015; Kitajima et al., 2014; Mthethwa et al., 2022; Ramo et al., 2017; Ward et al.,  
133 2002; Yamashiro et al., 2019).

134 Therefore, the aims of this study are: (i) characterize a *Cryptosporidium* qPCR assay for  
135 detection limits and specificity, (ii) evaluate eight DNA extraction protocols, consisting of two  
136 commercial kits (DNeasy Powersoil Pro kit and QIAamp DNA Mini kit) and two mechanical  
137 pretreatment steps (bead-beating and freeze-thawing), for effective DNA extraction of  
138 *Cryptosporidium* spp. from spiked influent wastewater samples, and (iii) evaluate the  
139 *Cryptosporidium* oocyst recovery rates for four different wastewater concentration methods,  
140 including centrifugation, electronegative membrane filtration, Envirocheck HV capsules filtration,  
141 immunomagnetic separation, and Nanotrap Microbiome particles, across various wastewater  
142 volumes (10, 30, 100, 500, and 1000 mL).

143

## 144 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 145 **2.1 Wastewater Preparation**

146 A bulk wastewater sample (~30 L) was collected from the influent of the Corvallis, Oregon,  
147 USA wastewater treatment plant prior to primary treatment. The wastewater was transported on  
148 ice to the laboratory and stored at 4 °C until further use. The *C. parvum* oocysts used to spike  
149 wastewater samples were purchased from the *Cryptosporidium* Production Laboratory at the  
150 School of Animal and Comparative Biomedical Sciences, the University of Arizona.

151

### 152 **2.2 *Cryptosporidium* qPCR Assay**

153 The *Cryptosporidium* 18S rRNA qPCR assays (**Table 1**) were performed in triplicate on a Bio-  
154 Rad CFX Connect Real-Time PCR Detection System (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, CA). The

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

155 reaction mixtures contained 10  $\mu$ L of 2X PrimeTime Gene Expression Master Mix (Cat No.  
156 1055770 IDT, Coralville, IA), 2  $\mu$ L of the primers and probe solution, 5  $\mu$ L of template DNA, and  
157 3  $\mu$ L of nuclease-free water to bring the final reaction volume up to 20  $\mu$ L. The thermocycling  
158 conditions for the qPCR assays used are reported in **Table 1**. Both threshold cycle values and  
159 starting quantities were automatically calculated by the Bio-Rad CFX Manager software.

160 gBlock gene fragments of the target 18S rRNA gene (**Table 2**) was purchased from Integrated  
161 DNA Technologies (IDT, Coralville, IA) and was used to prepare 10-fold serial dilution qPCR  
162 standards curves ranging from  $10^0$  to  $10^6$  gene copies per reaction. Each qPCR run also included a  
163 no-template negative control (consisting of nuclease-free water) and a non-specific amplification  
164 negative control (consisting of *Escherichia coli* DNA).

165 The sensitivity of the 18S rRNA qPCR assay was determined using its standard curve. The  
166 limit of blank (LOB) and limit of detection (LOD) of each assay were calculated from the assay  
167 standard curves using Equations 1 and 2, respectively, where  $\sigma$  is the calculated standard deviation  
168 (Forootan et al., 2017). The specificity of the primers and probe for the 18S rRNA qPCR assay  
169 was assessed through a BLAST analysis against the National Center for Biotechnology  
170 Information (NCBI) database.

171

$$172 \text{ LoB} = \text{mean}_{\text{blank}} + 1.645 \times \sigma_{\text{blank}} \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

$$173 \text{ LoD} = \text{LoB} + 1.645 \times \sigma_{\text{low concentration standard}} \quad (\text{Eq. 2})$$

174

### 175 **2.3 DNA Extraction**

176 A total of eight DNA extraction protocols were conducted in triplicate on both wastewater that  
177 was seeded with  $1 \times 10^5$  *C. parvum* oocysts and wastewater that was not seeded (to account for  
178 background levels of *Cryptosporidium* naturally in the wastewater). Thirty milliliters of the  
179 wastewater samples were filtered through an electronegative mixed cellulose ester membrane filter  
180 (catalog no. 7141-104, Whatman, Buckinghamshire, U.K), as described in *Section 2.4.2*, and were  
181 stored at 4  $^{\circ}$ C for less than 24 h until DNA extraction could occur.

182 Each DNA extraction protocol utilized one of two commercial DNA extraction kits, the  
183 QIAamp DNA Mini kit (Qiagen, Germany) or the DNeasy Powersoil Pro kit (Qiagen,  
184 Netherlands), per the manufacturer's instructions (**Table 3**). The DNA extraction kits were used  
185 either independently (*M1* & *M2*) or in combination with bead-beating (*M3* & *M4*), freeze-thawing

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

186 (M5 & M6), or both (M7 & M8). Samples subjected to bead-beating were homogenized by a  
187 BioSpec Mini-Beadbeater 16 (BioSpec Products, Inc., Bartlesville, OK) for 2 min. After cooling  
188 on ice for 2 min, the samples were centrifuged at 12,000 x g for 1 min and DNA was extracted  
189 from 250 µL of the supernatant. Samples subjected to freeze-thaw cycles were frozen in liquid  
190 nitrogen for 10 min and thawed in an 80 °C water-bath for 5 min for five freeze-thaw cycles before  
191 DNA was extracted from 250 µL aliquot of the lysate. Finally, samples subjected to both  
192 pretreatment methods underwent bead-beating first, followed by freeze-thawing.

193 After DNA extraction, the concentration of the *Cryptosporidium* 18S rRNA gene was  
194 quantified via qPCR, as described in Section 2.2, and converted into gene copies/µL DNA  
195 (Equation 3). To calculate the recovered seeded *Cryptosporidium* 18S rRNA gene concentration,  
196 the concentration of *Cryptosporidium* 18S rRNA genes from the unseeded wastewater samples  
197 was subtracted from the concentration of the *Cryptosporidium* 18S rRNA genes from the seeded  
198 wastewater samples.

$$199 \quad \frac{\text{gene copies}}{\mu\text{L DNA}} = \frac{\text{copies}}{\text{reaction}} * \frac{\text{reaction}}{\text{DNA template volume } (\mu\text{L})} \quad (\text{Eq. 3})$$

200

### 201 2.4 Wastewater Concentration

202 Wastewater aliquots of 10-, 30-, 100-, 500-, and 1000-mL volumes were seeded with  $1 \times 10^5$   
203 *C. parvum* oocysts and thoroughly mixed before undergoing a concentration method. Unseeded  
204 wastewater aliquots were also concentrated. After the concentration method had been completed,  
205 all samples were stored at 4 °C for less than 24 h until DNA extraction using Method 4 (M4), as  
206 described in Section 2.3, could occur.

207 *Cryptosporidium* concentrations were determined via qPCR targeting the 18S rRNA gene, as  
208 described in Section 2.2. The qPCR results were converted into *Cryptosporidium* oocysts  
209 concentrations (Equation 4). The percent recovery of each concentration method was determined  
210 by dividing the recovered seeded *Cryptosporidium* oocyst mass (Equation 5) by the mass of  
211 *Cryptosporidium* oocysts seeded into the wastewater (Equation 6).

$$212 \quad \frac{\text{oocysts}}{L} = \frac{\text{copies}}{\text{reaction}} * \frac{\text{reaction}}{\text{Template volume } (\mu\text{L})} * \frac{\text{Elution volume } (\mu\text{L})}{\text{Extracted volume } (\mu\text{L})} * \frac{\text{Shield or pellets volume } (\mu\text{L})}{\text{Wastewater volume } (\text{mL})} *$$
$$213 \quad \frac{1000 \text{ mL}}{L} * \frac{\text{oocyst}}{20 \text{ copies}} \quad (\text{Eq. 4})$$

214

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

$$\text{Recovered seeded oocysts} = [\text{Seeded } \textit{Cryptosporidium} \textit{ oocysts (oocysts/L)} - \text{Unseeded } \textit{Cryptosporidium} \textit{ oocysts (oocysts / L)}] \times \text{volume(L)} \quad (\text{Eq. 5})$$

$$\text{Recovery \%} = \frac{\text{Recovered seeded oocyst mass}}{\text{Seeded oocyst mass}} * 100 \quad (\text{Eq. 6})$$

### 2.4.1 Centrifugation

Wastewater aliquots were centrifuged at  $2000 \times g$  for 30 min in a swinging-bucket rotor using either 50 mL or 250 mL sterile conical tubes, for wastewater volumes of 30 mL or greater than 30 mL, respectively. The supernatant was carefully removed leaving 5 mL of supernatant for every 0.5 mL of pellet (USEPA Method 1693, 2014). For wastewater volumes greater than 250 mL, multiple 250 mL sterile conical tubes were used, and the pellets were combined into a single 5 mL suspension before DNA extraction occurred.

