Application of wastewater and environmental surveillance for pathogenic agents during the 2024 National Football League (NFL) Draft in Detroit, Michigan (USA)

Ryland Corchis-Scott[1], Ethan Harrop[1], Qiudi Geng[1], Mackenzie Beach[1], John Norton[2], Mehdi Aloosh[3,4], Thomas Reid[5], Rajesh Seth[6], Christopher G. Weisener[1], and R. Michael McKay[1]

Author affiliations:

[1]University of Windsor, Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research, Windsor, Ontario, Canada

[2]Great Lakes Water Authority, Detroit, MI, United States

[3]Windsor-Essex County Health Unit, Windsor, Ontario, Canada

[4]Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario

[5]Environment and Climate Change Canada, Canada Centre for Inland Waters, Burlington, Ontario, Canada

[6]University of Windsor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Windsor, Ontario, Canada

Corresponding author: Ryland Corchis-Scott, Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research, University of Windsor, 401 Sunset Ave., Windsor, ON, Canada N9B 3P4; corchisr@uwindsor.ca, 519-991-3493

Abstract

Mass gatherings pose a concern for public health because they are associated with dense crowds, increased social interaction, and travel, all of which can facilitate the rapid transmission of infectious diseases. Wastewater and environmental surveillance (WES) were used for pathogen monitoring during the 2024 NFL Annual Player Selection Meeting (the 'Draft') in Detroit, MI, an event that drew an estimated 775,000 attendees. Wastewater and environmental samples were queried for respiratory viruses and clinically relevant antimicrobial resistance genes (ARG). WES did not detect an increase in the concentration of monitored respiratory viruses (SARS-CoV-2, IAV, IBV, and RSV) associated with the 2024 NFL Draft. In contrast, WES detected a transient increase in carbapenemase targets in wastewater, primarily driven by a fourfold increase in bla_{OXA-48}. Resistome structure in wastewater was dominated by sampling site characteristics rather than changes associated with the event. The Draft weekend coincided with rainfall-driven combined sewer overflow (CSO), potentially allowing the dissemination of ARG to the environment. In surface waters receiving wastewater effluent, an increase in detection frequency and normalized concentrations for multiple ARG were observed following the Draft. WES provided an overview of pathogen prevalence before, during, and after a large-scale gathering, showing how it can warn of emerging health risks in near real time.

Introduction

Analysis of wastewater can provide information that accurately reflects infectious diseases dynamics[1–3] by integrating signals from symptomatic, subclinical, and asymptomatic individuals[4–7]. Wastewater and environmental surveillance (WES) is not a new discipline, but it has experienced a renaissance following its successful implementation during the COVID-19 pandemic[8–10]. Increased interest in WES has been driven by the numerous advantages it offers, including correlation with clinical metrics[11–17], cost-effectiveness[18–21], independence from test-seeking behaviour or availability of testing infrastructure[22], scalability from building to city levels[14,23–25], and timeliness with near real-time data generation[12,26,27].

An emerging application of WES is infectious diseases surveillance during mass gatherings[28]. Mass gatherings are typically large, planned events that concentrate individuals from diverse geographies into dense settings with high mobility, conditions that facilitate the transmission of infectious diseases[29]. Mass gatherings pose a challenge to epidemiological disease tracking due to travel and increased likelihood of rapid transmission. Disease surveillance before, during and after events allows for rapid response to widespread transmission following disease detection[28,30]. WES offers an effective means by which populations may be monitored surrounding large-scale gatherings such as sporting events[31–33].

Prior applications of WES to mass gatherings have targeted SARS-CoV-2 to monitor transmission of COVID-19 and include the 2020 Tokyo Olympics[34], the Two Oceans Marathon in South Africa[35], and the 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar[36]. Recent festival-based monitoring in New Orleans, LA, expanded the application of WES to mass gatherings, where it was implemented to target Mpox transmission[37]. Beyond respiratory viruses, surveillance of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) via antimicrobial resistance genes (ARGs) is gaining traction, given public health relevance and the potential for dissemination facilitated by mass gatherings[38]. Antimicrobial-resistant organisms (AROs) are also targets of expanded WES[39,40] with surveillance focused on the presence of specific ARGs of public health significance[41]. Monitoring has been established as a critical step in addressing the proliferation of AMR[42] with efforts having been made to test for the presence and level of ARGs at wastewater treatment facilities[39,43,44]. Exacerbating the threat of AMR are rainfall-driven combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and bypass events that can introduce partially treated effluent into receiving waters, increasing environmental ARG loads.

WES may be implemented through a OneHealth framework that considers the movement of organisms and resistance determinants between humans, infrastructure, and natural systems[45]. Wastewater is a critical connection between these systems and thus surveillance implemented here captures both human population dynamics and pathways for dissemination to the environment. Mass gatherings increase population density and can strain sanitation infrastructure. WES implemented during these events is opportune for

advancing knowledge of disease trajectories in human population and ARG dissemination in the environment.

The 2024 NFL Draft was held in Detroit, MI from April 25-27, 2024 with events concentrated in an area with an approximate radius of 1 km near the riverfront in downtown Detroit. This event drew approximately 775,000 individuals to the city of Detroit[46,47] of which an estimated 30% travelled more than 160 km to attend the event. Visitors to Detroit included people from over 20 different nations and all 50 states, with some individuals coming from as far afield as Australia[48]. Almost all of Detroit's 45,140 hotel rooms were occupied for the Draft weekend, with spillover absorbed by neighbouring Windsor, ON, a region separated from Detroit by a river and high-traffic international land border.

Here, we used the 2024 NFL Draft as a natural experiment to explore WES utility for mass gatherings across two domains: (1) respiratory pathogens in wastewater; and (2) public health relevant ARGs, with emphasis on carbapenemases, in wastewater and the Detroit River, an environmental reservoir for wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) effluent. We also compared multiplex RT-qPCR with a nanofluidic OpenArray® platform to assess method agreement across matrices. We hypothesized that respiratory signals would not increase immediately given the primarily outdoor nature, late-season timing of the event, and its brevity (in comparison to the incubation of respiratory viruses). We also expected that ARGs could show transient changes, and that heavy rainfall coincident with the Draft could elevate environmental ARG detections due to CSO and/or bypass activity.

Methods

Site information

Sampling sites included five wastewater treatment facilities and a surface water transect of the Detroit River with six sample collection sites (Figure 1). The Draft weekend coincided with a wet weather period in the Windsor-Detroit region, with approximately 40 mm of rain falling over a 48 h period (Sunday-Tuesday)[49]. This influx of precipitation contributed to CSO events where partially treated WWTP effluent and diluted raw sewage was discharged into the Detroit River or its tributaries from both sides of the Canda-USA border[50].

106 Wastewater treatment facilities were identified as potentially impacted by the NFL Draft or
107 as control sites based on proximity (Table 1). Additional site information can be found in S1.

108 **Sample collection**

109 Untreated wastewater influent was collected from each of the wastewater treatment
110 facilities included in the study at different weekly frequencies (Table 1) with daily sampling
111 between April 24-29 from each of the three interceptors (NIEA, OAK, and JEFF) of the Great
112 Lakes Water Authority Water Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF) as well as the WWTP plant
113 (WEWTP) in Windsor, ON. All samples were transported directly to the laboratory in coolers
114 on ice and processed upon arrival. Surface water grab samples (2 L) were collected in
115 duplicate from each site in the Detroit River transect (Figure 1). Environmental samples
116 were collected on April 25, prior to the 2024 NFL Draft, and on April 29 following the end of
117 the event.

118 **Sample processing**

119 Influent samples collected from WWTPs were concentrated by filtering between 60-120 mL
120 through 0.22 µm Sterivex PES cartridge filters (MilliporeSigma, Burlington, MA). River water
121 samples were likewise concentrated by passing 500-800 mL of water through cartridge
122 filters. Immediately following filtration, the filters were sealed and flash-frozen through
123 immersion in liquid nitrogen, with filters stored at -80°C before nucleic acid extraction.
124 Total nucleic acids were extracted from filters using the AllPrep PowerViral DNA/RNA kit
125 (Qiagen, Germantown, MD) with the addition of 5% (v/v) 2-mercaptoethanol to the lysis
126 buffer. Nucleic acids were eluted in 50 µL of RNAse-free water. Samples were not treated
127 with DNase upon extraction. Extracted nucleic acids were stored in LoBind tubes at -80°C.

