Comparing Wastewater-Based and Case-Based R_t Estimates of SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in Georgia Using Generalized Linear Mixed Models

2025-10-24

Authors:

Seth Edmunds[1*], Doug Landsittel[1,3], Marco Ajelli[2a], Maria Litinova[1a]

Affiliations:

[1] Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Indiana University School of Public Health, Bloomington, IN, USA
[2] Laboratory for Computational Epidemiology and Public Health, Indiana University School of Public Health, Bloomington, IN, USA
[3] Department of Biostatistics, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, USA

[*]Corresponding Author, [a] Co-senior Author

Email: shedmund@iu.edu

Word count: 2985

Keywords: wastewater surveillance; reproduction number; GLMM; SARS-CoV-2; Georgia

Abbreviations: WBE: Wastewater-based epidemiology; WWTP: Wastewater treatment plant; GLMM: Generalized linear mixed model; Rt: Effective reproduction number; DPH: Department of Public Health; CDC: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; HHS: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; PCR: Polymerase chain reaction; RT-qPCR: Reverse transcription quantitative polymerase chain reaction; dPCR: Digital polymerase chain reaction; IQR: Interquartile range; MAD: Median absolute deviation; CI: Confidence interval.

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted limitations in case-based surveillance due to inconsistent testing and reporting. Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) has emerged as a promising alternative for tracking SARS-CoV-2 transmission, capturing both symptomatic and asymptomatic infections. The aim of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of WBE in estimating the effective reproduction number (R_t) of SARS-CoV-2 in Georgia. We used a Generalized Linear Mixed Model to analyze viral concentration data from multiple wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) collected between June 1, 2022 and December 15, 2022. After controlling for flow rates and other spatiotemporal differences between the plants, residuals from the model were used to estimate wastewater-based R_t. It then was compared to case-based R_t estimates using Spearman correlations. The two R_t estimates generally aligned across most sites, with stronger correlations in areas with higher case counts (Spearman correlations ranging from 0.29 to 0.88, $p < 0.001$). The two estimates reflected the increases and decreases in transmission within two weeks of each other with wastewater being a potentially more sensitive surveillance instrument for transmission trend. These findings suggest that WBE is a reliable tool for estimating SARS-CoV-2 transmissibility and can complement traditional surveillance methods for a more comprehensive public health response.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic has underscored the need for effective surveillance systems to monitor disease transmission at the population level. Initially, case-based surveillance was critical for tracking the spread of COVID-19. However, fluctuations in testing rates and the loosening of reporting guidelines gradually undermined its reliability. By late 2022, the shift by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to aggregate weekly case and death reporting, instead of daily updates, further reduced the precision of data used for public health monitoring. This change was intended to reduce the reporting burden on states and maximize resource efficiency, but it also made it more challenging to monitor localized trends effectively. After the expiration of the public health emergency on May 11, 2023, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) could no longer require laboratories to submit COVID-19 testing results, and as of May 1, 2024, hospitals will no longer be required to report COVID-19 cases (Silk 2023). To address these limitations, alternative surveillance methods are needed to monitor disease transmission effectively at the population level.

In response to these challenges, wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) has re-emerged as a promising alternative, providing a non-invasive, scalable method to track viral RNA in community wastewater, capturing both symptomatic and asymptomatic infections. WBE offers a unique opportunity to supplement traditional case-based surveillance, particularly in its potential to detect rises in community transmission earlier and provide a more real-time picture of viral prevalence. Because wastewater surveillance occurs at the community level, it mitigates biases caused by uneven access to testing and underreporting, making WBE especially valuable in regions with limited healthcare infrastructure or inconsistent clinical testing (Huisman et al. 2022; Zheng et al. 2024).

With the rise of at-home COVID-19 testing—which is not reportable—comparing wastewater-based and clinical estimates of the effective reproduction number (R_t) has become increasingly important for understanding transmission dynamics. Epidemiologic models now leverage wastewater data alongside clinical testing to estimate transmission dynamics more comprehensively (Safford et al. 2022). By tracking SARS-CoV-2 RNA across entire populations, WBE provides a robust signal that is less influenced by biases in clinical data, such as uneven testing access or reporting delays (Nourbakhsh et al. 2022).

