

1 **Title:** “Real-time county-aggregated wastewater-based estimates for SARS-CoV-2 effective reproduction numbers”

2 **Authors:** Sindhu Ravuri^{§1}, Elisabeth Burnor¹, Isobel Routledge¹, Natalie Linton¹, Mugdha Thakur¹, Alexandria
3 Boehm², Marlene Wolfe³, Heather N. Bischel⁴, Colleen C. Naughton⁵, Alexander T. Yu¹, Lauren A. White¹ &
4 Tomás M. León¹

5
6 [§]Corresponding author

7
8 **Affiliations:**

9
10 ¹ California Department of Public Health Center for Infectious Diseases, Richmond and Sacramento, CA, USA

11 ² Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, California, USA

12 ³ Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

13 ⁴ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California Davis, Davis, CA, USA

14 ⁵ Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California Merced, Merced, CA, USA

15
16 **Complete contact information for the corresponding author (name, email address, and postal address):**

17 Sindhu Ravuri; sindhu.ravuri@cdph.ca.gov; 850 Marina Bay Pkwy, Building P, Richmond, CA 94804, USA

18
19 **Declaration of conflicts of interest:**

20 The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest related to this work to disclose.

21
22 **ABSTRACT**

23 *Background:* The effective reproduction number (R_e) serves as a metric of population-wide, time-varying disease
24 spread. During the COVID-19 pandemic, R_e was primarily estimated from clinical surveillance data streams (R_{cc}),
25 which have varied in quality and representativeness due to changes in testing volume, test-seeking behavior, and
26 resource constraints. Deriving R_e from alternative data sources such as wastewater could inform future public health
27 responses.

28
29 *Objectives:* We estimated county-aggregated, sewershed-restricted wastewater-based SARS-CoV-2 R_e (R_{ww}) from
30 May 1, 2022 to April 30, 2023 for five counties in California of varying population sizes, clinical testing rates,
31 demographics, proportions surveilled by wastewater, and sampling frequencies to validate the reliability of R_{ww} as a
32 real-time disease surveillance metric.

33
34 *Methods:* We produced both instantaneous and cohort sewershed-restricted R_e using smoothed and deconvolved
35 wastewater concentrations. We then population-weighted and aggregated these sewershed-level estimates to arrive
36 at county-level R_e . Using mean absolute error (MAE), Spearman’s rank correlation (ρ), confusion matrix
37 classification, and cross-correlation analyses, we compared the timing and trajectory of two R_{ww} models to: (1) a
38 publicly available, county-level ensemble of R_{cc} estimates, and (2) a county-aggregated, sewershed-restricted R_{cc} .

39
40 *Results:* Both R_{ww} models demonstrated high concordance with traditional R_{cc} estimates, as indicated by low mean
41 absolute errors ($MAE \leq 0.09$), significant positive Spearman correlation (Spearman $\rho \geq 0.66$, $p < 0.001$), and high
42 confusion matrix classification accuracy (≥ 0.81). The relative timings of R_{ww} and R_{cc} were less clear, with cross-
43 correlation analyses suggesting strong associations for a wide range of temporal lags that varied by county and R_{ww}
44 model type.

45
46 *Discussion:* This R_e estimation methodology provides a generalizable, robust, and operationalizable framework for
47 estimating county-level R_{ww} . Our results support the additional use of R_{ww} as an epidemiological tool for
48 surveillance. Based on this research, we produced publicly available R_{ww} nowcasts for the California Communicable
49 diseases Assessment Tool (<https://calcat.covid19.ca.gov/cacovidmodels/>).

50

51 INTRODUCTION

52
53 The effective reproduction number (R_e) of a disease represents the average number of secondary infections caused
54 by a newly infectious individual within a population of both susceptible and immune hosts.¹ An R_e value greater than
55 one suggests the number of new infections within a population will increase, while an R_e value less than one
56 indicates the number of new infections will decrease.² In the context of SARS-CoV-2, R_e commonly serves as a
57 metric of population-wide disease spread under conditions of time-varying vaccination rates, immunity viral variant
58 evolution, health protective behavior modifications, and other response measures.² Importantly, monitoring R_e can
59 inform public health policy decisions (e.g., travel restrictions, school closures, mask requirements).³⁻⁶

60
61 In the first years of the COVID-19 pandemic, R_e was estimated from clinical surveillance data streams such as
62 confirmed case counts (i.e., “case-based” R_e). However, the quality and representativeness of clinical data are not
63 always consistent through time and space. Ongoing changes in testing capacity, access, eligibility, test-seeking
64 behavior and reporting may bias case-based R_e estimates; for example, a simulation study mimicking alterations to
65 testing practices found that increasing or decreasing the proportion of detected cases over- or under-estimated R_e ,
66 respectively.⁷ Delays and administrative noise in case reporting (e.g., lagged processing speed for weekend data) are
67 also common issues for traditional R_e estimation tools.⁸ Deriving R_e from alternative data sources will be an
68 important means of informing response to the future public health impact of COVID-19 and bolstering nowcasting
69 efforts.

70
71 The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted wastewater surveillance as a timely and accurate monitoring tool reflecting
72 community-wide disease transmission.^{9,10} Wastewater surveillance measures the amount of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA
73 shed into wastewater by infected individuals. It circumvents limitations of traditional clinical SARS-CoV-2
74 surveillance in important ways. First, it captures both asymptomatic and symptomatic infections.¹¹ Second,
75 wastewater surveillance is not as impacted by heterogeneous, time- and space-varying testing-related factors.¹²⁻¹⁶
76 Third, wastewater surveillance data is usually available within days, overcoming case reporting delays.¹²⁻¹⁶ For
77 these reasons, using wastewater surveillance could improve the accuracy and reliability of R_e estimates while also
78 compensating for data delays from traditional sources. In addition, given that wastewater surveillance measures viral
79 RNA concentrations at the level of a single wastewater treatment plant’s catchment area (sewershed), it could be
80 used to estimate real-time R_e in finite geographies that may lack robust case reporting.

81
82 Existing methods of wastewater-based R_e (denoted as R_{ww} in this study, following notation by Huisman et al.¹⁷)
83 estimation include SEIR-like compartmental models,¹⁸ branching process-inspired models,^{17,19,20} and artificial neural
84 networks.²¹ Despite using different underlying mathematical approaches, these methods have consistently revealed
85 high concordance between R_{ww} and conventional case-based R_e estimates (denoted as R_{cc} in this study, following
86 notation by Huisman et al.¹⁷). In some circumstances, R_{ww} even highlights outbreak dynamics not captured by R_{cc}
87 alone; for example, Nadeau et al.²⁰ demonstrated that, compared to R_{cc} , R_{ww} better reflected the impact of COVID-19
88 interventions on influenza transmission. Notably, these studies have typically examined R_{ww} at the scale of an
89 individual sewershed. However, a single county may contain multiple treatment plants representing distinct
90 communities, and sewersheds do not typically map to municipal boundaries. Moreover, public health policies are
91 often enacted on a county or regional level. Deriving county-level R_{ww} estimates that integrate data from multiple
92 sewersheds would therefore provide a more comprehensive view of community transmission dynamics at a
93 geographic scale relevant for public health policymaking.

94
95 In this study, we provide proof-of-concept estimation of county-aggregated, sewershed-restricted R_{ww} for the state of
96 California from May 1, 2022 to April 30, 2023. We compare the timing and trajectory of two R_{ww} models to: (1) a
97 publicly available, county-level ensemble of R_{cc} estimates, and (2) a county-aggregated, sewershed-restricted R_{cc} for
98 SARS-CoV-2 (though it is important to note that R_{ww} and R_{cc} are both measuring an unobservable quantity, R_e , the
99 “true” underlying parameter). To evaluate generalizability of our estimation procedure across distinct populations,
100 we present results for five counties with varying sizes, clinical testing rates, demographics, proportions surveilled by
101 wastewater, and sampling frequencies.

102

103 METHODS

104 *R_e Estimation Overall Approach*

105
106 To produce R_{ww} estimates, we relied on the R_e derivation frameworks developed by Cori et al.¹ and Wallinga &
107 Teunis²² (hereafter denoted as instantaneous or cohort R_e , respectively). These two modeling approaches,
108 traditionally applied on case data, have been well characterized and broadly used in public health for real-time R_{cc}
109 estimation.⁸

110
111 We compared the timing and trajectory of these two R_{ww} models to the following: (1) county-level R_{cc} ensembles
112 sourced from the California Communicable diseases Assessment Tool, CalCAT
113 (<https://calcat.covid19.ca.gov/cacovidmodels/>) (hereafter denoted as the CalCAT ensemble); and (2) R_{cc} estimates
114 produced by applying Cori et al.¹ and Wallinga & Teunis²² to sewershed-restricted case data (hereafter denoted as
115 sewershed-restricted R_{cc}). Comparing R_{ww} results to the CalCAT ensemble allows us to validate the robustness and
116 reliability of R_{ww} as a real-time disease surveillance metric for public health. Additionally, comparing R_{ww} results to
117 sewershed-restricted R_{cc} offers two potential advantages. First, sewershed-restricted R_{cc} represents the same
118 populations within a given county as R_{ww} , while the CalCAT ensemble relies on county-wide data sources. Second,
119 sewershed-restricted R_{cc} can be indexed by time of infection. In contrast, the CalCAT ensemble integrates different
120 models with varying R_e estimation procedures, meaning its estimates cannot be easily indexed by time of infection.
121 Therefore, comparing R_{ww} and sewershed-restricted R_{cc} allows us to contextualize the former's timing with respect
122 to conventional case-based approaches.

