

# ***SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater Genomic Surveillance: Approaches, Challenges, and Opportunities***

**Viorel Munteanu<sup>1\*</sup>, Michael Saldana<sup>2\*</sup>, Nitesh Kumar Sharma<sup>3</sup>, Wenhao O. Ouyang<sup>4</sup>, Eva Aßmann<sup>5</sup>, Victor Gordeev<sup>1</sup>, Nadiia Kasianchuk<sup>6,7</sup>, Braden T Tierney<sup>8</sup>, Alexander G Lucaci<sup>8</sup>, Sergey Knyazev<sup>9,10</sup>, Dumitru Ciorba<sup>1</sup>, Viorel Bostan<sup>1</sup>, Christopher Mason<sup>8</sup>, Pavel Skums<sup>11</sup>, Nicholas C. Wu<sup>4,12-14</sup>, Piotr Rzymiski<sup>15</sup>, Martin Hölzer<sup>5</sup>, Alex Zelikovsky<sup>16</sup>, Adam Smith<sup>17§</sup>, Serghei Mangul<sup>3§✉</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Computers, Informatics and Microelectronics, Technical University of Moldova, Chisinau, 2045, Moldova

<sup>2</sup>Astani Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Southern California, 3620 South Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90089, USA.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Clinical Pharmacy, School of Pharmacy, University of Southern California, 1540 Alcazar Street, Los Angeles, CA 90033, USA

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biochemistry, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

<sup>5</sup>Genome Competence Center (MF1), Method Development and Research Infrastructure, Robert Koch Institute, 13353 Berlin, Germany

Centre for Artificial Intelligence in Public Health Research (ZKI-PH), Robert Koch Institute, 13353 Berlin, Germany

<sup>6</sup>Laboratory of Molecular Biology Techniques, Faculty of Biology, Adam Mickiewicz University Poznan, 61-712, Poland

<sup>7</sup>Faculty of Pharmacy, Bogomolets National University, Kyiv, 01601, Ukraine

<sup>8</sup>Department of Physiology and Biophysics, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY, USA, 10065

<sup>9</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, USA

<sup>10</sup>Department of Clinical Pharmacy, School of Pharmacy, University of Southern California, 1540 Alcazar Street, Los Angeles, CA 90033, USA

<sup>11</sup>Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut

<sup>12</sup>Centre for Biophysics and Computational Biology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

<sup>13</sup>Carl R. Woese Institute for Genomic Biology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

<sup>14</sup>Carle Illinois College of Medicine, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

<sup>15</sup>Department of Environmental Medicine, Poznan University of Medical Sciences, Poznan, Poland

<sup>16</sup>Department of Computer Science, College of Art and Science, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, USA

<sup>17</sup>Astani Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of Southern California 920 Downey Way; BHE 221 Los Angeles, CA 90089

\* These authors contributed equally to this work

§ These authors jointly supervised this work

✉ For correspondence: [serghei.mangul@gmail.com](mailto:serghei.mangul@gmail.com)

## **Abstract**


During the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, wastewater-based genomic surveillance (WWGS) emerged as an efficient viral surveillance tool that takes into account asymptomatic cases and can identify known and novel mutations and offers the opportunity to assign known virus lineages based on the detected mutations profiles. WWGS can also hint towards novel or cryptic lineages, but it is difficult to clearly identify and define novel lineages from wastewater (WW) alone. While WWGS has significant advantages in monitoring SARS-CoV-2 viral spread, technical challenges remain, including poor sequencing coverage and quality due to viral RNA degradation. As a result, the viral RNAs in wastewater have low concentrations and are often fragmented, making sequencing difficult. WWGS analysis requires advanced computational tools that are yet to be developed and benchmarked. The existing bioinformatics tools used to analyze wastewater sequencing data are often based on previously developed methods for quantifying the expression of transcripts or viral diversity. Those methods were not developed for wastewater sequencing data specifically, and are not optimized to address unique challenges associated with wastewater. While specialized tools for analysis of wastewater sequencing data have also been developed recently, it remains to be seen how they will perform given the ongoing evolution of SARS-CoV-2 and the decline in testing and patient-based genomic surveillance. Here, we discuss opportunities and challenges associated with WWGS, including sample preparation, sequencing technology, and bioinformatics methods.

## **Introduction**

Although many laboratory methods and bioinformatics tools have been rapidly developed in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, ongoing efforts persist in advancing wastewater-based genomic surveillance (WWGS) approaches. These endeavors aim to harness the potential of wastewater analysis for monitoring and detecting viral genetic material, thereby offering valuable insights and enhancing our understanding of the pandemic's spread and dynamics. Wastewater-based monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 epidemiology has demonstrated its efficacy in tracking SARS-CoV-2 viral infection dynamics in numerous countries around the globe<sup>1-5</sup>. Wastewater became a promising core component of infectious disease monitoring, providing a lineage-specific, community-representative picture of public health trends that captures previously undetected spread and pathogen transmission links. Building on recent laboratory and analytical advances to identify the diverse pathogens present in sewage will be essential for ongoing efforts to understand disease risks and will transform infectious disease surveillance<sup>6</sup>. Importantly, wastewater-based surveillance has been shown to provide balanced estimates of viral prevalence rates and does not require patient interaction, and can monitor entire communities, including underserved and vulnerable populations and asymptomatic cases<sup>7-10</sup>. SARS-CoV-2 WWGS can detect mutation patterns of virus lineages earlier than clinical monitoring<sup>11-13</sup>. Additionally, it allows for the detection of novel cryptic lineages, including those resistant to naturally acquired or vaccine-induced immunity, those rarely observed in clinical samples, and those from unsampled individuals with COVID-19 infections<sup>5</sup>. In contrast to clinical samples, wastewater sampling allows the development of community-level profiles

encompassing positive, non-reporting, and asymptomatic viral loads. This non-invasive technique allows for analyzing a community within a given sewershed and can provide insight into rising mutations and potential lineages of emerging concern<sup>14</sup> (VOC/VOI/VUM).

Typical WWGS comprises four steps (Figure 1) after the initial assay design: (i) wastewater sampling, viral particle concentration, and RNA extraction (Figure 1 A); (ii) SARS-CoV-2 targeting quantification (Figure 1 B); (iii) library preparation and sequencing (Figure 1 C,D); (iv) bioinformatics analysis, data sharing and outbreak investigation (Figure 1 D). WWGS involves a multitude of experimental and computational approaches, presenting researchers with a wide array of choices. Despite its seemingly straightforward *nature*, these approaches have inherent limitations due to potential experimental biases and the intricacies of computational analyses and interpretations. Here, we present a comprehensive overview that delves into best practices, challenges, and opportunities surrounding WWGS for SARS-CoV-2 by providing a thorough examination of the current status of WWGS, shedding light on the obstacles and prospects with both experimental and bioinformatics methodologies. We thoroughly evaluate the available choices and address the common challenges that arise at each step of WWGS. We thoroughly evaluate the available choices and address the common challenges that arise at each step of WWGS. The ultimate goal of this review is to motivate further advances in the field of WWGS, which has the significant potential to guide public health in the context of COVID-19 and other infectious diseases.



**Figure 1.** A general WWGS pipeline. (A) Overall workflow of sample collection and preparation for sequencing. Wastewater samples are collected from water reclamation facilities, followed by subsequent concentration and extraction of viral RNA. (B) SARS-CoV-2 quantification using primers targeting different SARS-CoV-2 viral genes (such as N1, N2, and E-gene) to assess SARS-CoV-2 genome copy numbers quantitatively. Positive samples then proceed through library preparation and next-generation sequencing (NGS) technologies, usually via amplicon sequencing. (C) Data analysis pipeline of wastewater sequencing results. NGS reads are mapped to reference sequence and variant calling is performed. (D) Further, supplementary analysis is done to contribute to both lineage surveillance and outbreak investigation.

## Foundations for wastewater genomic surveillance

In March 2020, the World Health Organization declared the outbreak of coronavirus infectious disease-2019 (COVID-19) caused by the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) a global pandemic<sup>15</sup>, forcing the public health system to develop efficient methods for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in real time<sup>16</sup>. Clinical testing emerged as a valuable resource providing an accurate assessment of an individual's diagnosis and offering a means for contact tracing to map and control the spread of SARS-CoV-2<sup>16</sup>. Rapidly, it became evident that sustaining government-supported clinical testing is not economically feasible, particularly for developing nations, leading to a shift in the responsibility of testing and reporting onto individuals, as in the case of the United States<sup>17</sup>. This shift has been accompanied by the rise of at-home testing, which has excluded the reporting of positive COVID-19 diagnoses from the mandated requirements of clinical facilities, and consequently, this has led to the generation of inaccurate clinical data<sup>17,18</sup>. In the meantime, early in the COVID-19 pandemic, the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the feces of individuals infected with the virus, including those who are asymptomatic or have recovered from respiratory symptoms<sup>19–23</sup>, prompted researchers to explore the use of wastewater networks for community-wide surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 prevalence. From April to July of 2020, several teams submitted proof-of-concept findings to peer-reviewed publications outlining the use of WWGS<sup>1–4,12,13,24–28</sup>. The remarkably rapid dissemination of methods and results during that period facilitated the widespread adoption of WWGS as a valuable tool for tracking the pandemic in municipal settings worldwide<sup>1,2,4,29,30</sup>. These accomplishments have emphasized the potential of wastewater testing for viral surveillance as a method to evaluate disease prevalence within the community and demonstrated that WWGS for SARS-CoV-2 can detect emerging lineages at an earlier stage compared to clinical monitoring<sup>11–13</sup>. In contrast to clinical samples, wastewater sampling allows the development of community-level profiles for SARS-CoV-2 loads encompassing positive and asymptomatic tested cases, as well as asymptomatic and symptomatic non-tested cases. This approach has also demonstrated its feasibility in monitoring the potential lineages of emerging concern (VOC)<sup>1–4,29</sup>, and can serve as a valuable warning system for detecting regional spikes for VOC<sup>31–33</sup>. To facilitate the coordination of SARS-CoV-2 surveillance data from wastewater reclamation facilities (WRFs), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the United States Department of Health collaborated to develop the National Wastewater Surveillance System (NWSS)<sup>34</sup>. The NWSS COVID Data Tracker<sup>35</sup> assists public health

agencies in detecting outbreaks and making informed decisions about where prevention protocols should be implemented.

There are currently two WWGS methodologies in use to track VOC, the genetic diversity of SARS-CoV-2 lineages and sublineages, and estimate their prevalence in communities. First, the detection of SARS-CoV-2 is achieved using polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-based methods, namely RT-qPCR and more recent technologies, such as RT-digital droplet PCR (RT-ddPCR). PCR technologies are relatively inexpensive and well-established and allow for the direct quantification of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples, presenting the following advantages: (1) an ability to probe a sample site at high frequency to generate real-time information; (2) ease of implementation by any lab running standard PCR assays; (3) short turn-around time, and (4) lower costs of reagents<sup>36</sup>. As with any PCR assay development, methods and results must be carefully scrutinized to minimize the chance of false positives or over-interpretation. The genomic sequence targets of RT-qPCR/RT-ddPCR methods are also limited by fluorophores and the detection instrument<sup>37</sup>. Most critically, these PCR methods lag in discovering the emergence of new lineages because they require a specific primer-probe design according to the details of the genomic information of new lineages<sup>38</sup>, usually derived from sequencing and analyzing patient samples. Thus, PCR is not effective for detecting new lineages as they evolve. PCR-based techniques are limited to detecting and quantifying only known lineages circulating in communities<sup>37</sup>.