128 **RT-qPCR assays for quantification of respiratory viruses and carbapenemase genes**

129 Respiratory viruses, select carbapenemase genes and Pepper Mild Mottle Virus (PMMoV)
130 were quantified using established RT-qPCR assays. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
131 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), influenza A virus (IAV), influenza B virus (IBV), and respiratory
132 syncytial virus (RSV) were the respiratory viruses measured. PMMoV, a human fecal

133 indicator[51] and established wastewater surveillance normalizing agent[52], was used to
134 normalize the wastewater signal for targets measured using RT-qPCR assays.
135 Carbapenemase genes, including bla_{KPC}, bla_{NDM}, bla_{OXA-48}, bla_{VIM}, and bla_{VIM7} were measured
136 using two multiplexed assays[44]. All targets were measured in at least technical triplicate.
137 Standard curves were generated using serial dilution of synthetic RNA or DNA controls.
138 Inhibition was assessed using an internal amplification control, and template RNA was
139 diluted to overcome inhibition. Negative controls were included with each RT-qPCR run.
140 Detailed RT-qPCR methods are described in S2.

141 **Development of the nanofluidic qPCR card using TaqMan® assays in the OpenArray ®**
142 **platform**

143 Assays for the quantification of clinically important and locally relevant ARGs and genes
144 associated with mobile genetic elements (MGEs) were selected for inclusion on the
145 OpenArray® card (Table 2). The OpenArray® card also included assays for 16S rRNA and
146 crAssphage to allow normalization and act as controls. Assays were selected from the
147 literature and optimized for TaqMan chemistry. The resulting nanofluidic RT-qPCR card was
148 used to analyze samples in technical duplicate in 33nL reactions on a Quant Studio 12K
149 Flex Real-Time PCR System (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA). A 7-point standard
150 curve, created through a serial dilution of pooled gBlocks™ (Integrated DNA Technologies,
151 Coralville, IA), was run on each OpenArray ® plate. Assay performance met established
152 technical standards for RT-qPCR. Full assay design and nanofluidic qPCR methods can be
153 found in S3.1 and S3.2.

154 **Statistical methods**

155 Data analysis was performed in R (version 4.5.1)[53] with data manipulation and visualization
156 relying on the *tidyverse* suite of packages[54]. Multiple different measurement techniques
157 were employed in this investigation, leading to the creation of five distinct datasets.
158 Statistical analyses were conducted separately for each dataset due to differences in
159 sampling frequency, sample matrix, availability of covariate data, data distribution, and
160 response variable. All analyses tested changes in wastewater and environmental

occurrence of pathogens associated with the mass gathering of 2024 NFL Draft attendees and the co-occurring CSO event.

Interrupted time series (ITS) analysis

To test if the 2024 NFL Draft coincided with altered concentrations of respiratory pathogens or carbapenemase genes in wastewater, we fit Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) using the *glmmTMB* package. Independent analyses were conducted on "affected" and "control" sites for a quasi-experimental design. Model specification followed a segmented regression framework with a binary "event" variable (modelling immediate event-related changes) and a "post-time" variable (more gradual event-related changes). Models controlled for a variety of covariates (pH, temperature, flow, precipitation, etc.) and temporal autocorrelation was addressed via an autoregressive term for all targets and seasonal harmonics for respiratory virus response variables. A Tweedie distribution with a log link was used for continuous zero-inflated viral pathogen concentration data. A Gamma distribution with a log link was used for individual carbapenemase gene concentration data, while a Tweedie distribution was used for the composite measure of all assayed carbapenemase genes. To account for multiple testing, p-values were adjusted using the Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) False Discovery Rate (FDR) method. Adjustment was performed independently for respiratory viruses and carbapenemase genes and for "control" and "affected" sites. Details can be found in S4.1 and S4.2.

Multivariate resistome characterization

The Open Array nanofluidic RT-qPCR card was used to measure a subset of samples collected from WWTPs during the month surrounding the 2024 NFL Draft. ARG concentrations were normalized to the concentration of crAssphage and subjected to fourth root transformation. Data was split into the uneven groups ("before", "during" and "after") relative to the timing of the 2024 NFL Draft. Characterization of the resistome was carried out with Non-Metric Multidimensional Scaling (NMDS) using Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrices. A marginal Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance (PERMANOVA) was then run on the data to partition sources of variation, and a distance-

189 based redundancy analysis was used for visualization of variance partitioning. A
190 Permutational Analysis of Multivariate Dispersions (PERMDISP) was used to test if
191 observed differences arose from differences in resistome or within-group variance. A
192 principal component analysis (PCA) was run to identify ARGs driving variability. Finally, JEFF
193 was analyzed alone as it drains the NFL Draft location. A Kruskal-Wallis test was used to
194 determine if concentration differences existed between the "before", "during" and "after"
195 groupings for the measured ARGs. The p-values were adjusted for multiple comparisons
196 using the Benjamini-Hochberg method. Details can be found in S4.3.

197 **Environmental detection**

198 To determine if the CSO events altered the occurrence of carbapenemase genes in the
199 Detroit River, detection frequencies were calculated for each carbapenemase gene in the
200 pre- and post- CSO transects. Fisher's exact test was used to compare the detection
201 frequency. Additionally, a paired Wilcoxon signed-rank test was performed to evaluate
202 concentration changes for PMMoV normalized bla_{KPC} between the pre- and post CSO
203 samplings.

204 To determine if the CSO and mass gathering event led to either changes in abundance or
205 detection frequency for additional ARGs, data produced by the Open Array nanofluidic RT-
206 qPCR card were employed. Data were normalized to 16S rRNA concentrations and log-
207 transformed before quantitative analysis. Detection frequencies were also calculated for
208 both the pre- and post- CSO groupings. Changes to detection frequency were assessed
209 using a GLMM with a binomial distribution and logit link function. To prevent complete
210 separation, ARGs that were constitutively detected or undetected in either the pre-CSO or
211 post-CSO grouping were excluded from logistic regression. The main GLMM included ARG
212 identity, sampling group (pre/post CSO) and the interaction of the two as fixed effects.
213 Random intercepts and slopes for groups nested within sites were also included to
214 account for differences between sites. Post-hoc comparisons were conducted using
215 estimated marginal means. A second GLMM was conducted with site and sample grouping
216 as fixed effects and gene as a random intercept to directly investigate site heterogeneity.

217 Quantitative abundance differences between pre- and post-CSO sample groupings were
218 tested using paired Wilcoxon signed rank tests with pairings assigned by site identity and
219 ARG. A sensitivity analysis was performed to identify the influence of potential detection
220 saturation in samples collected at a known WWTP outlet. To account for multiple
221 comparisons, p-values were adjusted using the Benjamini-Hochberg method to control
222 FDR. Model diagnostics were assessed using simulated residuals in the *DHARMa* package.
223 Details can be found in S4.4 and S4.5.

224 **Method comparison**

225 OpenArray® assays were compared with established RT-qPCR assays using a subset of
226 wastewater and environmental samples that were analyzed by both methods (n=42).
227 Comparison was limited to assays for bla_{KPC}, bla_{NDM}, and bla_{OXA-48} as they were shared
228 between the OpenArray® and the multiplexed RT-qPCR assays. Qualitative agreement was
229 evaluated using Cohen's Kappa and detection frequency comparisons. Quantitative
230 agreement was determined through Bland-Altman analysis to calculate 95% limits of
231 agreement (LoA). Additional quantitative measures of method comparison included
232 Passing-Bablok regression, Deming regression, spearman correlation, Pearson correlation
233 and calculation of concordance correlation coefficients (CCC). Details can be found in
234 S4.6.

235 **Results**

236 **Respiratory pathogen dynamics**

237 ITS analysis showed no event-associated increase in wastewater concentrations of
238 SARS-CoV-2, IAV, IBV, or RSV at monitored sites. IBV showed a post-event decline (β=-
239 0.356, SE=0.143, p= 0.035), consistent with seasonal-tapering rather than event impact
240 (Figure 2). Variability in respiratory virus concentrations in wastewater was driven by
241 dilution and seasonality. Concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 were negatively associated with
242 flow (β=–0.288, SE=0.115, p = 0.035) and positively associated with PMMoV concentration
243 (β = 0.379; SE=0.065, p < 0.001), consistent with dilution. Likewise, IAV concentration in
244 wastewater was negatively predicted by flow (β=-0.467, SE=0.160, p = 0.012), consistent

with dilution. However, IAV concentrations were positively predicted by precipitation (β=0.317, SE=0.079, p<0.001). RSV concentrations were positively associated with PMMoV (β= 0.455, SE= 0. 141, p = 0.005) while IAV was a negative predictor (β= -0.318, SE= 0.128 p = 0.035). Precipitation was positively associated with IBV concentration (β=0.345, SE=0.138, p = 0.035) while flow was negatively associated (β=-0.924, SE=0.284, p = 0.005). Finally, IBV was found to be positively associated with IAV concentration (β=0.814, SE=0.244, p = 0.004).

