WASTEWATER SURVEILLANCE BEYOND COVID-19: A RANKING SYSTEM FOR COMMUNICABLE DISEASES TESTING IN THE TRI-COUNTY DETROIT AREA, MICHIGAN, USA

By

Zachary Gentry

A THESIS

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Environmental Engineering - Master of Science

ABSTRACT

Throughout the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, wastewater surveillance has been utilized to monitor the disease in the United States through routine national, statewide, and regional monitoring projects. Over this period, a significant canon of evidence was produced showing that wastewater surveillance is a credible and effective tool for disease monitoring. Hence, the application of wastewater surveillance can extend beyond monitoring SARS-CoV-2 to encompass a diverse range of emerging diseases, including those caused by viral, bacterial, parasitic, and fungal pathogens. This article proposed a ranking system for prioritizing reportable communicable diseases (termed CDs, hereafter) in the Tri-County Detroit Area (TCDA), Michigan, for future wastewater surveillance applications at the Great Lakes Water Authority's Water Reclamation Plant (GLWA's WRP). The comprehensive CD wastewater surveillance ranking system (termed "CDWSRank", hereafter) was developed based on reported incidence data from 2014 to 2021. The CDWSRank system includes 6 binary and 6 quantitative parameters. The final ranking scores of CDs were computed by summing the multiplication products of weighting factors for each parameter, and then were sorted based on decreasing priority. Disease incidence data from 2014 to 2021 were collected for the TCDA, including City of Detroit, as well as Wayne, Macomb, and Oakland Counties, served by the GLWA's WRP. Disease incidence trends in the TCDA were endowed with higher weights, creating overall ranking scores that prioritize the TCDA over the state of Michigan. The CDWSRank system can be easily adopted to geographical locations beyond the TCDA. The CDWSRank system is the first of its kind to provide an empirical approach to select CDs for wastewater surveillance, specifically in geographies served by centralized wastewater collection in the area of interest. treatment plant. Appropriate wastewater sample concentration methods are summarized for the application of wastewater surveillance to viral, bacterial, parasitic, and fungal pathogens of epidemiological importance, where the parasitic category is designated for pathogens caused by parasitic organisms, excluding fungal, bacterial, and viral pathogens.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	
2. MATERIALS AND METHODS	
3. RESULTS	7
4. DISCUSSION	
5. CONCLUSION	
REFERENCES	
APPENDIX A: FIGURES	
APPENDIX B: TABLES	

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, wastewater surveillance has been consistently applied to monitor severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) viral RNA worldwide (1–10). Wastewater surveillance epidemiology is a translation of the theory that human wastewater can serve as a representative community-composite sample to monitor fluctuations of disease incidence. A pathogen that can be detected in bodily fluids, including excreta, urine, sputum, and saliva, has the potential to be detected and thus, monitored (2,11–14). Wastewater surveillance and epidemiology has a diverse range of benefits, including (1) circumventing the need for mass clinical testing, (2) conserving health, economic, and societal resources, (3) providing unbiased and unspecific monitoring of disease incidence regardless of symptomatic or asymptomatic conditions, and (4) providing early warnings of impending disease surges (4,5,7,10,12,15). Wastewater surveillance has been extraordinarily successful at monitoring multiple pathogens, including SARS-CoV-2 (2,4-7,11,16), hepatitis A and hepatitis E (17), herpesviruses (18), poliovirus (19,20), and others. Despite its great potential, most wastewater disease monitoring to date has been limited to SARS-CoV-2. Notably, recent exceptions encompass poliovirus (21) and monkeypox virus (22-24). Thus, it is paramount that the adoption and integration of this scientifically-validated methodology is accelerated, particularly among emerging disease, neglected disease, or diseases of high outbreak potential.

Communicable diseases (CDs), for instance, tuberculosis (TB) and sexually transmitted infections (STIs), are among the leading causes of death and disability worldwide, according to the WHO (who.int). CDs are caused by microorganisms including bacteria, viruses, fungi, or various parasites that can be transmitted widely and quickly within human populations (25). Some infectious diseases are transmitted through "bites" from insect vectors, while others can be caused by ingesting contaminated food or water (who.int). The WHO, U.S. NIH, U.S. AID, U.S. CDC, and the international scientific community has long recognized the need to develop a comprehensive education, prediction, and prevention system for CDs (13,26,27).

A few studies have developed methodologies for ranking CD threats to the public (28, 29, 30). However, these systems have limitations and cannot be directly used by local health department to make decisions regarding appropriate targets for wastewater surveillance. Briefly, they relied heavily on subjective assessments of weights given by experts to multiple parameters.

They were lacking critical quantitative information such as incidence of diseases based on clinical data, and basic reproduction numbers of CDs. Besides, most parameters were assigned a value according to the Delphi Method, which consists of gathering expert opinions to weight a disease on a parameter then multiplied by a scale of numbers such as 1-5 (29) or 0-7 (31) in terms of level of importance.

The objective of this study is to develop a comprehensive communicable disease ranking system ("CDWSRank" system) that prioritizes CDs for wastewater surveillance (Fig. 1). To this end, we investigated 96 CDs in the Tri-County Detroit Area (TCDA), Michigan, Unites States, reported through the Michigan Disease Surveillance System (MDSS). All CDs were ranked through the CDWSRank system, which involved 2 categories of parameter: binary and quantitative. Binary parameters examine the presence or absence of CDs in the following inventories: (1) CDC National Notifiable Infectious Disease and Conditions List (NNIDCL), (2) Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) Weekly Disease Report, (3) EPA Contaminant Candidate List (CCL), (4) CDC bioterrorism agents list, (5) pathogen's detectability in wastewater or excreta, and (6) association of disease with single or multiple pathogens. Quantitative parameters include: (1) clinical case trend in Michigan, (2) clinical case trend in the TCDA, (3) ratio of clinical cases in Michigan, (5) annual clinical cases in the TCDA, and (6) the R₀ (basic reproduction number) of the disease.

The CDWSRank system is the first of its kind to provide an empirical method for selecting CDs for wastewater surveillance, in geographies serviced by centralized wastewater collection and treatment. To demonstrate the importance of site-specific ranking, CD trends were analyzed for both the TCDA and Michigan as a whole for the period between 2014 and 2021. This manuscript will moreover summarize wastewater sampling methods based on pathogen type. Ultimately, this article should contribute to the reduced impact of CDs by procuring valuable information for public health practitioners, researchers, and medical professionals.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Communicable Disease Data Acquisition

Weekly reports from the MDSS between 2014 and 2021 were accessed from the MDHHS website (michigan.gov/mdhhs). Data in the weekly reports were provisional, based on current data at the time that the report was published. Communicable disease incidence (per 100,000) for the state of Michigan are shown in Fig. 2. Similar data was collected for the TCDA, including City of Detroit, and Wayne, Macomb, and Oakland Counties. Examples of disease trends between 2014 and 2017 are shown in Figs. 3-6. MDSS weekly disease reports define the epidemiological "week" in concurrence with the CDC's Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) (cdc.gov/mmwr), which runs from Sunday (day 1) to Saturday (day 7). All CDs were cross-referenced against multiple regulatory lists including the U.S. CDC's NNIDCL (cdc.gov/bioterrorism). Additionally, the detectability of the pathogens associated with each CD in human excreta and wastewater, which is crucial evidence for the applicability of wastewater surveillance for monitoring CDs, was investigated through an extensive literature review (Tables 1-4). R₀'s were also collected through a literature review and are summarized in Table 5.

2.2 The CDWSRank System

The following sections demonstrate the design of the CDWSRank system and its associated parameters. The presence and absence of all CDs in regulatory lists including NNIDCL, WDR, and CCL, as well as being described as a bioterrorism agent, the association of the disease with a single or multiple pathogens, and detectability of pathogens in human wastewater were modeled as binary parameters. Quantitative parameters include: (1) clinical case trend in Michigan, (2) clinical case trend in the TCDA, (3) ratio of clinical case incidence between Michigan and the TCDA (geographic ratio), (4) annual clinical cases in Michigan, (5) annual clinical cases in the TCDA, and (6) the R₀ (basic reproduction number) of the disease. The overall schematic of the parameters and weighting factors of each parameter is presented in Fig. 1.

2.2.1 Binary Parameters

The presence or absence of CDs for each binary parameter was treated as a ×1 weighting factor (multiplier) and ×0 weighting factor (multiplier), respectively, which were then summed for the final ranking score. The CDC's NNIDCL provides comprehensive reporting of CDs that

occur in the USA. Diseases that are reported in the NNIDCL are considered notifiable, but whether or not they are reported at the state level, varies (cdc.gov). Furthermore, internationally notifiable diseases reported in WHO's International Health Regulations (IHR), such as cholera, are also reportable in NNIDCL (cdc.gov). The IHR covers not only CDs but also other public health concerns including chemical and radiological threats (cdc.gov). All CDs were assessed for whether they are listed on the CDC's NNIDCL, and the corresponding presence or absence was marked with "Y" (presence in NNIDCL) or "N" (absence in NNIDCL). A multiplier of 1 was assigned to any CD's presence on NNIDCL. Similarly, the presence of a CD in the MDHHS Weekly Disease Report (WDR) was given a weighting factor or "multiplier" of 1.

The EPA's CCL includes drinking water contaminants that are recognized or expected to occur in public water systems and are not currently subject to EPA drinking water regulations (epa.gov). The EPA uses the CCL to identify priority contaminants for regulatory decision-making and information gathering (epa.gov). The EPA announced Draft CCL 5 on July 19, 2021, followed by the publication of Final CCL 5 on November 14, 2022 (epa.gov). All CDs were assessed for whether they appear on EPA CCL 5, and the corresponding presence or absence was marked with a "Y" (presence in CCL) or "N" (absence in CCL).

The CDC classifies bioterrorism agents into 3 categories, namely, A, B, and C, depending, primarily, on how easily the diseases can be transmitted and the severity of illness (cdc.gov). Agents in category A are considered of the highest risk, as they can be easily transmitted within human populations and can result in high death rates and significant public health impacts. Examples include anthrax and plague. Agents in category B have the second highest priority risk, as they are moderately easy to spread and can result in moderate morbidity rates. Examples include Q fever and typhus fever. Agents in category C are considered the third highest priority risk and they can easily spread among humans and cause health impacts (cdc.gov). Examples include hantavirus and Nipah virus. The presence of CDs as CDC-defined bioterrorism agents was marked with "*" for category A and "**" for category B. A weighting factor or multiplier of 1 was assigned to a CD listed as a CDC bioterrorism agent, regardless of category.

The detectability of pathogens causative of CDs in human wastewater is crucial to the successful implementation of wastewater surveillance. Following extensive literature reviews, the detectability of the causative pathogen in excreta or wastewater was marked with a "Y"

(detectable), "N" (non-detectable), or "N/A" (data unavailable) in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4. For the final ranking score, a multiplier of 1 or 0 was given to CDs with a causative pathogen that is detectable or non-detectable, respectively, in excreta and/or wastewater.

The binary parameter of disease associated with single or multiple pathogens considers the exact source of a causative pathogen of a CD. In this system, CDs with multiple causative pathogens would make them nearly impossible to be determined or detected. Therefore, CDs with multiple causative pathogens were assigned a multiplier of 0 at the final ranking score, to moderate the over-ranking of these CDs. A final ranking multiplier of 1 was assigned to CDs with a single causative pathogen.

2.2.2 Quantitative Parameters

Quantitative parameters include: (1) clinical case trend in Michigan, (2) clinical case trend in the TCDA, (3) ratio of clinical case incidence between Michigan and the TCDA (geographic ratio), (4) annual clinical cases in Michigan, (5) annual clinical cases in the TCDA, and (6) the R0 (basic reproduction number) of the disease. Clinical case trends in Michigan as a whole and in the TCDA specifically, were determined by calculating the correlation R-value between disease incidence (per 100,000) each year (2014 to 2021) and the given year, for all CDs. The weighting factor or multiplier of 1.5 and 2.5 were assigned to clinical case trends in Michigan and the TCDA, respectively, providing greater emphasis on the TCDA.

The ratio of clinical case incidence between Michigan and the TCDA is assessed through calculating case incidence (per 100,000) for each CD, for the state of Michigan, then the TCDA. Next, the ratio of these values is calculated as the quotient of Michigan cases and TCDA cases, done for each year in the study period. Finally, the average of annual ratios was calculated, and each CD was assigned a value of 1 if the average was less than 1 (indicating that the CD was more prevalent in the TCDA than the state of Michigan as a whole). A CD was assigned a value of 0 if the ratio was equal to, or greater than 1. A weighting factor or "multiplier" of 2 was given to this metric.

Clinical cases in Michigan and in the TCDA were determined by computing the decadic log of the average clinical caseload for the years studied. Taking the common logarithm was necessary as clinical caseloads varied greatly in magnitude; this operation, therefore, allowed for the comparison of CDs even with disparate magnitudes of caseloads, while still preserving accurate variation measures. The weighting factor or "multiplier" of 1.5 and 2.5 were assigned to

clinical cases in Michigan and the TCDA, respectively, providing greater emphasis on the TCDA.

