

1     **Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater in Japan by multiple molecular assays-**  
2                   **implication for wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE).**

3             Akihiko Hata<sup>1</sup>, Ryo Honda<sup>2,3,\*</sup>, Hiroe Hara-Yamamura<sup>2</sup>, Yuno Meuchi<sup>1</sup>

4  
5                   <sup>1</sup> *Faculty of Engineering, Toyama Prefectural University*

6                   <sup>2</sup> *Faculty of Geosciences and Civil Engineering, Kanazawa University*

7                   <sup>3</sup> *Graduate School of Engineering, Kyoto University*

8  
9     **\*Corresponding author:** Ryo Honda

10   **Mailing address:** *Faculty of Geosciences and Civil Engineering, Kanazawa University*

11   *Kakuma-machi, Kanazawa 920-1192, Japan*

12   **Tel:** +81-76-264-6393

13   **E-mail:** rhonda@se.kanazawa-u.ac.jp

14

15

## ABSTRACT

16       **Presence of SARS-coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) in wastewater sample has been**  
17 **documented in several countries. Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is**  
18 **potentially effective for early warning of COVID-19 outbreak. The purpose of this**  
19 **study was to verify the detection limit of WBE for COVID-19. In total, 27 influent**  
20 **wastewater samples were collected from four wastewater treatment plants in**  
21 **Ishikawa and Toyama prefectures in Japan. During the study period, numbers of**  
22 **the confirmed COVID-19 cases in these prefectures increased from almost 0 to**  
23 **around 20 per 100,000 peoples. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the samples were identified**  
24 **by several PCR-based assays. Among the 27 samples, 7 were positive for SARS-**  
25 **CoV-2 by at least one out of the three quantitative RT-PCR assays. These samples**  
26 **were also positive by RT-nested PCR assays. The detection frequency became**  
27 **higher when the number of total confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases in 100,000 peoples**  
28 **became above 10 in each prefecture. However, SARS-CoV-2 could also be detected**  
29 **with a low frequency when the number was below 1.0. Considering that the**  
30 **number of the confirmed cases does not necessarily reflect the actual prevalence of**  
31 **the infection at the time point, data on the relationship between the number of**  
32 **infection cases and concentration in wastewater needs to be accumulated further.**

33

## 1. INTRODUCTION

34 The recent novel coronavirus pneumonia (COVID-19) pandemic caused by the  
35 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection has led to  
36 more than 6.8 million of the confirmed cases and nearly 400,000 deaths worldwide, as of  
37 June 7, 2020 (WHO, 2020). Currently, this pandemic is likely to be heading for  
38 convergence due to world-wide stay-at-home order. However, there are still a concern of  
39 re-outbreak after lift of the stay-at-home order for reopening businesses, and also the  
40 2nd pandemic caused by seasonal factors. Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) is the  
41 effective approach to provide a snapshot of the outbreak situation in the entire catchment  
42 by monitoring pathogens and viruses in wastewater (Choi et al., 2018; Yang et al.,  
43 2015). The WBE could be an early warning tool for the possible re-outbreaks and  
44 seasonal pandemics in the future.

45 Recently, detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater is reported in Netherlands,  
46 Australia, US, China, France, Israel, Italy, Spain, and Japan (Ahmed et al., 2020; Bar-or  
47 et al., 2020; Haramoto et al., 2020; La Rosa et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Nemudryi  
48 et al., 2020; Randazzo et al., 2020; Rimoldi et al., 2020; WU et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al.,  
49 2020a). SARS-CoV-2 are present in wastewater because they are shed from not only in  
50 respiratory secretion but also feces of patients (Tang et al., 2020; Wölfel et al., 2020a; J.  
51 Zhang et al., 2020; Y. Zhang et al., 2020). Importantly, pre-symptomatic patients and  
52 asymptomatic patients also had a viral load in feces as well as symptomatic patients

53 (Tang et al., 2020; Wölfel et al., 2020a; Y. Zhang et al., 2020). Ratio of asymptomatic  
54 infection is estimated as 18% (16-20% as 95%-CI) from the cruise ship passengers in  
55 Yokohama (Mizumoto et al., 2020), and 31% (7.7-54% as 95%-CI) from the passengers  
56 of evacuation flight from Wuhan to Tokyo (Nishiura et al., 2020). Moreover, a much  
57 larger population of asymptomatic and mildly symptomatic infections was implied by  
58 the surveillance of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in Santa Clara County, California, in  
59 which the estimated number of infection is 50- to 85-fold more than the number of  
60 confirmed cases (Bendavid et al., 2020). However, these people with no symptoms and  
61 mild symptoms may not be included in clinical surveillance because most of them do not  
62 visit clinics or hospitals. Transmission from such asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic  
63 patients makes it difficult to enable the initial containment of COVID-19. Moreover, the  
64 number of the reported COVID-19 cases is possibly biased by circumstances of medical  
65 services in each country, e.g. access to medical services, capacity of PCR tests, stay-at-  
66 home policy for mildly symptomatic patients, situation of medical collapse, etc. So far,  
67 Japan has unique trend of COVID-19 epidemic. The increasing trend of cases is much  
68 slower than other countries in Europe, US and China (Gloeckner et al., 2020). Some  
69 paper argues that the number of cases is underestimated in Japan because of low  
70 capacity of PCR tests (Omori et al., 2020). WBE is able to cover people with  
71 asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic infections and to predict the overall epidemic status  
72 without such biases of medical situations. Therefore, WBE could be more sensitive and

73 possibly detect outbreak earlier than clinical surveillance and also effective to verify  
74 coverage of clinical surveillance under various medical situations. For application of  
75 WBE as an early warning tool of COVID-19 outbreak, it is necessary to verify  
76 correlations of SARS-CoV-2 concentration in wastewater and the number of COVID-19  
77 cases in each country.