The aim of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of wastewater-based epidemiology in estimating the effective reproduction number (R_t) of SARS-CoV-2, using it as a case study to assess how wastewater data can enhance the monitoring of transmission dynamics. This study focuses on wastewater data collected between June 1 and December 15, 2022—a period marked by relatively consistent clinical surveillance, allowing for a direct comparison of R_t estimates from both sources. To compare these estimates, we apply a Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM), adjusting for temporal trends and sewershed variability. This approach allows us to capture transmission dynamics and assess the potential of WBE as a complementary tool to traditional case-based methods for monitoring SARS-CoV-2 (Ungar 2022; Silk 2023).

Methods

Data Collection

Wastewater Data Sources

WWTP employees collected twice-weekly wastewater samples, which were shipped to two university laboratories for analysis. Viral RNA concentrations were quantified using PCR, specifically targeting the N2 gene for its widespread use and comparable performance to the N1 target. RT-qPCR was used at WWTP 9 following the method detailed by Lott et al. (2023) due to logistical constraints, while dPCR, preferred for its higher sensitivity to low viral concentrations, was used at all other sites following the protocol described by Sablon et al. (2022) (Lott et al. 2023; Sablon et al. 2022). Flow rate data were collected using either composite (multiple samples collected over time) or grab (single sample collected at a specific point

in time) methods (Antkiewicz et al. 2024). Concurrent flow rates were recorded to account for variability in wastewater volume.

Case Data Sources

Case data were received from routine provider and electronic laboratory reports, which were stored by the Department of Public Health (DPH) within an electronic disease reporting system. Residential addresses were geocoded to obtain XY coordinates. Sewershed shapefiles were provided by the facilities.

Data Processing

Case Data Processing

Cases were assigned to sewersheds based on geocoded residential addresses and the spatial overlap with sewershed boundaries. Epidemic curves were generated using either the date of symptom onset or, if unavailable, the date of the first positive specimen (including asymptomatic cases). Missing daily case counts were imputed using Kalman filtering to provide smoothed estimates, ensuring the preservation of temporal sequences while handling reporting fluctuations. Data were restricted to the study period from June 1, 2022, to December 31, 2023, and the processed case data were used in conjunction with wastewater viral concentrations for analysis.

Wastewater Data Processing

Outliers in wastewater viral concentrations and flow rates were detected using the Interquartile Range (IQR) method, with outliers replaced by the median to reduce their influence on downstream analysis. This method was selected based on a sensitivity analysis comparing various outlier detection techniques, including Median Absolute Deviation (MAD). Missing data were interpolated using Kalman filtering, chosen for its performance relative to linear and spline interpolation methods. (Miyazawa et al. 2024; Narci et al. 2021) Both viral concentrations and flow rates were log-transformed to stabilize variance and normalize the data distribution. Comparisons of raw and processed data are presented in Table 3 in the Appendix.

Statistical Modeling

Model Specification

A Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) was employed (type I set to α=0.05) to analyze viral concentrations in wastewater, with both fixed and random effects to capture the hierarchical and temporal structure of the data. The fixed effects included time and flow rate, while the random effects accounted for site-level variability across WWTPs. Model diagnostics were conducted to confirm that the residuals mostly followed expected distributions, and the fixed and random effects were statistically significant. By accounting for both site-specific and time-based variability, the model provided a flexible framework for analyzing viral transmission dynamics. (DazaTorres et al. 2024; Graaf et al. 2023)

$$\log(Y_{it}) = \text{time}_{it} + \log(\text{flow_rate}_{it}) + (1|\text{WWTP}_i) + \epsilon_{it}$$

Where:

- Y_{it} is the viral concentration in wastewater at time t for WWTP i.
- time_{it} is a daily time variable to account for temporal trends.
- flow_rate_{it} is the flow rate of wastewater at time t for WWTP i.

- $(1|\text{WWTP}_i)$ are the random intercept for each WWTP, capturing area-specific variations.
- ϵ_{it} is the residual error term.

