

1 **Successful Application of Wastewater-Based Epidemiology in Prediction and Monitoring of the**  
2 **Second Wave of COVID-19 in India with Fragmented Sewerage Systems- A Case Study of Jaipur**  
3 **(India)**

4 Sudipti Arora<sup>1\*</sup>††, Aditi Nag<sup>1\*</sup>, Aakanksha Kalra<sup>1</sup>, Vikky Sinha<sup>1</sup>, Ekta Meena<sup>1</sup>, Samvida Saxena<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Devanshi Sutaria<sup>1</sup>, Manpreet Kaur<sup>2</sup>, Tamanna Pamnani<sup>2</sup>, Komal Sharma<sup>2</sup>, Sonika Saxena<sup>1</sup>, Sandeep K  
6 Shrivastava<sup>2</sup>, A. B. Gupta<sup>3</sup>, Xuan Li<sup>4</sup>, Guangming Jiang<sup>4,5</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup> Dr. B. Lal Institute of Biotechnology, 6-E, Malaviya Industrial Area, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur (India)

8 <sup>2</sup>Centre for Innovation, Research & Development (CIRD), Dr. B. Lal Clinical Laboratory Pvt. Ltd., Jaipur  
9 (India)

10 <sup>3</sup>Department of Civil Engineering, Malaviya National Institute of Technology, Jaipur (India)

11 <sup>4</sup>School of Civil, Mining and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Information Sciences  
12 University of Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia

13 <sup>5</sup>Illawarra Health and Medical Research Institute (IHMRI), University of Wollongong, Wollongong,  
14 Australia

15

16 \*Sudipti Arora and Aditi Nag are equal contributors and thus shared the first authorship.

17

18 ††Corresponding author:

19 **Sudipti Arora, Ph.D**

20 Dr. B. Lal Institute of Biotechnology, 6-E, Malaviya Industrial Area, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur- 302017 (India),

21 Email: [sudiptiarora@gmail.com](mailto:sudiptiarora@gmail.com), [sudiptiarora@blalbiotech.com](mailto:sudiptiarora@blalbiotech.com)

22


23

24

25

26

27 **Graphical Abstract**



**Wastewater based early detection to monitor the outbreak of COVID19 in Jaipur city**

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 **Highlights**

- 42 • Successful application of WBE with prediction of 14-20 days for COVID-19 in Jaipur
- 43 • A comparison of SARS-CoV-2 RNA removal efficacy of 9 WWTPs was investigated
- 44 • SBR showed better performance than MBBR with SARS-CoV-2 RNA removal from
- 45 wastewater
- 46 • Presence of SARS-CoV-2 in effluents even after UV and Chlorine disinfection
- 47 • Using a combination of different detection genes reduce false positives in
- 48 WBE

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

## 68 **Abstract**

69 The present study tracked the city-wide dynamics of severe acute respiratory syndrome-  
70 corona virus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) RNA in the wastewater from nine different wastewater  
71 treatment plants (WWTPs) in Jaipur during second wave of COVID-19 out-break in India. A  
72 total of 164 samples were collected weekly between February 19<sup>th</sup> and June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021.  
73 SARS-CoV-2 was detected in 47.2% (52/110) influent samples and 37% (20/54) effluent  
74 samples. The increasing percentage of positive influent samples correlated with the city's  
75 increasing active clinical cases during the second wave of COVID-19 in Jaipur. Furthermore,  
76 WBE based evidence clearly showed early detection of about 20 days (9/9 samples reported  
77 positive on April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021) prior to the maximum cases & maximum deaths reported in the  
78 city on May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021. The present study further observed the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
79 in treated effluents at the time window of maximum active cases in the city even after tertiary  
80 disinfection treatments of UV & Chlorine. The average genome concentration in the effluents  
81 and removal efficacy of six commonly used treatments; Activated Sludge Treatment +  
82 Chlorine disinfection (ASP + Cl<sub>2</sub>), Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor (MBBR) with Ultraviolet  
83 radiations disinfection (MBBR + UV), MBBR + Chlorine (Cl<sub>2</sub>), Sequencing Batch Reactor  
84 (SBR) and SBR + Cl<sub>2</sub> were compared with removal efficacy of SBR + Cl<sub>2</sub> (81.2%)> MBBR +  
85 UV (68.8%) > SBR (57.1%) > ASP (50%) > MBBR + Cl<sub>2</sub>(36.4%). The study observed the  
86 trends & prevalence of four genes (E, RdRp, N, and ORF1ab gene) based on two different  
87 kits and found that prevalence of N> ORF1ab >RdRp> E gene, suggested that the effective  
88 genome concentration should be calculated based on the presence/absence of multiple  
89 genes. Hence, it is imperative to say that using a combination of different detection genes  
90 (E, N, RdRp & ORF1ab genes) reduce false positives in WBE.

## 91 **Keywords**

92 COVID-19, Hotspot Prediction, SARS-CoV-2, RT-PCR, Wastewater Based Epidemiology,  
93 Wastewater Treatment Plants

## 94 **Introduction**

95 An outbreak of pneumonia of unknown etiology was first reported in Wuhan (Hubei province,  
96 China) in late 2019, and the metagenomics sequencing shed light on the association of this  
97 outbreak with a novel coronavirus (nCoV) (Mehta et al., 2020). The “novel coronavirus-  
98 infected pneumonia” was officially designated as COVID-19 caused by SARS-CoV-2 (Zhu et  
99 al., 2020; Gorbalenya et al., 2020). A total of 222,895,613 confirmed cases, including  
100 4,602,961 deaths, were officially announced all over the world, by September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021  
101 (<https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>), with distressing consequences on human  
102 health and economy, particularly in the United States, India, and Russia, among others  
103 (Johns Hopkins University and Medicine, 2021). The available epidemiological evidence  
104 strongly suggests that COVID-19 is primarily transmitted through respiratory droplets and  
105 contact routes (Rothan & Byrareddy, 2020). The tracing of SARS-CoV-2 genetic material—  
106 viral RNA—in stool and urine of COVID-19 patients (Chen et al., 2020; Peng et al., 2020;  
107 Young et al., 2020) shed light on the pattern of spread of virus dissemination by aqueous  
108 matrices. The circulation of virus was speculated to have occurred from malfunctioning  
109 sewage works (sewer networks and wastewater treatment plants (WWTP)) in the community  
110 (Zaneti et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020).

111 Recently, there grew a huge interest in the scientific community in shedding of virus  
112 into feces as well as the presence and persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in health care and  
113 municipal effluents, although the potential of sewage to spread COVID-19 is extremely low  
114 and has not been reported to date (Ahmed et al, 2020; Medema et al., 2020). Both the World  
115 Health Organization (WHO) and the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)  
116 don't consider COVID-19 as waterborne and finding clues to support this claim throughout  
117 literature has not reached a clear conclusion (CDC, 2020). The presence of SARS-CoV-2 in  
118 wastewater indeed raises the potential for sewage analysis to inform epidemiological  
119 monitoring of COVID-19 as wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE). WBE is regarded as a  
120 complementary approach for current clinical surveillance which includes providing  
121 information on the prevalence and spread of disease in a population (Bivins et al, 2020a, b).  
122 WBE based on raw wastewater fingerprinting to obtain qualitative and quantitative data

123 within a given wastewater catchment, not only provides an early warning sign for disease  
124 outbreaks but also acts as a smart way of imposing preemptive quarantine (Sims et al.,  
125 2020).

126 For the last 1.5 years, several groups of researchers have been conducting different  
127 studies into sewage monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 with primarily two objectives. One is to  
128 detect the presence/surveillance of virus in a population for early epidemic prediction  
129 (SWEEP); and secondly, to assess infection risk to the public and sewage workers/operators  
130 from untreated/partially treated contaminated sewage and effluent as well as air surrounding  
131 wastewater treatment facilities (Tiwari et al., 2021). WBE is a potential tool to complement  
132 the current clinical surveillance as an affordable, convenient, and practical program as it  
133 gives a time period of at least 7- 28 days in advance for early preparedness by providing  
134 information on the prevalence and spread of disease in a population which helps decision &  
135 policy makers for proper allocation of resources (Sims et al., 2021).

