

1 **Protocol for Safe, Affordable, and Reproducible Isolation and Quantitation**
2 **of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from Wastewater**

3
4 Monica Trujillo¹, Kristen Cheung^{2¶}, Anna Gao^{2¶}, Irene Hoxie^{3¶}, Sherin Kannoly^{2¶}, Nanami
5 Kubota^{2¶}, Kaung Myat San^{2¶}, Davida S. Smyth^{4¶} and John J. Dennehy^{2,3*}

6
7
8 ¹Department of Biology, Queensborough Community College, The City University of New York,
9 New York; ²Biology Department, Queens College, The City University of New York, New York;
10 ³The Graduate Center, The City University of New York, New York; ⁴Department of Natural
11 Sciences and Mathematics, Eugene Lang College of Liberal Arts at The New School, New York.

12
13 [¶]These authors are listed in alphabetical order.

14
15 ***Corresponding Author**

16 john.dennehy@qc.cuny.edu, ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9678-4529>

17
18 **Short Title:** Protocol for Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Quantitation

19
20
21 **ABSTRACT**

22 The following protocol describes our workflow for processing wastewater with the goal of
23 detecting the genetic signal of SARS-CoV-2. The steps include pasteurization, virus
24 concentration, RNA extraction, and quantification by RT-qPCR. We include auxiliary steps that
25 provide new users with tools and strategies that will help troubleshoot key steps in the process.
26 This protocol is one of the safest, cheapest, and most reproducible approaches for the detection
27 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater. Furthermore, the RNA obtained using this protocol, minus
28 the pasteurization step, can be sequenced both using a targeted approach sequencing specific
29 regions or the whole genome. The protocol was adopted by the New York City Department of
30 Environmental Protection in August 2020 to support their efforts in monitoring SARS-CoV-2
31 prevalence in wastewater in all five boroughs of the city. Owing to a pasteurization step, it is
32 safe for use in a BSL1+ facility. This step also increases the genetic signal of the virus while
33 making the protocol safe for the personnel involved. This protocol could be used to isolate a
34 variety of other clinically relevant viruses from wastewater and serve as a foundation of a
35 wastewater surveillance strategy for monitoring community spread of known and emerging viral
36 pathogens.

37 **Introduction**

38 The tracking of SARS-CoV-2 infections has most often involved the detection of SARS-
39 CoV-2 RNA via RT-qPCR in biological samples obtained from patients that develop some of the
40 symptoms associated to COVID-19 [1]. One of the disadvantages of this approach is that if
41 much of the transmission within a population is asymptomatic or unsampled, infections from
42 these individuals may be overlooked [2,3]. Additionally, SARS-CoV-2 sequencing efforts, while
43 occurring at a much faster rate and larger, more global scale than in previous pandemics, suffer
44 biases because genomic information is often obtained from seriously ill patients, but not from
45 patients who do not seek medical attention, which include asymptomatic patients, and those
46 with mild symptoms who choose to follow the CDC's advice and convalesce at home. If most
47 transmission within a population is asymptomatic or unsampled, genomes from these
48 individuals are expected to represent most of the viral population circulating within the
49 community. Recently the discovery of novel variants of concern in different regions of the world
50 has added another challenge [4,5], which is to monitor the proportion of individuals that carry a
51 particular variant in a geographical area. Given that SARS-CoV-2 has been detected in fecal
52 samples [6,7], and subsequently in wastewater [3,8,9], wastewater is being tested in cities
53 around the world to determine SARS-CoV-2 prevalence in communities [10-12]. Furthermore,
54 isolation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater coupled with high-throughput deep sequencing
55 provides an almost unlimited source of unbiased viral sequences, which can be used to monitor
56 frequencies of variants of concern in populations.

