

# 1 Longitudinal Fecal Shedding of SARS-CoV-2, Pepper Mild Mottle Virus, and 2 Human Mitochondrial DNA in COVID-19 Patients

3 Pengbo Liu<sup>1\*</sup>, Orlando III Sablon<sup>1</sup>, Yuke Wang<sup>1</sup>, Stephen Patrick Hilton<sup>1</sup>, Lana Khalil<sup>2</sup>, Jessica  
4 Mae Ingersoll<sup>3</sup>, Jennifer Truell<sup>3</sup>, Sri Edupuganti<sup>2</sup>, Ghina Alaaeddine<sup>2</sup>, Amal Naji<sup>2</sup>, Eduardo  
5 Monarrez<sup>2</sup>, Marlene Wolfe<sup>1</sup>, Nadine Rouphael<sup>2</sup>, Colleen Kraft<sup>3</sup>, Christine L. Moe<sup>1\*</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Center for Global Safe Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory  
7 University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

8 <sup>2</sup>Hope Clinic of the Emory Vaccine Center, Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine,  
9 School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

10 <sup>3</sup>Division of Infectious Diseases, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

11 \*These authors share senior authorship

12

## 13 ABSTRACT

14 Since the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, wastewater-based  
15 epidemiology (WBE) has been widely applied in many countries and regions for  
16 monitoring COVID-19 transmission in the population through testing severe acute  
17 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in wastewater. However, the lack of  
18 dynamic level of viral shedding in the wastewater and accurate number of infections in  
19 the community creates challenges in predicting COVID-19 prevalence in the population  
20 and interpreting WBE results. In this study, we measured SARS-CoV-2, pepper mild  
21 mottle virus (PMMoV), and human mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) in longitudinal fecal  
22 samples collected from 42 COVID-19 patients for up to 42 days after diagnosis. SARS-  
23 CoV-2 RNA was detected in 73.1% (19/26) of inpatient study participants in at least one  
24 of the collected fecal specimens during the sampling period. Most participants shed the  
25 virus within three weeks after diagnosis, but five inpatient participants still shed the virus  
26 between 20 and 60 days after diagnosis. The median concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in  
27 positive fecal samples was  $1.08 \times 10^5$  genome copies (GC)/gram dry fecal material.  
28 PMMoV and mtDNA were detected in 99.4% (154/155) and 100% (155/155) of all fecal

29 samples, respectively. The median concentrations of PMMoV RNA and mtDNA in fecal  
30 samples were  $1.73 \times 10^7$  and  $2.49 \times 10^8$  GC/dry gram, respectively. These results provide  
31 important information about the dynamics of fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2 and two  
32 human fecal indicators in COVID-19 patients. mtDNA showed higher positive rates,  
33 higher concentrations, and less variability between and within individuals than PMMoV,  
34 suggesting that mtDNA could be a better normalization factor for WBE results than  
35 PMMoV.

36 **Key Words:** SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; longitudinal; fecal shedding; PMMoV; mtDNA

37

## 38 1. INTRODUCTION

39 COVID-19 (coronavirus disease 2019) is caused by SARS-CoV-2 (severe acute  
40 respiratory coronavirus 2), a positive-sense single-stranded RNA virus. Although  
41 COVID-19 is a respiratory disease and patients predominantly manifest respiratory  
42 symptoms, systemic and respiratory manifestations are often accompanied by  
43 gastrointestinal symptoms and fecal shedding of viral RNA. Meta-analysis of studies  
44 that focus on gastrointestinal (GI) infection and fecal shedding in patients with COVID-  
45 19 report the prevalence of GI symptoms to be around 17.6% (1) and 28.5% (2) in  
46 patients with severe COVID-19 during the acute infection phase. In COVID-19 patients,  
47 the prevalence of positive RNA in stool samples was about 50% (1, 3) within the first  
48 week of diagnosis. Interestingly, several studies that have collected paired longitudinal  
49 respiratory and fecal samples demonstrated prolonged fecal shedding and higher viral  
50 load in feces compared to the paired respiratory samples collected at the same time  
51 period (3, 4). This suggests that SARS-CoV-2 infection of the GI tract persists longer

52 than in the respiratory tract and the GI tract excretes more viruses than the respiratory  
53 tract. SARS-CoV-2 concentration in stool was reported to be between  $10^2$  to  $10^7$  GC/mL  
54 in an early study (5) for the prototype SARS-CoV-2, but there is a lack of this  
55 information for the recent variants.

56 While the presence and prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the GI tract are well  
57 established, much less is known about the duration and the amount of SARS-CoV-2  
58 fecal shedding in patients with COVID-19. Natarajan et al. (3) reported that 12.7% of  
59 subjects still shed SARS-CoV-2 at 4 months and 3.8% of patients shed SARS-CoV-2 at  
60 7 months post diagnosis. Whereas there was no evidence of ongoing oropharyngeal  
61 virus shedding at this time. Additionally, one study suggested that fecal SARS-CoV-2  
62 RNA shedding may start 3-4 days before the onset of the symptoms (5), indicating that  
63 the duration of SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding may be even longer.

64 Many studies have observed significant correlations between the SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
65 concentration in wastewater and the number of confirmed COVID-19 cases reported in  
66 the corresponding wastewater catchment areas (6-12), which highlights the application  
67 of WBE to monitor the burden of viral infection in the population. Other studies have  
68 attempted to use SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding levels as parameters in models to predict  
69 the prevalence or incidence of COVID-19 in communities (8, 13, 14). Predicting  
70 prevalence or incidence in the population is critical for public health decision-making.  
71 This application has been explored via several statistical modeling approaches (14-16);  
72 However, using modeling to accurately predict COVID-19 prevalence or incidence in  
73 populations from SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater requires longitudinal and  
74 quantitative SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding data. To date, there have been several reports

75 on SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding, but many studies lack longitudinal samples,  
76 quantitative SARS-CoV-2 concentrations (report Ct values rather than absolute  
77 quantification) in stool, accurate timing of when the samples were collected after the  
78 onset of symptoms, specific amount of fecal material used for viral quantification, and  
79 the limit of detection of the assay used for viral quantification, etc. This missing  
80 information in fecal shedding data limits the appropriate application of the models and  
81 the interpretation of WBE modeling results.