136 Considerable efforts have been devoted to detecting SARS-CoV-2 in sewage in  
137 several countries, particularly in high-and upper-middle-income communities such as the  
138 Netherlands, Italy, Spain, etc. where the sewerage systems are properly connected  
139 (Medema et al., 2020; La Rosa et al 2020; Randazzo et al., 2020;). However, the imbalance  
140 between the numbers of studies in developed countries, and those on the broad spectrum of  
141 developing and resource-limited communities especially India clearly indicates that much  
142 work has yet to be accomplished. Over 80% of wastewater is not connected to proper  
143 sewage networks and is discharged without treatment in India (CPCB Report, 2020). The  
144 problem with India's sewerage system is that it is fragmented, and poorly connected. There  
145 is still a large percentage of the population that is not connected to any sewage treatment  
146 plants and sewerage infrastructure. The coverage of the sewerage system in Jaipur is less  
147 than that of the drainage system as it covers only 60 percent of the Jaipur municipal  
148 corporation area and caters to about 80 percent of the population (NIUA Report, 2019).

149           There are very few case studies which have been reported from India, across the  
150 nation, including i.e., Uttarakhand and Rajasthan from Northern India (Arora et al., 2020a,  
151 2021), Hyderabad (Hemalatha et al., 2021; Kopperi et al., 2021) and Chennai from Southern  
152 India (Chakraborti et al, 2021); and Gujarat (Kumar et al., 2020a, 2021a, 2021b, 2021c) and  
153 Maharashtra from Central India (Sharma et al., 2021), most of which have successfully  
154 demonstrated the usefulness of WBE but on a limited scale. The awareness of WBE has  
155 been increasing during the COVID-19 pandemic; however, WBE is still not an established  
156 practice in developing regions like India. There are some challenges for an effective WBE  
157 implementation in India including lack of awareness among the public health officials and  
158 government authorities, leaders of corporations and the public. The implementation of a  
159 nation-wide WBE program in countries like India with a dissimilar sanitary coverage is an  
160 extremely complicated issue. The use of distinct sanitation systems, such as centralized  
161 sewer systems and on-site sanitation systems—pit latrines, bucket latrines and septic  
162 tanks—impose a challenge for WBE implementation in low and middle-income countries.  
163 The Viral RNA detection in dysfunctional sewer systems needs to be further explored  
164 (Gwenzi et al., 2021; Street et al., 2020).Therefore, it becomes even more imperative to  
165 validate these research in such systems to prove WBE as an efficient monitoring tool for  
166 early prediction.

167           Considering these limitations and challenges due to the fragmented sewerage  
168 system and the huge gap between generated versus treated sewage, this study aims to  
169 delineate how efficient can WBE be for predicting the upcoming surge of COVID-19 in Jaipur  
170 and whether such systems become a barrier in successful application of WBE? To answer  
171 these pertinent questions, the present research study was planned from Indian perspectives  
172 to bridge the knowledge gap between researchers, scientific community and government  
173 officials and policy makers and to successfully implement WBE at a city scale that could  
174 possibly help in controlling the pandemic. Thus the objectives of the present study were to  
175 (1) evaluate the implementation of WBE for Jaipur city, for prediction of second wave of  
176 COVID-19, (2) to determine the efficacy of different treatment systems in nine WWTPs in


177 removal of SARS-CoV-2 loads, (3) determine and validate the prevalence of different genes  
178 involved using the combination of two kits and (4) standardizing the methodology including  
179 sample collection, transportation, pre-processing, etc. in a cost effective manner to establish  
180 WBE as an overall economical approach. Further, the study will substantiate the potential of  
181 WBE for the city-wide surveillance in Jaipur city to incorporate WBE into the regular  
182 monitoring programs and policy framework to manage the future COVID-19 wave efficiently.

## 183 **2. Experimental Methodology**

### 184 **2.1. Wastewater Sampling**

185 Influent and effluent samples were collected from nine municipal wastewater treatment  
186 plants (WWTPs) located across the Jaipur city for the monitoring of the second wave of  
187 COVID-19. The influent samples have been analysed for the prediction of second wave  
188 while the analysis of effluent samples was done for evaluating the efficiency of the WWTPs  
189 for the removal of viral loads. This is a longitudinal study wherein the samples were taken  
190 between February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021 and June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021. All the samples were collected as one Litre  
191 grabs in sterile bottles and transported to the Environmental Biotechnology Laboratory at Dr.  
192 B. Lal Institute of Biotechnology, Jaipur for further investigation and analysis. Appropriate  
193 precautions including ambient temperatures were taken in consideration for sample  
194 collection. Concerned personnel wore standard personal protective equipment (PPE) during  
195 the entire sampling process. The collected samples were transported to the laboratory at  
196 ambient temperatures of the city during the collection months, as adopted by Arora et al.,  
197 (2020, 2021). Figure 1 shows the geographical locations of the sampling sites used in the  
198 study.





**Figure 1: Sampling sites of Jaipur for the study**

## 2.2. Sample preparation

The samples for RNA isolation were prepared with slight modifications from the protocol described previously (Arora et al., 2020, 2021). The wastewater samples were surface sterilized using UV treatment for 30 minutes followed by manual mixing. Further 1 ml sample was aliquoted and centrifuged at 7,000 rpm for 30 minutes (for removal of debris & unwanted materials) and the supernatant was then processed for RNA extraction as described in Arora et al., (2021).

## 2.3. Viral RNA Extraction

Viral RNA was extracted from the processed wastewater samples via the MagMAX Viral/Pathogen Nucleic Acid Isolation Kit (Applied Biosystems) following the manufacturer's instructions using the automated KingFisher™ Flex machine. The protocol involves “three wash” steps for the extraction of the RNA. Samples were vortexed for 10 seconds and then mixed with the extraction buffer consisting of binding solution, binding beads and Proteinase K (referred to as extraction master mix), vortexed for 30 seconds and then processed using

215 the automated system. This is followed by three washing steps using Wash Plate 1  
216 consisting of wash buffer, wash plate 2 and 3 each consisting of varying amounts of 80%  
217 PCR grade ethanol. The RNA is finally eluted out and the process takes about 24 minutes  
218 each time. The eluted RNA in the plates are then sealed and stored at -20°C till further use.

#### 219 **2.4. Qualitative and Quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2**

220 The qualitative and quantitative presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in the total  
221 RNA extracted from the wastewater samples using CFX 96 Thermal Cycler (Bio-Rad) RT-  
222 PCR machine using two separate commercially available kits. Kit 1 was Allplex™ 2019-  
223 nCoV Assay RT-PCR, used for qualitative detection of SARS-CoV 2 consisted of 2019-nCoV  
224 MOM (prepared master mix), 5X Real-time One-step Buffer, Real-time One-step Enzyme  
225 and exogenous Internal Control (IC). The kit 1 targeted E gene, N gene and RdRp gene with  
226 FAM and HEX as internal controls to be read on Cal Red 610 and Quasar 670 fluorophore  
227 channels, respectively. The PCR reaction was set up by mixing 11 µL of the isolated RNA  
228 with 14 µL of RT-PCR master mix. The reaction protocol consisted of 1 cycle at 50°C for  
229 20 min, 1 cycle at 95°C for 15 min followed by 45 cycles of denaturation at 94°C for 15 sec  
230 and combined annealing and extension for 30 sec at 58°C followed by plate read and  
231 detection. The PCR run was analyzed with Bio-Rad CFX Manager software version 3.1 (Bio-  
232 Rad Laboratories). As per manufacturer's instructions, the detection of a minimum of any  
233 two genes (out of three) in a sample was considered positive based on Ct values.

234 To further quantify the presence of SARS-CoV-2 viral genome in the wastewater  
235 samples, InnoDetect One Step COVID-19 (Kit 2) was used wherein two different plasmid  
236 DNA consisting of N gene and ORF1ab gene separately was used to prepare a standard  
237 curve (a range of 10pg/µL to 0.01fg/µL) as per the protocol in the manufacturer's  
238 instructions. These standard curves were then used for the quantification of the respective  
239 genes in the samples. RNase free water was used to make a main stock of concentration of  
240 40ng/µL. The kit 2 consists of a master mix, primer probe (N gene, ORF1ab & RNaseP) and  
241 uses three fluorophore channels (HEX/VIC, FAM & ROX/Texas Red, respectively) for

242 individual identification. Viral RNA of SARS-CoV-2 was used as a positive control and  
243 DNase RNase free water as a negative control provided with the kit. The reaction cycle  
244 consists of a reverse transcription step at 42°C for 15 min 1 cycle, cDNA initial denaturation  
245 at 95°C for 3 min 1 cycle, denaturation at 95°C for 15 Sec and combined annealing and  
246 extension at 60°C for 40 sec followed by plate read and detection. The samples with  
247 quantitative presence of any of the two genes (N or ORF1ab) or both the genes were  
248 considered positive.

## 249 **2.5. Statistical Analysis**

250 The co-detection of genes using different kits and the removal efficiency due to different  
251 treatment approach were visualized using R (ver. 3.31, <http://www.R-project.org/>). To  
252 evaluate the temporal effect, the viral concentration data (viral loads/positive  
253 detection rate) were paired with 7-day averaged new cases for Jaipur & India.