The R_0 of CDs were determined through literature investigation (Table 5). This parameter was included to increase the ranking score of CDs that can be transmitted efficiently, through person-to-person contact (32). This parameter prioritizes CDs that have the potential to spread rapidly. This parameter was given a weighting factor of 1.

2.2.3 Overall CDWSRank System Ranking Score (RCD)

An overall ranking score (R_{CD}) of the CDWSRank system for CDs is calculated using the following Eq. (1), where R_{CD} is the overall ranking score of the ith CD, W_i is the weighting factor for binary parameters, N_i is the weighting factor for quantitative parameters, B_i represents binary parameters, Q_i represents quantitative parameters, D_i represents the detectability of causative pathogens in human excreta or wastewater, and M_i represents the association of a CD with a single or multiple pathogens.

$$\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{CD}} = (W_i \sum_{i=1}^n B_i + N_i \sum_{i=1}^m Q_i) \times D_i \times M_i (1)$$

An equation for calculating an overall rank score of the ith CD with all binary and quantitative parameters displayed, can be expressed as follows:

 $RCD = [1 \times (NNIDCL) + 1 \times (WDR) + 1 \times (CCL) + 1 \times (Bioterrorism) + 2 \times (Geographic ratio) + 1.5 \times (Clinical case trend in Michigan) + 2.5 \times (Clinical case trend in the TCDA) + 1.5 \times (Clinical case in Michigan) + 2.5 \times (Clinical case in TCDA) + 1 \times (R_0)] \times [1 \times (Detectability in human excreta or wastewater)] \times [1 \times (Association of disease with single or multiple pathogens)]$ (2)

For example, an overall rank score of SARS-CoV-2 can be computed as: $[1 \times (1) + 1 \times (1) + 1 \times (0) + 1 \times (0) + 2 \times (1) + 1.5 \times (0.57) + 2.5 \times (0.6) + 1.5 \times (5.39) + 2.5 \times (4.98) + 1 \times (2.11)] \times (1) \times (1) = 29.$

2.3 Wastewater Surveillance Concentration Methods Based on Pathogen Type

In addition to the development of the CDWSRank system, a comprehensive literature review was conducted to summarize appropriate wastewater sample concentration surveillance methods based pathogen type, namely: bacterial, fungal, parasitic, and viral (Table 6).

3. RESULTS

3.1 Classification of CDs

Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 present viruses, bacteria, parasites and fungi that are detectable in human excrement or wastewater, indicating their potential to be monitored by wastewater surveillance. Notably, some of the listed pathogens were successfully detected in worldwide wastewater samples, with disease incidence monitored using wastewater surveillance. These include dengue virus (33), hepatitis B (34), monkeypox virus (22–24), norovirus (35,36), Poliovirus (19,20), SARS-CoV-2 (2,4–7,10,16), yellow fever virus, and zika virus (33).

Twenty-five CDs are associated with viral pathogens, including chickenpox, COVID-19, monkeypox, norovirus, West Nile fever and so on (Table 1). The viruses that are associated with the diseases are also summarized in Table 1. For instance, varicella-zoster virus is the causative agent of chickenpox. Notably, only 3 of the 25 viruses, including acute flaccid myelitis-related enterovirus, hepatitis A, and norovirus, appear on the EPA's CCL. Some viral diseases can be found on the CDC's NNIDCL, including COVID-19, HIV/AIDS, and Zika. No viral CDs in the list are classified as CDC bioterrorism agents. Table 2 shows 31 CDs associated with bacterial pathogens, including anthrax, cholera, gonorrhea, plague, syphilis, and so forth. The bacteria that are potentially associated with the diseases were also summarized in Table 2. For instance, clostridium (botulinum, butyricum, baratii) is the potential causative agent associated with botulism. Seven of the 31 bacteria are listed on the EPA's CCL, including chlamydia, CP-CRE, Guillain-Barre syndrome, legionellosis, salmonellosis, STEC, and shigellosis. And 25 of the 31 of the bacterial-related CDs are listed on the CDC's NNIDCL. Six of 31 bacterial-related CDs are not listed on the CDC's NNIDCL, including Guillain-Barre syndrome, leprosy, nontuberculous mycobacterium, paratyphoid fever, and streptococcus pneumoniae. Among all bacterial CDs, anthrax, botulism, and plague are listed in bioterrorism category A, while brucellosis, cholera, and Q fever are listed in bioterrorism category B. Table 3 includes 5 parasitic CDs that can be detected in either human excreta or wastewater. The potentially causative agents of these diseases were also summarized in Table 3. For instance, cryptosporidium parvum is the parasite associated with cryptosporidiosis. None of pathogens related to parasitic CDs are listed on the EPA's CCL, and 4 of them are listed on the CDC's NNIDCL, including cryptosporidiosis, cyclosporiasis, giardiasis, and malaria, expect for amebiasis. Cryptosporidiosis is listed in the CDC's bioterrorism category B. Lastly, Table 4

shows 3 fungal-related CDs, including blastomycosis, cryptococcosis, and candidiasis. The fungi associated with the diseases are summarized in Table 4. For instance, blastomyces dermatitidis and gilchristii are the potential causes of blastomycosis. None of them are listed on the EPA's CCL and only candidiasis (candida auris) was listed on the CDC's NNIDCL (Table 4).

3.2 Observation of CDs' Incidence and Trend

3.2.1 Comparison of CD Incidence in the TCDA versus the State of Michigan

All CD incidences (per 100,000) from 2014 to 2021 in Michigan are demonstrated in Fig. 2. Influenza, "influenza-like" or "flu-like" diseases, chlamydia, gonorrhea, and gastrointestinal illness (GI) have among the highest average incidences in Michigan.

Notably, multiple CDs presented lower incidences (per 100,000) in the TCDA than in broader Michigan (Fig. 3). GI presented much higher cases per 100,000 in Michigan than in TCDA. Between 2017 and 2019, more than 1,400 incidences per 100,000 were observed in Michigan. In contrast, during the same period, approximate 400 incidences per 100,000 were observed in TCDA (Fig. 3). Likewise, incidences per 100,000 of cryptosporidiosis, giardiasis, and norovirus were observed as much as twice higher in Michigan than in TCDA.

On the contrary, multiple CDs presented higher incidences (per 100,000) in the TCDA than in broader Michigan (Fig. 4). CDs, such as gonorrhea, which can cause severe and permanent health issues (cdc.gov), has increased continuously and dramatically from 5,245 cases in 2014 to 12,034 cases in 2020 (and slightly decreased to 10,483 cases in 2021) in the TCDA. Gonorrhea incidence in TCDA is approximately five times higher than the rest of Michigan (Michigan.gov). Likewise, sextually transmitted diseases such as HIV, syphilis, and chlamydia were observed with consistent higher incidences per 100,000 in TCDA than in statewide Michigan (Fig. 4). Also, West Nile fever incidences per 100,000 have increased dramatically in TCDA from 2019 to 2020 (Fig. 4).

Fig. 5 demonstrates selected CDs with approximately the same disease incidence (per 100,000), between the TCDA and Michigan, including AFM, brucellosis, Guillain-Barre syndrome, hepatitis E and C, as well as shigellosis.

3.2.2 Potential Impact of COVID Pandemic on CDs

Multiple CDs were potentially affected by the COVID-19 pandemic (Fig. 6). For instance, cases of hepatitis B surged from 675 (Michigan) and 1,081 (TCDA) in 2019, to 3,064 (Michigan) and 4,007 (TCDA) in 2020, during the inchoate stages of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Afterwards, incidences in both Michigan and the TCDA decreased significantly, during COVID-19 stabilization, suggesting that a pandemic could cause an impact on disease incidence. The pandemic also affected the incidence of several vector-borne diseases, for example Lyme disease. Lyme disease surged in both Michigan as a whole and the TCDA between 2020 and 2021 (Fig. 6). The incidence of influenza per 100,000 individuals in both TCDA and Michigan has been consistently decreasing since 2018. However, the decrease has been particularly significant from 2020 to 2021, concurring with the global spread of COVID-19. This may suggest that the health control measures implemented in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, such as shelter-in-place orders and social distancing, have had a positive impact on reducing the incidence of influenza.

3.3 Overall Ranking

Fig. 7 presents the final ranking (top 30 out of 96 CDs) generated from the CDWSRank system, prioritizing wastewater surveillance target applications in the TCDA. Several CDs caused by viruses that are detectable in human excreta or wastewater were among the top 30 listed. These include COVID-19 (ranked 1st), hepatitis B (ranked 2nd), measles (ranked 3rd), influenza (ranked 6th), hepatitis C (ranked 8th), polio (ranked 18th), HIV/AIDS (ranked 19st), hepatitis E (ranked 21st), norovirus (ranked 27th). Among the top 30 ranked CDs, some did not present relatively high incidences but were prioritized upon using the CDWSRank system. Examples include measles, polio, HIV/AIDS, hepatitis E, and norovirus, suggesting that such CDs require significant attention by wastewater surveillance practitioners, despite their relatively low incidence rates in the geographic study area in recent years.

Though not unexpected, the highest ranked CDs are those that do not spread solely by direct contact with animals, but rather those that are transmitted from person to person or from food or fomites. Only one vector-borne disease appears within the top 30, which is West Nile fever (ranked 29th). Over 50% (16/30) of CDs in the top 30 are either foodborne or STIs.

It is worth noting that 4 of the top 30 ranked CDs are known to health agencies to be vaccine preventable, highlighting the need for surveillance to warn against conditions that are not easily preventable, or those that could be particularly devastating to those not able to be immunized, such as infants or the immunodeficient. One CD ranked by this system was assigned a negative RCD, melioidosis. This indicates that, though detectable using wastewater surveillance methods, this disease has been trending downward in the geographic areas and

timeframe of this study, precluding it as a priority for monitoring.

Additionally, certain CDs (mentioned in sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) received a ranking score of 0 since a multiplier of 0 for binary parameters was assigned. Lyme disease, for example, received a score of 0 since the detectability of Lyme disease in excreta or wastewater was set to 0. It was set to 0 because at the time of this study there were no published reports available indicating the ability to detect the bacteria (Borrelia burgdorferi and Borrelia mayonii) that causes Lyme disease in excreta or wastewater. As research efforts of the scientific community progress this may change.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Differences of CDs in TCDA and State of Michigan

Differences in incidence among CDs in the TCDA versus the state of Michigan demonstrate epidemiological trends that differ, possibly due to population density, wildlife/ecology, climate, socioeconomic and racial inequities, cultural or behavioral differences, age distribution, and access to healthcare and/or medical insurance (37–41). The ranking system results focus on TCDA which is an urban area with high-density population. However, as of 2021 (42), approximately 1.8 million residents, which accounts for nearly 20 percent of Michigan's population, live in rural areas. Consequently, Michiganders as a whole face a relatively elevated risk of contracting CDs such as cryptosporidiosis, giardiasis, and norovirus (Fig. 3).

Residents in rural areas may have limited accessibility to medical care for diseases that require extensive or sophisticated care regimens (43). A study demonstrated possible causes for disparities between urban and rural areas by comparing outdoor time, where longer outdoor time were spent by rural residents than their urban counterparts (41), potentially creating an elevated risk of being infected by zoonotic pathogens. In rural areas, zoonotic diseases are of particular concern for farm workers, especially those working with livestock (44). In addition to zoonotic disease, residents of rural areas of Michigan are of great concern for vector-borne diseases, such as babesiosis (Fig. 3), and others (45). It is important to note that human behavior, such as water related human activities, can also impact the transmission of vector-borne diseases, in addition to the effects of a warming climate in Michigan, especially the TCDA area (46). For example, higher average incidence of West Nile fever in the TCDA than in statewide Michigan can be attributed to both factors (47,48).

Multiple CDs presented higher incidences per 100,000 in TCDA than in statewide Michigan, such as HIV and syphilis. This could possibly be related to a limited access to healthcare among the socioeconomically disadvantaged and racial minorities in TCDA (49). There are multiple causes of higher disease incidence of HIV and other STIs in TCDA, such as gonorrhea and syphilis (Fig. 4). Briefly, a recent investigation indicated that elevated HIV prevalence in the TCDA was associated with minorities, gay and bisexual populations up to 29 years old, and the socioeconomically disadvantaged, such as those experiencing homelessness, poverty, and unemployment (37). It is worth noting that this trend is observed nationwide

(50,51). Researchers have also found that TCDA had a TB incidence twice than that of Michigan, affected by both racial inequity and places of interaction (52).

4.2 Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on CDs in TCDA and State of Michigan

Incidences per 100,000 of diseases such as hepatitis B, influenza and others, in both Michigan and the TCDA changed significantly, during COVID-19 inception, suggesting that a pandemic could cause an impact on disease incidence (Fig 7). This was corroborated in recent studies (53–55), and has been shown in countless epidemics worldwide (56,57). Interestingly, several CDs whose incidences fell during the pandemic were those that traditionally rose in the other reported years, such as influenza. It is likely that reduced human contact and heightened hygiene in response to COVID-19 may have caused the dramatic decrease (63). On the contrary, Lyme disease surged in both Michigan as a whole and the TCDA between 2020 and 2021 (Fig. 6). This may be attributable to an increasing number of outdoor recreational activities as result of diminished indoor options, due to COVID-19 social distancing restrictions (58). Another potential explanation for the pandemic's effect on CD incidence is that some CDs are caused by opportunistic pathogens that reactivate in a host when an individual's immune response is weakened, often by another pathogenic condition (61). The renewed prevalence of these CDs can be a direct effect of COVID-19 disease, creating the conditions of pathogen reactivation or new infections (62).