57 With the goal of sequencing SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater, we developed a
58 protocol to extract and quantify viral RNA. The initial step in the development of this protocol
59 was the decision to pasteurize our samples at 60 °C for an hour on arrival at the laboratory.
60 Given that SARS-CoV-2 is a biosafety level 3 (BSL3) agent, inactivation of the virus before
61 processing is often required before samples can be processed in BSL2+ or BSL1+ laboratories.
62 Happily, as we report here, pasteurization did not impair our ability to detect SARS-CoV-2, but

63 instead, improved it. Interestingly, while SARS-CoV-2 recovery was not impaired, control spike-
64 in viruses bovine coronavirus (BcoV) [13] and bacteriophage Phi6 [14] were barely detectable
65 using RT-qPCR and PCR respectively. Subsequently, control viruses were spiked-in after
66 pasteurization. We are currently studying the effect of pasteurization on the quality of our
67 sequencing data. Preliminary results suggest that the output and quality of sequencing data
68 may be better with unpasteurized samples, therefore if the intention of the study is to sequence
69 SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater, we recommend skipping the pasteurization step.

70 A second major decision was to employ centrifugation and filtering (0.2 μ M) to remove
71 the wastewater solids. While it was acknowledged that SARS-CoV-2 may associate with the
72 solids, removing the solids facilitates downstream processing steps, and may remove genomic
73 contamination that would impair our ability to deep sequence SARS-CoV-2. As a counterpoint,
74 filtration is one of the more expensive steps of the protocol so those desiring to reduce costs
75 may consider eliminating filtration. We were able to acquire consistent results with and without
76 filtration, and neither strategy resulted in a significant increase in our ability to quantify SARS-
77 CoV-2.

78 Since viruses are greatly diluted in wastewater, virion concentration is a significant
79 challenge. We considered three common protocols to concentrate SARS-CoV-2 virus present in
80 the water: ultracentrifugation [15], skimmed milk flocculation [16], and polyethylene glycol
81 (PEG)/sodium chloride (NaCl) precipitation. High speed centrifugation was ruled out as
82 impractical for the volumes needing to be processed. Precipitation/flocculation using PEG/NaCl
83 or skimmed milk eliminates the need for high-speed ultracentrifugation and generates sufficient
84 RNA for viral quantification with RT-qPCR (i.e., resulting in Cts < 40). However, in our
85 experiments, PEG/NaCl precipitation performed marginally better than skim milk flocculation
86 and does not introduce additional genetic material to our samples, so this was chosen as our
87 concentration method. As we expanded our experiment to include sequencing the RNA from

88 wastewater, we explored the effect of longer incubation times on viral RNA recovery. Longer
89 storage in PEG/NaCl led to slightly greater recovery.

90 As we were mindful of the need to find cost effective solutions, we investigated
91 alternative, kit-free approaches to RNA isolation. In our hands, TRIzol (ThermoFisher Inc.)
92 performed better than the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini kit (Qiagen Inc.). As TRIzol is cheaper per
93 sample than column-based kits, we adopted it for the final protocol. An added benefit of TRIzol
94 relevant to downstream sequencing applications is that TRIzol segregates RNA in a separate
95 layer from DNA, unlike column-based isolation kits, which isolate both RNA and DNA.

96 In addition to the RNA isolation method, we compared the performance of different RT-
97 qPCR enzymes, TaqPath 1-Step RT-qPCR enzyme (Thermofisher Inc.) and One Step
98 PrimeScript III enzyme (Takara Bio USA Inc. The RT enzyme from Takara was 25% cheaper
99 and had a similar performance to Taq-Path so we chose it for the final protocol. A broader
100 investigation of different enzymes may identify other satisfactory, cost-effective solutions.

101 Our protocol provides a reproducible and low-tech approach that allows the detection
102 and quantification of SARS-CoV-2. Pasteurization of the sample at the very beginning of the
103 protocol ensures the safety of the user. Preliminary results suggest that pasteurization may also
104 release the virus bound to the wastewater solids, enhancing recovery. Filtering and PEG/NaCl
105 concentration simplifies downstream processing. The extraction of RNA using TRIzol reduces
106 the cost significantly when compared to extraction column-style protocols using commercial kits.
107 We have been able to do both targeted and whole genome sequencing of the SARS-CoV-2
108 genome using this protocol but recommend removing the pasteurization step if this is the main
109 goal of the experiments.

