Wastewater Monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 from Acute Care Hospitals Identifies Nosocomial Transmission and Outbreaks

Nicole Acosta¹, María A. Bautista², Jordan Hollman^{3,4}, Janine McCalder^{1,2}, Alexander Buchner Beaudet², Lawrence Man², Barbara J. Waddell¹, Jianwei Chen², Carmen Li², Darina Kuzma⁵, Srijak Bhatnagar², Jenine Leal^{1,6,7,10}, Jon Meddings⁸, Jia Hu^{7,9,10}, Jason L. Cabaj⁷⁻¹⁰, Norma J. Ruecker¹¹, Christopher Naugler^{7,12}, Dylan R. Pillai^{1,12-14}, Gopal Achari⁴, M. Cathryn Ryan³, John M. Conly^{1,6,8,10,12,13}, Kevin Frankowski⁵, Casey RJ Hubert² and Michael D. Parkins^{1,8,13}

¹ Department of Microbiology, Immunology and Infectious Diseases, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

² Department of Biological Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

³ Department of Geosciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

⁴ Department of Civil Engineering, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

⁵ Advancing Canadian Wastewater Assets, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

⁶ Infection Prevention and Control, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Canada

⁷ Department of Community Health Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

⁸ Department of Medicine, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

20 ⁹ Provincial Population & Public Health, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Canada

21 ¹⁰ O'Brien Institute for Public Health, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

22 ¹¹ Water Quality Services, City of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

23 ¹² Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

24 ¹³ Snyder Institute for Chronic Diseases, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada

25 ¹⁴ Alberta Precision Laboratories, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Canada

26

27 **Key words:** COVID-19, sewage, wastewater, wastewater-based epidemiology, hospital-acquired

28 **Running Title:** SARS-CoV-2 in Hospital Wastewaters

29 **Abstract word count:** 246

30 **Manuscript word count:** 2998

31 **Figures:** 2

32 **Tables:** 3

33 **Supplemental Material included**

34 **Key-points summary:**

35 SAS-CoV-2 RNA is detectable in hospital wastewater. Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 RNA increases
36 in conjunction with COVID-19-related hospitalizations. Spikes in SARS-CoV-2 wastewater signal
37 correspond to incident hospital-acquired cases and outbreaks, suggesting passive surveillance via
38 wastewater has great promise for COVID-19 monitoring.

39 ***Corresponding author:**

40 Michael D. Parkins, Associate Professor, University of Calgary.

41 Postal address: 3330 Hospital Drive, NW, Calgary, Alberta, T2N 4N1. CANADA.

42 e-mail: mdparkin@ucalgary.ca

43 Phone: 403-220-5951, Fax: 403-270-2772.

44

45 **Alternative corresponding author:**

46 Casey RJ Hubert, Associate Professor, University of Calgary

47 Postal address: 2500 University Gate NW, Calgary, AB T2N 1N4. CANADA

48 e-mail: chubert@ucalgary.ca

49 Phone: 403-220-7794, Fax 403-289-9311

50

51

ABSTRACT

Background: SARS-CoV-2 has been detected in wastewater and its abundance correlated with community COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations and deaths. We sought to use wastewater-based detection of SARS-CoV-2 to assess the epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 in hospitals.

Methods: Between August and December 2020, twice-weekly wastewater samples from three tertiary-care hospitals (totaling >2100 dedicated inpatient beds) were collected. Wastewater samples were concentrated and cleaned using the 4S-silica column method and assessed for SARS-CoV-2 gene-targets (N1, N2 and E) and controls using RT-qPCR. Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 as measured by quantification cycle (Cq), genome copies and genomes normalized to the fecal biomarker PMMoV were compared to the total daily number of patients hospitalized with active COVID-19, confirmed cases of hospital-acquired infection, and the occurrence of unit-specific outbreaks.

Results: Of 165 wastewater samples collected, 159 (96%) were assayable. The N1-gene from SARS-CoV-2 was detected in 64.1% of samples, N2 in 49.7% and E in 10%. N1 and N2 in wastewater increased over time both in terms of amount of detectable virus and the proportion of samples that were positive, consistent with increasing hospitalizations (Pearson's $r=0.679$, $P<0.0001$, Pearson's $r=0.728$, $P<0.0001$, respectively). Despite increasing hospitalizations through the study period, wastewater analysis was able to identify incident nosocomial-acquired cases of COVID-19 (Pearson's $r=0.389$, $P<0.001$) and unit-specific outbreaks by increases in detectable SARS-CoV-2 N1-RNA (median 112 copies/ml) versus outbreak-free periods (0 copies/ml; $P<0.0001$).

73 **Conclusions:** Wastewater-based monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 represents a promising tool for
74 SARS-CoV-2 passive surveillance and case identification, containment, and mitigation in acute-
75 care medical facilities.