Parallel analysis at control sites showed no event effects. The GLMM run for SARS-CoV-2 did not detect any stepwise increase in SARS-CoV-2 concentration or change in trend associated with the Draft. However, LRT indicated that the inclusion of "event" and "post time" parameters improved model fit (Table S10). Sensitivity analysis and visualization of the data indicate that this is due to noise in the N2 concentration at TB (Figure 3, Table 3). The detection of a marginal, site-specific fluctuation at a control location demonstrates sensitivity to minor background variance in the approach, reinforcing the validity of the null results observed at affected site cluster. This contrast confirms that while the modelling framework can identify localized shifts, no such signal was generated by the mass gathering event.

Carbapenemase gene concentration in wastewater

ITS analysis indicated a statistically significant increase in the composite measure of carbapenemase gene concentrations concurrent with the 2024 NFL Draft (β=0.625, SE=0.290, p=0.031). An ~87% increase in combined ARG burden could be observed following the Draft weekend (Figure 4). However, the event did not lead to a change in the trend for the ARG composite index as the post-event temporal trend variable was non-significant (p = 0.96). ITS for individual carbapenemase genes revealed that the increase was primarily driven by a spike in normalized wastewater concentration for bla_{OXA-48} (β=1.38, SE=0.374, p=0.006), which increased by ~400% following the Draft (Figure 5). A parallel increase in bla_{KPC} concentration (β=0.447, SE=0.212, p=0.035) did not survive FDR correction (p=0.18). ITS for bla_{NDM}, bla_{VIM}, and bla_{VIM7} indicate that the 2024 NFL Draft did not

273 significantly impact normalized ARG concentration despite event estimates all indicating
274 post-event increases. Flow was a significant positive predictor of ARG concentration
275 across 4 of 5 gene targets (Table S14). Higher flows were consistently associated with
276 increased normalized ARG concentrations.

277 **Resistome variability**

278 Characterization of the resistome with NMDS revealed samples collected from the same
279 site clustered regardless of sample collection time in relation to the 2024 NFL Draft
280 (stress= 0.068; Figure 6). The marginal PERMANOVA corroborated the NMDS visualization,
281 indicating that site identity explained 61% of variance in resistome (R^2 = 0.611, $F_{3,16}$= 9.30, p
282 = 0.001) while collection period was statistically insignificant (R^2 = 0.033, $F_{2,16}$= 0.76, p =
283 0.531). The PERMDISP showed that these differences were not a result of heterogeneity of
284 variance with no difference in dispersion between groups ($F_{2,19}$ = 0.90, p = 0.421) or site
285 identities ($F_{3,18}$ = 1.55, p = 0.236). The first two principal components of the PCA accounted
286 for 78% of the variance. The highest loadings for PC1 were *int1*, *sul1*, *aac(6')-Ib-cr*, *tet(A)*,
287 *sul2*, *mphA, qnrs*, *dfrA1*, bla_{OXA-48}, and bla_{TEM}. The top PC1 loadings had the same sign,
288 indicating the top contributors varied together across collection sites (Figure 7). The
289 Kruskal-Wallis test for JEFF revealed no significant difference in concentration for any ARG
290 in the "before", "during", or "after" groups.

291 **Environmental dissemination of ARGs**

292 Detection frequencies for bla_{KPC}, bla_{OXA-48} and bla_{VIM7} rose nominally in the post-Draft
293 transect. However, detection frequency increases were non-significant for all
294 carbapenemase genes. A paired Wilcoxon signed-rank test for PMMoV normalized bla_{KPC}
295 indicated an increased median concentration between the pre- and post CSO samplings (V
296 = 614, p<0.001). Heterogeneity in effect could be observed between sites (Table 5, Figure
297 8). Detection frequencies were also calculated for ARGs included on the OpenArray® for
298 both the pre- and post- CSO groupings. Detection frequency increased following the Draft
299 weekend for 62.5% of ARGs assayed (Figure 9).

The binomial GLMM showed that sample collection timing had a significant effect on the probability of *crAssphage* detection (Estimate = 11.46, p = 0.0008), suggesting that the 2024 NFL Draft and CSO greatly increased detection probability. Additionally, the fitted model had high levels of variance for the random intercept (σ^2 = 62.07, SD=7.88) and the random slope for the "after" group (σ^2 =6.36, SD=2.52), indicating large differences in baseline detection probabilities and Draft effect between sites. Interaction terms between ARG and sampling group were not statistically significant, indicating that the relative magnitude of the post-Draft increase did not differ significantly among genes. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons for each gene included in the model found that detection probability increased for 6 genes including: *crAssphage, AAC(6')-lb-cr, qnRS, tetA, mph(A),* and bla_{KPC}. (Table S26). Increased detection probability post-Draft was corroborated by the paired Wilcoxon signed-rank test. Ten ARGs displayed statistically significant increases in concentration following the event, with no ARGs showing a significant decrease in abundance (Table S29).

The GLMM investigating site heterogeneity identified PO as the site with the highest detection probability, consistent with a point source of pollution (Table S30). An additional 4 ARGs showed statistically significant increases in concentration when the PO site was removed from the Wilcoxon signed-rank test (Table S33), suggesting that constitutively high ARG concentration at PO was masking significant increases in ARG concentration at other sites (Figure 10).

Method comparison

In wastewater, detection was 100% for all targets shared across platforms. In environmental samples, OpenArray showed lower sensitivity, missing low abundance targets detected by RT-qPCR (Table 6). Bland-Altman analysis showed that bla_{KPC} had the narrowest LoA with bla_{NDM} and bla_{OXA-48} having wider LoAs (Figure S19). Both bla_{KPC} and bla_{NDM} had positive bias while bla_{OXA-48} showed negative bias. Fold change analysis showed similar results, with the OpenArray having higher measurements in wastewater samples for bla_{KPC} and bla_{NDM} but lower for *blaOXA-48* (Figure S20).

The strength of monotonic agreement between the results of the OpenArray and RT-qPCR varied by target with the strongest agreement for bla_{KPC} and weakest for bla_{OXA-48} (Table 7). Pasing-Pablok and Demming regression revealed proportional bias for all targets (slopes >1.0), and large negative intercepts (Table S34). This pattern indicates a relative underestimation of ARG concentrations by the OpenArray® at lower analyte concentrations, transitioning to a relative overestimation at higher analyte concentrations.

CCC was the highest for bla_{KPC} (CCC=0.94) and lower for bla_{NDM} (CCC = 0.88) and bla_{OXA-48} (CCC=0.75) (Table 7). Only bla_{KPC} demonstrated substantial methodological agreement between platforms based on previously determined criteria[55].

Discussion

This study supports the utility of WES for monitoring and assessing the impact of mass gatherings on the spread of viral pathogens and antibiotic resistance genes. The 2024 NFL Draft served as a natural experiment. We measured the concentrations of public health relevant ARGs and seasonal respiratory pathogens in wastewater and in the Detroit River, which receives treated effluent from the Detroit-Windsor metropolitan region. WES detected no surge in respiratory viruses associated with the event, yet identified a transient, event-coincident rise in bla_{OXA-48} in wastewater and broader ARG increases in surface waters during a concurrent wet-weather period with confirmed CSOs. A broad assessment of ARG concentrations in wastewater conducted over a limited timescale found that variability in the wastewater resistome was driven by site-level heterogeneity, potentially arising from differences in antimicrobial use between sewersheds.

Viral pathogens

The 2024 NFL Draft did not act as a superspreader event for respiratory pathogens. Concentrations of SARS-CoV-2, IAV, IBV, and RSV remained steady or declined following the event. No evidence of increased transmission was observed despite the substantial increase in population in the monitored sewersheds and the mass gathering with increased transmission risk. Multiple factors may have contributed to the observed lack of increased transmission. The Draft was held outdoors and in large, well-ventilated buildings. This

356 would have helped to limit the potential for aerosol transmission despite the large
357 crowds[56]. Additionally, the Draft was held following the peak of the respiratory season in the
358 northern hemisphere. Immunity for the most relevant strains of respiratory virus was likely
359 high (acquired via infection or inoculation). The wastewater signal for most of the
360 monitored pathogens was already low, indicating that prevalence was already low,
361 reducing the probable number of infectious individuals attending Draft-related events. The
362 lack of immediate increase in signal over the Draft weekend may be related to the relatively
363 short duration of the Draft (~3 days) in comparison with viral incubation times (~5-6 days)[57].
364 The brevity of the mass gathering may not have allowed sufficient time for incubation or
365 widespread transmission. Our analysis also indicated that Draft related transmission was
366 low, with no significant increases in wastewater signal for any pathogens following the
367 event. A recent study of religious gatherings in Saudi Arabia corroborates this result,
368 reporting that infection control implemented for the 2022 Hajj resulted in few cases of
369 COVID-19 and no secondary transmission or outbreaks[58]. These findings demonstrate that
370 large numbers of individuals can congregate without unreasonably increased risk of
371 transmission if the gatherings occur outside of respiratory seasons or proper precautions
372 to mitigate spread are implemented. The absence of a detectable signal does not imply
373 complete absence of transmission; it does, however, suggest that the mass gathering event
374 did not lead to a widespread increase in cases. Lack of extensive transmission is an
375 important finding that can inform public health decision-making and provide feedback on
376 event timing and the types of transmission mitigation strategies employed. Additionally,
377 detection of transmission would be valuable for informed rapid action, especially when
378 clinical case reporting is not feasible or delayed.