78 According the recent studies, SARS-CoV-2 were detected in wastewater when the  
79 number of confirmed cases reached 1-100 cases per 100,000 of population (Ahmed et  
80 al., 2020; Bar-or et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020; WU et al.,  
81 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020a). The sensitivity of WBE depends on viral load in feces of  
82 infected people. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater could be less sensitive than  
83 norovirus, because the viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in feces is reportedly 1 to 2 logs lower  
84 than norovirus (Hata and Honda, 2020). SARS-CoV-2 is an enveloped virus, while  
85 typical viral pathogens in water, such as noroviruses, are non-enveloped viruses. Then,  
86 commonly used methods for concentrating viruses in water might not be effective to  
87 SARS-CoV-2 (Kitajima et al., 2020). Besides, several RT-PCR assays for SARS-CoV-2  
88 are now available but their applicability to wastewater sample has not been well  
89 determined. These indicate that detection of SARS-CoV-2 in the wastewater is more  
90 challenging than that of norovirus and other enteric viruses. At this time, verifying  
91 concentration methods and downstream RT-PCR assays is necessary to make WBE  
92 reliable.

93        The objective of this study is to verify the detection limit of WBE for COVID-19 by  
94        comparing the detected concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and the COVID-19  
95        cases reported in clinical surveillance. In this study, wastewater samples were taken in  
96        two prefectures, Ishikawa and Toyama, in Japan which had the most reported COVID-  
97        19 cases per population except Tokyo Metropolitan. To deal with the methodological  
98        issues pointed above, sample processing was validated by assessing virus detection  
99        efficiency with process controls. Besides, multiple RT-PCR assays and nucleotide  
100        sequencing were applied to improve the reliability of the positive results. At the  
101        beginning of the study period, numbers of the confirmed COVID-19 cases in Ishikawa  
102        and Toyama prefectures were only 0.3 and 0 per 100,000 peoples (4 and no confirmed  
103        cases), respectively. This enabled us to discuss sensitivity of WBE for COVID-19 from  
104        the reported COVID-19 cases per population in the target area.

105

106

107

108

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 109 2.1 Sample collection.

110 Influent wastewater samples were collected at four WWTPs, WWTPs A-C and D, in  
111 Ishikawa and Toyama prefecture, respectively. These WWTPs were built to treat  
112 maximum volumes of 12,800, 53,300, 156,000, and 82,500 m<sup>3</sup>/day of wastewater in  
113 total and are serving population equivalents of 31,510, 112,396, 151,937, and 169,400,  
114 respectively (Table 1). At each WWTP, 100 mL of a grab sample was collected in the  
115 morning, during the hour of peak flow, weekly or biweekly from March 5 to April 23,  
116 2020. In total, 27 samples were obtained. The samples were kept cool or frozen until  
117 the analysis, which took place within 3 days after the collection. The sample was split  
118 into 80 mL and 20 mL of subsamples, which were then subjected to virus concentration  
119 process and quantification of F-phages, respectively (Fig. 1). At the beginning of the  
120 study period, there were only four and zero COVID-19 confirmed cases in Ishikawa  
121 and Toyama prefectures, respectively. However, the numbers increased during the  
122 period. At the end of April, Ishikawa and Toyama prefectures were ranked as second  
123 and third, respectively, in Japan in the number of infections per 100,000 peoples (21.9  
124 and 18.1 cases, respectively) (Fig. 2).

### 125 2.2 Virus concentration by polyethylene glycol precipitation (PEG precipitation).

126 Prior to the virus concentration, the 80 mL subsample was centrifuged at 5,000×g for  
127 5 minutes. The supernatant was recovered and mixed with 8.0 g of PEG8000 and 4.7 g

128 of sodium chloride to be final concentrations of 10% and 1 M, respectively. The mixture  
129 was incubated overnight on a shaker at 4°C. Subsequently, the mixture was centrifuged  
130 at 10,000×g for 30 minutes. The supernatant was discarded and the resultant pellet was  
131 resuspended in 500 µL of phosphate buffer as a virus concentrate.

### 132 **2.3 RNA extraction.**

133 Murine norovirus was used as a molecular process control to monitor the inhibitory  
134 effects on the RNA extraction-RT-qPCR processes. Briefly, 140 µL of the virus  
135 concentrate was spiked with  $1.7 \times 10^4$  copies of MNV and subjected to RNA extraction  
136 using a QIAamp viral RNA mini kit (Qiagen) to obtain a 60 µL of RNA extract, in  
137 accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. The obtained RNA extract was  
138 subjected to qRT-PCR assays and RT-semi nested PCR assays, for quantitative detection  
139 of the spiked MNV and indigenous SARS-CoV-2 and for qualitative detection of  
140 indigenous SARS-CoV-2, respectively.

### 141 **2.4 qRT-PCR assay.**

142 TaqMan-based qRT-PCR assays for quantitative detection of spiked MNV and  
143 indigenous SARS-CoV-2 were performed with a qTOWER<sup>3</sup> (Analytik Jena). For  
144 quantification of MNV RNA, a primer and TaqMan probe set described by Kitajima et  
145 al. (2008) was utilized, while for quantification of SARS-CoV-2, two and one primer  
146 and TaqMan probe sets described by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)  
147 in the USA (2020) (CDCN2, and CDCN3 assays, which were originally denoted as