76

INTRODUCTION

SARS-CoV-2 RNA is present in the feces of infected individuals – appearing just prior or concomitant with symptoms[1]. Accordingly, leaders in the field of wastewater-based epidemiology leveraged their expertise to study this emerging infectious disease[2, 3]. Medema *et al* first reported SARS-CoV-2-RNA in Dutch wastewater-treatment plants (WW-TP)[4]. Several groups have since adapted this technology to understand community disease-burden[5-8]. Recent studies suggest that SARS-CoV-2-RNA increases in WW-TP precede clinically diagnosed cases by 0-2 days and associated hospitalizations by 1-4 days[6].

Between 4-8% of individuals with COVID-19 will be hospitalized, with age and co-morbidities being key risk factors[9-11]. Nosocomial-transmission and outbreaks affecting patients and health care workers (HCW) are not uncommon, although drivers remain to be fully understood[12, 13]. While hospital-acquisition is rare (0.8-5 cases/10,000 patient-days in communities with high disease burden), public fear of acquiring COVID-19 from hospitals has resulted in reduced health-resource utilization and hospital avoidance, often to the detriment of patients[14, 15]. Accordingly, hospital-based detection tools are needed to understand the epidemiology of COVID-19 and potentially mitigate spread.

Hospitals hold great promise in understanding SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-generated data. Owing to their proximity to affected individuals in the municipal sewershed relative to WW-TP (i.e., shorter transit time for signal degradation[1]), hospitals may aid in understanding SARS-CoV-2 wastewater dynamics. Compared to the general community, hospitals are much more likely to comprehensively monitor and identify all cases within their populations. Furthermore, outbreaks in hospitals are rapidly and comprehensively investigated. For these reasons we embarked on this

study to determine relationships between hospital SARS-CoV-2 wastewater dynamics and COVID-19 hospitalizations, nosocomial-transmissions and outbreaks.

METHODS

Acute-care hospitals and hospital information systems

We monitored SARS-CoV-2-RNA in the wastewater from three of Calgary's four adult tertiary-care hospitals, accounting for 89% of staffed-inpatient beds (Supplementary Material). Daily prevalent-hospitalized cases were defined as those with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 within 14 days, remaining on contact/droplet precautions. Hospital-acquired cases were defined as patients who were admitted to hospital ≥ 7 days before COVID-19 symptom onset that were then confirmed by a positive RT-qPCR SARS-CoV-2 test; or a patient admitted to hospital for ≤ 7 days confirmed to have hospital-acquired COVID-19 infection based on an epidemiological link. Hospital-acquired cases were separately recorded including the unit where they were acquired and are reported as hospital-wide signals for Hospital-1 and 2. Data for Hospital-3 are presented as 3A, 3B, 3C based on wastewater drainage outflows of different units. COVID-19 outbreaks were defined as any unit with ≥ 1 confirmed hospital-acquired case(s) and/or ≥ 2 confirmed COVID-19 cases in HCWs linked to a unit. This research was approved by the University of Calgary's Conjoint Health Regional Ethics Board (REB-20-1252).

Wastewater sampling

Wastewater samples were collected from August 5th to December 17th, 2020 at three hospitals. Hospital-wide access through a single sampling point was not possible at Hospital-3 where an initial sampling point (Hospital-3A) captured the units predicted to be most relevant for COVID-19 (including ICUs and dedicated COVID-19 care-units). Beginning October 1st two additional

sites were added, Hospital-3B and Hospital-3C, expanding coverage to all inpatient-care buildings. Composite 24-hour samples of wastewater were collected using ISCO-GLS autosamplers (Lincoln, Nebraska) placed inside sewer access points outside of hospitals. Samples were taken from each location twice-weekly.

Sample Processing and RNA Purification

Sample preparation and molecular analysis were performed at separate sites to prevent cross contamination. At ACWA, wastewater samples were processed with a 40 ml aliquot taken to comprise the sample. Each sample was spiked with a positive control - Bovilis® attenuated-Coronavirus Vaccine (BCoV; Merck, #151921). Sample processing and RNA purification was conducted using the 4S-silica column method (i.e., Sewage, Salt, Silica and SARS-CoV-2) with modifications[16]. Purified nucleic acids were transported on dry ice to the Health Sciences Centre for molecular analysis. An extraction blank control was included for every processed sample batch to ensure no contamination occurred.

RT-qPCR analysis

We used RT-qPCR to quantify SARS-CoV-2-RNA and controls in wastewater. Specific primers and probes (Supplementary Table-S1) were used to amplify two regions of the nucleocapsid gene (i.e., N1 and N2) and a region of the envelope gene (i.e., E). Samples were considered positive for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA-target if amplification passed a detection cycle threshold in <40 cycles for at least one of N1, N2 and/or E [4, 17, 18]. The quantification cycle (Cq) value was used for calculations when this threshold was <40 cycles or reached between 40 and 45 cycles for one target as long as another target reached the threshold in <40 cycles. Amplification of the Pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV) was employed to incorporate a human fecal biomarker control

in order to normalize SARS-CoV-2 for the relative bioburden in samples[5]. RT-qPCR was performed using a QuantStudio-5 Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems) with each run including no-template controls (NTCs) in triplicate. For N1, N2 and E-assays three positive controls were included in each run. Samples where minimal signal for BCoV or PMMoV controls were recovered were excluded from the analysis to mitigate false-negative results. Amplified products from wastewater were also Sanger sequenced to confirm amplicons were derived from SARS-CoV-2.