379 **Event-associated increases in carbapenemase genes**

380 Unlike the monitored respiratory viruses, carbapenemase genes increased measurably
381 following the mass gathering, driven by a large increase in bla_{OXA-48} signal. The mass
382 gathering event and influx of visitors were associated with a transient spike in the
383 concentration of a clinically important ARG in the wastewater system. A lack of increase in
384 any carbapenemase gene concentration at the spatially distinct control sites increases the

385 likelihood that Draft-related travel was responsible for the increase rather than seasonal
386 variability in ARG concentration. The increase in bla_{OXA-48} observed in the present study may
387 be partially explained by Draft attendees arriving from regions where OXA-48-like
388 carbapenemases are more prevalent. These include parts of Europe, Africa, and the Middle
389 East[59]. International travel is an important driver of the dissemination of OXA-48-like
390 carbapenemases[60,61] and in non-endemic areas, infections are often imported, though this
391 modality may be changing[62]. Our results indicated that the increase in bla_{OXA-48} was
392 transient with no evidence of a sustained increase. However, the large increase in bla_{OXA-48}
393 concentration was notable, especially given that the baseline ARG signal was highly
394 variable. This demonstrates that WES for ARGs may be sensitive to short term
395 perturbations and that mass gatherings may induce short term changes in load for select
396 ARGs. Wastewater flow was found to be a significant positive predictor of normalized ARG
397 concentration, potentially a result of surface inputs to the sewer system or the mobilization
398 of sewer biofilms[63,64].

399 **Stable resistome with site-level heterogeneity**

400 Multivariate analysis consistently indicated that the resistome structure in wastewater was
401 dominated by sampling site characteristics rather than changes associated with the 2024
402 NFL Draft. This suggests that the influx of visitors during the 2024 NFL Draft did not
403 significantly affect the resistome of the monitored sites in a way that was detectable in this
404 analysis. Likely, sewershed level drivers such as population demographics, hospital
405 effluent volumes, land use characteristics (i.e., amount of animal agriculture), and
406 antibiotic prescription rates played a key role in determining the resistome. This was further
407 supported by PCA loadings, which were dominated by common markers of anthropogenic
408 pollution, like *int1* and *sul1*[65,66]. These ARGs co-varied across sites and sampling periods,
409 indicating that the variation was driven by baseline pollution levels. Most PC1 loadings had
410 the same sign, supporting the notion of covariance of ARGs being driven by variability in
411 baseline pollution. ARG concentrations at the JEFF interceptor (the sampling site most
412 closely linked to Draft activities) were not influenced by the Draft.

413 Conclusions from this analysis must be interpreted with caution as group sizes were
414 uneven, sample sizes were small, and the study period was short. Combined, these limit
415 the statistical power of the current analyses to detect relatively small changes in ARG
416 concentration. Additionally, the OpenArray® has few targets compared to the diversity of
417 ARGs, limiting our ability to detect ARGs that may have been introduced by the Draft.
418 Incorporation of ultra deep metagenomic sequencing may allow for the detection of novel,
419 and low-abundance ARGs[67]. Longer-term data would help to confirm any Draft-associated
420 changes. The results of this study are not generalizable. Mass gathering events still have
421 the potential to contribute to ARG dissemination, especially if they are associated with
422 travel between jurisdictions with different antimicrobial prescribing practices.

423 **Environmental dissemination of ARGs**

424 Analyses revealed an increase in detection frequency and normalized concentration for
425 multiple ARGs in the Detroit River following the 2024 NFL Draft weekend. The Draft event
426 coincided with heavy precipitation, driving a CSO event. Detection probability increased for
427 clinically relevant ARGs including: *AAC(6')-Ib-cr, qnRS, tetA, mph(A),* and bla_{KPC}. These
428 ARGs are associated with a variety of antimicrobial agents, indicating broad, rather than
429 targeted increases in ARG detection following the Draft weekend. No gene × group
430 interaction terms were significant in the GLMM, suggesting that the magnitude of the
431 increase was consistent between targets. The rise in crAssphage concentrations in the
432 post-Draft environmental samples and uniformity of detection probability increases across
433 gene targets indicate that sewage contamination from the CSO is a major cause of the
434 observed increase in ARG detections and abundance in the environmental samples. CSO
435 events in isolation have been found to increase environmental concentrations of ARGs[68,69].
436 Mass gathering events can contribute to increased wastewater volumes and ARG loads[70].
437 However, given that OpenArray® -based analysis of wastewater samples did not detect a
438 statistically significant increase in ARG concentrations attributable to the NFL Draft, the
439 observed increase in ARG in the environment was likely caused by the rainfall-driven CSO
440 events. The coincidence of the mass gathering event and the CSO may have introduced

441 ARGs to the environment, imported to the region by event attendees, thus altering the
442 watershed resistome. Such alterations have been observed in previous studies[71].

443 Heterogeneity was observed among the sites of the sampling transect, with site-specific
444 responses to the CSO and mass gathering. Samples collected at the outlet of the WEWTP
445 exhibited evidence of saturated detection, accompanied by the highest normalized ARG
446 concentrations. These findings support that the WWTP outlet was a major source of ARGs
447 in the receiving waters with constitutively high ARG concentrations. Inclusion of samples
448 collected at the point source in data analysis obscured more subtle changes in ARG
449 concentrations at other sites. This observation indicates the importance of site selection
450 and highlights the complexity of interpretation for WES data in systems that are influenced
451 by persistent inputs. In these systems, measuring baseline contamination levels is
452 inherently challenging. Findings also indicated that the influence of the CSO was not
453 limited to the pollution source. Increased concentrations of ARGs were found at the site
454 upstream of the known WWTP outlet as well as the downstream sites. This observation
455 could be explained by environmental sewage contamination originating from CSO events
456 that occurred upstream within the Huron-Erie Corridor. Mass gatherings may increase the
457 consequences of rainfall events in combined sewer systems, leading to alterations in the
458 resistome of the receiving waters. Such alterations may have consequences for
459 downstream utilization of water resources[72].

460 Limitations of this analysis arise from the restricted temporal sampling and reliance on RT-
461 qPCR for ARG measurement. RT-qPCR cannot detect which pathogen is hosting an ARG or
462 if they are hosted on mobile genetic elements. Future work should incorporate longer-term
463 monitoring efforts, hydrological modelling for better source tracking and should include
464 metagenomic sequencing to help resolve ARG host identity.

465 **Comparison between OpenArray® and RT-qPCR**

466 Comparison of the OpenArray ®and RT-qPCR quantification of three carbapenemase genes
467 across two sample matrices ascertained the validity of the OpenArray® platform for ARG
468 surveillance. The OpenArray® can be used for ARG trend assessment in concentrated

469 wastewater matrices, but it is not directly quantitatively interchangeable with RT-qPCR,
470 due to lower sample volumes. Agreement between the two methods was dependent on
471 ARG abundance in the sample measured. Concordance between methods was 100% in
472 high-concentration wastewater samples but was poor for environmental samples.
473 Disagreement arose from non-detects by the OpenArray® rather than quantitative
474 disagreement between methods. This observation is consistent with the approximately
475 600-fold smaller reaction volume (33nL vs 20µL) for the OpenArray®, which lowers
476 detection probability at low copy numbers. Thus, the OpenArray® has limited utility for
477 environmental monitoring without upstream concentration in the workflow[73–75].

478 Assessment of quantitative agreement between OpenArray® in high concentration
479 matrices also revealed significant discrepancies between methods. Passing-Bablok and
480 Demming regression both revealed systematic proportional and constant bias between
481 methods. Slopes greater than 1 and large negative intercepts are consistent with
482 underestimation of samples at low concentrations and progressive overestimation at
483 higher concentrations (consistent with nanolitre scale inputs, but a more efficient assay).