148 2019-nCoV\_N1, 2019-nCoV\_N2, and 2019-nCoV\_N3, respectively) and Shirato et al.  
149 (2020) (NIID assay, which was originally denoted as NIID\_2019-nCoV\_N),  
150 respectively, were separately used (Table 2). Shirato et al. (2020) described two reverse  
151 primers for NIID assay. In this study, one of them (NIID\_2019-nCoV\_N\_R2ver3,  
152 denoted as NIID-R in Table 2) was used because it does not have mismatch with  
153 reference strains (Wuhan-Hu-1 strain, Gen Bank acc. No. of MN908947.3, for example).  
154 A reaction mixture (20  $\mu$ L) was prepared using a One Step PrimeScript™ RT-PCR Kit  
155 (Perfect Real Time) (TaKaRa). Briefly, 20  $\mu$ L of a reaction mixture was prepared by  
156 mixing 2  $\mu$ L or 5  $\mu$ L of RNA extract with, of 10  $\mu$ L a 2 $\times$ One Step RT-PCR Buffer III,  
157 0.4  $\mu$ L of a TaKaRa Ex Taq HS, 0.4  $\mu$ L of a PrimeScript RT enzyme Mix II, 400 nM  
158 each of forward- and reverse primers, 100 nM of a TaqMan probe, and nuclease-free  
159 water. qRT-PCR was performed under the following thermal cycling conditions: RT  
160 reaction at 42°C for 5 min, initial denaturation and inactivation of the RT enzyme at  
161 95°C for 10 s, followed by 50 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 5 s  
162 and annealing and extension at specific temperatures for each assay (Table 2) for 30 s.  
163 To obtain a calibration curve, a 10-fold serial dilution (concentrations ranged from  
164  $1.0 \times 10^0$  to  $1.0 \times 10^6$  copies/reaction) of a standard DNA (plasmid DNA or oligo DNA)  
165 containing the target sequence was amplified. In each qPCR assay,  $1.0 \times 10^1$   
166 copies/reaction of the standard DNA were positive at all times, indicating that the limit  
167 of the quantification values for each qPCR assay was below  $1.0 \times 10^1$  copies/reaction. If

168 the resultant Ct value from a sample was corresponding to >1 copy/reaction, the sample  
169 was determined to be positive for SARS-CoV-2.

170 Absence of the positive signal in the no template control was confirmed in every  
171 qRT-PCR runs to exclude the potential contamination of the template into the reagents.

## 172 **2.5 RT-nested PCR assays.**

173 The RT reaction was performed with a high-capacity cDNA reverse transcription kit  
174 (Life Technologies, Tokyo, Japan). The obtained cDNA was subjected to nested PCR  
175 assays for qualitative gene detection of SARS-CoV-2 (Fig. 1). The first round of PCR  
176 amplification was performed in 50  $\mu$ L of a reaction mixture containing 10.0  $\mu$ L of  
177 cDNA, 2 $\times$ Premix Taq<sup>TM</sup> (TaKaRa), 400 nM each of CDCN3-F and NIID-R primers,  
178 which are also employed for CDCN3 and NIID qRT-PCR assays, respectively, and  
179 expected to amplify 600 bp gene fragment (Fig. 3 and Table 2), and nuclease-free water.  
180 The amplification was performed under the following thermal cycling conditions using a  
181 Thermal Cycler Dice (TaKaRa): initial denaturation and enzyme activation at 95°C for  
182 10 min, followed by 40 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 10 s,  
183 primer annealing at 55°C for 30 s, and an extension reaction at 72°C for 1 min and then  
184 a final extension at 72°C for 5 min. The first round PCR product was diluted with  
185 nuclease free water by 1,000-fold and then subjected to following PCR assays.

186 For the second round of PCR, four different assays were conducted, one is a  
187 conventional PCR assay (semi-nested PCR assay) followed by gel electrophoresis and

188 gene sequencing. Others are real-time PCR based on CDCN2, CDCN3, and NIID assays  
189 (nested-real time PCR assays). The semi-nested PCR assay was performed in a 20  $\mu$ L  
190 reaction mixture containing 2  $\mu$ L of the product of the first round of PCR amplification,  
191 2 $\times$ Premix Taq<sup>TM</sup> (Takara), and 400 nM each of CDCN3-F and CDCN2-R primers (Fig.  
192 3 and Table 2), which are also employed for CDCN3 and CDCN2 qRT-PCR assays,  
193 respectively, and expected to amplify 550 bp gene fragment, and nuclease-free water.  
194 PCR amplification was performed under the following thermal cycling conditions using  
195 a Thermal Cycler Dice (TaKaRa): initial denaturation at 95°C for 10 min, followed by  
196 40 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 10 s, primer annealing at 55°C  
197 for 30 s, and extension reaction at 72°C for 30 sec and then a final extension at 72°C for  
198 5 min. The semi nested PCR product was subjected to electrophoresis on a 1.5% agarose  
199 gel and visualized under a UV lamp after being stained with Gel Red<sup>TM</sup> (FUJIFILM).

200 For further confirmation of the successful amplification by the first round PCR, the  
201 PCR product was subjected to CDCN2, CDCN3, and NIID assays (nested-real time PCR  
202 assays) with a qTOWER<sup>3</sup> (Analytik Jena) (Fig. 3 and Table 2). The real time PCR was  
203 performed in a 20  $\mu$ L reaction mixture containing 2  $\mu$ L of the product of the first round  
204 of PCR amplification, 2 $\times$ Premix Taq<sup>TM</sup> (TaKaRa), and 400 nM each of primers, 100 nM  
205 of a TaqMan probe, and nuclease-free water. PCR amplification was performed under  
206 the following thermal cycling conditions: initial denaturation at 95°C for 10 min,

207 followed by 40 cycles of amplification with denaturation at 95°C for 10 s, annealing and  
208 extension at specific temperatures for each assay for 30 s (Table 2).

## 209 **2.6 Determining efficiencies of virus concentration and RNA extraction-qRT-PCR.**

210 Indigenous F-phage in the sample before and after the concentration process was  
211 quantified by a plate counting assay employing *Salmonella Typhimurium* WG49 as a  
212 host strain, as described previously (Mooijman et al., 2002). The efficiency of the virus  
213 concentration process was estimated by comparing the F-phage concentration in the  
214 sample before the concentration process with that after the concentration process.

215 The efficiency of RNA extraction-qRT-PCR was estimated by comparing the  
216 observed gene concentration of the spiked MNV in nuclease-free water with that in the  
217 concentrate.

