Norovirus Dynamics in Wastewater Discharges and in the Recipient Drinking Water Source: Long-Term Monitoring and Hydrodynamic

(article starts on next page)

1 **Norovirus dynamics in wastewater discharges and in the recipient drinking water source: Long-**

2 **term monitoring and hydrodynamic modelling**

3 Olaf Dienus [1,2], Ekaterina Sokolova [3,*], Fredrik Nyström [1,2,a], Andreas Matussek [1], Sture Löfgren [1],

4 Lena Blom [3,4], Thomas J.R. Pettersson [3], Per-Eric Lindgren [1,2]

5 [1] Ryhov County Hospital, Medical Services, Clinical Microbiology, SE-551 85 Jönköping, Sweden

6 [2] Linköping University, Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, Medical Microbiology, SE-

7 581 85 Linköping, Sweden

8 [3] Chalmers University of Technology, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Water

9 Environment Technology, SE-412 96 Gothenburg, Sweden

10 [4] City of Gothenburg, Department of Sustainable Waste and Water, Box 123, SE-424 23 Angered,

11 Sweden

12 [a] Currently: Luleå University of Technology, Department of Civil, Environmental and Natural

13 Resources Engineering, Architecture and Water, SE-971 87 Luleå, Sweden

14 * Corresponding author, e-mail: ekaterina.sokolova@chalmers.se; phone: +46 31 7721929

15

16 Supporting Information. Details regarding the sampling programme, norovirus analyses,

17 hydrodynamic modelling, measured microbial concentrations in wastewater, simulated microbial

18 concentrations in source water.

19

20

Abstract

Norovirus (NoV) that enters drinking water sources with wastewater discharges is a common cause of waterborne outbreaks. The impact of wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) on the river Göta älv (Sweden) was studied using monitoring and hydrodynamic modelling. The concentrations of NoV genogroups (GG) I and II in samples collected at WWTPs and drinking water intakes (source water) during one year were quantified using duplex real-time reverse-transcription PCR. The mean (standard deviation) NoV GGI and GGII genome concentrations were 6.2 (1.4) and 6.8 (1.8) in incoming wastewater, and 5.3 (1.4) and 5.9 (1.4) Log_{10} genome equivalents (g.e.) L^{-1} in treated wastewater, respectively. The reduction at the WWTPs varied between 0.4 and 1.1 Log_{10} units. In source water, the concentration ranged from below the detection limit to 3.8 Log_{10} g.e. L^{-1}. NoV GGII was detected in both wastewater and source water more frequently during the cold than the warm period of the year. The spread of NoV in the river was simulated using a three-dimensional hydrodynamic model. The modelling results indicated that the NoV GGI and GGII genome concentrations in source water may occasionally be up to 2.8 and 1.9 Log_{10} units higher, respectively, than the concentrations measured during the monitoring project.

Key words: Göta älv; *E. coli*; norovirus; somatic coliphages; sewage; real-time PCR; water quality.

1 Introduction

Human norovirus (NoV) is highly infectious.[1-2] NoV spreads rapidly through person-to-person contact, airborne droplets, and water and food.[1] Immunity after the disease is incomplete and short-lived,[3] thus repeated infections of the same agent are common. Stool from infected individuals contains 10^5 to 10^{12} NoV per gram.[4] Viruses are generally resistant to current methods of wastewater treatment and often remain infectious for a long time in the environment.[5] Thus, wastewater discharges to drinking water sources pose risks of waterborne disease outbreaks.[6-7]

44   NoV is one of the most common causes of nonbacterial waterborne outbreaks of gastroenteritis in all

45   age groups.[8] One of the largest waterborne NoV gastroenteritis outbreaks in Sweden in recent years

46   occurred in the municipality of Lilla Edet in 2008, with approximately 2400 cases. It was suspected

47   that the cause of the outbreak was the contamination of the drinking water source – the river Göta

48   älv.[9]

49   Traditionally, microbial water quality control is based on detection of faecal indicator

50   microorganisms, e.g. *E. coli*, coliforms, and coliphages. However, there is a lack of correlation

51   between the concentrations of faecal indicator bacteria and specific pathogens, such as NoV.[10-12] Yet,

52   there are contradictory reports regarding the correlation between the concentrations of somatic

53   coliphages and NoV in source water.[11, 13] Thus, traditional water quality monitoring may not fully

54   predict the health risks.[14]

55   Little is known about the concentrations of NoV in source water, but this information is crucial for

56   the assessment of health risks for drinking water consumers.[15] Molecular methods, like reverse

57   transcription – quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) with a high sensitivity for detection

58   of NoV in water,[16] have the potential to provide this information.