Studies have investigated the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on sexually transmitted infections (STIs), such as syphilis (Fig. 4) (59,60). The disease incidence (per 100,000) of syphilis increased significantly between 2020 and 2021 in both the TCDA and broader Michigan, amid the pandemic (Fig. 4). Potential causes may include the diversion of funding and health resources from STI programs, shutdown of STI clinics, less available treating physicians, a reticence to appear in-office to meet clinicians, and longer laboratory turnaround times (59). It is worth noting that during the COVID-19 pandemic, many health reporting systems faced challenges due to the increased workload and limited resources in the public health workforce (64). This may have led to delays in reporting some diseases or with lower-quality data. However, it is important to note that COVID-19 has also resulted in improvements in health reporting systems in some areas, as public health agencies and governments have recognized the importance of timely and accurate reporting of disease data (65). The impact on health reporting systems by COVID-19 pandemic varied depending on the region, the disease, and the public

health response to the pandemic.

4.3 Wastewater Surveillance for Viral CDs

CDWSRank placed 16 viral CDs in the top 30 for wastewater surveillance (Fig. 7). Hepatitis B, for example, ranked 2nd (Fig. 7). Recently, researchers conducted wastewater surveillance to monitor hepatitis B in 19 cities across China, after clinical cases had increased dramatically (34). The wastewater surveillance results were consistent with the prevalence reported in surveys, indicating that estimating Hepatitis B prevalence through wastewater surveillance is feasible in large cities in Southern China. Hepatitis C ranked 8th in CDWSRank for the TCDA region. Its RNA was detected and quantified in human fecal specimens in multiple studies, suggesting a significant potential for using wastewater monitoring as a tool for detecting hepatitis C virus (66). Chickenpox (ranked 11th) has been persistent in the statewide Michigan between 2014 and 2021, as shown in Fig. 2. A few studies have attempted to test human bodily fluids, particularly urine, for monitoring varicella-zoster virus (which causes chickenpox and shingles), and other similar pathogens, such as in the Poxviridae family (67,68). Notably, belonging to the same orthopoxvirus genus as varicella-zoster (69), the monkeypox virus has been spreading worldwide (outside of its traditional range) since May 2022. The virus has been detected in wastewater in Rome, Italy (23), and California, USA (24), showcasing the immense potential of wastewater surveillance as a tool for monitoring viruses in the Poxviridae family (67).

Viral pathogens, such as measles virus (measles is ranked 3rd) and varicella-zoster (shingles is ranked 23rd) were detected in urine specimens, indicating their potential to be monitored through wastewater surveillance as well (70,71). Influenza, which ranked 6th on CDWSRank, was investigated in previous studies regarding the potential of wastewater surveillance (72).

Notably, polio ranks 18th in our CDWSRank system primarily due to its high R0 value, indicating that it has the potential to spread widely and quickly. Although polio cases have not been identified in Michigan between 2014-2021, the disease can have severe health consequences and can be dangerous if it emerges. It is worth noting that the data published by the MDHHS is subject to yearly review. New information and inclusion of recent data could potentially affect the ranking of polio or any other CDs in our CDWSRank system. Polio's inclusion in our system is based on its potential to pose a significant public health threat,

highlighting the importance of ongoing disease surveillance efforts to prevent the resurgence of CDs like polio. Overall, our CDWSRank system is designed to indicate which diseases should be prioritized in the context of wastewater surveillance for TCDA based on local clinical data and other parameters such as R₀.

4.4 Wastewater Surveillance for Bacterial, Fungal, and Parasitic CDs

CDWSRank placed 12 bacterial CDs ranked in the top 30 (Fig. 7). These include tuberculosis (ranked 9th), CP-CRE (ranked 17th), legionellosis (ranked 15th), salmonellosis (ranked 26th), shigellosis (ranked 28th), all detecteble both in human excreta and wastewater. Also, campylobacter (ranked 13th) was identified as a highly-sensitive pathogen for wastewater surveillance (73). Bacterial pathogens, such as Chlamydia trachomatis can be detected in wastewater (74). Despite being detectable in human excreta and wastewater, paratyphoid fever, Q fever, and typhoid fever were not ranked among the top 30 CDs.

Only two parasitic CDs, giardiasis (ranked 20th) and amebiasis (ranked 25th) ranked among the top 30. No fungal CDs were ranked among the top 30 CDs. Despite this, fungal CDs, including blastomycosis and cryptococcosis have great potential to be monitored using wastewater, as they can be detected in either human excreta or wastewater (Table 4).

4.5 Strengths and Limitations of CDWSRank System

The goal of this study is to develop a quantitative prioritization system for wastewater surveillance of CDs in the TCDA. Several studies have developed methodologies to rank the threat of CDs with different scopes and methodologies (28-31). However, these studies have many limitations in their ranking systems which were refined and improved by the CDWSRank system.

Firstly, these ranking systems did not include parameters such as actual disease cases and basic reproduction numbers (R_0) for CDs (28-31). For instance, Balabanova et al., applied criteria such as incidence rate to prioritize 127 CDs in Germany (28). However, the study did not include the actual annual incidence number of the CDs. Instead, the importance of incidence for each disease was evaluated by weights given by experts. In our CDWSRank system, the actual disease incidence data between 2014 and 2021 for 96 CDs were extensively investigated and included in the system. Besides, in this study we investigated the R0 for 96 CDs and incorporated them in the system when available.

Secondly, existing ranking systems relied heavily on experts' opinions on weighting the

parameters when ranking the diseases (28-31). For instance, Cardoen et al., 2009, proposed a ranking system for 51 zoonotic agents which replied on scores given by 35 scientific experts in the field of animal and public health, food, clinical microbiology, and epidemiology (30). Likewise, Humblet et al., 2012, applied multicriteria decision-making methodologies based on expert opinions and data to rank 100 infectious diseases, in a system that included 57 criteria and 5 categories encompassing epidemiology, economy, public health, society, and prevention/control (31). The systems are affected by individual opinions of experts evaluating qualitative parameters. Experts' opinions could be subject to bias, which can affect the final ranking results. The subjective nature of weighting parameters by individuals for some criteria, such as public health impact, animal health impact, and food impact, can lead to uncertainty and variation in final ranking scores depending on individual interpretations of these parameters (30). In contrast, to circumvent the bias of subjective opinions of experts, we designed the CDWSRank system based on a data-driven approach that considers critical factors including quantitative parameters of disease incidence and trend, geographical ratio, and R0 for all CDs. In this way, the proposed ranking system differs from existing systems that are primarily based on the subjective, albeit expert, opinions. Besides, the weights given by experts for the specific locations can be hardly applied to other areas. However, by replacing the quantitative parameters in CDWSRank system, it can be applied beyond TCDA to other locations with accessible data. For instance, the clinical case trend in the State of Michigan and TCDA can be replaced by clinical disease databases based on different geographical information, henceforth enhancing the CDWSRank system's potential for wider applications.

Thirdly, the ranking systems in previous studies were designed for specific events or areas, which can be hardly applied beyond their scope. For instance, Balabanova et al (28) included notifiable diseases in Germany and reportable diseases within the European Union. Likewise, Economopoulou et al (29) focused only on the risk of CDs associated with the hosting of the London 2012 Olympic Games. To circumvent those biases, the 96 CDs included in CDWSRank system were selected based on U.S. CDC reportable disease lists and other governmental lists including the EPA CCL and CDC Bio-terrorism List, and local disease report lists including MDHHS WDR, which distinguishes it from all previous ranking systems for ranking CDs (28-31). This proposed ranking system is highly adaptable to other regions, especially those with similar reporting models which most states in the United Sates have, as a

result of the CDC National Notifiable Disease Surveillance System requirements. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, there have been no published studies ranking CDs of public health importance that can be monitored using wastewater surveillance.

The goal of this study was to develop a prioritization system for wastewater surveillance of CDs in the TCDA. Limitations of this study are expounded below. Firstly, a multiplier of 0 was applied to a given CD if their causative pathogen has not been detected in wastewater or human excrete according to published studies thus far. This excludes potentially harmful CDs which can result in severe public health consequences, such as anthrax, hantavirus, and plague. Secondly, the weighting factors or multipliers for both binary and quantitative parameters were determined by researchers of this study and specifically designed with an emphasis on the TCDA. Nonetheless, weighting factors are adjustable and can vary across studies and regions with dissimilar research emphases. Thirdly, data unavailability limited the parameter types that could be involved in the proposed ranking system. For instance, mortality rate, case fatality, or incidence rate of some CDs could not be located in any published studies or publicly-available datasets for the TCDA. Additionally, due to a lack of R0 information on some CDs, the ranking system may have disregarded diseases that are potentially harmful to human health but that do not yet have an established, specific R₀. R₀ values are situation-dependent and can significantly affect the rank (32). Besides, the CDWSRank system is limited since it does not explore the connection between severity and economic impact of the diseases ranked in this study. The severity of the disease in many instances would vary significantly with access to health care and the economic impact would vary with the severity. Despite the researchers' initial attempts to include parameters of mortality rate and severity, very few studies were found that adequately quantified these values in the TCDA region. It is, however, possible to include these parameters when adapting the CDWSRank system for a different locale if those data are available in the new area studied. Another significant limitation on the CDWSRank system is its reliance on case data being publicly and readily available. The implications of this limitation become particularly salient in locations where clinical data and information for reportable diseases are unavailable. However, as the CDWSRank system did produce a ranking score for Monkeypox, a disease without the case numbers published at the time of study, it is evident that the system can still create a ranking based on the other parameters. Hence, the CDWSRank system retains its utility in settings where access to data is restricted.

Social determinants of health such as socioeconomic status, environment, race and ethnicity, gender, culture, and access to health care would be other parameters for future development of the CDWSRank system. However, measuring and quantifying these factors for all 96 CDs in TCDA pose significant challenges, given the limited availability and accessibility of relevant data. Nonetheless, the insights generated by the CDWSRank system can be particularly valuable for guiding wastewater surveillance of emerging CDs which is beneficial for socioeconomically disadvantaged communities with limited healthcare access or traditional surveillance systems. Nevertheless, it is critical to note that as the aforementioned constraints become known, updating the CDWSRank system becomes necessary.

It is worth noting that some of the diseases of concern are seasonal (such as influenza) or rare (such as polio) and therefore only occasional surveillance may be recommended. In addition, some CDs, such as chlamydia, gonorrhea, and HIV, prioritized by CDWSRank system in TCDA are associated not only with urban areas, but also with socioeconomical and racial inequality, which can skew statistical designs. Social determinants of health, such as poverty, poor housing conditions, lack of access to healthcare, can disproportionately affect certain racial or ethnic groups and increase their risk of contracting and transmitting communicable diseases (37–40). For example, individuals living in crowded and unsanitary conditions are more likely to contract infectious diseases like TB or hepatitis A (75,76). Therefore, surveillance of specific regions of concern may be recommended.

4.6 Future Directions

In the State of Michigan, as in multiple other regions across the nation, the COVID-19 pandemic prompted the creation of wastewater surveillance networks. As the primary health focus shifts away from COVID-19 these currently available networks and their infrastructure and resources can be adapted to monitor other emerging diseases. This study offers a tool for transitioning to wastewater surveillance programs beyond COVID-19. By identifying and ranking the CDs that pose the most significant risk to public health in TCDA, the CDWSRank system provides a methodological tool and critical information that can help public health officials and policymakers allocate resources more effectively. This information can be used to prioritize disease surveillance efforts and ensure that public health interventions are targeted at the most potentially urgent threats.

Furthermore, with regards to the extension of the CDWSRank system's applicability

beyond the TCDA region, it is worth noting that the quantitative parameters heavily rely on local clinical data, while the binary parameters are primarily developed from regulatory lists obtained from local health departments as well as from U.S. governmental agencies. It is worth mentioning that all states in the U.S. are mandated to report to the C.D.C. and have their respective local health departments responsible for reporting notifiable diseases. Therefore, extending the application of the CDWSRank system to other regions within the U.S. would be relatively straightforward.

5. CONCLUSION

In this study, we developed a comprehensive and effective ranking system (CDWSRank) of wastewater surveillance prioritization for 96 CDs in the Tri-County Detroit Area (TCDA), Michigan, USA. The CDWSRank system comprises 6 binary and 6 quantitative parameters, with CDs classified into four groups: viral, bacterial, fungal, and parasitic. Critical regulatory lists, including the CDC's NNIDCL, MDHHS's WDR, EPA's CCL, and CDC's bioterrorism agents list were incorporated into the CDWSRank system. Disease incidences and trends of reportable CDs in the TCDA and broader state of Michigan were also incorporated into the system. Disparities in incidences of CDs were identified between the TCDA and state of Michigan, indicating epidemiological differences. Appropriate sampling and sample concentration methods for wastewater surveillance application were summarized as per our four categories, viral, bacterial, fungal, and parasitic.

