SARS-CoV-2 RNA in urban wastewater samples to monitor the COVID-19 epidemic in Lombardy, Italy (March – June 2020)

Sara Castiglioni^{1*}, Silvia Schiarea¹, Laura Pellegrinelli², Valeria Primache², Cristina Galli², Laura Bubba², Federica Mancinelli¹, Marilisa Marinelli³, Danilo Cereda⁴, Emanuela Ammoni⁴, Elena Pariani², Ettore Zuccato¹, Sandro Binda²

¹ Istituto di Ricerche Farmacologiche Mario Negri IRCCS, Department of Environmental Sciences, Via Mario Negri 2, 20156 Milan, Italy

² Department of Biomedical Sciences of Health, University of Milan, Via Pascal 36, 20133 Milan, Italy

³ ddPCR Field Applications Specialist, Bio-Rad Laboratories, Milan, Italy

⁴ DG Welfare, Regione Lombardia, Milan, Italy

*Corresponding Author:

Dr. Sara Castiglioni, PhD

Istituto di Ricerche Farmacologiche Mario Negri IRCCS

Via Mario Negri 2, 20156 Milano

e-mail: sara.castiglioni@marionegri.it

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Abstract

Wastewater-based viral surveillance is a promising approach to monitor the circulation of SARS-CoV-2 in the general population. The aim of this study was to develop an analytical method to detect SARS-CoV-2 RNA in urban wastewater, to be implemented in the framework of a surveillance network in the Lombardy region (Northern Italy). This area was the first hotspot of COVID-19 in Europe. Composite 24h samples were collected weekly in eight cities from end-March to mid-June 2020 (first peak of the epidemic). The method developed and optimized, involved virus concentration, using PEG centrifugation, and one-step real-time RT-PCR for analysis. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was identified in 65 (61%) out of 107 samples, and the viral concentrations (up to 2.1 E +05 copies/L) were highest in March-April. By mid-June, wastewater samples tested negative in all the cities. Viral loads were used for inter- city comparison and Brembate, Ranica and Lodi had the highest. The pattern of decrease of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater was closely comparable to the decline of active COVID-19 cases in the population, reflecting the effect of lock-down. Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 can integrate ongoing virological surveillance of COVID-19, providing information from both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals, and monitoring the effect of health interventions.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2; urban wastewater; viral loads, environmental surveillance, active cases.

1. Introduction

The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) is responsible for the Corona Virus Disease-19 (COVID-19), a highly infectious respiratory disease that has spread throughout the world at an unprecedented rate from Wuhan, China, since December 2019, affecting over 147 million people and causing more than 3,100,000 deaths so far (ECDC, COVID-19 situation update worldwide). On 11 March 2020, the World Health Organisation (WHO) declared a pandemic and most countries started practising social isolation and restrictions of commercial and industrial activities, which are partially still in place, with enormous socio-economic impact. Healthcare systems in all countries have been – and still are – facing big challenges to tackle the emergency and deal with the need for intensive care for large numbers of patients. In this framework, there is an urgent need for novel tools to monitor the epidemic trends timely and improve the sensitivity and representativeness of public health surveillance systems. Clinical data are currently the main source of information for infectious disease surveillance and tracking, but suffer reporting bias and inability to track asymptomatic carriers (Thompson et al., 2020).

Since the beginning of the pandemic, surveillance of untreated wastewater samples (also called wastewater-based epidemiology - WBE) has been regarded as a promising approach to monitor the circulation of SARS-CoV-2 in the general population (Bivins et al., 2020; Farkas et al., 2020; Lodder and de Roda Husman, 2020). So far, wastewater surveillance has been proposed as a powerful tool for monitoring several factors related to human health, such as the spread of infectious diseases (McCall et al., 2020; Sims and Kasprzyk-Hordern, 2020) and antibiotic resistance (Aarestrup and Woolhouse, 2020; The Global Sewage Surveillance project consortium et al., 2019). Wastewater-based viral surveillance has been used with successful results for early warning of disease outbreaks, informing

the efficacy of public health interventions as part of the poliovirus eradication strategy (Lodder and de Roda Husman, 2020; Pellegrinelli et al., 2017), and tracking other enteric viruses such as non-polio enteroviruses, Hepatitis viruses and Rotavirus (Bisseux et al., 2020; Delogu et al., 2018; Fumian et al., 2019; Pellegrinelli et al., 2019). These studies have indicated a good epidemiological link between viral outbreaks and the amounts of viruses in untreated wastewater (sewage), suggesting that wastewater monitoring can complement clinical surveillance of severe diseases giving useful additional information.

It has been demonstrated that SARS-CoV-2 is excreted by faecal route in 30-50% of people who test positive (Parasa et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020), and it lasts longer in stool than in the respiratory tract (nearly 28 days) (Y. Wu et al., 2020). This means it is likely to be found in sewage samples at the inlet of wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs), composed of the faecal material from an entire community. In fact, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in early March 2020 in wastewater in the Netherlands (Medema et al., 2020), demonstrating for the first time the feasibility of the WBE approach to monitor the circulation of the virus in the population. Wastewater surveillance offers a real-time cost-effective tool for surveying both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals in an entire community, complementing clinical data where testing is limited to patients with symptoms. Moreover, if applied as routine, it can give early warning of the (re)emergence of SARS-CoV-2 or other viruses in a population, as demonstrated by SARS-CoV-2 detection in wastewater before the first cases were notified to the healthcare systems (La Rosa et al., 2020; Medema et al., 2020).

Wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 has been applied in studies all over the world: The Netherlands (Medema et al., 2020), Italy (Baldovin et al., 2021; La Rosa et al., 2020; Rimoldi et al., 2020), Spain (Randazzo et al., 2020), Germany (Westhaus et al., 2021), Czech Republic (Mlejnkova et

92 al., 2020), the USA (Gonzalez et al., 2020; Peccia et al., 2020; Sherchan et al., 2020; F. Wu et al., 2020),
 93 Australia (Ahmed et al., 2020a), Japan (Haramoto et al., 2020; Hata et al., 2021), United Arab
 94 Emirates (Albastaki et al., 2021; Hasan et al., 2021). A global collaborative network was launched in
 95 early April 2020 (Bivins et al., 2020) to facilitate the combination of different expertise for undertaking
 96 WBE in the fight against COVID-19, through a common platform for data sharing
 97 (<http://www.covid19wbec.org/>) and the Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recently
 98 published guidance for wastewater-based disease surveillance (CDC, a 2020). A number of countries
 99 are applying this approach at a national level as an additional monitoring tool alongside of clinical and
 100 epidemiological investigations.