59   Microbial water quality can also be studied by hydrodynamic models, which simulate the spread of

60   faecal contamination in a water source. Hydrodynamic modelling can be used to describe the

61   temporal and spatial variability of microbial concentrations,[17] to study the influence of different

62   processes on the microbial water quality,[18] and to quantify the relative impact of different faecal

63   sources.[19] In addition, this approach can be used to quantify the concentrations that are below the

64   detection limits of analytical methods, yet still high enough to be relevant to consumer health.[20]

65   The aim of this study was to determine the seasonal dynamics of NoV in wastewater and in the

66   recipient drinking water source – the river Göta älv in Sweden. For this purpose, the concentrations

67   of NoV and faecal indicators *E. coli* and somatic coliphages were (i) measured during long-term

68   monitoring, and (ii) simulated by means of hydrodynamic modelling.

2 Methods

2.1 Study area

Göta älv is a river that drains Lake Vänern into the strait Kattegat at the city of Gothenburg on the west coast of Sweden (Figure S1). The total catchment area of the river Göta älv is 50 233 km^2, which constitutes approximately 10 % of the area of Sweden. The part of the catchment area that is located downstream of Lake Vänern is approximately 3500 km^2. The length of the river between the outflow from Lake Vänern and the mouth of the river is 93 km. The vertical drop of the river is approximately 44 m. The water flow in the river Göta älv is regulated by several hydropower stations (Figure S1) and varies strongly; the mean and the maximum water flows are 550 and 1000 $m^3\,s^{-1}$, respectively. The transport time between the outflow from Lake Vänern and the mouth of the river is between 1.5 and 5 days.

The river is used as a water source for the drinking water supply of 700 000 consumers in several municipalities, including Gothenburg with 500 000 consumers. Between Lake Vänern and the water intake for the city of Gothenburg (Figure S1) the river receives wastewater from approximately 100 000 persons. Approximately 95 % of this wastewater is treated at municipal wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs), while 5 % is treated by on-site sewer systems.

2.2 Sampling

Source water samples (n=58) were collected from five drinking water treatment plants (DWTPs) along the river: Skräcklan in Vänersborg, Överby in Trollhättan, Lilla Edet, Dösebacka in Kungälv, and Lärjeholm in Gothenburg (Figure S1). Wastewater samples (n=160) were collected from four WWTPs: Holmängen in Vänersborg, Arvidstorp in Trollhättan, Ellbo in Lilla Edet, and Ryaverket in Gothenburg (Figure S1).

Sampling was conducted during one year, from 8 June 2011 to 5 June 2012 (Table S1). Source water samples were collected as 10.5 L grab samples of the incoming water at the DWTPs. Wastewater

4

93   samples were collected at the WWTPs continuously for 24 hours using automatic flow rate controlled

94   samplers; 1.5 L was used for further analyses. The 24 hour sampling was done to compensate for

95   fluctuations in concentration. All samples were collected in sterile glass containers and kept at 4 °C

96   until analysis. From each sample, 0.5 L was used for faecal indicator analyses.

2.3 Norovirus analyses

98   In this study, NoV genogroups (GG) I and II were studied. NoV genome concentrations were analysed

99   at the Microbiology Laboratory, Medical Services, County Hospital Ryhov, Jönköping. The details

100   regarding enrichment from source water and wastewater, extraction of RNA and reverse

101   transcription, detection and quantification by TaqMan real-time PCR, and controls of the

102   methodology are described in supporting information.

103   For source water, the limit of quantification (LOQ) was 3.8×10^1 g.e. L^{-1}, and the limit of detection

104   (LOD) was extrapolated to 1.1×10^1 g.e. L^{-1}. For wastewater, the LOQ was 1.5×10^4 g.e. L^{-1}, and the LOD

105   was extrapolated to 4.5×10^3 g.e. L^{-1}.