123
124 We first conducted our R_{ww} estimation process using wastewater data. We subsequently repeated the estimation
125 procedure on sewershed-restricted case data to produce R_{cc} (Figure 2). County-level CalCAT ensemble estimates are
126 publicly available and were not further processed. Our analysis period spanned one year (May 1, 2022 to April 30,
127 2023).

128 *R_e Estimation Process*

129 **STEP 0: Raw Data Sources**

130 **Wastewater Sampling**

131
132
133 Wastewater samples included in the study were collected during the analysis period using two different methods of
134 sample processing, as described below (Table 1). Samples were collected from 14 sewersheds in five California
135 counties at a frequency of three to seven times per week (Table 1). Samples from eight sites (San Francisco
136 Southeast, San Francisco Oceanside, Sacramento, Palo Alto, San Jose, Sunnyvale, Gilroy/Morgan Hill, and Davis)
137 were processed according to Method 1. Samples from six sites (Modesto, Merced, Turlock, Esparto, Winters, and
138 Woodland) were processed according to Method 2 from May 1, 2022 to November 30, 2022 and according to
139 Method 1 from December 1, 2022 until April 30, 2023 (Tables 1 and S1). Method 2 was designed to closely follow
140 the protocol of Method 1, with sample processing and laboratory analyses performed at a different laboratory.

141 Method 1, Sample Processing

142
143
144 Protocols developed for Method 1 were designed and reported according to the Environmental Microbiology
145 Minimum Information (EMMI) guidelines, as described in Borchardt et al.²³ For samples processed via Method 1,
146 50 milliliters of wastewater settled solids were collected three to seven times per week from the primary clarifier or
147 from influent using an Imhoff cone,^{24,25} transferred at 4°C and processed immediately upon receipt at the lab. The
148 methods used to measure the N gene via digital droplet RT-PCR, including thorough descriptions of the extraction
149 and PCR negative and positive controls, process control recovery, QA/QC elements, thresholding methods, and
150 relevant EMMI guideline reporting, have been described in detail in the Supplemental Materials and in a previously
151 published data descriptor.²⁶

152
153
154 Briefly, wastewater settled solids were dewatered with centrifugation and added to DNA/RNA Shield (Zymo
155 Research Corporation, Irvine, CA) at a concentration of 75 mg/ml to minimize inhibition. Nucleic acids were

157 extracted and quantified by a digital droplet RT-PCR assay (dd-RT-PCR) targeting the N gene of SARS-CoV-2.²⁶
158 More detailed methods can be found in the Supplemental Materials.

159 Method 2. Sample Processing

161
162 For samples processed via Method 2, the collection procedure of wastewater solids varied by site (Table 1). For
163 Modesto, grab samples of settled solids from a primary clarifier were collected (similar to Method 1). For Esparto,
164 Turlock, and Woodland, composite samples of influent wastewater were collected, and for Winters, composite
165 samples of raw wastewater were collected from a pump station (Table 1). For sites collecting liquid wastewater
166 samples, solids were obtained by settling the samples in a glass beaker for a minimum of 30 minutes. These settled
167 solids were then processed according to the same protocol described for primary settled solids.²⁷ For all sites,
168 samples were collected three to five times per week and transferred at 4°C to the laboratory. Settled solids were
169 dewatered, diluted in DNA/RNA Shield (Zymo Research Corporation, Irvine, CA), extracted, and quantified by dd-
170 RT-PCR. Minor differences in the processing of dewatered solids, extraction, and dd-RT-PCR assays between
171 Methods 1 and 2 are described in Kadonsky et al.²⁷ A comparative interlaboratory analysis of wastewater samples
172 collected from sewersheds in Davis city of Yolo county suggests that data obtained using Methods 1 and 2 are
173 comparable.²⁷

174
175 In this analysis, we used raw, unadjusted wastewater data in units of copies of SARS-CoV-2 RNA per gram of
176 wastewater solids.

177 **County Selection**

178 For this analysis, we estimated R_{ww} for five California counties: Sacramento, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Stanislaus,
179 and Yolo. We selected counties using similar laboratory methodologies that have one or more site(s) with long
180 wastewater sampling histories (multiple years of available data). Inter-method comparisons of wastewater-derived
181 SARS-CoV-2 concentrations can be highly complex, as quantification is dependent on several unique features of a
182 processing pipeline (e.g., sample type (liquid vs. solids), extraction method and efficiency, assay target selection,
183 quantity of extraction replicates and PCR replicates, laboratory equipment, etc.²⁸ Although six of our sites
184 underwent laboratory changes and all sites underwent minor changes in methodology during the study period, we
185 sought to avoid some of the complications of inter-method data comparability by including only sites processing
186 settled solids (either grab samples from a primary clarifier or solids settled out from a composite wastewater sample)
187 and only sites using the same assay target for SARS-CoV-2 (see Supplemental Methods).

188 Wastewater monitoring tends to be more robust in urban locations for reasons such as larger population coverage,
189 proximity to laboratories, and greater plant staffing and resources, resulting in inequitable coverage for rural
190 communities.²⁹ Therefore, we included counties from both urban (San Francisco, Palo Alto, and Sacramento) and
191 rural areas (Stanislaus and Yolo) (Figures 1 and S1).

192 We define “coverage” as the proportion of a county’s population that resides within sewersheds that are monitored
193 with wastewater surveillance. Amongst California counties, coverage varies widely, ranging from as low as 10% to
194 as high as 100%. R_{ww} estimates produced for counties with low coverage may be subject to selection bias, as they
195 only account for infections in small subpopulations of the county that are sampled via wastewater monitoring
196 programs. Such R_{ww} estimates may consequently follow a trajectory that does not accurately reflect county-wide
197 infection and transmission dynamics. Due to this concern, we chose counties with at least 50% coverage.

198 **Sewershed-Restricted Case Data**

199
200 Sewershed shapefiles were generated in collaboration with each of the wastewater treatment plants selected for this
201 analysis. PCR-confirmed COVID-19 case counts reported to the California Department of Public Health (CDPH)
202 were linked with each sewershed using methods described previously.³⁰ Cases were counted as a function of episode
203 date (earliest of date received, date of diagnosis, date of symptom onset, date of death, or date of specimen
204 collection). The California Health and Human Services (CHHS) Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects
205 (CPHS) determined that use of this data is exempt from review under their criteria.

206 **CalCAT Ensemble**

207
208

209 As part of the COVID-19 Response, CDPH developed a R_e nowcast ensemble publicly available on CalCAT
210 (<https://calcat.covid19.ca.gov/cacovidmodels/>). This nowcast is a smoothed median ensemble of both internally
211 generated and externally contributed models. Median ensembles tend to outperform individual models, as has been
212 demonstrated during the COVID-19 pandemic.^{31,32} Smoothing ensures that the ensemble is robust to outliers,
213 dampening noise in the median nowcast. The models are predominantly case-based, though some additionally or
214 instead use test positivity, hospitalizations, intensive care unit census, and/or deaths as an input (Table S2).

215
216 The CalCAT ensemble is produced on county, region, and state levels. In this study, we strictly use county-level
217 CalCAT ensemble estimates. The ensemble is retroactively updated for the dates through the present day, based on
218 latest estimates from contributing models. The number and cadence of daily contributor models to the ensemble may
219 vary across time and geographies.

220
221 The CalCAT ensemble continues to serve as a real-time disease dynamics monitoring tool informing state
222 policymakers on the speed and strength of SARS-CoV-2 transmission and burden.

223 224 **STEP 1: Data transformation**

225
226 Input time series data streams for sewershed-level R_e estimation (i.e., case counts and wastewater viral
227 concentrations) were transformed using distinct approaches to minimize noisiness for each data stream (Figure 2).
228 Case counts were LOESS smoothed using the R package estimateR. Raw wastewater concentrations were spline
229 smoothed using the R package npreg.³³ To fit sewershed-specific smoothing splines, we spaced knots by seven days
230 over the course of the full analysis period. We selected optimal smoothing parameters unique to each sewershed
231 using ordinary cross validation. Smoothed wastewater concentrations were subsequently square root-transformed.
232 Root transformation produced R_{ww} estimates that were more comparable in absolute terms to R_{cc} , as raw wastewater
233 concentrations (which can be as high as 10^6 copies/gram) are often much greater in magnitude and variability than
234 traditional case counts.

235 236 **STEP 2: Produce sewershed-level R_e**

237
238 Both instantaneous and cohort R_e models required a time series input of incidence data indexed by date of infection
239 as well as an estimate of the generation time (i.e., the time interval between infections of an infector and their
240 infectee(s)).^{1,34} Sewershed-restricted case counts were indexed by episode date, while wastewater concentrations
241 were indexed by date of shedding into wastewater. We re-indexed these data streams to date of infection using
242 deconvolution with input-specific delay distributions. For case data, we derived a delay distribution using the
243 California COVID-19 case registry. As is typical of observational line list data, date of infection was unknown, and
244 date of symptom onset was not available for many cases, in large part due to the presence of mild or asymptomatic
245 infections and reporting practices. Since episode date in the line list was most representative of the date of nucleic
246 acid amplification test (NAAT) result, we approximated episode date as the date of NAAT result. Next, we
247 deconvolved from date of NAAT result to date of infection using two delay distributions: (1) an estimate of the
248 incubation period, based on Aguila-Mejia et al.,³⁵ and (2) the delay from symptom onset to NAAT result, based on
249 the line list (Table 2). For wastewater, we used the infection to shedding distribution reported by Huisman et al.
250 (Table 2).¹⁷ This distribution was optimized for San Jose, California, and reflects the profile of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
251 viral shedding by an infected individual during the days post-infection. We used the R package estimateR to perform
252 deconvolution through a variant of the Richardson-Lucy expectation-maximization algorithm.³⁶