101 Lombardy was the first hotspot in a country other than China and the outbreak of COVID-19 was
 102 one of the deadliest (ECDC, COVID-19 situation update worldwide) including the successive waves of
 103 the epidemic. An Italian surveillance strategy called “integrated virological surveillance of COVID-19”
 104 was established in response to the epidemic, for tracking infection by collecting respiratory samples
 105 mainly from symptomatic individuals (Istituto Superiore di Sanità - ISS). The present investigation
 106 aimed to complement this strategy by applying WBE to monitor spatial and temporal profiles of the
 107 epidemic by detecting SARS-CoV-2 RNA in urban wastewater collected in Lombardy (Northern Italy)
 108 from 31 March (first peak of the pandemic) to mid-June 2020 (end of the first wave). A simple and
 109 reliable analytical method was developed and implemented in the framework of a surveillance
 110 network in the Lombardy region. This method, based on virus concentration with PEG centrifugation
 111 and real-time PCR analysis, was optimized and employed for monitoring the spread of SARS-CoV-2 in
 112 the eight cities most affected by COVID-19 in Lombardy. To the best of our knowledge, this is one of

the most extensive WBE studies performed for monitoring the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in an area heavily affected by COVID-19.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Wastewater Sampling

Composite 24h raw wastewater samples were collected at the inlet of 8 Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs) located in 1) Bergamo, 2) Brembate, 3) Ranica, 4) Brescia, 5) Cremona, 6) Crema, 7) Lodi, 8) Milan, in the Lombardy region, North of Italy (Figure 1). Sampling was designed to include the cities most affected by the first wave of COVID-19 in Lombardy, the first area severely hit by COVID-19 in Europe. Figure 1 reports the municipalities investigated with the population served by each WWTP: overall, the combined WWTP catchments resulted in about 2,276,000 inhabitants. As the municipalities affected first and most by the epidemic in Italy, three WWTPs were investigated in the Bergamo province, namely Bergamo, Brembate and Ranica, the last one collecting wastewater from Alzano Lombardo and Nembro. Brescia was another nearby area rapidly involved in the epidemic and the main WWTP of the city was included in the study. Two WWTPs were investigated in Milan covering about 90% of the city population. Finally, three WWTPs in the south of the region were considered, i.e. Lodi, Crema and Cremona, because this was the place where SARS-CoV-2 was first detected and it was the first “red zone” in Italy (the municipality of Codogno).

Samples were collected once a week from the end of March 2020 to mid-June 2020 in all the sites. Sampling was done in volume or time proportional mode, depending on the automatic sampler available, and following protocols for WBE studies (Castiglioni et al., 2013). Samples were transferred

into polypropylene bottles, frozen at -20°C and transported to the laboratory, where they were stored at the same temperature until analysis (within 4 months).

2.2 Concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater

Samples were concentrated following the PEG/NaCl centrifugation method proposed by F. Wu et al., 2020, adapted as follows. Raw wastewater (45 mL) was transferred into a 50 mL sterile polypropylene Falcon tube and was left under UV light for 30 minutes to inactivate the infectivity of the virus. Two tubes per sample were processed (total volume 90 mL) and were kept under rotation during UV exposure. Thermic inactivation was also tested at different conditions, among which those suggested in the literature (60°C for 30 minutes)(F. Wu et al., 2020), and gave comparable results to the UV light treatment. Samples were centrifuged for 30 min at $4,500 \times g$ and 4°C , without brake, to remove particulate biomass (Centrifuge Eppendorf 5810 R). After centrifugation, 40 mL of supernatant were transferred into a fresh Falcon tube containing 4 g PEG 8000 and 0.9 g sodium chloride (Carlo Erba, Italy), and left in a shaker for 15 min at room temperature to dissolve the PEG. Samples were then centrifuged for 2h at $12,000 \times g$ and 4°C , without brake. After centrifugation, the supernatant was discarded and the tubes were returned to the centrifuge at 4°C for a second step at $12,000 \times g$ for 5 min. The pellet in each tube was suspended in 750 μL of tryzol (Life Technologies, Italy); the two aliquots per sample were merged and stored at -20°C until RNA extraction.

2.3 RNA extraction and SARS-CoV-2 molecular detection

156 Viral RNA was extracted from sewage concentrates using the commercial kit QIAamp MinElute
157 Virus Spin Kit (Qiagen, Germany) according to the manufacturer's instructions for large samples.
158 Briefly, a wastewater sample concentrate (volume optimized 400 µL) was added to 450 µL of lysis
159 mixture containing Buffer AL, carrier RNA and proteinase K. The lysate was added to 500 µL of ethanol
160 (96-100%) and nucleic acids were bound to the silica membrane of the QIAamp MinElute column by
161 centrifugation. After three washing steps, nucleic acids were eluted in buffer AVE. Extraction was
162 done using the automatic extractor QIAcube (Qiagen, Germany).

163 SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected by a one-step real-time RT-PCR assay, amplifying different
164 portions of the nucleocapsid (N) gene, namely N1 and N3, in accordance with the CDC protocol (CDC,
165 b 2020). Specific positive (EURM-019) and negative (DNase/RNase-free distilled water) controls
166 (three to six) were tested in all real-time RT-PCR runs.

167 To semi-quantify the SARS-CoV-2 viral load, a standard curve was plotted using 10-fold serial
168 dilutions of the positive control material (EURM-019) provided by the European Commission. A
169 sample was considered positive for SARS-CoV-2 when N1 or N3 or both viral targets showed a Cycle
170 threshold (Ct) <39. Real-time RT-PCR runs were done with the QuantStudio 5 Real-time RT-PCR
171 system (ThermoFisher Scientific, USA).

172 To assess the sensitivity of the different SARS-CoV-2 extraction protocols, results from a
173 droplet digital PCR (ddPCR) was appraise. Concentrated wastewater samples were prepared using a
174 droplet generator QX200 AutoDG (Bio-Rad, California, USA) and analysed with a QX200 ddPCR and
175 droplet reader (Bio-Rad, California, USA). The 2019-nCoV CDC ddPCR Triplex Probe Assay was used to
176 quantify the viral genome by targeting two regions of the N gene (N1 and N2). The PCR protocol was
177 the one suggested by Bio-Rad (Bio-Rad SARS-CoV-2 ddPCR Kit) and the sample volume loaded for each

178 PCR reaction was 5.5 μ L. Samples were analysed in triplicate and controls (three to six) were run
179 within each batch using RNA-free water.

180 To minimize potential Real-time RT-PCR contamination, RNA extraction, molecular assays set-
181 up and real-time RT-PCR runs were all done in separate laboratories.

182

183 **2.4 Optimization of viral concentration and RNA extraction**

184 Different protocols for viral RNA concentration were tested to choose the most efficient for
185 concentration from wastewater samples. A wastewater sample positive to SARS-CoV-2 in a
186 preliminary investigation was treated using three different procedures: i) the two-phase
187 (PEG/dextran) method from the 2003 WHO Guidelines for Environmental Surveillance of Poliovirus
188 protocol, modified for enveloped viruses (La Rosa et al., 2020); ii) the PEG/NaCl centrifugation
189 method (centrifuge speed 12000 x g) modified from F. Wu et al., 2020; iii) the PEG/NaCl
190 centrifugation method modified using PEG 6000 and PEG 8000 at a lower centrifugation speed (3890
191 x g). Details of each protocol are reported in the Supplementary Material (SM).

192 Viral RNA extraction was optimized by testing different volumes of concentrate: i) 200 μ L and
193 ii) 400 μ L and different elution volumes: i) 100 μ L, ii) two consecutive 50 μ L elutions (as suggested by
194 the manufacturer) for a total of 100 μ L, and iii) 60 μ L. To increase the sensitivity of analysis and have
195 quantitative results, the droplet digital PCR (ddPCR) was used for these optimization tests.

196

197 **2.5 Quality control of the optimized protocol**

198 Once an optimal method of sewage concentration and extraction procedure was set, a quality
199 control experiment was run to check the recovery rate of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and determine the

presence of real-time RT-PCR inhibition. A supernatant of cell culture infected by SARS-CoV-2 with a viral load of 2.66×10^{12} , was diluted 1:1000 to obtain a viral load of 2.66×10^9 and added to a sample of wastewater, followed by a pasteurization procedure to inactivate the replication of the virus (56° for 1 h). After concentration, the spiked wastewater sample was analyzed in triplicate to quantify SARS-CoV-2 RNA recovery molecularly.