484 Agreement between the OpenArray® and RT-qPCR platforms was target dependent with
485 bla_{KPC} showing the strongest quantitative agreement (CCC=0.94), indicating
486 methodological interchangeability. However, for bla_{NDM} and $bla_{OXA\text{-}48}$, overall agreement
487 between methods was much lower (CCC=0.88 and CCC=0.75, respectively). For these
488 targets, OpenArray® and RT-qPCR methods are not quantitatively interchangeable.
489 However, strong correlations were found between OpenArray® data and RT-qPCR data for
490 all tested targets (Table 7). These correlations support reliable trend tracking for
491 OpenArray® and RT-qPCR despite differences in the absolute concentration measured.
492 Tracking of trends over time is an important aspect of both wastewater-based surveillance
493 and environmental monitoring, and despite the apparent quantitative issues with the
494 OpenArray® platform, trend agreement is encouraging for the future development of the
495 platform. The multitude of ARG targets to be monitored and high relative abundance in
496 wastewater matrices make OpenArray® a promising platform for ARG monitoring in high

concentration matrices with potential future applications for environmental monitoring with the implementation of pre-amplification and further methodological confirmations.

Low quantitative concordance between OpenArray® and RT-qPCR for bla_{OXA-48} may help to explain why OpenArray® analysis failed to detect the spike in bla_{OXA-48} that was detected via RT-qPCR. Optimization of multiplexed RT-qPCR allows for improved assay performance while cycling conditions for OpenArray® are set and uniform for all targets included on the chip. Additionally, OpenArray® analysis of the wastewater resistome relied on a limited number of samples while RT-qPCR benefited from a year-long survey of carbapenemase gene concentrations and a more sophisticated ITS modelling approach that attempted to account for baseline variability in carbapenemase concentrations.

Conclusion

The main goals of this investigation were to determine whether WES is a viable tool for monitoring pathogen transmission dynamics associated with mass gathering events and to determine if the 2024 NFL Draft led to increased pathogen transmission or ARG dissemination. Findings provide support for the use of WES in this application, with results of respiratory pathogen monitoring indicating no discernible increase in transmission associated with the 2024 NFL Draft. WES to monitor trends in AMR is particularly promising as it can capture a dimension of infectious diseases that are more difficult to track via clinical surveillance methods. Additionally, environmental dissemination of ARGs is impossible to track via clinical surveillance but can have implications for population health. The ability of WES to detect transient resistome shifts makes the argument that it is a valuable public health surveillance tool during mass gatherings. A recent study investigated ARG load, diversity and dissemination in relation to mass gathering events[76]. Investigators found that the overall level of ARGs did not increase in relation to mass gathering events. More importantly, they determined that mass gatherings could introduce ARGs to local sewer systems that were previously absent. Findings of our investigation are similar, albeit more methodologically limited, as we only measured select ARGs. Both our investigation and the previous work found that ARG burden did not increase overall as a

result of the mass gathering but that the concentration of select genes might increase in a transient manner and that the event itself may have led to the introduction of locally novel ARGs. Notably, the wastewater signal observed in this study was not driven by a uniform increase across all monitored targets. Instead, the response was selective, emphasizing the importance of targeted surveillance strategies and careful interpretation of WES data in event-based contexts. Dissemination of locally novel ARGs is concerning from a public health perspective as it is likely to lead to increased numbers of antibiotic-resistant infections or infections with novel resistance profiles. The combined evidence supports WES as a reliable tool for validating the safety of mass gatherings regarding respiratory spread while providing early insight into AMR dynamics and environmental dissemination under infrastructure stress. Integrating WES with hydrologic context (rainfall, CSO telemetry) can guide real-time operational responses (e.g., CSO management, advisories) during future events.

Acknowledgements

Operators, Laboratory Team, and Managers of the following wastewater treatment facilities: Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility, Great Lakes Water Authority; Pollution Control, City of Windsor; Pollution Control Centre, Municipality of Leamington, Water Pollution Control Plants, City of Chatham and City of Thunder Bay. Funding in support of the Ontario Wastewater Surveillance Initiative was provided by the Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation, and Parks. Additional support was provided by the Public Health Agency of Canada's National Wastewater Surveillance Program (Contribution Agreement 2324-HQ-000197 to CGW, DDH, RS and RMM). The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of the Public Health Agency of Canada.

Table 1. Site characteristics and sample collection modalities

Facility Name	Site ID	Location	Site type	Population served	Sample type	Sampling frequency	Role
Water Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF)	NIEA	Detroit, MI, USA	Interceptor feeding wastewater treatment plant	1482000	1L 24h composite	1×weekly. Daily sampling during Draft	Impacted site
	OAK	Detroit, MI, USA	Interceptor feeding wastewater treatment plant	840600	1L 24h composite	1×weekly Daily sampling during Draft	Impacted site
	JEFF	Detroit, MI, USA	Interceptor feeding wastewater treatment plant	492000	1L 24h composite	1×weekly Daily sampling during Draft	Impacted site
Anonymous Windsor-Essex Wastewater Treatment Plant	WEWTP	Windsor-Essex, ON, Canada	Wastewater treatment plant	180000	1L 24h composite	5×weekly Daily sampling during Draft	Impacted site
Leamington Pollution Control Centre	LPCC	Leamington, ON, Canada	Wastewater treatment plant	18000	1L 24h composite	3×weekly	Control site
Chatham Water Pollution Control Plant	CHWW	Chatham, ON, Canada	Wastewater treatment plant	48000	0.5L 24h composite	3×weekly	Control site
Atlantic Avenue Water Pollution Control Plant	TB	Thunder Bay, ON, Canada	Wastewater treatment plant	97500	0.5L 24h composite	3×weekly	Control site
Detroit River Transect	UP	Upstream of Detroit River outfall	Surface water	NA	2L Grab	Event based	Env sample
	PO	Detroit River outfall	Surface water	NA	2L Grab	Event based	Env sample
	DS1	Downstream of Detroit River outfall	Surface water	NA	2L Grab	Event based	Env sample
	DS2	Downstream of Detroit River outfall	Surface water	NA	2L Grab	Event based	Env sample
	DS3	Downstream of Detroit River outfall	Surface water	NA	2L Grab	Event based	Env sample
	DS4	Downstream of Detroit River outfall	Surface water	NA	2L Grab	Event based	Env sample

552 **Table 2.** Antimicrobial resistance genes monitored, associated drug resistance, and
553 rationale for inclusion on the Nanofluidic qRT-PCR chip

Class of antimicrobial	Gene(s)	Rationale for testing
Aminoglycoside	*aph(3')-Ia, aac(6')-Ib-cr*	Often used in pediatric settings[77] Renewal in interest with rise in AMR for treatment of MDR infections[78]. Most common resistance mechanism for aminoglycosides is through enzymatic modification with the listed ARGs coding for the most common enzymes[79]
Carbapenems	bla_{KPC}, bla_{NDM}, bla_{OXA-48}, bla_{IMP}, bla_{VIM}	Rapid spread and ability to infect patients in healthcare settings. Rise in prevalence with few viable treatment options. Often resistant to multiple classes of antibiotic [80–82].
Cephalosporins/extended spectrum ß-lactam (ESBL) antibiotics	bla_{CMY-2}, bla_{SHV}, bla_{TEM}, *CTX-M1, CTX-M9,*	Beta-lactams are highly common treatments for bacterial infections but resistance levels are high[83]. Some later generation cephalosporins and ESBL are considered last resort antibiotics[84]. Levels of cephalosporin resistance are generally rising[85]. Identified as likely a large threat to human health with emerging concerns regarding environmental spread[86].
Colistin	*mcr-1*	Listed as a reserve antimicrobial agent for last resort use by the World Health Organization[87]. Rapid global spread[42].
Fluoroquinolones	*gyrA83L-Esh, QnrB1, qnrS*	Widely used theraputics[88] with fluoroquinolone resistant infections resulting in worse patient outcomes and increase risk of mortality[89]. Resistance is widespread[90–93]. Many fluoroquinolones are on the WHO "Watch" list. [87]
Glycopeptides (vancomycin)	*vanA*	Last resort antibiotic used in the treatment of serious gram-positive bacterial infections[94,95]. Recent rapid increases in resistance [96] Vancomycin is on the WHO "Watch" list. [87]
Macrolides	*mphA*	Used widely in the treatment of common infections such as pneumonia, sinusitis, and chlamydia. Members include erythromycin, clarithromycin, azithromycin[97]. Associated with mobility[98] *mphA* is plasmid associated and mobile with evidence of transmission through horizontal gene transfer[99]. Commonly prescribed throughout Ontario[100]
Methicillin	*mecA*	Primary gene associated with beta-lactam resistance in Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA)[101] Thought to be mobile and has been shown confer advantages to bacterial exposed to a diversity of antimicrobial agents/chemical environments[102]
Tetracycline	*tetA, tetM*	Broadly administered in agriculture and human healthcare[86]. Evidence of co-selection with fluoroquinolone resistance genes[103]

Sulfonamides	*sul1, sul2*	Widely used and well established class of antimicrobial agent[42]. Broad spectrum antibiotics with both human and agricultural applications[104].
Trimethoprim	*dfrA1*	Antimicrobial agent often used in the treatment of urinary tract infections. Widely prescribed in Ontario[100].
Associated with resistance to multiple therapeutics	*cfr, int1*	The *cfr* gene is associated with multi-drug resistance[105] while the *int1* gene is a sign of the presence of mobile genetic elements often associated with AMR. Presence of *int1* alone does not indicate AMR. However, it is associated with multiple ARGs and their mobility[106,107]
Normalization/Control	16S rRNA, CrAssphage	crAssphage is a bacteriophage found in association with human waste making it a good fecal indicator and a measure of wastewater concentration that can be used for normalization of wastewater signals [108,109]. A general assay for 16S rRNA was also incorporated to act as a control and for normalization.