### 2.4.2 Electronegative Filtration (HA)

Wastewater aliquots of 30 mL and 100 mL volumes were filtered through a 0.45  $\mu\text{m}$  electronegative mixed cellulose ester membrane filter (catalog no. 7141-104, Whatman, Buckinghamshire, U.K). After filtration, the filters were placed in a 2 mL tube containing 0.7 mm garnet beads and 1 mL of DNA/RNA Shield (Zymo Research, Irvine, CA) and stored at 4 °C for less than 24 h until DNA extraction could occur. To reduce clogging, the filtration of the 100 mL volumes was split into four filtration steps, with each filter processing 25 mL of wastewater. The four filters were placed sequentially into the same 2 mL beaded tube with each filter undergoing bead beating before being removed and the next filter was added.

In addition, PBST elution buffer (Phosphate Buffered Saline with 20% Tween 80) was evaluated as a potential washing step to enhance *Cryptosporidium* oocyst recoveries. In this case, 30 mL wastewater samples were filtered using the above protocol and placed in a 2 mL tube containing 0.7 mm garnet beads and 1 mL of DNA/RNA Shield. However, prior to bead beating, the filter was removed from the DNA/RNA Shield containing tube and placed in a new 2 mL tube containing 0.7 mm garnet beads and 1 mL of PBST elution buffer. Bead-beating commenced using the PBST elution buffer containing a beaded tube.

### 2.4.3 Envirocheck Filtration



## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

246 A modified version of USEPA Method 1693 concentration by filtration was conducted by  
247 filtering 500, or 1000 mL of wastewater through an Envirocheck polyester HV capsules (catalog  
248 no. 12098, Pall Corporation, New York, USA). Prior to elution, the capsules were rinsed with 5%  
249 sodium hexametaphosphate (NaHMP). Subsequently, the materials retained on the filters were  
250 eluted using PBST elution buffer. The resulting eluate was concentrated via centrifugation.

251

### 252 **2.5 Immunomagnetic Separation (IMS)**

253 To potentially increase the specificity of oocyst concentration and purification protocols, an  
254 immunomagnetic separation (IMS) procedure was performed on wastewater samples previously  
255 concentrated by either centrifugation (Section 2.4.1), electronegative filtration (Section 2.4.2) or  
256 Envirocheck filtration (Section 2.4.3). Dynabeads anti-*Cryptosporidium* beads were used to  
257 magnetically retain *Cryptosporidium* oocysts from each sample while discarding extraneous  
258 materials following manufacturer's instructions (catalog no. 73011, Applied Biosystems,  
259 Waltham, MA, USA). The recovery efficiencies of the IMS method alone were evaluated by  
260 seeding *C. parvum* oocysts into 10 mL of either nuclease-free water or wastewater and directly  
261 concentrating and eluting, via two acid dissociations, the samples per manufacturer's instructions.

262

### 263 **2.6 Nanotrap Microbiome B Particles**

264 Nanotrap Microbiome B particles (Ceres Nanosciences, Manassas, VA, USA) were used to  
265 capture and concentrate *Cryptosporidium* oocysts from 10 mL wastewater samples, per  
266 manufacturer's instructions. In brief, Nanotrap Microbiome B magnetic particles and enhancement  
267 reagent 3 (ER3) were added to the wastewater samples to initiate affinity-based binding. Once the  
268 affinity-based binding was complete, the particles were magnetically separated from extraneous  
269 supernatant and eluted in a lysis buffer. DNA was directly extracted using the recommended  
270 accompanying MACHERY-NAGEL DNA kit (Cat no. 744220.1, MACHERY-NAGEL, Düren,  
271 Germany), per manufacturer's instructions.

272

### 273 **2.7 Statistical analysis**

274 Statistical analysis was conducted in Microsoft Excel. To determine statistical significance,  
275 student t-tests were applied to the data sets, two-tailed p values were calculated, and  $p < 0.05$  was  
276 accepted as statistically significant.

Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

277

278

279 **Table 1.** *Cryptosporidium* spp. primers and probe

Target Assay	Sequence (5'> 3')	Final Conc. (nM)	Cycling conditions	References
<i>18S rRNA (JVA)</i>	F: ATGACGGGTAACGGGGAAT R: CCAATTACAAAACCAAAAAGTCC P: FAM/CGCGCCTGC/ZEN/TGCCTTCCTTAGATG/3IABkFQ/	250 250 100	95°C 3 min, 45 cycles of 95°C for 15 s and 55°C for 1 min	(Jothikumar et al., 2008)

280

281

282 **Table 2.** *Cryptosporidium parvum* gblock 18S rRNA gene fragment

Target gene	gblock Sequence (5' > 3')	GenBank Accession No.
<i>18S rRNA</i>	ATTCTAGAGCTAATACATGCGAAAAAACTCGACTTTATG GAAGGGTTGTATTTATTAGATAAAGAACCAATATAATTG GTGACTCATAATAACTTTACGGATCACATTAATGTGAC ATATCATTCAAGTTTCTGACCTATCAGCTTTAGACGGTA GGGTATTGGCCTACCGTGGCAATGACGGGTAACGGGGA ATTAGGGTTCGATTCCGGAGAGGGAGCCTGAGAAACGG CTACCACATCTAAGGAAGGCAGCAGGCGCGCAAATTAC CCAATCCTAATACAGGGAGGTAGTGACAAGAAATAACA ATACAGGACTTTTTGGTTTTGTAATTGGAATGAGTTAAG TATAAACCCCTTTACAAGTATCAATTGGAGGGCAAGTCT GGTGCCAGCAGCCGCGGTAATTCCAGCTCCAATAGCGTA TATTAAAGTTGTTGCAGTTAAAAAGCTCGTAGTTGGATT TCTGTTAATAATTTATATAAAATATTTTGATGAATATTTA TATAATATTAACATAATTCATATTACTATATATTT	AF108864

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

292

293

294 **Table 3.** DNA extraction methods

DNA extraction method	Pretreatment method	Extraction Kit used
<i>M1</i>	None	QIAamp DNA Mini kit
<i>M2</i>	None	Powersoil Pro kit
<i>M3</i>	Bead-beating	QIAamp DNA Mini kit
<i>M4</i>	Bead-beating	Powersoil Pro kit
<i>M5</i>	Freeze-thawing (5 cycles)	QIAamp DNA Mini kit
<i>M6</i>	Freeze-thawing (5 cycles)	Powersoil Pro kit
<i>M7</i>	Bead-beating and freeze-thawing	QIAamp DNA Mini kit
<i>M8</i>	Bead-beating and freeze-thawing	Powersoil Pro kit

295

296

### 297 3. Results and Discussion

#### 298 3.1 Comparison of *Cryptosporidium* qPCR Assays

299 Selecting a qPCR assay capable of detecting all *Cryptosporidium* species and genotypes  
300 presents a significant challenge in accurate identification and quantification of this pathogen in  
301 wastewater samples. An effective approach involves targeting highly conserved areas of the  
302 *Cryptosporidium* genome (e.g., the 18S rRNA gene) which contains a high copy number of  
303 interspecific polymorphisms in all species and genotypes (Roellig & Xiao, 2020). The  
304 *Cryptosporidium* 18S rRNA gene stands out as the most commonly used genetic target due to its  
305 low levels of intraspecific variation as well as its increased theoretical sensitivity as a multi-copy  
306 gene (O’Leary et al., 2021; Xiao, 2010). Therefore, our study targeted the *Cryptosporidium* 18S  
307 rRNA gene using primers and probe that were originally designed for *Cryptosporidium* spp.  
308 clinical surveillance from stool samples (Table 1).

309 To assess the assay’s sensitivity, the limit of blank (LOB) and limit of detection (LOD) were  
310 determined. In total, 99 qPCR reactions were run, encompassing no-template controls and 10-fold  
311 serially diluted standards ranging between  $10^0$  to  $10^6$  gene copies per reaction. The calculated LOB  
312 and LOD of the 18S rRNA assay were 0.0 and 2.91 gene copies per reaction, respectively. A

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

313 specificity analysis using NCBI BLAST confirmed that the 18S rRNA assay could detect all  
314 *Cryptosporidium* spp., including *C. hominis*, *C. parvum*, *C. canis*, *C. andersoni*, *C. bovis*, *C.*  
315 *ubiquitum*, *C. meleagridis*, *C. muris*, *C. felis*, *C. baileyi*, *C. cuniculus*, *C. wrairi*, *C. erinacei*, and  
316 many other genotypes including horse, chipmunk, skunk, mink, and ferret genotypes.