The CDWSRank system is first of its kind with the potential to prioritize resources and efforts towards monitoring and preventing the spread of CDs through wastewater surveillance. It helps researchers and public health practitioners to identify CDs that at a higher risk of disease transmission and prioritize monitoring efforts to mitigate their spread. The CDWSRank system provides an evidence- and data-based approach to decision making, ensuring the resources are allocated for wastewater surveillance beyond the COVID-19 pandemic. Ultimately, the development and implementation of the CDWSRank system for CDs can help reduce the impact of CDs on public health and promote broader applications of wastewater surveillance for public health benefits. CDWSRank can and should be adopted for ranking CDs in other geographical locations, with updated etiological and epidemiological information.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmed W, Tscharke B, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Bivins A, Choi P, et al. SARS-CoV-2 RNA monitoring in wastewater as a potential early warning system for COVID-19 transmission in the community: A temporal case study. Science of the Total Environment [Internet]. 2021;761:144216. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144216

2. Ahmed W, Bivins A, Simpson SL, Bertsch PM, Ehret J, Hosegood I, et al. Wastewater surveillance demonstrates high predictive value for COVID-19 infection on board repatriation flights to Australia. Environ Int. 2022 Jan;158:106938.

3. Ahmed W, Bertsch PM, Angel N, Bibby K, Bivins A, Dierens L, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in commercial passenger aircraft and cruise ship wastewater: a surveillance tool for assessing the presence of COVID-19 infected travellers. J Travel Med. 2020 Aug 20;27(5).

4. Li Y, Miyani B, Zhao L, Spooner M, Gentry Z, Zou Y, et al. Surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in nine neighborhood sewersheds in Detroit Tri-County area, United States: Assessing per capita SARS-CoV-2 estimations and COVID-19 incidence. Science of The Total Environment. 2022 Dec;851:158350.

5. Zhao L, Zou Y, Li Y, Miyani B, Spooner M, Gentry Z, et al. Five-week warning of COVID-19 peaks prior to the Omicron surge in Detroit, Michigan using wastewater surveillance. Science of The Total Environment. 2022 Jun;157040.

6. Miyani B, Fonoll X, Norton J, Mehrotra A, Xagoraraki I. SARS-CoV-2 in Detroit Wastewater. Journal of Environmental Engineering [Internet]. 2020 Nov 1;146(11):06020004. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EE.1943-7870.0001830</u>

7. Miyani B, Zhao L, Spooner M, Buch S, Gentry Z, Mehrotra A, et al. Early Warnings of COVID-19 Second Wave in Detroit. Journal of Environmental Engineering [Internet]. 2021 Aug 1;147(8):06021004. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EE.1943-7870.0001907</u>

8. Sherchan SP, Shahin S, Ward LM, Tandukar S, Aw TG, Schmitz B, et al. First detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater in North America: A study in Louisiana, USA. Science of The Total Environment. 2020 Nov;743:140621.

9. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in the Netherlands. Environ Sci Technol Lett. 2020;7(7):511–6.

10. Zhao L, Zou Y, David RE, Withington S, McFarlane S, Faust RA, et al. Simple methods for early warnings of COVID-19 surges: Lessons learned from 21 months of wastewater and clinical data collection in Detroit, Michigan, United States. Science of The Total Environment [Internet]. 2022;161152. Available from:

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969722082559

11. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, Bibby K, Bivins A, O'Brien JW, 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 [Internet]. 2020;728:138764. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764</u>

12. Bibby K, Bivins A, Wu Z, North D. Making waves: Plausible lead time for wastewater based epidemiology as an early warning system for COVID-19. Water Res [Internet]. 2021;202(July):117438. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117438</u>

13. Xagoraraki I, O'Brien E. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology for Early Detection of Viral Outbreaks. In: O'Bannon DJ, editor. Women in Water Quality: Investigations by Prominent Female Engineers [Internet]. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2020. p. 75–97. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17819-2_5</u>

14. Xagoraraki I. Can We Predict Viral Outbreaks Using Wastewater Surveillance? Journal of Environmental Engineering [Internet]. 2020 Nov 1;146(11):01820003. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EE.1943-7870.0001831

15. Kitajima M, Ahmed W, Bibby K, Carducci A, Gerba CP, Hamilton KA, et al. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and research needs. Science of The Total Environment [Internet]. 2020;139076. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139076

16. Ahmed W, Bivins A, Bertsch PM, Bibby K, Gyawali P, Sherchan SP, et al. Intraday variability of indicator and pathogenic viruses in 1-h and 24-h composite wastewater samples: Implications for wastewater-based epidemiology. Environ Res. 2021 Feb;193:110531.

17. McCall C, Wu H, O'Brien E, Xagoraraki I. Assessment of enteric viruses during a hepatitis outbreak in Detroit MI using wastewater surveillance and metagenomic analysis. J Appl Microbiol [Internet]. 2021 Sep 1;131(3):1539–54. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.15027

18. Miyani B, McCall C, Xagoraraki I. High abundance of human herpesvirus 8 in wastewater from a large urban area. J Appl Microbiol [Internet]. 2021 May 1;130(5):1402–11. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.14895</u>

19. HOVI T, SHULMAN LM, van der AVOORT H, DESHPANDE J, ROIVAINEN M, de GOURVILLE EM. Role of environmental poliovirus surveillance in global polio eradication and beyond. Epidemiol Infect. 2012 Jan 18;140(1):1–13.

20. Roberts L. Israel's Silent Polio Epidemic Breaks All the Rules. Science (1979). 2013 Nov 8;342(6159):679–80.

21. Link-Gelles R, Lutterloh E, Schnabel Ruppert P, Backenson PB, st. George K, Rosenberg ES, et al. Public Health Response to a Case of Paralytic Poliomyelitis in an Unvaccinated Person and Detection of Poliovirus in Wastewater — New York, June–August 2022. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2022 Aug 19;71(33):1065–8.

22. de Jonge EF, Peterse CM, Koelewijn JM, van der Drift AMR, van der Beek RFHJ,

Nagelkerke E, et al. The detection of monkeypox virus DNA in wastewater samples in the Netherlands. Science of The Total Environment. 2022 Dec;852:158265.

23. la Rosa G, Mancini P, Veneri C, Bonanno Ferraro G, Lucentini L, Iaconelli M, et al. Detection of Monkeypox virus DNA in the wastewater of an airport in Rome, Italy: expanding environmental surveillance to emerging threats. medRxiv [Internet]. 2022 Jan 1;2022.08.18.22278932. Available from:

http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2022/08/19/2022.08.18.22278932.abstract

24. Wolfe MK, Duong D, Hughes B, Chan-Herur V, White BJ, Boehm AB. Detection of monkeypox viral DNA in a routine wastewater monitoring program. medRxiv [Internet]. 2022 Jan 1;2022.07.25.22278043. Available from: http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2022/07/26/2022.07.25.22278043.abstract

25. van Seventer JM, Hochberg NS. Principles of Infectious Diseases: Transmission, Diagnosis, Prevention, and Control. In: International Encyclopedia of Public Health. Elsevier; 2017. p. 22-39.

26. Morse SS, Mazet JA, Woolhouse M, Parrish CR, Carroll D, Karesh WB, et al. Prediction and prevention of the next pandemic zoonosis. The Lancet. 2012 Dec;380(9857):1956-65.

27. Chharia A, Jeevan G, Jha RA, Liu M, Berman JM, Glorioso C. Accuracy of US CDC COVID-19 Forecasting Models. medRxiv [Internet]. 2022 Jan 1;2022.04.20.22274097. Available from: http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2022/06/13/2022.04.20.22274097.abstract

28. Balabanova Y, Gilsdorf A, Buda S, Burger R, Eckmanns T, Gärtner B, et al. Communicable Diseases Prioritized for Surveillance and Epidemiological Research: Results of a Standardized Prioritization Procedure in Germany, 2011. PLoS One. 2011 Oct 4;6(10):e25691.

29. Economopoulou A, Kinross P, Domanovic D, Coulombier D. Infectious diseases prioritisation for event-based surveillance at the European Union level for the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Eurosurveillance. 2014 Apr 17;19(15).

30. Cardoen S, van Huffel X, Berkvens D, Quoilin S, Ducoffre G, Saegerman C, et al. Evidence-Based Semiquantitative Methodology for Prioritization of Foodborne Zoonoses. Foodborne Pathog Dis. 2009 Nov;6(9):1083–96.

31. Humblet MF, Vandeputte S, Albert A, Gosset C, Kirschvink N, Haubruge E, et al. Multidisciplinary and Evidence-based Method for Prioritizing Diseases of Food-producing Animals and Zoonoses. Emerg Infect Dis. 2012 Apr;18(4).

32. Yadav AK, Kumar S, Singh G, Kansara NK. Demystifying R naught: Understanding what does it hide? Indian J Community Med. 2021;46(1):7.

33. Chandra F, Lee WL, Armas F, Leifels M, Gu X, Chen H, et al. Persistence of Dengue (Serotypes 2 and 3), Zika, Yellow Fever, and Murine Hepatitis Virus RNA in Untreated Wastewater. Environ Sci Technol Lett. 2021 Sep 14;8(9):785-91.

34. Hou C, Hua Z, Xu P, Xu H, Wang Y, Liao J, et al. Estimating the prevalence of hepatitis B by wastewater-based epidemiology in 19 cities in China. Science of The Total Environment. 2020 Oct;740:139696.

35. Kazama S, Masago Y, Tohma K, Souma N, Imagawa T, Suzuki A, et al. Temporal dynamics of norovirus determined through monitoring of municipal wastewater by pyrosequencing and virological surveillance of gastroenteritis cases. Water Res. 2016 Apr;92:244–53.

36. Fioretti JM, Fumian TM, Rocha MS, dos Santos I de AL, Carvalho-Costa FA, de Assis MR, et al. Surveillance of Noroviruses in Rio De Janeiro, Brazil: Occurrence of New GIV Genotype in Clinical and Wastewater Samples. Food Environ Virol. 2018 Mar 21;10(1):1–6.

37. Bauermeister J, Eaton L, Stephenson R. A Multilevel Analysis of Neighborhood Socioeconomic Disadvantage and Transactional Sex with Casual Partners Among Young Men Who Have Sex with Men Living in Metro Detroit. Behavioral Medicine. 2016 Jul 2;42(3):197– 204.

38. Bayeh R, Yampolsky MA, Ryder AG. The social lives of infectious diseases: Why culture matters to COVID-19. Front Psychol. 2021;3731.

39. Du WY, Yin CN, Wang HT, Li ZW, Wang WJ, Xue FZ, et al. Infectious diseases among elderly persons: Results from a population-based observational study in Shandong province, China, 2013-2017. J Glob Health. 2021;11.

40. Greene SK, Levin-Rector A, Hadler JL, Fine AD. Disparities in reportable communicable disease incidence by census tract-level poverty, New York City, 2006–2013. Am J Public Health. 2015;105(9):e27–34.

41. Thulin CG, Malmsten J, Ericsson G. Opportunities and challenges with growing wildlife populations and zoonotic diseases in Sweden. Eur J Wildl Res. 2015 Oct 25;61(5):649–56.

42. Wright N, Scherdt M, Aebersold ML, McCullagh MC, Medvec BR, Ellimoottil C, et al. Rural Michigan Farmers' Health Concerns and Experiences: A Focus Group Study. J Prim Care Community Health. 2021;12:21501327211053520.

43. Lin YH, Tseng YH, Chen YC, Lin MH, Chou LF, Chen TJ, et al. The rural-urban divide in ambulatory care of gastrointestinal diseases in Taiwan. BMC Int Health Hum Rights. 2013;13(1):1–7.

44. LeJeune J, Kersting A. Zoonoses: an occupational hazard for livestock workers and a public health concern for rural communities. J Agric Saf Health. 2010;16(3):161–79.

45. Parola P, Paddock CD. Travel and tick-borne diseases: Lyme disease and beyond. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2018;26:1–2.

46. Vanos JK, Kalkstein LS, Sanford TJ. Detecting synoptic warming trends across the US Midwest and implications to human health and heat-related mortality. International Journal of

Climatology. 2015 Jan;35(1):85–96.

47. Filho WL, Scheday S, Boenecke J, Gogoi A, Maharaj A, Korovou S. Climate Change, Health and Mosquito-Borne Diseases: Trends and Implications to the Pacific Region. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2019 Dec 14;16(24):5114.

48. Vora N. Impact of anthropogenic environmental alterations on vector-borne diseases. The medscape journal of medicine. 2008;10(10):238.

49. Bowen VB, Braxton J, Davis DW, Flagg EW, Grey J, Grier L, et al. Sexually transmitted disease surveillance 2018. 2019;

50. Denning P, DiNenno E. Communities in crisis: is there a generalized HIV epidemic in impoverished urban areas of the United States. In: XVIII international AIDS conference. 2010.

51. Pellowski JA, Kalichman SC, Matthews KA, Adler N. A pandemic of the poor: Social disadvantage and the U.S. HIV epidemic. American Psychologist. 2013 May;68(4):197–209.

52. Noppert GA, Clarke P, Hicken MT, Wilson ML. Understanding the intersection of race and place: the case of tuberculosis in Michigan. BMC Public Health. 2019 Dec 11;19(1):1669.