Statistical analysis

To compare the surrogate BCoV and PMMoV signals between hospitals, pairwise Mann-Whitney tests were performed. Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis tests were performed for multiple comparisons of assay sensitivity and surrogate organism signals between sampling locations. Pearson's correlation analyses were performed to determine the correlation of wastewater RNA-signal measured as *i*). Cq, or *ii*). genome copies/ml of wastewater or *iii*). genome copies/genome of PMMoV, vs daily-hospitalized cases. To assess for correlation of wastewater RNA-signal with incident hospital-acquired cases, and to compensate for gaps owing to the twice-weekly sampling, incident cases occurring +/- 3 days were compared to wastewater signals. To compare the SARS-CoV-2 wastewater N1-signal observed during and between unit-outbreaks, each sample was dichotomized as being collected within 3-days of a declared outbreak or not. Samples after a declared outbreak were excluded until 3-days after the last in-hospital linked case was identified. Statistical tests analyzed Hospital-1 and Hospital-2 together (given their capture of the entire hospital-facility) and separately. Statistical analyses were conducted with GraphPad's Prism-8 software (La Jolla, CA).

RESULTS

Hospital SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater-RNA Kinetics

In total, 165 hospital wastewater samples were collected and 159 assessed through 135-days of bi-weekly observation (40 Hospital-1; 39 Hospital-2; 34 Hospital-3A; 23 Hospital-3B; 23 Hospital-3C). Six samples were excluded (Supplementary Figures S1-S2) SARS-CoV-2-RNA in wastewater increased over time in both the amount detectable and the proportion of samples that were positive, consistent with increasing cases and hospitalizations (Table 1, Supplementary Figure S3), coinciding with Calgary's COVID-19 'second wave'. We observed that the N1-assay had the best sensitivity for detecting SARS-CoV-2. Of the 96 samples tested using N1, N2 and E-assays (i.e., those received between August 1st and October 29th), 9 samples were positive for all three targets, 28 were positive only for N1 and N2, and 39 were positive only for N1. After October 29th the E-assay was dropped, and 69 samples were analyzed, 51 were positive for both N1 and N2 and 63 were positive just with N1. N1 and N2-signals measured as Cq were positively correlated (Pearson's $r=0.710$ Hospital-1, 0.762 Hospital-2, 0.792 Hospital-3A, 0.417 Hospital-3B and 0.491 Hospital-3C) across all sites (Table 2). No-template and blank controls for sample processing and RNA purification were negative for all assays (i.e., N1, N2, E, BCoV and PMMoV). Standard curves for all RT-qPCR assays were within an acceptable range for efficiencies (75 to 162%) and R^2 (0.7 to 1.0) (Supplementary Table-S2).

Hospital-1 had a higher proportion of SARS-COV-2-positive wastewater compared to Hospital-2 and Hospital-3, consistent with the higher burden of disease in NE Calgary (Table 1 and Figure 1). Following a large outbreak in Hospital-3 involving 45 patients, 43 HCW and 5 visitors (beginning in a ward not monitored via Hospital-3A site and compounded by affected patients

being transferred into different units through the hospital) that was declared on September 17th, wastewater sampling was expanded to include additional sites; Hospital-3B and Hospital-3C (Figure 2) to enable complete capture of Hospital-3.

Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 signal correlates with total hospitalized COVID-19 cases

We assessed the correlation between the SARS-CoV-2 wastewater-N1 with active-COVID-19 patients on contact/droplet isolation at each hospital. When assessed together, Hospital-1 and Hospital-2, we observed that as prevalent cases increased, the wastewater-signal measured as N1-Cq also increased (Pearson's $r=0.679$, CI: 0.529-0.787, $P<0.0001$). This was also true when Hospital-1 and Hospital-2 were assessed separately (Table 2). The same was observed when SARS-CoV-2-N1 wastewater was normalized against copies of the PMMoV at Hospital-2, but only trended towards significance at Hospital-1 (Table 2). These same correlations are not as reliable at the Hospital-3 as we did not have access to prevalent cases as a function of sampling site. However, we continued to observe a positive correlation (Table 2) between prevalent cases vs N1-wastewater signal was measured as Cq at Hospital-3A (including dedicated COVID-19 care units and ICUs) (Pearson's $r=0.717$) or measured as copies/ml and copies normalized to PMMoV at Hospital-3C (Pearson's $r=0.503$ and 0.479 , respectively).