218

219

### 3. RESULTS

#### 220 3.1 Efficiency of virus detection.

221 The recovery efficiency of indigenous F-phage by the concentration process was  
222 57% in geometric mean and was always above 10% (n = 27). RNA extraction-qRT-PCR  
223 efficiency determined with the spiked MNV was 66% in geometric mean and was  
224 always above 10% (n = 27). These indicate that the virus concentration and following  
225 molecular processes were conducted efficiency enough (Haramoto et al., 2018).  
226 Presumptive virus detection efficiency, which can be estimated by multiplying these  
227 efficiencies, was 38% in geometric mean and below 10% for 5 out of 27 samples (3.7%  
228 was the lowest).

#### 229 3.2 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 by qRT-PCR assays.

230 In this study, three qRT-PCR assays, CDCN2, CDCN3 and NIID assays, were  
231 separately applied. A sample collected at WWTP D on April 3 was positive for SARS-  
232 CoV-2 using all the assays with an observed concentration of around  $3.0 \times 10^4$  copies/L  
233 ( $2.1 \times 10^4 - 4.4 \times 10^4$  copies/L) (Fig. 2 and Table 3). The presumptive virus detection  
234 efficiency in the sample was relatively high (estimated as 130%). In addition to the  
235 sample, CDCN2, CDCN3, and NIID assays showed positive signals in 1 (WWTP B on  
236 April 16), 4 (WWTP A on March 19, WWTP B on March 26 and April 23, and WWTP  
237 C on April 21), and 1 (WWTP D on April 24) samples. In total, 7 samples were  
238 determined to be positive for SARS-CoV-2 by at least one of the assays with observed

239 concentration of  $1.2 \times 10^4 - 4.4 \times 10^4$  copies/L. The detection frequency seems to be  
240 higher when the number of total confirmed SARS-CoV-2 cases in 100,000 peoples  
241 became above 10 in each prefecture (Fig. 2 and Table 3). The SARS-CoV-2 detection  
242 frequency was 15% (3 positives out of 20 samples) before the number became  $>10$ ,  
243 whereas it reached 57% (4 positives out of 7 samples) after the number became  $>10$ .

### 244 **3.3 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-nested PCR assays and nucleotide sequencing.**

245 The qRT-PCR assays used in this study target a 600 bp fraction of gene coding N-  
246 protein. Then, nested PCR assays could be performed using the primers used in the qRT-  
247 PCR assays for further confirmation of the positive results obtained by the qRT-PCR  
248 assays. A semi-nested PCR assay to amplify 550 bp of a gene fragment showed a band  
249 of around 600 bp size in four out of seven samples, which were collected during April  
250 (Table 3 and Fig. 4). However, direct Sanger sequencing could not confirm if the  
251 amplicon was obtained from SARS-CoV-2 or not, because of too many heterozygous  
252 peaks. Application of real-time PCR to the first round PCR products showed ambiguous  
253 results. CDCN2 and NIID assay did not show any positive results, while CDCN3 assay  
254 showed positive signal from six out of the seven samples. Among them, samples  
255 collected during March resulted in relatively high ( $>35$ ) Ct values, while those collected  
256 during April resulted in lower (around 30) Ct values.

257

258

#### 4. DISCUSSION

259

Most of previous studies investigated pathogenic and indicator viruses targeted non-

260

enveloped viruses (Haramoto et al., 2018). Consequently, retrospective virus

261

concentration methods are optimized for non-enveloped viruses and may not be effective

262

to enveloped virus like SARS-CoV-2. For instance, adsorption-elution methods using

263

electropositive or electronegative microfilter and glass wool are surely effective to non-

264

enveloped viruses (Cashdollar et al., 2013) but resulted in inefficient recovery efficiency

265

(consistently less than or around 10%) for at least some of enveloped viruses (Haramoto

266

et al., 2009; Honjo et al., 2010; Deboosere et al., 2011; Francy et al., 2013; Blanco et al.,

267

2019). A size exclusive method using ultrafiltration is also widely applied for virus

268

monitoring (Cashdollar et al., 2013). Even though its efficacy in concentrating

269

enveloped viruses has not been fully elucidated yet, some researchers have been

270

succeeded in detecting enveloped viruses, influenza-A virus and SARS-CoV-2 (Heijnen

271

and Medema, 2011; Medema et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020).

272

One of the drawbacks of the ultrafiltration-based method is the cost of the ultrafiltration

273

unit. For example, Centricon plus-70, which can process up to 70 mL of a sample at

274

once, costs approximately 50 USD per unit, and it might not be suitable for frequent use.

275

On the contrary, PEG precipitation is one of the most cost-effective method for

276

concentrating virus in a low volume (around 100 mL) of water sample (Lewis and

277

Metcalf, 1988). The technique is effective not only for viruses but also for variety of

278 proteins (Atha and Ingham, 1981). Therefore, it might be effective for SARS-CoV-2,  
279 even though only a limited number of studies have applied the technique to enveloped  
280 viruses, including SARS-CoV-2, in water (Honjo et al., 2010; Deboosere et al., 2011;  
281 Wu et al., 2020). For PEG precipitation, several conditions, i.e., concentrations of PEG  
282 and NaCl, have been applied (Jones and Johns, 2009). Among them, we selected  
283 relatively high concentrations of PEG and NaCl (10% and 1.0 M), in accordance with  
284 Jones and Johns (2009). As expected, the method revealed a sufficiently high and stable  
285 recovery efficiency of indigenous F-phages (57% in geometric mean), indicating that  
286 SARS-CoV-2 was also recovered efficiently. An efficient way for recovering SARS-  
287 CoV-2 in wastewater and an appropriate recovery control to ascertain the efficient  
288 recovery of SARS-CoV-2 should be found in future.