317

### 318 **3.2 Comparison of DNA Extraction Protocols**

319 The detection and quantification of *Cryptosporidium* spp. in environmental samples highly  
320 relies on DNA extraction among other factors (Hawash, 2014). The main challenge in extracting  
321 DNA from *Cryptosporidium* spp. and other parasitic protozoa resides in breaking their robust thick  
322 outer wall (Samuelson et al., 2013). Prior research has indicated the necessity of pretreatments,  
323 either mechanical or chemical, to break this barrier and enhance DNA recoveries (Valeix et al.,  
324 2020).

325 To determine the most effective DNA extraction protocol for enhancing *Cryptosporidium*  
326 DNA recovery in wastewater, our study evaluated the DNA yields of eight different protocols  
327 which used combinations of two pretreatments (freeze-thaw and bead beating) and two  
328 commercial extraction kits (QIAamp DNA mini kit and DNeasy Powersoil Pro kit). Both  
329 pretreatments and commercial extraction kits have been previously utilizing in *Cryptosporidium*  
330 quantification from wastewater (Elwin et al., 2012; Lindergard et al., 2003; Mthethwa et al., 2022;  
331 Valeix et al., 2020). However, the specific effectiveness of these approaches in extracting  
332 *Cryptosporidium* DNA, both individually and in combination, had not been thoroughly explored.

333 Regardless of the extraction method employed, the 18S rRNA gene was quantifiable in all  
334 samples, demonstrating 100% qPCR positivity (**Figure 1**). Furthermore, in the absence of  
335 pretreatment, samples extracted using both the QIAamp DNA Mini kit and the Powersoil Pro kit  
336 resulted in comparably similar DNA yields ( $p > 0.05$ ) with an average of  $3.43 \times 10^1 (\pm 1.95)$  gene  
337 copies/ $\mu\text{L}$  and  $3.26 \times 10^1 (\pm 2.03)$  gene copies/ $\mu\text{L}$ , respectively (M1 & M2). The bead-beating  
338 pretreatment (M3 & M4) drastically improved DNA yields by an order of magnitude, however,  
339 there were notable differences between the two extraction kits ( $p < 0.05$ ). The bead-beating  
340 pretreatment increased the DNA yield to  $3.14 \times 10^2 (\pm 3.61)$  gene copies/ $\mu\text{L}$  for the Powersoil Pro  
341 kit and to  $2.38 \times 10^2 (\pm 2.52)$  gene copies/ $\mu\text{L}$  for the QIAamp DNA Mini kit. In contrast, the freeze-  
342 thawing pretreatment only increased the DNA yield of the QIAamp DNA Mini kits (M5) by  
343 roughly a factor of 2, up to  $6.08 \times 10^1 (\pm 1.10)$  gene copies/ $\mu\text{L}$  and decreased the DNA yield of the

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

344 Powersoil Pro kit (M6) by roughly a factor of 2, down to  $1.74 \times 10^1 (\pm 2.84)$  gene copies/ $\mu$ L.  
345 Incorporating bead-beating prior to freeze-thawing significantly increased DNA yields ( $p < 0.05$ )  
346 for both kits (M7 and M8). However, once again, the QIAamp DNA Mini kits had a higher DNA  
347 yield,  $9.19 \times 10^1 (\pm 2.82)$  gene copies/ $\mu$ L, compared to the Powersoil Pro kits,  $4.46 \times 10^1 (\pm 1.06)$   
348 gene copies/ $\mu$ L.


349 Thus, bead-beating, emerged as the most effective method for rupturing the tough structure of  
350 the oocyst wall while also preserving genomic material by not causing excessive DNA shearing or  
351 hydrolysis. This finding aligns with other studies investigating *Cryptosporidium* and other  
352 parasites across various matrices (Babaei et al., 2011; Amoah et al., 2019; Temesgen et al., 2020;  
353 Shipley et al., 2022). Compared to other pretreatments, bead-beating not only improved DNA  
354 extraction but also enhanced PCR sensitivity, offering a rapid, cost effective, and straightforward  
355 approach for sample preparation (Elwin et al., 2014; Lindergard et al., 2003; Scharf et al., 2020;  
356 Shipley et al., 2022).

357 The lower DNA yields from freeze-thaw pretreatments could be due to DNA degradation, as  
358 has been reported in other studies using freeze-thaw pretreatment for DNA extraction from  
359 *Cryptosporidium* oocysts and other protozoa and parasites (Babaei et al., 2011; Mthethwa et al.,  
360 2022). Additionally, a reduction in detection sensitivity has been noted as a drawback associated  
361 with freeze-thaw cycles. Lindergard et al. (2003) reported that the highest sensitivity of detecting  
362 *C. parvum* and *T. gondii* oocysts was achieved using a single freeze-thaw cycle and that the DNA  
363 detection sensitivity and concentration decreased with each additional cycle due to DNA  
364 degradation (Lindergard et al., 2003). Furthermore, freeze-thaw pretreatments have been  
365 associated with the increased release of PCR inhibitors (D'Alessandro et al., 2007).

366 Incorporating a bead-beating step prior to the freeze-thaw cycles did result in improved DNA  
367 yields ( $p < 0.05$ ). This is in alignment with other studies in which these two pretreatments  
368 demonstrated more satisfactory results for DNA extraction from *Cryptosporidium* oocysts and  
369 other protozoa compared to solely using freeze-thaw pretreatment (Babaei et al., 2011; Hamed et  
370 al., 2016; Mthethwa et al., 2022). However, the DNA yields from combined pretreatments were  
371 still lower than those from bead-beating alone, indicating significant DNA loss due to degradation  
372 during the freeze-thaw process.

373

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater



374

375 **Figure 1:** *Cryptosporidium* DNA yields (gene copies/μL of DNA) from either the QIAamp DNA  
376 mini kit (□) or the DNeasy Powersoil Pro kit (■) after a variety of pretreatment steps. Error bars  
377 represent standard deviation intervals.

378

379

380 In contrast, the Powersoil Pro kits produced lower DNA yields than the QIAamp DNA Mini  
381 kit when a freeze-thaw pretreatment was applied, regardless of whether bead-beating was  
382 performed first. While some studies have shown that freeze-thaw pretreatment increased DNA  
383 yields when used with the QIAamp kit (Adamska et al., 2011; Xin et al., 2021), others have  
384 indicated that freeze-thaw cycles led to DNA degradation when used with the DNeasy Powersoil  
385 Pro kit (Portnoy & Baxter, 2023). This disparity could stem from the unique characteristics of  
386 each extraction kit. Both kits use lysis buffers, but the QIAamp kit also includes enzymatic lysis  
387 (Proteinase K) while the Powersoil Pro kit utilizes an additional physical disruption step through  
388 a 10-minute homogenization step. This additional homogenization step following freeze-thaw  
389 pretreatment exacerbated DNA degradation, likely through physical disruption of the DNA.

390

391 The results of this study also demonstrated that the choice of pretreatment will affect the  
efficiencies of the DNA kits. For instance, while there is no significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) in

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

392 DNA yields between the DNA kits when no pretreatment is applied, the Powersoil Pro Kit  
393 produced higher DNA yields than the QIAamp DNA Mini kit when bead-beating pretreatment was  
394 conducted. This can be explained by the higher sensitivity and inhibitor removal technology  
395 attributed to this kit, as well as its associated 10-minute homogenization step (Amoah et al., 2019;  
396 Feng et al., 2023; Shipley et al., 2022).

397


### 398 **3.3 Comparison of Wastewater Concentration Protocols**

399 Wastewater concentration is a critical step in the molecular detection of *Cryptosporidium* spp.  
400 and other protozoa within environmental matrices. The choice of concentration method can have  
401 significant impacts on the sensitivity and efficiency of downstream methods (e.g., DNA extraction,  
402 PCR, and genomic sequencing), and can influence the observed microbial diversity within  
403 wastewater samples (Zahedi et al., 2021). Reported concentration methods for *Cryptosporidium*  
404 analyses include centrifugation, membrane filtration, and hollow fiber filtration (e.g.,  
405 Envirocheck). IMS is also often used to increase the specificity of the concentration protocol,  
406 remove additional impurities, and increase the concentration of oocysts in the sample (Lowery et  
407 al., 2000). Finally, Ceres Nanoscience's Nanotrap® Microbiome Particles have been used to  
408 concentrate viral and bacterial pathogens in wastewater and may also be effective for  
409 *Cryptosporidium*, although it remains largely untested (Ceres Nanosciences, Inc. | United States,  
410 2024). While there are numerous concentration methods available for *Cryptosporidium* spp., they  
411 have generally been developed and validated for concentrating oocysts from surface waters and  
412 not wastewater (Hassan et al., 2021). Given the lack of standardization and comparison of these  
413 methods for wastewater samples, our study evaluated these concentration protocols at different  
414 wastewater volumes, spiked with *Cryptosporidium* oocysts, to determine their yields of recovery  
415 for *Cryptosporidium* oocysts.