110 Our protocol performed strongly in a large-scale, nationwide comparative study of the
111 reproducibility and sensitivity of 36 methods of quantifying SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater [17]. Our
112 protocol is identified as 4S.1(H) in Table 3. In addition, the Pecson et al. study offers strong
113 support for several of the primary claims of the present paper. First, the removal or non-removal

114 of the wastewater solids did not show a clear systematic impact on outcomes. Second,
115 pasteurization resulted in a small, but significant, increase in recovery. Third, methodological
116 differences between teams had minimal impact on reproducibility and sensitivity, thus indicating
117 that our modifications to implement cheaper, simpler methods will not impair SARS-2-CoV-2
118 detection and quantification relative to other strategies.

119 We recognize that our protocol has some limitations. Our current protocol isolates the
120 RNA from 40 ml of wastewater and requires access to a centrifuge capable of reaching 12,000 x
121 g. Thus, scaling up the volume of samples from 40 ml or increasing the number of individual
122 samples, represents a challenge. Our protocol requires filtration units which are dependent on
123 the supply chain. Additionally, extracting RNA with TRIzol requires the user to take care not to
124 contaminate the aqueous phase with organic material after centrifugation, which can be difficult
125 for inexperienced users. Nevertheless, the basic protocol and techniques involved is
126 economical, simple, and reproducible when compared to alternative strategies.

127

128 **Materials and Methods**


129 *“The protocol described in this article is published on [protocols.io](https://www.protocols.io),*
130 *[dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.brr6m59e](https://doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.brr6m59e) and is included for printing as file S1.”*

131

132 **Expected Results**

133 Our protocol results in the reproducible isolation and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from
134 wastewater samples (Fig. 1). Enough RNA can be acquired for RT-qPCR, and isolated RNA is
135 suitable for whole genome amplification and sequencing (although pasteurization is not
136 recommended if the intention is to sequence SARS-CoV-2 RNA isolated from wastewater). As a
137 general note, wastewater treatment plants indicated in our figures have been deidentified. There
138 is no correspondence between the numerical wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) IDs in
139 different figures. Moreover, experiments described in different figures were performed at


140 different times using different wastewater samples. Our purpose here is not to report regional
141 prevalence, but rather to demonstrate the reliability and consistency of our protocol.



142
143 **Figure 1. Repeatability of Protocol:** Copy number yield for the N1 target for 24-hr composite
144 wastewater samples obtained from all 14 wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) in New York
145 City demonstrating reproducibility of our protocol. Each point is the mean of two technical
146 replicate measurements from a 24-hour composite sample. All samples collected and initially
147 processed on the same day. Error bars are \pm SEM. Some error bars are too small to be visible.
148 Samples 2 and 11 are from plants with a significant influx of ocean water, but it is not clear if this
149 is driving variation in these sites.


150 Key steps were optimized during the development phase of our protocol. Initially we
151 used Phi6 [14] as a spike in control. However, we found that Phi6 was rapidly degraded in the
152 pasteurization step of our protocol. Reports from the scientific community suggested that BCoV
153 would serve as a better control, however, we found that BCoV was significantly degraded by
154 pasteurization as well. Consequently, we switched to spiking samples with BCoV after
155 pasteurization and before the first centrifugation to remove solids. It would be interesting to
156 determine why BCoV was rapidly degraded by pasteurization, but an ostensibly similar virus,
157 SARS-CoV-2, was not.

158 To ascertain the impact of pasteurization on SARS-CoV-2 quantitation, a single
159 California wastewater sample was divided into ten parts. Five of these replicate samples were
160 pasteurized and five were not. The positive impact of pasteurization on SARS-CoV-2
161 quantification is reflected in the increase of N1 copies/L of pasteurized versus unpasteurized
162 samples (Fig. 2; paired t-test: $t = 7.191$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.002$). We speculate that incubation of
163 samples at 60 °C contributes to release of virus from wastewater solids. As an additional
164 advantage, pasteurization appears to increase repeatability of sample quantification. The pooled
165 variance for pasteurized and unpasteurized samples were 0.005 and 0.177 respectively. We
166 conclude that pasteurization results in greater sensitivity and more precise estimates of SARS-
167 CoV-2 prevalence. Similar outcomes have been reported elsewhere [17].
168