Wastewater SARS-COV2 signal correlates with hospital-acquired infections and outbreaks

We observed a positive correlation between wastewater N1-signal and hospital-acquired cases at Hospital-1 and Hospital-2 when analyzed together (Pearson's $r=0.389$, CI: 0.177–0.566, $P<0.001$) and individually (Table 2). Hospital-3 data could not be fully analyzed as we did not have complete access to patient/HCW movements. Total SARS-CoV-2 as measured by Cq correlated with incident hospital-acquired cases at Hospital-3A when normalized relative to PMMoV. With

respect to whether peaks in SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater associated with outbreaks, we compared SARS-CoV-2 signal from wastewater samples collected within 3 days of an outbreak being declared with samples collected during outbreak-free periods. When Hospital-1 and Hospital-2 were analysed together, we observed significant differences in median SARS-CoV-2 N-1 between outbreak-free periods vs outbreak periods when measured as copies/ml (0 [IQR: 0-57] vs 112 [IQR: 12-1726], $P < 0.0001$) and normalized for PMMoV (0 [IQR: 0-0.06] vs 0.17 [IQR: 0.06-0.89], $P = 0.0003$). We observed that at each of Hospital-1, Hospital-2 and Hospital-3A there were significant differences in median SARS-CoV-2-N1 measured using copies/ml between outbreak and outbreak-free periods (Table 3). Similarly, the same trend was observed at Hospital-1 and Hospital-3A when wastewater SARS-CoV-2-N1 was normalized for PMMoV (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

Hospital-associated outbreaks of COVID-19 are increasingly being reported. Early data suggests that patients with nosocomial COVID-19 may fare worse than those with community-acquired disease, experiencing longer hospital stays but not increased mortality[13]. This observation balances the opposing impacts of increased co-morbidities and medical acuity in hospitalized individuals on one-hand, with the potential for earlier detection and more rapid supportive care/treatment on the other.

Preventing nosocomial transmission of COVID-19 is challenging for a myriad of reasons[19]. In addition to its highly infectious nature, accurate identification, triage, and effective isolation of cases is exceedingly difficult. While COVID-19 has a typical incubation period of 5-7 days, it can take as long as 14 days to manifest such that identifying evolving symptoms in previously admitted patients is challenging[20, 21]. Furthermore, up to 40% of individuals (including patients and

HCW) may be asymptomatic, pauci-symptomatic, or pre-symptomatic— each just as likely to transmit infection as symptomatic individuals[22-24]. Despite rigorous infection control protocols, nosocomial infections continue to occur. Novel strategies to understand the epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 in hospitals are therefore urgently required. One such strategy may be the monitoring of hospital wastewater[25].

To date, most wastewater-based SARS-CoV-2 RNA surveillance has focused on monitoring community burden of disease by sampling WW-TP[5-8]. More recently, moving sampling ‘upstream’ in the wastewater-network, closer to patients, is actively being explored. The most granular data comes from single-facility assessments. Passive wastewater surveillance could hold promise as an early warning strategy, adaptable to both low- and high-risk facilities. Importantly, if an incipient signal is detected in facility-wide wastewater samples, in-building plumbing systems can be strategically sampled in a nested manner in order to confirm an outbreak location.

Here we demonstrate that both the frequency of positive samples and the abundance of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in hospital wastewater systems correlated with increasing hospitalised cases – analogous to WW-TP levels correlating with the COVID-19 community-diagnosed cases[5-8]. This was most evident using raw SARS-CoV-2 Cq values but was also evident when normalized against PMMoV levels. We observed the N1-region of the nucleocapsid gene to be more sensitive than N-2, and E so low as to be dropped from our protocol. Other groups have reported similar trends in that the N1-target is the most sensitive marker in WW-TP studies[4] and cruise ships[26].

Despite nosocomial cases and outbreaks representing a small fraction of the overall population of patients hospitalized with COVID-19, these events were discernable by wastewater testing. The natural history of SARS-CoV-2-RNA presence in the gastrointestinal tract remains incompletely

understood[2, 3]. Changes in fecal viral loads over the course of the disease have not been explored. Extrapolating from our hospital-based wastewater data, it appears that peak fecal viral shedding may occur around symptom onset, given the congruence of wastewater RNA-signal and nosocomial cases and outbreaks identified in hospitals. Based on the rapid decline in wastewater signal thereafter, it is likely that fecal SARS-CoV-2-RNA drops significantly after initial presentation. Indeed, early in the pandemic when fewer patients with COVID-19 were hospitalized, wastewater samples routinely tested negative. This critical observation suggests that wastewater-based monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 may be most sensitive for identifying incident cases. Accordingly, wastewater-based monitoring of individual high-risk facilities (i.e., hospitals, nursing homes and industrial meat plants) – providing more granular data - through to WW-TP may have great merit.

A key limitation to the identification of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples, relative to clinical samples (e.g., swabs) is the massive volume of water in which samples are diluted. This necessitates sample concentration. While procedures for the efficient recovery of non-enveloped viruses exist, researchers continue to search for satisfactory protocols for enveloped viruses such as SARS-CoV-2[27]. Many groups have explored ways to improve the sensitivity of wastewater SARS-CoV-2 detection. Diagnostic platforms with improved sensitivity and more impervious to impurities in the wastewater matrix (i.e., digital droplet RT-PCR) also show considerable promise[28, 29]. Sampling in the proximal sewershed may lead to day-to-day variance resulting in signal noise. This is particularly true for single-facility studies where potential extremes in individual virus shedding could confound results; limited data suggests significant variations in fecal viral load occur (from $10^{3.4}$ to $10^{7.6}$)[30]. This is a key challenge that remains to be solved if wastewater data is to be used in a meaningful way. Similarly, issues arise with attempts to

normalize SARS-CoV-2 based on the contributing population. We chose to use the PMMoV as a fecal biomarker to control for variations in fecal loading – a particular risk when sampling takes place ‘upstream’ in the sewershed. While this marker has been validated in WW-TP samples where large and diverse populations contribute to sewage[31], hospitals are a much smaller collection of individuals and variations in PMMoV excretion owing to differences in diet could have a much larger impact[32].