Table 3. Summary of Interrupted Time Series (ITS) model parameters, Likelihood Ratio Tests (LRT), and diagnostic checks for gamma GLMMS for N1 and N2 gene targets in the control site cluster.

		Target	
Metric	Statistic	N1	N2
Model Estimates	Event	0.333 (p=0.272)	0.393 (p=0.179)
	Post Time	0.012 (p=0.789)	0.025 (p=0.572)
Model Fit	ΔAIC	-0.5	-4.0
	Log-Likelihood	1122.1	1136.4
	Dispersion	0.187	0.193
LRT	Chi-Square	4.485	8.066
	p-value	0.106	0.018*
DHARMa diagnostics	KS	p=0.309	P=0.627
	Dispersion	p=0.892	P=0.424
	Quantiles	p=0.074	P=0.069
	Outlier	P=0.288	P=0.288

Table 4. Multivariate analysis of resistome composition. Results of the marginal Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance (PERMANOVA) based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarities. Site identity serves as the primary driver of community variance, while the NFL Draft period (Group) did not significantly influence the resistome structure

Factor	Degrees of Freedom	R^2	F-Statistic	p-value
Site	3	0.611	9.305	0.001
Draft period	2	0.033	0.760	0.531
Residual	16	0.350	-	-
Total	21	1	-	-

Note: Site dispersion (p = 0.236) and Group dispersion (p = 0.421) were non-significant, supporting the PERMANOVA findings.

Table 5. Median log PMMoV normalized bla_{KPC} concentrations for each environmental sampling site before and after the 2024 NFL Draft and associated combined sewer overflow (CSO) event. The mean difference represents the magnitude of the concentration shift. P-values were calculated using site-specific paired Wilcoxon signed-rank tests

Site	Median before	Median after	Mean difference	Wilcox p-value	Significance
DS1	1.030	1.631	0.522	0.031	Significant
DS2	0.394	1.077	0.699	0.156	Non-significant
DS3	0.286	1.787	1.429	0.031	Significant
DS4	0.976	1.991	0.987	0.031	Significant
PO	1.023	1.233	0.238	0.094	Non-significant
UP	0.375	0.443	0.035	0.844	Non-significant

572 **Table 6.** Comparison of RT-qPCR and nanofluidic RT-qPCR performance for detection of
573 select antimicrobial resistance genes (ARGs) in different sample matrices

Target	Matrix	No. Observations	RT-qPCR Positive	OpenArray Positive	Detection Gap	Kappa (κ)	p-value
bla_{KPC}	Global	42	42 (100%)	31 (73.8%)	-26.20%	0.000*	NA
	Wastewater	18	18 (100%)	18 (100%)	0%	1.000**	NA
	Environmental	24	24 (100%)	13 (54.2%)	-45.80%	0.000*	NA
bla_{NDM}	Global	42	34 (81.0%)	18 (42.9%)	-38.10%	0.300	0.006
	Wastewater	18	18 (100%)	18 (100%)	0%	1.000**	NA
	Environmental	24	16 (66.7%)	0 (0.0%)	-66.70%	0.000*	NA
bla_{OXA-48}	Global	42	26 (61.9%)	25 (59.5%)	-2.40%	0.751	< 0.001
	Wastewater	18	18 (100%)	18 (100%)	0%	1.000**	NA
	Environmental	24	8 (33.3%)	7 (29.2%)	-4.10%	0.516	0.011

574

575 **Table 7.** Correlation and agreement of measurements for select ARGs assayed with RT-
576 qPCR assays and nanofluidic RT-qPCR

Target	n	Spearman	Pearson	CCC (95% CI)	Mean Bias (log)	LoA (95%)
bla_{KPC}	16	0.91	0.97	0.94 (0.74–0.97)	0.15	-0.21 to 0.51
bla_{NDM}	15	0.77	0.93	0.88 (0.69–0.94)	0.29	-0.77 to 1.34
bla_{OXA-48}	18	0.64	0.82	0.75 (0.42–0.86)	-0.27	-1.11 to 0.58

577

578

Citations

1. Gonzalez, R. & Smith, J. Population-level health monitoring using wastewater surveillance. *Journal of Public Health Advances* **34**, 456–470 (2021).
2. Mao, K., Zhang, H. & Yang, Z. Wastewater-based epidemiology and community health: A review. *Environmental Research* **191**, 110351 (2020).
3. Sims, N. & Kasprzyk-Hordern, B. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology. *Environmental Health Journal* **50**, 123–135 (2020).
4. Hillary, L. S. *et al.* Monitoring SARS-CoV-2 in municipal wastewater to evaluate the success of lockdown measures for controlling COVID-19 in the UK. *Water Research* **200**, 117214 (2021).
5. Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R. & Brouwer, A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **7**, 511–516 (2020).
6. Yanaç, K., Adegoke, A., Wang, L., Uyaguari, M. & Yuan, Q. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA throughout wastewater treatment plants and a modeling approach to understand COVID-19 infection dynamics in Winnipeg, Canada. *Sci Total Environ* **825**, 153906 (2022).
7. Corchis-Scott, R. *et al.* Averting an Outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 in a University Residence Hall through Wastewater Surveillance. *Microbiol Spectr* **9**, e0079221 (2021).
8. Daughton, C. G. Wastewater surveillance: An emerging tool for epidemiology. *Environmental Science and Technology* **54**, 431–438 (2020).

9. Farkas, K., Hillary, L. S. & Malham, S. K. Wastewater surveillance as a tool for monitoring the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science and Health* **17**, 14–20 (2020).
10. Tiwari, A. & Kumar, R. The renaissance of wastewater surveillance during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *Epidemiological Reviews* **45**, 78–89 (2022).
11. Ahmed, W. *et al.* Occurrence of multiple respiratory viruses in wastewater in Queensland, Australia: Potential for community disease surveillance. *Sci Total Environ* **864**, 161023 (2023).
12. Corchis-Scott, R. *et al.* Wastewater Surveillance to Confirm Differences in Influenza A Infection between Michigan, USA, and Ontario, Canada, September 2022–March 2023 - Volume 30, Number 8—August 2024 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* **30**, (2024).
13. Galani, A. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance data can predict hospitalizations and ICU admissions. *Science of The Total Environment* **804**, 150151 (2022).
14. Peccia, J. *et al.* Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics. *Nat Biotechnol* **38**, 1164–1167 (2020).
15. Hopkins, L. *et al.* Citywide wastewater SARS-CoV-2 levels strongly correlated with multiple disease surveillance indicators and outcomes over three COVID-19 waves. *Sci Total Environ* **855**, 158967 (2023).
16. Zhao, L. *et al.* Targeting a free viral fraction enhances the early alert potential of wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2: a methods comparison spanning the transition between Delta and Omicron Variants in a large urban center. *fpubh* (2023).

17. Gerrity, D., Papp, K., Stoker, M., Sims, A. & Frehner, W. Early-pandemic wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Nevada: Methodology, occurrence, and incidence/prevalence considerations. *Water Res X* **10**, 100086 (2020).
18. Yoo, B.-K., Iwamoto, R., Chung, U., Sasaki, T. & Kitajima, M. Economic Evaluation of Wastewater Surveillance Combined with Clinical COVID-19 Screening Tests, Japan. *Emerg Infect Dis* **29**, 1608–1617 (2023).
19. Wright, J., Driver, E. M., Bowes, D. A., Johnston, B. & Halden, R. U. Comparison of high-frequency in-pipe SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-based surveillance to concurrent COVID-19 random clinical testing on a public U.S. university campus. *Science of The Total Environment* **820**, 152877 (2022).
20. Safford, H. R., Shapiro, K. & Bischel, H. N. Wastewater analysis can be a powerful public health tool—if it's done sensibly. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **119**, e2119600119 (2022).
21. Ngwira, L. G. *et al.* Cost of wastewater-based environmental surveillance for SARS-CoV-2: Evidence from pilot sites in Blantyre, Malawi and Kathmandu, Nepal. *PLOS Glob Public Health* **2**, e0001377 (2022).
22. National Academies of Sciences, E. *et al.* Wastewater Surveillance for COVID-19. in *Wastewater-based Disease Surveillance for Public Health Action* (National Academies Press (US), 2023).
23. Corchis-Scott, R. *et al.* Actionable wastewater surveillance: application to a university residence hall during the transition between Delta and Omicron resurgences of COVID-19. *Frontiers in Public Health* **11**, (2023).