High-throughput sequencing can be employed to overcome the limitation of pre-defined sequence targets and to identify emerging lineages<sup>37,39</sup>. The use of sequencing technologies coupled with advanced bioinformatics methods for analyzing wastewater sequencing data (WWS data) has provided an unparalleled level of detail in assessing wastewater samples. Sequencing overcomes some of the limitations of PCR-based technologies, allowing for the comprehensive detection of SARS-CoV-2 mutation profiles present in wastewater samples, although the tiling amplicon sequencing methods primarily used in SARS-CoV-2 surveillance are still somewhat vulnerable to unexpected changes in primer binding sequences as new lineages emerge. Sequence data collected at sufficient depth can be deconvoluted to estimate lineage and sublineage proportions. The inclusion of high-throughput sequencing, with appropriate bioinformatics methods, is the foundation of fundamental transformations of environmental genomic surveillance and virology that promise to revolutionize our approaches to epidemiological data analysis and outbreak early detection and prevention<sup>40-44</sup>.

To effectively use the wealth of information provided by WWS data, it is crucial to undertake targeted initiatives to develop robust and accurate bioinformatics algorithms and analytical pipelines. Additionally, comprehensive methodologies must be established to efficiently access SARS-CoV-2 viral genomic material, optimize adaptive sampling strategies, recover viral particles, and select appropriate sequencing technologies. Establishing such efforts is critical for the widespread adoption of WWGS as an all-encompassing approach for monitoring SARS-CoV-2 lineage prevalence and detecting novel cryptic strains. Overall, the true power of real-time SARS-CoV-2 tracking through WWGS comes from combining the two methodologies, qPCR and sequencing. By including sequencing approaches, samples can be explored for novel mutations and emerging lineages. When a concerning mutation profile or a new potential lineage are discovered, primers and probes can be adjusted for these new lineages to provide rapid turnaround monitoring via qPCR.


## **Approaches for effective wastewater genomic surveillance**

Access to SARS-CoV-2 viral genomic material in wastewater infrastructure is provided through a highly variable and complex wastewater collection system rather than direct access to individual clinical specimens. Ambient conditions within the wastewater collection system are harsh to viral material because of changing chemistry and physicochemical conditions outside the human host. Additionally, ambient conditions may include non-ideal and fluctuating temperatures, variable pH, water quality parameters (e.g., presence of DNases and RNases) that promote the degradation of the viral capsid and nucleic acids, and extended time from release from the human host to WRFs<sup>45,46</sup>. As a result, viral genetic material can be severely degraded and fragmented prior to sample collection. Before collection, SARS-CoV-2 viruses may travel through the sewer network for several days; however, in untreated wastewater, the SARS-CoV-2 virus can survive for up to 10 days at room temperature (below 37°C) and between 30 and 60 days at 4°C<sup>47</sup>. Several studies have taken different approaches to overcoming the challenges presented by wastewater for WWGS (Supplementary Table 1).

Currently, there are over 1000 WRFs that have established wastewater surveillance programs and report their data to NWSS<sup>34</sup>. With this, there is access to current and historical SARS-CoV-2 viral loads from participating WRFs. Another public source of WRFs' viral wastewater tracking is wastewaterSCAN<sup>48</sup>. This public database was established by the collaborative efforts of Stanford University, the University of Michigan, and Emory University. There are three qualifying metrics for WRFs to participate: a sewershed encompassing at least 10,000 people, sampling three times a week for 18 months, and allowing the data to be displayed on wastewaterSCAN. The data that is displayed on wastewaterSCAN is also shared with the NWSS. All data and methods for analysis are open to the public.

### ***Wastewater Sampling***

Outside of the host cell, viruses cannot replicate. As a result, monitoring the concentrations excreted into the wastewater collection system over time can accurately represent the population within a sewershed<sup>49</sup>. It is important to consider when and where sampling will occur, for this can dictate the level of RNA degradation of SARS-CoV-2<sup>50</sup>. Sampling techniques include grab samples at peak flow times (typically occurring between 0800-1100)<sup>24,40,41</sup> and 24-hour time-weighted composite samples using refrigerated autosamplers<sup>24,42-44</sup> (Figure 2).



**Figure 2:** An outline of different sampling types and locations for WWGS.


Wastewater sampling frequency varies across WWGS programs, e.g., ranging from once per week to daily. Clinical sampling data early during the pandemic was available daily and transitioned to a weekly basis later. One challenge in establishing relationships between wastewater SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels and disease prevalence is temporally matching the wastewater and clinical data. Data alignment necessitates aggregation so that both wastewater and clinical data are on the same time scale (e.g., weekly). In addition, the development of accurate models will also require an understanding of the progression of the disease and viral shedding for infected individuals. To reduce the short-term variability inherent in wastewater measurements and clinical case counts, moving averages (e.g., 7 days to 3 weeks) are also typically utilized to evaluate overall trends.

The placement of sampling locations depends on the scale of SARS-CoV-2 monitoring. Collection at WRFs allows for monitoring SARS-CoV-2 from a potentially large population within the sewershed. Here, two different sample types can be collected: untreated wastewater and primary sludge. It has been demonstrated that primary sludge can provide higher sensitivity and less variance when compared to untreated wastewater<sup>51</sup>; however, primary sludge does not possess the same predictive capabilities as untreated wastewater, providing a much shorter lead-time to clinical diagnosis<sup>12</sup>. SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in untreated wastewater precede clinical data by 4-10 days<sup>52</sup>. It is important to note that the size of the surveyed population when collecting untreated wastewater at a WRF is dictated by the sewershed service area. Large sewershed service areas, that are typical of centralized WRFs in many urban areas, can make public health interventions challenging. Sub-sewershed sampling (e.g., from a manhole within the sewer network) or building-scale sampling allows for a more targeted spatio-temporal analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in a community and allows source tracking of outbreaks and VOCs

more effectively. For example, several universities have implemented SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance monitoring systems to ensure the health and safety of students and faculty. Typically, these sampling locations are established at sewer cutoffs, allowing access to the wastewater leaving campus living facilities (e.g., dorms and campus apartments) or frequently visited facilities (e.g., student unions, libraries, dining areas)<sup>40,44,50</sup>. Being able to specify locations can allow for targeted intervention and mitigation efforts.

### ***Virus concentration and RNA extraction methods***

Due to the complexity of wastewater matrices, recovering viral particles can be challenging. Without an effective recovery protocol, downstream quantification may significantly underestimate true SARS-CoV-2 levels. There are several methods to concentrate viral particles from wastewater; however, the most frequently used methods are polyethylene glycol (PEG) precipitation, electronegative membrane filtration, ultrafiltration, and ultracentrifugation<sup>24,41–43,52–54</sup> (Figure 3).



**Figure 3:** Different laboratory methods of concentrating SARS-CoV-2 viral particles from wastewater. Each section describes the most common viral particle concentration and RNA extraction methods employed.

PEG precipitation requires the amendment of wastewater samples with a solution of salt and PEG, resulting in a supernatant that contains concentrated SARS-CoV-2 particles. Recovery rates ranging from 46.6 to 62.2% are typical of this method<sup>55–57</sup>. This method provides a reliable and inexpensive option for viral particle concentration, but can be a severe bottleneck in the wastewater analysis workflow. PEG precipitation takes 2 to 6 hours for initial mixing, which requires overnight incubation and a lengthy centrifugation step. A rapid PEG approach, without an overnight incubation step, yields drastically lower recovery efficiencies between 18.8% and 35%<sup>56</sup>.



Electronegative membrane filtration in conjunction with a cation conditioning solution (e.g., NaCl or MgCl<sub>2</sub>) provides a simple, high-speed method to concentrate SARS-CoV-2 viral particles. Typically, the pore diameter of electronegative membranes is between 0.22 and 0.8 µm, thereby accumulating larger particles on the membrane surface. Adding a cation conditioning solution results in the formation of salt bridges within the negatively charged membrane, promoting the adsorption of free-floating SARS-CoV-2 virus particles that are significantly smaller than the membrane pore size. This method boasts a high recovery efficiency of SARS-CoV-2, up to 65.7%<sup>47,58</sup>.

Ultrafiltration is a direct virus concentration method without conditioning treatment or a lengthy precipitation process. This method differs from electronegative membranes as it concentrates SARS-CoV-2 particles based on size exclusion rather than electrostatic forces, maintaining pore sizes ranging from 5 nm to 0.1 µm down to 3 kDa. While this does seem promising, the viral particle recovery efficiencies are lower than other methods (28-56%)<sup>58</sup>. This method can only process small volumes of wastewater and is prone to clogging. The complexity of wastewater matrices necessitates multiple ultrafiltration units to overcome this, but the equipment and cartridges are expensive and concentrate potential PCR inhibitors alongside SARS-CoV-2 virus particles<sup>58</sup>.

Ultracentrifugation is a long-standing method of concentrating viral material by centrifuging the wastewater sample at upwards of 100,000g to create a pellet<sup>58-60</sup>. Although this method provides a quick concentration of viral particles, it co-concentrates inhibitors and relies on larger sample volumes to achieve a pellet large enough to extract RNA<sup>59</sup>. Further, ultracentrifugation results in consistently low recovery rates of SARS-CoV-2, as low as 19%<sup>58,59</sup>.

Following sample concentration, it is necessary to lyse the concentrate via mechanical or chemical methods. Mechanical lysis is typically needed for targets with cell walls. Mechanical lysis is not recommended for virus detection due to the release of nucleic acids from cells, potentially interfering with analyses of viral targets. Chemical lysis through commercially available products (such as Zymo's DNA/RNA Shield) generally suffices for lysing the outer protein coat of viruses, releasing the viral genomic material while reducing interferences from cellular genomic material. Once the samples are lysed, they can be stored, if necessary, without considerable degradation.

After lysis, samples undergo extraction to purify RNA. Several commercially available kits exist, including New England Biolabs Monarch RNA MiniPrep, Qiagen PowerViral DNA/RNA kit, and Zymo Environ Water RNA Kit. The indicated kits yield >70% extraction efficiency when using spiked concentrations of BCoV as a surrogate in wastewater<sup>60</sup>. However, they are column-based extraction kits that require manual extraction, which can lead to an increase in turn-around time based on the user's experience. Conversely, automated RNA extraction reduces risk of user error and drastically increases throughput. Instruments such as the Maxwell RSC, MagMAX, and KingFisher Flex system offer magnetic bead RNA extraction. Both magnetic bead and column-based extractions have demonstrated equitable numbers of usable sequencing reads<sup>61</sup>.

Unfortunately, there is a lack of research investigating different viral concentration methods and sequencing quality. The research that has been conducted is prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the methods used in concentrating viral particles are no longer the

most frequently used in labs. This knowledge gap can impede future work in WWGS and needs further investigation.

### ***Quantification methods for wastewater genomic surveillance***

As the COVID-19 pandemic progressed, several molecular tools were employed to quantify SARS-CoV-2. The gold standard of quantification is genomic-based methods, such as RT-qPCR and ddPCR. These methods focus on the gene-specific identification of targets. The detection of target genes is both accurate and highly sensitive, making PCR-based methods a cornerstone of WWGS projects.

RT-qPCR emerged as a powerful tool for wastewater surveillance, allowing for the detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2. With the addition of a fluorescent dye, a qPCR instrument can measure the fluorescence as the thermal cycler progresses and provide a real-time amplification curve with each cycle. This analysis compares the quantification cycle (C<sub>q</sub>) value of a sample with an unknown concentration to a standard curve of known concentrations, allowing for the extrapolation of SARS-CoV-2 virus copy numbers; however, this provides an inherent quantification bias as this method is dependent on the accuracy of the standard curve. Further, due to the complexity of wastewater matrices, amplification and quantification can be affected by inhibitors<sup>62,63</sup>.