53. Kang SH, Cho DH, Choi J, Baik SK, Gwon JG, Kim MY. Association between chronic hepatitis B infection and COVID-19 outcomes: A Korean nationwide cohort study. PLoS One [Internet]. 2021 Oct 5;16(10):e0258229-. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0258229

54. Kondili LA, Buti M, Riveiro-Barciela M, Maticic M, Negro F, Berg T, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on hepatitis B and C elimination: An EASL survey. JHEP Reports. 2022 Sep;4(9):100531.

55. Pley CM, McNaughton AL, Matthews PC, Lourenço J. The global impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection. BMJ Glob Health. 2021 Jan;6(1):e004275.

56. Formenti B, Gregori N, Crosato V, Marchese V, Tomasoni LR, Castelli F. The impact of COVID-19 on communicable and non-communicable diseases in Africa: a narrative review. Infez Med. 2022;30(1):30.

57. Latini A, Magri F, Donà MG, Giuliani M, Cristaudo A, Zaccarelli M. Is COVID-19 affecting the epidemiology of STIs? The experience of syphilis in Rome. Sex Transm Infect. 2021 Feb;97(1):78–78.

58. Pal M. Lyme Disease-An Emerging Metazoonosis of Public Health Concern. Journal of Clinical Immunology & Microbiology. 2021;02(01).

59. Wright SS, Kreisel KM, Hitt JC, Pagaoa MA, Weinstock HS, Thorpe PG. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Centers for Disease Control and Prevention–Funded Sexually Transmitted Disease Programs. Sex Transm Dis. 2022 Apr;49(4):e61–3.

60. Stanford KA, Almirol E, Schneider J, Hazra A. Rising Syphilis Rates During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Sex Transm Dis [Internet]. 2021;48(6). Available from: https://journals.lww.com/stdjournal/Fulltext/2021/06000/Rising Syphilis Rates During the CO VID_19_Pandemic.14.aspx

61. Mahalaxmi I, Jayaramayya K, Venkatesan D, Subramaniam MD, Renu K, Vijayakumar P, et al. Mucormycosis: An opportunistic pathogen during COVID-19. Environ Res. 2021 Oct;201:111643.

62. Maldonado MD, Romero-Aibar J, Pérez-San-Gregorio MA. COVID-19 pandemic as a risk factor for the reactivation of herpes viruses. Epidemiol Infect. 2021 Jun 16;149:e145.

63. Chiu NC, Chi H, Tai YL, Peng CC, Tseng CY, Chen CC, et al. Impact of Wearing Masks, Hand Hygiene, and Social Distancing on Influenza, Enterovirus, and All-Cause Pneumonia During the Coronavirus Pandemic: Retrospective National Epidemiological Surveillance Study. J Med Internet Res. 2020 Aug 20;22(8):e21257.

64. Willis K, Ezer P, Lewis S, Bismark M, Smallwood N. "Covid Just Amplified the Cracks of the System": Working as a Frontline Health Worker during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021 Sep 28;18(19):10178.

65. Schønning K, Dessau RB, Jensen TG, Thorsen NM, Wiuff C, Nielsen L, et al. Electronic reporting of diagnostic laboratory test results from all healthcare sectors is a cornerstone of national preparedness and control of COVID-19 in Denmark. Apmis. 2021;129(7):438–51.

66. Beld M, Sentjens R, Rebers S, Weel J, Wertheim-van Dillen P, Sol C, et al. Detection and Quantitation of Hepatitis C Virus RNA in Feces of Chronically Infected Individuals. J Clin Microbiol. 2000;38(9):3442–4.

67. Vaidya SR, Tilavat SM, Kumbhar NS, Kamble MB. Chickenpox outbreak in a tribal and industrial zone from the Union Territory of Dadra and Nagar Haveli, India. Epidemiol Infect. 2018 Mar 13;146(4):476–80.

68. McCall C, Wu H, Miyani B, Xagoraraki I. Identification of multiple potential viral diseases in a large urban center using wastewater surveillance. Water Res. 2020 Oct;184:116160.

69. Delhon G. Poxviridae. In: Veterinary Microbiology [Internet]. 2022. p. 522–32. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119650836.ch53</u>

70. Rota PA, Khan AS, Durigon E, Yuran T, Villamarzo YS, Bellini WJ. Detection of measles virus RNA in urine specimens from vaccine recipients. J Clin Microbiol. 1995 Sep;33(9):2485–8.

71. Sims N, Kasprzyk-Hordern B. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology: Monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level. Environ Int. 2020 Jun;139:105689.

72. Lee WL, Gu X, Armas F, Leifels M, Wu F, Chandra F, et al. Monitoring human arboviral

diseases through wastewater surveillance: Challenges, progress and future opportunities. Water Res. 2022 Sep;223:118904.

73. Guo Y, Sivakumar M, Jiang G. Decay of four enteric pathogens and implications to wastewater-based epidemiology: Effects of temperature and wastewater dilutions. Science of The Total Environment. 2022 May;819:152000.

74. Marques PX, Wand H, Nandy M, Tan C, Shou H, Terplan M, et al. Serum antibodies to surface proteins of *Chlamydia trachomatis* as candidate biomarkers of disease: results from the Baltimore Chlamydia Adolescent/Young Adult Reproductive Management (CHARM) cohort. FEMS Microbes. 2022 Mar 17;3.

75. Tanır G, Kılıçarslan F, Göl N, Arslan Z. Age-spesific seroprevalence and associated risk factors for hepatitis A in children in Ankara, Turkey. Journal of Ankara medical school. 2003;25(2):81–8.

76. Dhanaraj B, Papanna MK, Adinarayanan S, Vedachalam C, Sundaram V, Shanmugam S, et al. Prevalence and Risk Factors for Adult Pulmonary Tuberculosis in a Metropolitan City of South India. PLoS One. 2015 Apr 23;10(4):e0124260.

77. Faleye TOC, Adewumi MO, Japhet MO, David OM, Oluyege AO, Adeniji JA, et al. Non-polio enteroviruses in faeces of children diagnosed with acute flaccid paralysis in Nigeria. Virol J. 2017 Dec 12;14(1):175.

78. Leung J, Harpaz R, Baughman AL, Heath K, Loparev V, Vázquez M, et al. Evaluation of Laboratory Methods for Diagnosis of Varicella. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2010 Jul;51(1):23–32.

79. Musso D, Teissier A, Rouault E, Teururai S, de Pina JJ, Nhan TX. Detection of chikungunya virus in saliva and urine. Virol J. 2016 Dec 16;13(1):102.

80. Lamb LE, Bartolone SN, Tree MO, Conway MJ, Rossignol J, Smith CP, et al. Rapid Detection of Zika Virus in Urine Samples and Infected Mosquitos by Reverse Transcription-Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification. Sci Rep. 2018 Dec 28;8(1):3803.

81. Jain S, Su YH, Su YP, McCloud S, Xue R, Lee TJ, et al. Characterization of the hepatitis B virus DNA detected in urine of chronic hepatitis B patients. BMC Gastroenterol. 2018 Dec 16;18(1):40.

82. Numata N, Ohori H, Hayakawa Y, Saitoh Y, Tsunoda A, Kanno A. Demonstration of hepatitis C virus genome in saliva and urine of patients with type C hepatitis: Usefulness of the single round polymerase chain reaction method for detection of the HCV genome. J Med Virol. 1993 Oct;41(2):120–8.

83. Aggarwal R, McCaustland KA. Hepatitis E virus RNA detection in serum and feces specimens with the use of microspin columns. J Virol Methods. 1998 Oct;74(2):209–13.

84. Beyer S, Szewzyk R, Gnirss R, Johne R, Selinka HC. Detection and Characterization of

Hepatitis E Virus Genotype 3 in Wastewater and Urban Surface Waters in Germany. Food Environ Virol. 2020 Jun 14;12(2):137–47.

85. Kevill JL, Lambert-Slosarska K, Pellett C, Woodhall N, Richardson-O'Neill I, Pântea I, et al. Assessment of two types of passive sampler for the efficient recovery of SARS-CoV-2 and other viruses from wastewater. Science of The Total Environment. 2022 Sep;838:156580.

86. Krause CH, Eastick K, Ogilvie MM. Real-time PCR for mumps diagnosis on clinical specimens—Comparison with results of conventional methods of virus detection and nested PCR. Journal of Clinical Virology. 2006 Nov;37(3):184–9.

87. Baek SH, Kim MW, Park CY, Choi CS, Kailasa SK, Park JP, et al. Development of a rapid and sensitive electrochemical biosensor for detection of human norovirus via novel specific binding peptides. Biosens Bioelectron. 2019 Jan;123:223–9.

88. Kitajima M, Haramoto E, Phanuwan C, Katayama H, Ohgaki S. Detection of genogroup IV norovirus in wastewater and river water in Japan. Lett Appl Microbiol. 2009 Nov;49(5):655–8.

89. Kim JM, Kim HM, Lee EJ, Jo HJ, Yoon Y, Lee NJ, et al. Detection and Isolation of SARS-CoV-2 in Serum, Urine, and Stool Specimens of COVID-19 Patients from the Republic of Korea. Osong Public Health Res Perspect. 2020 Jun 30;11(3):112–7.

90. Lago PM, Gary HE, Pérez LS, Cáceres V, Olivera JB, Puentes RP, et al. Poliovirus detection in wastewater and stools following an immunization campaign in Havana, Cuba. Int J Epidemiol. 2003 Oct;32(5):772–7.

91. Gdoura M, Fares W, Bougatef S, Inoubli A, Touzi H, Hogga N, et al. The value of West Nile virus RNA detection by real-time RT-PCR in urine samples from patients with neuroinvasive forms. Arch Microbiol. 2022 May 3;204(5):238.

92. Domingo C, Yactayo S, Agbenu E, Demanou M, Schulz AR, Daskalow K, et al. Detection of Yellow Fever 17D Genome in Urine. J Clin Microbiol. 2011 Feb;49(2):760–2.

93. Peiró-Mestres A, Fuertes I, Camprubí-Ferrer D, Marcos MÁ, Vilella A, Navarro M, et al. Frequent detection of monkeypox virus DNA in saliva, semen, and other clinical samples from 12 patients, Barcelona, Spain, May to June 2022. Eurosurveillance. 2022 Jul 14;27(28).

94. Battistone A, Buttinelli G, Fiore S, Amato C, Bonomo P, Patti AM, et al. Sporadic Isolation of Sabin-Like Polioviruses and High-Level Detection of Non-Polio Enteroviruses during Sewage Surveillance in Seven Italian Cities, after Several Years of Inactivated Poliovirus Vaccination. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2014 Aug;80(15):4491–501.

95. Palmer CJ, Bonilla GF, Tsai YL, Lee MH, Javier BJ, Siwak EB. Analysis of sewage effluent for human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) using infectivity assay and reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction. Can J Microbiol. 1995 Sep 1;41(9):809–15.

96. Li JJ, Huang YQ, Poiesz BJ, Zaumetzger-Abbot L, Friedman-Kien AE. Detection of

human immunodeficiency virus type 1 (HIV-1) in urine cell pellets from HIV-1-seropositive individuals. J Clin Microbiol. 1992 May;30(5):1051–5.

97. Wattiau P, Klee SR, Fretin D, van Hessche M, Ménart M, Franz T, et al. Occurrence and Genetic Diversity of *Bacillus anthracis* Strains Isolated in an Active Wool-Cleaning Factory. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2008 Jul;74(13):4005–11.

98. Kalb SR, Moura H, Boyer AE, McWilliams LG, Pirkle JL, Barr JR. The use of Endopep– MS for the detection of botulinum toxins A, B, E, and F in serum and stool samples. Anal Biochem. 2006 Apr;351(1):84–92.

99. LaGier MJ, Joseph LA, Passaretti T v, Musser KA, Cirino NM. A real-time multiplexed PCR assay for rapid detection and differentiation of Campylobacter jejuni and Campylobacter coli. Mol Cell Probes. 2004 Aug;18(4):275–82.

100. Bonetta Si, Pignata C, Lorenzi E, de Ceglia M, Meucci L, Bonetta Sa, et al. Detection of pathogenic Campylobacter, E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella spp. in wastewater by PCR assay. Environmental Science and Pollution Research. 2016 Aug 23;23(15):15302–9.

101. Gaydos CA, Theodore M, Dalesio N, Wood BJ, Quinn TC. Comparison of Three Nucleic Acid Amplification Tests for Detection of *Chlamydia trachomatis* in Urine Specimens. J Clin Microbiol. 2004 Jul;42(7):3041–5.

102. Rahman M, Sack DA, Mahmood S, Hossain A. Rapid diagnosis of cholera by coagglutination test using 4-h fecal enrichment cultures. J Clin Microbiol. 1987 Nov;25(11):2204–6.

103. Galler H, Feierl G, Petternel C, Reinthaler FF, Haas D, Grisold AJ, et al. KPC-2 and OXA-48 carbapenemase-harbouring Enterobacteriaceae detected in an Austrian wastewater treatment plant. Clinical Microbiology and Infection. 2014 Feb;20(2):O132–4.

104. Akduman D, Ehret JM, Messina K, Ragsdale S, Judson FN. Evaluation of a Strand Displacement Amplification Assay (BD ProbeTec-SDA) for Detection of *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* in Urine Specimens. J Clin Microbiol. 2002 Jan;40(1):281–3.