Since both viral concentrations and flow rates were log-transformed during preprocessing, no further transformations were necessary. This approach allows for the estimation of overall trends and localized deviations while accommodating the nested data structure. Model diagnostics, including residual analysis and checks for the validity of random effects, confirmed that the model met key assumptions.

Residual Extraction and Smoothing

Residuals from the GLMM were extracted to capture variability in viral concentrations not explained by the fixed effects of time and flow rate. Random effects allowed us to avoid the need to scale individual plant data. As the result, the model residuals allow us to detect shifts in transmission trend that may be influenced by dynamic factors such as the epidemic growth. To smooth short-term fluctuations and reduce noise, a 14-day rolling average was applied, a window commonly used in epidemiology to balance trend detection with noise reduction. This approach ensures that critical transmission patterns are preserved while minimizing the impact of daily fluctuations.

Estimation of the Effective Reproduction Number (Rt)

Rt Calculation

The R_t was calculated using the *EpiEstim* package in R. (Nash et al. 2023) The analysis employed a parametric serial interval distribution with a mean of 3.19 days (95% CI: 2.95–3.43), consistent with known SARS-CoV-2 transmission characteristics. (Xu et al. 2023) Two estimates of R_t were calculated: one from case-based surveillance and the other from the wastewater GLMM residuals. Both were smoothed using a 14-day rolling average to account for short-term reporting fluctuations and noise. (Huisman et al. 2022; Zheng et al. 2024)

Sensitivity Analysis: Rolling Average Window

A sensitivity analysis was performed to determine the optimal rolling average window for smoothing both case-based and wastewater-based R_t estimates. Windows ranging from 3 to 30 days were evaluated, with the primary criterion being the ability to reduce noise while preserving key transmission trends. The 14-day window was selected as it offered the best balance between noise reduction and trend visibility. While longer windows further reduced noise, they tended to mask important shifts in transmission dynamics, particularly during periods of rapid change, making them less suitable for this analysis. (Wannigama et al. 2023)

Estimate Alignment

To evaluate the reliability and consistency of wastewater-based R_t estimates, we analyzed the correlation between wastewater-based and case-based R_t by using Spearman correlation coefficients. This comparison was conducted for the data before the end of December, when a significant shift in case-based reporting requirements occurred and case surveillance data became less consistent. The alignment between wastewater-based and case-based R_t estimates was assessed using confidence intervals, with a high degree of overlap indicating statistical agreement. The robustness of the GLMM residuals in capturing transmission dynamics was evaluated by comparing their trends with case-based R_t estimates and reported case counts. (Rezaeitavabe et al. 2024)

Results

The initial dataset comprised 294 observations for both PCR target average concentration and flow rate measurements across eight WWTPs. After data preprocessing, which included outlier handling and missing

data imputation, the number of observations increased to 1,043. Detailed statistics on preprocessing outcomes are presented in Appendix A. A total of 749 data points (71.8% of the dataset) were imputed using Kalman smoothing to create continuous daily time series for each WWTP. Kalman smoothing was employed because it effectively estimates missing values in time series data by modeling the underlying stochastic processes. This method accounts for variability by incorporating both the observed data and the process noise, allowing for more accurate and smoothed estimates of the true signal amidst measurement uncertainties and fluctuations. (Narci et al. 2021)

Table 1. Core Statistics of R_t Estimates and Correlations Across Sites.

Sewershed	Duration (days)	Total Cases	Median R_t (Case)	Median R_t (WW)	Spearman Correlation	P-Value
WWTP 5	183	1647	1.02	1.03	0.81	<0.001
WWTP 6	32	154	1.05	1.27	-0.09	0.645
WWTP 8	197	1157	1.01	1.03	0.53	<0.001
WWTP 3	197	2740	0.99	1.00	0.29	<0.001
WWTP 2	32	1079	1.12	1.21	0.76	<0.001
WWTP 1	197	16225	1.00	1.01	0.67	<0.001
WWTP 9	197	516	1.06	1.02	-0.11	0.124
WWTP 10	32	66	1.05	1.28	-0.04	0.833