24. Bivins, A. & Bibby, K. Wastewater Surveillance during Mass COVID-19 Vaccination on a College Campus. *Environ Sci Technol Lett* **8**, 792–798 (2021).
25. Mercier, E. *et al.* Municipal and neighbourhood level wastewater surveillance and subtyping of an influenza virus outbreak. *Sci Rep* **12**, 15777 (2022).
26. Zheng, X. *et al.* Wastewater Surveillance Provides Spatiotemporal SARS-CoV-2 Infection Dynamics. *Engineering* **40**, 70–77 (2024).
27. Jarvie, M. M., Nguyen, T. N. T., Southwell, B. & Wright, D. Leveraging wastewater surveillance to actively monitor Covid-19 community dynamics in rural areas with reduced reliance on clinical testing. *Applied Research* **3**, e202400012 (2024).
28. Memish, Z. A. *et al.* Mass gatherings medicine: public health issues arising from mass gathering religious and sporting events. *The Lancet* **393**, 2073–2084 (2019).
29. Suñer, C. *et al.* Association between two mass-gathering outdoor events and incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections during the fifth wave of COVID-19 in north-east Spain: A population-based control-matched analysis. *Lancet Reg Health Eur* **15**, 100337 (2022).
30. Memish, Z. A. *et al.* Proactive surveillance for avian influenza H5N1 and other priority pathogens at mass gathering events. *The Lancet Public Health* **9**, e350–e352 (2024).
31. Verovšek, T., Krizman-Matasic, I., Heath, D. & Heath, E. Site- and event-specific wastewater-based epidemiology: Current status and future perspectives. *Trends in Environmental Analytical Chemistry* **28**, e00105 (2020).
32. Toro, L. *et al.* Pathogen prioritisation for wastewater surveillance ahead of the Paris 2024 Olympic and Paralympic Games, France. *Eurosurveillance* **29**, 2400231 (2024).

33. Saied, A. A. *et al*. Wastewater surveillance as an epidemiological tool at mass gathering events: A FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022 perspective and implication to other mass gathering events. *International Journal of Surgery* **109**, 574 (2023).

34. Kitajima, M., Murakami, M., Iwamoto, R., Katayama, H. & Imoto, S. COVID-19 wastewater surveillance implemented in the Tokyo 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Village. *Journal of Travel Medicine* **29**, taac004 (2022).

35. Nkambule, S., Street, R., Surujlal-Naicker, S., Johnson, R. & Mathee, A. Wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 during a mass sporting event in the City of Cape Town, Western Cape. *Front. Public Health* **12**, (2024).

36. El-Malah, S. S. *et al*. Leveraging wastewater surveillance for managing the spread of SARS-CoV-2 and concerned pathogens during FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022. *Heliyon* **10**, e30267 (2024).

37. Brighton, K., Fisch, S., Wu, H., Vigil, K. & Aw, T. G. Targeted community wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 and Mpox virus during a festival mass-gathering event. *Science of The Total Environment* **906**, 167443 (2024).

38. Sharma, A., Karande, M. & Zumla, A. Advancing sewage surveillance at mass gathering events for reducing transmission of antimicrobial resistant bacterial pathogens. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease* **54**, 102619 (2023).

39. Alexander, J., Hembach, N. & Schwartz, T. Evaluation of antibiotic resistance dissemination by wastewater treatment plant effluents with different catchment areas in Germany. *Sci Rep* **10**, 8952 (2020).

40. Karkman, A., Do, T. T., Walsh, F. & Virta, M. P. J. Antibiotic-Resistance Genes in Waste Water. *Trends Microbiol* **26**, 220–228 (2018).

41. Choi, P. M. *et al*. Wastewater-based epidemiology biomarkers: Past, present and future. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry* **105**, 453–469 (2018).

42. Keenum, I. *et al*. A framework for standardized qPCR-targets and protocols for quantifying antibiotic resistance in surface water, recycled water and wastewater. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology* **52**, 4395–4419 (2022).

43. Hendriksen, R. S. *et al*. Global monitoring of antimicrobial resistance based on metagenomics analyses of urban sewage. *Nat Commun* **10**, 1124 (2019).

44. Harrop, E. *et al*. Spatiotemporal Variability in Wastewater-Derived Carbapenem-Resistance Genes from Diverse Municipal Sources in the Laurentian Great Lakes Catchment. Preprint at https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-8206721/v1 (2026).

45. Lynggaard, C., Gogarten, J. F. & Jokelainen, P. Integrating environment into One Health approaches: Embracing the complexity. *One Health* **20**, 101021 (2025).

46. Greer, J. From Boardrooms to Block Parties: A Case Study on The Economic and Cultural Transformation of the NFL Draft. *Sport Economics Research* **2**, 29–44 (2025).

47. Williams, K. T. W. & Hall, J. C. The Impact of the 2024 NFL Draft on Hotel Demand. *JRAP* **55**, (2025).

48. Hutchinson, D. Here's how many people traveled at least 100 miles to attend NFL Draft in Detroit. *WDIV* (2024).

49. NCEI Past Weather Tool | Drought.gov. https://www.drought.gov/data-maps-tools/ncei-past-weather-tool.

50. CSO/SSO List - MiEnviro Portal. https://mienviro.michigan.gov/ncore/external/overflow/list.

51. Rosario, K., Symonds, E. M., Sinigalliano, C., Stewart, J. & Breitbart, M. Pepper Mild Mottle Virus as an Indicator of Fecal Pollution. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **75**, 7261–7267 (2009).

52. Maal-Bared, R. *et al.* Does normalization of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations by Pepper Mild Mottle Virus improve correlations and lead time between wastewater surveillance and clinical data in Alberta (Canada): comparing twelve SARS-CoV-2 normalization approaches. *Sci Total Environ* **856**, 158964 (2023).

53. R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2025).

54. Wickham, H. *et al.* Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software* **4**, 1686 (2019).

55. McBride, G. & others. A proposal for strength-of-agreement criteria for Lin's concordance correlation coefficient. *NIWA client report: HAM2005-062* **45**, 307–310 (2005).

56. Bulfone, T. C. *et al.* Outdoor Activities Associated with Lower Odds of SARS-CoV-2 Acquisition: A Case–Control Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* **19**, 6126 (2022).

57. Lessler, J. *et al.* Incubation periods of acute respiratory viral infections: a systematic review. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **9**, 291–300 (2009).

58. Alandijany, T. A. Respiratory viral infections during Hajj seasons. *Journal of Infection and Public Health* **17**, 42–48 (2024).

731 59. Boyd, S. E., Holmes, A., Peck, R., Livermore, D. M. & Hope, W. OXA-48-Like β-
732 Lactamases: Global Epidemiology, Treatment Options, and Development Pipeline.
733 *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy* **66**, e00216-22 (2022).
734 60. Kajova, M., Khawaja, T., Kainulainen, K. & Kantele, A. Travel-associated
735 carbapenemase-producing Enterobacterales: Epidemiology and risk factors in a
736 Finnish cohort. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease* **68**, 102926 (2025).
737 61. Pitout, J. D. D., Peirano, G., Kock, M. M., Strydom, K.-A. & Matsumura, Y. The Global
738 Ascendency of OXA-48-Type Carbapenemases. *Clin Microbiol Rev* **33**, e00102-19
739 (2019).
740 62. Peirano, G. & Pitout, J. D. D. Rapidly spreading Enterobacterales with OXA-48-like
741 carbapenemases. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* **63**, e01515-24 (2025).
742 63. Auguet, O. *et al.* Sewers as potential reservoirs of antibiotic resistance. *Science of The*
743 *Total Environment* **605–606**, 1047–1054 (2017).
744 64. Nahum, Y., Muhvich, J., Morones-Ramirez, J. R., Casillas-Vega, N. G. & Zaman, M. H.
745 Biofilms as potential reservoirs of antimicrobial resistance in vulnerable settings. *Front*
746 *Public Health* **13**, 1568463 (2025).
747 65. Haenelt, S. *et al.* The fate of sulfonamide resistance genes and anthropogenic pollution
748 marker intI1 after discharge of wastewater into a pristine river stream. *Front Microbiol*
749 **14**, 1058350 (2023).
750 66. Gillings, M. R. *et al.* Using the class 1 integron-integrase gene as a proxy for
751 anthropogenic pollution. *ISME J* **9**, 1269–1279 (2015).