By capturing longitudinal data from three tertiary-care hospitals (>2100 inpatient beds) we have demonstrated that passive wastewater monitoring is indeed possible at a range of hospital-facilities. Whereas Hospital-1 and Hospital-2 had a single municipal access point enabling surveillance of the entire facility – Hospital-3 required three locations to capture fully. As patients were frequently moved from one unit/building to another, either based on attending services geographic location, COVID-positive patient cohorting or need for ICU support, attributing SARS-CoV-2 signal in the wastewater of this facility was more complicated but nonetheless correlations were evident. Furthermore, while nursing staff is often assigned to individual units, many allied health workers and physicians work or consult throughout the entire facility. If passive wastewater monitoring is to be adapted for other aspects of nosocomial surveillance (i.e., antibiotic consumption, emergence of antimicrobial resistant organisms, etc.) – a keen insight into the collection network is required.

There are limitations of our work that merit discussion. Given the complexity involved in sample collection, we were limited to twice-weekly sampling. Knowing how quickly SARS-CoV-2 can spread and outbreaks can occur, a daily monitoring strategy would have much greater capacity to identify and mitigate secondary cases of COVID-19. Incident cases are likely to be clinically diagnosed in hospital far faster than in other high-risk facilities owing to greater resources and

heightened suspicion – potentially leading to an even greater lead-time associated with a positive wastewater-signal of outbreaks than observed herein. Hospitals pose unique challenges in wastewater monitoring owing to these facilities’ high use of chemical disinfectants and detergents[33] that could interfere with molecular assays; this may explain why 3.6% of our samples spiked controls and PMMoV were not detected by RT-qPCR. To minimize the risk of false negatives, rigorous protocols that use internal controls (such as our BCoV spike) are necessary. The role of PCR-inhibitors in the wastewater matrix within the proximal sewershed is an area that deserves considerable study if this field is to expand.

Wastewater-based monitoring can only effectively monitor those individuals that contribute fecal matter to the sewershed. Importantly, hospitalized patients – those most vulnerable to COVID-19 adverse events – are often unable to self-toilet. Rather, these sick and often elderly individuals are dependent on continence aids, adult diapers, sanitary pads and nursing cleanup; this results in fecal matter from these individuals being disposed into biohazard solid waste. Accordingly, wastewater-based sampling could miss between 10-20% of patients in general hospital patients[34, 35]. This proportion is expected to be even higher in ICU where immobilization necessitated through ventilatory support further heightens toileting assistance requirements. Adapting wastewater surveillance technology to other high-risk settings like long-term care will encounter this same limitation. Finally, – tracking workers through passive wastewater monitoring poses inherent challenges. There is data that suggests that 52-56% of employees are uncomfortable defecating at work[36, 37].

Conclusion

In a five-month observational study we were able to detect SARS-CoV-2 from the wastewater of Calgary's three largest tertiary-care hospitals. The rate of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater test-positivity and RNA-abundance increased over time, concomitant with the increasing proportion of patients hospitalized with COVID-19. Despite persistent low levels of SARS-CoV-2-RNA in wastewater resulting from patients being treated for and recovering from COVID-19, we detected spikes attributable to hospital-acquired infections and outbreaks. This study reveals that wastewater-based monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA holds promise for early detection, monitoring and containment of incident infections.

329 **FUNDING**

330 This work was supported by grants from the Canadian Institute of Health Research [448242 to
331 M.D.P.]; and Canadian Foundation for Innovation [41054 to C.R.J.H], as well as discretionary
332 start-up funding from the Cumming School of Medicine Infectious Disease Section-Chief Fund
333 (M.D.P.) and Campus Alberta Innovates Program Chair (C.R.J.H).

334

335 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

336 The authors gratefully acknowledge the staff of the City of Calgary and in particular members of
 337 Water Quality Services for their continued efforts for sample site planning, maintenance, and
 338 collection. The authors are grateful to staff from Alberta Health Services and AHS Infection
 339 Prevention and Control for assistance in data collection on patient disposition in the Calgary Zone.
 340 The authors also thanks Cameron Semper for providing the pMCSG53 vector and T7/T7
 341 terminator primers, and for providing support with Gibson assembly cloning. We would like to
 342 acknowledge the tremendous efforts of Dr Rhonda Clark for program administration and
 343 management.

344 All authors report no potential conflicts. All authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for
 345 Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest.