105. Riera L. Detection of Haemophilus influenzae type b antigenuria by Bactigen and Phadebact kits. J Clin Microbiol. 1985 Apr;21(4):638–40.

106. Murdoch DR, Walford EJ, Jennings LC, Light GJ, Schousboe MI, Chereshsky AY, et al. Use of the Polymerase Chain Reaction to Detect Legionella DNA in Urine and Serum Samples from Patients with Pneumonia. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 1996 Sep 1;23(3):475–80.

107. Catalan V, Garcia F, Moreno C, Vila MJ, Apraiz D. Detection of Legionella pneumophila in wastewater by nested polymerase chain reaction. Res Microbiol. 1997 Jan;148(1):71–8.

108. Caleffi KR, Hirata RDC, Hirata MH, Caleffi ER, Siqueira VLD, Cardoso RF. Use of the polymerase chain reaction to detect Mycobacterium leprae in urine. Brazilian Journal of Medical and Biological Research. 2012 Feb;45(2):153–7.

109. Mérien F, Amouriaux P, Perolat P, Baranton G, saint Girons I. Polymerase chain reaction for detection of Leptospira spp. in clinical samples. J Clin Microbiol. 1992 Sep;30(9):2219–24.

110. Moreno Y, Ballesteros L, García-Hernández J, Santiago P, González A, Ferrús MA. Specific detection of viable Listeria monocytogenes in Spanish wastewater treatment plants by Fluorescent In Situ Hybridization and PCR. Water Res. 2011 Oct;45(15):4634–40.

111. Lee DY, Lauder H, Cruwys H, Falletta P, Beaudette LA. Development and application of an oligonucleotide microarray and real-time quantitative PCR for detection of wastewater bacterial pathogens. Science of The Total Environment. 2008 Jul;398(1–3):203–11.

112. Guo F, Zhang T, Li B, Wang Z, Ju F, Liang Y ting. Mycobacterial species and their contribution to cholesterol degradation in wastewater treatment plants. Sci Rep. 2019 Dec 29;9(1):836.

113. Amalina ZN, Khalid MF, Rahman SF, Ahmad MN, Ahmad Najib M, Ismail A, et al. Nucleic Acid-Based Lateral Flow Biosensor for Salmonella Typhi and Salmonella Paratyphi: A Detection in Stool Samples of Suspected Carriers. Diagnostics. 2021 Apr 14;11(4):700.

114. Liu P, Ibaraki M, Kapoor R, Amin N, Das A, Miah R, et al. Development of Moore Swab and Ultrafiltration Concentration and Detection Methods for Salmonella Typhi and Salmonella Paratyphi A in Wastewater and Application in Kolkata, India and Dhaka, Bangladesh. Front Microbiol. 2021 Jul 15;12.

115. Branley JM, Roy B, Dwyer DE, Sorrell TC. Real-time PCR detection and quantitation of Chlamydophila psittaci in human and avian specimens from a veterinary clinic cluster. European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases. 2008 Apr 9;27(4):269–73.

116. Schets FM, de Heer L, de Roda Husman AM. Coxiella burnetii in sewage water at sewage water treatment plants in a Q fever epidemic area. Int J Hyg Environ Health. 2013 Nov;216(6):698–702.

117. Araj GF, Chugh TD. Detection of Salmonella spp. in clinical specimens by capture enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay. J Clin Microbiol. 1987 Nov;25(11):2150–3.

118. Cohen D, Orr N, Robin G, Slepon R, Ashkenazi S, Ashkenazi I, et al. Detection of antibodies to Shigella lipopolysaccharide in urine after natural Shigella infection or vaccination. Clinical Diagnostic Laboratory Immunology. 1996 Jul;3(4):451–5.

119. Pant A, Mittal AK. New Protocol for the Enumeration of *Salmonella* and *Shigella* from Wastewater. Journal of Environmental Engineering. 2008 Mar;134(3):222–6.

120. Domanguez J, Gal N, Blanco S, Pedroso P, Prat C, Matas L, et al. Detection of Streptococcus pneumoniae Antigen by a Rapid Immunochromatographic Assay in Urine Samples. Chest. 2001 Jan;119(1):243–9.

121. Wang C, Zheng X, Guan Z, Zou D, Gu X, Lu H, et al. Quantified Detection of Treponema pallidum DNA by PCR Assays in Urine and Plasma of Syphilis Patients. Microbiol

Spectr. 2022 Apr 27;10(2).

122. Gómez P, Lozano C, Benito D, Estepa V, Tenorio C, Zarazaga M, et al. Characterization of staphylococci in urban wastewater treatment plants in Spain, with detection of methicillin resistant Staphylococcus aureus ST398. Environmental Pollution. 2016 May;212:71–6.

123. Bulterys MA, Wagner B, Redard-Jacot M, Suresh A, Pollock NR, Moreau E, et al. Point-Of-Care Urine LAM Tests for Tuberculosis Diagnosis: A Status Update. J Clin Med. 2019 Dec 31;9(1):111.

124. Mtetwa HN, Amoah ID, Kumari S, Bux F, Reddy P. Molecular surveillance of tuberculosis-causing mycobacteria in wastewater. Heliyon. 2022 Feb;8(2):e08910.

125. Bahl MI, Rosenberg K. High abundance and diversity of Bacillus anthracis plasmid pXO1-like replicons in municipal wastewater. FEMS Microbiol Ecol. 2010 Oct;74(1):241–7.

126. Al-Gheethi AAS, Abdul-Monem MO, AL-Zubeiry AHS, Efaq AN, Shamar AM, Al-Amery RMA. Effectiveness of selected wastewater treatment plants in Yemen for reduction of faecal indicators and pathogenic bacteria in secondary effluents and sludge. Water Pract Technol. 2014 Sep 1;9(3):293–306.

127. Berendes D, Kirby A, Brown J, Wester AL. Human faeces-associated extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing Escherichia coli discharge into sanitation systems in 2015 and 2030: a global and regional analysis. Lancet Planet Health. 2020 Jun;4(6):e246–55.

128. Stark D, van Hal S, Fotedar R, Butcher A, Marriott D, Ellis J, et al. Comparison of Stool Antigen Detection Kits to PCR for Diagnosis of Amebiasis. J Clin Microbiol. 2008 May;46(5):1678–81.

129. Srikanth R, Naik D. Health Effects of Wastewater Reuse for Agriculture in the Suburbs of Asmara City, Eritrea. Int J Occup Environ Health. 2004 Jul 19;10(3):284–8.

130. Guy RA, Payment P, Krull UJ, Horgen PA. Real-Time PCR for Quantification of *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* in Environmental Water Samples and Sewage. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2003 Sep;69(9):5178–85.

131. Dixon BR, Bussey JM, Parrington LJ, Parenteau M. Detection of *Cyclospora cayetanensis* Oocysts in Human Fecal Specimens by Flow Cytometry. J Clin Microbiol. 2005 May;43(5):2375–9.

132. Sturbaum GD, Ortega YR, Gilman RH, Sterling CR, Cabrera L, Klein DA. Detection of *Cyclospora cayetanensis* in Wastewater. Appl Environ Microbiol. 1998 Jun;64(6):2284–6.

133. Johnston SP, Ballard MM, Beach MJ, Causer L, Wilkins PP. Evaluation of Three Commercial Assays for Detection of *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* Organisms in Fecal Specimens. J Clin Microbiol. 2003 Feb;41(2):623–6.

134. Mayer CL, Palmer CJ. Evaluation of PCR, nested PCR, and fluorescent antibodies for

detection of Giardia and Cryptosporidium species in wastewater. Appl Environ Microbiol. 1996 Jun;62(6):2081–5.

135. Jirků M, Pomajbíková K, Petrželková KJ, Hůzová Z, Modrý D, Lukeš J. Detection of *Plasmodium* spp. in Human Feces. Emerg Infect Dis. 2012 Apr;18(4).

136. Khurana S, Chaudhary P. Laboratory diagnosis of cryptosporidiosis. Trop Parasitol. 2018;8(1):2.

137. Jia S, Zhang X. Biological HRPs in wastewater. In: High-Risk Pollutants in Wastewater. Elsevier; 2020. p. 41–78.

138. Kauffman CA, Pappas PG, Sobel JD, Dismukes WE. Essentials of clinical mycology. Springer; 2011.

139. Mataraci-Kara E, Ataman M, Yilmaz G, Ozbek-Celik B. Evaluation of antifungal and disinfectant-resistant Candida species isolated from hospital wastewater. Arch Microbiol. 2020 Nov 12;202(9):2543–50.

140. Walchak RC, Buckwalter SP, Zinsmaster NM, Henn KM, Johnson KM, Koelsch JM, et al. Candida auris Direct Detection from Surveillance Swabs, Blood, and Urine Using a Laboratory-Developed PCR Method. Journal of Fungi. 2020 Oct 15;6(4):224.

141. Hategekimana F, Saha S, Chaturvedi A. Dynamics of amoebiasis transmission: stability and sensitivity analysis. Mathematics. 2017;5(4):58.

142. van den Driessche P. Reproduction numbers of infectious disease models. Infect Dis Model. 2017;2(3):288–303.

143. Haider N, Vairo F, Ippolito G, Zumla A, Kock RA. Basic Reproduction Number of Chikungunya Virus Transmitted by Aedes Mosquitoes. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020;26(10):2429.

144. Potterat JJ, Zimmerman-Rogers H, Muth SQ, Rothenberg RB, Green DL, Taylor JE, et al. Chlamydia transmission: concurrency, reproduction number, and the epidemic trajectory. Am J Epidemiol. 1999;150(12):1331–9.

145. Phelps M, Perner ML, Pitzer VE, Andreasen V, Jensen PKM, Simonsen L. Cholera epidemics of the past offer new insights into an old enemy. J Infect Dis. 2018;217(4):641–9.

146. Tien JH, Earn DJD. Multiple transmission pathways and disease dynamics in a waterborne pathogen model. Bull Math Biol. 2010;72:1506–33.

147. Nishiura H. Mathematical and statistical analyses of the spread of Dengue. 2006;

148. Matsuyama R, Akhmetzhanov AR, Endo A, Lee H, Yamaguchi T, Tsuzuki S, et al. Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis of the basic reproduction number of diphtheria: a case study of a Rohingya refugee camp in Bangladesh, November–December 2017. PeerJ. 2018;6:e4583. 149. Mpeshe S, Nyerere N. A human-animal model of giardiasis infection in contaminated environment. International Journal of Advances in Applied Mathematics and Mechanics. 2021;8(4):37–47.

150. Jolly AM, Wylie JL. Gonorrhoea and chlamydia core groups and sexual networks in Manitoba. Sex Transm Infect. 2002;78(suppl 1):i145–51.

151. Khan A, Naveed M, Dur-e-Ahmad M, Imran M. Estimating the basic reproductive ratio for the Ebola outbreak in Liberia and Sierra Leone. Infect Dis Poverty. 2015;4:1–8.

152. Hung HF, Wang YC, Yen AMF, Chen HH. Stochastic model for hepatitis B virus infection through maternal (vertical) and environmental (horizontal) transmission with applications to basic reproductive number estimation and economic appraisal of preventive strategies. Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment. 2014;28:611–25.

153. Pybus OG, Charleston MA, Gupta S, Rambaut A, Holmes EC, Harvey PH. The epidemic behavior of the hepatitis C virus. Science (1979). 2001;292(5525):2323–5.

154. Dalton HR, Hunter JG, Bendall RP. Hepatitis e. Curr Opin Infect Dis. 2013;26(5):471-8.

155. Lietman T, Porco T, Blower S. Leprosy and tuberculosis: the epidemiological consequences of cross-immunity. Am J Public Health. 1997;87(12):1923–7.

156. Engida HA, Theuri DM, Gathungu D, Gachohi J, Alemneh HT. A Mathematical Model Analysis for the Transmission Dynamics of Leptospirosis Disease in Human and Rodent Populations. Comput Math Methods Med. 2022;

157. Guerra FM, Bolotin S, Lim G, Heffernan J, Deeks SL, Li Y, et al. The basic reproduction number (R0) of measles: a systematic review. Lancet Infect Dis. 2017;17(12):e420–8.

158. Opoku NKDO, Borkor RN, Adu AF, Nyarko HN, Doughan A, Appiah EM, et al. Modelling the Transmission Dynamics of Meningitis among High and Low-Risk People in Ghana with Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. In: Abstract and Applied Analysis. Hindawi; 2022.

159. Trotter CL, Gay NJ, Edmunds WJ. Dynamic models of meningococcal carriage, disease, and the impact of serogroup C conjugate vaccination. Am J Epidemiol. 2005;162(1):89–100.

160. Grant R, Nguyen LBL, Breban R. Modelling human-to-human transmission of monkeypox. Bull World Health Organ. 2020;98(9):638.

161. Caley P, Hone J. Assessing the host disease status of wildlife and the implications for disease control: Mycobacterium bovis infection in feral ferrets. Journal of Applied Ecology. 2005;42(4):708–19.

162. Gaythorpe KAM, Trotter CL, Lopman B, Steele M, Conlan AJK. Norovirus transmission dynamics: a modelling review. Epidemiol Infect. 2018;146(2):147–58.