82 Pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV) and human mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) are two  
83 human fecal indicators which are often analyzed along with SARS-CoV-2 quantification  
84 in wastewater samples, and both are used for normalization of SARS-CoV-2  
85 concentrations in wastewater. PMMoV, a plant RNA virus that causes infection in  
86 pepper crops, is excreted in high concentrations in human fecal material if people  
87 consume food products containing infected peppers. Up to  $10^9$  virion particles of  
88 PMMoV have been reported per gram of human feces by dry weight (17). Because of its  
89 abundance in human stool, persistence in the environment, and multiple exposure  
90 pathways to humans, PMMoV is frequently reported as a human fecal indicator in WBE  
91 studies (18, 19). Human mtDNA is exclusively human in origin and highly abundant in  
92 human feces. However, it is less frequently reported (20, 21) than PMMoV and is  
93 potentially a new, reliable human fecal indicator. This marker has been detected in high  
94 copy numbers in 100% of human fecal specimens across multiple geographic regions  
95 (22) and in 92% of sewage samples (23).

96 The objective of this study was to examine the fecal shedding dynamics of SARS-CoV-2  
97 RNA, PMMoV, and mtDNA in longitudinal fecal samples collected from confirmed

98 COVID-19 inpatient and outpatient participants. The results can be used to better  
99 predict COVID-19 prevalence or incidence in communities using mathematical modeling  
100 and guide interpretation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in wastewater samples using WBE  
101 approaches.

102

## 103 **2. MATERIALS and METHODS**

### 104 **2.1. Study Description and Stool Sample Collection**

105 Study participants were recruited from the inpatient clinic at Emory University Hospital  
106 between March 21, 2021 and September 21, 2021 and the outpatient clinic by the Hope  
107 Clinic of Emory Vaccine Center between September 22, 2021 and July 28 2022. All  
108 participants were required to sign an informed consent. In addition, information on  
109 demographics, clinical symptoms, and COVID-19 vaccination was also collected.  
110 COVID-19 patients were enrolled as study participants if an in-house real-time RT-PCR  
111 test detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in their nasopharyngeal swab samples or other  
112 commercial assays (e.g., antigen test) showed SARS-CoV-2 antigen in their saliva  
113 specimens within 7 days after the onset of COVID-19 symptoms. Participants with any  
114 behavioral, cognitive, or psychiatric condition were excluded from the enrollment. The  
115 day with SARS-CoV-2 positive detection was considered the COVID-19 confirmation  
116 date in this study. The first stool sample was collected after the participant was enrolled,  
117 usually within 7 days after the confirmation date. The date of the first stool sample  
118 collection was defined as Day 1, and subsequent samples were collected on Days 3, 7,  
119 14, 28, and 42 from the first stool sample for each subject. The sampling day was  
120 converted to the day of COVID-19 confirmation for data analysis and visualization

121 purposes. Stool collection kits were provided to study participants. For inpatients, stool  
122 samples were picked up from the hospital room and there was usually no delay. For  
123 outpatients, stool collection kits were shipped to the home address, and study  
124 participants were asked to ship samples back to the Emory study lab using prepaid  
125 mailers. These samples were usually delayed for shipment and may not have been  
126 kept all the way in the cold chain. Once received by the study lab, the samples were  
127 immediately stored at -80°C prior to nucleic acid extraction and RT-qPCR detection.

## 128 **2.2. Fecal Sample Processing and Nucleic Acid Extraction.**

129 Stool samples were processed by the physical disruption method of bead lysing  
130 followed by total nucleic acid extraction with an automated purification platform, Qiagen  
131 EZ1 Advanced XL (Qiagen, #9001875). First, fecal specimens were thawed on ice from  
132 -80°C. Each specimen was precisely weighed on an analytical balance, ranging  
133 between 27.0 mg to 33.1 mg, into a 2.0 mL pre-filled 0.7 mm garnet bead tube (Omni  
134 International, #19-624). Then, 600 µL of Qiagen PowerBead solution (Qiagen, #12955-  
135 4-BS) was added to each wet sample. Specimens were immediately mixed on a Bead  
136 Genie (Scientific Industries Inc, #SI-B100) at 3,000 rpm for 2 minutes, which introduces  
137 physical agitation resulting in the lysing of the sample matrix and homogenizing the  
138 sample. A 200 µL aliquot of lysate was added to 5,000 genome copies (10 µL) of  
139 Bovine Respiratory Syncytial Virus (BRSV) (INFORCE 3, Zoetis, Parsippany, NJ) and  
140 processed by the Qiagen EZ1 Advanced XL with the Qiagen EZ1 DSP virus kit (Qiagen,  
141 # 62724) and Qiagen EZ1 Advanced DSP Virus Card (Qiagen, #9018306). BRSV  
142 served as an internal processing control during the concentration and extraction  
143 procedures. Total nucleic acids were extracted by a Zymo Research OneStep™ PCR

144 Inhibitor Removal kit (Zymo Research, #D6030). A Zymo-Spin™ III-HRC Column  
145 (Zyme Research, #C1005) was used for each sample as per the manufacturer's  
146 instructions. We inserted the column into a collection tube and added 600 µL of Prep-  
147 Solution. Then, we centrifuged the column at 8,000 × g for 3 minutes. The prepared  
148 column was transferred to a clean 1.5 ml microcentrifuge tube, and 60 µL of RNA was  
149 added to the Zymo-Spin™ III-HRC Column. The sample was then centrifuged at 16,000  
150 × g for 3 minutes. Total nucleic acid was collected and stored at 80°C. To estimate the  
151 dry weight, each fecal sample was weighed, placed onto an aluminum weigh boat,  
152 incubated at 105-110°C for 24 hours, and re-weighed after incubation.