An overview of the R_t estimates derived from both case-based and wastewater-based surveillance is provided in Table 1. This table includes the duration of data collection, total case counts, median R_t values, and Spearman correlation coefficients across the eight wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). All statistically significant results illustrate notable positive correlation between the two R_t estimations, with the highest correlation being observed for WWTP5 (0.81, $p < 0.001$) and the lowest for WWTP3 (0.29, $p < 0.001$). The results (Table 1) show that the duration of observation has a lower impact on the statistical significance and the strength of the correlation that the average number of cases (Figure 1). In fact, no statistically significant correlation is observed for WWTP 9 despite its data collection duration being comparable to WWTP 1. In general, the wastewater-based estimation shows no statistically significant correlation for all WWTPs with less than 5 daily cases on average. For those WWTPs, however, the trends are extremely similar between the two methods but due to low variability are not captured by the Spearman correlation.

Figure 1: Correlation Between Average Case Rate and Spearman Coefficient by WWTP



Overview of Rt Estimates Across All Sites

Table 2. Percent of Days with R_t Confidence Intervals Above or Below 1.

Sewershed	Case-Based 95% CI		Case-Based 50% CI		Wastewater-Based 95% CI		Wastewater-Based 50% CI	
	% Days >1	% Days <1	% Days >1	% Days <1	% Days >1	% Days <1	% Days >1	% Days <1
WWTP 5	0.56	1.13	18.64	11.30	36.16	15.82	52.54	36.16
WWTP 6	3.85	0.00	7.69	0.00	84.62	0.00	92.31	0.00
WWTP 8	0.52	0.00	7.85	7.33	19.37	12.04	52.88	27.75
WWTP 3	0.52	0.00	11.52	17.82	14.14	13.52	35.44	35.15
WWTP 2	38.46	0.00	84.62	0.00	80.77	0.00	92.31	0.00
WWTP 1	9.42	18.32	24.61	34.03	30.89	10.99	43.46	37.17
WWTP 9	0.52	0.00	9.42	4.19	13.66	1.05	47.12	13.61
WWTP 10	0.00	0.00	7.69	0.00	61.54	23.08	69.23	26.92

Table 2 illustrates the percentage of days on which lower and upper bounds of the R_t confidence intervals (CIs) were either above or below the epidemic threshold (1.0). This metric, however, is not as consistent for the two methods as the correlation of the mean estimates.

Detailed Analysis of Representative Sites

The wastewater-based and case-based R_t estimates were analyzed across five representative sites with total case incidence greater than 1,000 cases during the study period. Each site exhibits unique patterns in transmission dynamics, as captured by the two surveillance methods.

Figure 2. Comparison of Wastewater-Based and Case-Based R_t Estimates for WWTP 1



At WWTP 1, the wastewater-based and case-based R_t estimates closely tracked from June through August, both peaking in mid-July, which aligns with the peak in case incidence (Figure 2). By late August, both estimates fell below the threshold of 1.0. From mid-October onward, the wastewater-based R_t began to rise above 1.0 earlier than the case-based R_t, which crossed above 1.0 in November.

Figure 3. Comparison of Wastewater-Based and Case-Based R_t Estimates for WWTP 3



In WWTP 3, the wastewater-based estimates sometimes lagged behind peaks in the case-based R_t (Figure 3). In mid-October, the wastewater-based R_t rose to between 1.1 and 1.3, with narrower confidence intervals, while the case-based estimates had wider confidence intervals that encompassed the threshold of 1.0.

Figure 4. Comparison of Wastewater-Based and Case-Based R_t Estimates for WWTP 5



For WWTP 5, the wastewater-based R_t initially aligned with case-based trends during early summer, with values above 1.0 (Figure 4). In mid-September, the wastewater-based R_t decreased below 0.8 ahead of similar trends in the case-based data. A subsequent increase in the wastewater-based R_t in mid-October preceded a rise in cases.

Figure 5. Comparison of Wastewater-Based and Case-Based R_t Estimates for WWTP 8



At WWTP 8, the wastewater-based R_t remained above 1.0 from early July, with brief dips (Figure 5). The case-based R_t showed similar trends but with delays compared to the wastewater data.