163. Pitzer VE, Bowles CC, Baker S, Kang G, Balaji V, Farrar JJ, et al. Predicting the impact

of vaccination on the transmission dynamics of typhoid in South Asia: a mathematical modeling study. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2014;8(1):e2642.

164. Kretzschmar M, Teunis PFM, Pebody RG. Incidence and reproduction numbers of pertussis: estimates from serological and social contact data in five European countries. PLoS Med. 2010;7(6):e1000291.

165. Sichone J, Simuunza MC, Hang'ombe BM, Kikonko M. Estimating the basic reproduction number for the 2015 bubonic plague outbreak in Nyimba district of Eastern Zambia. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2020;14(11):e0008811.

166. Eichner M, Dietz K. Eradication of poliomyelitis: when can one be sure that polio virus transmission has been terminated? Am J Epidemiol. 1996;143(8):816–22.

167. Polo G, Labruna MB, Ferreira F. Basic reproduction number for the Brazilian Spotted Fever. J Theor Biol. 2018;458:119–24.

168. Sfikas N, Greenhalgh D, Lewis F. The basic reproduction number and the vaccination coverage required to eliminate rubella from England and Wales. Math Popul Stud. 2007;14(1):3–29.

169. Khan MA, Atangana A. Mathematical modeling and analysis of COVID-19: A study of new variant Omicron. Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications. 2022;599:127452.

170. Chen S, Sanderson MW, Lee C, Cernicchiaro N, Renter DG, Lanzas C. Basic reproduction number and transmission dynamics of common serogroups of enterohemorrhagic Escherichia coli. Appl Environ Microbiol. 2016;82(18):5612–20.

171. Joh RI, Hoekstra RM, Barzilay EJ, Bowen A, Mintz ED, Weiss H, et al. Dynamics of shigellosis epidemics: estimating individual-level transmission and reporting rates from national epidemiologic data sets. Am J Epidemiol. 2013;178(8):1319–26.

172. Obolski U, Lourenço J, Thompson C, Thompson R, Gori A, Gupta S. Vaccination can drive an increase in frequencies of antibiotic resistance among nonvaccine serotypes of Streptococcus pneumoniae. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2018;115(12):3102–7.

173. Garnett GP, Aral SO, Hoyle D v, Cates Jr W, Anderson RM. The natural history of syphilis: implications for the transmission dynamics and control of infection. Sex Transm Dis. 1997;185–200.

174. Martin DL, Wiegand R, Goodhew B, Lammie P, Black CM, West S, et al. Serological measures of trachoma transmission intensity. Sci Rep. 2015;5(1):1–5.

175. Dobay A, Pilo P, Lindholm AK, Origgi F, Bagheri HC, König B. Dynamics of a tularemia outbreak in a closely monitored free-roaming population of wild house mice. PLoS One. 2015;10(11):e0141103.

176. Marangi L, Mirinaviciute G, Flem E, Scalia Tomba G, Guzzetta G, Freiesleben de Blasio B, et al. The natural history of varicella zoster virus infection in Norway: Further insights on exogenous boosting and progressive immunity to herpes zoster. PLoS One. 2017;12(5):e0176845.

177. Towers S, Brauer F, Castillo-Chavez C, Falconar AKI, Mubayi A, Romero-Vivas CME. Estimate of the reproduction number of the 2015 Zika virus outbreak in Barranquilla, Colombia, and estimation of the relative role of sexual transmission. Epidemics. 2016;17:50–5.

178. Lemarchand K, Berthiaume F, Maynard C, Harel J, Payment P, Bayardelle P, et al. Optimization of microbial DNA extraction and purification from raw wastewater samples for downstream pathogen detection by microarrays. J Microbiol Methods. 2005 Nov;63(2):115–26.

179. Volkmann H, Schwartz T, Kirchen S, Stofer C, Obst U. Evaluation of inhibition and cross-reaction effects on real-time PCR applied to the total DNA of wastewater samples for the quantification of bacterial antibiotic resistance genes and taxon-specific targets. Mol Cell Probes. 2007 Apr;21(2):125–33.

180. Shannon KE, Lee DY, Trevors JT, Beaudette LA. Application of real-time quantitative PCR for the detection of selected bacterial pathogens during municipal wastewater treatment. Science of The Total Environment. 2007 Aug 15;382(1):121–9.

181. Caldwell JM, Levine JF. Domestic wastewater influent profiling using mitochondrial real-time PCR for source tracking animal contamination. J Microbiol Methods. 2009 Apr;77(1):17–22.

182. Moges F, Endris M, Belyhun Y, Worku W. Isolation and characterization of multiple drug resistance bacterial pathogens from waste water in hospital and non-hospital environments, Northwest Ethiopia. BMC Res Notes. 2014;7(1):215.

183. Kumaraswamy R, Amha YM, Anwar MZ, Henschel A, Rodríguez J, Ahmad F. Molecular Analysis for Screening Human Bacterial Pathogens in Municipal Wastewater Treatment and Reuse. Environ Sci Technol [Internet]. 2014 Oct 7;48(19):11610–9. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1021/es502546t</u>

184. Weidhaas JL, Macbeth TW, Olsen RL, Sadowsky MJ, Norat D, Harwood VJ. Identification of a *Brevibacterium* marker gene specific to poultry litter and development of a quantitative PCR assay. J Appl Microbiol. 2010 Jul 10;109(1):334–47.

185. Ezeonuegbu BA, Abdullahi MD, Whong CMZ, Sohunago JW, Kassem HS, Yaro CA, et al. Characterization and phylogeny of fungi isolated from industrial wastewater using multiple genes. Sci Rep. 2022 Dec 8;12(1):2094.

186. Zhang H, Feng J, Chen S, Li B, Sekar R, Zhao Z, et al. Disentangling the Drivers of Diversity and Distribution of Fungal Community Composition in Wastewater Treatment Plants Across Spatial Scales. Front Microbiol. 2018 Jun 18;9.

187. Dalecka B, Oskarsson C, Juhna T, Kuttava Rajarao G. Isolation of Fungal Strains from

Municipal Wastewater for the Removal of Pharmaceutical Substances. Water (Basel). 2020 Feb 13;12(2):524.

188. Guest RK, Smith DW. Isolation and screening of fungi to determine potential for ammonia nitrogen treatment in wastewater. Journal of Environmental Engineering and Science. 2007 Mar 1;6(2):209–17.

189. Ali EAM, Sayed MA, Abdel-Rahman TMA, Hussein R. Fungal remediation of Cd(
<scp>ii</scp>) from wastewater using immobilization techniques. RSC Adv. 2021;11(8):4853–63.

190. Zhou L, Singh A, Jiang J, Xiao L. Molecular Surveillance of *Cryptosporidium* spp. in Raw Wastewater in Milwaukee: Implications for Understanding Outbreak Occurrence and Transmission Dynamics. J Clin Microbiol. 2003 Nov;41(11):5254–7.

191. Li N, Xiao L, Wang L, Zhao S, Zhao X, Duan L, et al. Molecular Surveillance of Cryptosporidium spp., Giardia duodenalis, and Enterocytozoon bieneusi by Genotyping and Subtyping Parasites in Wastewater. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2012 Sep 6;6(9):e1809.

192. Berglund B, Dienus O, Sokolova E, Berglind E, Matussek A, Pettersson T, et al. Occurrence and removal efficiency of parasitic protozoa in Swedish wastewater treatment plants. Science of The Total Environment. 2017 Nov;598:821–7.

193. Martins FDC, Ladeia WA, Toledo R dos S, Garcia JL, Navarro IT, Freire RL. Surveillance of Giardia and Cryptosporidium in sewage from an urban area in Brazil. Revista Brasileira de Parasitologia Veterinária. 2019 Apr;28(2):291–7.

194. Ulloa-Stanojlović FM, Aguiar B, Jara LM, Sato MIZ, Guerrero JA, Hachich E, et al. Occurrence of Giardia intestinalis and Cryptosporidium sp. in wastewater samples from São Paulo State, Brazil, and Lima, Peru. Environmental Science and Pollution Research. 2016 Nov 9;23(21):22197–205.

195. Wang Y, Liu P, Zhang H, Ibaraki M, VanTassell J, Geith K, et al. Early warning of a COVID-19 surge on a university campus based on wastewater surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 at residence halls. Science of The Total Environment. 2022 May;821:153291.

196. ben Ayed L, Yang W, Widmer G, Cama V, Ortega Y, Xiao L. Survey and genetic characterization of wastewater in Tunisia for Cryptosporidium spp., Giardia duodenalis, Enterocytozoon bieneusi, Cyclospora cayetanensis and Eimeria spp. J Water Health. 2012 Sep 1;10(3):431–44.

197. Stensvold CR, Lebbad M, Hansen A, Beser J, Belkessa S, O'Brien Andersen L, et al. Differentiation of Blastocystis and parasitic archamoebids encountered in untreated wastewater samples by amplicon-based next-generation sequencing. Parasite Epidemiol Control. 2020 May;9:e00131.

198. Ajonina C, Buzie C, Otterpohl R. The Detection of *Giardia* Cysts in a Large-Scale Wastewater Treatment Plant in Hamburg, Germany. J Toxicol Environ Health A. 2013

Apr;76(8):509–14.

199. Randazzo W, Cuevas-Ferrando E, Sanjuán R, Domingo-Calap P, Sánchez G. Metropolitan wastewater analysis for COVID-19 epidemiological surveillance. Int J Hyg Environ Health. 2020 Sep;230:113621.

200. Kaya D, Niemeier D, Ahmed W, Kjellerup B v. Evaluation of multiple analytical methods for SARS-CoV-2 surveillance in wastewater samples. Science of The Total Environment. 2022 Feb;808:152033.

201. O'Brien M, Rundell ZC, Nemec MD, Langan LM, Back JA, Lugo JN. A comparison of four commercially available RNA extraction kits for wastewater surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 in a college population. Science of The Total Environment. 2021 Dec;801:149595.

202. Torii S, Furumai H, Katayama H. Applicability of polyethylene glycol precipitation followed by acid guanidinium thiocyanate-phenol-chloroform extraction for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA from municipal wastewater. Science of The Total Environment. 2021 Feb;756:143067.

203. Hjelmsø MH, Hellmér M, Fernandez-Cassi X, Timoneda N, Lukjancenko O, Seidel M, et al. Evaluation of Methods for the Concentration and Extraction of Viruses from Sewage in the Context of Metagenomic Sequencing. PLoS One. 2017 Jan 18;12(1):e0170199.

204. Zheng X, Deng Y, Xu X, Li S, Zhang Y, Ding J, et al. Comparison of virus concentration methods and RNA extraction methods for SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance. Science of The Total Environment. 2022 Jun;824:153687.

205. Sherchan SP, Shahin S, Patel J, Ward LM, Tandukar S, Uprety S, et al. Occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in Six Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants at the Early Stage of COVID-19 Pandemic in The United States. Pathogens. 2021 Jun 23;10(7):798.

206. Ahmed W, Bivins A, Metcalfe S, Smith WJM, Verbyla ME, Symonds EM, et al. Evaluation of process limit of detection and quantification variation of SARS-CoV-2 RT-qPCR and RT-dPCR assays for wastewater surveillance. Water Res. 2022 Apr;213:118132.

207. Dunn, J. (2014). The mathematical epidemiology of human babesiosis in the North-Eastern United States (Doctoral dissertation, RMIT University).

APPENDIX A: FIGURES



Figure 1. Overall schematic of CDWSRank system

(Note: "*" marked parameter indicates that the annual caseload for Michigan from 2014-2021 was divided by the annual caseload for the TCDA, where the average of those was then taken for downstream analyses. The A+1 value was assigned to those CDs with an average ratio of <1.)