153 The dry weight percent for the calculation of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations per mass of  
154 dry weight was calculated using the following formula:

155  $[1 - (\text{wet mass of fecal material} - \text{dry mass of fecal material}) / \text{wet mass of fecal material}]$   
156  $\times 100\%$

### 157 **2.3. Quantification of SARS-CoV-2, PMMoV, and mtDNA in Stool Samples using** 158 **dPCR**

159 Digital PCR was performed using the QIAcuity Digital PCR System and QIAcuity  
160 OneStep Advanced Probe Kit (Qiagen, #250132) following the manufacturer's protocol.  
161 The Qiagen QIAcuity instrument was programmed using the following parameters.  
162 Reverse transcription was set at 50°C for 40 minutes for 1 cycle followed by PCR initial  
163 heat activation at 95°C for 2 minutes. The PCR was repeated for 45 cycles at 95°C for 5  
164 seconds, and at 50°C for 30 seconds. One triplex PCR was used to quantify PMMoV,  
165 BRSV, and N1 (nucleocapsid gene) of SARS-CoV-2, while mtDNA was quantified in a

166 singleplex assay. For the triplex PCR assay, each 40- $\mu$ L reaction contained 10  $\mu$ L of 4 $\times$   
167 One-step Advanced Probe Master Mix, 0.4  $\mu$ L of 100 $\times$  OneStep RT Mix, 2  $\mu$ L of each  
168 16 $\times$  primer-probe mix of PMMoV, BRSV, and N1, 5  $\mu$ L of nucleic acid extract, and 18.6  
169  $\mu$ L of RNase-free water. For the mtDNA singleplex master mix, each 40- $\mu$ L reaction  
170 contained 10  $\mu$ L of 4 $\times$  One-step Advanced Probe Master Mix, 0.4  $\mu$ L of 100 $\times$  OneStep  
171 RT Mix, 2  $\mu$ L of 16 $\times$  primer-probe mix of mtDNA, 5  $\mu$ L of 1:100 diluted nucleic acid  
172 extract, and 22.6  $\mu$ L of RNase-free water. The master mix was pipetted into a QIAGEN  
173 QIAcuity 24 well 26k partition nanoplate.

## 174 **2.4. Data Analysis and Statistics**

175 We performed data analysis using R program (version 4.0.1). A logistic regression  
176 model was used to study the association between SARS-CoV-2 positivity and other  
177 variables including inpatient, outpatient, days after COVID-19 was confirmed, PMMoV,  
178 and mtDNA concentration. The Pearson correlation was used to estimate the  
179 association between  $\log_{10}$ -transformed PMMoV and mtDNA concentrations.

## 180 **3. RESULTS**

181

### 182 **3.1. Participant Description**

183 A total of 42 subjects with confirmed COVID-19 were enrolled in this study, and 155  
184 fecal samples were collected throughout the 42-day follow-up period. Most of these  
185 subjects, 61.9% (26/42), were inpatients, and 38.1% (16/42) were outpatients. Most  
186 participants manifested severe clinical symptoms if hospitalized (inpatients), while  
187 outpatient participants usually had mild symptoms. The self-reported COVID-19  
188 vaccination status indicated that 66.7% (28/42) were vaccinated (received at least one



189 dose of COVID-19 vaccine and had a breakthrough infection) and 33.3% (14/42) were  
190 unvaccinated. Among these subjects, only 14.3% (6/42) were  $\geq 65$  years old (Table 1).

### 191 **3.2. COVID-19 Clinical Symptoms**

192 To compare the clinical course of infections of vaccinated and unvaccinated  
193 participants, clinical symptoms relevant to COVID-19 infection were assessed. Cough,  
194 diarrhea, fever, loss of smell, and shortness of breath were more frequently observed in  
195 unvaccinated subjects than in vaccinated subjects. Frequencies of headache and  
196 myalgia fatigue were higher in vaccinated and in unvaccinated groups. When inpatients  
197 and outpatients were compared, inpatients were much more likely to report cough,  
198 diarrhea, and fever than outpatients while outpatients tended to have more symptoms of  
199 headache, loss of smell, myalgia and fatigue. These differences may be caused by the  
200 small number of subjects in both groups (Table 2).

### 201 **3.3. Longitudinal SARS-CoV-2 Fecal Shedding**

202 The SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding patterns for each inpatient and outpatient study  
203 subject are shown in Figure 1. SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in at least one of the  
204 fecal samples collected during the sampling period for 73.1% (19/26) of inpatient  
205 participants. Most SARS-CoV-2 RNA-positive samples were collected within two weeks  
206 of COVID-19 diagnosis. Five inpatients still shed the virus in their stools after two  
207 weeks, and one inpatient had detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA in a stool sample at 59  
208 days after COVID-19 diagnosis. For the 71 fecal samples collected from inpatients,  
209 47.9% (34/71) had SARS-CoV-2 N1 gene measurements above the limit of detection of  
210 our PCR assay. In contrast, outpatients showed a different fecal shedding pattern. Only  
211 7.1% of 84 fecal samples collected from 16 outpatients were SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
212 positive, and all of these came from four study subjects. The low proportion of SARS-

213 CoV-2 positive stool samples from outpatients may be due to delays in sample  
214 collection. Interestingly, all four outpatient subjects with positive SARS-CoV-2 stool  
215 samples were intermittent shedders and were excreting the virus at three or more  
216 weeks after infection was confirmed.

### 217 **3.4. SARS-CoV-2 RNA Concentrations in Fecal Specimens**

218 Concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in stool samples ranged from  $4.5 \times 10^3$  genome  
219 copies (GC)/dry gram to  $1.19 \times 10^9$  GC/dry gram with a median of  $1.08 \times 10^5$  GC/dry gram.  
220 For the 34 fecal samples from inpatients that tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA, the  
221 median concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was  $1.35 \times 10^5$  GC/dry gram. For the six  
222 fecal samples from outpatient participants that tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA,  
223 the median concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was  $9.11 \times 10^3$  GC/dry gram (Figure 2,  
224 bottom left). Both the SARS-CoV-2 detection rates in stool samples and the mean virus  
225 RNA  $\log_{10}$  concentrations in stool were significantly different in samples from inpatients  
226 versus outpatients ( $p < 0.001$  and  $p = 0.003$ , respectively).