346

REFERENCES

1. Foladori P, Cutrupi F, Segata N, et al. SARS-CoV-2 from faeces to wastewater treatment: What do we know? A review. *Sci Total Environ* **2020**; 743: 140444.
2. Ling Y, Xu SB, Lin YX, et al. Persistence and clearance of viral RNA in 2019 novel coronavirus disease rehabilitation patients. *Chin Med J (Engl)* **2020**; 133(9): 1039-43.
3. Gupta S, Parker J, Smits S, Underwood J, Dolwani S. Persistent viral shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in faeces - a rapid review. *Colorectal Dis* **2020**; 22(6): 611-20.
4. 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* **2020**; 7: 511-6.
5. D'Aoust PM, Mercier E, Montpetit D, et al. Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence. *Water Res* **2021**; 188: 116560.
6. Peccia J, Zulli A, Brackney DE, et al. Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics. *Nat Biotechnol* **2020**; 38(10): 1164-7.
7. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, et al. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Sci Total Environ* **2020**; 728: 138764.
8. Wurtzer S, Marechal V, Mouchel J, et al. Evaluation of lockdown effect on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics through viral genome quantification in waste water, Greater Paris, France, 5 March to 23 April 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **2020**; 25(50): 2000776.

- 369 9. Ioannou GN, Locke E, Green P, et al. Risk Factors for Hospitalization, Mechanical
370 Ventilation, or Death Among 10131 US Veterans With SARS-CoV-2 Infection. JAMA
371 Netw Open **2020**; 3(9): e2022310.
- 372 10. Carrillo-Vega MF, Salinas-Escudero G, Garcia-Pena C, Gutierrez-Robledo LM, Parra-
373 Rodriguez L. Early estimation of the risk factors for hospitalization and mortality by
374 COVID-19 in Mexico. PLoS One **2020**; 15(9): e0238905.
- 375 11. Ko JY, Danielson ML, Town M, et al. Risk Factors for COVID-19-associated
376 hospitalization: COVID-19-Associated Hospitalization Surveillance Network and
377 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. Clin Infect Dis **2020**.
- 378 12. Long DR, O'Reilly-Shah V, Rustagi AS, et al. Incidence of Health Care-Associated
379 COVID-19 During Universal Testing of Medical and Surgical Admissions in a Large US
380 Health System. Open Forum Infect Dis **2020**; 7(10): ofaa435.
- 381 13. Carter B, Collins JT, Barlow-Pay F, et al. Nosocomial COVID-19 infection: examining
382 the risk of mortality. The COPE-Nosocomial Study (COVID in Older PEople). J Hosp
383 Infect **2020**; 106(2): 376-84.
- 384 14. Hartnett KP, Kite-Powell A, DeVies J, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on
385 Emergency Department Visits - United States, January 1, 2019-May 30, 2020. MMWR
386 Morb Mortal Wkly Rep **2020**; 69(23): 699-704.
- 387 15. Czeisler ME, Marynak K, Clarke KEN, et al. Delay or Avoidance of Medical Care
388 Because of COVID-19-Related Concerns - United States, June 2020. MMWR Morb
389 Mortal Wkly Rep **2020**; 69(36): 1250-7.

16. Whitney ON, Al-Shayeb B, Crits-Cristoph A, et al. V.4 -Direct wastewater RNA capture and purification via the "Sewage, Salt, Silica and SARS-CoV-2 (4S). Available at: <https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bpdfmi3n>. Accessed 1 June 2020.
17. Randazzo W, Truchado P, Cuevas-Ferrando E, Simón P, Allende A, Sánchez G. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water research* **2020**; 181: 115942.
18. Wu F, Zhang J, Xiao A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than Expected from Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems* **2020**; 5(4): e00614-20.
19. Harada S, Uno S, Ando T, et al. Control of a Nosocomial Outbreak of COVID-19 in a University Hospital. *Open Forum Infect Dis* **2020**; 7(12): ofaa512.
20. Wang X, Zhou Q, He Y, et al. Nosocomial outbreak of COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *Eur Respir J* **2020**; 55(6).
21. Backer JA, Klinkenberg D, Wallinga J. Incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) infections among travellers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. *Euro Surveill* **2020**; 25(5).
22. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382(22): 2081-90.
23. Yanes-Lane M, Winters N, Fregonese F, et al. Proportion of asymptomatic infection among COVID-19 positive persons and their transmission potential: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* **2020**; 15(11): e0241536.
24. Johansson MA, Quandelacy TM, Kada S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission From People Without COVID-19 Symptoms. *JAMA Netw Open* **2021**; 4(1): e2035057.