2.6 Data analysis

SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations, obtained as copies of RNA out of 1 liter of wastewater, were multiplied by the daily flow rate of each WWTP (m^3/day) to obtain the viral loads entering the WWTPs daily from the population served. Loads were then normalized to the population to compare results from the different communities. The residential population was available for almost all the WWTPs and was used for normalization, in other cases the population equivalents estimated using hydrochemical parameters (i.e. biological oxygen demand - BOD) were used following a best practice protocol for data normalization (Castiglioni et al., 2013).

Viral loads were then compared to the number of “COVID-19 Active cases” at the date of sampling, estimated by summing the new cases diagnosed daily in the previous four weeks. The daily numbers of new cases in the different municipalities were obtained from The Economist (GitHub) and from the Regione Lombardia database (Regione Lombardia, 2020). A four week period was used considering the extended fecal excretion of SARS-CoV-2 up to 28 days after diagnosis, reported in the literature (Y. Wu et al., 2020).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Protocol optimization

The wastewater samples analysed using PEG/dextran procedure (i) were negative, while those analysed with the PEG/NaCl centrifugation methods (ii and iii) gave positive results, with the best performance using PEG 8000 and centrifuge at 12000xg (Table S1). This best protocol was also tested by adding the particulate collected from the first centrifuge to the water concentrate before RNA extraction (see SM for details), and performance improved (Table S1), though further investigation is needed to confirm this result.

The best volume for viral RNA extraction was 400 μ L (Table S2), and ddPCR clearly showed a double number of gene copies/mL when using 400 μ L instead of 200 μ L (Table S2). Considering the elution volume, the best result was obtained with 60 μ L (Table S3). The limit of detection (LOD) of the amplification assay with the optimized concentration and extraction methods was 1 copy/ μ L.

3.2 Quality control of the extraction procedure

After sample concentration, the viral load of SARS-CoV-2 in spiked wastewater was 2.5E+9 (Ct 20.1) with a variability of replicates (relative standard deviation - RSD) of 0.4% (Table 1). The repeatability of the optimized extraction procedure for triplicate analysis of a real (not spiked) wastewater sample was good, with a RSD of 1%. The amount of SARS-CoV-2 recovered was fully comparable with the amount spiked in the wastewater samples (viral load 2.66E+9).

These results confirmed the efficiency of viral recovery from the optimized procedure and the absence of real-time RT-PCR inhibitors.

3.3 Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater samples

At the end of February 2020, Italy reported the first two clusters of autochthonous SARS-CoV-2 infection, identified in the provinces of Lodi and Bergamo (Codogno and Alzano Lombardo municipalities, respectively) in Lombardy. This region was the most affected with 94,000 COVID-19 cases and over 16,500 related deaths up to June 2020 (Regione Lombardia, Dashboard COVID-19). The national lock-down with schools, offices, restaurants, bars and shops closed excluded those for primary needs such as food and medical supplies, and with people at home, was obligatory from mid-March 2020. The present study was conducted from the end of March to mid-June 2020, in the midst of the first Italian wave of COVID-19, starting two weeks after the national lock-down. Wastewater samples were collected at the inlet of 8 WWTPs in the Lombardy region and were frozen at -20°C after collection; this procedure did not affect the SARS-CoV-2 concentration since freezing temperatures can be used for storage when immediate SARS-CoV-2 RNA analysis from the wastewater influent is not possible (Hokajärvi et al., 2021).

SARS-CoV-2 RNA was identified in 65 out of 107 (61%) wastewater samples collected in Lombardy (Figure 1). The rate of positive samples was highest in the Bergamo area (78.7%; 26/33), with 83.3% (7/11) of positive samples in Brembate, 75% (9/12) in Ranica, and 63.6% (7/11) in Bergamo. A similar rate of positive samples was found in the close area of Brescia (77.8%; 7/9). Positive samples were slightly lower in the other areas, where respectively, 66.7% (8/12) and 61.5% (16/26) of sewage samples from WWTPs in Lodi and Milan tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, and 58.3% (7/12) in Cremona and Crema. As reported in Tables 2-4, the temporal trends of SARS-CoV-2 circulation across Lombardy were similar; SARS-CoV-2 was highest in March-April 2020, followed by a

265 steep decline, with samples starting to give negative results for SARS-CoV-2 at the end of May, as
266 observed in the Veneto region, close to Lombardy (Baldovin et al., 2021).

267 Overall, the highest SARS-CoV-2 concentrations were in the samples collected in late March
268 and early April. From the province of Bergamo, the highest SARS-CoV-2 concentration was in
269 Brembate (2.10×10^5 copies/L), followed by Ranica (2.28×10^4 copies/L) and Bergamo (1.02×10^4
270 copies/L) at the end of March (Table 2). The SARS-CoV-2 genome was identified until mid-May in
271 Bergamo and Ranica and until mid-June in Brembate. In the Brescia WWTP, the concentration of
272 SARS-CoV-2 was highest at the end of March (6.28×10^4 copies/L) and the virus was detected until early
273 May 2020 (Table 2). In the south of Lombardy, Lodi was the most affected province, where the virus
274 was detected until mid-May with the highest concentration of SARS-CoV-2 for N1 assay at the end of
275 March (7.64×10^4 copies/L) (Table 3). In Cremona and Crema, SARS-CoV-2 circulated until early May
276 with the highest concentrations in early April (8.16×10^3 copies/L and 6.96×10^3 copies/L,
277 respectively) (Table 3).

278 The first evidence of the presence of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples from Milan was
279 reported in December 2019 (La Rosa et al., 2021), and wastewater was also positive in February 2020,
280 on investigating the gene ORF1ab (La Rosa et al., 2020). In our study, two WWTPs in Milan were
281 investigated; in the first (WWTP1), sewage was monitored from the beginning of March until mid-
282 June 2020, with a peak of SARS-CoV-2 (1.47×10^4 copies/L) on 26 March, followed by a decline (Table
283 4). The second WWTP (WWTP 2) showed a progressive decline of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations until
284 mid-May when it became undetectable (Table 4). In mid-June, SARS-CoV-2 was not detectable in any
285 of the wastewater samples in Lombardy.

To the best of our knowledge, the present study reports the largest number of positive wastewater samples (61%) ever found in wastewater monitoring studies. This well reflects the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infections in the area investigated, which was probably the most affected worldwide in March-April 2020. Samples from the Netherlands and in Massachusetts in March 2020, tested using the same N gene targets, gave SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels up to 2.2 E+03 copies/mL (Medema et al., 2020), and to 3 E+02 copies/mL (F. Wu et al., 2020), respectively. Randazzo et al., 2020 reported results from six cities in the region of Murcia, Spain, with a lower circulation of SARS-CoV-2 and a lower incidence of COVID-19. Ten cities were also investigated in Germany in April 2020 and had lower concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 (2-20 copies/mL) than Italy, but they used a PCR assay targeting two different genes, M and RdRP (Westhaus et al., 2021). In the Czech Republic, 33 WWTPs were investigated in April-June 2020, but only 27% of WWTPs tested positive to SARS-CoV-2 (Mlejnkova et al., 2020).