### 227 **3.5. Fecal Shedding Among Vaccinated (Breakthrough) and Unvaccinated** 228 **Participants**

229 There was little difference in the detection rates and concentrations of SARS-CoV-2  
230 RNA in fecal samples from study subjects with different COVID-19 vaccination status.  
231 For the 28 vaccinated participants, 53.6% (15/28) of vaccinated participants shed  
232 SARS-CoV-2 in at least one of the fecal specimens collected during the study period,  
233 and 26.2% (28/107) fecal samples from vaccinated participants were SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
234 positive with a median concentration of  $1.08 \times 10^5$  GC/dry gram. There were 14  
235 participants who reported that they were unvaccinated, and 8 of them (57.1%) had  
236 evidence of SARS-CoV-2 shedding in at least one of the collected fecal samples. Of the

237 48 fecal samples collected from unvaccinated participants, 25.0% (12/48) fecal samples  
238 from unvaccinated participants were positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA and the median  
239 concentration was  $9.14 \times 10^4$  GC/dry gram (Figure 2, bottom right).

### 240 **3.6. PMMoV Detection in Fecal Samples**

241 PMMoV was analyzed in each fecal sample by dPCR on the same day as the SARS-  
242 CoV-2 dPCR to observe the biological variability of this fecal indicator within and  
243 between individuals over the sampling period. Almost all (99.4%, 154/155) of the fecal  
244 samples in this study had detectable PMMoV. The median concentration of PMMoV  
245 RNA was  $1.73 \times 10^7$  GC/dry gram. PMMoV RNA concentrations were highly variable over  
246 the sampling period within and between the individual study subjects. Some individuals  
247 showed relatively consistent concentrations of PMMoV RNA in their longitudinal  
248 samples; while for others the PMMoV RNA concentrations varied across several orders  
249 of magnitude among all the samples from an individual. The lowest PMMoV  
250 concentration was 790 GC/dry gram, and the highest concentration was  $3.51 \times 10^9$   
251 GC/dry gram (Figure 3).

### 252 **3.7. Human mtDNA Detection in Fecal Samples**

253 Human mtDNA, another fecal indicator, was analyzed in all the collected fecal samples.  
254 All 155 samples (100%) tested positive for mtDNA, and the median concentration of  
255 mtDNA in all positive samples was  $2.49 \times 10^8$  GC/dry gram. The concentration of mtDNA  
256 ranged between  $8.22 \times 10^6$  GC/dry gram and  $3.88 \times 10^{10}$  GC/dry gram. In contrast to  
257 PMMoV, the mtDNA concentration in stool was more consistent both between and  
258 within the study subjects over the study period (Figure 4).

### 259 **3.8. Correlation between PMMoV and mtDNA**

260 Pearson correlation analysis was performed to examine the association between  
261 PMMoV and mtDNA concentrations, the two human fecal markers measured in the  
262 fecal samples in this study. Figure 5 indicated a weak correlation ( $p = 0.16$ ) between the  
263 concentrations of these two markers. Interestingly, mean  $\log_{10}$  PMMoV concentration  
264 was significantly higher ( $p < 0.001$ ) in fecal specimens from outpatients compared to  
265 those from inpatients.

#### 266 267 **4. DISCUSSION**

268 In this study, we describe frequency, duration, and concentration of SARS-CoV-2,  
269 PMMoV, and mtDNA shedding in fecal specimens from inpatient and outpatient study  
270 subjects with COVID-19 over a 42 day period after the confirmation of SARS-CoV-2  
271 infection. Consistent with other reports (24-26), study subjects who had been  
272 vaccinated but had breakthrough infections were less likely to exhibit some clinical  
273 symptoms, such as cough, diarrhea, fever, loss of smell, loss of taste, and shortness of  
274 breath, compared to unvaccinated study subjects. Inpatient participants were more  
275 likely to be shedding SARS-CoV-2 RNA in their fecal specimens and had higher  
276 concentrations of the virus in their stool compared to outpatient participants. These  
277 results provide important information about the dynamics of the fecal shedding of  
278 SARS-CoV-2 and two human fecal indicators. Understanding the presence, magnitude,  
279 and duration of these targets of interest is critical for the broad application of WBE and  
280 interpretation of WBE results.

281 Although several cross-sectional studies have reported SARS-CoV-2 fecal shedding in  
282 patients with COVID-19 at the early stage of infection, little is known about longitudinal  
283 SARS-CoV-2 shedding. In this study, we observed that 73.1% (19/26) inpatients shed

284 SARS-CoV-2 up to three weeks and 19.2% (5/26) inpatients continued to shed viruses  
285 beyond day 20; however only 25.0% (4/16) outpatients shed viruses after three weeks  
286 of diagnosis. In contrast, the study led by Natarajan et al.,(3) included a total of 113  
287 individuals diagnosed with COVID-19 who were followed for up to 10 months. They  
288 reported that 49.2% of fecal specimens tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 during the week  
289 following diagnosis using PCR-based methods, with the positivity rate declining to  
290 12.7% at 4 months and 3.8% at 7 months after diagnosis. Another study reported the  
291 fecal shedding results from 48 SARS-CoV-2 infected individuals and observed that  
292 approximately 80% of the fecal samples collected within the first 5 days were positive  
293 for SARS-CoV-2, and this positivity rate dropped to 10% at 28 days after symptom  
294 onset. A median concentration of three orders GC of magnitude/mg dry weight was  
295 reported in positive fecal samples (27), which is one order GC of magnitude higher  
296 compared to this study.

297 Normalizing SARS-CoV-2 concentrations measured in wastewater with a human fecal  
298 indicator is a common practice in order to adjust for factors that may contribute to the  
299 variability in SARS-CoV-2 concentrations from distinct catchment areas and the  
300 recovery of the virus from wastewater with different methods. Several fecal indicators,  
301 including human ribonuclease P (37), PMMoV (38), Bacteroides HF183 (39); F-specific  
302 RNA bacteriophages (40), human 18S rRNA (41), cross-assembly phage (CrAssphage)  
303 (42), have been proposed. Among these recommended fecal indicators, PMMoV is  
304 widely used. PMMoV is a plant RNA virus associated with pepper products and human  
305 diet (17, 38). The presence and magnitude of PMMoV RNA in biological and  
306 environmental samples are varied due to the geographic and dietary variations between