## 254 **3. Results**

### 255 **3.1. Characteristics of selected sampling sites for prediction and monitoring of the** 256 **second wave of COVID-19**

257 Similar to other tier-2 cities of India, Jaipur also has a fragmented sewerage network system  
258 with different centralized and decentralized wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs). The  
259 main objective of the present study was to determine whether a WBE based early warning  
260 system can be established in such a fragmented system. Seven different sampling sites  
261 (Site 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8) were selected across the whole length and two sites (Site 7 and  
262 9) were selected across the cross-section of the city, the details of which are described in  
263 Table 1. This ensured coverage of about 60-70% of the city population connected to the  
264 main sewerage trunk. Of the nine sites, one (Site 4) was a system connected to an  
265 academic institution (MNIT Jaipur) connected with a residential capacity of 2000 inhabitants.  
266 Site 2, 3, 5 and 8 are small-sized decentralized systems which receive wastewater from  
267 multiple catchment areas and inhabit population size of about 5000 individuals. Site 1 and 9

268 are medium-sized decentralized systems with a population size of greater than 50,000  
269 individuals while site 6 and 7 are large centralized systems with population size of about 5  
270 Lakhs (official data obtained from Jaipur Development Authority (JDA), & NIUA report 2021).

271 Grab samples were collected every week during the entire duration of the study.  
272 Samples were collected from the sites located at the centre towards the sites at the  
273 upstream or downstream across the sewage trunk line. As a result, samples of the sites  
274 closer to the centre were collected around 11 AM while those of the sites at the terminal  
275 were collected around late afternoon at 1 PM. Wastewater sample collection from WWTPs,  
276 its transportation to the experimental laboratory and pre-processing before RNA extraction is  
277 a challenge in terms of both logistic feasibility as well as a for the applicability of WBE at a  
278 city scale. Our previous studies (Arora et al., 2021) have already reported that direct RNA  
279 extraction (without pre-processing) from 1 ml centrifuged supernatant of the properly mixed 1  
280 Litre collected wastewater sample is sufficient enough for the qualitative detection of SARS-  
281 CoV-2. As a result, the similar protocol was used in this study.

282

283 **Table 1:** Details of the sampling location sites along with treatment characteristics of WWTPs located in  
284 Jaipur, Rajasthan

Site No.	Sampling Location	Type of Secondary treatment technology	Type of Tertiary Treatment	Dosage & contact time tertiary treatment	Design Capacity (MLD)	Flow Rate (avg. MLD)	Number of connected residents (Approx.)
Site 1	Brahmpuri, Jaipur 26.9373°N, 75.8250°E	SBR	No treatment	NA	27 MLD	~8	□59,000

Site 2	Central Park Garden, Jaipur 26.9048°N, 75.8073°E	SBR	Cl <sub>2</sub> (Bleach Powder)	4 ppm by dropping system	1 MLD	~1	□7,000
Site 3	Ramniwas Garden, Jaipur 26.8963°N, 75.8100°E	MBBR	UV	NA	1 MLD	~1	□7,000
Site 4	MNIT, Jaipur 26.8640°N, 75.8108°E	MBBR	Cl <sub>2</sub> (Hypochlori te)	2.5-3 ppm, 30 min	1 MLD	~1	□2000
Site 5	Jawahar Circle Garden, Jaipur 26°50'29"N ,75°48'0"E	MBBR	UV	NA	1 MLD	~1	□7,000
Site 6	Dravyavati River, Jaipur 26.7980°N, 75.8039°E	SBR	Cl <sub>2</sub> (Hypochlori te)	3-5 ppm, 30 min	65 MLD	~65	□480,000

Site 7	Dhelawas, Jaipur 27.3735°N, 75.8926°E	ASP	No treatment	3 ppm, 30 min	65 MLD	~62.5	□480,000
Site 8	Paldi Meena, Jaipur 26.8759° N, 75.8945° E	SBR	No treatment	NA	3 MLD	0.6 – 0.7	~5,000
Site 9	Ralawata, Jaipur 26.76873° N, 75.93092° E	ASP	Cl <sub>2</sub> (Hypochlorite)	10 kg per hour	30 MLD	20-22	~1,70,370

285 Note: MNIT = Malaviya National Institute of Technology, MBBR= Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor, SBR=  
 286 Sequencing Batch Reactor, ASP = Activated Sludge Process, Cl<sub>2</sub>= Chlorine disinfection, UV- Ultra violet  
 287 disinfection, MLD= million litres per day, NA= Not applicable

288 **3.2. Qualitative and Quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 in the Influent samples of**  
 289 **WWTPs with monthly variations and correlation with the active cases in the city**

290 In the present study, we reported weekly data of wastewater samples collected from nine  
 291 different locations for sixteen weeks during February to June 2021 and the results are  
 292 mapped in heat map as shown in Figure 2. The average Ct values for E, RdRp, N and ORF  
 293 1ab genes were 32.3, 35.1, 33.4 and 34.7, respectively. Likewise, the average Ct value of  
 294 internal control (MS2 bacteriophage) was 27.3, and no SARS-CoV-2 genes were detected in  
 295 the negative control samples. We detected and quantified monthly variations in SARS-CoV-2

296 RNA from wastewater samples to understand the pandemic situation during the second  
297 wave in Jaipur, Rajasthan (India). The longitudinal analysis of the wastewater samples  
298 collected from the nine sites showed the first detection of SARS-CoV-2 as early as 27<sup>th</sup>  
299 February 2021 as evident from Figure 2. The percentage prevalence of positive influent  
300 samples to the total samples collected showed 44.4% positivity on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2021 when  
301 the new active case number per day was only 61. The percentage positivity then increased  
302 to almost 100% from 26<sup>th</sup> March 2021 and continued till 15<sup>th</sup> May 2021 before declining. The  
303 increasing prevalence of percentage positive influent wastewater samples correlated well  
304 with the increasing cases & deaths reported during the second wave of COVID-19 in Jaipur.  
305 The noticeable increase in the case number viz. 528 per day appeared on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2021  
306 which is 2 weeks post the significant number of positive wastewater samples (on 26<sup>th</sup> March  
307 2021). So, this time period of 2 weeks could be sufficiently utilized to control the ever  
308 increasing cases & deaths, in the city. This can also be correlated with the number of deaths  
309 due to COVID-19 in this duration wherein the 7 day moving death average was around 1 on  
310 1st April which increased to 55.57 on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2021 (peak of COVID-19). The restricted  
311 movement was imposed in the city on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2021 when the new active case number had  
312 already reached 1484 per day, which rose to a maximum of 4202 on 7<sup>th</sup> May 2021 (as per  
313 official data from [www.covid-19india.org](http://www.covid-19india.org)).

314 The quantitative analysis of all the influent samples was also carried out wherein the  
315 genome copy number of N gene and ORF1ab gene was calculated. As observed in Figure 2,  
316 during the months of February, average genome concentration was  $\log_{10}$  4.40 GC/litre which  
317 increased to  $\log_{10}$  4.58 in March, to  $\log_{10}$  5.43 and 5.47 in April & May, respectively. The  
318 increasing genome concentration correlated well with the increasing number of active cases  
319 and mortality rate. Figure 3 also shows the detection of N gene as early as 27<sup>th</sup> February  
320 2021 coinciding with the qualitative analysis while ORF1ab gene was first detected on 26<sup>th</sup>  
321 March 2021. Thus, the N gene could be detected 20 days prior to the significant rise in the  
322 new active patients per day while ORF1ab was detected 10 day prior. It is worth noting that  
323 the genome copies of both the genes were quantifiable in the wastewater samples

324 throughout the second wave. Another interesting observation to note here is that although  
 325 the N gene could be detected earlier during the rise of the cases, it was the ORF1ab gene  
 326 which could be detected and quantified when the patient case numbers declined while the  
 327 detection of N gene had already reached below limit of detection (LOD). The SARS-CoV2  
 328 RNA concentrations in the wastewater influent samples calculated from the N gene ranged  
 329 from 4.4 to 6.04 log<sub>10</sub> GC/L and ORF1ab ranged from 4.5- 5.60 log<sub>10</sub> GC/L (n = 110).  
 330 Normalized viral loads of quantifiable wastewater influent samples from WWTPs were  
 331 plotted and compared with new cases from Jaipur city and India (Figure 3).