253
254 We also used the estimateR package to produce R_e values derived from the Cori et al.¹ method (hereon referred to as
255 instantaneous R_{ww}). estimateR implements a wrapper around the Cori et al.¹ approach and enables repeated R_e
256 estimation on a user-defined number of bootstrap samples built from the input data time series.³⁶ The distribution of
257 bootstrapped R_e estimates is then used to produce 95% confidence intervals.³⁶ We generated 1000 bootstrap samples
258 for our study for each location estimate. To produce R_e values derived from the Wallinga and Teunis method
259 (hereon referred to as cohort R_{ww}), we used the R package R0.³⁷ We applied an adjustment for right-censorship to
260 obtain accurate R_e estimates at the end of the time series.^{34,38} With the R0 package, we ran 1000 multinomial
261 simulations at each time step to compute 95% confidence intervals.³⁷ Both the instantaneous and cohort models
262 exhibit noise in initial R_e estimates (i.e., extreme spikes). To account for this, we trimmed the first week of estimates
263 for each sewershed-level R_e . For both models, we utilized the generation time reported by Manica et al. (Table 2).³⁹

264

265 **STEP 3: Produce county-level R_e via population weighting**

266
267 Sewershed-restricted R_{ww} and R_{cc} estimates were weighted by population and subsequently aggregated to produce
268 county-level R_e . The aggregation approach is described in Equation [1], where $R_{ww,i}$ represents R_{ww} of sewershed i ,
269 Pop_i represents the population size serviced by sewershed i , and n represents the total number of sewersheds
270 enrolled in wastewater monitoring within the relevant county. This aggregation approach ensures sewersheds
271 corresponding to larger or smaller populations have proportional influence on and representation in the county-level
272 R_{ww} estimate.
273

$$274 \text{ County-level } R_e = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (R_{ww,i} \times Pop_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (Pop_i)} \quad [1]$$

275
276 Sewershed population sizes should be considered approximate, as they are estimated by wastewater utilities using
277 unique and non-standardized methodologies.
278

279 For Yolo county's R_{cc} , we modified our aggregation approach to accommodate low case counts in sewershed-
280 restricted boundaries. The minimum number of cumulative infections prior to R_e estimation recommended by Cori et
281 al. is 12.^{1,36} In certain Yolo sites (Esparto and Winters), the minimum number of cumulative infections prior to R_e
282 estimation on May 1, 2022 (the analysis period start date) was below this threshold. Such low input case counts
283 generated unreliable R_{cc} estimates with extreme sensitivity to small shifts in case incidence. To address this, we
284 combined case counts across all Yolo sites and input this single time series into our R_e estimation procedure.
285

286 Only sewersheds with wastewater data available for a given date were included in the county-aggregated R_e estimate
287 for that date. While most sewersheds in our analysis sampled wastewater for the full study period, San Francisco
288 Southeast began sampling on May 20, 2022. As a result, county-aggregated R_{ww} for San Francisco only includes San
289 Francisco Oceanside for the first 19 days of the study period.
290

291 We derived confidence intervals for county-level R_{ww} and R_{cc} as population-weighted ensembles of sewershed-level
292 confidence intervals. For each date, we assumed that a sewershed's R_e (R_{ww} or R_{cc}) point estimate served as the mean
293 of a normal (or Gaussian) distribution with 95% confidence intervals matching those estimated for each sewershed.
294 Under this simplifying assumption, we then linearly interpolated the means and variances of sewershed-level normal
295 distributions within a county to produce a combined normal distribution; confidence intervals of this resultant
296 distribution were used for county-level R_{ww} and R_{cc} . This method of linear interpolation of Gaussian distributions has
297 been shown to reduce the error coverage for ensemble estimates.^{40,41} Uncertainty estimation for the CalCAT
298 ensemble was not feasible, as contributing models did not all report confidence intervals.
299

300 *Comparison of R_e trajectories*

301
302 To evaluate R_{ww} and R_{cc} concordance in magnitude and direction, we calculated the mean absolute error (MAE) and
303 Spearman's rank correlation (ρ). For R_{ww} versus sewershed-restricted R_{cc} , identical R_e models (instantaneous or
304 cohort) were compared.
305

306 CalCAT ensemble values provide real-time, ongoing R_{cc} estimates with relevance for statewide public health
307 response, while sewershed-restricted R_{cc} values provide comparative controls for our particular study. Additional
308 analyses characterizing the directional concordance between R_{ww} and the CalCAT ensemble would provide greater
309 evidence of the former's potential real-time public health utility. To that end, we produced multi-class confusion
310 matrices relating R_{ww} to the CalCAT ensemble. Based on magnitude, R_e values were grouped into transmission
311 strength categories for the state of California (<0.7, 0.7-0.9, 0.9-1.1, 1.1-1.3, >1.3, which represent a sharp decrease,
312 decrease, stability, increase, and sharp increase in R_e , respectively). When predicted R_{ww} values and reference
313 CalCAT ensemble values belong to the same category, the confusion matrix marks it an instance of agreement (in
314 this context, CalCAT ensemble values are treated as the source of truth, or actuals). The total frequency of
315 agreement instances for each R_e category are then visualized by the confusion matrix.
316

317 We reported the resulting sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive values (PPV), and negative predictive values
318 (NPV) for each R_e category. Sensitivity and specificity reflected the fraction of CalCAT ensemble observations

319 which were correctly classified by R_{ww} for each R_e category. PPV and NPV reflected the proportion of matching and
320 non-matching classifications for R_{ww} predictions for each R_e category. Here, for a given R_e category, “true positives”
321 indicate reference observations correctly classified by R_{ww} as belonging to the category, and “true negatives” indicate
322 reference observations correctly classified by R_{ww} as not belonging to the category. We also reported the overall
323 accuracy, which summarizes across all R_e categories. The overall accuracy sums the number of R_e predictions
324 correctly classified by R_{ww} and divides that sum by the total number of observations in the time series. These five
325 metrics do not include the categories $R_e < 0.7$ and $R_e > 1.3$ as they had no values during the study period.

326
327 We used the R package caret to generate all confusion matrices and corresponding performance metrics.⁴²

328
329 *Comparison of R_e temporalities*

330
331 We performed cross-correlation between R_{ww} and R_{cc} to identify temporal lags in the former that may be useful
332 predictors of the latter. Cross-correlations were performed for a lag value range of -20 to 20 days (negative lag
333 values: R_{ww} temporally precedes R_{cc} ; positive lag values: R_{cc} temporally precedes R_{ww} ; lag value of zero: R_{ww} is not
334 temporally shifted with respect to R_{cc}).

335 RESULTS

336
337 We produced two SARS-CoV-2 R_{ww} models for five California counties. We then compared the timing, magnitude,
338 and directionality of R_{ww} to the CalCAT ensemble and sewershed-restricted R_{cc} . All results for San Francisco, Santa
339 Clara, and Yolo counties are included in the main text; numerical results for Sacramento and Stanislaus counties are
340 included in the main text and graphical results are in the Supplemental Material.

341 *Comparison of R_e trajectories*

342
343 R_{ww} tracks closely with R_{cc} over time and geography (Figures 3, S2, and S4). Quantitatively, we found high
344 correspondence between R_{ww} and R_{cc} trajectories for all counties across three analyses: mean absolute error (MAE),
345 Spearman's rank correlation, and confusion matrix classification.

347 **Mean Absolute Error Analysis**

348 When compared against R_{cc} for the entire analysis period, R_{ww} had a low average MAE ($MAE \leq 0.09$, Table 3). For
349 both instantaneous and cohort R_{ww} models, MAE values relating R_{ww} to CalCAT ensemble estimates were lower
350 ($MAE \leq 0.07$) than MAE values relating R_{ww} to sewershed-restricted R_{cc} estimates ($MAE \leq 0.09$). MAE values
351 relating R_{ww} to CalCAT ensemble estimates were lower for instantaneous R_{ww} ($MAE \leq .05$), while MAE values
352 relating R_{ww} to sewershed-restricted R_{cc} estimates were lower for cohort R_{ww} ($MAE \leq 0.06$). These results were
353 consistent across all five counties.

354
355 **Spearman's Rank Correlation Analysis**
356 Over the entire analysis period, R_{ww} estimates were strongly, positively, and significantly correlated with R_{cc}
357 estimates for all five counties (Spearman $\rho \geq 0.62$, $p < 0.001$) (Table 3). For instantaneous R_{ww} , strength of
358 correlation between R_{ww} and CalCAT ensemble estimates was higher (Spearman $\rho \geq 0.78$, $p < 0.001$) than the
359 strength of correlation between R_{ww} and sewershed-restricted R_{cc} estimates (Spearman $\rho \geq 0.66$, $p < 0.001$) in four of
360 five counties. For cohort R_{ww} , strength of correlation between R_{ww} and the CalCAT ensemble (Spearman $\rho \geq 0.62$, p
361 < 0.001) did not show a clear pattern in relation to the strength of correlation between R_{ww} and sewershed-restricted
362 R_{cc} estimates (Spearman $\rho \geq 0.66$, $p < 0.001$). Strength of correlation between R_{ww} and the CalCAT ensemble
363 estimates was higher across all counties for the instantaneous R_{ww} model (Spearman $\rho \geq 0.78$, $p < 0.001$). The
364 strength of correlation between R_{ww} and sewershed-restricted R_{cc} estimates was generally higher for the cohort R_{ww}
365 approach (Spearman $\rho \geq 0.62$, $p < 0.001$), with the exceptions of Sacramento and Yolo counties (for which
366 instantaneous R_{ww} demonstrated slightly higher strength of correlation).

368 **Confusion Matrix Analysis**

369 We performed confusion matrix classification analysis, stratified by county and R_{ww} modeling approach, to further
370 characterize the directional concordance between R_{ww} and the CalCAT ensemble (Figures 4 and S3).