307 populations and individuals. These variations may complicate the application of PMMoV  
308 as a normalizing indicator in some situations, such as countries with less consumption  
309 of plants and pepper products. Although PMMoV has been consistently detected in  
310 wastewater and has been proposed as a normalization indicator, there are few reports  
311 characterizing PMMoV detection in human fecal samples. Additionally, high  
312 concentrations of PMMoV have been detected in non-human fecal samples, such as  
313 chickens and seagulls (43, 44), indicating that PMMoV is not human-specific and  
314 detection of PMMoV in wastewater may originate from other non-human sources, eg.,  
315 livestock and wildlife. Therefore, accurate characterization of the frequency of detection  
316 and quantification of PMMoV in human fecal samples provides critical information for  
317 better application of this marker as a normalization control in WBE. In this study,  
318 PMMoV was detected in 99.4% fecal samples, with a median concentration of  $1.73 \times 10^7$   
319 GC/dry gram. The PMMoV concentrations measured in this study are similar to those  
320 reported in one recent publication that also quantified PMMoV in human stool samples  
321 using digital PCR and reported dry mass concentrations (27). In concordance with their  
322 results, we observed significant variations of PMMoV concentrations between and  
323 within individuals throughout the sampling period. This suggests that PMMoV levels in  
324 human fecal materials may be affected by an individual's daily diet and lifestyle.

325 Human mtDNA is a human-specific intrinsic genetic marker for fecal source tracking.  
326 This marker is abundant in human feces and sewage which makes it a useful indicator  
327 of human fecal contamination for environmental microbial research and risk assessment  
328 applications (22, 23, 45, 46). There are limited reports on the use of mtDNA as a  
329 normalization control in SARS-CoV-2 wastewater studies. In this study, mtDNA was

330 detected in 100% fecal samples, with a median concentration of  $2.49 \times 10^8$  GC/dry gram.

331 Our mtDNA concentrations are within the range of mtDNA concentrations in human  
332 feces reported by other studies(45). Compared to PMMoV detection in human feces,  
333 mtDNA was detected in all the fecal specimens, was present at ten-fold higher  
334 concentrations, and exhibited little variability between and within individuals.

335 Furthermore, there are no non-human sources of this marker. These characteristics  
336 suggest that mtDNA may be better suited for use as a normalization factor for WBE  
337 results than PMMoV.

338 There are several limitations in this study. First, the sample size was small, with 42  
339 confirmed COVID-19 patients enrolled and 155 fecal samples collected. This population  
340 was not large enough to allow for stratification for further examination of the effects of  
341 some demographic variables on the fecal shedding of SARS-CoV-2. Second, the  
342 recruited subjects were from a limited geographic area, basically within the metro  
343 Atlanta area of Georgia. Therefore, the sample may not be representative of the US  
344 population, and the conclusions may not be generalizable. Third, the fecal samples  
345 were collected between March 21, 2021 and July 28, 2022, when the Delta and  
346 Omicron variants were prevalent. We do not know the shedding dynamics of other  
347 SARS-CoV-2 variants, and the small sample size did not allow us to compare the  
348 shedding dynamics of the Delta versus Omicron variants. Fourth, outpatient participants  
349 had much lower proportion of SARS-CoV-2 positive fecal specimens than inpatient  
350 participants in this study, and surprisingly, all the fecal samples from outpatient study  
351 subjects were negative for SARS-CoV-2 within the first three weeks of COVID-19  
352 diagnosis. The low SARS-CoV-2 detection rate in fecal specimens from outpatient

353 participants may be due to the delays between subject enrollment and stool sample  
354 collection and possible mishandling during storage and shipment from the participants'  
355 homes to the research laboratory. In contrast, fecal specimens from inpatient  
356 participants were collected earlier in the course of infection and stored under optimum  
357 conditions until analysis. Despite these limitations, the quantitative measurements of  
358 SARS-CoV-2, PMMoV, and mtDNA in longitudinal fecal samples from confirmed  
359 COVID-19 patients have significant relevance to our understanding of COVID-19  
360 epidemiology, and the SARS-CoV-2 shedding information addresses a critical  
361 knowledge gap for the advancement of WBE and the use of wastewater monitoring data  
362 for SARS-CoV-2 to estimate COVID-19 prevalence and incidence in specific catchment  
363 populations.

## 364 **5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

365 This study was supported by the NIH Rapid Acceleration of Diagnostics (RADx)  
366 initiative (contract No. 75N92021C00012 to Ceres Nanosciences, Inc) through a  
367 contract from Ceres Nanosciences to Emory University. We are grateful to Salvins J.  
368 Strods, Shawn Mulvaney, Chipso Chemoyo J. Baker Afamefuna, and Jenica Patterson  
369 with the NIH RADx Initiative, and Ross Dunlap, Robbie Barbero, and Ben Lepene from  
370 Ceres Nanosciences, Inc.

371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380



381  
382  
383  
384

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of 42 Study Participants

	Yes (%)
Male	17 (40.5)
Inpatient	26 (61.9)
Vaccinated	28 (66.7)
White	24 (57.1)
Hispanic or Latin	1 (2.4)
Age (≥65 years old)	6 (14.3)

385  
386  
387

388 Table 2. Symptoms Among Patients Participants

Symptom	Vaccination Status		Admission Status	
	Vaccinated (N=28) %	Unvaccinated (N=14) %	Inpatient (N=26) %	Outpatient (N=16) %
Cough	35.7	71.4	61.9	18.8
Diarrhea	7.1	28.6	14.3	6.2
Fever	28.6	42.9	47.6	12.5
Headache	35.7	21.4	19.0	43.8
Loss of smell	17.9	21.4	19.0	31.2
Loss of taste	14.3	14.3	19.0	25.0
Myalgia/fatigue	60.7	50.0	47.6	75.0
Shortness of Breath	46.4	57.1	52.4	50.0
Other symptoms	21.4	0	23.8	18.8
ICU* stay	4.0	0	4.8	0

389 \*Intensive care unit  
390

391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
  
422  
  
423  
  
424  
  
425  
  
426  
427  
428

Figure 1. SARS-CoV-2 RNA longitudinal shedding dynamics in stool samples of COVID-19 patients in this study. The patient IDs are shown on the y-axis. The x-axis indicates days after COVID-19 diagnosis was confirmed. Patients 001–031 were enrolled as inpatients, and patients 035–074 were enrolled as outpatients. Three patients with unclear confirmation dates were excluded from this figure. Red circles indicate positive SARS-CoV-2 detection, and blue circles indicate the sample was negative for SARS-CoV-2 RNA by dPCR.