332  
 333

Sampling sites	Sampling Dates	Feb-21		Mar-21				Apr-21				May-21				Jun-21	
		20-Feb	27-Feb	4-Mar	12-Mar	19-Mar	26-Mar	1-Apr	5-Apr	9-Apr	20-Apr	1-May	8-May	15-May	24-May	31-May	8-Jun
	Daily New cases	17	36	39	31	61	140	242	528	767	1875	3301	4202	2605	804	220	141
	7 Day Moving Average (new cases)	22.86	31	31.57	48.57	92.43	151.43	363.86	603.14	885	2801.71	3682.57	3467.29	2138.29	670.43	225.14	119.67
	Deaths Reported	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	9	43	53	41	17	18	5
	7 Day moving average (Deaths)	0.14	0.14	0	0	0.43	0.14	0.43	1.57	2.14	10.14	51.86	55.57	34.57	17	9.43	3.33
	Percentage Prevalence of Positive samples	0(8)	1(7)	2(8)	2(9)	4(9)	2(2)	5(6)	3(3)	7(7)	6(6)	5(5)	3(3)	7(7)	4(8)	1(9)	1(9)
		0.0%	14.3%	25.0%	22.2%	44.4%	100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	8.3%	8.3%
Site 1	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	P	NA	P	P	P	NA	P	N	N	N
	ORF1ab	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	NA	N	P	N	NA	P	N	N	N
Site 2	N	N	N	P	N	P	NA	P	NA	P	P	NA	NA	P	P	N	N
	ORF1ab	N	N	N	N	N	NA	P	NA	P	P	NA	NA	P	N	N	N
Site 3	N	N	P	N	N	N	P	P	NA	P	P	NA	NA	NA	NA	N	N
	ORF1ab	N	N	N	N	N	N	P	N	NA	N	P	NA	NA	NA	N	N
Site 4	N	NA	NA	NA	N	P	NA	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N
	ORF1ab	NA	NA	NA	N	N	NA	N	N	N	N	N	P	P	N	N	N
Site 5	N	N	N	ND	P	P	NA	N	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N
	ORF1ab	N	N	ND	N	N	NA	N	N	N	P	P	P	P	N	P	N
Site 6	N	N	N	ND	N	N	NA	P	NA	P	NA	P	P	P	P	N	N
	ORF1ab	N	N	ND	N	N	NA	P	NA	N	NA	P	P	P	N	N	N
Site 7	N	N	NA	ND	P	P	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	P	N	N
	ORF1ab	N	NA	ND	N	N	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	P	N	N	N
Site 8	N	N	N	ND	N	N	NA	NA	P	P	P	NA	NA	P	N	N	N
	ORF1ab	N	N	ND	N	N	NA	NA	N	N	P	P	NA	N	N	N	N
Site 9	N	N	N	P	N	N	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	P	N	P
	ORF1ab	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	N	N	N
Effective Genome concentration- N (log GC/litre)		4.40		4.58				5.43				5.47				ND	
Effective Genome concentration- ORF1ab (log GC/litre)		ND		4.72				4.94				5.20				4.86	


N = Negative P = Positive NI = Not Included



334  
 335 **Figure 2:** Heat map showing Temporal variation in positive prevalence of the SARS-CoV-2  
 336 targeted genes in Influent samples at various locations in Jaipur city with increasing active  
 337 cases and deaths reported (Green N= negative, Pink P= Positive, NA= Not applicable)

338





339

340 **Figure 3:** Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 concentration week wise with daily COVID-19 cases &  
341 Deaths reported in Jaipur & India (LOD- Limit of detection)

### 342 3.3. Prevalence of genes targeted for SARS-CoV-2 detection

343 Owing to the low sensitivity of the RT-PCR kits towards wastewater samples, two different  
344 kits consisting of five different probes were used for the study to ensure accurate detection.  
345 As already described in the methodology section, four different genes (N, RdRp, E and  
346 ORF1ab) were analysed where RdRp and E gene were detected qualitatively, ORF1ab was  
347 detected quantitatively and N gene was detected both qualitatively and quantitatively using  
348 two different probes. Figure 4 describes the prevalence & co-prevalence of four genes in  
349 both the samples (influent & effluent). Out of the 164 total wastewater samples tested, all the  
350 four target genes could be detected in only 15 wastewater samples whereas in other  
351 samples, genes were detected in different combinations. N gene was the most commonly  
352 detected gene in the samples wherein 33 samples tested positive for only one of the N gene  
353 targets (N detected by either or both probes from Kits 1 and 2) followed by 5, 8 and 12  
354 samples in combination with E, RdRp and ORF1ab genes, respectively. Furthermore, one

355 samples each consisting of positive targets of only ORF1ab or only RdRp genes. However,  
356 interestingly, the E gene showed the highest number of false positives and was never  
357 detected alone. Similarly, 16 and 7 samples were found positive for a combination of (N,  
358 RdRp, E gene) or of (ORF1ab, N and E genes), respectively.

359         Among the 164 wastewater samples analysed in the study, only 52 samples (30.5%)  
360 could be confirmed by both kits. However, the total number of wastewater samples that  
361 could be ruled positive by either of the kit target criteria was 72. The difference of 69.5%  
362 positive prevalence in samples was reported using combination of 2 kits. It is also observed  
363 that six samples were detected positive qualitatively, i.e., showed any two out of three genes  
364 positive using Kit 1 (including N gene) but could not be quantified by Kit 2. This could be  
365 attributed to the variation in the probe used for detection, sensitivity, and the detection limits  
366 of the two kits. In addition, 16 samples which were considered negative during the qualitative  
367 detection by Kit 1 (as per manufacturer's criteria) were detected positive by Kit 2 (either N  
368 gene or ORF1ab gene or both present). These observations thus support the use of a  
369 combination of kits to achieve a finer distinction and broader detection of SARS-CoV-2  
370 genome when compared to detection by a single kit. Hence, it is imperative to say that  
371 wastewater surveillance-based data must not be validated based on a single particular gene  
372 of SARS-CoV-2 but its effective gene concentration including multiple genes.

373

374


375

376

377

378

379



380  
 381 **Figure 4:** Positive detections using two kits with different genes (i.e., E, N, RdRp, ORF1ab) of all samples  
 382 (both influent and effluent). The red triangle indicates positive samples identified based on the criteria.  
 383 The blue and green bars indicate the false negative identified by Kit 1, and Kit 2, respectively.

384 **3.4. Efficacy of WWTPs in removal of SARS-CoV-2**

385 The efficacy of the WWTPs in the removal of SARS-CoV-2 from the wastewater samples was  
 386 observed in our earlier study during the first wave of COVID-19 (Arora et al., 2020, 2021). However, in the  
 387 present study, it was observed that the efficacy of the WWTPs was compromised wherein the virus load  
 388 could be detected in the effluent samples as well. Due to limitations (mainly permissions or breakdown of  
 389 WWTP), in sample collection, the effluent samples from site 9 were not considered for analysis. Figure 5

390 summarizes the positive prevalence & the efficacy of different treatment technologies in removal of  
 391 SARS-CoV-2 in the samples. It was observed that during March, an average of only 20% effluents  
 392 samples were positive, which increased to 43.2% in April, and 55% in May. It was observed that this  
 393 percentage can be correlated with the high active case-loads in the city, (between 9<sup>th</sup> April 2021 and 24<sup>th</sup>  
 394 May 2021 as per [www.COVID-19.org](http://www.COVID-19.org)) which makes it difficult for WWTPS to remove SARS-CoV-2. The  
 395 removal efficacy of different treatment technologies was also compared in terms of qualitative detection.  
 396 Paired t-tests between the influent and effluent wastewater samples, taken on the same days, were  
 397 performed to understand the significance of the SARS-CoV-2 gene removal efficacy of each treatment  
 398 process, i.e., Activated sludge treatment ASP + Cl<sub>2</sub>, Moving Bed biofilm Reactor (MBBR) with Ultraviolet  
 399 radiations (UV), MBBR + Chlorine (Cl<sub>2</sub>), Sequencing Batch Reactor (SBR) and SBR + Cl<sub>2</sub> (Figure 5).  
 400 Overall comparison of SARS-CoV-2 genome removal efficacy of different treatments is expressed on the  
 401 total positive prevalence obtained throughout monitoring. The significance of SARS-CoV-2 genes removal  
 402 efficacy in different treatment technologies includes the order of SBR + Cl<sub>2</sub> (81.2%) > MBBR + UV (68.8%)  
 403 > SBR (57.1%) > ASP (50%) > MBBR + Cl<sub>2</sub> (36.4%).