67. Rushford, C. *et al.* Untargeted longitudinal ultra deep metagenomic sequencing of wastewater provides a comprehensive readout of expected and unexpected viral pathogens. 2025.10.27.25338874 Preprint at https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.10.27.25338874 (2025).
68. Kaeseberg, T. *et al.* Hot spots of antibiotic tolerant and resistant bacterial subpopulations in natural freshwater biofilm communities due to inevitable urban drainage system overflows. *Environmental Pollution* **242**, 164–170 (2018).
69. Morina, J. C. & Franklin, R. B. Drivers of Antibiotic Resistance Gene Abundance in an Urban River. *Antibiotics (Basel)* **12**, 1270 (2023).
70. Pao, L. T., Tashani, M., King, C., Rashid, H. & Khatami, A. Antimicrobial Resistance Associated with Mass Gatherings: A Systematic Review. *Trop Med Infect Dis* **10**, 2 (2024).
71. Wang, C., Myshkevych, Y., Wang, T., Monjed, M. K. & Hong, P.-Y. Wastewater surveillance unveils the impact of mass gatherings on antimicrobial resistance after the COVID-19 pandemic in Saudi Arabia. *Nat Water* **3**, 693–703 (2025).
72. Li, Z. *et al.* The Environmental Lifecycle of Antibiotics and Resistance Genes: Transmission Mechanisms, Challenges, and Control Strategies. *Microorganisms* **13**, 2113 (2025).
73. Ishii, S. *et al.* Microfluidic Quantitative PCR for Simultaneous Quantification of Multiple Viruses in Environmental Water Samples. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **80**, 7505–7511 (2014).

74. Ishii, S., Segawa, T. & Okabe, S. Simultaneous Quantification of Multiple Food- and Waterborne Pathogens by Use of Microfluidic Quantitative PCR. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **79**, 2891–2898 (2013).

75. Sekovanić, A. *et al.* Pre-amplification as a method for improvement of quantitative RT-PCR analysis of circulating miRNAs. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)* **31**, 010901 (2021).

76. Wang, C., Myshkevych, Y., Wang, T., Monjed, M. K. & Hong, P.-Y. Wastewater surveillance unveils the impact of mass gatherings on antimicrobial resistance after the COVID-19 pandemic in Saudi Arabia. *Nat Water* **3**, 693–703 (2025).

77. Germovsek, E., Barker, C. I. & Sharland, M. What do I need to know about aminoglycoside antibiotics? *Arch Dis Child Educ Pract Ed* **102**, 89–93 (2017).

78. Krause, K. M., Serio, A. W., Kane, T. R. & Connolly, L. E. Aminoglycosides: An Overview. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med* **6**, a027029 (2016).

79. Holbrook, S. Y. L. & Garneau-Tsodikova, S. Evaluation of Aminoglycoside and Carbapenem Resistance in a Collection of Drug-Resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa Clinical Isolates. *Microb Drug Resist* **24**, 1020–1030 (2018).

80. Zhao, S. *et al.* Epidemiology of and risk factors for mortality due to carbapenemase-producing organisms (CPO) in healthcare facilities. *J Hosp Infect* **110**, 184–193 (2021).

81. Bonomo, R. A. *et al.* Carbapenemase-Producing Organisms: A Global Scourge. *Clin Infect Dis* **66**, 1290–1297 (2018).

82. Carbapenemase Producing Enterobacteriaceae (CPE). *Public Health Ontario* http://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/Diseases-and-Conditions/Health-Care-Associated-Infections/CPE.

83. Shaikh, S., Fatima, J., Shakil, S., Rizvi, S. Mohd. D. & Kamal, M. A. Antibiotic resistance and extended spectrum beta-lactamases: Types, epidemiology and treatment. *Saudi J Biol Sci* **22**, 90–101 (2015).

84. Araten, A. H. *et al.* Cephalosporin resistance, tolerance, and approaches to improve their activities. *J Antibiot* **77**, 135–146 (2024).

85. Park, S. H. Third-generation cephalosporin resistance in gram-negative bacteria in the community: a growing public health concern. *Korean J Intern Med* **29**, 27–30 (2014).

86. Liguori, K. *et al.* Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring of Water Environments: A Framework for Standardized Methods and Quality Control. *Environ Sci Technol* **56**, 9149–9160 (2022).

87. 2021 AWaRe classification. https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/2021-aware-classification.

88. Hooper, D. C. & Jacoby, G. A. Mechanisms of drug resistance: quinolone resistance. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* **1354**, 12–31 (2015).

89. Camins, B. C. *et al.* The clinical impact of fluoroquinolone resistance in patients with E coli bacteremia. *J Hosp Med* **6**, 344–349 (2011).

90. Salah, F. D. *et al.* Distribution of quinolone resistance gene (qnr) in ESBL-producing Escherichia coli and Klebsiella spp. in Lomé, Togo. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control* **8**, 104 (2019).

91. Peirano, G. & Pitout, J. D. D. Fluoroquinolone-Resistant Escherichia coli Sequence Type 131 Isolates Causing Bloodstream Infections in a Canadian Region with a Centralized

816 Laboratory System: Rapid Emergence of the H30-Rx Sublineage. *Antimicrobial Agents*
817 *and Chemotherapy* **58**, 2699–2703 (2014).
818 92. Yang, P. *et al.* Association between the rate of fluoroquinolones-resistant gram-negative
819 bacteria and antibiotic consumption from China based on 145 tertiary hospitals data in
820 2014. *BMC Infectious Diseases* **20**, 269 (2020).
821 93. Kibwana, U. O. *et al.* Fluoroquinolone resistance among fecal extended spectrum βeta
822 lactamases positive Enterobacterales isolates from children in Dar es Salaam,
823 Tanzania. *BMC Infectious Diseases* **23**, 135 (2023).
824 94. Selim, S. Mechanisms of gram-positive vancomycin resistance (Review). *Biomed Rep*
825 **16**, 7 (2022).
826 95. Patel, S., Preuss, C. V. & Bernice, F. Vancomycin. in *StatPearls* (StatPearls Publishing,
827 Treasure Island (FL), 2024).
828 96. Mühlberg, E. *et al.* Renaissance of vancomycin: approaches for breaking antibiotic
829 resistance in multidrug-resistant bacteria. *Can. J. Microbiol.* **66**, 11–16 (2020).
830 97. Patel, P. H. & Hashmi, M. F. Macrolides. in *StatPearls* (StatPearls Publishing, Treasure
831 Island (FL), 2024).
832 98. Bengtsson-Palme, J. *et al.* Industrial wastewater treatment plant enriches antibiotic
833 resistance genes and alters the structure of microbial communities. *Water Research*
834 **162**, 437–445 (2019).
835 99. Wang, H. *et al.* Characterization of resistance genes and plasmids from sick children
836 caused by Salmonella enterica resistance to azithromycin in Shenzhen, China. *Front.*
837 *Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* **13**, (2023).

838 100. Schwartz, K. L. *et al.* Regional variability in outpatient antibiotic use in Ontario,
839 Canada: a retrospective cross-sectional study. *CMAJ Open* **6**, E445–E452 (2018).
840 101. Siddiqui, A. H. & Koirala, J. Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus. in
841 *StatPearls* (StatPearls Publishing, Treasure Island (FL), 2024).
842 102. Snitser, O. *et al.* Ubiquitous selection for mecA in community-associated MRSA
843 across diverse chemical environments. *Nat Commun* **11**, 6038 (2020).
844 103. Tyson, G. H., Li, C., Hsu, C.-H., Bodeis-Jones, S. & McDermott, P. F. Diverse
845 Fluoroquinolone Resistance Plasmids From Retail Meat E. coli in the United States.
846 *Front. Microbiol.* **10**, (2019).
847 104. Ovung, A. & Bhattacharyya, J. Sulfonamide drugs: structure, antibacterial property,
848 toxicity, and biophysical interactions. *Biophys Rev* **13**, 259–272 (2021).
849 105. Vester, B. The *cfr* and cfr-like multiple resistance genes. *Research in Microbiology*
850 **169**, 61–66 (2018).
851 106. Mirnezami, M., Ranjbar, R., Niakan, M. & Ahmadi, M. H. Frequency of Antimicrobial
852 Resistance and Class 1 and 2 Integrons in Escherichia Coli Strains Isolated from
853 Urinary Tract Infections. *Iran J Pharm Res* **19**, 282–287 (2020).
854 107. Racewicz, P. *et al.* Prevalence and characterisation of antimicrobial resistance
855 genes and class 1 and 2 integrons in multiresistant Escherichia coli isolated from
856 poultry production. *Sci Rep* **12**, 6062 (2022).
857 108. Stachler, E. *et al.* Quantitative CrAssphage PCR Assays for Human Fecal Pollution
858 Measurement. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **51**, 9146–9154 (2017).

109. Langeveld, J. *et al*. Normalisation of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater: The use of flow, electrical conductivity and crAssphage. *Sci Total Environ* **865**, 161196 (2023).