Figure 2. Boxplot of  $\log_{10}$ -transformed SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations (genome copies/dry gram, y-axis) in 155 fecal samples from inpatients vs. outpatients, based on status when enrolled, (bottom left, x-axis) and 146 fecal samples from vaccinated vs. unvaccinated study subjects (bottom right, x-axis). The horizontal lines in boxes denote the 50<sup>th</sup> percentiles of SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations. The top boxes represent the fraction of SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive samples in each group.

Figure 3. Boxplot of  $\log_{10}$ -transformed PMMoV concentration (genome copies/dry gram) in inpatient (top) and outpatient (bottom) study subjects. Each box summarizes the range of PMMoV concentrations in multiple fecal samples from an individual, and the vertical line in the box represents the median PMMoV concentration. The vertical line without the box indicates only one sample was tested for PMMoV for that individual.

429 Figure 4. Boxplot of  $\log_{10}$ -transformed mtDNA concentration (GC/dry gram) in inpatient (top) and  
430 outpatient (bottom) study subjects. Each box summarizes the range of mtDNA concentrations in  
431 multiple fecal samples from an individual, and the vertical line in the box represents the median  
432 mtDNA concentration. The vertical line without the box indicates only one sample was tested for  
433 mtDNA for that individual.  
434

435

436  
437 Figure 5. Pearson correlation between  $\log_{10}$ -transformed PMMoV RNA and mtDNA  
438 concentrations (GC/dry gram) from fecal samples of inpatients (green) and outpatients (red) in  
439 this study.  
440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

459

459

459

## 460 References

- 461 1. Cheung KS, Hung IFN, Chan PPY, Lung KC, Tso E, Liu R, Ng YY, Chu MY, Chung  
462 TWH, Tam AR, Yip CCY, Leung KH, Fung AY, Zhang RR, Lin Y, Cheng HM, Zhang  
463 AJX, To KKW, Chan KH, Yuen KY, Leung WK. 2020. Gastrointestinal Manifestations of  
464 SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Virus Load in Fecal Samples From a Hong Kong Cohort:  
465 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology* 159:81-95.
- 466 2. Zhou JQ, Liu GX, Huang XL, Gan HT. 2022. The importance of fecal nucleic acid  
467 detection in patients with coronavirus disease (COVID-19): A systematic review and  
468 meta-analysis. *J Med Virol* 94:2317-2330.
- 469 3. Natarajan A, Zlitni S, Brooks EF, Vance SE, Dahlen A, Hedlin H, Park RM, Han A,  
470 Schmidtke DT, Verma R, Jacobson KB, Parsonnet J, Bonilla HF, Singh U, Pinsky BA,  
471 Andrews JR, Jagannathan P, Bhatt AS. 2022. Gastrointestinal symptoms and fecal  
472 shedding of SARS-CoV-2 RNA suggest prolonged gastrointestinal infection. *Med* 3:371-  
473 387 e9.
- 474 4. Yuan C, Wang H, Li K, Tang A, Dai Y, Wu B, Zhang H, Chen J, Liu J, Wu W, Gu S,  
475 Wang H, Xu H, Wu M, Yu M, Wang Y, Yu X, He J, Liu S, Zhang Y, Tong Z, Yan J. 2021.  
476 SARS-CoV-2 viral shedding characteristics and potential evidence for the priority for  
477 faecal specimen testing in diagnosis. *PLoS One* 16:e0247367.
- 478 5. Jones DL, Baluja MQ, Graham DW, Corbishley A, McDonald JE, Malham SK, Hillary LS,  
479 Connor TR, Gaze WH, Moura IB, Wilcox MH, Farkas K. 2020. Shedding of SARS-CoV-2  
480 in feces and urine and its potential role in person-to-person transmission and the  
481 environment-based spread of COVID-19. *Sci Total Environ* 749:141364.
- 482 6. Nemudryi A, Nemudraia A, Wiegand T, Surya K, Buyukyoruk M, Cicha C, Vanderwood  
483 KK, Wilkinson R, Wiedenheft B. 2020. Temporal Detection and Phylogenetic  
484 Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Wastewater. *Cell Rep Med* 1:100098.
- 485 7. Roka E, Khayer B, Kis Z, Kovacs LB, Schuler E, Magyar N, Malnasi T, Oravecz O, Palyi  
486 B, Pandics T, Vargha M. 2021. Ahead of the second wave: Early warning for COVID-19  
487 by wastewater surveillance in Hungary. *Sci Total Environ* 786:147398.
- 488 8. Li X, Zhang S, Sherchan S, Orive G, Lertxundi U, Haramoto E, Honda R, Kumar M,  
489 Arora S, Kitajima M, Jiang G. 2023. Correlation between SARS-CoV-2 RNA  
490 concentration in wastewater and COVID-19 cases in community: A systematic review  
491 and meta-analysis. *J Hazard Mater* 441:129848.
- 492 9. Lu E, Ai Y, Davis A, Straathof J, Halloran K, Hull N, Winston R, Weir MH, Soller J,  
493 Bohrerova Z, Oglesbee M, Lee J. 2022. Wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in  
494 dormitories as a part of comprehensive university campus COVID-19 monitoring.  
495 *Environ Res* 212:113580.
- 496 10. Brooks YM, Gryskwicz B, Sidaway E, Shelley B, Coroi L, Downing M, Downing T,  
497 McDonnell S, Ostrye D, Hoop K, Parrish G. 2023. A case study of a community-  
498 organized wastewater surveillance in a small community: correlating weekly reported  
499 COVID-19 cases with SARS-CoV-2 RNA concentrations during fall 2020 to summer  
500 2021 in Yarmouth, ME. *J Water Health* 21:329-342.
- 501 11. Acosta N, Bautista MA, Hollman J, McC Calder J, Beaudet AB, Man L, Waddell BJ, Chen  
502 J, Li C, Kuzma D, Bhatnagar S, Leal J, Meddings J, Hu J, Cabaj JL, Ruecker NJ,  
503 Naugler C, Pillai DR, Achari G, Ryan MC, Conly JM, Frankowski K, Hubert CR, Parkins  
504 MD. 2021. A multicenter study investigating SARS-CoV-2 in tertiary-care hospital  
505 wastewater. viral burden correlates with increasing hospitalized cases as well as  
506 hospital-associated transmissions and outbreaks. *Water Res* 201:117369.
- 507 12. Ai Y, Davis A, Jones D, Lemeshow S, Tu H, He F, Ru P, Pan X, Bohrerova Z, Lee J.  
508 2021. Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 monitoring as a community-level COVID-19 trend  
509 tracker and variants in Ohio, United States. *Sci Total Environ* 801:149757.