RT-ddPCR emerged as a strong alternative to RT-qPCR. Instead of comparing to a standard curve, this technique applies Poisson statistics to determine the absolute concentration of the target<sup>64</sup>. Each PCR reaction consists of an oil-water emulsion that partitions each sample into tens of thousands of droplets. Each droplet will either read with a positive or negative fluorescence, and the reader will detect the number of positive droplets. For wastewater, RT-ddPCR has demonstrated a stronger resilience to inhibitors and a higher sensitivity compared to RT-qPCR<sup>62,65-67</sup>. With newer instruments, up to 6 different fluorescent dyes can be detected with ddPCR, enabling an amplitude multiplex of up to 12 targets.

A variation of RT-qPCR developed during the pandemic for detecting SARS-CoV-2 is called Volcano 2nd Generation (V2G)-qPCR<sup>68,69</sup>. The V2G-qPCR method uses a novel polymerase capable of reading both RNA and DNA templates and, therefore, it does not require a separate cDNA synthesis step. Results from V2G-qPCR and RT-qPCR measures are statistically equivalent<sup>70</sup>. Another employed methodology is proteomic quantification detection. Proteomics can provide insight into proteins and their role specific to the target<sup>71</sup>. SARS-CoV-2 encodes for at least 14 proteins and can be identified using several types of mass spectrometry analyses<sup>72,73</sup>. While mass spectrometry may be less expensive, and can provide shorter, cheaper runs than RT-qPCR<sup>72,74,75</sup>, RT-qPCR has displayed better sensitivity and specificity<sup>76</sup>. ELISA assays can provide semi-quantitative measurements of specific protein indicators of infection and immunity, such as SARS-CoV-2 specific IgA and IgG<sup>77</sup>.

Several primer-probe sets are available to identify SARS-CoV-2, typically in the most conserved regions, such as the N gene<sup>35</sup>. Despite being a relatively conserved region, the N gene is not immune from mutations<sup>78</sup>. As VOC emerge, primer/probe sets become less specific and have a degrading ability to detect positive SARS-CoV-2 samples<sup>27</sup>. Compared to the Index reference sequence from Wuhan strain<sup>79</sup>, over 1000 N gene nucleotide mutations have been detected, and more than 300 of them are in commonly used primer sets<sup>80</sup>. Omicron contains

several deletions in the N gene, which can hinder the ability to accurately detect SARS-CoV-2<sup>78</sup>. Therefore, updating primer sets is an ongoing need to adapt to VOC.

Regardless of the specific protocols employed, quality control measures should be incorporated into workflows. This includes integrating non-template controls or blanks, recovery controls, extraction controls, and inhibition controls. Non-template controls are typically prepared as a sample, except the sample is replaced with nuclease-free water. These samples should be at below detection limits. Recovery controls are typically added prior to sample concentration and then measured at the end of processing to determine the fraction recovered. The targets chosen for recovery controls should not be those found naturally in the sample. Typical controls include those that correspond to specific animals that would normally not contribute towards wastewater, e.g., Bovine coronaviruses. Extraction controls are similar to recovery controls but added immediately before the extraction step to quantify potential losses during extraction. Inhibition controls are added after extraction and used to determine whether contaminants that co-accumulate during extraction impact the qPCR detection technology used.

### ***Advancements in wastewater sequencing technologies***

Sequencing approaches proved highly effective for detecting mutations and subsequently deconvoluting this information to estimate SARS-CoV-2 lineage and sublineage frequencies for WWGS<sup>81-83</sup>. RNA, extracted from wastewater samples, can be reverse-transcribed into complementary DNA (cDNA) and sequenced using various methodological approaches and sequencing technologies<sup>84</sup> to recover as much as possible of the entire viral genome from the wastewater: 1) metagenomics or -transcriptomics, 2) capture-based sequencing, and 3) amplicon-based sequencing. In metatranscriptomics, the RNA is recovered directly from wastewater samples without any further enrichment for SARS-CoV-2 or depletion of potentially contaminating material from other sources. While metatranscriptomics is a powerful approach for recovering information about whole communities from an environmental sample<sup>85</sup>, the downside is that low levels of SARS-CoV-2 are difficult to detect, and much of the sequencing work will go into sequencing other RNA, such as that derived from humans. Previous wastewater metagenomics/-transcriptomics studies showed that genetic material derived from bacteria was more abundant despite additional depletion efforts via size exclusion<sup>85</sup>. As alternatives, capture-based and amplicon-based sequencing, also known as target enrichment approaches, can selectively capture or amplify specific regions of interest from a complex mixture of genetic material<sup>84</sup>. In capture-based sequencing, the target regions of interest (e.g., specific genes or the whole SARS-CoV-2 genome) are selected using capture probes or baits that are complementary to those regions. The capture probes are used to selectively bind and capture the SARS-CoV-2 RNA fragments of interest from a complex wastewater sample. Once the target regions are captured, they can be subjected to library preparation and sequencing. In amplicon-based sequencing, specific regions of interest are selected for amplification and sequencing. Primers are designed to target these specific regions (again, specific genes or the whole SARS-CoV-2 genome), and amplification is carried out using PCR. Such enrichment approaches are particularly useful when the analysis can be focused on specific genomic regions or genes that are known, such as those associated with a particular pathogen like SARS-CoV-2. In the clinical context and genomic surveillance of patient samples, tiled

amplicon-based approaches are widely established for sequencing and constructing whole SARS-CoV-2 genomes, e.g., using open-source primer schemes developed and maintained by the ARTIC Network. Since similar protocols and primer schemes can also be used directly for sequencing SARS-CoV-2 from wastewater samples, amplicon sequencing has also become the main approach in WWGS. Amplicon sequencing generally provides adequate material for sequencing low-abundance viral material out of the wastewater matrix, but amplicon-based methods are vulnerable to primer failure and loss of coverage as new lineages arise, and reagents must be continually monitored and updated, similar to reagents used in qPCR and ddPCR assays.

Several sequencing technologies can be used to sequence SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater, each with its own set of advantages and disadvantages. Illumina sequencing is the most widely used sequencing technology for genomic surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in general<sup>86</sup> and WWGS in particular<sup>87,88</sup>. Short reads produced by Illumina sequencing have a high accuracy, and the platform can generate a large number of reads in a single run. In situations where genomes are reconstructed *de novo*, or large structural variations need to be detected, the major drawback is the limited read length, but this is not so critical when fragmented RNA from wastewater samples is sequenced anyway, and the main purpose is reference-based variant calling. A second short-read technology, more rarely used but also applied in WWGS, is IonTorrent sequencing<sup>81,89,90</sup>. As alternatives, single-molecule real-time sequencing (SMRT) technologies, such as those provided by Pacific Biosciences (PacBio) and Oxford Nanopore Technologies (ONT), can produce longer amplicon reads, e.g., approximately 400 bp reads based on an ARTIC Network Protocol<sup>4,91</sup>, which can be useful for resolving complex regions of the SARS-CoV-2 genome. In the specific context of WWGS, longer reads can help infer synteny information about mutations that belong to the same viral lineage because they are detected on the same read. However, it is challenging to derive long RNA fragments from wastewater samples, and the amplicon approach limits maximum achievable read lengths. Nevertheless, ONT is placed second among the most used sequencing technologies in clinical SARS-CoV-2 genomic surveillance<sup>86</sup> due to its lower initial costs, the putative option to sequence longer amplicons<sup>92</sup>, and potential future applications regarding real-time and on-side sequencing. In addition, ONT can also sequence RNA natively without the need for cDNA transcription. SMRT technologies, and in particular ONT sequencing, had higher error rates than other technologies, which may affect accurate lineage detection. However, the technologies and thus their accuracy are constantly improving, making them more and more suitable also for accurate variant calling<sup>93</sup>.

In addition to technology-related biases, the success of each sequencing technology in recovering most parts of the SARS-CoV-2 genome is highly dependent on the primer scheme used. As with sequencing of patient samples, mutations in the SARS-CoV-2 genome can lead to inefficient primer binding and thus reduced or even absent amplification of the target region, also known as amplicon drop-out. Primer schemes need to be constantly evaluated and adjusted, which is mainly done based on clinical genomic surveillance data. With the decreasing availability of SARS-CoV-2 genomes from clinical genomic surveillance, primer designs may become less accurate and lead to more frequent amplicon drop-outs. In WWGS, such failures may go unnoticed due to the mixture of SARS-CoV-2 lineages in the wastewater sample. An amplicon of a lineage that can still be sequenced with the used primer scheme could mask the

failure of another amplicon of a different lineage that has accumulated one or more mutations in primer sites. Such problems with primer (or bait) designs can be circumvented by metagenomic or -transcriptomic sequencing, but with the other drawbacks already mentioned.

## **Robust bioinformatics analysis for wastewater sequencing data**

### ***Data processing***

The initial stages of a bioinformatics pipeline for wastewater sequencing data usually include quality control and filtering of the reads, error correction, then trimming of adapters, and subsequently mapping reads to a reference SARS-CoV-2 sequence, primer clipping, and calling mutations (Figure 4 A). Conventional error correction tools can be quite challenging when dealing with WWS data reads, as they were primarily optimized for human genome reads and may struggle to handle the subtle variations among viral lineages or sublineages<sup>94</sup>. To address this issue, several error correction methods tailored for viral sequencing have been proposed, such as KEK<sup>95</sup>, ET<sup>95</sup>, MultiRes<sup>96</sup> or Bayesian probabilistic clustering approach<sup>97</sup>. Quality control and filtering are supported by viral sequencing data bioinformatics pipelines such as V-pipe<sup>98</sup> or COVID-19 Viral Epidemiology Workflow<sup>99</sup> (C-VIEW), or performed with specialized tools such as Trimmomatic<sup>100</sup>, fastp<sup>101</sup>, often used for short reads, and Filtlong<sup>102</sup> for filtering long reads by quality or custom scripts. Read mapping is done using scalable aligners such as BWA-MEM<sup>103</sup>, Bowtie<sup>104</sup>, or minimap2<sup>105</sup>. Paired-end reads may be merged before alignment using tools such as BBTools<sup>106</sup>. PCR typically amplifies the genetic material in the sample before sequencing. To avoid bias in mutation calling, removing the primers from the alignment is important, which is commonly done using iVar<sup>107</sup>, BAMClipper<sup>108</sup>, or custom scripts. Mutation calling can be performed by a variety of tools also depending on the used sequencing technology, such as iVar<sup>107</sup>, SAMtools<sup>109</sup>, ShoRAH<sup>110</sup>, LoFreq<sup>111</sup>, GATK<sup>112</sup>, FreeBayes<sup>113</sup>, BCFTools<sup>109</sup>, Medaka<sup>114</sup>, or custom scripts<sup>90</sup>. Comparative performance of some of these tools when applied to SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance data has been the subject of published studies<sup>115</sup>. All these variant calling tools have different parameters for filtering according to metrics such as sequencing depth, quality, and allele frequency, impacting the final mutation calls.