Other studies investigated temporal trends of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater, in February-March and May-June, in Brisbane (Australia) (Ahmed et al., 2021), and in Southern Nevada (USA) (Gerrity et al., 2021) testing N1, N2 and E genes. Further monitoring has been done in Japan (Haramoto et al., 2020; Hata et al., 2021), in the United Arab Emirates (Albastaki et al., 2021; Hasan et al., 2021) and in the USA, in Louisiana (Sherchan et al., 2020) and Southeastern Virginia (Gonzalez et al., 2020). Generally in these studies, fewer wastewater samples tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 and concentrations were lower than those observed in Lombardy in the present study.

3.4 Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater samples

To compare the loads of SARS-CoV-2 among the populations in this study, the viral copies/L detected in wastewater samples were multiplied by the flow rate of each WWTP (m^3/day) and the obtained loads (copies/day) were normalized to the number of inhabitants served by each WWTP (Table 5). The N-gene, of which we amplified two portions (N1 and N3 assays), yields similar quantitative results, although there were more positive samples with the N1 fragment, as in previous studies (Medema et al., 2020; Randazzo et al., 2020; F. Wu et al., 2020).

In the period end of March - early April 2020, the overall viral load of SARS-CoV-2 that reflected the largest numbers of symptomatic, asymptomatic and paucisymptomatic individuals shedding the virus ranged from $9.3 \text{ E}+10$ copies/day/1,000 people to $8.2\text{E}+8$ copies/day/1,000 people (Table 5). The load of SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies/day/1,000 people was highest in Brembate ($9.28+10$), Lodi ($1.97\text{E}+10$), Ranica ($1.25\text{E}+10$), Brescia ($1.24\text{E}+10$) and Bergamo ($3.4\text{E}+09$) in the first week of the study. This is in agreement with the COVID-19 hotspots in March 2020 that were seen exactly in these areas (Bergamo, Brescia and Lodi provinces) as described above. In May, the viral load decreased in all the areas, though low levels persisted until the beginning of June in some cities (Brembate, Ranica, Brescia and Crema). Viral loads were also used in a recent study in Germany, in the Frankfurt metropolitan area, to assess temporal trends of SARS-CoV-2 from April to August 2020 (Agrawal et al., 2021).

3.5 Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in wastewater samples and in respiratory samples (active cases)

SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in wastewater were compared to other epidemiological indicators, such as the number of COVID-19 infections recorded in the corresponding area (Regione Lombardia,

2020). Clearly, virus level in wastewater should not be compared with the number of “new” cases, but with the “total” number of active cases in the population. Total active infections were calculated in all the municipalities served by each WWTP by considering as “active” those diagnosed in the past 4 weeks before the date of sampling, as described above.

Figure 2 and 3 report the correlation among RNA viral loads of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater and COVID-19 total active cases in the population in the same areas. In general, similar trends were observed, with a pattern of decrease of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples comparable to the decline of the active cases in the population. This very likely reflected the effect of the lock-down at the beginning of March in Lombardy. However, in some cities the trend of the curve of the virus in wastewater seems to anticipate the curve of the number of active cases, pointing to a possible predictive capacity of this indicator for the development of the pandemic, as suggested in other studies (Agrawal et al., 2021; Saguti et al., 2021; Trottier et al., 2020). For instance, in Ranica (Figure 2) an increase of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples was observed in mid-April and early May, followed by an increase of active cases two weeks later.

3.6 Gaps and future perspectives

Several studies, including the present, have demonstrated that monitoring SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater can depict the epidemic curve of COVID-19. Analytical methods set up have been performed promptly, and several useful applications are now available in the literature. Nevertheless, further research is still needed to close some knowledge gaps, related especially to the comparability of the protocols for monitoring SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater, the quality controls and data interpretation.

351 Several different analytical protocols have been adopted so far (Ahmed et al., 2020c), and they
352 need to be optimized and standardized (Kitajima et al., 2020; Michael-Kordatou et al., 2020) using
353 common quality control procedures. Different external controls, including human coronavirus
354 surrogates, have been tested so far, giving a wide range of recoveries (Alygizakis et al., 2021). The
355 European Commission recently released a first recommendation for a common approach to establish
356 systematic surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater (EU, 2021 a), which is the result of a common
357 joint action to share information (European Commission, 2021 b).

358 In terms of interpreting data, we proposed here the calculation of viral loads and
359 normalization to the population investigated to facilitate comparison between studies. Results from
360 wastewater should also be related to the existing epidemiological indicators. This was an explorative
361 study, and wastewater data were correlated only with the total number of active cases. However, it
362 would be interesting to work out correlations with other epidemiological indicators, such as
363 hospitalization, intensive care demand and death, using also finer statistical tools. This could help
364 make better use of the results from wastewater and valorize the ability of WBE to track infections
365 from symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals in an entire community.

366 Another possibility lies in estimating prevalence of the infection from the total number of
367 SARS-CoV-2 RNA copies in wastewater by considering the number of viral copies shed in stool by
368 infected individuals (Ahmed et al., 2020a). This estimation was attempted by F. Wu et al., 2020, and
369 indicated a much larger number of infections than the clinical cases recorded. Nevertheless, the
370 uncertainty related to this procedure may be very high due to the wide variability of the load of viral
371 material shed in faeces by asymptomatic, pre-symptomatic and symptomatic cases, the duration of
372 excretion, and limited knowledge of the fate of viral particles in sewer systems. To the best of our

373 knowledge, only one study has investigated SARS-CoV-2 decay in wastewater under different
374 conditions that may simulate the sewer network (Ahmed et al., 2020b). Further information is
375 therefore required to reduce the biases currently associated to relate viral loads to the numbers of
376 cases.

377 Wastewater monitoring for SARS-CoV-2 may cast light on the real number of cases in a
378 population which – especially during the first phase of the epidemic – was underestimated. In fact,
379 population monitoring through swabbing mainly involved symptomatic individuals, and therefore
380 covered only part of the total individuals infected. Some preliminary data on SARS-CoV-2 in
381 wastewater seems to confirm the initial underestimation of COVID-19 cases in the population. Future
382 research will have to enlarge the case studies and quantitatively assess this phenomenon in
383 Lombardy.

384 A further application of this surveillance tool that call for more investigation is the identification of
385 virus variants in wastewater and the estimation of their incidence in the population with a single
386 measurement that gives information for an entire community.

387

388 **4. Conclusions**

389 Monitoring SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater may serve as a new surveillance tool to describe the trend
390 of the COVID-19 epidemic in the population. It should be seen as complementary to other
391 epidemiological indicators, but offers the unique capacity to reflect, with a single measurement, the
392 state of the pandemic in a population, and predict the spread of the infection. This indicator can
393 integrate data from the ongoing virological surveillance of COVID-19, providing reliable estimates of
394 the SARS-CoV-2 spread including both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals, burdening the

395 population-level prevalence of COVID-19 disease, and the real dimension and trends of the epidemic
396 in a population. Therefore, it can be helpful to monitor the effect of public health intervention, such
397 as lock-down on the development of the pandemic.

398 The surveillance of wastewater samples will also serve as a valuable early warning of the
399 circulation and re-emergence of SARS-CoV-2 infections in the coming months, including the
400 identification of variants. This study will help in establishing a wide surveillance network to follow
401 spatial and temporal profiles of the outbreak.