404 The removal efficacy of the WWTPs was also analysed by comparing the viral genome load in  
 405 terms of quantitative analysis of N gene and ORF1ab gene, respectively in the influent and the effluent  
 406 samples. Figure 6 shows the box plots, of different treatment types using N gene & ORF1ab gene,  
 407 respectively. These results suggested that in case of the sites like Sites 4 and 5 once the genome load in  
 408 the influent samples exceeded the log of five, effluent loads were in the median range of 5 logs for both  
 409 genes irrespective of the loads observed in corresponding effluent grabs which fluctuated between logs of  
 410 4 to 6.


Sites	Dates	Mar-21		Apr-21				May-21					Jun-21	Removal Efficacy
		19-Mar	26-Mar	1-Apr	5-Apr	9-Apr	20-Apr	1-May	8-May	15-May	24-May	31-May		
	Percentage prevalence of Positive samples	1(5)	0(2)	2(5)	1(3)	1(5)	4(5)	2(3)	3(3)	4(5)	1(4)	0(5)	0(5)	
		20%	0%	40%	33%	20%	80%	67%	100%	80%	25%	0%	0%	
1	SBR	NA	N	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	57.1
8		N	NA	NA	N	N	P	P	NA	P	NA	NA	NA	
2	SBR + Chlorine	N	NA	N	NA	N	P	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81.2
6		NA	NA	N	NA	N	NA	NA	P	N	N	N	N	
3	MBBR + UV	NA	N	P	NA	NA	N	NA	NA	NA	NA	N	N	68.8
5		P	NA	N	N	N	P	N	P	P	N	N	N	
4	MBBR + Chlorine	P	NA	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	N	N	N	36.4
7	ASP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	P	P	N	50
9	ASP + Chlorine	P	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI

N = Negative P = Positive NI = Not Included

High Low

411


412 Figure 5: Temporal variation in gene copies of the SARS-CoV-2 targeted genes and  
413 effective gene concentration in Effluent samples at various locations in Jaipur city with  
414 removal efficacy of different treatments  
415



416

417

418 (a)



419

420 (b)

421

422 **Figure 6:** Box plot indicating Removal efficiency of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in 5 different  
423 treatments systems at WWTPs using (a) N gene and (b) ORF1ab gene. Only the WWTP with no less  
424 than 2 data points for the removal efficiency was included in the figure.

425

#### 426 4. Discussions

427 **4.1. Sampling from fragmented and selected areas of a city can successfully be**  
428 **harnessed into a prediction model**

429 WBE has been evaluated as a potential tool for the prediction of COVID-19 pandemic across  
430 various sections of the world (Fongaro et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020). However, those  
431 studies have been carried out either based on a small scale in developing country (such as  
432 in studies of Kumar et al., 2020a, 2021a,b,c) or within a city with a highly connected sewer  
433 network in developed countries. The wastewater systems in majority of Indian urban cities  
434 are fragmented and composed of various decentralized treatment plants scattered  
435 throughout the city confines. The rural & slum areas and outskirts of these urban areas have

436 practically a non-existent WWTP and thus most of the wastewater is dumped either in  
437 surface water bodies like rivers or in the community wide septic tanks. Given the fragmented  
438 state of the sanitation network, a mere ability to detect pathogens or biomarkers in  
439 wastewater is not sufficient. This detection needs to be carried out in a systematic, regular,  
440 and planned manner to monitor the community uniformly and warn the same well in advance  
441 about any potential threats. There is an urgent need for time-series data of SARS-CoV-2  
442 RNA concentration in the wastewater that can be matched with the actual clinical survey  
443 data to confirm the utility and predictability of wastewater surveillance in India. This is also  
444 imperative for the adaptation of the Surveillance of Wastewater for Early Epidemic Prediction  
445 (SWEET) on the policy level. This becomes more important in India since the development  
446 of a proper and integrated wastewater treatment system is far-fetched even in the urban  
447 areas considering the overall limitations. Therefore, the present study aimed to investigate  
448 the applicability of WBE in the prediction and monitoring of COVID-19 wave in a city level  
449 paradigm with a limited interconnected sewerage system. Despite the presence of  
450 disconnected and fragmented WWTPs, undergoing the treatment of only 60-70% of the total  
451 wastewater generated, the collection sites were selected such that they covered most of the  
452 total WWTPs installed in the city. A combination of small and medium decentralized WWTPs  
453 and large centralized treatment plants was selected to investigate in detail about the ability &  
454 feasibility of WBE to detect the upcoming COVID-19 active case load rise in advance. As  
455 mentioned in results section 3.1, it was observed that even with such a restricted coverage,  
456 the increase in positivity from various sites could be observed at least 14-20 days (at a total  
457 active case count of less than 50 per day) before a visible rise in newly detected active  
458 cases. Another important observation to be made in this case study that in contrast to Kumar  
459 et al., 2021 this study shows that if the sites are selected carefully it is possible to directly  
460 correlate the positivity rate of the sites to the upcoming wave in advance. As is the case in  
461 point where this study was able to predict the upcoming wave of COVID19 in Jaipur city, well  
462 in advance of 14-20 days (on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2020) while the cases started increasing exponentially  
463 after 20<sup>th</sup> April, with peak maximum cases load on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2021. Overall, it can be

464 highlighted that even in Indian sewage system networks rudimentary as they might be, WBE  
465 can be either directly (as observed here) or at least indirectly can be applied for early  
466 predictions (Kumar et al.,2021). Similar to the temporal variations in copy number reported in  
467 previous study by Kumar et al., 2021, an exact trend of copy number could not be  
468 established however, it was observed that the general positivity rates observed in this study  
469 could be correlated with the rise of caseloads in the city. Thus, it may seem that in a  
470 carefully monitored city, just qualitative detection might be enough in raising a rudimentary  
471 alarm for the city officials.

472 Another interesting observation was, in contrast to the previously published reports  
473 which suggest that WBE detection of SARS-CoV-2 genomes outlasts the clinical detection  
474 and falls slowly (Nemudryi et al., 2020); this study reported a sharp decline in positive  
475 prevalence rate (Figure 2 & 3) in the wastewater samples with the fall in cases. Within 2-3  
476 weeks of COVID-19 second wave peak, the positive prevalence rate dropped to 50% (4/8)  
477 and 8% (1/9) in samples collected after 20<sup>th</sup> May 2020. This contrast is interesting and needs  
478 to be further investigated. One of the possible explanations for this observation may be the  
479 limited sampling from selected collection points. Another explanation of this observation may  
480 be the symptoms present in the passing wave where coughing subsides contributing to  
481 decreased ratio of sputum to fecal viral load. However, more investigation is needed in this  
482 direction and in absence of a certain load to case number conversion metric, this  
483 observation might not be completely explained.

#### 484 **4.2. A combination of kits with multiple target probes has a large coverage and** 485 **detection sensitivity**

486 The premise of using WBE successfully in community wide surveillance of a disease or a  
487 biomarker is the shedding of respective pathogens or certain specific molecules into the  
488 wastewater (Weidhas et al., 2021). SARS-CoV-2 is known to be shed in wastewater through  
489 body excreta of any infected individual regardless of the manifested symptoms. Although  
490 several targets for detection of such diseases are available, several factors contribute to the  
491 efficiency of the method such as sensitivity of a detection primer-probe combination or any



492 inhibiting factor present in each test sample. Therefore, it can be argued that relying on only  
493 one type of target or probe may lead to false negative or positive detection. Since timely  
494 detection of the target is essential for the management of the disease in the community, the  
495 percentage efficacy of two different kits was compared. To surveil and continuously monitor  
496 the presence of the viral particles, already available and ICMR approved kits were used as a  
497 part of investigating the uniform up-scalement of the city-wide surveillance. The set of  
498 targets consisted of both structural (N, E) and non-structural (RdRp and ORF1ab) genes  
499 (Naqvi et al., 2020). Out of total collected 164 samples, 148 samples were confirmed  
500 positive by kit 1 which could also be quantified by kit 2. However, 16 samples were  
501 confirmed positive only based on 2 kits used. Interestingly, only 30.48% (50 out of 164) of  
502 the positive samples could be detected by both the kits while 12.8% (21 out of 164) of the  
503 samples were additionally identified by either Kit 1 or Kit 2 alone.