25. Gonçalves J, Koritnik T, Mioč V, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in hospital wastewater from a low COVID-19 disease prevalence area. *Science of The Total Environment* **2021**; 755: 143226.
26. Ahmed W, Bertsch PM, Angel N, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in commercial passenger aircraft and cruise ship wastewater: a surveillance tool for assessing the presence of COVID-19 infected travellers. *J Travel Med* **2020**; 27(5).
27. Alygizakis N, Markou AN, Rousis NI, et al. Analytical methodologies for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: Protocols and future perspectives. *Trends Analyt Chem* **2021**; 134: 116125.
28. Gonzalez R, Curtis K, Bivins A, et al. COVID-19 surveillance in Southeastern Virginia using wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Res* **2020**; 186: 116296.
29. Falzone L, Musso N, Gattuso G, et al. Sensitivity assessment of droplet digital PCR for SARS-CoV-2 detection. *Int J Mol Med* **2020**; 46(3): 957-64.
30. Cheung KS, Hung IFN, Chan PPY, et al. Gastrointestinal Manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Virus Load in Fecal Samples From a Hong Kong Cohort: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology* **2020**; 159(1): 81-95.
31. Kitajima M, Sassi HP, Torrey JR. Pepper mild mottle virus as a water quality indicator. *npj Clean Water* **2018**; 1(1): 19.
32. Colson P, Richet H, Desnues C, et al. Pepper mild mottle virus, a plant virus associated with specific immune responses, Fever, abdominal pains, and pruritus in humans. *PLoS One* **2010**; 5(4): e10041.
33. Zotesso JP, Cossich ES, Janeiro V, Tavares CRG. Treatment of hospital laundry wastewater by UV/H₂O₂ process. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* **2017**; 24(7): 6278-87.

- 435 34. Condon M, Mannion E, Molloy DW, O'Caoimh R. Urinary and Faecal Incontinence:
436 Point Prevalence and Predictors in a University Hospital. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*
437 **2019**; 16(2): 194.
- 438 35. Toba K, Ouchi Y, Orimo H, et al. Urinary incontinence in elderly inpatients in Japan: a
439 comparison between general and geriatric hospitals. *Aging (Milano)* **1996**; 8(1): 47-54.
- 440 36. Bennet J, McCall A. Women Poop. Sometime at work. Get over it. Available at:
441 <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/17/style/women-poop-at-work.html>. Accessed 1
442 December 2020.
- 443 37. MacKenzie M. This is how many people refuse to poop at work-Are you one of them?
444 Womens Health. Available at:
445 <https://www.womenshealthmag.com/health/a19998266/pooping-at-work/>. Accessed 1
446 December 2020.

447 TABLES

448 **Table 1.** Descriptive statistics of SARS-CoV-2 RNA monitoring among wastewater hospital samples.

Hospital	Collection period	No. of tested samples	N1			N2			E ^β		
			% of (+) SARS-CoV-2*	Cq median (IQR)	Cq range [†]	% of (+) SARS-CoV-2*	Cq median (IQR)	Cq range [†]	% of (+) SARS-CoV-2*	Cq median (IQR)	Cq range [†]
1	August 5 th to December 17 th	40	62.5	32.5 (30.6-36.4)	12.5	50	35.3 (33.5-37.7)	13.5	7.5	35.5 (31.3-37.3)	12.1
2	August 5 th to December 17 th	40	45	31.8-35.9	8.6	35	35.9 (34.5-37.8)	9.04	0	-	-
3A	August 5 th to December 17 th	39	51.3	32.8 (30.7-35.6)	11.9	48.7	36.2 (33.2-41.2)	16.3	12.8	30.6 (28.5-30.7)	5.7
3B	October 1 st to December 17 th	23	91.3	34.6 (33.8-36.5)	8.3	73.9	39.6 (38.1-41.7)	9.7	0	-	-

	3C	October 1 st to December 17 th	23	78.3	36.4 (34.7- 37.1)	11.07	52.2	41.1 (39.7- 41.7)	13.08	4.3	34.9	-
--	----	---	----	------	-------------------------	-------	------	-------------------------	-------	-----	------	---

449 * Percentage of samples positive for SARS-CoV2 (no. of positive samples/no. of tested samples).

450 † Range is the difference between the max and min value for Cq, cycle of quantification.

451 ^β E assay was performed for samples collected from August 5th to October 29th.

452

453 **Table 2.** Correlation analyses between SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in wastewater from Calgary Hospitals with daily-prevalent cases of
454 patients hospitalized with COVID-19 and those incident hospital-acquired cases.

455

Hospital	Comparison	Cq			Copies/ml			Copies/Copies PMMoV [†]		
		r	P-value	95% CI	r	P-value	95% CI	r	P-value	95% CI
1	N1 vs N2	0.710	<0.0001	0.511 – 0.836	-	-	-	-	-	-
	N1 vs prevalent	0.486	0.0027	0.187 – 0.702	0.290	0.0858	-0.0422 – 0.565	0.187	0.2737	-0.150 – 0.486
	N1 vs incident*	0.537	0.0005	0.263 – 0.731	0.279	0.0896	-0.0445 – 0.550	0.277	0.0920	-0.0466 – 0.548
2	N1 vs N2	0.762	<0.0001	0.587 – 0.868	-	-	-	-	-	-
	N1 vs prevalent	0.862	<0.0001	0.742 – 0.929	0.542	0.0008	0.255 – 0.741	0.534	0.0009	0.245 – 0.736
	N1 vs incident*	0.474	0.0030	0.177 – 0.692	0.25 5	0.1273	-0.0750 – 0.535	0.283	0.0900	-0.0455 – 0.556
3A	N1 vs N2	0.792	<0.0001	0.620 – 0.892	-	-	-	-	-	-