106   To control virus enrichment and RNA extraction steps, the samples were spiked with murine

107   norovirus 1 solution (MNV-1). The recovery rate was estimated for each sample using quantitative

108   real-time PCR for MNV-1. Inhibition control of the reverse transcription step was done with Alien

109   Reference RNA VIC QRT-PCR Detection Kit. To rule out PCR inhibition and to optimise PCR

110   performance, tick-borne encephalitis virus (TBEV) was used.

111   The process control MNV-1 showed that the virus recovery rate varied between 1.2 % and 23 % with

112   a mean of 18 % for source water, and between 0.1 % and 31 % with a mean of 5 % for wastewater.

113   All reported concentrations were corrected for the recovery rate. Inhibition control of the reverse

114   transcription step showed no inhibition. The PCR inhibition control TBEV showed no inhibition.

2.4 Faecal indicator analyses

The concentrations of *E. coli* were analysed within four hours after sampling at ALcontrol AB,

Linköping, Sweden, according to the Swedish standard SS 028167-2 (membrane filtration method).

The concentrations of somatic coliphages were analysed on the sampling day at Lackarebäck

laboratory, Gothenburg, Sweden, according to the standard ISO 10705-2 (plaque assay method).

2.5 Statistical analyses

The measured data were Log_{10} transformed and analysed using t-tests and correlation analyses. To

analyse the seasonality of concentrations, the warm and cold periods were defined based on

whether the air temperature was above or below +10 °C, respectively. The warm period included 13

sampling occasions (8 Jun 2011 – 12 Oct 2011 and 9 May 2012 – 5 Jun 2012); and the cold period

included 14 sampling occasions (26 Oct 2011 – 25 Apr 2012). To compare the number of samples

above the LOD during the warm and cold periods, Fischer's exact test was used. P-value <0.05 was

considered statistically significant.

When concentrations were below the LOD, the value for LOD was used for calculations. When the

NoV genome concentration was above the LOD, but below the LOQ, the geometric mean of the LOD

and LOQ was used for calculations: 2.0×10^1 g.e. L^{-1} for source water and 8.2×10^3 g.e. L^{-1} for

wastewater.

2.6 Hydrodynamic modelling

2.6.1 Model setup

To evaluate the impact of the WWTPs on the source water, the hydrodynamic conditions and the

transport of NoV and faecal indicators in the river Göta älv were simulated. The details about the

model setup and validation can be found in Sokolova et al.[21] and in supporting information.

The three-dimensional time-dependent hydrodynamic model MIKE 3 FM (MIKE Powered by DHI) was

used. This model is based on the numerical solution of three-dimensional incompressible Reynolds

139 averaged Navier-Stokes equations invoking the assumptions of Boussinesq and of hydrostatic

140 pressure. The model consists of continuity and momentum equations and is closed by a turbulent

141 closure scheme. The water density was assumed to be homogenous (barotropic formulation). The

142 modelling domain was approximated with prisms (triangles in horizontal plane) using a flexible mesh

143 approach. The length of the triangles' sides varied from 20 to 90 m. In vertical direction, the river was

144 divided into 10 layers with a thickness that could vary depending on the depth and water surface

145 elevation in the river (sigma-layers).

146 The transport of NoV, *E. coli*, and somatic coliphages in the river Göta älv was simulated using the

147 water quality model ECO Lab (MIKE Powered by DHI), which was coupled with the hydrodynamic

148 model of the river. The water quality model used flow fields from the hydrodynamic model to

149 calculate the microbial concentrations in the river. The processes accounted for in the model are:

150 advection, dispersion, and decay (for faecal indicators only).

151 It was assumed that NoV does not decay in the river (same as by Sokolova et al.),[22] since NoV is

152 highly resistant to environmental degradation in water.[7, 23-24] For example, Bae and Schwab (2008)[23]

153 reported the nucleic acid decay of a NoV surrogate to be 0.08 ± 0.02 Log_{10} per day in surface water at

154 25 °C. Based on this, the decay in the river Göta älv can be estimated to be at most 0.40 ± 0.10 Log_{10},

155 given the transport time (< 5 days) and water temperature (< 25 °C). In addition, a sensitivity analysis

156 was conducted by simulating the NoV decay in the same way as for somatic coliphages, since