504 It was also observed that most of the samples uniquely detected by Kit 1 were  
505 collected from a site connecting to centralized wastewater treatment plants (Sites 7 and 8)  
506 while all the samples which could only be detected by Kit 2 were from decentralized systems  
507 (Sites 1, 3 and 5). The sites which show sample variability between the detection by Kit 1  
508 versus Kit 2 operate at a different scale and collect over different sizes of catchment area.  
509 Thus, the variability in detection could be because of the differential sensitivity of the primer  
510 probe set used in Kit 1 and 2. Or it could be due to the difference in silt or contaminant levels  
511 accumulated during the collection of wastewater in larger catchments between the origin and  
512 the centralized treatment plants. Furthermore, the sites which could be ruled positive only by  
513 Kit 2 were tested positive for at least one of the three target genes of Kit 1 but were ruled  
514 negative as per the Kit 1 criteria. Therefore, it can be inferred that using additional detection  
515 probes might be required to determine any false negative results obtained with a single kit.  
516 While such factors will always be a consideration in WBE approach and can only be  
517 resolved by upgrading the detection infrastructure, using more than one kit seems to  
518 increase the coverage of detection by 13% approximately which becomes more relevant as  
519 the increase in the number of samples becomes larger. It is worth highlighting that gene N,

520 while could be detected by Kit 1 probe very efficiently, did have a couple of instances of only  
521 being detected by the probe from Kit 2 only indicating the benefits of multiple target  
522 approach.

523 It is interesting to note that not all the target genes could be detected uniformly or  
524 independently in all the samples analysed. This observation further highlights the need of  
525 analysis of multiple targets while surveilling pathogen presence in a given community. In  
526 addition to the use of multiple targets for detection, the criteria for considering a sample  
527 positive in terms of wastewater also needs to be revisited owing to the dilution of the virus  
528 particle and/or genes in the wastewater samples or the presence of various inhibitors. The  
529 current study for instance has followed the ICMR approved criteria of detecting two out of  
530 three targets for a sample to be positive by Kit 1. However, it is worth noting that these  
531 criteria were first approved for testing in patients directly and might not be as applicable to  
532 the wastewater sample where the presence of a single gene (with Ct values below the  
533 detection cut-off of 40) might indicate a very low presence of circulating pathogens in the  
534 community. Such observations should be worth a second look as even though it is possible  
535 that they are false positives, an alternative scenario where the detection of a spread is  
536 inhibited by some community specific factors which might be present in the wastewater  
537 samples. Standardizing a way therefore where the validity of presence of one single target  
538 out of many may provide a more sensitive application of WBE in containing a large-scale  
539 spread.

#### 540 **4.3. Quantification by two different targets probes could cover the complete second** 541 **wave in the city**

542 It was also interesting to note that even though the sensitivity of two quantitative probes  
543 seemed to be different (Limit of detection for N gene being  $\log 10^3$  Genome concentration  
544 while that of ORF1ab being  $\log 10^4$ ) (Figure 4), both the genes could be quantified  
545 throughout the study period. Although a more sensitive detection method like droplet PCRs  
546 in combination to an integrated wastewater-based monitoring is ideal for the monitoring at

547 the city level, this study has tried to investigate the success of WBE monitoring on the  
548 existing current wastewater treatment facilities in the city using simple qPCR-based  
549 detection. It was observed that with a weekly monitoring across the selected few sites in the  
550 city of Jaipur (9 sites spread across the city- 7 longitudinally and 2 cross sectionally) the data  
551 of sites' sample positivity could be correlated with a rise in active case rate approximately  
552 14-20 days in advance. This observation has great implications in the context of countries  
553 like India where dense population per unit area and minimal individual testing facilities are  
554 real limitations. Indeed, the lack of applications like wastewater-based epidemiology  
555 predictions in city-wide pandemic management was painfully apparent during the second  
556 wave of COVID-19 in Jaipur. The study clearly hypothesizes that with the appropriate  
557 individual testing and smart lockdown strategy including micro-containment zone formation  
558 based on WBE prediction observations, unnecessary loss of many lives could have been  
559 saved along with reduced burden on the healthcare sector by proper management of the  
560 resources leading to reduced mortality & morbidity rate.

#### 561 **4.4. High SARS-CoV-2 loading led to incomplete removal in WWTPs**

562 It is well known that these WWTPs are designed as per certain design parameters & criteria  
563 and work on the specified limited capacity. During the first wave of COVID-19 in Jaipur, it  
564 was observed that the treatment technologies available at different WWTPs in the city were  
565 sufficient in the removal of SARS-CoV-2 genome from the effluents and none of the effluent  
566 samples in the 14WWTPs were detected positive by qualitative assays (Arora et al 2021).  
567 However, during the second wave, it was observed that 37% (20/54) effluent samples were  
568 tested positive for the target genes both by qualitative and quantitative assays. This  
569 observation can be explained by several factors. Firstly, during the early phase of COVID-19  
570 infections in 2020, the samples were collected during the months of May-July when the  
571 number of daily confirmed cases were in the range of 40-45 cases per day, while during the  
572 second wave in city, the daily confirmed case numbers were as high as 4202 (on May  
573 82021) which is approximately 100 times higher. Thus, it can be extrapolated that the shear

574 load of viral particles shed in the wastewater has increased significantly and possibly even  
575 higher than the working capacities of the treatment plants. This suggests a clear correlation  
576 between increased load in influent and RNA decay efficiency. The duration of the effluent  
577 sample collection corresponds to the months (April & May 2021) of maximum patient case  
578 load in the city. Secondly, it was also observed that upon exceeding a load of 5 log genome  
579 copies (GC) in the influent; quantification of gene load of neither gene N nor ORF1ab  
580 seemed to be proportional to their corresponding influent loads. This is an interesting  
581 observation in terms of RNA decay efficiency as well as retention. Thus, a) it is possible that  
582 during the peak phase of the second wave the wastewater treatment systems were  
583 exceedingly overloaded with the viral genome that they simply failed in complete removal of  
584 the viral RNA fragments; b) the uniform quantities of gene loads within their median load  
585 indicates that there is a steady retention of the genomic fragments in the treatment system  
586 reaching saturation under high viral load or c) the difference in two of the tertiary treated  
587 samples in case of the existence of the second mechanism it would be interesting to find out  
588 which component of treatment might promote this retention and is there any possibility that  
589 viral particles can be viable for a prolonged duration in these retended fractions. Further, it is  
590 important to understand the size of the treatment plant and operational and management  
591 consistencies, along with the quality of influent water will play a critical role in understanding  
592 in depth about the entire research scenario of COVID-19 transmission and monitoring.

593 Further, it is imperative to understand sample collection was done from three  
594 different secondary treatment technologies viz., ASP, MBBR and SBR and followed by two  
595 tertiary disinfection processes (UV and Chlorine) and still found the genetic fragments of  
596 SARS-CoV-2 in the effluent. This observation may imply that owing to nano-sized colloidal  
597 nature of genetic fragments, disinfection processes like chlorination/UV are likely to be less  
598 effective than the process of coagulation as reported in Kumar et al., 2021. In our study, all  
599 the different treatment processes are found to effectively remove SARS-CoV-2 RNA with  
600 varying efficacy. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first report assessing the  
601 effectiveness of five different treatment schemes for SARS-CoV-2 RNA reduction. As far as

602 treatment type is concerned, the (SBR + Cl<sub>2</sub>) showed better efficacy of 81.2%, followed by  
603 MBBR + UV with 68.8% followed by SBR, MBBR + Cl<sub>2</sub> and ASP. However, the detection &  
604 quantification of SARS-CoV-2RNA in wastewater does not imply viable viruses, it is highly  
605 recommended to validate on the infectivity/viability of SARS-CoV-2 after the treatment.  
606 However, it is worth considering here that effective aerobic WWTPs may not be sufficient to  
607 completely remove the genetic fragments of SARS-CoV-2.

#### 608 **4.5. Relevance of standardizing the WBE protocols & guidelines for pandemic** 609 **management in a city like Jaipur**

610 As mentioned above, the application of WBE in surveillance and monitoring of physiological  
611 and pathogenic trace markers has attained a lot of attention in countries with fully developed  
612 and integrated wastewater treatment systems during the COVID-19 pandemic. However,  
613 more research is required before this model can be adopted at a city-wide or national level,  
614 beyond the pandemic era particularly in developing countries. In India, these applications are  
615 even further from application owing to the limitations faced by underdeveloped wastewater  
616 treatment systems.

617 First, despite being a cost-effective measure to complement the individual testing;  
618 state of current sanitation network is thought of as a major challenge. In this context,  
619 establishing sophisticated sewerage systems will become an expensive step. This glaring  
620 gap, along with the consequent lack of awareness in policy makers of India has led to a  
621 nationwide reluctance in developing WBE methods in India. This study thus provides the  
622 example of successful application of WBE in Jaipur, a city with fragmented sewerage  
623 system. Even if it is possible to detect an upcoming wave as early as 14-20 days, various  
624 requirements as per the internationally established protocols previously reported by other  
625 groups e.g. size of sample collected, cold chain transportation, facilities of ultrafiltration  
626 setups, ultracentrifugation, sophisticated detection instruments like droplet PCR, etc. still  
627 need to be established.