402

403

404

405

406 **Acknowledgements**

407 The authors are grateful to WWTP personnel for sample collection and technical support with
408 information for data analysis. In particular we acknowledge the valid assistance of Uniacque S.p.A,
409 Società SAL srl, A2A Ciclo Idrico S.p.A., Metropolitana Milanese S.p.A., Padania Acque S.p.A.

410

411 **References**

- 412 Aarestrup, F.M., Woolhouse, M.E.J., 2020. Using sewage for surveillance of antimicrobial resistance. *Science*
413 367, 630–632. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba3432>
- 414 Agrawal, S., Orschler, L., Lackner, S., 2021. Long-term monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater of the
415 Frankfurt metropolitan area in Southern Germany. *Scientific Reports* 11.
416 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84914-2>
- 417 Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J.W., Choi, P.M., Kitajima, M., Simpson, S.L., Li, J.,
418 Tschärke, B., Verhagen, R., Smith, W.J.M., Zaugg, J., Dierens, L., Hugenholtz, P., Thomas, K.V., Mueller,
419 J.F., 2020a. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of
420 concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Science of The Total*
421 *Environment* 728, 138764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764>

422 Ahmed, W., Bertsch, P.M., Bibby, K., Haramoto, E., Hewitt, J., Huygens, F., Gyawali, P., Korajkic, A., Riddell, S.,
423 Sherchan, S.P., Simpson, S.L., Sirikanchana, K., Symonds, E.M., Verhagen, R., Vasan, S.S., Kitajima, M.,
424 Bivins, A., 2020b. Decay of SARS-CoV-2 and surrogate murine hepatitis virus RNA in untreated
425 wastewater to inform application in wastewater-based epidemiology. *Environmental Research* 191,
426 110092. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110092>

427 Ahmed, W., Bivins, A., Bertsch, P.M., Bibby, K., Choi, P.M., Farkas, K., Gyawali, P., Hamilton, K.A., Haramoto, E.,
428 Kitajima, M., Simpson, S.L., Tandukar, S., Thomas, K.V., Mueller, J.F., 2020c. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2
429 RNA in wastewater: Methods optimization and quality control are crucial for generating reliable public
430 health information. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health* 17, 82–93.
431 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.09.003>

432 Ahmed, W., Tschärke, B., Bertsch, P.M., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., Choi, P., Clarke, L., Dwyer, J., Edson, J., Nguyen,
433 T.M.H., O'Brien, J.W., Simpson, S.L., Sherman, P., Thomas, K.V., Verhagen, R., Zaugg, J., Mueller, J.F.,
434 2021. SARS-CoV-2 RNA monitoring in wastewater as a potential early warning system for COVID-19
435 transmission in the community: A temporal case study. *Science of The Total Environment* 761, 144216.
436 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144216>

437 Albastaki, A., Naji, M., Lootah, R., Almeheiri, R., Almulla, H., Almarri, I., Alreyami, A., Aden, A., Alghafri, R., 2021.
438 First confirmed detection of SARS-COV-2 in untreated municipal and aircraft wastewater in Dubai, UAE:
439 The use of wastewater based epidemiology as an early warning tool to monitor the prevalence of
440 COVID-19. *Science of The Total Environment* 760, 143350.
441 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143350>

442 Alygizakis, N., Markou, A.N., Rousis, N.I., Galani, A., Avgeris, M., Adamopoulos, P.G., Scorilas, A., Lianidou, E.S.,
443 Paraskevis, D., Tsiodras, S., Tsakris, A., Dimopoulos, M.-A., Thomaidis, N.S., 2021. Analytical
444 methodologies for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: Protocols and future perspectives. *TrAC*
445 *Trends in Analytical Chemistry* 134, 116125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2020.116125>

446 Baldovin, T., Amoroso, I., Fonzo, M., Buja, A., Baldo, V., Cocchio, S., Bertonecello, C., 2021. SARS-CoV-2 RNA
447 detection and persistence in wastewater samples: An experimental network for COVID-19
448 environmental surveillance in Padua, Veneto Region (NE Italy). *Science of The Total Environment* 760,
449 143329. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143329>

450 Bio-Rad SARS-CoV-2 ddPCR Kit. Instruction for Use. Available at: [https://www.bio-](https://www.bio-rad.com/webroot/web/pdf/lsr/literature/10000128901.pdf)
451 [rad.com/webroot/web/pdf/lsr/literature/10000128901.pdf](https://www.bio-rad.com/webroot/web/pdf/lsr/literature/10000128901.pdf). Last Access: 30 April 2021.

452 Bisseux, M., Debroas, D., Mirand, A., Archimbaud, C., Peigue-Lafeuille, H., Bailly, J.-L., Henquell, C., 2020.
453 Monitoring of enterovirus diversity in wastewater by ultra-deep sequencing: An effective
454 complementary tool for clinical enterovirus surveillance. *Water Research* 169, 115246.
455 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2019.115246>

456 Bivins, A., North, D., Ahmad, A., Ahmed, W., Alm, E., Been, F., Bhattacharya, P., Bijlsma, L., Boehm, A.B., Brown,
457 J., Buttiglieri, G., Calabro, V., Carducci, A., Castiglioni, S., Cetecioglu Gurol, Z., Chakraborty, S., Costa, F.,
458 Curcio, S., de los Reyes, F.L., Delgado Vela, J., Farkas, K., Fernandez-Casi, X., Gerba, C., Gerrity, D.,
459 Girones, R., Gonzalez, R., Haramoto, E., Harris, A., Holden, P.A., Islam, M.T., Jones, D.L., Kasprzyk-
460 Hordern, B., Kitajima, M., Kotlarz, N., Kumar, M., Kuroda, K., La Rosa, G., Malpei, F., Mautus, M.,
461 McLellan, S.L., Medema, G., Meschke, J.S., Mueller, J., Newton, R.J., Nilsson, D., Noble, R.T., van Nuijs,
462 A., Peccia, J., Perkins, T.A., Pickering, A.J., Rose, J., Sanchez, G., Smith, A., Stadler, L., Stauber, C.,
463 Thomas, K., van der Voorn, T., Wigginton, K., Zhu, K., Bibby, K., 2020. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology:
464 Global Collaborative to Maximize Contributions in the Fight Against COVID-19. *Environmental Science*
465 *& Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c02388>

466 Castiglioni, S., Bijlsma, L., Covaci, A., Emke, E., Hernandez, F., Reid, M., Ort, C., Thomas, K.V., van Nuijs, A.L., de
467 Voogt, P., Zuccato, E., 2013. Evaluation of uncertainties associated with the determination of
468 community drug use through the measurement of sewage drug biomarkers. *Environ Sci Technol* 47,
469 1452–60. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es302722f>

- Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)a, Developing a Wastewater Surveillance Sampling Strategy. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/wastewater-surveillance.html> Last Access: 30 April 2021.
- Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)b, Research Use Only 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-time RT-PCR Primers and Probes. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/lab/rt-pcr-panel-primer-probes.html>. Last Access: 30 April 2021.
- Delogu, R., Battistone, A., Buttinelli, G., Fiore, S., Fontana, S., Amato, C., Cristiano, K., Gamper, S., Simeoni, J., Frate, R., Pellegrinelli, L., Binda, S., Veronesi, L., Zoni, R., Castiglia, P., Cossu, A., Triassi, M., Pennino, F., Germinario, C., Balena, V., Cicala, A., Mercurio, P., Fiore, L., Pini, C., Stefanelli, P., 2018. Poliovirus and Other Enteroviruses from Environmental Surveillance in Italy, 2009–2015. Food and Environmental Virology 10, 333–342. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-018-9350-8>
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), COVID-19 situation update worldwide. Available at: <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/cases-2019-ncov-eueea>. Last Access: 30 April 2021
- European Commission (EU) 2021 a. Commission recommendation of 17.03.21 on a common approach to establish a systematic surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 and its variants in wastewaters in the EU. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/environment/pdf/water/recommendation_covid19_monitoring_wastewaters.pdf Last Access: 30 April 2021
- European Commission (EU) 2021 b. SARS-CoV-2 Surveillance employing Sewers EU Umbrella Study – Status Update. Available at: <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/science-update/sars-cov-2-surveillance-employing-sewers-eu-umbrella-study-status-update>. Last Access: 30 April 2021
- Farkas, K., Hillary, L.S., Malham, S.K., McDonald, J.E., Jones, D.L., 2020. Wastewater and public health: the potential of wastewater surveillance for monitoring COVID-19. Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health 17, 14–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coesh.2020.06.001>
- Fumian, T.M., Fioretti, J.M., Lun, J.H., dos Santos, I.A.L., White, P.A., Miagostovich, M.P., 2019. Detection of norovirus epidemic genotypes in raw sewage using next generation sequencing. Environment International 123, 282–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2018.11.054>
- Gerrity, D., Papp, K., Stoker, M., Sims, A., Frehner, W., 2021. Early-pandemic wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in Southern Nevada: Methodology, occurrence, and incidence/prevalence considerations. Water Research X 10, 100086. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wroa.2020.100086>
- Gonzalez, R., Curtis, K., Bivins, A., Bibby, K., Weir, M.H., Yetka, K., Thompson, H., Keeling, D., Mitchell, J., Gonzalez, D., 2020. COVID-19 surveillance in Southeastern Virginia using wastewater-based epidemiology. Water Research 186, 116296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116296>
- Haramoto, E., Malla, B., Thakali, O., Kitajima, M., 2020. First environmental surveillance for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and river water in Japan. Science of The Total Environment 737, 140405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140405>
- Hasan, S.W., Ibrahim, Y., Daou, M., Kannout, H., Jan, N., Lopes, A., Alsafar, H., Yousef, A.F., 2021. Detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater and treated effluents: Surveillance of COVID-19 epidemic in the United Arab Emirates. Science of The Total Environment 764, 142929. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142929>
- Hata, A., Hara-Yamamura, H., Meuchi, Y., Imai, S., Honda, R., 2021. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater in Japan during a COVID-19 outbreak. Science of The Total Environment 758, 143578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.143578>
- Hokajärvi, A.-M., Rytönen, A., Tiwari, A., Kauppinen, A., Oikarinen, S., Lehto, K.-M., Kankaanpää, A., Gunnar, T., Al-Hello, H., Blomqvist, S., Miettinen, I.T., Savolainen-Kopra, C., Pitkänen, T., 2021. The detection and stability of the SARS-CoV-2 RNA biomarkers in wastewater influent in Helsinki, Finland. Science of The Total Environment 770, 145274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145274>
- Istituto Superiore di Sanità (ISS), Epicentro. Sorveglianza integrata COVID-19: i principali dati nazionali. Available at: <https://www.epicentro.iss.it/coronavirus/sars-cov-2-sorveglianza-dati>. Last Access: 30 April 2021.

519 Kitajima, M., Ahmed, W., Bibby, K., Carducci, A., Gerba, C.P., Hamilton, K.A., Haramoto, E., Rose, J.B., 2020.
520 SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. *Science of The Total*
521 *Environment* 739, 139076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076>
522 La Rosa, G., Iaconelli, M., Mancini, P., Bonanno Ferraro, G., Veneri, C., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L., Suffredini,
523 E., 2020. First detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewaters in Italy. *Science of The Total*
524 *Environment* 736, 139652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139652>
525 La Rosa, G., Mancini, P., Bonanno Ferraro, G., Veneri, C., Iaconelli, M., Bonadonna, L., Lucentini, L., Suffredini,
526 E., 2021. SARS-CoV-2 has been circulating in northern Italy since December 2019: Evidence from
527 environmental monitoring. *Science of The Total Environment* 750, 141711.
528 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141711>
529 Lodder, W., de Roda Husman, A.M., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: potential health risk, but also data
530 source. *The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 5, 533–534. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30087-X)
531 [1253\(20\)30087-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30087-X)
532 McCall, C., Wu, H., Miyani, B., Xagorarakis, I., 2020. Identification of multiple potential viral diseases in a large
533 urban center using wastewater surveillance. *Water Research* 184, 116160.
534 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116160>
535 Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R., Brouwer, A., 2020. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in
536 Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in The
537 Netherlands. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* 7, 511–516.
538 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357>
539 Michael-Kordatou, I., Karaolia, P., Fatta-Kassinos, D., 2020. Sewage analysis as a tool for the COVID-19
540 pandemic response and management: the urgent need for optimised protocols for SARS-CoV-2
541 detection and quantification. *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering* 8, 104306.
542 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2020.104306>
543 Mlejnkova, H., Sovova, K., Vasickova, P., Ocenaskova, V., Jasikova, L., Juranova, E., 2020. Preliminary Study of
544 Sars-Cov-2 Occurrence in Wastewater in the Czech Republic. *International Journal of Environmental*
545 *Research and Public Health* 17, 5508. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155508>
546 Parasa, S., Desai, M., Thoguluva Chandrasekar, V., Patel, H.K., Kennedy, K.F., Roesch, T., Spadaccini, M.,
547 Colombo, M., Gabbiadini, R., Artifon, E.L.A., Repici, A., Sharma, P., 2020. Prevalence of Gastrointestinal
548 Symptoms and Fecal Viral Shedding in Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Systematic Review
549 and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Network Open* 3, e2011335.
550 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.11335>
551 Peccia, J., Zulli, A., Brackney, D.E., Grubaugh, N.D., Kaplan, E.H., Casanovas-Massana, A., Ko, A.I., Malik, A.A.,
552 Wang, D., Wang, M., Warren, J.L., Weinberger, D.M., Arnold, W., Omer, S.B., 2020. Measurement of
553 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics. *Nature Biotechnology* 38, 1164–
554 1167. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0684-z>
555 Pellegrinelli, L., Bubba, L., Primache, V., Pariani, E., Battistone, A., Delogu, R., Fiore, S., Binda, S., 2017.
556 Surveillance of poliomyelitis in Northern Italy: Results of acute flaccid paralysis surveillance and
557 environmental surveillance, 2012–2015. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* 13, 332–338.
558 <https://doi.org/10.1080/21645515.2017.1264726>
559 Pellegrinelli, L., Galli, C., Binda, S., Primache, V., Tagliacarne, C., Pizza, F., Mazzini, R., Pariani, E., Romanò, L.,
560 2019. Molecular Characterization and Phylogenetic Analysis of Enteroviruses and Hepatitis A Viruses in
561 Sewage Samples, Northern Italy, 2016. *Food and Environmental Virology* 11, 393–399.
562 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-019-09401-4>
563 Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Simón, P., Allende, A., Sánchez, G., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
564 wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water Research* 181, 115942.
565 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.115942>
566 Regione Lombardia, 2020. DGR N° XI / 3114 del 07/05/2020 "DETERMINAZIONI IN MERITO ALLE ATTIVITÀ DI
567 SORVEGLIANZA IN FUNZIONE DELL'EPIDEMIA COVID-19".