Figure 6. Comparison of Wastewater-Based and Case-Based R_t Estimates for WWTP 2



At WWTP 2, over the shorter study period, the wastewater-based R_t remained consistently above 1.0, while the case-based R_t rose above 1.0 in early December (Figure 6). An initial peak in the wastewater data was identified as an artifact.

Discussion

Our analyses revealed that wastewater-based R_t estimates provided similar indications of changes in transmission compared to case-based estimates. In most cases, the two estimates reflected the increases and decreases in transmission within two weeks of each other. This suggests that wastewater surveillance can serve as a timely indicator of community transmission dynamics and be a critical tool of surveillance in the absence of a systematic case-based surveillance. As a result, this study is advancing the field of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance by providing a method to understand sewershed-level changes in the transmission and a more granular view of community-level transmission.

Despite the strengths of this study, certain limitations should be acknowledged. A significant portion of the dataset required imputation using Kalman smoothing that can introduce some uncertainty into the R_t estimates. However, Kalman smoothing relies on modeling underlying stochastic processes and allows us not only create a continuous dataset essential for understanding dynamic processes, but also accounts for variability. Additionally, the assignment of COVID-19 cases to sewersheds was based on patient resident

address which may underestimate the transmission potential if a significant amount of shedding took place elsewhere.

Future studies could enhance geolocation accuracy by incorporating additional data sources or methods, such as mobile phone data or utility usage patterns, to better align cases with their corresponding sewersheds. These limitations highlight areas for further improvement but do not diminish the study's key findings. Wastewater-based R_t estimates consistently provided similar indications of transmission changes with respect to case-based surveillance. This timely detection capability is crucial for enabling swift public health interventions and underscores the importance of integrating wastewater surveillance.

Future research may benefit from expanding the scalability of wastewater surveillance to larger geographic areas, such as counties or clusters of WWTPs. Evaluating whether multiple WWTPs within a region capture consistent spatiotemporal patterns of transmission would provide insight into how wastewater data could be aggregated to represent broader population trends more effectively. Additionally, investigating the integration of wastewater data with regional epidemiologic models could enhance real-time monitoring and intervention strategies. As wastewater surveillance becomes an increasingly valuable tool for public health monitoring, integrating these data with regional models will be crucial. In a world where infectious disease threats are likely to continue, wastewater data offers an adaptable, population-level surveillance mechanism that can fill gaps left by traditional testing and reporting systems. This study contributes to the growing evidence supporting the utility of wastewater surveillance in monitoring infectious diseases and highlights its potential role in future public health strategies.

Acknowledgments

We thank the Georgia Department of Public Health for providing access to county-level COVID-19 case data.

Declaration of interest

None declared.

Data and Code Availability

Code scripts can be found here: https://github.com/sethmund/wastewater_glmm

Data is available upon request from GADPH.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: SE, MA, ML, DL. Methodology: SE, ML, DL. Formal analysis: SE. Supervision: DL, MA, ML. Writing – original draft: SE. Writing – review & editing: all authors. All authors approved the final manuscript.

References

Antkiewicz, Dagmara S., Kayley H. Janssen, Adélaïde Roguet, Hannah E. Pilch, Rebecca B. Fahney, Paige A. Mullen, Griffin N. Knuth, et al. 2024. "Wastewater-Based Protocols for SARS-CoV-2: Insights into Virus Concentration, Extraction, and Quantitation Methods from Two Years of Public Health Surveillance." *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology* 10 (8): 1766–84. https://doi.org/10.1039/D3EW00958K.

DazaTorres, Maria L., J. Cricelio Montesinos-López, Heather N. Bischel, Colleen C. Naughton, Angel N. Desai, Marlene K. Wolfe, Alexandria B. Boehm, and Miriam Nuño. 2024. "A Mixed-Effects Model to Predict COVID-19 Hospitalizations Using Wastewater Surveillance." *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering* 12 (2): 112485. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2024.112485.