628 The focus of this study was to apply the procedure developed in the lab scale to the  
629 city surveillance. Therefore, a feasibility of using these steps over a full wave of SARS-CoV-

630 2 surge in the city was analysed. The advantages of the method used here include less time  
631 consuming, lesser number of steps and very less equipment requirements. For example, the  
632 prediction could be done successfully with randomly taking just 1 ml volume from 1 litre grab  
633 samples indicating that there is no need for large collection volume saving the transportation  
634 cost. Also, these samples were collected and transported to the laboratory at the ambient  
635 city temperatures (non-refrigerated vehicles, duration between collection and storage at 4  
636 degrees was maximum 3.5 hours) for same day RNA isolation and qualitative detection  
637 suggesting cheaper sample collection and storage on a city level. Along with the  
638 observations of Arora et al., 2021, this collection model can be extended to remote locations  
639 where facilities of RNA extraction and detection might not be established. Therefore, instead  
640 of establishing and maintaining testing centres in every small village, gated community or  
641 towns, the collected sample can simply be transported to a centralized testing centre under  
642 cold chain-transport for detection and monitoring on a regular basis. The protocol for sample  
643 pre-processing is simple and can be completed by using even low speed centrifuges. Thus,  
644 the procedure reported in this study has been shown to be working perfectly on city scale  
645 weekly monitoring and can be applied to scale up even harnessing in the moderately  
646 equipped cities with centrally equipped detection centres.

## 647 **5. Conclusions**

648 Wastewater surveillance is a promising tool that detects real-time and early disease signals  
649 & determines emerging hotspots in the surveillance of COVID-19 prevalence at the  
650 community level. Yet in India, the city scale surveillance of SARS- CoV-2 RNA in wastewater  
651 remains poorly understood and needs to be explored, especially in cities with fragmented  
652 sewerage systems. A temporal variation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA presence in wastewater was  
653 studied for a period of five months in Jaipur, India. This study reported the first successful  
654 SARS-CoV-2 WBE application in 9 wastewater systems in Jaipur (n = 164) with varying  
655 sizes, which serve 60-70% of Jaipur's sewerage network). Interestingly, the positive  
656 detection rates of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the wastewater from all the WWTPs increased along  
657 with the clinical cases over time. A total of 72 samples (43.9%) of the total 164 samples

658 tested in the study were found to be positive, with at least two positive RT-PCR results  
659 targeting four SARS-CoV-2 genes such as E, RdRp, N and ORF1ab gene. This system of  
660 wastewater-based epidemiology is extremely essential in practice in an Indian context where  
661 the resources are lacking in terms of both disease management and diagnosis. As  
662 demonstrated by this study, a gap of 14-20 days warning could be sufficient to take  
663 necessary actions to stop the spread of the next COVID-19 wave. This finding was further  
664 supported by the relation between the percentage change in effective gene concentration  
665 level and confirmed cases, which followed a similar trend on the temporal scale with a ~1 to  
666 2 weeks' time distance. The study has successfully proven the global implications of WBE  
667 for India, highlighting the role of WBE through application of scalable and cost-effective  
668 protocol reported in the study for societal benefit and third wave improved management.

#### 669 **Acknowledgements**

670 The study group would like to acknowledge the constant support received from Dr. B. Lal  
671 Gupta (Director) and Dr. Aparna Datta (Principal). The support received from the Centre for  
672 Innovation, Research & development (CIRD, Dr. B. Lal Clinical laboratory Pvt. Ltd.) for  
673 analysis and the Jaipur development authority (JDA) officials & plant operators at WWTPs is  
674 sincerely acknowledged.

675 **Funding:** This work was financially supported by the Internal Mural Grants (IMG)  
676 Fund (BIBT/IRSC/IMG/2020-21/036), supported by IRSC, Dr. B. Lal Institute of  
677 Biotechnology, Jaipur and Dr. Xuan Li was also supported by the Australian Research  
678 Council Discovery project (DP190100385).

679

#### 680 **Credit Author Statement:**

681 **Sudipti Arora:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation,  
682 Resources, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review & Editing, Project administration,  
683 Funding acquisition.

684 **Aditi Nag:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing – Original Draft, Writing  
685 – Review & Editing, Visualization.  
686 **Aakanksha Kalra:** Formal analysis, Visualization.  
687 **Vikky Sinha:** Investigation.  
688 **Ekta Meena:** Investigation.  
689 **Samvida Saxena:** Investigation.  
690 **Devanshi Sutaria:** Investigation, Writing – Review & Editing  
691 **Manpreet Kaur:** Investigation.  
692 **Tamanna Pamnani:** Investigation.  
693 **Komal Sharma:** Investigation.  
694 **Sonika Saxena:** Resources, Supervision, Project administration  
695 **Sandeep K Shrivastava:** Resources, Methodology, Validation  
696 **AB. Gupta:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Writing – Review & Editing  
697 **Xuan Li:** Formal analysis, Writing – Review & Editing  
698 **Guangming Jiang:** Formal analysis, Writing – Review & Editing  
699

## 700 **References**

- 701 1. Ahmed, W., Angel, N., Edson, J., Bibby, K., Bivins, A., O'Brien, J.W., Choi, P.M.,  
702 Kitajima, M., Simpson, S.L., Li, J. and Tscharke, B., 2020. First confirmed detection  
703 of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: a proof of concept for the  
704 wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Science of The Total  
705 Environment*, 728, p.138764.
- 706 2. Arora, S., Nag, A., Sethi, J., Rajvanshi, J., Saxena, S., Shrivastava, S.K. and Gupta,  
707 A.B., 2020. Sewage surveillance for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 genome as a  
708 useful wastewater based epidemiology (WBE) tracking tool in India. *Water Science  
709 and Technology*, 82(12), pp.2823-2836.



- 710 3. Arora, S., Nag, A., Rajpal, A., Tyagi, V.K., Tiwari, S.B., Sethi, J., Sutaria, D.,  
711 Rajvanshi, J., Saxena, S., Shrivastava, S.K. and Srivastava, V., 2021. Imprints of  
712 Lockdown and Treatment Processes on the Wastewater Surveillance of SARS-CoV-  
713 2: A Curious Case of Fourteen Plants in Northern India. *Water*, 13(16), p.2265.
- 714 4. Bivins, A., Greaves, J., Fischer, R., Yinda, K.C., Ahmed, W., Kitajima, M., Munster,  
715 V.J. and Bibby, K., 2020a. Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in water and  
716 wastewater. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 7(12), pp.937-942.
- 717 5. Bivins, A., North, D., Ahmad, A., Ahmed, W., Alm, E., Been, F., Bhattacharya, P.,  
718 Bijlsma, L., Boehm, A.B., Brown, J. and Buttiglieri, G., 2020b. Wastewater-based  
719 epidemiology: global collaborative to maximize contributions in the fight against  
720 COVID-19.
- 721 6. Chakraborty, P., Pasupuleti, M., Shankar, M.J., Bharat, G.K., Krishnasamy, S.,  
722 Dasgupta, S.C., Sarkar, S.K. and Jones, K.C., 2021. First surveillance of SARS-  
723 CoV-2 and organic tracers in community wastewater during post lockdown in  
724 Chennai, South India: Methods, occurrence and concurrence. *Science of The Total  
725 Environment*, 778, p.146252.
- 726 7. Chen, Y., Chen, L., Deng, Q., Zhang, G., Wu, K., Ni, L., Yang, Y., Liu, B., Wang, W.,  
727 Wei, C. and Yang, J., 2020. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the feces of  
728 COVID-19 patients. *Journal of medical virology*, 92(7), pp.833-840.
- 729 8. Ding, Z., Qian, H., Xu, B., Huang, Y., Miao, T., Yen, H.L., Xiao, S., Cui, L., Wu, X.,  
730 Shao, W. and Song, Y., 2020. Toilets dominate environmental detection of SARS-  
731 CoV-2 virus in a hospital. *MedRxiv*.
- 732 9. Fongaro, G., Stoco, P.H., Souza, D.S.M., Grisard, E.C., Magri, M.E., Rogovski, P.,  
733 Schörner, M.A., Barazzetti, F.H., Christoff, A.P., de Oliveira, L.F.V. and Bazzo, M.L.,  
734 2021. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in human sewage in Santa Catarina,  
735 Brazil, November 2019. *Science of The Total Environment*, 778, p.146198.
- 736 10. Gorbalenya, A.E., Baker, S.C., Baric, R., Groot, R.J.D., Drosten, C., Gulyaeva, A.A.,  
737 Haagmans, B.L., Lauber, C., Leontovich, A.M., Neuman, B.W. and Penzar, D.,