### ***Estimation of lineages relative abundances***


The next step of the pipeline is to identify the lineages that are believed to be present in the sample and to estimate their relative abundances from a read alignment produced from NGS data of an RNA extract derived from a wastewater sample. In wastewater sequencing data, the full phasing information of mutations is lost. This is due to fragmentation of the genetic material in the sample, amplification protocols amplifying genomic regions in separate amplicons, and the length of sequencing reads being much shorter than the genome length. In contrast to clinical samples, where we typically assume low diversity and report a consensus sequence representing the dominant inferred lineage, this approach is unsuitable for environmental samples. Specifically, in wastewater samples, multiple lineages may coexist, stemming from

individuals infected with different lineages. This sample heterogeneity must be considered, and is further complicated because these lineages often share mutations.

A variety of computational tools have been developed for this task, based either on a classification approach, such as COJAC<sup>82</sup>, VLQ pipeline<sup>116</sup>, and expectation maximization EM algorithm for obtaining maximum likelihood estimates of the proportions of different haplotype in a sample<sup>117</sup>, or a deconvolution approach, such as LCS<sup>118</sup>, VaQuERo<sup>83</sup>, Alcov<sup>119</sup>, PiGx<sup>120</sup>, Freyja<sup>11</sup>, LolliPop<sup>121</sup>. The classification approach works at the level of reads and assigns each read (probabilistically or deterministically) to the different reference lineages with signature mutations according to the mutations they display. Aggregating the counts of reads assigned to different lineages provides an estimation of their relative abundances (Figure 4 B). In contrast, the deconvolution approach takes as input the individual mutation frequencies computed from the alignment. In a mixed sample, the expected proportion of mutated reads at a given locus equals the sum of the relative abundances of lineages harboring this particular mutation. Again, using a reference set of lineages, their relative contributions to the observed distribution of mutation frequencies is then estimated by a constrained regression method (Figure 4 C). Some of these methods also allow for considering time dependency in the data by employing different nonparametric smoothing approaches<sup>11,83,121</sup>. Some methods additionally provide confidence intervals for the estimates of lineage relative abundances, which is done using bootstrap methods<sup>11,118,121</sup> or closed-form expressions<sup>121</sup>.

To detect a novel lineage or to specify the lineage, haplotype reconstruction methods are used, in which tools classify the mixed read data using different types of methods, including multiple sequence alignment and clustering-based methods, such as ShoRAH<sup>110</sup> and PredictHaplo<sup>122</sup>, QuasiRecomb<sup>123</sup> that is based on hidden Markov model, PEHaplo<sup>124</sup> that uses longest common substring, FM-index based search with overlap graph as in case of Savage<sup>125</sup>, and rReference-guided assembly used VirGenA<sup>126</sup> tool.

All of these methods are reference-based and rely on precise definitions of the lineages, which can be generated from clinical sequences generated since the beginning of the pandemic. Reference sets of lineage genomes may be constructed from existing databases, such as GISAID<sup>127</sup>, CoV-Spectrum<sup>128</sup>, UShER<sup>129</sup>, or NextClade<sup>130</sup>. The selection of appropriate reference datasets is nontrivial, and the results of some deconvolution methods may vary significantly depending upon the reference dataset or classification scheme used<sup>131</sup>.



**Figure 4:** Estimating the relative abundances of SARS-CoV-2 genomic lineages from wastewater sequencing. **A:** The lineages X, Y and Z each have unique but partially overlapping mutation profiles, situated on loci a, b, c, and d. The reads from a wastewater sequencing experiment are aligned to the reference genome, and mutations are called. **B:** In a classification approach, each read is assigned to the lineage that most likely generated it. The counts are then aggregated to estimate the relative abundance of lineages in the sample. **C:** In the deconvolution approach, the proportions of mutated reads at each variable locus are decomposed into the individual contribution of each lineage.

### ***Outbreak investigation***

One important application of bioinformatics analytics is the investigation of outbreaks, which is necessary to detect virus transmission and trace its evolutionary relation with existing VOCs. The existing methods of clustering and phylogenetic analysis can achieve both tasks. Phylogenetic analysis of genomic sequences can calculate the distance across the closest pairs to trace the evolutionary lineage of viruses. To assess the direction of transmission and detection for a superspreader event, a directional network of the viral outbreak is required. This is pivotal to finding transmission clusters and limiting them to the containment zone. QUENTIN<sup>132</sup> and VOICE<sup>133</sup> construct a Markov-type model using the distance between lineages and decide the direction of infection using the minimum evolution principle. PhyloScanner<sup>134</sup> is another tool that uses paraphyletic, monophyletic, and polyphyletic relations along with phylogenetic analysis of samples to detect the direction of transmission. Geographical transmission networks can also be inferred using the TNet tool<sup>135</sup>.

### **Applications of wastewater genomic surveillance**

WWGS offers an additional, independent, non-invasive resource for tracking SARS-CoV-2 evolution, which is crucial for long-term adaptation to co-existence with this pathogen and its continuous control to decrease the COVID-19 health burden in the post-acute pandemic period<sup>136</sup>. This is of particular value during the phase of reduced clinical surveillance, lifted restrictions, and increasing genomic diversity, with different viral sublineages in side-by-side circulation and higher odds for co-infections and recombination events<sup>137</sup>. WWGS can detect the emergence or introduction of novel sublineages in particular regions weeks prior to their identification in clinical samples, subsequent monitoring of their contribution to SARS-CoV-2 infections at the population level, prediction of the reproductive advantage, and further accumulation of novel mutations<sup>11,88,138</sup>. This allows viral trees that have evolved over time and among various regions to be recognized and compared. Identifying novel mutation signals and potential sublineages through WWGS may even prompt their increased and targeted clinical surveillance<sup>139</sup>, indicating that both approaches are complementary and can strengthen the viral monitoring network. However, WWGS is likely superior in regions with limited genomic surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 due to non-challenging sample collection and the ability to generalize data for a particular area without a need for mass sample sequencing, contrary to clinical surveillance<sup>140</sup>.

Earlier characterization of amino acid substitutions in spike protein and other viral proteins through WWGS offers a more swift initiation of experimental studies on immune escape mutations and drug resistance, pivotal in vaccine-adaptation efforts and predicting the efficiency of authorized direct-acting antivirals. It also enables the initiation of *in vivo* research on the clinical relevance of novel sublineages and particular mutations, which is of utmost importance considering that the intrinsic severity of future SARS-CoV-2 lineages remains uncertain<sup>141</sup>. Using WWGS to detect more severe viral lineages, e.g., harboring mutations enhancing fusogenicity, would allow for more targeted and rapid public health responses, translating into decreased morbidity and mortality. Furthermore, WWGS could be employed to track mutational signatures from exposure to mutagenic antivirals (i.e., molnupiravir authorized in selected world regions)<sup>142</sup>, essential to explore the impacts of such treatments on the trajectory of sublineages generation and onward transmission. Moreover, WWGS is a tool to track the cryptic circulation of SARS-CoV-2 lineages that may appear entirely deescalated using clinical surveillance but may otherwise re-emerge or lead to the generation of new lineage, e.g., through recombination events<sup>143</sup>. Last but not least, WWGS can support the early detection of spillback of mutated lineages that could arise during viral circulation in non-human reservoirs that SARS-CoV-2 has already established (e.g., free-ranging white-tailed deer<sup>144</sup>). The clinical consequences of such retransmission to the human population are challenging to predict since mutation-driven adaptations to a new host may lead to decreased adaptation to the human environment but also to improved evasion of acquired immunity, including cellular response, and thus higher susceptibility to severe disease<sup>145,146</sup>. Therefore, detecting such events as soon as possible can guide other surveillance systems and is necessary to implement effective containment measures.

As SARS-CoV-2 is far from eradication and continues to evolve, while the risk of the emergence of novel, clinically relevant viral lineages remains high, implementing WWGS to detect them ahead of their effective spread in the community is essential. Although WWGS is increasingly applied in this regard, the results are primarily made available through peer-reviewed literature. Ultimately, WWGS should be used as an early warning indicator of the rise of novel mutations and associated sublineages. However, considering its value and ongoing transition from the acute phase of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is pivotal to establish a global public repository of SARS-CoV-2 sequences generated with WWGS over time in various world regions, enabling genomic epidemiology and real-time surveillance to monitor the emergence and spread of viral sublineages in a fashion similar to GISAID. This would increase the relevance of WWGS to global COVID-19 research and guidance of public health measures and policy, including recommendations on maintaining or updating COVID-19 vaccine composition for primary or booster doses.

Wastewater-based epidemiology is an established early warning tool for viral spread in the community, identifying new outbreaks and monitoring infection trends, with the potential to guide public health actions and policy decisions. Contrary to clinical surveillance, it is not biased toward symptomatic infections and not affected by individual engagement in testing. Instead, it can be applied to estimate the temporal and spatial trends of total (including undiagnosed) infection load at the community level<sup>147</sup>. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, wastewater epidemiology, particularly based on quantitative assessment of genomic copies, has been applied to detect SARS-CoV-2 for community-wide surveillance as well as in smaller



catchments for more targeted surveillance<sup>148–152</sup>. The role of such an approach in routine monitoring of infection trends and outbreak identification is even increasing during the transition from the acute phase of the pandemic when clinical surveillance is no longer as extensive, restrictions are lifted, and the public is generally less concerned about the COVID-19 threat. Under such conditions, routine quantitative assessment of wastewater should become a primary source of epidemiological information on trends of SARS-CoV-2 circulation in various communities. Forecasting models derived from wastewater-based epidemiology can accurately predict the weekly new hospital admissions due to COVID-19, providing a 1-4 weeks window for introducing mitigation measures<sup>153</sup>.

The qualitative assessment offers additional advantages in this regard. Tracking the dynamics of the contribution of particular sublineages in wastewater is a powerful early warning tool to understand viral shifts that occur at the community level. Their spatial and temporal spread can be tracked, real-time or retrospectively, by integrating data derived from various catchment areas, allowing for the identification of hot spots of specific viral sublineages<sup>154–156</sup>. Foremost, qualitative WWGS can detect them much earlier than clinical testing, ahead by weeks or even months<sup>11,157–160</sup>, enabling expedition of the effective outbreak response by guiding public health policies regarding face masking, booster vaccinations, and/or decreased social mobility. Ultimately, WWGS, coupled with sublineages-oriented risk assessments, can become a robust tool to decrease infection rates, long-term consequences of COVID-19, hospital admissions, and mortality.


Moreover, WWGS has the potential to screen cross-border SARS-CoV-2 spread. Applied to aircraft wastewater samples, it can effectively monitor viral sublineages carried by onboard passengers, enriching data on viral diversity in departure areas and enforcing mitigation strategies in arrival regions. In the past, selected SARS-CoV-2 lineages were detected in clinical samples from returning overseas travelers<sup>89,161</sup>. Therefore, establishing a global aircraft-based WWGS network is postulated with use in the context of COVID-19 and future viral threats<sup>162</sup>. Such a network could compensate for limited genomic surveillance in various world regions, particularly low- and middle-income countries, which is essential to counter the threat of future viral lineages<sup>140</sup>.

In the post-acute pandemic era, COVID-19 vaccination remains an essential and primary public health intervention to decrease SARS-CoV-2 morbidity and mortality. Omicron sublineages are clinically milder, but their infections can lead to severe outcomes in selected patient groups, causing health and economic burdens, management of which requires appropriate preparedness<sup>163,164</sup>. However, vaccine-induced humoral immunity is short-lived, while the virus accumulates immune escape mutations, justifying booster dose recommendations and vaccine updates. At least one booster dose will likely be recommended annually, particularly for the elderly, patients with comorbidities and immune deficiencies, and healthcare workers<sup>165</sup>.