371
372 The overall classification accuracy of both R_{ww} models was consistently high (≥ 0.79) across all counties; the sole
373 exception to this pattern was Stanislaus, which had a slightly lower overall accuracy for its R_{ww} models (≥ 0.64)
374 (Tables 4 and 5). Overall accuracy for the cohort R_{ww} model was lower as compared to instantaneous R_{ww} for all
375 counties. For all counties and R_{ww} approaches, the total frequency of agreement instances was greatest for the 0.9 to
376 1.1 R_e (stable) range (Figures 4 and S3).

377
378 Across all counties, both R_{ww} models generally demonstrated the greatest sensitivity and PPV for R_e estimates with
379 magnitudes between 0.9 and 1.1 (sensitivity = 0.78-0.99 and 0.70-0.99; PPV = 0.89-0.97 and 0.77-0.95 for
380 instantaneous and cohort, respectively). For all R_e classifications, sensitivity and PPV varied by geography and R_{ww}
381 model type. Interestingly, for R_e estimates between 0.7 and 0.9, the PPV of cohort R_{ww} was incalculable (San
382 Francisco and Yolo) or 0 (Sacramento and Santa Clara) for all counties except Stanislaus (PPV = 0.48). An
383 incalculable PPV indicates there were no R_{ww} predictions within this range; a PPV of 0 indicates R_{ww} never estimated
384 R_e between 0.7 and 0.9 when the CalCAT ensemble did. However, it is important to caveat that there were few ($<$
385 20) eligible observations in this category for all counties except Stanislaus.

386
387 For R_e estimates between 0.7 and 0.9 or 1.1 and 1.3, all misclassified R_e (i.e., R_e estimates categorized differently by
388 the CalCAT ensemble versus R_{ww}) were estimated to be in the 0.9 to 1.1 range by both R_{ww} models. Consistent with
389 this finding, both R_{ww} models demonstrated the lowest specificity and NPV for the 0.9 to 1.1 category across all

390 counties (specificity = 0.48-0.86 and 0.17-0.56; NPV = 0.51-0.85 and 0.31-0.67 for instantaneous and cohort,
391 respectively). For R_e estimates between 0.7 and 0.9 or 1.1 and 1.3, the specificity and NPV remained greater than
392 0.86 and 0.90, respectively, across all counties for both R_{ww} models. We observed inter- and intra- county- and
393 model-dependent variability in relative magnitudes of the four reported metrics (sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV)
394 across R_e classifications.

395 396 *Comparison of R_e temporalities*

397
398 We calculated cross-correlation with a maximum lag of 20 days between R_{ww} and R_{cc} to numerically evaluate
399 temporal alignment. Across all counties and R_{ww} - R_{cc} pairings, cross-correlation coefficients ranged from 0.65 to 0.93
400 (CalCAT ensemble: 0.72-0.93 and 0.69-0.89; sewershed-restricted R_{cc} : 0.65-0.87 and 0.67-0.89 for instantaneous
401 and cohort R_{ww} , respectively). We report the range of time lags for cross-correlation coefficients within 0.05 of the
402 maximum observed correlation value (Table 6, Figures S5 and S6). The reported range of time lags were wide and
403 variable across counties, R_{cc} sources (CalCAT ensemble versus sewershed-restricted), and R_{ww} models
404 (instantaneous versus cohort). Importantly, though, nearly all ranges included a lead time of 0 days, when R_{ww} was
405 not temporally shifted with respect to R_{cc} (the two exceptions to this were: (1) instantaneous R_{ww} with respect to
406 sewershed-restricted R_{cc} for Stanislaus county, and (2) cohort R_{ww} with respect to the CalCAT ensemble for
407 Sacramento county); this is consistent with our previous observations of high concordance between non-time-shifted
408 R_{ww} and R_{cc} (Figures 3 and S2, Table 3).

409
410 Within each county, the size and bounds (i.e., minimum and maximum) of the reported range of time lags with
411 respect to sewershed-restricted R_{cc} was broadly similar between both R_{ww} models; this was not true for the range of
412 time lags with respect to the CalCAT ensemble, which differs between R_{ww} models (boundaries of ranges with
413 respect to the CalCAT ensemble: -3 to +10 days and -4 to +10 days of lag for instantaneous and cohort, respectively;
414 boundaries of ranges with respect to the CalCAT ensemble: -8 to +3 days and -16 to +1 days of lag for instantaneous
415 and cohort, respectively).

416

417 DISCUSSION

418
419 We estimated instantaneous and cohort wastewater-based SARS-CoV-2 effective reproduction numbers for five
420 California counties from May 1, 2022 to April 30, 2023. Across counties with varying population characteristics
421 (e.g., demographics, sizes, clinical testing rates) and wastewater surveillance (e.g., sampling frequency, coverage),
422 both instantaneous and cohort R_{ww} models demonstrated high correspondence with traditional R_{cc} models based on
423 sewershed-restricted and county-wide case data. Correspondence was indicated by low average MAE, significant
424 positive Spearman correlation, and high classification accuracy of R_{ww} with respect to R_{cc} for the entire study period
425 (Table 3, Figure 4). These findings align with existing studies on R_{ww} estimation, which consistently reveal high
426 concordance between R_{ww} and R_{cc} estimates across geographies and time.^{17,20,21} R_{ww} concordance with the county-
427 level CalCAT ensemble was generally greater than with sewershed-restricted R_{cc} (Table 3).

428
429 Our work did not yield clear conclusions on the relative timing of R_{ww} and R_{cc} . Cross correlative analyses suggested
430 strong associations ranging from a lead time of -16 days to a lag time of +10 days, depending on county, R_{cc} source
431 (CalCAT ensemble versus sewershed-restricted), and R_{ww} model type (Table 6). These findings align mixed results
432 in previous studies assessing the temporal alignment between wastewater and clinical surveillance data⁴³⁻⁴⁶; several
433 factors, such as clinical data completeness, SARS-CoV-2 variant predominance, sewershed location, and population
434 immunity, may influence the strength of wastewater as a leading indicator of disease incidence.

435 Similar SARS-CoV-2 R_{ww} estimation pipelines are described in Huisman et al.,¹⁷ Amman et al.,¹⁹ and the publicly
436 available “COVID-19 R estimation for California” dashboard by Worden et al. (<https://ca-covid-r.info/>). Both
437 published studies produce sewershed-level instantaneous R_{ww} , while the dashboard produces county-level cohort
438 R_{ww} . All methods share a general pipeline schema: wastewater time series data is first processed and subsequently
439 fed into an R_e model. However, the methods differ in their strategies for data transformation, deconvolution
440 (including selection of infection to shedding delay distributions), and county aggregation. For data transformation,
441 our method is most similar to Amman et al.,¹⁹ as both implement a spline approach to smooth wastewater data. For
442 deconvolution, our method is most similar to Huisman et al.,¹⁷ as both implement a variant of the Richardson-Lucy
443 expectation-maximization algorithm. For county aggregation, our method differs from that of the “COVID-19 R
444 estimation for California” dashboard (<https://ca-covid-r.info/>): we perform population weighting of sewershed-level
445 R_{ww} , while the dashboard uses non-population-weighted, county-aggregated input wastewater data to estimate R_{ww} .
446 We chose population-weighting to ensure sewersheds corresponding to larger or smaller populations have
447 proportional influence on and representation in the county-level R_{ww} estimate. We opted for aggregating sewershed-
448 restricted R_{ww} instead of sewershed-restricted raw RNA concentrations because the latter are not necessarily
449 comparable between sewersheds due to environmental conditions and wastewater attributes.

450 There are several limitations to our study. First and most importantly, to validate R_{ww} we treated R_{cc} as the gold
451 standard R_e metric. However, both clinical and wastewater data streams have their respective strengths and
452 limitations. Clinical data streams are influenced by heterogeneous, time- and space-varying testing-related factors,
453 ultimately capturing only a subset of infections. Wastewater data streams, while independent of some of the biases
454 impacting clinical surveillance, require accurate characterization of the fecal shedding load distribution in order to
455 be interpreted; the temporal dynamics of fecal shedding and its relationship to variant, immunity status, or disease
456 severity, continue to be an ongoing area of investigation.⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹ Given this uncertainty surrounding fecal shedding,
457 pooled viral concentrations in wastewater are difficult to directly translate into unique infection or transmission
458 events. Consequently, R_{ww} may not truly represent the average number of secondary cases caused by a newly
459 infectious individual. Instead, it may be more indicative of other disease characteristics such as infectiousness (since
460 highest shedding tends to occur when someone is most infectious). This is in contrast to traditional R_{cc} estimates,
461 which use discrete units of disease burden (e.g., case counts) in conjunction with generation time or serial interval
462 distributions to directly reconstruct and quantify transmission events. Ultimately, these limitations suggest that both
463 clinical and wastewater data streams are imperfect proxies for COVID-19 disease dynamics; together though, both
464 sources could potentially offer a more comprehensive picture of transmission dynamics and infection risk. While the
465 present study frames R_{cc} as a gold-standard metric, R_{cc} and R_{ww} should instead be considered as two complementary
466 R_e metrics informed by synergistic data sources.

467 Second, county-level R_{ww} is based on sewershed-restricted wastewater data. Such data only reflects the shedding
468 patterns and disease conditions of wastewater-surveilled communities and may not be generalizable to the entire
469 county population. This has important implications for the utility of R_{ww} in the context of public health policies, such
470 as health mandates, which are often applied at the county level. Any county-level policies informed by R_{ww} would be

471 tied to a transmission indicator that can only account for the sewershed-surveilled subset of the infected population.
472 This is especially relevant for the state of California, where most counties (especially those in rural areas) have
473 <50% of the county population surveilled by wastewater. Given that our study focuses on counties with >50%
474 coverage, our findings on the agreement between county-aggregated, sewershed-level R_{ww} and county-level CalCAT
475 ensemble R_{cc} may not translate to communities with lower programmatic wastewater surveillance. In addition, the
476 wastewater-surveilled subset may demonstrate unique behaviors that are not representative of the entire county,
477 potentially biasing R_{ww} .