157 coliphages are considered a useful surrogate for behaviour of enteric viruses in water environment.[25]

158 The decay of faecal indicators was described according to Equation 1:[26-27]

159
$$\frac{dC}{dt} = -k_0 \cdot \theta_I^{Int} \cdot \theta_T^{(Temp-20)} \cdot C \tag{1}$$

160 In Equation 1, *C* is the faecal indicator concentration; *t* is the time; k_0 (1/day) is the decay rate at 20

161 °C for a salinity of 0 ‰ and darkness; ϑ_I is the light coefficient; *Int* (kW/m^2) is the light intensity

162 integrated over depth; ϑ_T is the temperature coefficient; *Temp* (°C) is the water temperature.

7

163   The coefficients in Equation 1 for *E. coli* and somatic coliphages were determined based on the data

164   from the microcosm trials performed in different seasons for the conditions of Lake Rådasjön in

165   Sweden.[27] The coefficients k_0, ϑ_I and ϑ_T were set to 0.76, 1 and 1.04 for *E. coli* and to 0.25, 1 and 1.08

166   for somatic coliphages, respectively.[21]

167   The discharges of treated wastewater from eight WWTPs (Holmängen, Arvidstorp, Hjärtum, Ellbo,

168   Nygård, Lödöse, Älvängen, and Diseröd) were considered in the model as contamination sources

169   (Figure S1). The magnitude of these discharges was described using the mean values for the

170   respective WWTPs (Table S3). The water flow in the tributaries was described using the mean values.

171   ### 2.6.2 Scenarios

172   Several scenarios were formulated to represent the conditions in the river: different NoV loading

173   caused by the seasonality of diseases; different water temperature, which may affect the microbial

174   decay; different water flow, which affects contaminant transport in the river.

175   In case of NoV, due to the assumption of no decay, the water temperature was irrelevant and was

176   not accounted for. On the other hand, the NoV genome concentration in wastewater is dependent

177   on the prevalence of infection in the human population, and the prevalence of infection may be

178   dependent on the season. Thus, the NoV genome concentrations in treated wastewater were

179   described using the values calculated for the cold and warm periods by combining the measured data

180   from all WWTPs for each period (Table S4; see also the definition of the periods in Section 2.5

181   Statistical analyses).

182   In case of the faecal indicators *E. coli* and somatic coliphages, scenarios for low and high water

183   temperature were simulated to account for the temperature dependent decay. The concentrations

184   in treated wastewater were described using the data measured at the respective WWTPs. For the

185   WWTPs, for which measured data were not available, the values for concentrations were calculated

186   by combining all the measured data from the other WWTPs (Table S4).

187   Four scenarios were formulated: low flow cold, low flow warm, high flow cold, and high flow warm.

188   In case of NoV, these scenarios described the combination of low or high flow conditions with the

189   NoV genome concentrations representative for the warm or cold periods. In case of faecal indicators,

190   these scenarios described the combination of low or high flow conditions with warm or cold water in

191   the river.

192   To account for the variability of microbial concentrations in discharges of treated wastewater, the

193   scenarios were simulated using the median (baseline) and 95th percentile (worst case) values. The

194   water temperature was specified using the mean values for winter and summer (data for 2002 –

195   2013): 2.4 and 17.7 °C respectively. The water flow for the low and high flow scenarios was specified

196   as 200 and 850 m^3 s^{-1} respectively.

3 Results

3.1 Measured concentrations of norovirus and faecal indicators in wastewater

3.1.1 Incoming wastewater

201   The measured concentrations of NoV GGI and GGII genome in incoming wastewater at each sampling

202   occasion are shown in Figure 1 (see also Table S5). For incoming wastewater, the mean (standard

203   deviation) Log_{10} concentrations of NoV GGI and GGII genome for the combined data from the

204   WWTPs in Vänersborg, Trollhättan, and Lilla Edet were 6.2 (1.4) and 6.8 (1.8) Log_{10} g.e. L^{-1},

205   respectively. For incoming wastewater, all NoV genome concentrations that were above the LOD,

206   were also above the LOQ.