Graaf, Miranda de, Jeroen Langeveld, Johan Post, Christian Carrizosa, Eelco Franz, Ray W. Izquierdo-Lara, Goffe Elsinga, et al. 2023. "Capturing the SARS-CoV-2 Infection Pyramid Within the Municipality of Rotterdam Using Longitudinal Sewage Surveillance." *The Science of the Total Environment* 883 (July): 163599. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.163599.

Huisman, Jana S., Jérémie Scire, Lea Caduff, Xavier Fernandez-Cassi, Pravin Ganesanandamoorthy, Anina Kull, Andreas Scheidegger, et al. 2022. "Wastewater-Based Estimation of the Effective Reproductive Number of SARS-CoV-2." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 130 (5): 057011. https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP10050.

Lott, Megan E J, William A Norfolk, Cody A Dailey, Amelia M Foley, Carolina Melendez-Declet, Megan J Robertson, Stephen L Rathbun, and Erin K Lipp. 2023. "Direct Wastewater Extraction as a Simple and Effective Method for SARS-CoV-2 Surveillance and COVID-19 Community-Level Monitoring." *FEMS Microbes* 4 (January): xtad004. https://doi.org/10.1093/femsmc/xtad004.

Miyazawa, Shogo, Ting Sam Wong, Genta Ito, Ryo Iwamoto, Kozo Watanabe, Michiel van Boven, Jacco Wallinga, and Fuminari Miura. 2024. "Wastewater-Based Reproduction Numbers and Projections of COVID-19 Cases in Three Areas in Japan, November 2021 to December 2022." *Eurosurveillance* 29 (8): 2300277. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2024.29.8.2300277.

Narci, Romain, Maud Delattre, Catherine Larédo, and Elisabeta Vergu. 2021. "Inference for Partially Observed Epidemic Dynamics Guided by Kalman Filtering Techniques." *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 164 (December): 107319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2021.107319.

Nash, Rebecca K., Samir Bhatt, Anne Cori, and Pierre Nouvellet. 2023. "Estimating the Epidemic Reproduction Number from Temporally Aggregated Incidence Data: A Statistical Modelling Approach and Software Tool." *PLOS Computational Biology* 19 (8): e1011439. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1011439.

Nourbakhsh, Shokoofeh, Aamir Fazil, Michael Li, Chand S. Mangat, Shelley W. Peterson, Jade Daigle, Stacie Langner, et al. 2022. "A Wastewater-Based Epidemic Model for SARS-CoV-2 with Application to Three Canadian Cities." *Epidemics* 39 (June): 100560. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2022.100560.

Rezaeitavabe, Fatemeh, Mehdi Rezaie, Maria Modayil, Tuyen Pham, Gillian Ice, Guy Riefler, and Karen T. Coschigano. 2024. "Beyond Linear Regression: Modeling COVID-19 Clinical Cases with Wastewater Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 for the City of Athens and Ohio University Campus." *Science of The Total Environment* 912 (February): 169028. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.169028.

Sablon, Orlando, Jamie VanTassell, Julia Raymond, Marlene Wolfe, Pengbo Liu, and Christine Moe. 2022. "Nanotrap® KingFisher™ Concentration/Extraction & MagMAX KingFisher™ Extraction." https://www.protocols.io/view/nanotrap-kingfisher-concentration-extraction-amp-m-b2nkqdcw.

Safford, Hannah, Rogelio E. Zuniga-Montanez, Minji Kim, Xiaoliu Wu, Lifeng Wei, James Sharpnack, Karen Shapiro, and Heather N. Bischel. 2022. "Wastewater-Based Epidemiology for COVID-19: Handling qPCR Nondetects and Comparing Spatially Granular Wastewater and Clinical Data Trends." *ACS ES&T Water* 2 (11): 2114–24. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsestwater.2c00053.

Silk, Benjamin J. 2023. "COVID-19 Surveillance After Expiration of the Public Health Emergency Declarationunited States, May 11, 2023." *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 72. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7219e1.

Ungar. 2022. "Pandemic Gets Tougher to Track as COVID Testing Plunges." https://apnews.com/article/covid-us-testing-decline-14bf5b0901260b063e4fa444633f4d31.