416 All the concentration methods yielded quantifiable recoveries of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts.  
417 However, the percent recoveries varied considerably based on the concentration method and  
418 wastewater volume (**Figure 2**). For instance, the filtration-based protocols (i.e., electronegative  
419 membrane and Envirocheck) had statistically lower percent recoveries ( $p < 0.05$ ) than the  
420 centrifugation and Nanotrap Microbiome particle protocols at comparable wastewater volumes.  
421 The lower performance of the filtration-based concentration protocols may be attributed to the  
422 inefficient dislodging of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts from the filters.

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

423



424

425 **Figure 2:** Percent recoveries of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts by various concentration methods at  
426 various wastewater volumes. Error bars represent standard deviation intervals.

427

428

429 For instance, the use of an electronegative membrane filter with a pore size of 0.45  $\mu\text{m}$  should  
430 guarantee that all of the larger *Cryptosporidium* oocysts, with an average diameter of 4 - 6  $\mu\text{m}$ , are  
431 removed by size exclusion (Fayer & Ungar, 1986). Yet, this method resulted in some of the lowest  
432 *Cryptosporidium* oocyst recoveries. However, when these filters were subjected to a PBST wash,  
433 the *Cryptosporidium* oocyst percent recoveries significantly increased ( $p < 0.05$ ) from  $5.1 \pm 0.32\%$   
434 to  $21.5 \pm 0.39\%$ .

435

436 PBST contains Tween 80, a surfactant that can help dislodge solids from surfaces, and PBST  
437 washing is a standard step in the Envirocheck filtration protocol to help increase the dislodging of  
438 solids from the hollow fiber filters (USEPA Method 1693, 2014). As such, when PBST was used  
439 during the bead-beating step of the electronegative membrane filtration protocol, it helped to  
440 dislodge *Cryptosporidium* oocysts that were stuck to the electronegative filter. Based on the  
observed improvement in *Cryptosporidium* oocyst recoveries, it is recommended that a surfactant



## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

441 elution buffer, such as PBST, be included when conducting bead beating of electronegative  
442 membrane filters.

443 Unlike electronegative membrane filtration, the Envirocheck filtration protocol does not rely  
444 on strict pore-size exclusion but rather depth filtration and capture (Matheson et al., 1998), which  
445 allows the processing of larger volumes of water. When filtering 500 mL of wastewater, the  
446 *Cryptosporidium* oocyst percent recovery was higher ( $p < 0.05$ ),  $12.5 \pm 0.45\%$ , than that observed  
447 for electronegative membrane filtration at 30 mL without PBST, likely due to the inclusion of  
448 PBST in the Envirocheck filtration protocol. However, this percent recovery was lower than that  
449 observed for electronegative membrane filtration at 30 mL with PBST ( $p < 0.05$ ). Additionally,  
450 the percent recovery decreased from  $12.5 \pm 0.45\%$  to  $4.9 \pm 0.22\%$  when the wastewater volume  
451 increased from 500 mL to 1,000 mL. These findings suggest that the Envirocheck filter was also  
452 being clogged by wastewater solids and this clogging was preventing the elution of oocysts from  
453 the filter. It is important to note that this method (USEPA 1693, 2014) was originally developed  
454 for surface water filtration and the standard method does not recommend the use of hollow fiber  
455 filters with high turbidity samples, but rather centrifugation (USEPA Method 1693, 2014).

456 Overall, centrifugation-based concentration protocols yielded higher oocysts recoveries  
457 starting at  $7.5 \pm 0.28\%$  and  $15.8 \pm 0.11\%$  when 30 mL or 100 mL of wastewater was processed,  
458 respectively, up to  $77.01 \pm 0.39\%$  and  $39.3 \pm 1.4\%$  when 500 mL or 1,000 mL of wastewater was  
459 processed, respectively. The increased percent recoveries with increasing wastewater volumes  
460 may be due to the increased mass of solids in the centrifuge tubes. As the wastewater solids pellet,  
461 they are likely to capture *Cryptosporidium* oocyst and help collect them in the pellet. More solid  
462 mass in the centrifuge tube results in a higher likelihood that the *Cryptosporidium* oocyst will be  
463 collected at the bottom of the centrifuge tube. A similar study used centrifugation as a  
464 concentration method of *Cryptosporidium* spp. in wastewater and found an oocyst recovery of  
465 53.63%, when centrifuging 1L of influent wastewater at 3500 rpm (max 4 x 340 g) for 10 min  
466 (Mthethwa et al., 2022).

467 The Nanotrap Microbiome particles are porous magnetically functionalized hydrogels  
468 containing binding receptors with an affinity for biological materials ( *Ceres Nanosciences, Inc. |*  
469 *United States*, 2024). The Nanotrap Microbiome particle protocol has been successfully used to  
470 quantify viral and bacterial pathogens in wastewater (Ahmed et al., 2023; Boehm et al., 2023). In  
471 this study, the Nanotrap Microbiome particle protocol produced similar results to the

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater


472 electronegative membrane filtration with PBST protocol at 24.1% and  $21.5 \pm 0.57\%$ , respectively  
473 ( $p > 0.05$ ). This agrees with previous work that found similar performances between the Nanotrap  
474 Microbiome particle protocol and electronegative membrane filtration for SARS-CoV-2 (Liu et  
475 al., 2023).

476 A key advantage of the Nanotrap Microbiome particle protocol is its ability to work in an  
477 automated workflow, due to the use of magnetic beads and a small sample volume of 10 mL.  
478 However, the percent recoveries from the Nanotrap Microbiome particle protocol were lower than  
479 the percent recoveries from the centrifugation protocol at the 500- and 1,000-mL volumes ( $p <$   
480  $0.05$ ). The reason for the lower percent recoveries is uncertain but may stem from complex  
481 wastewater matrix interference with the particles' binding affinity for *Cryptosporidium*.

482 Finally, in an effort to enhance the specificity of *Cryptosporidium* oocyst detection in  
483 wastewater samples, immunomagnetic separation (IMS) was performed on wastewater samples  
484 previously concentrated by centrifugation or filtration. Increased specificity of the  
485 *Cryptosporidium* oocyst concentration protocol would potentially increase the sensitivity and data  
486 quality of downstream processes, including qPCR and next-generation sequencing. Although IMS  
487 has shown higher specificity and oocysts recovery in other studies on surface water and food  
488 matrices (McCuin et al., 2001; McCuin et al., 2005; Plutzer et al., 2010; Silva et al., 2020), our  
489 findings indicate that this method yielded lower recoveries in wastewater samples, with the  
490 majority of recoveries being less than 0.4% (**Figure 3**).

491 When used under pristine conditions (*i.e.*, nuclease-free water spiked with *Cryptosporidium*  
492 oocysts), the percent recovery from the IMS protocol was 100% (data not shown). Thus, it was the  
493 wastewater matrix diversity and complexity that might have inhibited the performance of this  
494 method (McCuin & Clancy, 2006). Higher turbidity, particulate matter, suspended solids, organic  
495 and inorganic substances as well as fats and oils, and the other inhibiting substances present in  
496 wastewater could then interfere with the antibody binding to the *Cryptosporidium* oocysts leading  
497 to non-specific binding and lower efficiency and recovery rates (Chesnot & Schwartzbrod, 2004).  
498

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater



499

500 **Figure 3:** *Cryptosporidium* oocyst percent recoveries post IMS concentration protocol. Error  
501 bars represent standard deviation intervals.

502

503

#### 504 4. Conclusion

505 This study highlights how the selection of concentration, DNA extraction and qPCR  
506 quantification methods significantly affect the reported recovery rates of *Cryptosporidium* in  
507 wastewater samples. Although great variability exists, most of these methods would still be  
508 acceptable for wastewater surveillance efforts. For example, centrifugation demonstrated the  
509 greatest recovery among concentration methods and is a low-cost, simple, and easily accessible  
510 method for wastewater concentrations. However, its requirement of handling and potential  
511 shipping of relatively large volumes of wastewater poses significant challenges for its integration  
512 into existing wastewater surveillance efforts and high-throughput workflows.