207   Combined data for incoming wastewater at the WWTPs in Lilla Edet and Trollhättan showed that

208   NoV GGI was detected equally frequent during the warm (22 out of 26 samples) and the cold (25 out

209   of 28 samples) periods (Fischer's exact test). For NoV GGII, the number of positive samples collected

210   during the warm (15 out of 26) and the cold (26 out of28) periods differed significantly (Fischer's

211   exact test). As only few samples were obtained from Vänersborg during the warm period, this WWTP

212   was omitted in the seasonality analysis. All samples from the Vänersborg WWTP (n=9; obtained

213   during 26 Oct 2011 – 5 Jun 2012) were positive for NoV GGI and GGII.

214   *E. coli* and somatic coliphages were detected in all collected samples of incoming wastewater; the

215   descriptive statistics are shown in Table S5. For incoming wastewater, no significant differences were

216   observed between the warm and the cold periods for *E. coli* and somatic coliphages (independent

217   samples t-test).

218   At the Trollhättan WWTP, the concentrations of NoV GGII genome and *E. coli* in incoming

219   wastewater positively correlated (bivariate correlation analysis). No other correlations between the

220   concentrations of NoV genome and of faecal indicators in incoming wastewater were observed.

221   3.1.2 Treated wastewater

222   The measured concentrations of NoV GGI and GGII genome in treated wastewater at each sampling

223   occasion are shown in Figure 1 (see also Table S5). For treated wastewater, the mean (standard

224   deviation) Log_{10} concentrations of NoV GGI and GGII genome in the combined data from the WWTPs

225   in Vänersborg, Trollhättan, Lilla Edet, and Gothenburg were 5.3 (1.4) and 5.9 (1.4) Log_{10} g.e. L^{-1},

226   respectively. For treated wastewater, all NoV genome concentrations that were above the LOD, were

227   also above the LOQ.

228   Combined data for treated wastewater at the WWTPs in Lilla Edet and Trollhättan showed that NoV

229   GGI was detected equally frequent during the warm (16 out of 26 samples) and the cold (17 out of 28

230   samples) periods (Fischer's exact test). For NoV GGII, the number of positive samples collected

231   during the warm (15 out of 26) and the cold (26 out of 28) periods differed significantly (Fischer's

232   exact test). As only few samples were obtained from Vänersborg and Gothenburg during the warm

233   period, these WWTPs were omitted in the seasonality analysis. All samples from the WWTPs in

234   Vänersborg (n=9; obtained during 26 Oct 2011 – 5 Jun 2012) and Gothenburg (n=7; obtained during

235   21 Dec 2011 – 5 Jun 2012) were positive for NoV GGI and GGII.

236   *E. coli* and somatic coliphages were detected in all collected samples of treated wastewater; the

237   descriptive statistics are shown in Table S5. For treated wastewater, no significant differences were

238   observed between the warm and the cold periods for *E. coli* and somatic coliphages (independent

239   samples t-test).

240   In treated wastewater, no correlations between the concentrations of NoV genome and of faecal

241   indicators were observed.

242   **3.1.3 Reduction of the norovirus and faecal indicator concentrations at the wastewater**

243   **treatment plants**

244   The Log_{10} reduction at each WWTP was calculated as the mean of the difference between the Log_{10}

245   concentrations in incoming and treated wastewater on each sampling occasion. At the Vänersborg

246   WWTP, the Log_{10} reduction for NoV GGI and GGII was 0.4 and 0.7, respectively. At the Lilla Edet

247   WWTP, the Log_{10} reduction for NoV GGI, GGII, and somatic coliphages was 0.8, 0.7, and 1.5,

248   respectively. At the Trollhättan WWTP, the Log_{10} reduction for NoV GGI, GGII, *E. coli*, and somatic

249   coliphages was 1.1, 1.0, 1.2, and 0.9, respectively.

250

Sampling date (dd-mm-yy)

251

252

253

254

12

255 Figure 1 Measured concentrations of norovirus genome in incoming (IN) and treated (OUT)

256 wastewater at the wastewater treatment plants in Vänersborg (a), Trollhättan (b), Lilla Edet (c), and

257 Gothenburg (d) (only treated wastewater). The star (*) indicates that no sample was collected. The

258 absence of bars for the dates, on which samples were collected, indicates that the NoV genome

259 concentration was below the limit of detection (4.5×10^3 g.e. L^{-1}).