169
170 **Figure 2. Effect of Pasteurization:** Copy number yield for the N1 target obtained from one
171 California 24-hr composite wastewater sample processed either with pasteurization or without
172 pasteurization. Each point is the mean of 5 independent assays. Error bars are \pm SEM. A paired
173 t-test revealed significant differences between the treatments ($t = 7.191$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.002$).
174


175 In previous work on bacteriophages, we had observed that longer PEG/NaCl incubation
176 times increased phage recovery. To determine if longer incubation similarly impacts SARS-CoV-
177 2 recovery, we compared SARS-CoV-2 quantitation for samples incubated in PEG/NaCl for 24
178 hrs versus 48 hrs. We found that 48 hrs incubation significantly increased sample yield (Fig. 3;
179 RM ANOVA: $F = 398$, $P = 0.0003$). This result should ameliorate concerns about longer term
180 storage of wastewater samples if they cannot be processed immediately. In our hands, SARS-
181 CoV-2 quantitation was not impaired in the short term by storage at 4 °C either with or without
182 PEG/NaCl, an outcome similarly reflected by other studies [18, 19]. However, storing the
183 pasteurized samples at 4 °C for 72 hours without added PEG and NaCl negatively impacted the
184 recovery of N1 copies by RT-qPCR.



185
186 **Figure 3. Effect of Storage Time:** Following initial processing (pasteurization, preliminary
187 centrifugation, and filtering), 24-hr composite samples from 3 different wastewater treatment
188 plants were stored in a PEG/NaCl solution for precipitation and concentration of virions.
189 Samples stored in PEG/NaCl solution for 48-hrs are labeled by dark blue circles; samples
190 stored in PEG/NaCl solution for 24-hrs are labeled by light blue circles. Each point is the mean
191 of two technical replicate measurements from a 24-hour composite sample. Error bars are
192 \pm SEM. Some error bars are too small to be visible. A repeated measures ANOVA indicated that

193 48-hrs storage in PEG/NaCl resulted in significantly greater yields than did storage for 24-hrs (F
194 = 398, P = 0.0003).

195
196 The pellet obtained after centrifugation of the wastewater sample (with added PEG and
197 NaCl) is not visible to the naked eye in most cases and is usually distributed along the side of a
198 polypropylene Oak Ridge tube. Additionally, it takes time to dissolve the pellet in TRIzol, and
199 premature decanting may leave residual RNA unrecovered. Therefore, untrained users often
200 resuspend the pellet incompletely, resulting in the loss of valuable RNA. To aid in visualizing the
201 pellet, we added safranin at 0.2% final concentration immediately before centrifugation. Safranin
202 did not interfere with downstream processing (Fig. 4). When safranin is added, a pale pink pellet
203 is easily visible. The video uploaded as Supplementary Material (S2) shows how long it takes to
204 dissolve the pellet in TRIzol. This strategy of adding safranin is particularly useful for training
205 purposes.




206
207 **Figure 4. Effect of Safranin Staining:** Copy number yield for the N1 target for 24-hr composite
208 wastewater samples obtained from 3 wastewater treatment plants. Samples processed with
209 safranin are labeled by dark blue circles; controls are labeled with light blue circles. Each point
210 is the mean of 4 technical replicate measurements from a 24-hour composite sample. Error bars

211 are \pm SEM. Some error bars are too small to be visible. A repeated measures ANOVA revealed
212 that safranin staining improved virus recovery ($F= 15.10$, $P = 0.006$). This effect is likely a result
213 of better visibility of the RNA pellet during recovery.

214

215 To explore the cheapest alternatives of extracting RNA from wastewater samples we
216 compared a widely used column-based QIAamp Viral RNA Mini kit (Qiagen Inc.) with TRIzol
217 (ThermoFisher Inc.). TRIzol facilitates significantly better RNA recovery than the kit at a fraction
218 of the cost (Fig. 5; RM ANOVA: $F= 1441$, $P < 0.0001$). We note that we also found phenol-
219 chloroform extraction to be less consistent than TRIzol on saliva samples, so while phenol-
220 chloroform is likely even cheaper, we advise against its use in this protocol. TRIzol was
221 therefore chosen as the organic extraction method to compare with column approaches.
222 Importantly the supply of TRIzol is less impacted by supply chain issues. Additionally, TRIzol
223 removes DNA, but retains RNA, whereas column-based kits are unable to do so. If the intention
224 is to sequence RNA obtained from wastewater samples, TRIzol extraction provides a cleaner
225 sample with less contaminating DNA from non-SARS-CoV-2 genomes. As a caveat, because
226 TRIzol requires the careful extraction of an aqueous layer from a multilayered solution, TRIzol
227 extraction requires training and is best performed by experienced users.