Figure 2. Disease incidence (per 100,000) for 95 CDs between 2014 and 2021 in the state of Michigan (Note: Disease incidence for Monkeypox was unavailable during this period)



Figure 3. Comparison of selected CDs incidences (per 100,000) between TCDA and MI (ratio < 1)



Figure 4. Comparison of selected CDs incidences (per 100,000) between TCDA and MI (ratio > 1)



Figure 5. Comparison of selected CDs incidences (per 100,000) between TCDA and MI (ratio \approx 1)



Figure 6. Selected CDs incidences potentially affected by the COVID-19 pandemic

COVID-19							_	-	29
Hepatitis B								26	
Measles							24	1	
Gonorrhea							24		
Chlamydia (Genital)							22		
Influenza						2	21		
Syphilis (Total)		_				20	0		
Hepatitis C	000	00000	00000	00000		19			
Tuberculosis	000	00000	00000	00000		19			
VZ Infection, Unspecified	000		00000			18			
Chickenpox (Varicella)						18			
Dengue Fever					1	7			
Campylobacter					1	7			
Mumps					1	7			
Legionellosis					1	7			
STEC		_			1	7			
CP-CRE					16				
Polio					15				
HIV					14				
Giardiasis		-	_		14				
Hepatitis E	2000	00000		0000	14				
Streptococcus pneumoniae, Inv	3000	10000		0000	14				
Shingles			-		13				
Rubella		-	-		13				
Amebiasis				1	3				
Salmonellosis				1	3				
Norovirus				1	3				
Shigellosis				12					
West Nile Virus				11					
H. influenzae Disease - Inv.				10					
	0	4	8	12	16	20	24	28	32
			O	verall:	rankir	ng sco	ore		

Ranking scores for CDs in the TCDA (Top 30)

Figure 7. Top 30 CDs by CDWSRank system for prospective wastewater surveillance in the TCDA

APPENDIX B: TABLES

Table 1. MDHHS-reported conditions associated with viruses that can potentially be monitor	ed
with wastewater surveillance	

Disease Name	Virus Potentially Associated with the Disease	Found in Excrement	Found in Wastewater	CDC NNIDCL?	EPA CCL?
Acute Flaccid Myelitis (AFM)	West Nile, enteroviruses, other viruses	Yes	Yes	N	Y
Chickenpox (Varicella)	Varicella-Zoster Virus	Yes	Yes	Y	N
Chikungunya	Chikungunya Virus	Yes	N/A	Y	N
Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)	Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)	Yes	Yes	Y	N
Dengue Fever	Dengue Virus	Yes	Yes	Y	N
Flu Like Disease	Multiple viruses	N/A	Yes	N	N
Gastrointestinal Illness	Multiple viruses, bacteria, parasites	Yes	Yes	Y	N
Hepatitis A	Hepatitis A Virus	N/A	Yes	Y	Y
Hepatitis B	Hepatitis B Virus	Yes	Yes	Y	N
Hepatitis C Hepatitis C Virus		Yes	Yes	Y	N
Hepatitis E	Hepatitis E Hepatitis E Virus		Yes	N	N
Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Infection		Yes	Yes	Y	N
Influenza	Influenza Virus	N/A	Yes	Y	N
Measles	Measles Virus	Yes	Yes	Y	N
Meningitis - Aseptic Several kinds of viruses. Most Commonly nonpolio enteroviruses		N/A	Yes	N	N
Monkeypox	Monkeypox Virus	Yes	Yes	N	N
Mumps	Mumps Virus	Yes	N/A	Y	N
Norovirus	Norovirus	Yes	Yes	N	Y
Polio	Poliovirus	Yes	Yes	Y	N
Rubella	Rubella Virus	N/A	Yes	Y	N
Shingles	Varicella-Zoster Virus		Yes	N	N
VZ Infection, Unspecified	Varicella-Zoster Virus	Yes	Yes	Y	N
West Nile Virus	West Nile Virus	Yes	Yes	N	N
Yellow Fever	Yellow Fever Virus	Yes	N/A	Y	N
Zika	Zika Zika Virus		Yes	Y	N

Notes: 1. MDHHS: Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, NNIDCL: National Notifiable Infectious Disease and Conditions List, CCL: Contaminant Candidate List. 2. N/A indicates the information was unavailable at the time that the study was conducted. 3. Data sources: (4–7,13,24,33,34,68,70,77–96).

Disease Name	Bacteria Potentially	Found in	Found in	CDC	EPA
	Associated with the Disease		Wastewater	NNIDCL?	CCL?
Anthrax*	Bacillus anthracis	N/A	Yes	Y	N
Botulism*	Clostridium (botulinum,	Yes	N/A	Y	N
	butyricum, baratii)				
Brucellosis**	Brucella spp.	N/A	Yes	Y	N
Campylobacter	Campylobacter spp.	Yes	Yes	Y	Y^
Chlamydia (Genital)	Chlamydia trachomatis	Yes	N/A	Y	N
Cholera**	Vibrio cholerae	Yes	N/A	Y	N
CP-CRE	Enterobacter resistant to	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
	carbapenem				
Gonorrhea	Neisseria gonorrhoeae	Yes	N/A	Y	N
Guillain-Barre	Campylobacter jejuni,	N/A	Yes	N	Y
Syndrome	several viruses				
H. Influenzae Disease -	Haemophilus influenzae	Yes	N/A	Y	N
Inv.					
Legionellosis	Legionella pneumophila	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Leprosy	Mycobacterium leprae	Yes	N/A	N	N
Leptospirosis	Leptospira spp.	Yes	N/A	Y	N
Listeriosis	Listeria monocytogenes	N/A	Yes	Y	N
Lymphogranuloma	Chlamydia trachomatis L1,	Yes	N/A	Y	N
Venereum	L2, L3				
Nontuberculous	Mycobacteria spp.	Yes	Yes	N	N
Mycobacterium					
Paratyphoid Fever	Salmonella Paratyphii A, B,	Yes	Yes	N	N
	and C				
Plague*	Y ersinia pesits	N/A	Yes	Y	N
Psittacosis	Chlamydia psittaci	Yes	N/A	Y	N
Q Fever**	Coxiella burnetti	N/A	Yes	Y	N
Salmonellosis	Salmonella	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Shiga Toxin-producing	E. coli	N/A	Yes	Y	Y
Escherichia Coli (STEC)	<u> </u>	37	X 7		37
Shigellosis	Shigella	Yes	Yes	Y	Y
Streptococcus	Streptococcus pneumoniae	Yes	N/A	N	N
Pneumoniae, Drug					
Resistant		37		NT	N
Streptococcus	Streptococcus pneumoniae	Yes	N/A	N	N
Pneumoniae, Inv		V		V	N
Syphilis Taxia Shaala	Syphilis I reponema pallidum		IN/A Vaa	Y	N N
I OXIC Shock Staphylococcus and		N/A	Yes	Ŷ	N
streptococcus bacteria		V		V	NT
Tubereulesis	Mucha a tamiuma tub ancula cia	r es Vez	IN/A Vac	Y V	IN N
Turbaid Free	Solmonglis trubil	r es	r es	Y V	IN N
I ypnoid Fever	Saimonella typhii	Y es	Y es	Y	IN N
VISA/VRSA	Staphylococcus aureus	IN/A	Yes	Y	N

 Table 2. MDHHS-reported conditions associated with bacteria that can potentially be monitored with wastewater surveillance

Notes: 1. MDHHS: Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, NNIDCL: National Notifiable Infectious Disease and Conditions List, CCL: Contaminant Candidate List. 2. N/A indicates the information was unavailable at the time that the study was conducted. 3. "*" indicates bioterrorism category A. "**" indicates bioterrorism category B. 4. Data sources: (97–127).

 Table 3. MDHHS-reported conditions associated with parasites that can potentially be monitored with wastewater surveillance

	With Wastewater Surveinance				
Disease Name	Parasite(s) Potentially	Found in	Found in	CDC	EPA
	Associated with the Disease	Excrement	Wastewater	NNIDCL?	CCL?
Amebiasis	Entamoeba histolytica	Yes	Yes	N	N
Cryptosporidiosis**	Cryptosporidium parvum	Yes	Yes	Y	N
Cyclosporiasis	Cyclospora cayetanensis	Yes	Yes	Y	N
Giardiasis	Giardiasis Giardia duodenalis		Yes	Y	N
Malaria	Plasmodium falciparum	Yes	N/A	Y	N

Notes: 1. MDHHS: Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, NNIDCL: National Notifiable Infectious Disease and Conditions List, CCL: Contaminant Candidate List. 2. N/A indicates the information was unavailable at the time that the study was conducted. 3. "**" indicates bioterrorism category B. 4. The parasitic category is designated for pathogens caused by parasitic organisms, excluding fungal, bacterial, and viral pathogens. 5. Data sources: (128–136).

 Table 4. MDHHS-reported conditions associated with fungi that can potentially be monitored with wastewater surveillance

Disease Name	Fungus Potentially	Found in	Found in	CDC	EPA
	Associated with the Disease	Excrement	Wastewater	NNIDCL?	CCL?
Blastomycosis	Blastomyces dermatitidis	Yes	N/A	Ν	Ν
	and gilchristii				
Candida auris	Candida auris	Yes	Yes	Y	Ν
Cryptococcosis	Cryptococcus neoformans	N/A	Yes	Ν	N

Notes: 1. MDHHS: Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, NNIDCL: National Notifiable Infectious Disease and Conditions List, CCL: Contaminant Candidate List. 2. N/A indicates the information was unavailable at the time that the study was conducted. 3. Data sources: (137–140).

Table 5. No values for 70 CDS						
Disease Name	R _o Value	Source				
Acute Flaccid Myelitis (AFM)	0	N/A				
Amebiasis	7	(141)				
Anthrax	1.251	(142)				
Babesiosis++	1.56	(207)				
Blastomycosis	0	N/A				
Botulism (Total)	0	N/A				
Brucellosis	0	N/A				
Campylobacter	0	N/A				
Candida auris	0	N/A				
Chancroid	0	N/A				
Chickenpox (Varicella)	11	(rcpi.ie)				
Chikungunya	3.4	(143)				
Chlamydia (Genital)	0.55	(144)				
Cholera	2.15	(145)				
Coccidioidomycosis	0	N/A				

Table 5. R₀ values for 96 CDs

TABLE 5 (CONT'D)

CP-CRE	0	N/A
Creutzfeldt-Jakob Disease	0	N/A
Cryptococcosis	0	N/A
Cryptosporidiosis	0	(146)
Cyclosporiasis	0	N/A
Dengue Fever	10	(147)
Diphtheria	7.2	(148)
Ehrlichiosis	0	N/A
Encephalitis	0	N/A
Flu Like Disease	1.5	(vdh.virginia.gov)
Gastrointestinal Illness	0	N/A
Giardiasis	4.181	(149)
Gonorrhea	0.89	(150)
Granuloma Inguinale	0	N/A
Guillain-Barre Syndrome	0	N/A
HIV	3.5	(netec.org)
H. influenzae Disease - Inv.	0	N/A
Hantavirus	0	N/A
Hemolytic Uremic Syndrome	0	N/A
Hemorrhagic Fever	1.62	(151)
Hepatitis A	0	N/A
Hepatitis B (Total)	9,175	(152)
Hepatitis C (Total)	2.12	(153)
Hepatitis E	6.5	(154)
Histoplasmosis	0	N/A
Influenza (Total)	1.5	(vdh.virginia.gov)
Kawasaki	0	N/A
Latent Tuberculosis	0	N/A
Legionellosis	0	N/A
Leprosy	2.75	(155)
Leptospirosis	1.52	(156)
Listeriosis (Total)	0	N/A
Lyme Disease	0	N/A
Lymphogranuloma venereum	3.5	(netec.org)
Malaria	0	N/A
Measles	15	(157)
Melioidosis	0	N/A
Meningitis - Aseptic	1.048	(158)
Meningitis - Bacterial Other	1.048	(158)
Meningococcal Disease	1.36	(159)
Monkeypox	2.1	(160)
Multiquator Inflormatory Syndrome	0	N/A

TABLE 5	(CONT'D)

Mumps	11	(health.gov.au)
Nontuberculous Mycobacterium	9	(161)
Norovirus	2	(162)
Paratyphoid Fever	2.8	(163)
Pertussis	5.5	(164)
Plague	1.45	(165)
Polio	12	(166)
Psittacosis	0	N/A
Q Fever (Total)	0	N/A
Rabies	0	N/A
Reve Syndrome	0	N/A
Rheumatic Fever	0	N/A
Rickettsial Disease - Spotted Fever	1.7	(167)
Rickettsial Disease - Typhus	0	N/A
Rubella (Total)	6.6	(168)
Salmonellosis	0	N/A
SARS	2.11	(169)
STEC	1.5	(170)
Shigellosis	1.29	(171)
Shingles	0	N/A
Streptococcal Dis. Inv. Grp A	0	N/A
Streptococcal Toxic Shock	0	N/A
Streptococcus pneumoniae, Drug Resistant	1.5	(172)
Streptococcus pneumoniae, Inv	1.5	(172)
Syphilis (Total)	1.5	(173)
Tetanus	0	N/A
Toxic Shock	0	N/A
Trachoma	2.8	(174)
Trichinosis	0	N/A
Tuberculosis	8	(155)
Tularemia	1.57	(175)
Typhoid Fever	2.8	(163)
VISA	0	N/A
VRSA	0	N/A
VZ Infection, Unspecified	6.5	(176)
West Nile	0	N/A
Yellow Fever	0	N/A
Yersinia enteritis	0	N/A
Zika	3.8	(177)

for which the Ro is unknown will have zero (0) added to their cumulative score.

Pathogen	Concentration Methods	Reference
Туре		
	Centrifugation	(178–181)
Bacterial	Membrane filtration	(182,183)
	Precipitation and filtration	(184)
E 1	Centrifugation and culture	(185,186)
Fungal	Plate culture growth	(187–189)
Demositie	Centrifugation	(190–196)
Parasitic	Filtration and centrifugation	(197,198)
	Aluminum-driven flocculation	(199)
	Concentrator instrument	(2)
	Centrifugation	(200,201)
	Electronegative membrane	(202)
	vortex	
	Filtration	(200,203)
	Membrane adsorption	(199,204)
Viral	Organic flocculation	(203)
	PEG	(5,200,202,203)
	Precipitation	(204)
	Ultracentrifugation	(204)
	Ultrafiltration	(8,11,200-202,204,205)
	VIRADEL	(4-8,17,205,206)
	Without pre-	(16)
	treatment/concentration	

 Table 6. Concentration methods for wastewater surveillance by pathogen type