3.2 Measured concentrations of norovirus and faecal indicators in source water

260

261

262 In source water samples from Vänersborg, Trollhättan, Lilla Edet, Kungälv, and Gothenburg DWTPs,

263 the concentrations of NoV GGI and GGII genome were above the LOD in 7 out of 58 and in 18 out of

264 58 samples, respectively (Figure 2). The NoV genome concentrations were below the LOQ in all

265 source water samples.

266 Combined data for source water at the Trollhättan, Lilla Edet, and Gothenburg DWTPs showed that

267 NoV GGI was detected in 3 out of 42, while NoV GGII was detected in 13 out of 42 samples. For NoV

268 GGI, the difference between the number of positive samples collected during the warm (0 out of 24)

269 and the cold (3 out of 18) periods was not significant (Fischer's exact test). For NoV GGII, the number

270 of positive samples collected during the warm (3 out of 24) and the cold (10 out of 18) periods

271 differed significantly (Fischer's exact test). As only few samples were obtained from Vänersborg and

272 Kungälv during the warm period, these DWTPs were omitted in the seasonality analysis.

273 For source water, no significant differences were observed between the warm and the cold periods

274 for *E. coli* and somatic coliphages (independent samples t-test).

275 Since the NoV genome concentrations were below the LOQ in all source water samples, the

276 correlations with faecal indicators could not be analysed.

277

278   Figure 2 Measured concentrations of norovirus genome in source water at the water intakes in Vänersborg (V), Trollhättan (T), Lilla Edet (L), Kungälv (K), and

279   Gothenburg (G). The star (*) indicates that no sample was collected. The absence of bars for the dates, on which samples were collected, indicates that the

280   NoV genome concentration was below the limit of detection (1.1×10^1 g.e. L^{-1}). The NoV genome concentrations were below the limit of quantification in all

281   source water samples.

282

3.3 Simulated concentrations of norovirus and faecal indicators in source water

For the baseline scenario (Figure S2), the modelling results for NoV GGI were similar under warm and cold conditions, while the modelling results for NoV GGII were higher under cold than under warm conditions. For the worst case scenario (Figure S2), the modelling results for both NoV GGI and GGII were higher under warm than under cold conditions. For both NoV GGI and GGII, the genome concentrations were higher under low flow conditions compared to high flow conditions (Figure S2).

The modelling results for *E. coli* and somatic coliphages (Figure S2) were higher under cold than under warm conditions, due to the temperature dependent decay. Under cold conditions, the modelling results were higher under low flow conditions, due to dilution in a smaller volume of water in comparison to high flow conditions. However, under warm conditions, the effect of dilution was counteracted by the effect of decay, since the latter was more pronounced under conditions of low flow because of longer transport time (Figure S2).

The comparison of the modelling results with the measured data (Table 1) was limited by the fact that in the model only one type of contamination source was considered, i.e. treated discharges from the WWTPs. In reality, other sources exist, e.g. emergency discharges from the WWTPs and the sewer system, and discharges from on-site sewer systems. Moreover, the comparison for NoV was also limited by the fact that only few concentrations were above the LOD, and all concentrations were below the LOQ.

The simulated NoV genome concentrations at the water intakes, for the baseline scenario, were either in agreement or lower than the measured concentrations (Table 1). However, for the worst case scenario, the simulated NoV genome concentrations at the water intakes were much higher (up to 2.8 and 1.9 Log_{10} units for NoV GGI and GGII, respectively) than the measured concentrations.

306   The simulated *E. coli* concentrations at the water intakes, for the baseline scenario, were in

307   agreement with the mean measured concentrations for Trollhättan and Lilla Edet, but lower (0.7

308   Log_{10} units) for Gothenburg (Table 1). For the worst case scenario, the simulated *E. coli*

309   concentrations at the water intakes were in agreement with the maximum measured concentrations

310   for Trollhättan and Lilla Edet, but lower (0.9 Log_{10} units) for Gothenburg (Table 1).

311   The simulated concentrations of somatic coliphages at the water intakes, for the baseline scenario,

312   were in agreement with the mean measured concentrations (Table 1). For the worst case scenario,

313   the simulated concentrations of somatic coliphages at the water intakes were in agreement with the

314   maximum measured concentrations for Lilla Edet and Gothenburg, but lower (0.7 Log_{10} units) for

315   Trollhättan and higher (1.1 Log_{10} units) for Kungälv (Table 1).

316   The sensitivity analysis showed that the maximum simulated NoV genome concentrations at the

317   water intakes were on average 0.15 and at most 0.40 Log_{10} units lower, when the NoV decay was

318   taken into account (Table S6).