Wastewater-based epidemiology can be employed to assess the effectiveness of vaccinations as successfully demonstrated in the initial phase of mass COVID-19 vaccination, showing a decline in SARS-CoV-2 RNA positivity in response to immunization<sup>166,167</sup>. Surprisingly, opportunities created by such analyses have not been fully exploited in the context of vaccination. Similar studies following subsequent booster administration, integrating data on vaccination coverage in particular areas, could reinforce confidence in COVID-19 vaccinations,

especially when resources for real-time tracking of vaccine effectiveness are available to the public in limited form. Such an approach could also be employed in specific settings, e.g., hospitals or nursing homes, before, during, and after booster vaccination campaigns, enabling a better understanding of the effect of immunization on virus spread in the community. WWGS provides further opportunities, as it can offer to track the effect of vaccination on particular sublineages, which are in concurrent circulation but may differ in sensitivity to neutralization antibodies elicited by vaccines as observed currently within the Omicron lineage<sup>168,169</sup>. By employing WWGS, such data could be obtained earlier than through clinical surveillance and epidemiological analyses. This is of particular use if one considers that even with an mRNA platform, the time needed to develop and authorize an updated vaccine may be enough for SARS-CoV-2 to generate progenitors that diverge from the selected antigen, causing public concern over the vaccine's effectiveness. Therefore, WWGS may be the first to provide an initial assessment of its performance on the population level, which may be valuable in decreasing vaccine hesitancy. Furthermore, WWGS can provide a more accurate assessment of vaccine effectiveness on the population level than analyses based on cases of breakthrough infections with presenting clinical symptoms. Last but not least, since SARS-CoV-2 eradication is highly unlikely with currently available vaccines, WWGS could generate data on which viral sublineages are positively selected under increased immunization levels due to booster administration.

In addition, data generated through WWGS need to be integrated into the system of continued monitoring of the evolution of SARS-CoV-2, which is pivotal in guiding antigen selection for updated COVID-19 vaccines. Of note, none of the authorized COVID-19 vaccines is based on attenuated live SARS-CoV-2; thus, shedding of the vaccine-derived virus will not confound WWGS with false positive signals<sup>170</sup>, although such a possibility needs to be considered if replication-competent vaccines would become available. Main applications of wastewater genomic surveillance are briefly described in Figure 5.



**Figure 5.** Main applications of wastewater genomic surveillance and their impacts on risk assessment, public health guidance, and mitigation strategies.

### Challenges in wastewater genomic surveillance

The acknowledged advantages of utilizing wastewater samples in epidemiology arise from its ability to yield near real-time insights, reflecting a comprehensive snapshot of the disease state within a community<sup>171,172</sup>. It promises a holistic view of the disease prevalence by measuring virus RNA theoretically excreted by all viable shedders within the sewer catchment. However, the actual accuracy and representativeness of measurements acquired from wastewater are contingent upon multiple influencing factors, notably including observable factors like sample dilution by exogenous hydrological flows and partially observable ones like in-network analyte decay/degradation<sup>150,173,174</sup>.

Variability poses a significant challenge in wastewater-based epidemiology, especially for diseases like COVID-19, where different measured virus RNA concentrations can be observed for the same proportion of infected individuals in the population. This variability is intricately linked to uncertainties between the target analyte, such as RNA, and its representation of disease prevalence or incidence. Complications such as rainfall or snow melt entering a combined sewer network during or after wet weather events can further introduce unwanted variability by diluting the analyte concentrations<sup>150</sup>.

Comparative analyses between different geographical locations using WWGS measurements also encounter variations, potentially causing disparities in concentration measurements due to differences in hydraulic residence times among catchments. Strategies

are imperative to account for the myriad of factors causing unwanted variability and uncertainty, including large-scale processes like transient populations and smaller scale ones like laboratory-specific methods<sup>174</sup>. Employing raw wastewater measurements without compensating for influencing factors like wastewater dilution or signal decay can significantly impact decision-making, especially when integrated with other disease prevalence data<sup>150</sup>.

Addressing the drivers of variability, including population factors, in-network characteristics, sampling strategies, and sample analysis, is pivotal for the effective management of variability and mitigation of uncertainty. This involves embracing strategies like population normalization, measurement correction, and meticulous design and implementation of sampling<sup>150</sup>.

The complex nature of wastewater is also reflected in the WWS data quality. Amplicon dropout due to RNA degradation or outdated primer designs lead to uneven coverage and depth of the sequenced genomic regions. If not corrected by bioinformatic methods, this can bias lineage detection and lineage abundance estimates and might lead to misleading interpretation of the data. A comprehensive benchmarking of bioinformatic WWGS methods and data should also provide requirements for WWS data quality to ensure a certain performance quality. Furthermore, WWGS based on selected genomic regions (e.g., the *spike* gene) instead of the whole genome might require different WWS data quality standards to keep up the performance of bioinformatic analysis<sup>116,175</sup>.

The robustness of both SNV-based and sequence-based methods for bioinformatic analysis of WWS data heavily relies on the wastewater sample composition. Sequence similarities among related sublineages can cause ambiguity in lineage detection. Thus, the set of reference data, i.e., the considered lineages and selected characteristic mutations/sequences that the WWS data are compared against, impacts which lineages and sub-lineages can be identified and how specific variant calls/reads can be assigned. Current bioinformatic methods already implement various approaches for reference reconstruction. VLQ<sup>116</sup> selects reference lineages based on the spatio-temporal context of the wastewater sample and samples a specific number of genomic sequences for every lineage according to a predefined threshold for the genomic variation that should be captured<sup>116</sup>. Freyja reconstructs a set of characteristic lineage mutations based on the USHER phylogenetic tree<sup>11</sup>, while other SNV-based tools like wastewaterSPAdes and SAMRefiner rely on a rule-based selection of characteristic sets of mutations considering lineage-differentiating power<sup>176,177</sup>. However, the reference bias remains strong and requires continuous awareness and manual review<sup>131</sup>. Because of the fast evolutionary changes of the virus, reference data need to be re-evaluated for every sample and pandemic timeframe. Specifically, convergent evolution and novel lineages challenge the current strategies for reference reconstruction: depending on the circulating lineages of interest, it becomes more challenging to represent genomic variation and still guarantee sufficient differentiation power between sub-lineages. Furthermore, most currently applied tools rely on a large amount of clinical sequence data to reconstruct their reference data sets. Decreased clinical sampling poses a challenge for bioinformatic WWGS and should be considered for further research in method development, especially in terms of identifying and quantifying unknown lineages.

Early identification of unknown lineages based on novel genomic signals represents one desired benefit and also a great challenge for WWGS. Currently, novel lineage detection is

mostly conducted retrospectively, while real-time cryptic lineage detection represents an ongoing bioinformatic research topic where slowly the first approaches are published. Previously, CryKey was developed as one of the first tools for non-retrospective cryptic lineage detection<sup>178</sup>. CryKey identifies cryptic lineages based on sets of mutations that co-occur on the same reads but have not been observed to co-occur before in clinical sequence data. The tool addresses bias and artifacts in WWS data by rule-based filtering of mutations and reconstructs a reference table mapping SNP information and lineage assignments from clinical sequence data. Overall, biases of WWS data and their epidemic context should be continuously monitored and considered during bioinformatic method development.

## Conclusions

Genomic sequencing of wastewater samples coupled with effective computational tools can complement clinical or epidemiological methods or even independent means for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance. To make it feasible, bioinformatics methods that can address wastewater-specific genomic data should be developed. There are a plethora of tools developed for similar problems in genomics, but it is imperative to perform comprehensive benchmarking before they can be applied to genome-based wastewater sequencing. Benchmarking will allow not only an understanding of the quality of state-of-the-art methods, but will help to determine the future direction for methods development.

Genome-based wastewater surveillance is an excellent supplement to clinical or epidemiological monitoring of pathogens' spread. However, it is not mainstream yet. Currently, only 70 out of 194 countries use wastewater surveillance<sup>179</sup>. For example, in India, with a population of more than 1.3B, five wastewater-based surveillance sites are in effect. Developing countries do not have the resources to sequence several samples of the population to trace emerging lineages of SARS-CoV-2<sup>180</sup>. An appealing alternative to that can be collecting and sequencing viral samples from wastewater, which is significantly more cost-effective and expands the coverage of a surveilled population.

A typical COVID-19 wastewater surveillance program is a powerful epidemiological tool that provides quantification of SARS-CoV-2 and acts as an early warning system for community infections<sup>181-183</sup>. Wastewater genomic surveillance provides the same assurances as a typical surveillance program while generating sequencing data, which can be used for novel lineage or VOC detection. To make it more cost-effective, pooled sequencing and advanced algorithmic processing can be used. Pooling will increase the number of samples sequenced in a single run. It should be noted that computational methods for inference of heterogeneous viral populations from pooling data exist<sup>184,185</sup>, but should be benchmarked and adjusted to the specifics of wastewater surveillance data. Novel bioinformatics pipelines specific to wastewater surveillance can be developed to detect novel lineages and their abundance quantification. Currently, universal guidelines are not established to collect wastewater samples, concentrate viral particles, extract RNA, and quantify viral loads. As such, standard operating procedures (SOP) should be defined, and data can be shared on public repositories just like clinical data repositories<sup>186</sup>. That data can further help us detect novel lineages before they appear in a large population, and preventive measures can be taken. Wastewater data can help identify the relative abundance of existing VOC and potentially assemble a novel one. Additionally,

wastewater can be used to monitor other viruses without a significant increase in the cost of monitoring, including Influenza A and B, monkeypox, and norovirus<sup>187–196</sup>. All the current initiatives in exploring possibilities of wastewater-based surveillance indicate its tremendous potential for reliable viral surveillance. Wastewater-based genomic surveillance can be a powerful supplement or even a main methodology for cost-efficient and reliable surveillance of current and future viral pandemics.

## Supporting Information

**Supplementary Table 1.** Collection of studies and methods used for the genomic surveillance of SARS-CoV-2.

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1UcJEczHSdDYsAKUMIiCNZjtgeaFB5vL4Vu1mMYsPM50/edit#gid=654029053> (XLSX)

## References

1. Ahmed, W. *et al.* First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. *Science of The Total Environment* **728**, 138764 (2020).
2. Medema, G., Heijnen, L., Elsinga, G., Italiaander, R. & Brouwer, A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **7**, 511–516 (2020).
3. Wurtzer, S. *et al.* Evaluation of lockdown effect on SARS-CoV-2 dynamics through viral genome quantification in waste water, Greater Paris, France, 5 March to 23 April 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **25**, 2000776 (2020).
4. Nemudryi, A. *et al.* Temporal Detection and Phylogenetic Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Wastewater. *CR Med* **1**, (2020).
5. Smyth, D. S. *et al.* Tracking cryptic SARS-CoV-2 lineages detected in NYC wastewater. *Nat Commun* **13**, 635 (2022).
6. Levy, J. I., Andersen, K. G., Knight, R. & Karthikeyan, S. Wastewater surveillance for public health. *Science* **379**, 26–27 (2023).
7. Supply Shortages Impacting COVID-19 and Non-COVID Testing. *ASM.org* <https://asm.org:443/Articles/2020/September/Clinical-Microbiology-Supply-Shortage-Collecti-1>.
8. Byambasuren, O. *et al.* Estimating the extent of asymptomatic COVID-19 and its potential for community transmission: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of the Association of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Disease Canada* **5**, 223–234 (2020).
9. Oran, D. P. & Topol, E. J. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Ann Intern Med* **173**, 362–367 (2020).
10. Poletti, P. *et al.* Association of Age With Likelihood of Developing Symptoms and Critical Disease Among Close Contacts Exposed to Patients With Confirmed SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Italy. *JAMA Network Open* **4**, e211085 (2021).
11. Karthikeyan, S. *et al.* Wastewater sequencing reveals early cryptic SARS-CoV-2 variant transmission. *Nature* **609**, 101–108 (2022).
12. Peccia, J. *et al.* Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics. *Nat Biotechnol* **38**, 1164–1167 (2020).