228

229 **Figure 5. Effect of TRizol Extraction:** Copy number yield for the N1 target for 24-hr composite
230 wastewater samples obtained from 5 wastewater treatment plants. Samples processed with
231 TRizol are labeled by dark blue circles; samples processed with the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit
232 are labeled with light blue circles. Each point is the mean of 2 technical replicate measurements
233 from a 24-hour composite sample. Error bars are \pm SEM. Some error bars are too small to be
234 visible. A repeated measures ANOVA revealed that the use of TRizol significantly improved
235 virus RNA recovery ($F= 1441, P < 0.0001$).

236

237 In addition to comparing RNA isolation methods, we evaluated the performance of
238 different enzymes, including the TaqPath 1-Step RT-qPCR enzyme (ThermoFisher Inc.) and
239 One Step PrimeScript III enzyme (Takara Bio USA Inc.) Our results indicated that the One Step
240 PrimeScript III enzyme gave slightly better results (Fig. 6). As the One Step PrimeScript III
241 enzyme was 25% cheaper and performed similarly to the ThermoFisher enzyme, we chose the
242 PrimeScript III enzyme for the final protocol.



243

244 **Figure 6. Effect of Different RT-qPCR Enzymes:** Copy number yield for the N1 target for 24-
245 hr composite wastewater samples obtained from 6 wastewater treatment plants (WWTP). RT-
246 qPCR assays performed with the TaqPath 1-Step RT-qPCR enzyme (ThermoFisher Inc.)
247 recommended by the CDC [20] are labeled by light blue circles; RT-qPCR assays performed
248 with One Step PrimeScript III enzyme (Takara Bio USA Inc.) are labeled with dark blue circles.
249 Each point in the mean of 2 technical replicate measurements from a 24-hour composite
250 sample. Error bars are \pm SEM. Some error bars are too small to be visible. A repeated measure
251 ANOVA revealed that the use of the PrimeScript III enzyme improved virus RNA recovery ($F=$
252 13.09, $P = 0.011$).

253

254 The need to adapt wastewater surveillance detection programs to include variant
255 detection requires deep sequencing of cDNA generated from the wastewater RNA. Our
256 preliminary results have shown that RNA extracted with our PEG/TRIzol protocol can be
257 sequenced using both traditional Sanger sequencing and NGS technology. However, we also
258 note that pasteurization reduced sequencing quality and output relative to unpasteurized
259 samples, so we recommend skipping this step if the intention is to sequence RNA obtained from
260 wastewater.

261 We used both the Swift Normalase[®] Amplicon Panel (SNAP) SARS-CoV-2 Panel kit as
262 well as the Qiagen QIAseq[®] SARS-CoV-2 Primer Panel and QIAseq FX DNA Library kit and
263 have obtained SARS-CoV-2 sequences from several of our wastewater treatment plants.
264 Known and novel variants were identified. We continue to optimize and improve our library
265 preparation methods to increase both length of coverage and depth of coverage for our NYC
266 samples. In addition, we are developing real-time assays for the identification and quantification
267 of additional viruses that circulate among our New York communities including Influenza.

268

269 **Acknowledgements**

270 The research described herein would not be possible if not for the assistance and support of a
271 wide-range of organizations and individuals that came together to address the shared calamity
272 that is the COVID-19 pandemic. We thank Gina Behnke, Esmeraldo Castro, Francoise Chauvin,
273 Alexander Clare, Pilar Domingo-Calap, Pam Elardo, Raul Gonzalez, Crystal Hepp, Catherine
274 Hoar, Dimitrios Katehis, William Kelly, Samantha McBride, Hope McGibbon, Timon
275 McPhearson, Samantha Patinella, Krish Ramalingam, Andrea Silverman, Fabrizio Spagnolo,
276 Jasmin Torres, Arvind Varsani, Peter Williamsen for support, advice, discussions, and feedback.
277 This work was funded in part by the New York City Department of Environmental Protection.
278 The Water Research Foundation, the NSF Research Coordination Network for Wastewater
279 Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 and Qiagen Inc. provided resources, materials and supplies,
280 technical support, and community support.