Wannigama, Dhammika Leshan, Mohan Amarasiri, Parichart Hongsing, Cameron Hurst, Charin Modchang,

Sudarat Chadsuthi, Suparinthon Anupong, et al. 2023. "COVID-19 monitoring with sparse sampling of sewered and non-sewered wastewater in urban and rural communities." *iScience* 26 (7): 107019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2023.107019.

Zheng, Xiawan, Kathy Leung, Xiaoqing Xu, Yu Deng, Yulin Zhang, Xi Chen, Chung In Yau, et al. 2024. "Wastewater Surveillance Provides Spatiotemporal SARS-CoV-2 Infection Dynamics." *Engineering*, March. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eng.2024.01.016.

Appendix

Table 3

Summary of PCR Data Processing by Site

Processing	WWTP	Mean	Median	SD	Min	Max	IQR
Before	WWTP 1	275567.57	262200.00	183275.40	30768	718320.0	289602.00
After	WWTP 1	273994.45	270000.00	158919.01	30768	718320.0	257634.75
Before	WWTP 2	148761.60	105636.00	111029.72	33288	400320.0	138450.00
After	WWTP 2	151976.45	132499.56	74113.50	33288	400320.0	106920.06
Before	WWTP 3	154226.50	127512.00	131326.58	2568	564720.0	135426.00
After	WWTP 3	125056.12	126522.59	63318.11	2568	343680.0	113520.25
Before	WWTP 5	298434.82	266400.00	250634.09	7656	870480.0	423948.00
After	WWTP 5	293611.31	266400.00	215000.23	7656	870480.0	422698.50
Before	WWTP 6	410628.00	265776.00	440561.65	15312	1264560.0	656886.00
After	WWTP 6	557677.41	599405.71	385081.82	15312	1264560.0	755942.00
Before	WWTP 8	242032.58	220056.00	170878.01	17280	858480.0	204192.00
After	WWTP 8	230775.09	224565.24	127439.25	17280	590880.0	193128.00
Before	WWTP 9	358856.32	265719.50	330413.66	3430	1930000.0	268250.00
After	WWTP 9	287822.60	282892.61	112508.64	3430	725277.5	122300.91
Before	WWTP 10	70096.80	78012.00	47083.93	11592	142752.0	84126.00
After	WWTP 10	68307.33	72079.96	34165.03	11592	142752.0	57982.46

Summary of Flow Rate Data Processing by Site

Processing	WWTP	Mean	Median	SD	Min	Max	IQR
Before	WWTP 1	136274760	136274760	9466965.7	117347710	166558040	7570820.0
After	WWTP 1	136710713	136274760	3265984.5	128703940	151416400	4338306.1
Before	WWTP 2	93113515	94635250	17185416.8	68137380	128703940	21009025.5
After	WWTP 2	91422972	93330654	13170412.0	68137380	128703940	20343919.0
Before	WWTP 3	42924972	41639510	6082644.9	34068690	64351970	7570820.0
After	WWTP 3	42440991	41677483	3468922.3	34068690	52995740	3470340.3
Before	WWTP 5	8795511	8706443	584417.5	7192279	10599148	757082.0
After	WWTP 5	8760782	8706443	278733.6	7949361	9842066	419320.2
Before	WWTP 6	15217348	15141640	1878350.1	11734771	17791427	2176610.8
After	WWTP 6	15559818	15526695	1268328.0	11734771	17791427	1874083.0
Before	WWTP 8	6380136	6435197	388355.3	6056656	7570820	378541.0
After	WWTP 8	6307407	6305598	113990.1	6056656	6813738	135739.7
Before	WWTP 9	21378453	21463275	2682107.0	16617950	32440964	2309100.1
After	WWTP 9	21068991	21116996	1477037.8	16617950	24150916	1956811.1
Before	WWTP 10	9084984	8895714	1921921.6	5299574	11356230	2839057.5
After	WWTP 10	8982859	8698193	1715826.7	5299574	11356230	2915457.4

Comparison of Wastewater-Based and Case-Based R_t Estimates for WWTP 6



Comparison of Wastewater-Based and Case-Based R_t Estimates for WWTP 9



Comparison of Wastewater-Based and Case-Based R_t Estimates for WWTP 10