13. Randazzo, W. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence area. *Water Research* **181**, 115942 (2020).
14. Tracking SARS-CoV-2 variants. <https://www.who.int/activities/tracking-SARS-CoV-2-variants>.
15. WHO (2020) Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. <https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020>.
16. Desvars-Larrive, A. *et al.* A structured open dataset of government interventions in response to COVID-19. *Sci Data* **7**, 285 (2020).
17. Rader, B. Use of At-Home COVID-19 Tests — United States, August 23, 2021–March 12, 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **71**, (2022).
18. Procop, G. W., Kadkhoda, K., Rhoads, D. D., Gordon, S. G. & Reddy, A. J. Home testing for COVID-19: Benefits and limitations. *CCJM* (2021) doi:10.3949/ccjm.88a.ccc071.
19. Alberca, G. G. F., Solis-Castro, R. L., Solis-Castro, M. E. & Alberca, R. W. Coronavirus disease–2019 and the intestinal tract: An overview. *World Journal of Gastroenterology* **27**, 1255–1266 (2021).
20. Dergham, J., Delerce, J., Bedotto, M., La Scola, B. & Moal, V. Isolation of Viable SARS-CoV-2 Virus from Feces of an Immunocompromised Patient Suggesting a Possible Fecal Mode of Transmission. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* **10**, 2696 (2021).
21. Joukar, F. *et al.* Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the nasopharyngeal, blood, urine, and stool samples of patients with COVID-19: a hospital-based longitudinal study. *Virology Journal* **18**, 134 (2021).
22. Nishiura, H., Linton, N. M. & Akhmetzhanov, A. R. Serial interval of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) infections. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* **93**, 284–286 (2020).
23. Wu, Y. *et al.* Altered oral and gut microbiota and its association with SARS-CoV-2 viral load in COVID-19 patients during hospitalization. *npj Biofilms Microbiomes* **7**, 1–9 (2021).
24. Gonzalez, R. *et al.* COVID-19 surveillance in Southeastern Virginia using wastewater-based epidemiology. *Water Research* **186**, 116296 (2020).
25. La Rosa, G. *et al.* First detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewaters in Italy. *Science of The Total Environment* **736**, 139652 (2020).
26. Lodder, W. & Husman, A. M. de R. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: potential health risk, but also data source. *The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology* **5**, 533–534 (2020).
27. Randazzo, W., Cuevas-Ferrando, E., Sanjuán, R., Domingo-Calap, P. & Sánchez, G. Metropolitan wastewater analysis for COVID-19 epidemiological surveillance. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* **230**, 113621 (2020).
28. Sherchan, S. P. *et al.* First detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in North America: A study in Louisiana, USA. *Science of The Total Environment* **743**, 140621 (2020).
29. Wu, F. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than Expected from Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems* **5**, e00614-20 (2020).
30. Naughton, C. C. *et al.* Show us the data: global COVID-19 wastewater monitoring efforts, equity, and gaps. *FEMS Microbes* **4**, xtad003 (2023).
31. Maida, C. M. *et al.* Wastewater-based epidemiology for early warning of SARS-COV-2 circulation: A pilot study conducted in Sicily, Italy. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* **242**, 113948 (2022).
32. Assoum, M. *et al.* Wastewater Surveillance Can Function as an Early Warning System for COVID-19 in Low-Incidence Settings. *Tropical Medicine and Infectious Disease* **8**, 211 (2023).
33. Panchal, D., Prakash, O., Bobde, P. & Pal, S. SARS-CoV-2: sewage surveillance as an early warning system and challenges in developing countries. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* **28**, 22221–22240 (2021).

34. National Wastewater Surveillance System. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention* <https://www.cdc.gov/nwss/wastewater-surveillance.html> (2023).
35. CDC. COVID Data Tracker. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention* <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker> (2020).
36. Hrudehy, S. E. *et al.* Wastewater Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Canada. *FACETS* **7**, 1493–1597 (2022).
37. Tiwari, A. *et al.* Tracing COVID-19 Trails in Wastewater: A Systematic Review of SARS-CoV-2 Surveillance with Viral Variants. *Water* **15**, 1018 (2023).
38. Tiwari, A. *et al.* Application of digital PCR for public health-related water quality monitoring. *Science of The Total Environment* **837**, 155663 (2022).
39. Wurtz, N. *et al.* Monitoring the Circulation of SARS-CoV-2 Variants by Genomic Analysis of Wastewater in Marseille, South-East France. *Pathogens* **10**, 1042 (2021).
40. Betancourt, W. Q. *et al.* COVID-19 containment on a college campus via wastewater-based epidemiology, targeted clinical testing and an intervention. *Science of The Total Environment* **779**, 146408 (2021).
41. Lu, E. *et al.* Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in dormitories as a part of comprehensive university campus COVID-19 monitoring. *Environmental Research* **212**, 113580 (2022).
42. Lou, E. G. *et al.* Direct comparison of RT-ddPCR and targeted amplicon sequencing for SARS-CoV-2 mutation monitoring in wastewater. *Science of The Total Environment* **833**, 155059 (2022).
43. Stadler, L. B. *et al.* Wastewater Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 as a Predictive Metric of Positivity Rate for a Major Metropolis. 2020.11.04.20226191 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.04.20226191> (2020).
44. Wolken, M. *et al.* Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 and influenza in preK-12 schools shows school, community, and citywide infections. *Water Research* **231**, 119648 (2023).
45. Tran, H. N. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus in water and wastewater: A critical review about presence and concern. *Environmental Research* **193**, 110265 (2021).
46. Bivins, A. *et al.* Persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in Water and Wastewater. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **7**, 937–942 (2020).
47. Ahmed, W. *et al.* Decay of SARS-CoV-2 and surrogate murine hepatitis virus RNA in untreated wastewater to inform application in wastewater-based epidemiology. *Environmental Research* **191**, 110092 (2020).
48. WastewaterSCAN Dashboard.  
<https://data.wastewaterscan.org/tracker/?charts=CiEQACABSABSBjM3MzcwMloGTiBHZW5IeHskaqY1OTJkYml%3D&selectedChartId=592dbb> (2023).
49. Polo, D. *et al.* Making waves: Wastewater-based epidemiology for COVID-19 – approaches and challenges for surveillance and prediction. *Water Research* **186**, 116404 (2020).
50. McCall, C. *et al.* Modeling SARS-CoV-2 RNA degradation in small and large sewersheds. *Environ. Sci.: Water Res. Technol.* **8**, 290–300 (2022).
51. Larsen, D. A. & Wigginton, K. R. Tracking COVID-19 with wastewater. *Nat Biotechnol* **38**, 1151–1153 (2020).
52. Kim, S. & Boehm, A. B. Wastewater monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 RNA at K-12 schools: comparison to pooled clinical testing data. *PeerJ* **11**, e15079 (2023).
53. Scott, L. C. *et al.* Targeted wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 on a university campus for COVID-19 outbreak detection and mitigation. *Environmental Research* **200**, 111374 (2021).
54. Wolfe, M. K. *et al.* High-Frequency, High-Throughput Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids at Eight Publicly Owned Treatment Works in Northern California



- Shows Strong Association with COVID-19 Incidence. *mSystems* **6**, e00829-21 (2021).
55. Barril, P. A. *et al.* Evaluation of viral concentration methods for SARS-CoV-2 recovery from wastewaters. *Science of The Total Environment* **756**, 144105 (2021).
  56. Flood, M. T., D'Souza, N., Rose, J. B. & Aw, T. G. Methods Evaluation for Rapid Concentration and Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 in Raw Wastewater Using Droplet Digital and Quantitative RT-PCR. *Food Environ Virol* **13**, 303–315 (2021).
  57. Sapula, S. A., Whittall, J. J., Pandopoulos, A. J., Gerber, C. & Venter, H. An optimized and robust PEG precipitation method for detection of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater. *Science of The Total Environment* **785**, 147270 (2021).
  58. Ahmed, W. *et al.* Comparison of virus concentration methods for the RT-qPCR-based recovery of murine hepatitis virus, a surrogate for SARS-CoV-2 from untreated wastewater. *Science of The Total Environment* **739**, 139960 (2020).
  59. Sangkham, S. A review on detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in light of the current knowledge of treatment process for removal of viral fragments. *Journal of Environmental Management* **299**, 113563 (2021).
  60. Prata, C., Ribeiro, A., Cunha, Â., Gomes, N. C. M. & Almeida, A. Ultracentrifugation as a direct method to concentrate viruses in environmental waters: virus-like particle enumeration as a new approach to determine the efficiency of recovery. *J. Environ. Monit.* **14**, 64–70 (2012).
  61. Janjic, A. *et al.* Prime-seq, efficient and powerful bulk RNA sequencing. *Genome Biology* **23**, 88 (2022).
  62. Hinkle, A. *et al.* Comparison of RT-qPCR and Digital PCR Methods for Wastewater-Based Testing of SARS-CoV-2. 2022.06.15.22276459 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.15.22276459> (2022).
  63. Cao, Y., Griffith, J. F., Dorevitch, S. & Weisberg, S. B. Effectiveness of qPCR permutations, internal controls and dilution as means for minimizing the impact of inhibition while measuring Enterococcus in environmental waters. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **113**, 66–75 (2012).
  64. Hindson, B. J. *et al.* High-Throughput Droplet Digital PCR System for Absolute Quantitation of DNA Copy Number. *Anal. Chem.* **83**, 8604–8610 (2011).
  65. Kuypers, J. & Jerome, K. R. Applications of Digital PCR for Clinical Microbiology. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* **55**, 1621–1628 (2017).
  66. Ciesielski, M. *et al.* Assessing sensitivity and reproducibility of RT-ddPCR and RT-qPCR for the quantification of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater. *J Virol Methods* **297**, 114230 (2021).
  67. D'Aoust, P. M. *et al.* Quantitative analysis of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from wastewater solids in communities with low COVID-19 incidence and prevalence. *Water Research* **188**, 116560 (2021).
  68. Sharkey, M. E. *et al.* Lessons learned from SARS-CoV-2 measurements in wastewater. *Science of The Total Environment* **798**, 149177 (2021).
  69. Babler, K. M. *et al.* Degradation rates influence the ability of composite samples to represent 24-hourly means of SARS-CoV-2 and other microbiological target measures in wastewater. *Science of The Total Environment* **867**, 161423 (2023).
  70. Babler, K. M. *et al.* Comparison of Electronegative Filtration to Magnetic Bead-Based Concentration and V2G-qPCR to RT-qPCR for Quantifying Viral SARS-CoV-2 RNA from Wastewater. *ACS EST Water* **2**, 2004–2013 (2022).
  71. Shah, T. R. & Misra, A. 8 - Proteomics. in *Challenges in Delivery of Therapeutic Genomics and Proteomics* (ed. Misra, A.) 387–427 (Elsevier, 2011). doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-384964-9.00008-6.
  72. Lara-Jacobo, L. R., Islam, G., Desaulniers, J.-P., Kirkwood, A. E. & Simmons, D. B. D. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 Proteins in Wastewater Samples by Mass Spectrometry. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **56**, 5062–5070 (2022).