281

282 **Author Contributions: Conceptualization:** MT, DSS, JJD; **Data Curation:** MT, KC, TG, SK,
283 KMS, DSS, JJD; **Formal Analysis:** MT, IH, SK, DSS, JJD; **Funding Acquisition:** MT, DSS,
284 JJD; **Investigation:** MT, KC, TG, SK, NK, KMS, DSS; **Methodology:** MT, KC, TG, SK, KMS,
285 DSS, JJD; **Project Administration:** MT, DSS, JJD; **Resources:** MT, DSS, JJD; **Supervision:**
286 MT, DSS, JJD; **Visualization:** JJD; **Writing – Original Draft Preparation:** MT, DSS, JJD;
287 **Writing – Review & Editing:** MT, IH, SK, NK, DSS, JJD.

288

289

290 **Data Availability**

291 All data associated with this manuscript are available on <https://datadryad.org/>:

292 <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.zkh189396>.

293

294 **Supporting Information**

295 S1: Step-by-step protocol, also available on protocols.io

296 [S2: Video showing the resuspension of the pellet with safranin](#)

297

298 **References**

299 1. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different
300 Types of Clinical Specimens. JAMA. 2020;323(18):1843-4. doi:

301 10.1001/jama.2020.3786. PubMed PMID: 32159775.

302 2. Johansson MA, Quandelacy TM, Kada S, Prasad PV, Steele M, Brooks JT, et al. SARS-
303 CoV-2 Transmission From People Without COVID-19 Symptoms. JAMA Network Open.
304 2021;4(1):e2035057-e. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.35057.

305 3. Larsen DA, Wigginton KR. Tracking COVID-19 with wastewater. Nature Biotechnology.
306 2020;38(10):1151-3. doi: 10.1038/s41587-020-0690-1.

307 4. Wibmer CK, Ayres F, Hermanus T, Madzivhandila M, Kgagudi P, Lambson BE, et al.
308 SARS-CoV-2 501Y.V2 escapes neutralization by South African COVID-19 donor
309 plasma. bioRxiv. 2021:2021.01.18.427166. doi: 10.1101/2021.01.18.427166.

310 5. Rambaut A, Loman N, Pybus O, Barclay W, Barrett J, Carabelli A, et al. Preliminary
311 genomic characterisation of an emergent SARS-CoV-2 lineage in the UK defined by a
312 novel set of spike mutations. Available from: [https://virological.org/t/preliminary-genomic-
313 characterisation-of-an-emergent-sars-cov-2-lineage-in-the-uk-defined-by-a-novel-set-of-
314 spike-mutations/563](https://virological.org/t/preliminary-genomic-characterisation-of-an-emergent-sars-cov-2-lineage-in-the-uk-defined-by-a-novel-set-of-spike-mutations/563). 2020.

315 6. Chen Y, Chen L, Deng Q, Zhang G, Wu K, Ni L, et al. The presence of SARS-CoV-2