	N1 vs prevalent#	0.717	<0.0001	0.481 – 0.856	0.20 2	0.2840	-0.171 – 0.524	0.147	0.4382	-0.225 – 0.482
	N1 vs incident*	0.350	0.0492	0.00201 – 0.623	0.46 3	0.0077	0.136 – 0.699	0.444	0.0109	0.113 – 0.686
	N1 vs N2	0.417	0.0478	0.00565 – 0.708	-	-	-	-	-	-
3B	N1 vs prevalent#	0.139	0.5709	-0.337 – 0.558	0.13 5	0.5821	-0.340 – 0.555	- 0.139	0.5707	-0.558 – 0.337
	N1 vs incident*	0.0654	0.7783	-0.377 – 0.483	- 0.03 96	0.8645	-0.463 – 0.399	0.187	0.4179	-0.267 – 0.572
	N1 vs N2	0.491	0.0174	0.0987 – 0.751	-	-	-	-	-	-
3C	N1 vs prevalent#	- 0.0929	0.7052	-0.525 – 0.377	0.50 3	0.0282	0.0632 – 0.779	0.479	0.0379	0.0318 – 0.767
	N1 vs incident*	0.266	0.2433	-0.187 – 0.626	- 0.04 81	0.8361	-0.470 – 0.392	0.006 04	0.9793	-0.427 – 0.437

456 * Average of incident hospital acquired cases (-/+3 days from sample collection).

457 † Relative SARS-CoV2 genomic copies compared to genomic copies of PMMoV.

458 # Prevalent cases at Hospital-3 are reported for the entire facility – as opposed to those cases directly housed in 3A, 3B, 3C.

459 Cq, quantification cycle.

Table 3. SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in hospital-wastewater samples as a function of proximity to a declared outbreak.

Hospital	Measurement	Outbreak-free periods vs outbreaks	P-value
		(Median (IQR))	
1	Copies/ml	0 (0-7.9) vs 280 (35-1768)	<0.0001
	Copies/Copies PMMoV	0 (0-0.07) vs 0.18 (0.09-1.8)	0.0001
2	Copies/ml	0 (0-0) vs 8 (1.1-17)	0.022
	Copies/Copies PMMoV	0 (0-0) vs 0.035 (0-0.21)	0.453
3A	Copies/ml	0 (0-12) vs 122 (5.9-408)	0.031
	Copies/Copies PMMoV	0 (0-0.11) vs 0.5 (0.01-10)	0.026
3C	Copies/ml	2.4 (0-8.8) vs 26 (1.1-3179)	0.212
	Copies/Copies PMMoV	0.013 (0-0.08) vs 0.1 (0.0003-6.9)	0.253

FIGURES LEGENDS

Figure 1. Determination of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater samples from Hospital-1 and Hospital-2. Relative SARS-CoV-2 genomic copies compared to genomic copies of PMMoV from A) Hospital 1 (August 5th to December 17th) and B) Hospital 2 (August 5th to December 17th). Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in samples was determined by the N1 (black) and N2 (red) assays. Green line denotes the total daily number of active prevalent cases in the hospital. Orange bars denotes the number of daily hospital-acquired cases. Plots show the average of three technical replicates and error bars represent the standard deviation. Vertical dash lines correspond to days where outbreaks were declared (Table S3), where the number of patients and health care workers involved are indicated at the top each dotted dash line. Asterisk denotes that for a specific outbreak more than one unit was involved. Gray zones denote duration of the outbreak. HA: hospital acquired. Bottom individual boxed areas represent individual samples as Positives (+) = samples where SARS-CoV-2 signal identified with a Cq<40, and negatives (-) had values ≥ 40 . Please note that the scale is different in Figure A and B.

Figure 2. Determination of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater samples from Hospital-3. Relative SARS-CoV-2 genomic copies compared to genomic copies of PMMoV from A) Hospital 3A (Trauma, Medical & Surgical ICUs, orthopedics surgery and designated COVID-care units) August 5th to December 17th), B) Hospital 3B (i.e., Main Building, North wing, October 1st to December 17th) and C) Hospital3C (i.e., Main Building South Wing, cancer care building, complex medical care building and hostel/administration building), October 1st to December 17th). Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in samples was determined by the N1 (black) and N2 (red) assays. Green line denotes the number of prevalent cases in the hospital. Orange bars denotes the number of daily hospital-acquired cases. Plots show the average of three technical replicates and

error bars represent the standard deviation. Vertical dash lines correspond to days where outbreaks were declared (Table S3), where the number of patients and health care workers involved are indicated at the top each dotted dash line. Asterisk (*) denotes the largest outbreak which occurred initially at Hospital_3C prior to instituted monitoring at that site – and reflects the SARS-CoV-2 infected patients who were relocated to the designated COVID-19 wards in Hospital_3A where it was detected by wastewater monitoring. The last case associated with the large outbreak was identified October 19th. Gray zones denote duration of the outbreak. HA: hospital acquired. Bottom individual boxed areas represent individual samples as Positives (+) = samples where SARS-CoV-2 signal identified with a Cq<40, and negatives (-) had values ≥ 40 . Please note that the scale is different from A, B and C figures.

502 **Figure 2**

A

B

C

503