568 Regione Lombardia, Dashboard COVID-19. Available at:
569 [https://www.regione.lombardia.it/wps/portal/istituzionale/HP/servizi-e-informazioni/cittadini/salute-](https://www.regione.lombardia.it/wps/portal/istituzionale/HP/servizi-e-informazioni/cittadini/salute-e-prevenzione/coronavirus/dashboard-covid19)
570 [e-prevenzione/coronavirus/dashboard-covid19](https://www.regione.lombardia.it/wps/portal/istituzionale/HP/servizi-e-informazioni/cittadini/salute-e-prevenzione/coronavirus/dashboard-covid19). Last Access 30 March 2021.

571 Rimoldi, S.G., Stefani, F., Gigantiello, A., Polesello, S., Comandatore, F., Mileto, D., Maresca, M., Longobardi, C.,
572 Mancon, A., Romeri, F., Pagani, C., Cappelli, F., Roscioli, C., Moja, L., Gismondo, M.R., Salerno, F., 2020.
573 Presence and infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 virus in wastewaters and rivers. *Science of The Total*
574 *Environment* 744, 140911. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140911>

575 Saguti, F., Magnil, E., Enache, L., Churqui, M.P., Johansson, A., Lumley, D., Davidsson, F., Dotevall, L., Mattsson,
576 A., Trybala, E., Lagging, M., Lindh, M., Gisslén, M., Brezicka, T., Nyström, K., Norder, H., 2021.
577 Surveillance of wastewater revealed peaks of SARS-CoV-2 preceding those of hospitalized patients with
578 COVID-19. *Water Research* 189, 116620. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116620>

579 Sherchan, S.P., Shahin, S., Ward, L.M., Tandukar, S., Aw, T.G., Schmitz, B., Ahmed, W., Kitajima, M., 2020. First
580 detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in North America: A study in Louisiana, USA. *Science of*
581 *The Total Environment* 743, 140621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140621>

582 Sims, N., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., 2020. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology: Monitoring
583 infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level. *Environment International* 139,
584 105689. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105689>

585 The Economist, covid-19-italy-herd-immunity-GD. Available at: [https://github.com/TheEconomist/covid-19-](https://github.com/TheEconomist/covid-19-italy-herd-immunity-GD)
586 [italy-herd-immunity-GD](https://github.com/TheEconomist/covid-19-italy-herd-immunity-GD) Last Access: 30 April 2021

587 The Global Sewage Surveillance project consortium, Hendriksen, R.S., Munk, P., Njage, P., van Bunnik, B.,
588 McNally, L., Lukjancenko, O., Röder, T., Nieuwenhuijse, D., Pedersen, S.K., Kjeldgaard, J., Kaas, R.S.,
589 Clausen, P.T.L.C., Vogt, J.K., Leekitcharoenphon, P., van de Schans, M.G.M., Zuidema, T., de Roda
590 Husman, A.M., Rasmussen, S., Petersen, B., Amid, C., Cochrane, G., Sicheritz-Ponten, T., Schmitt, H.,
591 Alvarez, J.R.M., Aidara-Kane, A., Pamp, S.J., Lund, O., Hald, T., Woolhouse, M., Koopmans, M.P., Vigre,
592 H., Petersen, T.N., Aarestrup, F.M., 2019. Global monitoring of antimicrobial resistance based on
593 metagenomics analyses of urban sewage. *Nature Communications* 10. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-08853-3)
594 [019-08853-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-08853-3)

595 Thompson, J.R., Nanchaiah, Y.V., Gu, X., Lee, W.L., Rajal, V.B., Haines, M.B., Girones, R., Ng, L.C., Alm, E.J.,
596 Wuertz, S., 2020. Making waves: Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 for population-based health
597 management. *Water Research* 184, 116181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116181>

598 Trottier, J., Darques, R., Ait Mouheb, N., Partiot, E., Bakhache, W., Deffieu, M.S., Gaudin, R., 2020. Post-
599 lockdown detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the wastewater of Montpellier, France. *One Health* 10,
600 100157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2020.100157>

601 Wang, D., Hu, B., Hu, C., Zhu, F., Liu, X., Zhang, J., Wang, B., Xiang, H., Cheng, Z., Xiong, Y., Zhao, Y., Li, Y., Wang,
602 X., Peng, Z., 2020. Clinical Characteristics of 138 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus–
603 Infected Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA* 323, 1061. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.1585>

604 Westhaus, S., Weber, F.-A., Schiwy, S., Linnemann, V., Brinkmann, M., Widera, M., Greve, C., Janke, A., Hollert,
605 H., Wintgens, T., Ciesek, S., 2021. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in raw and treated wastewater in Germany
606 – Suitability for COVID-19 surveillance and potential transmission risks. *Science of The Total*
607 *Environment* 751, 141750. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141750>

608 Wu, F., Zhang, J., Xiao, A., Gu, X., Lee, W.L., Armas, F., Kauffman, K., Hanage, W., Matus, M., Ghaeli, N., Endo,
609 N., Duvallet, C., Poyet, M., Moniz, K., Washburne, A.D., Erickson, T.B., Chai, P.R., Thompson, J., Alm,
610 E.J., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than Expected from Clinically Confirmed Cases.
611 *mSystems* 5. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00614-20>

612 Wu, Y., Guo, C., Tang, L., Hong, Z., Zhou, J., Dong, X., Yin, H., Xiao, Q., Tang, Y., Qu, X., Kuang, L., Fang, X.,
613 Mishra, N., Lu, J., Shan, H., Jiang, G., Huang, X., 2020. Prolonged presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in
614 faecal samples. *The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 5, 434–435.
615 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253\(20\)30083-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30083-2)

616

617

618

619 **Table 1.** Extraction efficiency of SARS-CoV-2 from spiked wastewater samples and repeatability for
620 triplicate analysis of a real sample.

	Viral Target N1 (Ct)			
	Replicates			Mean and RSD %
<i>Spiked wastewater sample</i>	19.99	20.14	20.07	20.1 (0.4)
<i>Not spiked wastewater sample</i>	33.06	32.81	33.48	33.1 (1)

621

622

623

Table 2. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater in north-western Lombardy (Bergamo and Brescia provinces). Viral targets were two different portions of the nucleocapsid (N) gene, N1 and N3 (copies/L).