289 Several molecular assays have been designed for detection of SARS-CoV-2  
290 (CDC2020; Shirato 2020; Corman et al., 2020; Chu et al., 2020). Although some studies  
291 revealed effectiveness of these assays in comparative manner (Jung et al., 2020), a gold  
292 standard method has not been determined yet. Especially, wastewater contains variety of  
293 microbes and free nucleic acids, which might lead to false positive due to non-specific  
294 amplification. Therefore, most studies on SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples applied  
295 multiple RT-PCR assays, gel electrophoresis, and amplicon sequencing in attempts to  
296 improve reliability (Ahmed et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020; Wu  
297 et al., 2020; Wurtzet et al., 2020). In this study, three qRT-PCR assays and additional RT-

298 nested PCR assays, to confirm the positive results obtained by the qRT-PCR assays,  
299 were applied. Among seven samples positive by at least one of the qRT-PCR assays, one  
300 collected at WWTP D on April 3 were consistently positive by all three qRT-PCR assays,  
301 while other six samples were positive by one of the assays. Low concentrations of  
302 SARS-CoV-2 gene in the concentrates can be one possible reason for the ambiguous  
303 results. The observed concentration was at most 8 copies/reaction. In this case, the target  
304 gene is occasionally absent in the analyte. It is also possible that some of the positive  
305 signals were generated by non-specific amplicons or that some assays failed to amplify  
306 specific SARS-CoV-2 strains.

307 Then, RT-nested PCR assays sharing primers with the qRT-PCR assays were  
308 conducted to ascertain the positives obtained by the qRT-PCR assays. Most of the qRT-  
309 PCR positive samples again showed positive results by at least one of the RT-nested  
310 PCR assays, indicating that the positive signals obtained by the qRT-PCR assays are  
311 reliable. Some previous studies revealed that CDCN2 assay seems to be less efficient in  
312 detecting SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples than CDCN1 and CDCN3 assays  
313 (Medema et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020; Nemudryi et al., 2020; Randazzo et al., 2020).  
314 Accordingly, CDCN2 assay, as well as NIID assay, seem to be inefficient in this study,  
315 showed no positive results after the first round PCR. Similarly, the first round PCR  
316 followed by CDCN3 assay seems to be better than that followed by the semi nested PCR  
317 assay, in view of the number of positives. These suggest that primers and TaqMan probe

318 used in CDCN2 and NIID assays might contain mismatches with SARS-CoV-2 strains in  
319 wastewater. Notably, one sample (at WWTP B on April 16) failed to confirm the  
320 presence of SARS-CoV-2 by the second round CDCN3 assay. This sample was also  
321 negative by qRT-PCR with CDCN3 assay. Considering that the sample was positive by  
322 the semi nested assay, the first round PCR was successfully conducted. This implies that  
323 CDCN3 assay may also not be effective in detecting all the circulating SARS-CoV-2  
324 strains.

325       Detection frequency of SARS-CoV-2 in our wastewater samples seemed to be in  
326 agreement with the numbers of confirmed cases in both prefectures. The detection  
327 frequency seems to be higher when it becomes above 10 in 100,000 peoples (Fig. 2 and  
328 Table 3) Besides, no positive result was obtained in the samples collected in Toyama  
329 prefecture during March, when no confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection cases were  
330 reported. Our results also suggest that SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater sample could be  
331 identified even when the number of cases per 100,000 peoples is below 1.0, although the  
332 detection frequency becomes low (Fig. 2 and Table 3). One SARS-CoV-2 positive  
333 sample during March was collected at WWTP A. A relatively low number of populations  
334 served by the WWTP (31,510 peoples) might be attributed to the positive result. Smaller  
335 WWTP would have a limited dilution effect and can be more sensitive to the presence of  
336 the number of infected individuals. Previous studies have suggested that the  
337 concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater is affected by number of peoples infected

338 in the catchment area (Medema et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020; Wurtzer et al., 2020b).  
339 However, there seems to be a discrepancy in the observed relationships between the  
340 concentration in wastewater and the number of infected people. Ahmed et al. (2020)  
341 could not identify SARS-CoV-2 in a wastewater sample in Queensland until the number  
342 of the confirmed cases reached up to around 100 cases per 100,000 peoples. In addition,  
343 the observed concentration was below the limit of quantification at that time. In contrast,  
344 Wurtzer et al. (2020b) repeatedly obtained positive results in Paris even when the  
345 number of the confirmed cases was below 1 case per 100,000 peoples, in accordance  
346 with our observation. One of the reasons for this discrepancy might be due to the  
347 difference in methods applied; collecting composite samples or grab samples and ways  
348 of sample concentration, nucleic acid extraction, and qRT-PCR. Besides, the number of  
349 the confirmed cases does not necessarily reflect the actual prevalence of the infection at  
350 the time point, which can be better correlated to the concentration in the wastewater. In  
351 Japan, it takes a few days to confirm the case by the clinical surveillance since the  
352 symptom first appeared or the one become infected. There should be asymptomatic  
353 cases, which were not confirmed. In the context of WBE, data on the relationship  
354 between the number of infection cases and concentration in wastewater needs to be  
355 accumulated further.