- 316 RNA in the feces of COVID-19 patients. *J Med Virol.* 2020;92(7):833-40. Epub
317 2020/04/04. doi: 10.1002/jmv.25825. PubMed PMID: 32243607.
- 318 7. Walsh KA, Jordan K, Clyne B, Rohde D, Drummond L, Byrne P, et al. SARS-CoV-2
319 detection, viral load and infectivity over the course of an infection. *J Infect.*
320 2020;81(3):357-71. Epub 2020/07/03. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2020.06.067. PubMed PMID:
321 32615199; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7323671.
- 322 8. Ahmed W, Tschärke B, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Bivins A, Choi P, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA
323 monitoring in wastewater as a potential early warning system for COVID-19 transmission
324 in the community: A temporal case study. *Science of The Total Environment.*
325 2021;761:144216. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144216>.
- 326 9. Medema G, Been F, Heijnen L, Petterson S. Implementation of environmental
327 surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 virus to support public health decisions: Opportunities and
328 challenges. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health.* 2020;17:49-71. doi:
329 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.006>.
- 330 10. Crits-Christoph A, Kantor RS, Olm MR, Whitney ON, Al-Shayeb B, Lou YC, et al.
331 Genome Sequencing of Sewage Detects Regionally Prevalent SARS-CoV-2 Variants.
332 *mBio.* 2021;12(1):e02703-20. doi: 10.1128/mBio.02703-20.
- 333 11. Fontenele RS, Kraberger S, Hadfield J, Driver EM, Bowes D, Holland LA, et al. High-
334 throughput sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater provides insights into circulating
335 variants. *medRxiv.* 2021. Epub 2021/01/28. doi: 10.1101/2021.01.22.21250320. PubMed
336 PMID: 33501452; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7836124 Raintree, Ste 130,
337 Scottsdale, AZ 85260, USA, an ASU start-up company providing commercial services in
338 wastewater-based epidemiology. R.U.H. is the founder of OneWaterOneHealth, a non-
339 profit project of the Arizona State University Foundation.
- 340 12. Martin J, Klapsa D, Wilton T, Zambon M, Bentley E, Bujaki E, et al. Tracking SARS-CoV-
341 2 in Sewage: Evidence of Changes in Virus Variant Predominance during COVID-19

- 342 Pandemic. *Viruses*. 2020;12(10). Epub 2020/10/15. doi: 10.3390/v12101144. PubMed
343 PMID: 33050264; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7601348.
- 344 13. Saif LJ. Bovine respiratory coronavirus. *Vet Clin North Am Food Anim Pract*.
345 2010;26(2):349-64. Epub 2010/07/14. doi: 10.1016/j.cvfa.2010.04.005. PubMed PMID:
346 20619189; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4094360.
- 347 14. Vidaver AK, Koski RK, Van Etten JL. Bacteriophage phi6: a Lipid-Containing Virus of
348 *Pseudomonas phaseolicola*. *J Virol*. 1973;11(5):799-805. Epub 1973/05/01. doi:
349 10.1128/jvi.11.5.799-805.1973. PubMed PMID: 16789137; PubMed Central PMCID:
350 PMCPMC355178.
- 351 15. Fumian TM, Leite JPG, Castello AA, Gaggero A, Caillou MSLd, Miagostovich MP.
352 Detection of rotavirus A in sewage samples using multiplex qPCR and an evaluation of
353 the ultracentrifugation and adsorption-elution methods for virus concentration. *Journal of*
354 *Virological Methods*. 2010;170(1):42-6. doi:
355 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jviromet.2010.08.017>.
- 356 16. Calgua B, Mengewein A, Grunert A, Bofill-Mas S, Clemente-Casares P, Hundesa A, et
357 al. Development and application of a one-step low cost procedure to concentrate viruses
358 from seawater samples. *J Virol Methods*. 2008;153(2):79-83. Epub 2008/09/04. doi:
359 10.1016/j.jviromet.2008.08.003. PubMed PMID: 18765255.
- 360 17. Pecson BM, Darby E, Haas CN, Amha YM, Bartolo M, Danielson R, et al. Reproducibility
361 and sensitivity of 36 methods to quantify the SARS-CoV-2 genetic signal in raw
362 wastewater: findings from an interlaboratory methods evaluation in the U.S.
363 *Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology*. 2021. doi:
364 10.1039/D0EW00946F.
- 365 18. Hokajärvi A-M, Rytönen A, Tiwari A, Kauppinen A, Oikarinen S, Lehto K-M, et al. The
366 detection and stability of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA biomarkers in wastewater influent in
367 Helsinki, Finland. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2021;770:145274. doi:

368 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145274>.

369 19. Jørgensen ACU, Gamst J, Hansen LV, Knudsen IIH, Jensen SKS. Eurofins Covid-19
370 Sentinel™ Wastewater Test Provide Early Warning of a potential COVID-19 outbreak.

371 medRxiv. 2020:2020.07.10.20150573. doi: 10.1101/2020.07.10.20150573.

372 20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV)
373 Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel.

374 <https://www.fda.gov/media/134922/download2020>.

375

376

377

378

379