Bergamo WWTP			Brembate WWTP			Ranica WWTP			Brescia WWTP		
Sampling dates	N1 copies/L	N3 copies/L	Sampling dates	N1 copies/L	N3 copies/L	Sampling dates	N1 copies/L	N3 copies/L	Sampling dates	N1 copies/L	N3 copies/L
30/03/2020	1,02E+04	1,03E+04	30/03/2020	2,10E+05	1,22E+05	01/04/2020	2,28E+04	1,56E+04	30/03/2020	6,28E+04	3,98E+04
05/04/2020	7,29E+03	4,95E+03	06/04/2020	9,73E+04	7,93E+04	05/04/2020	2,58E+04	1,69E+04	06/04/2020	2,22E+04	1,36E+04
13/04/2020	4,61E+03	4,04E+03	14/04/2020	1,97E+04	2,12E+04	08/04/2020	6,24E+03	1,38E+04	13/04/2020	7,03E+03	8,24E+03
21/04/2020	2,06E+03	1,86E+03	22/04/2020	1,67E+04	1,76E+04	15/04/2020	5,00E+03	1,95E+04	21/04/2020	3,81E+03	5,57E+03
29/04/2020	1,42E+03	nd	29/04/2020	1,50E+03	1,99E+03	19/04/2020	8,91E+03	8,61E+03	28/04/2020	2,53E+03	4,51E+02
04/05/2020	1,06E+03	2,65E+03	06/05/2020	3,37E+03	3,59E+03	26/04/2020	3,24E+03	4,03E+03	12/05/2020	nd	nd
12/05/2020	1,15E+03	nd	13/05/2020	nd	4,55E+03	03/05/2020	9,45E+03	1,10E+04	19/05/2020	2,72E+03	nd
19/05/2020	nd	nd	20/05/2020	1,51E+03	2,31E+03	10/05/2020	nd	nd	26/05/2020	nd	nd
27/05/2020	nd	nd	27/05/2020	3,82E+03	5,51E+03	17/05/2020	3,57E+03	4,11E+03	16/06/2020	nd	2,70E+03
10/06/2020	nd	nd	03/06/2020	1,39E+03	4,63E+03	24/05/2020	nd	nd			
16/06/2020	nd	nd	10/06/2020	nd	nd	07/06/2020	nd	nd			
			17/06/2020	nd	nd	14/06/2020	nd	3,84E+03			

Table 3. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater in the south of Lombardy (Cremona and Lodi provinces). Viral targets were two different portions of the nucleocapsid (N) gene, N1 and N3 (copies/L).

Cremona WWTP			Crema WWTP			Lodi WWTP		
<i>Sampling dates</i>	<i>N1 copies/L</i>	<i>N3 copies/L</i>	<i>Sampling dates</i>	<i>N1 copies/L</i>	<i>N3 copies/L</i>	<i>Sampling dates</i>	<i>N1 copies/L</i>	<i>N3 copies/L</i>
31/03/2020	8,16E+03	9,15E+03	31/03/2020	6,96,E+03	6,85,E+03	30/03/2020	7,64E+04	8,29E+04
05/04/2020	9,19E+03	5,48E+03	07/04/2020	1,47,E+04	1,27,E+04	01/04/2020	9,29E+03	1,01E+04
10/04/2020	1,02E+04	3,20E+03	14/04/2020	9,91,E+03	3,21,E+03	05/04/2020	8,24E+03	1,26E+04
16/04/2020	2,39E+03	1,90E+03	21/04/2020	1,21,E+03	5,30,E+03	13/04/2020	1,62E+04	1,93E+04
23/04/2020	2,00E+03	3,61E+03	28/04/2020	2,78,E+03	6,25,E+03	21/04/2020	8,44E+03	1,14E+04
28/04/2020	2,02E+03	1,52E+03	05/05/2020	2,54,E+03	nd	28/04/2020	1,53E+04	1,22E+04
05/05/2020	nd	nd	12/05/2020	nd	nd	05/05/2020	nd	nd
12/05/2020	nd	nd	20/05/2020	nd	nd	12/05/2020	2,30E+03	2,74E+03
20/05/2020	2,31E+03	nd	26/05/2020	nd	nd	19/05/2020	2,34E+03	2,70E+03
26/05/2020	nd	nd	02/06/2020	nd	nd	26/05/2020	nd	nd
02/06/2020	nd	nd	09/06/2020	nd	2,41,E+03	02/06/2020	nd	nd
10/06/2020	nd	nd	16/06/2020	nd	nd	09/06/2020	nd	nd
						16/06/2020	nd	nd

Table 4. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater in the municipality of Milan. Viral targets were two different portions of the nucleocapsid (N) gene, N1 and N3 (copies/L).

Milano WWTP 1			Milano WWTP 2		
<i>Sampling dates</i>	<i>N1 copies/L</i>	<i>N3 copies/L</i>	<i>Sampling dates</i>	<i>N1 copies/L</i>	<i>N3 copies/L</i>
03/03/2020	5,23E+03	2,58E+03			
26/03/2020	1,47E+04	3,24E+04			
31/03/2020	1,39E+04	1,43E+04	31/03/2020	9,19E+03	2,31E+03
07/04/2020	7,34E+03	4,93E+03	07/04/2020	2,10E+03	2,04E+03
14/04/2020	1,92E+03	6,29E+03	14/04/2020	4,72E+03	3,10E+03
21/04/2020	1,73E+03	2,55E+03	21/04/2020	nd	1,42E+03
28/04/2020	2,81E+03	2,44E+03	28/04/2020	1,30E+03	nd
06/05/2020	3,25E+03	nd	05/05/2020	nd	nd
12/05/2020	nd	1,68E+03	12/05/2020	nd	nd
19/05/2020	nd	nd	19/05/2020	1,32E+03	2,89E+03
26/05/2020	4,69E+03	2,32E+03	26/05/2020	nd	nd
31/05/2020	nd	nd	02/06/2020	nd	nd
09/06/2020	nd	nd	09/06/2020	nd	nd
14/06/2020	nd	nd	16/06/2020	nd	nd

646 **Table 5.** Viral loads (RNA copies/day/1,000 people) of SARS-CoV-2 in the cities investigated in March-June 2020.

<i>Viral load (RNA copies/day/1000 people)</i>									
<i>Dates</i>	<i>Bergamo</i>	<i>Brembate</i>	<i>Ranica</i>	<i>Brescia</i>	<i>Cremona</i>	<i>Crema</i>	<i>Lodi</i>	<i>Milan 1</i>	<i>Milan 2</i>
March 30-31	3,40E+09	9,28E+10	1,25E+10	1,24E+10	1,95E+09	2,23E+09	1,97E+10	2,26E+09	3,21E+09
April 1-15	2,10E+09	2,43E+10	8,79E+09	3,08E+09	2,60E+09	4,03E+09	2,74E+09	8,23E+08	1,21E+09
April 16-30	7,46E+08	4,25E+09	3,60E+09	6,40E+08	6,35E+08	6,90E+08	3,95E+09	6,01E+08	7,25E+08
May 1-15	4,42E+08	2,01E+09	3,64E+09	0,00E+00	0,00E+00	4,88E+08	4,44E+08	4,89E+08	0,00E+00
May 16-30	0,00E+00	1,37E+09	2,17E+09	3,03E+08	4,96E+08	0,00E+00	3,79E+08	3,56E+08	3,07E+08
June 1-15	0,00E+00	3,80E+08	1,99E+09	5,66E+08	0,00E+00	6,90E+08	0,00E+00	0,00E+00	0,00E+00

647

648

649

650 **Figures Captions**

651 **Figure 1.** Cities and wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) investigated in Lombardy, Italy.

652 **Figure 2.** Correlations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA viral loads in wastewater samples and active cases in
653 northwestern Lombardy (Bergamo and Brescia provinces).

654 **Figure 3.** Correlations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA viral loads in wastewater samples and active cases in south
655 Lombardy (Lodi, Crema and Cremona) and in Milan.

656

WWTPs *(population served)*

1. Bergamo (115,822)
2. Brembate (114,070)
3. Ranica (63,865)
4. Brescia (278,495)
5. Cremona (101,036)
6. Crema (94,545)
7. Lodi (46,000)
8. Milan (1,461,950)