478 Third, wastewater data is susceptible to location- or time-specific environmental conditions. Wastewater samples are
479 relatively small volumes of wastewater collected from millions of gallons of organic and inorganic materials flowing
480 through a treatment plant; as such, factors like rainfall, industrial input, temperature, and sewage travel time can
481 impact measured SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations. This may weaken R_{ww} - R_{cc} concordance in specific counties.

482 There are also key limitations within our R_{ww} estimation process. For all five counties in our study, we assume the
483 experimentally inferred, optimized infection to shedding distribution for San Jose described by Huisman et al.¹⁷ This
484 distribution maximized R_{ww} - R_{cc} agreement for a single treatment plant studied by Huisman et al.,¹⁷ and is therefore
485 not reflective of the highly variable fecal shedding profile amongst individuals and populations. This upstream
486 assumption in our pipeline impacts the number of inferred infections per day from wastewater, ultimately
487 influencing R_{ww} estimates. Similarly, specific decisions were made in the estimation process related to smoothing
488 (e.g., methodology), trimming (e.g., width or window), and deconvolution (e.g., choice of incubation period,
489 generation time) which may influence downstream results.

490 Lastly, it is important to consider practical limitations relevant for operationalization of our methods. Firstly, our
491 study is a retrospective analysis using readily available historical surveillance data that has been updated post hoc as
492 more accurate information was reported. This contrasts with real-time or emergency conditions, when both R_{cc} and
493 R_{ww} can only rely on data available at a given time. As such, real-time operationalization of the R_{ww} estimation
494 procedure outlined in this study may require additional data pre-processing, nowcasting, and forecasting steps in the
495 absence of current data. Secondly, counties were selected for this pilot analysis to prioritize similar laboratorial
496 methodologies, long-term sampling histories, high population coverage by wastewater surveillance, and
497 representation of diverse (rural and urban) demographics. Such historically comprehensive, consistently measured,
498 and frequently sampled wastewater data is not available for all sewersheds, counties, or regions. Therefore, the
499 performance of the R_{ww} estimation process presented here may vary considerably when applied to other jurisdictions
500 in California and may not be generalizable. In the future, investigating R_{ww} estimation in a larger suite of counties
501 and regions will be essential to comprehensively understanding the utility of our method in a wide range of
502 scenarios. Another future extension includes identifying the minimum wastewater county coverage and sampling
503 frequency required for high R_{ww} - R_{cc} concordance, which would increase county representation (building upon initial
504 work done by Huisman et al. 2022 for San Jose). Finally, methodological differences can impact measured
505 wastewater concentrations, which in turn can complicate comparability between sites. While we selected
506 sewersheds using similar laboratory methods for this study, some differences still remained in how wastewater
507 solids were collected, processed, or quantified. We do not have conclusive evidence on the impact of even minor
508 differences in laboratory methodologies on downstream R_{ww} estimation. Moreover, best practices for combining
509 wastewater data across multiple methods and laboratories (either over time for a single site, or for distinct sites
510 within a single county) remain an area of ongoing and future research.

511
512 We estimated county-level R_{ww} , which we demonstrated tracks closely with robust traditional case-based R_{cc}
513 estimates. Our results support the future use of R_{ww} as an additional epidemiological tool with public health
514 relevance in the context of disease dynamics monitoring. Moreover, our study provides a generalizable, robust, and
515 operationalizable framework for estimating county-level R_{ww} . On the basis of this research, we produced publicly
516 available SARS-CoV-2 R_{ww} nowcasts for the CalCAT dashboard (<https://calcat.covid19.ca.gov/cacovidmodels/>),
517 advancing COVID-19 transmission monitoring for the state of California. This study and the described approach can
518 inform other jurisdictions' construction and implementation of sewershed- and county-level R_{ww} estimation
519 pipelines. In the future, the described estimation procedure could be applied to other pathogens with available
520 wastewater and case surveillance data (e.g., respiratory syncytial virus [RSV], influenza).

521

522 REFERENCES

- 523 1. New Framework and Software to Estimate Time-Varying Reproduction Numbers During Epidemics | American
524 Journal of Epidemiology | Oxford Academic. Accessed November 21, 2023.
525 <https://academic.oup.com/aje/article/178/9/1505/89262?login=false>
- 526 2. Joint Research Centre (European Commission), Annunziato A, Asikainen T. *Effective Reproduction Number*
527 *Estimation from Data Series*. Publications Office of the European Union; 2020. Accessed November 21, 2023.
528 <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2760/036156>
- 529 3. Linka K, Peirlinck M, Kuhl E. The reproduction number of COVID-19 and its correlation with public health
530 interventions. *Comput Mech*. 2020;66(4):1035-1050. doi:10.1007/s00466-020-01880-8
- 531 4. Fauci AS, Lane HC, Redfield RR. Covid-19 — Navigating the Uncharted. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(13):1268-
532 1269. doi:10.1056/NEJMe2002387
- 533 5. Dainton C, Hay A. Quantifying the relationship between lockdowns, mobility, and effective reproduction
534 number (Rt) during the COVID-19 pandemic in the Greater Toronto Area. *BMC Public Health*.
535 2021;21(1):1658. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-11684-x
- 536 6. Inglesby TV. Public Health Measures and the Reproduction Number of SARS-CoV-2. *JAMA*.
537 2020;323(21):2186-2187. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.7878
- 538 7. Pitzer VE, Chitwood M, Havumaki J, et al. The Impact of Changes in Diagnostic Testing Practices on
539 Estimates of COVID-19 Transmission in the United States. *Am J Epidemiol*. Published online April 8,
540 2021:kwab089. doi:10.1093/aje/kwab089
- 541 8. Nash RK, Nouvellet P, Cori A. Real-time estimation of the epidemic reproduction number: Scoping review of
542 the applications and challenges. *PLOS Digit Health*. 2022;1(6):e0000052. doi:10.1371/journal.pdig.0000052
- 543 9. Li X, Zhang S, Sherchan S, et al. Correlation between SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentration in wastewater and
544 COVID-19 cases in community: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Hazard Mater*. 2023;441:129848.
545 doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2022.129848
- 546 10. Rabe A, Ravuri S, Burnor E, et al. Correlation between wastewater and COVID-19 case incidence rates in
547 major California sewersheds across three variant periods. *J Water Health*. 2023;21(9):1303-1317.
548 doi:10.2166/wh.2023.173
- 549 11. Bivins A, North D, Ahmad A, et al. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology: Global Collaborative to Maximize
550 Contributions in the Fight Against COVID-19. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2020;54(13):7754-7757.
551 doi:10.1021/acs.est.0c02388
- 552 12. Peccia J, Zulli A, Brackney DE, et al. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community
553 infection dynamics. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2020;38(10):1164-1167. doi:10.1038/s41587-020-0684-z
- 554 13. Wolfe MK, Topol A, Knudson A, et al. High-Frequency, High-Throughput Quantification of SARS-CoV-2
555 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids at Eight Publicly Owned Treatment Works in Northern California Shows
556 Strong Association with COVID-19 Incidence. *mSystems*. 2021;6(5):10.1128/msystems.00829-21.
557 doi:10.1128/msystems.00829-21
- 558 14. Kirby AE, Walters MS, Jennings WC, et al. Using Wastewater Surveillance Data to Support the COVID-19
559 Response — United States, 2020–2021. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(36):1242-1244.
560 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7036a2
- 561 15. Olesen SW, Imakaev M, Duvallet C. Making waves: Defining the lead time of wastewater-based epidemiology
562 for COVID-19. *Water Res*. 2021;202:117433. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2021.117433