513 Meanwhile, filtration through electronegative membranes, a widely adopted approach in  
514 wastewater surveillance protocols, produced acceptable recoveries with the addition of a PBST  
515 wash. Similar recoveries were also observed for the Nanotrap Microbiome particle protocol,  
516 another common wastewater surveillance concentration protocol that is amenable to automated

## Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

517 high throughput workflows. To the authors' knowledge, this study is among the first to evaluate  
518 the utility of the Nanotrap Microbiome particles in detecting *Cryptosporidium* in wastewater.  
519 Additionally, of the concentration protocols tested, only the IMS purification protocol is not  
520 recommended due to unacceptable recovery rates.

521 Similarly, the choice of DNA extraction kit seemed less critical in affecting DNA yields. A  
522 much more important choice was the use of a physical pretreatment prior to DNA extraction.  
523 Specifically, bead-beating pretreatment outperformed the freeze-thaw protocol in yielding higher  
524 DNA concentrations, likely due to the harshness of the freeze-thaw cycles on DNA integrity.

525 Thus, as wastewater surveillance expands to other pathogens, including *Cryptosporidium* spp.,  
526 there are many acceptable concentration, DNA extraction, and qPCR quantification protocols that  
527 can be used to fit the unique needs, budgets, and capabilities of each wastewater surveillance effort.  
528 However, this study demonstrates that the choices made in the methodology of the wastewater  
529 surveillance protocol can have significant effects on the *Cryptosporidium* spp. concentrations  
530 reported. Therefore, it is critical to evaluate and report recovery rates to optimize the surveillance  
531 protocol and enable more accurate cross-comparisons between studies.

532

### 533 **5. Acknowledgements**

534 We thank the City of Corvallis Wastewater Treatment Facility, Casey Kanalos and James  
535 Gallagher for providing and collecting wastewater samples. We thank Ana Child and Gregory  
536 Sturbaum of the Portland Water Bureau for their input on methodology selection. We also thank  
537 Daniel Goldfarb, Lauren Sanders and Tara Jones-Roe of Ceres Nanosciences, Inc. and Terry  
538 Versaw of Streck for their guidance and assistance in using the Ceres Nanotrap Microbiome  
539 Particle B workflow. This work was funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
540 (cooperative agreement no. CK-19-1904).

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

548 **References**

- 549 Adamska, M., Leońska-Duniec, A., Maciejewska, A., Sawczuk, M., & Skotarczak, B. (2011).  
550 PCR and real time PCR for the detection of *Cryptosporidium parvum* oocyst DNA. *Folia*  
551 *Biologica*, 59(3–4), 115–120. [https://doi.org/10.3409/fb59\\_3-4.115-120](https://doi.org/10.3409/fb59_3-4.115-120)
- 552 Amar, C. F. L., Dear, P. H., & McLauchlin, J. (2004). Detection and identification by real time  
553 PCR/RFLP analyses of *Cryptosporidium* species from human faeces. *Letters in Applied*  
554 *Microbiology*, 38(3), 217–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765X.2004.01473.x>
- 555 Amoah, I. D., Singh, G., Troell, K., Reddy, P., Stenström, T. A., & Bux, F. (2019). Comparative  
556 assessment of DNA extraction procedures for *Ascaris* spp. Eggs. *Journal of Helminthology*, 94,  
557 e78. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022149X19000683>
- 558 Babaei, Z., Oormazdi, H., Rezaie, S., Rezaeian, M., & Razmjou, E. (2011). *Giardia intestinalis*:  
559 DNA extraction approaches to improve PCR results. *Experimental Parasitology*, 128(2), 159–  
560 162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exppara.2011.02.001>
- 561 Chalmers, R. M., & Davies, A. P. (2010). Minireview: Clinical cryptosporidiosis. *Experimental*  
562 *Parasitology*, 124(1), 138–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exppara.2009.02.003>
- 563 Chesnot, T., & Schwartzbrod, J. (2004). Quantitative and qualitative comparison of density-  
564 based purification methods for detection of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts in turbid environmental  
565 matrices. *Journal of Microbiological Methods*, 58(3), 375–386.  
566 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2004.05.001>
- 567 Collier, S. A., Deng, L., Adam, E. A., Benedict, K. M., Beshearse, E. M., Blackstock, A. J.,  
568 Bruce, B. B., Derado, G., Edens, C., Fullerton, K. E., Gargano, J. W., Geissler, A. L., Hall, A. J.,  
569 Havelaar, A. H., Hill, V. R., Hoekstra, R. M., Reddy, S. C., Scallan, E., Stokes, E. K., ... Beach,  
570 M. J. (n.d.). *Estimate of Burden and Direct Healthcare Cost of Infectious Waterborne Disease in*  
571 *the United States—Volume 27, Number 1—January 2021—Emerging Infectious Diseases*  
572 *journal—CDC*. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2701.190676>
- 573 *Cryptosporidiosis NNDSS Summary Report for 2019 | Water-related Topics | Healthy Water |*  
574 *CDC*. (2021). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.  
575 <https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/surveillance/cryptosporidium/cryptosporidium-2019.html>
- 576 D'Alessandro, B., Antúnez, K., Piccini, C., & Zunino, P. (2007). DNA extraction and PCR  
577 detection of *Paenibacillus* larvae spores from naturally contaminated honey and bees using  
578 spore-decoating and freeze-thawing techniques. *World Journal of Microbiology and*  
579 *Biotechnology*, 23(4), 593–597. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11274-006-9261-y>
- 580 Danišová, O., Halánová, M., Valenčáková, A., & Luptáková, L. (2018). Sensitivity, specificity  
581 and comparison of three commercially available immunological tests in the diagnosis of  
582 *Cryptosporidium* species in animals. *Brazilian Journal of Microbiology: [Publication of the*  
583 *Brazilian Society for Microbiology]*, 49(1), 177–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjm.2017.03.016>

Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

- 584 Efstratiou, A., Ongerth, J. E., & Karanis, P. (2017). Waterborne transmission of protozoan  
585 parasites: Review of worldwide outbreaks - An update 2011–2016. *Water Research*, *114*, 14–22.  
586 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2017.01.036>
- 587 Elwin, K., Fairclough, H. V., Hadfield, S. J., & Chalmers, R. M. (2014). *Giardia duodenalis*  
588 typing from stools: A comparison of three approaches to extracting DNA, and validation of a  
589 probe-based real-time PCR typing assay. *Journal of Medical Microbiology*, *63*(Pt 1), 38–44.  
590 <https://doi.org/10.1099/jmm.0.066050-0>
- 591 Elwin, K., Hadfield, S. J., Robinson, G., Crouch, N. D., & Chalmers, R. M. (2012).  
592 *Cryptosporidium viatorum* n. sp. (Apicomplexa: Cryptosporidiidae) among travellers returning  
593 to Great Britain from the Indian subcontinent, 2007-2011. *International Journal for*  
594 *Parasitology*, *42*(7), 675–682. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2012.04.016>
- 595 Fayer, R., & Ungar, B. L. (1986). *Cryptosporidium* spp. And cryptosporidiosis. *Microbiological*  
596 *Reviews*, *50*(4), 458–483. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC373083/>
- 597 Feng, S., DeKlotz, M., & Taş, N. (2023). Comparison of three DNA extraction methods for  
598 recovery of microbial DNA from Arctic permafrost. *microPublication Biology*.  
599 <https://doi.org/10.17912/micropub.biology.000834>
- 600 Gallas-Lindemann, C., Sotiriadou, I., Plutzer, J., & Karanis, P. (2013). Prevalence and  
601 distribution of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in wastewater and the surface, drinking and ground  
602 waters in the Lower Rhine, Germany. *Epidemiology and Infection*, *141*(1), 9–21.  
603 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268812002026>
- 604 Ghazy, A. A., Shafy, S. A.-, & Shaapan, R. M. (2015). Cryptosporidiosis in Animals and Man: 1.  
605 Taxonomic Classification, Life Cycle, Epidemiology and Zoonotic Importance. *Asian Journal of*  
606 *Epidemiology*, *8*(3), 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.3923/aje.2015.48.63>
- 607 Gobet, P., & Toze, S. (2001). Relevance of *Cryptosporidium parvum* hsp70 mRNA amplification  
608 as a tool to discriminate between viable and dead oocysts. *The Journal of Parasitology*, *87*(1),  
609 226–229. [https://doi.org/10.1645/0022-3395\(2001\)087\[0226:ROCPHM\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1645/0022-3395(2001)087[0226:ROCPHM]2.0.CO;2)
- 610 Gonzales-Gustavson, E., Cárdenas-Youngs, Y., Calvo, M., da Silva, M. F. M., Hundesa, A.,  
611 Amorós, I., Moreno, Y., Moreno-Mesonero, L., Rosell, R., Ganges, L., Araujo, R., & Girones, R.  
612 (2017). Characterization of the efficiency and uncertainty of skimmed milk flocculation for the  
613 simultaneous concentration and quantification of water-borne viruses, bacteria and protozoa.  
614 *Journal of Microbiological Methods*, *134*, 46–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2017.01.006>
- 615 Gururajan, A., Rajkumari, N., Devi, U., & Borah, P. (2021). *Cryptosporidium* and waterborne  
616 outbreaks—A mini review. *Tropical Parasitology*, *11*(1), 11–15.  
617 [https://doi.org/10.4103/tp.TP\\_68\\_20](https://doi.org/10.4103/tp.TP_68_20)
- 618 HALL, G. V., KIRK, M. D., ASHBOLT, R., STAFFORD, R., & LALOR, K. (2006). Frequency  
619 of infectious gastrointestinal illness in Australia, 2002: Regional, seasonal and demographic

Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

- 620 variation. *Epidemiology and Infection*, 134(1), 111–118.  
621 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268805004656>
- 622 Hamed, J., Danaiefar, M., & Moghimi, H. (2016). RAPID AND EFFICIENT METHOD FOR  
623 ENVIRONMENTAL DNA EXTRACTION AND PURIFICATION FROM SOIL. *Journal of*  
624 *Microbiology, Biotechnology and Food Sciences*, 5(6), 530–533.  
625 <https://doi.org/10.15414/jmbfs.2016.5.6.530-533>
- 626 Hamilton, K. A., Waso, M., Reyneke, B., Saeidi, N., Levine, A., Lalancette, C., Besner, M.-C.,  
627 Khan, W., & Ahmed, W. (2018). Cryptosporidium and Giardia in Wastewater and Surface Water  
628 Environments. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 47(5), 1006–1023.  
629 <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2018.04.0132>
- 630 Hassan, E. M., Örmeci, B., DeRosa, M. C., Dixon, B. R., Sattar, S. A., & Iqbal, A. (2021). A  
631 review of *Cryptosporidium* spp. And their detection in water. *Water Science and Technology*,  
632 83(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2020.515>
- 633 Hawash, Y. (2014). DNA Extraction from Protozoan Oocysts/Cysts in Feces for Diagnostic  
634 PCR. *The Korean Journal of Parasitology*, 52(3), 263–271.  
635 <https://doi.org/10.3347/kjp.2014.52.3.263>
- 636 Helmy, Y. A., & Hafez, H. M. (2022). Cryptosporidiosis: From Prevention to Treatment, a  
637 Narrative Review. *Microorganisms*, 10(12), 2456.  
638 <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms10122456>
- 639 Helmy, Y. A., Krücken, J., Nöckler, K., von Samson-Himmelstjerna, G., & Zessin, K.-H. (2014).  
640 Comparison between two commercially available serological tests and polymerase chain reaction  
641 in the diagnosis of *Cryptosporidium* in animals and diarrhoeic children. *Parasitology Research*,  
642 113(1), 211–216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-013-3645-3>
- 643 Huang, C., Hu, Y., Wang, L., Wang, Y., Li, N., Guo, Y., Feng, Y., & Xiao, L. (2017).  
644 Environmental Transport of Emerging Human-Pathogenic *Cryptosporidium* Species and  
645 Subtypes through Combined Sewer Overflow and Wastewater. *Applied and Environmental*  
646 *Microbiology*, 83(16), e00682-17. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00682-17>
- 647 Hughes, B., Duong, D., White, B. J., Wigginton, K. R., Chan, E. M. G., Wolfe, M. K., & Boehm,  
648 A. B. (2022). Respiratory Syncytial Virus (RSV) RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Reflects  
649 RSV Clinical Positivity Rates. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 9(2), 173–178.  
650 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00963>
- 651 Jothikumar, N., da Silva, A. J., Moura, I., Qvarnstrom, Y., & Hill, V. R. (2008). Detection and  
652 differentiation of *Cryptosporidium hominis* and *Cryptosporidium parvum* by dual TaqMan  
653 assays. *Journal of Medical Microbiology*, 57(9), 1099–1105.  
654 <https://doi.org/10.1099/jmm.0.2008/001461-0>
- 655 Khalil, I. A., Troeger, C., Rao, P. C., Blacker, B. F., Brown, A., Brewer, T. G., Colombara, D.  
656 V., De Hostos, E. L., Engmann, C., Guerrant, R. L., Haque, R., Houpt, E. R., Kang, G., Korpe, P.

Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

- 657 S., Kotloff, K. L., Lima, A. A. M., Petri, W. A., Platts-Mills, J. A., Shoultz, D. A., ... Mokdad,  
658 A. H. (2018). Morbidity, mortality, and long-term consequences associated with diarrhoea from  
659 *Cryptosporidium* infection in children younger than 5 years: A meta-analysis study. *The Lancet*  
660 *Global Health*, 6(7), e758–e768. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(18\)30283-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30283-3)
- 661 Khan, A., Shaik, J. S., & Grigg, M. E. (2018). Genomics and molecular epidemiology of  
662 *Cryptosporidium* species. *Acta Tropica*, 184, 1–14.  
663 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actatropica.2017.10.023>
- 664 King, B., Fanok, S., Phillips, R., Swaffer, B., & Monis, P. (2015). Integrated cryptosporidium  
665 assay to determine oocyst density, infectivity, and genotype for risk assessment of source and  
666 reuse water. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 81(10), 3471–3481.  
667 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00163-15>
- 668 King, B. J., & Monis, P. T. (2007). Critical processes affecting *Cryptosporidium* oocyst survival  
669 in the environment. *Parasitology*, 134(3), 309–323. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182006001491>
- 670 Kitajima, M., Haramoto, E., Iker, B. C., & Gerba, C. P. (2014). Occurrence of *Cryptosporidium*,  
671 *Giardia*, and *Cyclospora* in influent and effluent water at wastewater treatment plants in Arizona.  
672 *Science of The Total Environment*, 484, 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.03.036>
- 673 Kotloff, K. L., Nasrin, D., Blackwelder, W. C., Wu, Y., Farag, T., Panchalingham, S., Sow, S.  
674 O., Sur, D., Zaidi, A. K. M., Faruque, A. S. G., Saha, D., Alonso, P. L., Tamboura, B., Sanogo,  
675 D., Onwuchekwa, U., Manna, B., Ramamurthy, T., Kanungo, S., Ahmed, S., ... Levine, M. M.  
676 (2019). The incidence, aetiology, and adverse clinical consequences of less severe diarrhoeal  
677 episodes among infants and children residing in low-income and middle-income countries: A 12-  
678 month case-control study as a follow-on to the Global Enteric Multicenter Study (GEMS). *The*  
679 *Lancet. Global Health*, 7(5), e568–e584. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(19\)30076-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(19)30076-2)
- 680 Kotloff, K. L., Nataro, J. P., Blackwelder, W. C., Nasrin, D., Farag, T. H., Panchalingam, S.,  
681 Wu, Y., Sow, S. O., Sur, D., Breiman, R. F., Faruque, A. S., Zaidi, A. K., Saha, D., Alonso, P.  
682 L., Tamboura, B., Sanogo, D., Onwuchekwa, U., Manna, B., Ramamurthy, T., ... Levine, M. M.  
683 (2013). Burden and aetiology of diarrhoeal disease in infants and young children in developing  
684 countries (the Global Enteric Multicenter Study, GEMS): A prospective, case-control study.  
685 *Lancet (London, England)*, 382(9888), 209–222. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)60844-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60844-2)  
686 2
- 687 Layton, B. A., Kaya, D., Kelly, C., Williamson, K. J., Alegre, D., Bachhuber, S. M., Banwarth,  
688 P. G., Bethel, J. W., Carter, K., Dalziel, B. D., Dasenko, M., Geniza, M., George, A., Girard, A.-  
689 M., Haggerty, R., Higley, K. A., Hynes, D. M., Lubchenco, J., McLaughlin, K. R., ... Radniecki,  
690 T. S. (2022). Evaluation of a Wastewater-Based Epidemiological Approach to Estimate the  
691 Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infections and the Detection of Viral Variants in Disparate Oregon  
692 Communities at City and Neighborhood Scales. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 130(6),  
693 067010. <https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP10289>



Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

- 694 Lindergard, G., Nydam, D. V., Wade, S. E., Schaaf, S. L., & Mohammed, H. O. (2003). The  
695 Sensitivity of PCR Detection of *Cryptosporidium* Oocysts in Fecal Samples Using Two DNA  
696 Extraction Methods. *Molecular Diagnosis*, 7(3), 147–153. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03260031>
- 697 Liu, P., Guo, L., Cavallo, M., Cantrell, C., Hilton, S. P., Nguyen, A., Long, A., Dunbar, J.,  
698 Barbero, R., Barclay, R., Sablon, O., Wolfe, M., Lepene, B., & Moe, C. (2023). Comparison of  
699 Nanotrap® Microbiome A Particles, membrane filtration, and skim milk workflows for SARS-  
700 CoV-2 concentration in wastewater. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 14.  
701 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2023.1215311>
- 702 Lonigro, A., Pollice, A., Spinelli, R., Berrilli, F., Di Cave, D., D’Orazi, C., Cavallo, P., &  
703 Brandonisio, O. (2006). *Giardia* cysts and *Cryptosporidium* oocysts in membrane-filtered  
704 municipal wastewater used for irrigation. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 72(12),  
705 7916–7918. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01903-06>
- 706 Lora-Suarez, F., Rivera, R., Triviño-Valencia, J., & Gomez-Marin, J. E. (2016). Detection of  
707 protozoa in water samples by formalin/ether concentration method. *Water Research*, 100, 377–  
708 381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2016.05.038>
- 709 Lowery, C. J., Moore, J. E., Millar, B. C., Burke, D. P., McCORRY, K. A. J., Crothers, E., &  
710 Dooley, J. S. G. (2000). Detection and speciation of *Cryptosporidium* spp. In environmental  
711 water samples by immunomagnetic separation, PCR and endonuclease restriction. *Journal of*  
712 *Medical Microbiology*, 49(9), 779–785. <https://doi.org/10.1099/0022-1317-49-9-779>
- 713 Ma, J., Feng, Y., Hu, Y., Villegas, E. N., & Xiao, L. (2016). Human infective potential of  
714 *Cryptosporidium* spp., *Giardia duodenalis* and *Enterocytozoon bienersi* in urban wastewater  
715 treatment plant effluents. *Journal of Water and Health*, 14(3), 411–423.  
716 <https://doi.org/10.2166/wh.2016.192>
- 717 Ma, L., Zhang, X., Jian, Y., Li, X., Wang, G., Hu, Y., & Karanis, P. (2019). Detection of  
718 *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in the slaughterhouse, sewage and river waters of the Qinghai  
719 Tibetan plateau area (QTPA), China. *Parasitology Research*, 118(7), 2041–2051.  
720 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-019-06330-w>
- 721 Matheson, Z., Hargy, T. M., McCuin, R. M., Clancy, J. L., & Fricker, C. R. (1998). An  
722 evaluation of the Gelman Envirochek capsule for the simultaneous concentration of  
723 *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* from water. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 85(4), 755–761.  
724 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.1998.00588.x>
- 725 McCuin, R. M., & Clancy, J. L. (2006). Occurrence of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts in US  
726 wastewaters. *Journal of Water and Health*, 4(4), 437–452. <https://doi.org/10.2166/wh.2006.0028>
- 727 Meurs, L., Polderman, A. M., Vinkeles Melchers, N. V. S., Brienen, E. A. T., Verweij, J. J.,  
728 Groosjohan, B., Mendes, F., Mechendura, M., Hepp, D. H., Langenberg, M. C. C., Edelenbosch,  
729 R., Polman, K., & van Lieshout, L. (2017). Diagnosing Polyparasitism in a High-Prevalence  
730 Setting in Beira, Mozambique: Detection of Intestinal Parasites in Fecal Samples by Microscopy

Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

- 731 and Real-Time PCR. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 11(1), e0005310.  
732 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0005310>
- 733 Montemayor, M., Valero, F., Jofre, J., & Lucena, F. (2005). Occurrence of *Cryptosporidium* spp.  
734 Oocysts in raw and treated sewage and river water in north-eastern Spain. *Journal of Applied*  
735 *Microbiology*, 99(6), 1455–1462. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2005.02737.x>
- 736 Mthethwa, N. P., Amoah, I. D., Reddy, P., Bux, F., & Kumari, S. (2022). Development and  
737 evaluation of a molecular based protocol for detection and quantification of *Cryptosporidium*  
738 spp. In wastewater. *Experimental Parasitology*, 234, 108216.  
739 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exppara.2022.108216>
- 740 *Nanotrap® Microbiome Particles | Ceres Nanosciences, Inc. | United States*. (n.d.). Ceres Nano.  
741 Retrieved January 5, 2023, from <https://www.ceresnano.com/microbiome>
- 742 O’Donoghue, P. J. (1995). *Cryptosporidium* and cryptosporidiosis in man and animals.  
743 *International Journal for Parasitology*, 25(2), 139–195. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-7519(94)e0059-v)  
744 [7519\(94\)e0059-v](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-7519(94)e0059-v)
- 745 O’Leary, J. K., Sleator, R. D., & Lucey, B. (2021). *Cryptosporidium* spp. Diagnosis and research  
746 in the 21st century. *Food and Waterborne Parasitology*, 24, e00131.  
747 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fawpar.2021.e00131>
- 748 Osman, M., Benamrouz, S., Guyot, K., Baydoun, M., Frealle, E., Chabe, M., Gantois, N.,  
749 Delaire, B., Goffard, A., Aoun, A., Jurdi, N., Dabboussi, F., Even, G., Slomianny, C., Gosset, P.,  
750 Hamze, M., Creusy, C., Viscogliosi, E., & Certad, G. (2017). High association of  
751 *Cryptosporidium* spp. Infection with colon adenocarcinoma in Lebanese patients. *PLoS ONE*,  
752 12(12), e0189422. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189422>
- 753 Painter, J. E., Hlavsa, M. C., Collier, S. A., Xiao, L., Yoder, J. S., & Centers for Disease Control  
754 and Prevention. (2015). *Cryptosporidiosis surveillance—United States, 2011-2012. MMWR*  
755 *Supplements*, 64(3), 1–14.
- 756 Pecson, B. M., Darby, E., Danielson, R., Dearborn, Y., Giovanni, G. D., Jakubowski, W., Leddy,  
757 M., Lukasik, G., Mull, B., Nelson, K. L., Olivieri, A., Rock, C., & Slifko, T. (2022).  
758 Distributions of waterborne pathogens in raw wastewater based on a 14-month, multi-site  
759 monitoring campaign. *Water Research*, 213, 118170.  
760 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2022.118170>
- 761 Pomari, E., Piubelli, C., Perandin, F., & Bisoffi, Z. (2019). Digital PCR: A new technology for  
762 diagnosis of parasitic infections. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection: The Official Publication of*  
763 *the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*, 25(12), 1510–1516.  
764 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2019.06.009>
- 765 Portnoy, D., & Baxter, A. (2023). Development, verification, and implementation of an eDNA  
766 detection assay for diamondback terrapins in the Texas Coastal Bend. *Coastal Bend Bays &*  
767 *Estuaries Program*.

Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

- 768 Ramo, A., Del Cacho, E., Sánchez-Acedo, C., & Quílez, J. (2017). Occurrence and genetic  
769 diversity of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in urban wastewater treatment plants in north-eastern  
770 Spain. *The Science of the Total Environment*, 598, 628–638.  
771 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.04.097>
- 772 Roellig, D. M., & Xiao, L. (2020). *Cryptosporidium* Genotyping for Epidemiology Tracking. In  
773 J. R. Mead & M. J. Arrowood (Eds.), *Cryptosporidium: Methods and Protocols* (pp. 103–116).  
774 Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-9748-0\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-9748-0_7)
- 775 Ryan, U. M., Feng, Y., Fayer, R., & Xiao, L. (2021). Taxonomy and molecular epidemiology of  
776 *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* – a 50 year perspective (1971–2021). *International Journal for*  
777 *Parasitology*, 51(13), 1099–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2021.08.007>
- 778 Samuelson, J., Bushkin, G. G., Chatterjee, A., & Robbins, P. W. (2013). Strategies To Discover  
779 the Structural Components of Cyst and Oocyst Walls. *Eukaryotic Cell*, 12(12), 1578–1587.  
780 <https://doi.org/10.1128/ec.00213-13>
- 781 Scharf, S., Bartels, A., Kondakci, M., Pfeffer, K., Henrich, B., & Haas, R. (2020). Introduction  
782 of a bead beating step improves fungal DNA extraction from selected patient specimens.  
783 *International Journal of Medical Microbiology: IJMM*, 310(6), 151443.  
784 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmm.2020.151443>
- 785 Schmitz, B. W., Moriyama, H., Haramoto, E., Kitajima, M., Sherchan, S., Gerba, C. P., &  
786 Pepper, I. L. (2018). Reduction of *Cryptosporidium*, *Giardia*, and Fecal Indicators by Bardenpho  
787 Wastewater Treatment. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 52(12), 7015–7023.  
788 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b05876>
- 789 Shields, J. M., Hill, V. R., Arrowood, M. J., & Beach, M. J. (2008). Inactivation of  
790 *Cryptosporidium parvum* under chlorinated recreational water conditions. *Journal of Water and*  
791 *Health*, 6(4), 513–520. <https://doi.org/10.2166/wh.2008.068>
- 792 Shin, J.-H., Lee, S.-E., Kim, T. S., Ma, D.-W., Cho, S.-H., Chai, J.-Y., & Shin, E.-H. (2018).  
793 Development of Molecular Diagnosis Using Multiplex Real-Time PCR and T4 Phage Internal  
794 Control to Simultaneously Detect *Cryptosporidium parvum*, *Giardia lamblia*, and *Cyclospora*  
795 *cayetanensis* from Human Stool Samples. *The Korean Journal of Parasitology*, 56(5), 419–427.  
796 <https://doi.org/10.3347/kjp.2018.56.5.419>
- 797 Shipley, A., Arida, J., & Almeria, S. (2022). Comparative Evaluation of an Easy Laboratory  
798 Method for the Concentration of Oocysts and Commercial DNA Isolation Kits for the Molecular  
799 Detection of *Cyclospora cayetanensis* in Silt Loam Soil Samples. *Microorganisms*, 10(7), Article  
800 7. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms10071431>
- 801 Shirley, D.-A. T., Moonah, S. N., & Kotloff, K. L. (2012). Burden of disease from  
802 *Cryptosporidiosis*. *Current Opinion in Infectious Diseases*, 25(5), 555–563.  
803 <https://doi.org/10.1097/QCO.0b013e328357e569>

Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

- 804 Troeger, C., Forouzanfar, M., Rao, P. C., Khalil, I., Brown, A., Reiner, R. C., Fullman, N.,  
805 Thompson, R. L., Abajobir, A., Ahmed, M., Alemayohu, M. A., Alvis-Guzman, N., Amare, A.  
806 T., Antonio, C. A., Asayesh, H., Avokpaho, E., Awasthi, A., Bacha, U., Barac, A., ... Mokdad,  
807 A. H. (2017). Estimates of global, regional, and national morbidity, mortality, and aetiologies of  
808 diarrhoeal diseases: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *The*  
809 *Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 17(9), 909–948. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(17\)30276-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30276-1)
- 810 Uppal, B., Singh, O., Chadha, S., & Jha, A. K. (2014). A comparison of nested PCR assay with  
811 conventional techniques for diagnosis of intestinal cryptosporidiosis in AIDS cases from  
812 northern India. *Journal of Parasitology Research*, 2014, 706105.  
813 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/706105>
- 814 Valeix, N., Costa, D., Basmaciyan, L., Valot, S., Vincent, A., Razakandrainibe, R., Robert-  
815 Gangneux, F., Nourrisson, C., Pereira, B., Fréal, E., Poirier, P., Favennec, L., & Dalle, F.  
816 (2020). Multicenter Comparative Study of Six *Cryptosporidium parvum* DNA Extraction  
817 Protocols Including Mechanical Pretreatment from Stool Samples. *Microorganisms*, 8(9), Article  
818 9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms8091450>
- 819 van Lieshout, L., & Roestenberg, M. (2015). Clinical consequences of new diagnostic tools for  
820 intestinal parasites. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection: The Official Publication of the*  
821 *European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*, 21(6), 520–528.  
822 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2015.03.015>
- 823 Walker, M. J., Montemagno, C. D., & Jenkins, M. B. (1998). Source water assessment and  
824 nonpoint sources of acutely toxic contaminants: A review of research related to survival and  
825 transport of *Cryptosporidium parvum*. *Water Resources Research*, 34(12), 3383–3392.  
826 <https://doi.org/10.1029/98WR02286>
- 827 Ward, P. I., Deplazes, P., Regli, W., Rinder, H., & Mathis, A. (2002). Detection of eight  
828 *Cryptosporidium* genotypes in surface and waste waters in Europe. *Parasitology*, 124(4), 359–  
829 368. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182001001317>
- 830 Weitzel, T., Dittrich, S., Möhl, I., Adusu, E., & Jelinek, T. (2006). Evaluation of seven  
831 commercial antigen detection tests for *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* in stool samples. *Clinical*  
832 *Microbiology and Infection: The Official Publication of the European Society of Clinical*  
833 *Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*, 12(7), 656–659. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2006.01457.x>
- 835 Wells, B., Thomson, S., Ensor, H., Innes, E. A., & Katzer, F. (2016). Development of a sensitive  
836 method to extract and detect low numbers of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts from adult cattle faecal  
837 samples. *Veterinary Parasitology*, 227, 26–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2016.07.018>
- 838 Wiedenmann, A., Krüger, P., & Botzenhart, K. (1998). PCR detection of *Cryptosporidium*  
839 *parvum* in environmental samples—A review of published protocols and current developments.  
840 *Journal of Industrial Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 21(3), 150–166.  
841 <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.jim.2900566>

Evaluation of molecular-based methods for *Cryptosporidium* spp. detection and quantification in wastewater

- 842 Wolfe, M. K., Duong, D., Kevin, M. B., Ammerman, M., Mortenson, L., Hughes, B., Arts, P.,  
843 Lauring, A. S., Fitzsimmons, W. J., Bendall, E., Hwang, C. E., Martin, E. T., White, B. J.,  
844 Boehm, A. B., & Wigginton, K. R. (2022). Wastewater-Based Detection of Two  
845 Influenza Outbreaks. *Environmental Science and Technology*, 9(8), 687–692.  
846 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.2c00350>
- 847 Xiao, L. (2010). Molecular epidemiology of cryptosporidiosis: An update. *Experimental*  
848 *Parasitology*, 124(1), 80–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exppara.2009.03.018>
- 849 Xin, Y., Xie, J., Nan, B., Tang, C., Xiao, Y., Wu, Q., Lin, Y., Zhang, X., & Shen, H. (2021).  
850 Freeze-Thaw Pretreatment Can Improve Efficiency of Bacterial DNA Extraction From  
851 Meconium. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 12.  
852 <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/microbiology/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2021.753688>
- 853 Yamashiro, S., Foco, M. L. R., Pineda, C. O., José, J., Nour, E. A. A., Siqueira-Castro, I. C. V.,  
854 & Franco, R. M. B. (2019). Giardia spp. And Cryptosporidium spp. Removal efficiency of a  
855 combined fixed-film system treating domestic wastewater receiving hospital effluent.  
856 *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 26(22), 22756–22771.  
857 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-05500-8>
- 858 Yang, R., Jacobson, C., Gardner, G., Carmichael, I., Campbell, A. J. D., Ng-Hublin, J., & Ryan,  
859 U. (2014). Longitudinal prevalence, oocyst shedding and molecular characterisation of  
860 Cryptosporidium species in sheep across four states in Australia. *Veterinary Parasitology*,  
861 200(1–2), 50–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2013.11.014>
- 862 Zahedi, A., Gofton, A. W., Greay, T., Monis, P., Oskam, C., Ball, A., Bath, A., Watkinson, A.,  
863 Robertson, I., & Ryan, U. (2018). Profiling the diversity of Cryptosporidium species and  
864 genotypes in wastewater treatment plants in Australia using next generation sequencing. *Science*  
865 *of The Total Environment*, 644, 635–648. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.07.024>
- 866 Zahedi, A., Monis, P., Deere, D., & Ryan, U. (2021). Wastewater-based epidemiology—  
867 Surveillance and early detection of waterborne pathogens with a focus on SARS-CoV-2,  
868 Cryptosporidium and Giardia. *Parasitology Research*, 120(12), 4167–4188.  
869 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-020-07023-5>

870