- 510 13. McMahan CS, Lewis D, Deaver JA, Dean D, Rennert L, Kalbaugh CA, Shi L, Kriebel D,  
511 Graves D, Popat SC, Karanfil T, Freedman DL. 2022. Predicting COVID-19 Infected  
512 Individuals in a Defined Population from Wastewater RNA Data. *ACS ES T Water*  
513 2:2225-2232.
- 514 14. Joseph-Duran B, Serra-Compte A, Sarrias M, Gonzalez S, Lopez D, Prats C, Catala M,  
515 Alvarez-Lacalle E, Alonso S, Arnaldos M. 2022. Assessing wastewater-based  
516 epidemiology for the prediction of SARS-CoV-2 incidence in Catalonia. *Sci Rep*  
517 12:15073.
- 518 15. McMahan CS, Self S, Rennert L, Kalbaugh C, Kriebel D, Graves D, Colby C, Deaver JA,  
519 Popat SC, Karanfil T, Freedman DL. 2021. COVID-19 wastewater epidemiology: a  
520 model to estimate infected populations. *Lancet Planet Health* 5:e874-e881.
- 521 16. Proverbio D, Kemp F, Magni S, Ogorzaly L, Cauchie HM, Goncalves J, Skupin A, Aalto  
522 A. 2022. Model-based assessment of COVID-19 epidemic dynamics by wastewater  
523 analysis. *Sci Total Environ* 827:154235.
- 524 17. Zhang T, Breitbart M, Lee WH, Run JQ, Wei CL, Soh SW, Hibberd ML, Liu ET, Rohwer  
525 F, Ruan Y. 2006. RNA viral community in human feces: prevalence of plant pathogenic  
526 viruses. *PLoS Biol* 4:e3.
- 527 18. Maal-Bared R, Qiu Y, Li Q, Gao T, Hrudey SE, Bhavanam S, Ruecker NJ, Ellehoj E, Lee  
528 BE, Pang X. 2023. Does normalization of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations by Pepper Mild  
529 Mottle Virus improve correlations and lead time between wastewater surveillance and  
530 clinical data in Alberta (Canada): comparing twelve SARS-CoV-2 normalization  
531 approaches. *Sci Total Environ* 856:158964.
- 532 19. Ahmed W, Bivins A, Payyappat S, Cassidy M, Harrison N, Besley C. 2022. Distribution  
533 of human fecal marker genes and their association with pathogenic viruses in untreated  
534 wastewater determined using quantitative PCR. *Water Res* 226:119093.
- 535 20. Hajj-Mohamad M, Hachad M, Deschamps G, Sauve S, Villemur R, Blais MA, Prevost M,  
536 Dorner S. 2019. Fecal contamination of storm sewers: Evaluating wastewater  
537 micropollutants, human-specific *Bacteroides* 16S rRNA, and mitochondrial DNA genetic  
538 markers as alternative indicators of sewer cross connections. *Sci Total Environ* 659:548-  
539 560.
- 540 21. Ragot R, Villemur R. 2022. Influence of temperature and water quality on the  
541 persistence of human mitochondrial DNA, human Hf183 *Bacteroidales*, fecal coliforms  
542 and enterococci in surface water in human fecal source tracking context. *Sci Total*  
543 *Environ* 838:156025.
- 544 22. Zhu K, Suttner B, Pickering A, Konstantinidis KT, Brown J. 2020. A novel droplet digital  
545 PCR human mtDNA assay for fecal source tracking. *Water Res* 183:116085.
- 546 23. Tanvir Pasha ABM, Hinojosa J, Phan D, Lopez A, Kapoor V. 2020. Detection of human  
547 fecal pollution in environmental waters using human mitochondrial DNA and correlation  
548 with general and human-associated fecal genetic markers. *J Water Health* 18:8-18.
- 549 24. Bajpai J, Kant S, Verma A, Patwa AK, Atam V, Chaudhary SC, Pandey A. 2022. The  
550 Severity of COVID 19 Pneumonia in Vaccinated vs. Non-vaccinated Patients in the  
551 Second Wave: An Experience From a Tertiary Care Center in India. *Cureus* 14:e25378.
- 552 25. Nakakubo S, Kishida N, Okuda K, Kamada K, Iwama M, Suzuki M, Yokota I, Ito YM,  
553 Nasuhara Y, Boucher RC, Konno S. 2023. Associations of COVID-19 symptoms with  
554 omicron subvariants BA.2 and BA.5, host status, and clinical outcomes in Japan: a  
555 registry-based observational study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 23:1244-1256.
- 556 26. Tian W, Ren X, Han M, Zhang Y, Gao X, Chen Z, Zhang W. 2022. Epidemiological and  
557 clinical characteristics of vaccinated COVID-19 patients: A meta-analysis and systematic  
558 review. *Int J Immunopathol Pharmacol* 36:3946320221141802.
- 559 27. Arts PJ, Kelly JD, Midgley CM, Anglin K, Lu S, Abedi GR, Andino R, Bakker KM,  
560 Banman B, Boehm AB, Briggs-Hagen M, Brouwer AF, Davidson MC, Eisenberg MC,