- 563 16. Zhu Y, Oishi W, Maruo C, et al. Early warning of COVID-19 via wastewater-based epidemiology: potential
564 and bottlenecks. *Sci Total Environ.* 2021;767:145124. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145124
- 565 17. Huisman JS, Scire J, Caduff L, et al. Wastewater-Based Estimation of the Effective Reproductive Number of
566 SARS-CoV-2. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2022;130(5):057011. doi:10.1289/EHP10050
- 567 18. Nourbakhsh S, Fazil A, Li M, et al. A wastewater-based epidemic model for SARS-CoV-2 with application to
568 three Canadian cities. *Epidemics.* 2022;39:100560. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2022.100560
- 569 19. Amman F, Markt R, Endler L, et al. Viral variant-resolved wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 at national
570 scale. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2022;40(12):1814-1822. doi:10.1038/s41587-022-01387-y
- 571 20. Nadeau S, Devaux AJ, Bagutti C, et al. Influenza transmission dynamics quantified from wastewater. Published
572 online January 25, 2023;2023.01.23.23284894. doi:10.1101/2023.01.23.23284894
- 573 21. Jiang G, Wu J, Weidhaas J, et al. Artificial neural network-based estimation of COVID-19 case numbers and
574 effective reproduction rate using wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Res.* 2022;218:118451.
575 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2022.118451
- 576 22. Wallinga J, Teunis P. Different epidemic curves for severe acute respiratory syndrome reveal similar impacts of
577 control measures. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2004;160(6):509-516. doi:10.1093/aje/kwh255
- 578 23. Borchardt MA, Boehm AB, Salit M, Spencer SK, Wigginton KR, Noble RT. The Environmental Microbiology
579 Minimum Information (EMMI) Guidelines: qPCR and dPCR Quality and Reporting for Environmental
580 Microbiology. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2021;55(15):10210-10223. doi:10.1021/acs.est.1c01767
- 581 24. Kim S, C. Kennedy L, K. Wolfe M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA is enriched by orders of magnitude in primary
582 settled solids relative to liquid wastewater at publicly owned treatment works. *Environ Sci Water Res Technol.*
583 2022;8(4):757-770. doi:10.1039/D1EW00826A
- 584 25. Wolfe MK, Archana A, Catoe D, et al. Scaling of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Settled Solids from Multiple
585 Wastewater Treatment Plants to Compare Incidence Rates of Laboratory-Confirmed COVID-19 in Their
586 Sewersheds. *Environ Sci Technol Lett.* 2021;8(5):398-404. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00184
- 587 26. Boehm AB, Wolfe MK, Wigginton KR, et al. Human viral nucleic acids concentrations in wastewater solids
588 from Central and Coastal California USA. *Sci Data.* 2023;10(1):396. doi:10.1038/s41597-023-02297-7
- 589 27. Kadonsky KF, Naughton CC, Susa M, et al. Expansion of wastewater-based disease surveillance to improve
590 health equity in California's Central Valley: sequential shifts in case-to-wastewater and hospitalization-to-
591 wastewater ratios. *Front Public Health.* 2023;11. Accessed November 21, 2023.
592 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1141097>
- 593 28. M. Pecson B, Darby E, N. Haas C, et al. Reproducibility and sensitivity of 36 methods to quantify the SARS-
594 CoV-2 genetic signal in raw wastewater: findings from an interlaboratory methods evaluation in the U.S.
595 *Environ Sci Water Res Technol.* 2021;7(3):504-520. doi:10.1039/D0EW00946F
- 596 29. Medina CY, Kadonsky KF, Roman FA, et al. The need of an environmental justice approach for wastewater
597 based epidemiology for rural and disadvantaged communities: A review in California. *Curr Opin Environ Sci*
598 *Health.* 2022;27:100348. doi:10.1016/j.coesh.2022.100348
- 599 30. Yu AT, Hughes B, Wolfe MK, et al. Estimating Relative Abundance of 2 SARS-CoV-2 Variants through
600 Wastewater Surveillance at 2 Large Metropolitan Sites, United States. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2022;28(5):940-947.
601 doi:10.3201/eid2805.212488

- 602 31. White LA, McCorvie R, Crow D, Jain S, León TM. Assessing the accuracy of California county level COVID-
603 19 hospitalization forecasts to inform public policy decision making. *BMC Public Health*. 2023;23(1):782.
604 doi:10.1186/s12889-023-15649-0
- 605 32. Evaluation of individual and ensemble probabilistic forecasts of COVID-19 mortality in the United States |
606 PNAS. Accessed November 21, 2023. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.2113561119>
- 607 33. Helwig N. npreg: Nonparametric Regression via Smoothing Splines. Published online 2022. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=npreg)
608 [project.org/package=npreg](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=npreg)
- 609 34. Gostic KM, McGough L, Baskerville EB, et al. Practical considerations for measuring the effective
610 reproductive number, Rt. *PLOS Comput Biol*. 2020;16(12):e1008409. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008409
- 611 35. Del Águila-Mejía J, Wallmann R, Calvo-Montes J, Rodríguez-Lozano J, Valle-Madrado T, Aginagalde-
612 Llorente A. Secondary Attack Rate, Transmission and Incubation Periods, and Serial Interval of SARS-CoV-2
613 Omicron Variant, Spain. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2022;28(6):1224-1228. doi:10.3201/eid2806.220158
- 614 36. Scire J, Huisman JS, Grosu A, et al. estimateR: an R package to estimate and monitor the effective reproductive
615 number. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2023;24(1):310. doi:10.1186/s12859-023-05428-4
- 616 37. Pierre-Yves Boelle, Obadia T. R0: Estimation of R0 and Real-Time Reproduction Number from Epidemics.
617 Published online 2023. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=R0>
- 618 38. Cauchemez S, Boëlle PY, Thomas G, Valleron AJ. Estimating in Real Time the Efficacy of Measures to
619 Control Emerging Communicable Diseases. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2006;164(6):591-597. doi:10.1093/aje/kwj274
- 620 39. Manica M, Bellis AD, Guzzetta G, et al. Intrinsic generation time of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant: An
621 observational study of household transmission. *Lancet Reg Health – Eur*. 2022;19.
622 doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2022.100446
- 623 40. Ahmadi J, Basiri E, Kundu D. Confidence and prediction intervals based on interpolated records. *J*
624 *Nonparametric Stat*. 2017;29(1):1-21. doi:10.1080/10485252.2016.1239826
- 625 41. Beutner E, Cramer E. Using linear interpolation to reduce the order of the coverage error of nonparametric
626 prediction intervals based on right-censored data. *J Multivar Anal*. 2014;129:95-109.
627 doi:10.1016/j.jmva.2014.04.007
- 628 42. Kuhn M. caret: Classification and Regression Training. Published online 2022. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=caret)
629 [project.org/package=caret](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=caret)
- 630 43. Hegazy N, Cowan A, D’Aoust PM, et al. Understanding the dynamic relation between wastewater SARS-CoV-
631 2 signal and clinical metrics throughout the pandemic. *Sci Total Environ*. 2022;853:158458.
632 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158458
- 633 44. Duvallet C, Wu F, McElroy KA, et al. Nationwide Trends in COVID-19 Cases and SARS-CoV-2 RNA
634 Wastewater Concentrations in the United States. *ACS EST Water*. 2022;2(11):1899-1909.
635 doi:10.1021/acsestwater.1c00434
- 636 45. Li L, Mazurowski L, Dewan A, et al. Longitudinal monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater using viral
637 genetic markers and the estimation of unconfirmed COVID-19 cases. *Sci Total Environ*. 2022;817:152958.
638 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.152958
- 639 46. Morvan M, Jacomo AL, Souque C, et al. An analysis of 45 large-scale wastewater sites in England to estimate
640 SARS-CoV-2 community prevalence. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13(1):4313. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-31753-y

- 641 47. Hoffmann T, Alsing J. *Faecal Shedding Models for SARS-CoV-2 RNA amongst Hospitalised Patients and*
642 *Implications for Wastewater-Based Epidemiology*. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2021.
643 doi:10.1101/2021.03.16.21253603
- 644 48. Crank K, Chen W, Bivins A, Lowry S, Bibby K. Contribution of SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding routes to RNA
645 loads in wastewater. *Sci Total Environ*. 2022;806:150376. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150376
- 646 49. Arts PJ, Kelly JD, Midgley CM, et al. Longitudinal and quantitative fecal shedding dynamics of SARS-CoV-2,
647 pepper mild mottle virus, and crAssphage. *mSphere*. 2023;8(4):e00132-23. doi:10.1128/msphere.00132-23
- 648 50. Topol A. *High Throughput Pre-Analytical Processing of Wastewater Settled Solids for SARS-CoV-2 RNA*
649 *Analyses V2*; 2021. doi:10.17504/protocols.io.b2kmqcu6
- 650 51. Sciences) AT (Verily L, Sciences) BW (Verily L, Michigan) KW (Univ, Boehm AB, marlene.wolfe. High
651 Throughput SARS-COV-2, PMMOV, and BCoV quantification in settled solids using digital RT-PCR.
652 Published online April 21, 2021. Accessed November 22, 2023. [https://www.protocols.io/view/high-](https://www.protocols.io/view/high-throughput-sars-cov-2-pmmov-and-bcov-quantifi-btywnpxe)
653 [throughput-sars-cov-2-pmmov-and-bcov-quantifi-btywnpxe](https://www.protocols.io/view/high-throughput-sars-cov-2-pmmov-and-bcov-quantifi-btywnpxe)
- 654 52. Boehm AB, Wolfe MK, White B, Hughes B, Duong D. Divergence of wastewater SARS-CoV-2 and reported
655 laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 incident case data coincident with wide-spread availability of at-home
656 COVID-19 antigen tests. *PeerJ*. 2023;11:e15631. doi:10.7717/peerj.15631
- 657

658 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

659
660 The wastewater sampling conducted through Method 1 was supported by gifts from the CDC Foundation and the
661 Sergey Brin Family Foundation to ABB. Additional research support for Method 2 were provided through a
662 philanthropic gift to the University of California, Davis. CDPH wastewater surveillance efforts are supported in part
663 by the Epidemiology and Laboratory Capacity for Infectious Diseases Cooperative Agreement (no.
664 6NU50CK000539-04-02) from CDC.

665 The authors sincerely thank the operators at Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plan, Esparto Wastewater
666 Treatment Facility, Woodland Water Pollution Control Facility, Winters Water Treatment Facility, City of Davis
667 Wastewater Treatment Plant, Modesto's Sutter Primary Treatment Facility, Turlock Regional Water Quality Control
668 Facility, Silicon Valley Clean Water, San Jose Santa Clara Regional Wastewater Facility, City of Sunnyvale Water
669 Pollution Control Plant, Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant, South County Regional Wastewater
670 Authority, Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant, and Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant for providing
671 wastewater samples.

672 The authors further thank the modeling and wastewater surveillance sections at CDPH for input and guidance on the
673 data sources and procedure for R_{ww} estimation outlined in this study.