356

357

358

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

359        This work was supported by Hiramoto-gumi Inc., the civil construction company in

360    Japan.

361

362

## REFERENCES

- 363 1. Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J.W., Choi, P.M.,  
364 Kitajima, M., Simpson, S.L., Li, J., Tscharke, B., Verhagen, R., Smith, W.J.M.,  
365 Zaugg, J., Dierens, L., Hugenholtz, P., Thomas, K. V., Mueller, J.F., 2020. First  
366 confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof  
367 of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Sci.*  
368 *Total Environ.* 138764.
- 369 2. Atha, D.H., Ingham, K.C., 1981. Mechanism of precipitation of proteins by  
370 polyethylene glycols. Analysis in terms of excluded volume. *J. Biol. Chem.* 256,  
371 12108–12117
- 372 3. Bar-or, I., Yaniv, K., Shagan, M., Ozer, E., Erster, O., Mendelson, E., Shirazi, R.,  
373 Kramarsky-winter, E., Nir, O., Abu-ali, H., Ronen, Z., Lewis, Y.E., Friedler, E.,  
374 Bitkover, E., Paitan, Y., Berchenko, Y., Goldstein-goren, S., Science, N., Sheva, B.,  
375 Saba, K., Boker, S., 2020. Regressing SARS-CoV-2 sewage measurements onto  
376 COVID-19 burden in the population: a proof-of-concept for quantitative  
377 environmental surveillance. medRxiv 020.04.26.20073569.
- 378 4. Bendavid, E., Mulaney, B., Sood, N., Shah, S., Ling, E., Bromley-Dulfano, R., Lai,  
379 C., Weissberg, Z., Saavedra, R., Tedrow, J., Tversky, D., Bogan, A., Kupiec, T.,  
380 Eichner, D., Gupta, R., Ioannidis, J., Bhattacharya, J., 2020. COVID-19 Antibody  
381 Seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California. medRxiv 2020.04.14.20062463.

- 382 5. Blanco, A., Abid, I., Al-Otaibi, N., Pérez-Rodríguez, F.J., Fuentes, C., Guix, S.,  
383 Pintó, R.M., Bosch, A., 2019. Glass Wool Concentration Optimization for the  
384 Detection of Enveloped and Non-enveloped Waterborne Viruses. *Food Environ.*  
385 *Virol.* 11, 184–192.
- 386 6. Cashdollar, J.L., Wymer, L., 2013. Methods for primary concentration of viruses  
387 from water samples: A review and meta-analysis of recent studies. *J. Appl.*  
388 *Microbiol.* 115, 1–11.
- 389 7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Respiratory Viruses Branch, Division  
390 of Viral Diseases Instructions. 2020. Real-Time RT-PCR Panel for Detection 2019-  
391 Novel Coronavirus Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Respiratory Viruses  
392 Branch, Division of Viral Diseases, accessed: February 28, 2020.
- 393 8. Choi, P.M., Tschärke, B.J., Donner, E., O’Brien, J.W., Grant, S.C., Kaserzon, S.L.,  
394 Mackie, R., O’Malley, E., Crosbie, N.D., Thomas, K. V., Mueller, J.F., 2018.  
395 Wastewater-based epidemiology biomarkers: Past, present and future. *TrAC -*  
396 *Trends Anal. Chem.*
- 397 9. Chu, D.K.W., Pan, Y., Cheng, S.M.S., Hui, K.P.Y., Krishnan, P., Liu, Y., Ng,  
398 D.Y.M., Wan, C.K.C., Yang, P., Wang, Q., Peiris, M., Poon, L.L.M., 2020.  
399 Molecular Diagnosis of a Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Causing an Outbreak of  
400 Pneumonia. *Clin. Chem.* 7, 1–7.
- 401 10. Corman, V.M., Landt, O., Kaiser, M., Molenkamp, R., Meijer, A., Chu, D.K.,

- 402 Bleicker, T., Brünink, S., Schneider, J., Luisa Schmidt, M., GJC Mulders, D.,  
403 Haagmans, B.L., van der Veer, B., van den Brink, S., Wijsman, L., Goderski, G.,  
404 Romette, J.-L., Ellis, J., Zambon, M., Peiris, M., Goossens, H., Reusken, C.,  
405 Koopmans, M.P., Drosten, C., Victor, C.M., Olfert, L., Marco, K., Richard, M.,  
406 Adam, M., Daniel, C.K., Tobias, B., Sebastian, B., Julia, S., Marie Luisa, S.,  
407 Daphne GJC, M., Bart, H.L., der Veer Bas, V., den Brink Sharon, V., Lisa, W.,  
408 Gabriel, G., Jean-Louis, R., Joanna, E., Maria, Z., Malik, P., Herman, G., Chantal,  
409 R., 2020. Detection of 2019-nCoV by RT-PCR. *Euro. Surveill.* 25, 1–8.
- 410 11. Deboosere, N., Horm, S.V., Pinon, A., Gachet, J., Coldefy, C., Buchy, P., Vialette,  
411 M., 2011. Development and validation of a concentration method for the detection  
412 of influenza A viruses from large volumes of surface water. *Appl. Environ.*  
413 *Microbiol.* 77, 3802–3808.
- 414 12. Francy, D.S., Stelzer, E.A., Brady, A.M.G., Huitger, C., Bushon, R.N., Ip, H.S.,  
415 Ware, M.W., Villegas, E.N., Gallardo, V., Lindquist, H.D.A., 2013. Comparison of  
416 filters for concentrating microbial indicators and pathogens in lake water samples.  
417 *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 79, 1342–1352.
- 418 13. Gloeckner, S., Krause, G., Hoehle, M., 2020. Now-casting the COVID-19 epidemic:  
419 The use case of Japan, March 2020. medRxiv 2020.03.18.20037473.
- 420 14. Hata, A., Honda, R., 2020. Potential sensitivity of wastewater monitoring for SARS-  
421 CoV-2: comparison with norovirus cases. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* (in press).