73. Aravind Kumar, N., Aradhana, S., Harleen & Vishnuraj, M. R. SARS-CoV-2 in digital era: Diagnostic techniques and importance of nucleic acid quantification with digital PCRs. *Reviews in Medical Virology* *n/a*, e2471 (2023).
74. Singh, P. *et al.* A rapid and sensitive method to detect SARS-CoV-2 virus using targeted-mass spectrometry. *J Proteins Proteom* **11**, 159–165 (2020).
75. Cardozo, K. H. M. *et al.* Establishing a mass spectrometry-based system for rapid detection of SARS-CoV-2 in large clinical sample cohorts. *Nat Commun* **11**, 6201 (2020).
76. Wu, Y.-C. *et al.* Comparison of IHC, FISH and RT-PCR Methods for Detection of ALK Rearrangements in 312 Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Patients in Taiwan. *PLOS ONE* **8**, e70839 (2013).
77. Agan, M. L. *et al.* Wastewater as a back door to serology? 2022.11.11.22282224 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.11.22282224> (2022).
78. Thakur, S. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Mutations and Their Impact on Diagnostics, Therapeutics and Vaccines. *Frontiers in Medicine* **9**, (2022).
79. Wu, F. *et al.* A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. *Nature* **579**, 265–269 (2020).
80. Rahman, M. S. *et al.* Evolutionary dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid protein and its consequences. *Journal of Medical Virology* **93**, 2177–2195 (2021).
81. Agrawal, S. *et al.* Prevalence and circulation patterns of SARS-CoV-2 variants in European sewage mirror clinical data of 54 European cities. *Water Research* **214**, 118162 (2022).
82. Jahn, K. *et al.* Early detection and surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 genomic variants in wastewater using COJAC. *Nat Microbiol* **7**, 1151–1160 (2022).
83. Amman, F. *et al.* Viral variant-resolved wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 at national scale. *Nat Biotechnol* **40**, 1814–1822 (2022).
84. Nieuwenhuijse, D. F. *et al.* Towards reliable whole genome sequencing for outbreak preparedness and response. *BMC Genomics* **23**, 569 (2022).
85. Wyler, E. *et al.* Comprehensive profiling of wastewater viromes by genomic sequencing. 2022.12.16.520800 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.16.520800> (2022).
86. Brandt, C. *et al.* poreCov-An Easy to Use, Fast, and Robust Workflow for SARS-CoV-2 Genome Reconstruction via Nanopore Sequencing. *Frontiers in Genetics* **12**, (2021).
87. Hillary, L. S. *et al.* Monitoring SARS-CoV-2 in municipal wastewater to evaluate the success of lockdown measures for controlling COVID-19 in the UK. *Water Research* **200**, 117214 (2021).
88. Pérez-Cataluña, A. *et al.* Spatial and temporal distribution of SARS-CoV-2 diversity circulating in wastewater. *Water Research* **211**, 118007 (2022).
89. Agrawal, S. *et al.* Genome Sequencing of Wastewater Confirms the Arrival of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant at Frankfurt Airport but Limited Spread in the City of Frankfurt, Germany, in November 2021. *Microbiology Resource Announcements* **11**, e01229-21 (2022).
90. Agrawal, S., Orschler, L., Zachmann, K. & Lackner, S. Comprehensive mutation profiling from wastewater in southern Germany extends evidence of circulating SARS-CoV-2 diversity beyond mutations characteristic for Omicron. *FEMS Microbes* **4**, xtad006 (2023).
91. Swift, C. L., Isanovic, M., Correa Velez, K. E. & Norman, R. S. Community-level SARS-CoV-2 sequence diversity revealed by wastewater sampling. *Science of The Total Environment* **801**, 149691 (2021).
92. Freed, N. E., Vlková, M., Faisal, M. B. & Silander, O. K. Rapid and inexpensive whole-genome sequencing of SARS-CoV-2 using 1200 bp tiled amplicons and Oxford Nanopore Rapid Barcoding. *Biology Methods and Protocols* **5**, bpa014 (2020).
93. Luo, J. *et al.* Systematic benchmarking of nanopore Q20+ kit in SARS-CoV-2 whole genome sequencing. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **13**, (2022).
94. Mitchell, K. *et al.* Benchmarking of computational error-correction methods for

- next-generation sequencing data. *Genome Biology* **21**, 71 (2020).
95. Skums, P. *et al.* Efficient error correction for next-generation sequencing of viral amplicons. *BMC Bioinformatics* **13**, S6 (2012).
  96. Malhotra, R., Jha, M., Poss, M. & Acharya, R. A random forest classifier for detecting rare variants in NGS data from viral populations. *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal* **15**, 388–395 (2017).
  97. Zagordi, O., Geyrhofer, L., Roth, V. & Beerenwinkel, N. Deep Sequencing of a Genetically Heterogeneous Sample: Local Haplotype Reconstruction and Read Error Correction. in *Research in Computational Molecular Biology* (ed. Batzoglou, S.) 271–284 (Springer, 2009). doi:10.1007/978-3-642-02008-7\_21.
  98. Posada-Céspedes, S. *et al.* V-pipe: a computational pipeline for assessing viral genetic diversity from high-throughput data. *Bioinformatics* **37**, 1673–1680 (2021).
  99. C-VIEW: COVID-19 Viral Epidemiology Workflow. (2023).
  100. Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M. & Usadel, B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114–2120 (2014).
  101. Chen, S., Zhou, Y., Chen, Y. & Gu, J. fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor. *Bioinformatics* **34**, i884–i890 (2018).
  102. Wick, R. rrwick/Filtlong. (2023).
  103. Li, H. & Durbin, R. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler transform. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 1754–1760 (2009).
  104. Langmead, B., Trapnell, C., Pop, M. & Salzberg, S. L. Ultrafast and memory-efficient alignment of short DNA sequences to the human genome. *Genome Biology* **10**, R25 (2009).
  105. Li, H. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. *Bioinformatics* **34**, 3094–3100 (2018).
  106. Bushnell, B., Rood, J. & Singer, E. BBMerge – Accurate paired shotgun read merging via overlap. *PLOS ONE* **12**, e0185056 (2017).
  107. Grubaugh, N. D. *et al.* An amplicon-based sequencing framework for accurately measuring intrahost virus diversity using PrimalSeq and iVar. *Genome Biology* **20**, 8 (2019).
  108. Au, C. H., Ho, D. N., Kwong, A., Chan, T. L. & Ma, E. S. K. BAMClipper: removing primers from alignments to minimize false-negative mutations in amplicon next-generation sequencing. *Sci Rep* **7**, 1567 (2017).
  109. Danecek, P. *et al.* Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. *GigaScience* **10**, giab008 (2021).
  110. Zagordi, O., Bhattacharya, A., Eriksson, N. & Beerenwinkel, N. ShoRAH: estimating the genetic diversity of a mixed sample from next-generation sequencing data. *BMC Bioinformatics* **12**, 119 (2011).
  111. Wilm, A. *et al.* LoFreq: a sequence-quality aware, ultra-sensitive variant caller for uncovering cell-population heterogeneity from high-throughput sequencing datasets. *Nucleic Acids Research* **40**, 11189–11201 (2012).
  112. McKenna, A. *et al.* The Genome Analysis Toolkit: A MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data. *Genome Res.* **20**, 1297–1303 (2010).
  113. Garrison, E. & Marth, G. Haplotype-based variant detection from short-read sequencing. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1207.3907> (2012).
  114. Medaka. (2023).
  115. Bassano, I. *et al.* Evaluation of variant calling algorithms for wastewater-based epidemiology using mixed populations of SARS-CoV-2 variants in synthetic and wastewater samples. *Microbial Genomics* **9**, 000933 (2023).
  116. Baaijens, J. A. *et al.* Lineage abundance estimation for SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater using transcriptome quantification techniques. *Genome Biology* **23**, 236 (2022).
  117. Pipes, L., Chen, Z., Afanaseva, S. & Nielsen, R. Estimating the relative proportions of SARS-CoV-2 haplotypes from wastewater samples. *Cell Reports Methods* **2**, 100313 (2022).

118. Valieris, R. *et al.* A mixture model for determining SARS-Cov-2 variant composition in pooled samples. *Bioinformatics* **38**, 1809–1815 (2022).
119. Ellmen, I. *et al.* Alcov: Estimating Variant of Concern Abundance from SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater Sequencing Data. 2021.06.03.21258306 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.03.21258306> (2021).
120. Schumann, V.-F. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 infection dynamics revealed by wastewater sequencing analysis and deconvolution. *Science of The Total Environment* **853**, 158931 (2022).
121. Dreifuss, D., Topolsky, I., Baykal, P. I. & Beerenwinkel, N. Tracking SARS-CoV-2 genomic variants in wastewater sequencing data with LolliPop. 2022.11.02.22281825 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.02.22281825> (2022).
122. Prabhakaran, S., Rey, M., Zagordi, O., Beerenwinkel, N. & Roth, V. HIV Haplotype Inference Using a Propagating Dirichlet Process Mixture Model. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* **11**, 182–191 (2014).
123. Töpfer, A. *et al.* Probabilistic Inference of Viral Quasispecies Subject to Recombination. *Journal of Computational Biology* **20**, 113–123 (2013).
124. Chen, J., Zhao, Y. & Sun, Y. De novo haplotype reconstruction in viral quasispecies using paired-end read guided path finding. *Bioinformatics* **34**, 2927–2935 (2018).
125. Baaijens, J. A., Aabidine, A. Z. E., Rivals, E. & Schönhuth, A. De novo assembly of viral quasispecies using overlap graphs. *Genome Res.* **27**, 835–848 (2017).
126. Fedonin, G. G., Fantin, Y. S., Favorov, A. V., Shipulin, G. A. & Neverov, A. D. VirGenA: a reference-based assembler for variable viral genomes. *Briefings in Bioinformatics* **20**, 15–25 (2019).
127. Shu, Y. & McCauley, J. GISAID: Global initiative on sharing all influenza data – from vision to reality. *Eurosurveillance* **22**, 30494 (2017).
128. Chen, C. *et al.* CoV-Spectrum: analysis of globally shared SARS-CoV-2 data to identify and characterize new variants. *Bioinformatics* **38**, 1735–1737 (2022).
129. Turakhia, Y. *et al.* Ultrafast Sample placement on Existing tRees (USHER) enables real-time phylogenetics for the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. *Nat Genet* **53**, 809–816 (2021).
130. Aksamentov, I., Roemer, C., Hodcroft, E. B. & Neher, R. A. Nextclade: clade assignment, mutation calling and quality control for viral genomes. *Journal of Open Source Software* **6**, 3773 (2021).
131. Aßmann, E. *et al.* Impact of reference design on estimating SARS-CoV-2 lineage abundances from wastewater sequencing data. 2023.06.02.543047 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.02.543047> (2023).
132. Skums, P. *et al.* QUENTIN: reconstruction of disease transmissions from viral quasispecies genomic data. *Bioinformatics* **34**, 163–170 (2018).
133. Rosenberg, N. E. *et al.* Identifying Adolescent Girls and Young Women at High Risk for HIV Acquisition: A Risk Assessment Tool From the Girl Power-Malawi Study. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* **47**, 760 (2020).
134. Wymant, C. *et al.* PHYLOSCANNER: Inferring Transmission from Within- and Between-Host Pathogen Genetic Diversity. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **35**, 719–733 (2018).
135. Dhar, S., Zhang, C., Măndoiu, I. I. & Bansal, M. S. TNet: Transmission Network Inference Using Within-Host Strain Diversity and its Application to Geographical Tracking of COVID-19 Spread. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* **19**, 230–242 (2022).
136. Rzymiski, P. *et al.* Key Essentials during the Transition from the Acute Phase of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202308.1245.v1> (2023).
137. Markov, P. V. *et al.* The evolution of SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **21**, 361–379 (2023).