674
675 **DATA SHARING**

676 All wastewater data used in this study is publicly accessible through the CA Open Data Portal at
677 <https://data.ca.gov/dataset/covid-19-wastewater-surveillance-data-california>. Models contributing to the CalCAT
678 ensemble also use data publicly accessible through the CA Open Data Portal, such as downloadable case counts,
679 hospitalizations, deaths and test positivity (<https://data.chhs.ca.gov/organization/california-department-of-public-health>). Sewershed-restricted COVID-19 case data reported to CDPH is not publicly available; readers should
680 contact the corresponding author with data requests.
681

682
683 **PUBLICATION POLICY DISCLAIMER**

684
685 The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views or
686 opinions of the California Department of Public Health or the California Health and Human Services Agency.
687

688 **TABLES**

689 **Table 1. Population and sampling characteristics of counties and wastewater treatment plants included in the**
 690 **analyses.**
 691

County	Wastewater Treatment Plant	Monitoring Lab	Population Served by WW Treatment Plant	County Population Size	Coverage	Median Weekly County Testing Rate (per 100,000)	WW Sample Type	Median WW Weekly Sampling Frequency	Total WW Samples
Sacramento	Sacramento	Method 1	1,480,000	1,570,000	0.94	1,160	Primary settled solids	7	366
San Francisco	San Francisco Southeast	Method 1	750,000	890,000	1	2,040	Primary settled solids	7	340
	San Francisco Oceanside	Method 1	250,000	890,000	1	2,040	Primary settled solids	7	354
Santa Clara	Palo Alto	Method 1	236,000	1,970,000	1	2,175	Primary settled solids	7	366
	Gilroy/Morgan Hill	Method 1	110,338	1,970,000	1	2,175	Primary settled solids	7	366
	San Jose	Method 1	1,500,000	1,970,000	1	2,175	Primary settled solids	7	366
	Sunnyvale	Method 1	153,000	1,970,000	1	2,175	Primary settled solids	7	362
Stanislaus	Modesto	Method 2: May 1 – Nov 30, 2022 Method 1: Dec 1, 2022 – May 1, 2023	230,000	550,000	0.57	1,090	Primary settled solids	Method 2: 4 Method 1: 3	198
	Turlock	Method 2: May 1 – Nov 30, 2022 Method 1: Dec 1, 2022 – May 1, 2023	86,000	550,000	0.57	1,090	Solids settled from 24-hour time-weighted composite influent	Method 2: 4 Method 1: 3	198

Yolo	Davis	Method 1	70,717	220,000	0.63	2,230	Primary settled solids	7	298
	Esparto	Method 2: May 1 – Nov 30, 2022 Method 1: Dec 1, 2022 – May 1, 2023	3,272	220,000	0.63	2,230	Solids settled from 24-hour time-weighted composite influent	Method 2: 4 Method 1: 3	186
	Winters	Method 2: May 1 – Nov 30, 2022 Method 1: Dec 1, 2022 – May 1, 2023	7,285	220,000	0.63	2,230	Solids settled from raw, composite wastewater from pump station	Method 2: 4 Method 1: 3	184
	Woodland	Method 2: May 1 – Nov 30, 2022 Method 1: Dec 1, 2022 – May 1, 2023	59,000	220,000	0.63	2,230	Solids settled from 24-hour time-weighted composite influent	Method 2: 4 Method 1: 3	196

692
693 Note: Counties and wastewater treatment plants included in this study were selected based on consistency in
694 laboratory methodology (Methods 1 and 2 both process wastewater settled solids and utilized laboratory protocols
695 designed to be similar), high (>50%) coverage (proportion of the county’s population that reside within sewersheds
696 contributing to wastewater monitoring data), and representation of diverse demographics (urban and rural). Samples
697 from six sites (Modesto, Merced, Turlock, Esparto, Winters, and Woodland) were processed via Method 2 for the
698 first part of the study period, followed by Method 1 for the remaining part of the study period. Abbreviations: WW,
699 wastewater
700
701

702 **Table 2. Key distribution parameters used in sewershed-level R_e estimation pipeline.**

Distribution	Purpose	Relevant R_e	Distribution Type	Mean (SD)	Distribution Parameters	Source
Generation time	Sewershed-restricted R_e estimation from input time series	R_{ww} ; sewershed-restricted R_{cc}	Gamma	6.84 (4.48)	Shape: 2.33 Scale: 2.93	Manica et al. ³⁹
Infection to shedding	Deconvolution of wastewater concentrations	R_{ww}	Gamma	5 (0.5)	Shape: 100 Scale: 0.05	Huisman et al. ¹⁷
Incubation period	Deconvolution of sewershed-restricted case counts	sewershed-restricted R_{cc}	Lognormal	3.1 (2.6)	Meanlog: 0.87 Sdlog: 0.73	Aguila-Mejia et al. ³⁵
Onset to NAAT result	Deconvolution of sewershed-restricted case counts	sewershed-restricted R_{cc}	Lognormal	3.35 (2.84)	Meanlog: 0.94 Sdlog: 0.73	CA cases line list

703
704 Note: Estimation of instantaneous and cohort sewershed-level R_e requires a user-specified generation time
705 distribution. Estimation also requires a time series input of incidence data indexed by date of infection. To index
706 both raw sewershed-restricted case counts and wastewater viral concentrations by date of infection, we performed
707 deconvolution. For cases, we deconvolved using two delay distributions. For wastewater, we deconvolved using a
708 single delay distribution optimized for San Jose, California. Abbreviations: NAAT, nucleic acid amplification test,
709 R_e , effective reproduction number; R_{ww} , sewershed-restricted, wastewater-based effective reproduction number; R_{cc} ,
710 case-based effective reproduction number; SD, standard deviation.
711
712

713 **Table 3. Comparative analyses of county-level R_{ww} and R_{cc} trajectories using mean absolute error and**
 714 **Spearman’s rank correlation.**

County	Type of R_{cc} estimate	MAE, Instantaneous R_{ww}	MAE, Cohort R_{ww}	Spearman’s ρ , Instantaneous R_{ww}	ρ p-value, Instantaneous R_{ww}	Spearman’s ρ , Cohort R_{ww}	ρ p-value, Cohort R_{ww}
Sacramento	Sewershed-restricted cases	0.082	0.072	0.719	3.20E-59	0.712	8.80E-58
	CalCAT ensemble	0.042	0.052	0.775	3.10E-74	0.621	2.30E-40
San Francisco	Sewershed-restricted cases	0.077	0.071	0.726	5.30E-61	0.754	3.10E-68
	CalCAT ensemble	0.025	0.031	0.936	3.80E-167	0.866	2.50E-111
Santa Clara	Sewershed-restricted cases	0.064	0.059	0.800	1.20E-82	0.823	5.50E-91
	CalCAT ensemble	0.028	0.043	0.843	9.10E-100	0.668	1.70E-48
Stanislaus	Sewershed-restricted cases	0.087	0.066	0.779	1.30E-75	0.873	1.60E-115
	CalCAT ensemble	0.052	0.065	0.775	2.20E-74	0.662	2.50E-47
Yolo	Sewershed-restricted cases	0.081	0.073	0.657	2.10E-46	0.658	1.30E-46
	CalCAT ensemble	0.016	0.019	0.891	3.20E-126	0.884	1.10E-121

715 Note: By calculating mean absolute errors and Spearman’s rank correlations, we compared the magnitude and
 716 direction of instantaneous and cohort R_{ww} models to two types of R_{cc} estimates: (1) a publicly available ensemble of
 717 county-wide R_{cc} estimates (“CalCAT ensemble”), and (2) a county-aggregated, sewershed-restricted R_{cc} . Reported p-
 718 values correspond to Spearman’s rank correlation, ρ (R_{ww} compared against R_{cc}). Abbreviations: R_{ww} , sewershed-
 719 restricted, wastewater-based effective reproduction number; R_{cc} , case-based effective reproduction number; MAE,
 720 mean absolute error; ρ (rho), Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient.

721
 722
 723

724 **Table 4. Summary metrics from multi-class confusion matrix analysis evaluating agreement between**
 725 **instantaneous R_{ww} and the CalCAT ensemble.**

County	R_e Classification	Overall Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	
							726
							727
Sacramento	0.7-0.9	0.87	0.73	0.89	0.17	0.99	728
	0.9-1.1	^a	0.87	0.84	0.97	0.51	729
	1.1-1.3		0.87	0.99	0.94	0.98	730
San Francisco	0.7-0.9	0.89	0.32	0.99	0.75	0.96	731
	0.9-1.1		0.93	0.64	0.95	0.57	732
	1.1-1.3		0.86	0.94	0.53	0.99	733
Santa Clara	0.7-0.9	0.90	0.75	0.95	0.32	0.99	734
	0.9-1.1		0.90	0.86	0.97	0.63	735
	1.1-1.3		0.89	0.97	0.79	0.98	736
Stanislaus	0.7-0.9	0.76	0.95	0.94	0.73	0.99	737
	0.9-1.1		0.78	0.79	0.89	0.63	738
	1.1-1.3		0.52	0.88	0.46	0.9	739
Yolo	0.7-0.9	0.96	0	1	^b NA	0.98	740
	0.9-1.1		0.99	0.48	0.97	0.85	741
	1.1-1.3		0.65	0.99	0.85	0.98	742

741 Note: We produced multi-class confusion matrices relating instantaneous R_{ww} to the CalCAT ensemble (real-time,
 742 ongoing R_{cc} estimates with relevance for statewide public health). R_e values were classified into transmission
 743 strength categories based on magnitude (<0.7-0.9, 0.9-1.1, 1.1-1.3, >1.3, which represent a strong decrease,
 744 decrease, stability, increase, and strong increase in transmission, respectively). The resulting sensitivity, specificity,
 745 positive predictive and negative predictive values for each R_e category are reported. The overall accuracy for each
 746 county-level R_{ww} is also reported. We did not report two R_e categories (< 0.7, >1.3), which had no observations
 747 during the study period. ^aAll gray boxes indicate values identical to the closest, previous non-zero entry within the
 748 same column. ^bNA entries correspond to R_e categories with zero R_{ww} predictions during the study period. R_e ,
 749 effective reproduction number; PPV, Positive Predictive Value; NPV, Negative Predictive Value.
 750