- 422 15. Haramoto, E., Kitajima, M., Katayama, H., Ito, T., Ohgaki, S., 2009. Development  
423 of virus concentration methods for detection of koi herpesvirus in water. *J. Fish Dis.*  
424 32, 297–300.
- 425 16. Haramoto, E., Kitajima, M., Hata, A., Torrey, J.R., Masago, Y., Sano, D.,  
426 Katayama, H., 2018. A review on recent progress in the detection methods and  
427 prevalence of human enteric viruses in water. *Water Res.* 135. 168-186.
- 428 17. Haramoto, E., Malla, B., Thakali, O., Kitajima, M. 2020. First environmental  
429 surveillance for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and river water in  
430 Japan. medRxiv.
- 431 18. Heijnen, L., Medema, G., 2011. Surveillance of influenza A and the pandemic  
432 influenza A (H1N1) 2009 in sewage and surface water in the Netherlands. *J. Water*  
433 *Health* 9, 434–442.
- 434 19. Honjo, M.N., Minamoto, T., Matsui, K., Uchii, K., Yamanaka, H., Suzuki, A. a,  
435 Kohmatsu, Y., Iida, T., Kawabata, Z., 2010. Quantification of cyprinid herpesvirus  
436 3 in environmental water by using an external standard virus. *Appl. Environ.*  
437 *Microbiol.* 76, 161–8.
- 438 20. Jones, T.H., Johns, M.W., 2009. Improved detection of F-specific RNA coliphages  
439 in fecal material by extraction and polyethylene glycol precipitation. *Appl. Environ.*  
440 *Microbiol.* 75, 6142–6.
- 441 21. Jung, Y.J., Park, G.-S., Moon, J.H., Ku, K., Beak, S.-H., Kim, Seil, Park, E.C., Park,

- 442 D., Lee, J.-H., Byeon, C.W., Lee, J.J., Maeng, J., Kim, S.J., Kim, Seung Il, Kim, B.-  
443 T., Lee, M.J., Kim, H.G., 2020. Comparative analysis of primer-probe sets for the  
444 laboratory confirmation of SARS-CoV-2. *BioRxiv* 2020.02.25.964775.
- 445 22. Kitajima, M., Tohya, Y., Matsubara, K., Haramoto, E., Utagawa, E., Katayama, H.,  
446 Ohgaki, S. (2008). Use of murine norovirus as a novel surrogate to evaluate  
447 resistance of human norovirus to free chlorine disinfection in drinking water supply  
448 system. *Environ. Eng. Res.* 45, 361–370 (in Japanese).
- 449 23. Kitajima, M., Ahmed, W., Bibby, K., Carducci, A., Gerba, C.P., Hamilton, A.,  
450 Haramoto, E., Rose, J.B. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge  
451 and research needs. *Science of the Total Environment*. (in press).
- 452 24. La Rosa, D., Iaconelli, M., Mancini, P., Ferraro, G.B., Veneri, C., Bonadonna, L.,  
453 Lucentini, L., Suffredini, E. 2020. First Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Untreated  
454 Wastewaters in Italy. *medRxiv*.
- 455 25. Lewis, G.D., Metcalf, T.G., 1988. Polyethylene glycol precipitation for recovery of  
456 pathogenic viruses, including hepatitis A virus and human rotavirus, from oyster,  
457 water, and sediment samples. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 54, 1983–8.
- 458 26. Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., Brouwer, A., 2020. Presence  
459 of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in sewage and correlation with reported COVID-19  
460 prevalence in the early stage of the epidemic in the Netherlands. *Environ. Sci.*  
461 *Technol.* (in press).

- 462 27. Mizumoto, K., Kagaya, K., Zarebski, A., Chowell, G., 2020. Estimating the  
463 asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board  
464 the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Eurosurveillance* 25, 1–  
465 5.
- 466 28. Mooijman, K. a, Bahar, M., Muniesa, M., Havelaar, A.H., 2002. Optimisation of  
467 ISO 10705-1 on enumeration of F-specific bacteriophages. *J. Virol. Methods* 103,  
468 129–36.
- 469 29. Nemudryi, A., Nemudraia, A., Surya, K., Wiegand, T., Buyukyoruk, M., Wilkinson,  
470 R., Wiedenheft, B., 2020. Temporal detection and phylogenetic assessment of  
471 SARS-CoV-2 in municipal wastewater. medRxiv 2020.03.22.20041079.
- 472 30. Nishiura, H., Kobayashi, T., Suzuki, A., Jung, S.-M., Hayashi, K., Kinoshita, R.,  
473 Yang, Y., Yuan, B., Akhmetzhanov, A.R., Linton, N.M., Miyama, T., 2020.  
474 Estimation of the asymptomatic ratio of novel coronavirus infections (COVID-19).  
475 *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* 94, 154-155.
- 476 31. Omori, R., Mizumoto, K., Chowell, G., 2020. Changes in testing rates could mask  
477 the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) growth rate. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* 94, 116–  
478 118.
- 479 32. Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Simón, P., Allende, A., Sánchez,  
480 G. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Anticipated COVID-19 Occurrence in a  
481 Low Prevalence Area. *Water Res.* (in press)

- 482 33. Rimoldi, S.G., Stefani, F., Gigantiello, A., Polesello, S., Comandatore, F., Mileto, D.,  
483 Maresca, M., Longobardi, C., Mancon, A., Romeri, F., Pagani, C., Moja, L.,  
484 Gismondo, M. R., Salerno, F. 2020. Presence and vitality of SARS-CoV-2 virus in  
485 wastewaters and rivers. MedRxiv.
- 486 34. Shirato, K., Nao, N., Katano, H., Takayama, I., Saito, S., Kato, F., Katoh, H.,  
487 Sakata, M., Nakatsu, Y., Mori, Y., Kageyama, T., Matsuyama, S., Takeda, M.,  
488 2020. Development of Genetic Diagnostic Methods for Novel Coronavirus 2019  
489 (nCoV-2019) in Japan. Jpn. J. Infect. Dis. (in press).
- 490 35. World Health Organization, 2020. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation  
491 reports [WWW Document]. URL [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports)  
492 [coronavirus-2019/situation-reports](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports) (accessed 6.8.20).
- 493 36. Wu, F., Xiao, A., Zhang, J., GU, X., Lee, W., Kauffman, K., Hanage, W., Matus, M.,  
494 Ghaeli, N., Endo, N., Duvallet, C., Moniz, K., Erickson, T., Pr, C., Thompson, J.,  
495 Alm, E., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from  
496 clinically confirmed cases. medRxiv 2020.04.05.20051540.
- 497 37. Wurtzer, S., Marechal, V., Mouchel, J.M., Moulin, L. 2020a. Time course  
498 quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Parisian wastewaters correlates with  
499 COVID-19 confirmed cases. medRxiv. 2020.04.12.20062679.
- 500 38. Wurtzer, S., Marechal, V., Mouchel, J.M., Maday, Y., Teyssou, R., Richard, E.,  
501 Almayrac, J.L., Moulin L. 2020b. Evaluation of lockdown impact on SARS-CoV-2

502 dynamics through viral genome quantification in Paris wastewaters.