138. Gupta, P. *et al.* Wastewater Genomic Surveillance Captures Early Detection of Omicron in Utah. *Microbiology Spectrum* **11**, e00391-23 (2023).
139. Vo, V. *et al.* Identification of a rare SARS-CoV-2 XL hybrid variant in wastewater and the subsequent discovery of two infected individuals in Nevada. *Science of The Total Environment* **858**, 160024 (2023).
140. Chen, Z. *et al.* Global landscape of SARS-CoV-2 genomic surveillance and data sharing. *Nat Genet* **54**, 499–507 (2022).
141. Pascall, D. J. *et al.* Directions of change in intrinsic case severity across successive SARS-CoV-2 variant waves have been inconsistent. *Journal of Infection* **87**, 128–135 (2023).
142. Sanderson, T. *et al.* A molnupiravir-associated mutational signature in global SARS-CoV-2 genomes. 2023.01.26.23284998 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.26.23284998> (2023).
143. Yaniv, K. *et al.* Managing an evolving pandemic: Cryptic circulation of the Delta variant during the Omicron rise. *Science of The Total Environment* **836**, 155599 (2022).
144. Hale, V. L. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 infection in free-ranging white-tailed deer. *Nature* **602**, 481–486 (2022).
145. Kuchipudi, S. V. *et al.* Multiple spillovers from humans and onward transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in white-tailed deer. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **119**, e2121644119 (2022).
146. Willgert, K. *et al.* Transmission history of SARS-CoV-2 in humans and white-tailed deer. *Sci Rep* **12**, 12094 (2022).
147. Sridhar, J. *et al.* Importance of wastewater-based epidemiology for detecting and monitoring SARS-CoV-2. *Case Studies in Chemical and Environmental Engineering* **6**, 100241 (2022).
148. Medema, G., Been, F., Heijnen, L. & Petterson, S. Implementation of environmental surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 virus to support public health decisions: Opportunities and challenges. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health* **17**, 49–71 (2020).
149. Ali, W. *et al.* Occurrence of various viruses and recent evidence of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater systems. *Journal of Hazardous Materials* **414**, 125439 (2021).
150. Wade, M. J. *et al.* Understanding and managing uncertainty and variability for wastewater monitoring beyond the pandemic: Lessons learned from the United Kingdom national COVID-19 surveillance programmes. *Journal of Hazardous Materials* **424**, 127456 (2022).
151. Shah, S. *et al.* Wastewater surveillance to infer COVID-19 transmission: A systematic review. *Science of The Total Environment* **804**, 150060 (2022).
152. Mac Mahon, J., Criado Monleon, A. J., Gill, L. W., O'Sullivan, J. J. & Meijer, W. G. Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) for SARS-CoV-2 – A review focussing on the significance of the sewer network using a Dublin city catchment case study. *Water Science and Technology* **86**, 1402–1425 (2022).
153. Li, X. *et al.* Wastewater-based epidemiology predicts COVID-19-induced weekly new hospital admissions in over 150 USA counties. *Nat Commun* **14**, 4548 (2023).
154. Rouchka, E. C. *et al.* The Rapid Assessment of Aggregated Wastewater Samples for Genomic Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 on a City-Wide Scale. *Pathogens* **10**, 1271 (2021).
155. Brunner, F. S. *et al.* City-wide wastewater genomic surveillance through the successive emergence of SARS-CoV-2 Alpha and Delta variants. *Water Research* **226**, 119306 (2022).
156. Gonçalves-Brito, A. S. *et al.* Environmental genomic surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Journal of Water and Health* **21**, 653–662 (2023).
157. Rahman, M. *et al.* The emergence of SARS-CoV-2 variants in Dhaka city, Bangladesh. *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases* **68**, 3000–3001 (2021).
158. Gupta, P. *et al.* Wastewater Genomic Surveillance Captures Early Detection of Omicron in Utah. *Microbiology Spectrum* **11**, e00391-23 (2023).

159. Wilhelm, A. *et al.* Wastewater surveillance allows early detection of SARS-CoV-2 omicron in North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany. *Science of The Total Environment* **846**, 157375 (2022).
160. Lamba, S. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 infection dynamics and genomic surveillance to detect variants in wastewater – a longitudinal study in Bengaluru, India. *The Lancet Regional Health - Southeast Asia* **11**, 100151 (2023).
161. Viana, R. *et al.* Rapid epidemic expansion of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in southern Africa. *Nature* **603**, 679–686 (2022).
162. Li, J. *et al.* A global aircraft-based wastewater genomic surveillance network for early warning of future pandemics. *The Lancet Global Health* **11**, e791–e795 (2023).
163. Portmann, L. *et al.* Hospital Outcomes of Community-Acquired SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant Infection Compared With Influenza Infection in Switzerland. *JAMA Network Open* **6**, e2255599 (2023).
164. Flisiak, R. *et al.* Change in the Clinical Picture of Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19 between the Early and Late Period of Dominance of the Omicron SARS-CoV-2 Variant. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* **12**, 5572 (2023).
165. Statement on the antigen composition of COVID-19 vaccines. <https://www.who.int/news/item/18-05-2023-statement-on-the-antigen-composition-of-covid-19-vaccines>.
166. Bivins, A. & Bibby, K. Wastewater Surveillance during Mass COVID-19 Vaccination on a College Campus. *Environmental Science & Technology Letters* (2021) doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.1c00519.
167. Hegazy, N. *et al.* Understanding the dynamic relation between wastewater SARS-CoV-2 signal and clinical metrics throughout the pandemic. *Science of The Total Environment* **853**, 158458 (2022).
168. Davis-Gardner, M. E. *et al.* Neutralization against BA.2.75.2, BQ.1.1, and XBB from mRNA Bivalent Booster. *New England Journal of Medicine* **388**, 183–185 (2023).
169. Qu, P. *et al.* Enhanced evasion of neutralizing antibody response by Omicron XBB.1.5, CH.1.1, and CA.3.1 variants. *Cell Reports* **42**, (2023).
170. Mohapatra, S. *et al.* Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 and chemical markers in campus dormitories in an evolving COVID – 19 pandemic. *Journal of Hazardous Materials* **446**, 130690 (2023).
171. Mao, K. *et al.* The potential of wastewater-based epidemiology as surveillance and early warning of infectious disease outbreaks. *Current Opinion in Environmental Science & Health* **17**, 1–7 (2020).
172. Hoffmann, T. & Alsing, J. Faecal shedding models for SARS-CoV-2 RNA among hospitalised patients and implications for wastewater-based epidemiology. 2021.03.16.21253603 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.16.21253603> (2023).
173. Li, X., Zhang, S., Shi, J., Luby, S. P. & Jiang, G. Uncertainties in estimating SARS-CoV-2 prevalence by wastewater-based epidemiology. *Chemical Engineering Journal* **415**, 129039 (2021).
174. Ahmed, W. *et al.* Minimizing errors in RT-PCR detection and quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA for wastewater surveillance. *Science of The Total Environment* **805**, 149877 (2022).
175. Kayikcioglu, T. *et al.* Performance of methods for SARS-CoV-2 variant detection and abundance estimation within mixed population samples. *PeerJ* **11**, e14596 (2023).
176. Korobeynikov, A. wastewaterSPAdes: SARS-CoV-2 strain deconvolution using SPAdes toolkit. 2022.12.08.519672 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.08.519672> (2022).
177. Gregory, D. A., Wieberg, C. G., Wenzel, J., Lin, C.-H. & Johnson, M. C. Monitoring SARS-CoV-2 Populations in Wastewater by Amplicon Sequencing and Using the Novel Program SAM Refiner. *Viruses* **13**, 1647 (2021).

178. Liu, Y., Sapoval, N., Treangen, T. J. & Stadler, L. B. Crykey: Comprehensive Identification of SARS-CoV-2 Cryptic Mutations in Wastewater. 2023.06.16.23291524 Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.16.23291524> (2023).
179. COVID-19 Wastewater Epidemiology SARS-CoV-2. [covid19wbec.org](https://www.covid19wbec.org) <https://www.covid19wbec.org>.
180. Brito, A. F. *et al.* Global disparities in SARS-CoV-2 genomic surveillance. *Nat Commun* **13**, 7003 (2022).
181. McClary-Gutierrez, J. S. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater Surveillance for Public Health Action - Volume 27, Number 9—September 2021 - Emerging Infectious Diseases journal - CDC. doi:10.3201/eid2709.210753.
182. Nourbakhsh, S. *et al.* A wastewater-based epidemic model for SARS-CoV-2 with application to three Canadian cities. *Epidemics* **39**, 100560 (2022).
183. Diamond, M. B. *et al.* Wastewater surveillance of pathogens can inform public health responses. *Nat Med* **28**, 1992–1995 (2022).
184. Skums, P. *et al.* Computational framework for next-generation sequencing of heterogeneous viral populations using combinatorial pooling. *Bioinformatics* **31**, 682–690 (2015).
185. Zhernakov, A. I., Afonin, A. M., Gavriliuk, N. D., Moiseeva, O. M. & Zhukov, V. A. s-dePooler: determination of polymorphism carriers from overlapping DNA pools. *BMC Bioinformatics* **20**, 45 (2019).
186. Omic Wastewater Surveillance. (2022).
187. Ahmed, W. *et al.* Occurrence of multiple respiratory viruses in wastewater in Queensland, Australia: Potential for community disease surveillance. *Science of The Total Environment* **864**, 161023 (2023).
188. Deshpande, J. M., Shetty, S. J. & Siddiqui, Z. A. Environmental Surveillance System To Track Wild Poliovirus Transmission. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **69**, 2919–2927 (2003).
189. Heijnen, L. & Medema, G. Surveillance of Influenza A and the pandemic influenza A (H1N1) 2009 in sewage and surface water in the Netherlands. *Journal of Water and Health* **9**, 434–442 (2011).
190. Hellmér, M. *et al.* Detection of Pathogenic Viruses in Sewage Provided Early Warnings of Hepatitis A Virus and Norovirus Outbreaks. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **80**, 6771–6781 (2014).
191. Hughes, B. *et al.* Respiratory Syncytial Virus (RSV) RNA in Wastewater Settled Solids Reflects RSV Clinical Positivity Rates. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **9**, 173–178 (2022).
192. Koureas, M. *et al.* Wastewater Levels of Respiratory Syncytial Virus Associated with Influenza-like Illness Rates in Children—A Case Study in Larissa, Greece (October 2022–January 2023). *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **20**, 5219 (2023).
193. Pintó, R. M. *et al.* Hepatitis A virus in urban sewage from two Mediterranean countries. *Epidemiology & Infection* **135**, 270–273 (2007).
194. Tedcastle, A. *et al.* Detection of Enterovirus D68 in Wastewater Samples from the UK between July and November 2021. *Viruses* **14**, 143 (2022).
195. de Jonge, E. F. *et al.* The detection of monkeypox virus DNA in wastewater samples in the Netherlands. *Science of The Total Environment* **852**, 158265 (2022).
196. Xagorarakis, I. & O'Brien, E. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology for Early Detection of Viral Outbreaks. in *Women in Water Quality: Investigations by Prominent Female Engineers* (ed. O'Bannon, D. J.) 75–97 (Springer International Publishing, 2020). doi:10.1007/978-3-030-17819-2\_5.