751
 752

753 **Table 5. Summary metrics from multi-class confusion matrix analysis evaluating agreement between cohort**
 754 **R_{ww} and the CalCAT ensemble.**

County	R_e Classification	Overall Accuracy	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	
	0.7-0.9	0.79	0	0.87	0	0.97	755
Sacramento	0.9-1.1	^a	0.84	0.46	0.91	0.31	756
	1.1-1.3		0.59	0.98	0.82	0.95	757
							758
San Francisco	0.7-0.9	0.85	0	1	^b NA	0.95	759
	0.9-1.1		0.93	0.28	0.9	0.38	760
	1.1-1.3		0.46	0.94	0.38	0.95	761
Santa Clara	0.7-0.9	0.82	0	0.95	0	0.97	762
	0.9-1.1		0.89	0.46	0.89	0.44	763
	1.1-1.3		0.57	0.95	0.63	0.94	764
Stanislaus	0.7-0.9	0.64	0.54	0.89	0.48	0.91	765
	0.9-1.1		0.70	0.56	0.77	0.47	766
	1.1-1.3		0.5	0.86	0.41	0.9	767
Yolo	0.7-0.9	0.94	0	1	NA	0.98	768
	0.9-1.1		0.99	0.17	0.95	0.67	769
	1.1-1.3		0.24	0.99	0.67	0.96	770

770 Note: We produced multi-class confusion matrices relating instantaneous R_{ww} to the CalCAT ensemble (real-time,
 771 ongoing R_{cc} estimates with relevance for statewide public health). R_e values were classified into transmission
 772 strength categories based on magnitude (<0.7-0.9, 0.9-1.1, 1.1-1.3, >1.3, which represent a strong decrease,
 773 decrease, stability, increase, and strong increase in R_e , respectively). The resulting sensitivity, specificity, positive
 774 predictive and negative predictive values for each R_e category are reported. The overall accuracy for each county-
 775 level R_{ww} is also reported. We did not report two R_e categories (< 0.7, >1.3), which had no observations during the
 776 study period. ^aAll gray boxes indicate values identical to the closest, previous non-zero entry within the same
 777 column. ^bNA entries correspond to R_e categories with zero R_{ww} values during the study period. R_e , effective
 778 reproduction number; PPV, Positive Predictive Value; NPV, Negative Predictive Value.
 779

780
 781

782 **Table 6. Comparison of R_c temporality via cross correlations.**

County	R_{cc}	Lag (Days), Instantaneous R_{ww}	Lag (Days), Cohort R_{ww}	CC, Instantaneous R_{ww}	CC, Cohort R_{ww}
Sacramento	Sewershed-restricted cases	[-3, 4]	[-4, 3]	[0.65, 0.7]	[0.67, 0.72]
	CalCAT ensemble	[-8, 2]	[-15, -4]	[0.72, 0.77]	[0.69, 0.73]
San Francisco	Sewershed-restricted cases	[0, 8]	[0, 10]	[0.73, 0.77]	[0.76, 0.80]
	CalCAT ensemble	[-4, 2]	[-11, 0]	[0.87, 0.92]	[0.84, 0.89]
Santa Clara	Sewershed-restricted cases	[-2, 3]	[-3, 4]	[0.84, 0.87]	[0.84, 0.89]
	CalCAT ensemble	[-8, 1]	[-16, -6]	[0.84, 0.88]	[0.8, 0.84]
Stanislaus	Sewershed-restricted cases	[4, 10]	[-1, 7]	[0.72, 0.76]	[0.81, 0.85]
	CalCAT ensemble	[-6, 2]	[-15, -6]	[0.73, 0.76]	[0.78, 0.83]
Yolo	Sewershed-restricted cases	[-2, 9]	[-2, 10]	[0.68, 0.73]	[0.68, 0.73]
	CalCAT ensemble	[-5, 3]	[-9, 1]	[0.88, 0.93]	[0.84, 0.89]

783

784 Note: Using cross-correlation analysis with a maximum lag of 20 days, we investigated temporal alignment of R_{ww}
785 (cohort or instantaneous) and R_{cc} . R_{cc} included either the CalCAT ensemble – a publicly available ensemble of
786 county-wide R_{cc} estimates – or county-aggregated, sewershed-restricted R_{cc} estimates. We report the range of time
787 lags for cross-correlation coefficients within 0.05 of the maximum observed correlation value. We also include the
788 range of cross-correlation coefficients within 0.05 of the maximum observed correlation value. Negative lag values
789 indicate R_{ww} temporally precedes R_{cc} ; positive lag values indicate R_{cc} temporally precedes R_{ww} ; lag values of zero
790 indicate no temporal shift of R_{ww} with respect to R_{cc} . R_{ww} , sewershed-restricted, wastewater-based effective
791 reproduction number; R_{cc} , case-based effective reproduction number; CC, cross-correlation coefficient

792 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

793

794 **Figure 1. Map of sewersheds included in analysis.**

795 The geographical boundaries of sewersheds (a wastewater treatment plant's catchment area) selected for the present
796 study are highlighted in blue. Each sewershed's respective county is outlined in black. Three of the five studied
797 counties (San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Yolo) are illustrated; maps of the remaining counties (Sacramento and
798 Stanislaus) are included in the Supplemental Material.

799

800 **Figure 2. Stepwise process of county-aggregated, sewershed-restricted R_e estimation for a single location.**

801 Using San Francisco as an example, we demonstrate our stepwise pipeline for estimating county-aggregated,
802 sewershed-restricted R_e . Each column represents a single wastewater treatment plant within the county. The left
803 column corresponds to San Francisco Oceanside, which surveils 28% of the total county population; the right
804 column corresponds to San Francisco Southeast, which surveils 84% of the total county population. Detailed axes
805 are excluded for this generic, representation of the R_e estimation process. (A) The pipeline begins with raw,
806 sewershed-restricted time series data; in our study, input data includes case counts (pink) and wastewater viral
807 concentrations (blue). (B) In Step 1, raw time series data are transformed: case counts are LOESS smoothed, while
808 wastewater concentrations are spline smoothed and root transformed. Transformed data are subsequently
809 deconvolved, shifting both time series' backwards temporally such that observations are indexed by date of
810 infection. (C) In Step 2, the methods of Cori et al.¹ and Wallinga and Teunis²² are applied on the modified time
811 series data streams to produce instantaneous and cohort sewershed-level R_e estimates. (D) Finally, in Step 4,
812 sewershed-level R_e estimates are population-weighted and aggregated to yield county-level R_e estimates. Note: WW,
813 wastewater surveillance data; R_e , effective reproduction number; Model, R_e modeling approach (instantaneous or
814 cohort).

815

816 **Figure 3. Time series of county-aggregated, sewershed-restricted R_e for Santa Clara, San Francisco, and Yolo.**

817 Between May 1, 2022 and April 30, 2023, three county-level R_e time series are compared: (top, black) the CalCAT
818 ensemble – a publicly available ensemble of county-wide R_{cc} estimates; (middle, pink) county-aggregated,
819 sewershed-restricted R_{cc} ; and (bottom, blue) R_{ww} . Both R_{ww} and sewershed-restricted R_{cc} were calculated using the R_e
820 estimation pipeline piloted in this study. Solid pink or blue lines indicate instantaneous R_e , while dashed pink or blue
821 lines indicate cohort R_e . 95% confidence intervals for each R_e type (instantaneous or cohort) are depicted. Results for
822 three of five studied counties (San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Yolo) are included; results for the remaining counties
823 (Sacramento and Stanislaus) are included in the Supplemental Material. Note: R_{ww} , sewershed-restricted,
824 wastewater-based effective reproduction number; R_{cc} , case-based effective reproduction number.

825


826 **Figure 4. Frequency of agreement between R_{ww} and the CalCAT ensemble for Santa Clara, San Francisco
827 and Yolo.**

828 Based on magnitude, R_e values were classified into transmission strength categories (<0.7-0.9, 0.9-1.1, 1.1-1.3, >1.3,
829 which represent a strong decrease, decrease, stability, increase, and strong increase in R_e , respectively). Frequency of
830 agreement between R_{ww} and the CalCAT ensemble (i.e., instances when predicted R_{ww} values and reference CalCAT
831 ensemble values belong to the same R_e category) are visualized by the confusion matrix. The right column illustrates
832 results for cohort R_{ww} , and the left for instantaneous R_{ww} . Each row represents a single county. The counter diagonals
833 (top right to bottom left) of each matrix represents true positives. Off-diagonal values indicate instances of
834 disagreement between R_{ww} model predictions and the CalCAT ensemble. Two R_e categories ($R_e < 0.7$, $R_e > 1.3$) with
835 no R_e values during the study period were excluded. Results for three of five studied counties (San Francisco, Santa
836 Clara, and Yolo) are included; results for the remaining counties (Sacramento and Stanislaus) are included in the
837 Supplemental Material. Note: R_{ww} , sewershed-restricted, wastewater-based effective reproduction number;
838 Instantaneous, instantaneous R_{ww} ; Cohort, cohort R_{ww} .


839

Yolo

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.02.24306456>; this version posted May 3, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



Santa Clara



San Francisco





San Francisco

Oceanside (28%)



Southeast (84%)

(A) STEP 0: Raw data (sewershed-level)


medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.02.24306456>; this version posted May 3, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#).




(B) STEP 1: Data transformation (sewershed-level)



(C) STEP 2: Produce R_e (sewershed-level)



(D) STEP 3: Produce county-level R_e via population weighting



Data Type • Sewershed-restricted cases • WW
Model — Instantaneous - - Cohort

San Francisco

Santa Clara

Yolo