- 561 Garcia-Knight M, Knight S, Peluso MJ, Pineda-Ramirez J, Diaz Sanchez R, Saydah S,  
562 Tassetto M, Martin JN, Wigginton KR. 2023. Longitudinal and quantitative fecal shedding  
563 dynamics of SARS-CoV-2, pepper mild mottle virus, and crAssphage. *mSphere*  
564 8:e0013223.
- 565 28. Xiao F, Sun J, Xu Y, Li F, Huang X, Li H, Zhao J, Huang J, Zhao J. 2020. Infectious  
566 SARS-CoV-2 in Feces of Patient with Severe COVID-19. *Emerg Infect Dis* 26:1920-  
567 1922.
- 568 29. Jeong HW, Kim SM, Kim HS, Kim YI, Kim JH, Cho JY, Kim SH, Kang H, Kim SG, Park  
569 SJ, Kim EH, Choi YK. 2020. Viable SARS-CoV-2 in various specimens from COVID-19  
570 patients. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 26:1520-1524.
- 571 30. Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, Tan W. 2020. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in  
572 Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA* 323:1843-1844.
- 573 31. Zhang YN, Zhang QY, Li XD, Xiong J, Xiao SQ, Wang Z, Zhang ZR, Deng CL, Yang XL,  
574 Wei HP, Yuan ZM, Ye HQ, Zhang B. 2020. Gemcitabine, lycorine and oxysophoridine  
575 inhibit novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) in cell culture. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 9:1170-  
576 1173.
- 577 32. Wolfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Muller MA, Niemeyer D,  
578 Jones TC, Vollmar P, Rothe C, Hoelscher M, Bleicker T, Brunink S, Schneider J,  
579 Ehmann R, Zwirgmaier K, Drosten C, Wendtner C. 2020. Virological assessment of  
580 hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* 581:465-469.
- 581 33. Albert S, Ruiz A, Peman J, Salavert M, Domingo-Calap P. 2021. Lack of evidence for  
582 infectious SARS-CoV-2 in feces and sewage. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 40:2665-  
583 2667.
- 584 34. Britton GJ, Chen-Liaw A, Cossarini F, Livanos AE, Spindler MP, Plitt T, Eggers J, Mogno  
585 I, Gonzalez-Reiche AS, Siu S, Tankelevich M, Grinspan LT, Dixon RE, Jha D, van de  
586 Guchte A, Khan Z, Martinez-Delgado G, Amanat F, Hoagland DA, tenOever BR,  
587 Dubinsky MC, Merad M, van Bakel H, Krammer F, Bongers G, Mehandru S, Faith JJ.  
588 2021. Limited intestinal inflammation despite diarrhea, fecal viral RNA and SARS-CoV-2-  
589 specific IgA in patients with acute COVID-19. *Sci Rep* 11:13308.
- 590 35. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Kruger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S, Schiergens  
591 TS, Herrler G, Wu NH, Nitsche A, Muller MA, Drosten C, Pohlmann S. 2020. SARS-  
592 CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically  
593 Proven Protease Inhibitor. *Cell* 181:271-280 e8.
- 594 36. Maffia-Bizzozero S, Cevallos C, Lenicov FR, Freiburger RN, Lopez CAM, Guano  
595 Toaquiza A, Sviercz F, Jarmoluk P, Bustos C, D'Addario AC, Quarleri J, Delpino MV.  
596 2023. Viable SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sub-variants isolated from autopsy tissues. *Front*  
597 *Microbiol* 14:1192832.
- 598 37. Holm RH, Nagarkar M, Yeager RA, Talley D, Chaney AC, Rai JP, Mukherjee A, Rai SN,  
599 Bhatnagar A, Smith T. 2022. Surveillance of RNase P, PMMoV, and CrAssphage in  
600 wastewater as indicators of human fecal concentration across urban sewer  
601 neighborhoods, Kentucky. *FEMS Microbes* 3:1-12.
- 602 38. Hamza H, Rizk NM, Gad MA, Hamza IA. 2019. Pepper mild mottle virus in wastewater in  
603 Egypt: a potential indicator of wastewater pollution and the efficiency of the treatment  
604 process. *Arch Virol* 164:2707-2713.
- 605 39. Chettleburgh C, Ma SX, Swinwood-Sky M, McDougall H, Kireina D, Taggar G, McBean  
606 E, Parreira V, Goodridge L, Habash M. 2023. Evaluation of four human-associated fecal  
607 biomarkers in wastewater in Southern Ontario. *Sci Total Environ* 904:166542.
- 608 40. He Z, Dong L, Zhu P, Zhang Z, Xu T, Zhang D, Pan X. 2022. Nano-scale analysis of  
609 uranium release behavior from river sediment in the Ili basin. *Water Res* 227:119321.
- 610 41. Greenwald HD, Kennedy LC, Hinkle A, Whitney ON, Fan VB, Crits-Christoph A, Harris-  
611 Lovett S, Flamholz AI, Al-Shayeb B, Liao LD, Beyers M, Brown D, Chakrabarti AR, Dow



- 612 J, Frost D, Koekemoer M, Lynch C, Sarkar P, White E, Kantor R, Nelson KL. 2021.  
613 Tools for interpretation of wastewater SARS-CoV-2 temporal and spatial trends  
614 demonstrated with data collected in the San Francisco Bay Area. *Water Res X*  
615 12:100111.
- 616 42. Crank K, Li X, North D, Ferraro GB, Iaconelli M, Mancini P, La Rosa G, Bibby K. 2020.  
617 CrAssphage abundance and correlation with molecular viral markers in Italian  
618 wastewater. *Water Res* 184:116161.
- 619 43. Malla B, Makise K, Nakaya K, Mochizuki T, Yamada T, Haramoto E. 2019. Evaluation of  
620 Human- and Animal-Specific Viral Markers and Application of CrAssphage, Pepper Mild  
621 Mottle Virus, and Tobacco Mosaic Virus as Potential Fecal Pollution Markers to River  
622 Water in Japan. *Food Environ Virol* 11:446-452.
- 623 44. Rosario K, Symonds EM, Sinigalliano C, Stewart J, Breitbart M. 2009. Pepper mild  
624 mottle virus as an indicator of fecal pollution. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 75:7261-7.
- 625 45. Zhu KJ, Suttner B, Knee J, Capone D, Moe CL, Stauber CE, Konstantinidis KT, Wallach  
626 TE, Pickering AJ, Brown J. 2022. Elevated Fecal Mitochondrial DNA from Symptomatic  
627 Norovirus Infections Suggests Potential Health Relevance of Human Mitochondrial DNA  
628 in Fecal Source Tracking. *Environ Sci Technol Lett* 9:543-550.
- 629 46. He X, Liu P, Zheng G, Chen H, Shi W, Cui Y, Ren H, Zhang XX. 2016. Evaluation of five  
630 microbial and four mitochondrial DNA markers for tracking human and pig fecal pollution  
631 in freshwater. *Sci Rep* 6:35311.

632