503 39. Yang, Z., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., Frost, C.G., Estrela, P., Thomas, K. V., 2015.


504 Community sewage sensors for monitoring public health. Environ. Sci. Technol. 49,

505 5845–5846.

506

507

**FIGURES**




508

509 **Figure 1.** Flow diagram of sample processing for confirming the presence of SARS-

510 CoV-2 in wastewater by RT-PCR assays and for assessing virus detection efficiency

511 with process controls.

512



513

514 **Figure 2.** Temporal relationship between number of SARS-CoV-2 infection cases and

515 presence of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples in Ishikawa and Toyama prefectures.

516 Number of inpatients was calculated by subtracting numbers of discharged and dead


517 from number of total confirmed cases, which were derived from a databased

518 summarized by Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare in Japan

519 ([https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/0000121431\\_00086.html](https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/0000121431_00086.html)).

520





528

529 **Figure 4.** Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples by the RT-semi-nested PCR  
530 assay, which is expected to result in a 550 bp of amplicon. Lanes 1-3: Samples collected  
531 at WWTPs A, B, and D on March 19, 26, and April 3, which did not show the positive  
532 band. Lanes 4-7: Samples collected at WWTPs A, B, C, B, on April 16, 21, 23, and 24,  
533 which showed the positive band. Lane 8: Non target control. Lane 9: 100-bp ladder.

534

**TABLES**

TABLE 1. Characteristics of WWTPs studied in this study.

<b>WWTP</b>	<b>Prefecture</b>	<b>Population served by WWTP</b>	<b>Sewered population rate (%)</b>	<b>Maximum treatment capacity (m<sup>3</sup>/d)</b>	<b>Actual treatment capacity (m<sup>3</sup>/d)</b>
A	Ishikawa	31,510	91.0	12,800	9,366
B	Ishikawa	112,396	91.4	53,300	37,106
C	Ishikawa	151,937	97.2	156,000	86,446
D	Toyama	169,400	91.1	82,500	55,639

**TABLE 2.** Primer and TaqMan probe sequences used for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in this study.

Assay	Name	Function	Sequence (5' → 3') <sup>a</sup>	Location	temperature for annealing/extension	Reference
2019-nCoV_N2	CDCN2-F	Forward primer	TTACAAACATTGGCCGCAAA	29164-29183	55°C	CDC (2020)
	CDCN2-R <sup>b</sup>	Reverse primer	GCGCGACATTCCGAAGAA	29213-29230		
	CDCN2-P	TaqMan Probe	ACAATTTGCCCCAGCGCTTCAG-	29188-29210		
2019-nCoV_N3	CDCN3-F <sup>b</sup>	Forward primer	GGGAGCCTTGAATACACCAAAA	28681-28702	55°C	CDC (2020)
	CDCN3-R	Reverse primer	TGTAGCACGATTGCAGCATTG	28732-28752		
	CDCN3-P	TaqMan Probe	AYCACATTGGCACCCGCAATCCTG-	28704-28727		
NIID_2019-nCoV_N	NIID-F	Forward primer	AAATTTGGGGACCAGGAAC	29125-29144	60°C	Shirato et al. (2020)
	NIID-R <sup>b</sup>	Reverse primer	TGGCACCTGTGTAGGTCAAC	29263-29282		
	NIID-P	TaqMan Probe	ATGTCGCGCATTGGCATGGA	29222-29241		

<sup>a</sup>: All TaqMan probes were labeled with 5'-FAM and 3'-TAMRA.

<sup>b</sup>: CDCN3-F, CDCN2-R, NIID-R were also used for nested PCR assays.

**TABLE 3.** Summary of samples positive for SARS-CoV-2 by qRT-PCR assays.

Date	WWTP <sup>a</sup>	Total confirmed cases in 100,000 peoples		Efficiency of detection process			qRT-PCR			RT-nested PCR			
		Ishikawa	Toyama	Concentration %	RNA extraction-qRT-PCR %	Total %	CDCN2	CDCN3	NIID	semi-nested	CDCN2 Ct	CDCN3 Ct	NIID Ct
March 19	A	0.4	0.0	263	72	190	Neg. <sup>b</sup>	2.8×10 <sup>4</sup>	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	35.2	Neg.
March 27	B	0.5	0.0	76	50	38	Neg.	1.7×10 <sup>4</sup>	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.	36.2	Neg.
April 3	D	1.4	0.8	125	102	130	4.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	1.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	2.1×10 <sup>4</sup>	Neg.	Neg.	29.9	Neg.
April 16	B	12.2	5.1	10	49	4.9	1.5×10 <sup>4</sup>	Neg.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	Neg.	Neg.
April 21	C	15.7	10.9	87	41	36	Neg.	1.5×10 <sup>4</sup>	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	32.1	Neg.
April 23	B	17.4	11.0	36	50	18	Neg.	1.2×10 <sup>4</sup>	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.	31.1	Neg.
April 24	D	18.9	14.3	51	31	16	Neg.	Neg.	1.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	Pos.	Neg.	30.3	Neg.

<sup>a</sup>: WWTPs A-C and D are located in Ishikawa and Toyama prefecture, respectively.

<sup>b</sup>: Neg.: Negative; Pos.: Positive.