- 738 2020. Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus: The species and its  
739 viruses—a statement of the Coronavirus Study Group.
- 740 11. Gwenzi, W., 2021. Leaving no stone unturned in light of the COVID-19 faecal-oral  
741 hypothesis? A water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) perspective targeting low-  
742 income countries. *Science of The Total Environment*, 753, p.141751.
- 743 12. Hemalatha, M., Kiran, U., Kuncha, S.K., Kopperi, H., Gokulan, C.G., Mohan, S.V.  
744 and Mishra, R.K., 2021. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 spread using wastewater-  
745 based epidemiology: Comprehensive study. *Science of The Total Environment*, 768,  
746 p.144704.
- 747 13. (<https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/>),
- 748 14. <https://www.cdc.gov/ncezid/dfwed/waterborne/index.html>
- 749 15. [https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/surveillance/wastewater-surveillance/wastewater-](https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/surveillance/wastewater-surveillance/wastewater-surveillance.html)  
750 [surveillance.html](https://www.cdc.gov/healthywater/surveillance/wastewater-surveillance/wastewater-surveillance.html)
- 751 16. [https://niu.org/scbp/sites/default/files/Jaipur\\_1\\_0.pdf](https://niu.org/scbp/sites/default/files/Jaipur_1_0.pdf)
- 752 17. Johns Hopkins University and Medicine. Available online:  
753 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html> (Last accessed on 9 September 2021).
- 754 18. Kopperi, H., Tharak, A., Hemalatha, M., Kiran, U., Gokulan, C.G., Mishra, R.K. and  
755 Mohan, S.V., 2021. Defining the methodological approach for wastewater based  
756 epidemiological studies—Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2. *Environmental Technology &*  
757 *Innovation*, p.101696.
- 758 19. Kumar, M., Patel, A.K., Shah, A.V., Raval, J., Rajpara, N., Joshi, M. and Joshi, C.G.,  
759 2020. First proof of the capability of wastewater surveillance for COVID-19 in India  
760 through detection of genetic material of SARS-CoV-2. *Science of The Total*  
761 *Environment*, 746, p.141326.
- 762 20. Kumar, M., Joshi, M., Shah, A.V., Srivastava, V. and Dave, S., 2021. Wastewater  
763 surveillance-based city zonation for effective COVID-19 pandemic preparedness  
764 powered by early warning: A perspectives of temporal variations in SARS-CoV-2-  
765 RNA in Ahmedabad, India. *Science of The Total Environment*, p.148367.

- 766 21. Kumar, M., Kuroda, K., Patel, A.K., Patel, N., Bhattacharya, P., Joshi, M. and Joshi,  
767 C.G., 2021. Decay of SARS-CoV-2 RNA along the wastewater treatment outfitted  
768 with Upflow Anaerobic Sludge Blanket (UASB) system evaluated through two  
769 sample concentration techniques. *Science of the Total Environment*, 754, p.142329.
- 770 22. Kumar, M., Joshi, M., Patel, A.K. and Joshi, C.G., 2021. Unravelling the early  
771 warning capability of wastewater surveillance for COVID-19: A temporal study on  
772 SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection and need for the escalation. *Environmental*  
773 *research*, 196, p.110946.
- 774 23. La Rosa, G., Iaconelli, M., Mancini, P., Ferraro, G.B., Veneri, C., Bonadonna, L.,  
775 Lucentini, L. and Suffredini, E., 2020. First detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated  
776 wastewaters in Italy. *Science of The Total Environment*, 736, p.139652.
- 777 24. Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R. and Brouwer, A., 2020.  
778 Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in sewage and correlation with reported  
779 COVID-19 prevalence in the early stage of the epidemic in the  
780 Netherlands. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 7(7), pp.511-516.
- 781 25. Mehta, P., McAuley, D.F., Brown, M., Sanchez, E., Tattersall, R.S. and Manson,  
782 J.J., 2020. COVID-19: consider cytokine storm syndromes and  
783 immunosuppression. *The lancet*, 395(10229), pp.1033-1034.
- 784 26. Naqvi, A.A.T., Fatima, K., Mohammad, T., Fatima, U., Singh, I.K., Singh, A., Atif,  
785 S.M., Hariprasad, G., Hasan, G.M. and Hassan, M.I., 2020. Insights into SARS-CoV-  
786 2 genome, structure, evolution, pathogenesis and therapies: Structural genomics  
787 approach. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Molecular Basis of*  
788 *Disease*, 1866(10), p.165878.
- 789 27. Nemudryi, A., Nemudraia, A., Wiegand, T., Surya, K., Buyukyoruk, M., Cicha, C.,  
790 Vanderwood, K.K., Wilkinson, R. and Wiedenheft, B., 2020. Temporal detection and  
791 phylogenetic assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in municipal wastewater. *Cell Reports*  
792 *Medicine*, 1(6), p.100098.

- 793 28. Peng, L., Liu, J., Xu, W., Luo, Q., Chen, D., Lei, Z., Huang, Z., Li, X., Deng, K., Lin,  
794 B. and Gao, Z., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 can be detected in urine, blood, anal swabs,  
795 and oropharyngeal swabs specimens. *Journal of medical virology*, 92(9), pp.1676-  
796 1680.
- 797 29. Randazzo, W., Truchado, P., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Simón, P., Allende, A. and  
798 Sánchez, G., 2020. SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19  
799 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water research*, 181, p.115942.
- 800 30. Rothan, H.A. and Byrareddy, S.N., 2020. The epidemiology and pathogenesis of  
801 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak. *Journal of autoimmunity*, 109, p.102433.
- 802 31. Sharma, D.K., Nalavade, U.P., Kalgutkar, K., Gupta, N. and Deshpande, J.M., 2021.  
803 SARS-CoV-2 detection in sewage samples: Standardization of method & preliminary  
804 observations. *The Indian journal of medical research*, 153(1-2), p.159.
- 805 32. Sims, N. and Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., 2020. Future perspectives of wastewater-based  
806 epidemiology: monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance to the community  
807 level. *Environment international*, 139, p.105689.
- 808 33. Sims, J.T., Krishnan, V., Chang, C.Y., Engle, S.M., Casalini, G., Rodgers, G.H., Bivi,  
809 N., Nickoloff, B.J., Konrad, R.J., de Bono, S. and Higgs, R.E., 2021.  
810 Characterization of the cytokine storm reflects hyperinflammatory endothelial  
811 dysfunction in COVID-19. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 147(1),  
812 pp.107-111.
- 813 34. Street, R., Malema, S., Mahlangeni, N. and Mathee, A., 2020. Wastewater  
814 surveillance for Covid-19: an African perspective. *Science of the Total  
815 Environment*, 743, p.140719.
- 816 35. Tiwari, S.B., Gahlot, P., Tyagi, V.K., Zhang, L., Zhou, Y., Kazmi, A.A. and Kumar,  
817 M., 2021. Surveillance of Wastewater for Early Epidemic Prediction (SWEEP):  
818 Environmental and health security perspectives in the post COVID-19  
819 Anthropocene. *Environmental Research*, 195, p.110831.

- 820 36. Weidhaas, J., Aanderud, Z.T., Roper, D.K., VanDerslice, J., Gaddis, E.B.,  
821 Ostermiller, J., Hoffman, K., Jamal, R., Heck, P., Zhang, Y. and Torgersen, K., 2021.  
822 Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater with COVID-19 disease burden in  
823 sewersheds. *Science of The Total Environment*, 775, p.145790.
- 824 37. [www.covid19india.org](http://www.covid19india.org) (Last accessed on 4 september 2021)
- 825 38. Young, B.E., Ong, S.W.X., Kalimuddin, S., Low, J.G., Tan, S.Y., Loh, J., Ng, O.T.,  
826 Marimuthu, K., Ang, L.W., Mak, T.M. and Lau, S.K., 2020. Epidemiologic features  
827 and clinical course of patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 in  
828 Singapore. *Jama*, 323(15), pp.1488-1494.
- 829 39. Zaneti, R.N., Girardi, V., Spilki, F.R., Mena, K., Westphalen, A.P.C., da Costa  
830 Colares, E.R., Pozzebon, A.G. and Etchepare, R.G., 2021. Quantitative microbial  
831 risk assessment of SARS-CoV-2 for workers in wastewater treatment  
832 plants. *Science of The Total Environment*, 754, p.142163.
- 833 40. Zhu, N., Zhang, D., Wang, W., Li, X., Yang, B., Song, J., Zhao, X., Huang, B., Shi,  
834 W., Lu, R. and Niu, P., 2020. A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in  
835 China, 2019. *New England journal of medicine*.
- 836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843