319

320 Table 1 Measured and simulated concentrations (Log$_{10}$ transformed) of norovirus (NoV) genome and

321 faecal indicators in source water at the drinking water treatment plants in Trollhättan (T), Lilla Edet

322 (L), Kungälv (K), and Gothenburg (G).

Place	N [a]	Measured	Simulated	
		Minimum – Maximum (Mean)[b]	Minimum – Maximum Baseline	Minimum – Maximum Worst case
NoV GGI, Log$_{10}$ (g.e. L^{-1})				
T	1 (14)	<1.0 – 2.7	1.6 – 2.4	3.6 – 5.5
L	2 (14)	<1.0 – 3.8	2.1 – 2.9	4.1 – 6.0
K	3 (7)	<1.0 – 3.8	2.2 – 2.9	4.1 – 6.0
G	0 (14)	<1.0	2.2 – 2.9	4.1 – 6.0
NoV GGII, Log$_{10}$ (g.e. L^{-1})				
T	4 (14)	<1.0 – 3.8	1.6 – 3.3	4.2 – 5.1
L	4 (14)	<1.0 – 3.8	2.1 – 3.7	4.7 – 5.6
K	1 (7)	<1.0 – 3.7	2.2 – 3.8	4.7 – 5.6
G	5 (14)	<1.0 – 3.7	2.2 – 3.8	4.7 – 5.6
E. coli, Log$_{10}$ (CFU L^{-1})				
T	22 (25)	<1.0 – 3.0 (2.2)	1.8 – 2.4	2.5 – 3.1
L	25 (27)	<1.0 – 3.0 (2.4)	2.2 – 2.6	2.9 – 3.4
K	-	-	2.1 – 2.5	2.9 – 3.2
G	26 (26)	2.3 – 3.9 (3.0)	1.8 – 2.3	2.5 – 3.0
Somatic coliphages, Log$_{10}$ (PFU L^{-1})				
T	9 (10)	<1.0 – 3.3 (1.9)	1.1 – 1.7	2.0 – 2.6
L	10 (10)	1.8 – 3.0 (2.2)	1.7 – 2.3	2.5 – 3.2
K	5 (5)	1.3 – 2.0 (1.7)	1.7 – 2.3	2.5 – 3.1
G	9 (9)	1.3 – 3.2 (2.3)	1.6 – 2.2	2.5 – 3.1

323 [a] number of samples above the LOD (total number of samples)

324 [b] When the concentration was below the LOD, the value for LOD was used. For NoV in source water,

325 the LOD was extrapolated to 1.1×10^1 g.e. L^{-1}, i.e. 1.0 Log$_{10}$ units. The mean NoV genome

326 concentrations were not calculated, due to a small number of concentrations above the LOD.

4 Discussion

In this article, the concentrations of NoV genome and faecal indicators at the WWTPs and in the recipient drinking water source – the river Göta älv were studied in a one-year monitoring project. The effect of treated wastewater discharges from these WWTPs on source water was studied using hydrodynamic modelling.

Our findings add to previous studies[28-29] on NoV genome concentrations in wastewater and recipient source water, and reduction of NoV by wastewater treatment. The detection of NoV in treated wastewater is in agreement with previous results.[5, 30] The reduction of NoV in the WWTPs was of the same magnitude as the reduction of faecal indicators – around one Log_{10} unit; this is also in agreement with previous results.[30] Our findings regarding the seasonal variation of NoV in source water are also in agreement with the previous observations from other European countries.[5, 31] The more frequent detection of GGII compared to GGI during the colder period is in agreement with previous reports[32] and is suggested to reflect the high prevalence of NoV GGII infections during the colder period of the year.[33]

A limitation of the NoV measurements is that the virus recovery in this study varied strongly; this is however a common problem for this type of studies.[34] An improvement of the virus enrichment methodology to increase the recovery rate and reproducibility of NoV detection is desired.[34] A potential inhibition[35] during cDNA synthesis and the PCR reaction was ruled out. Another limitation of the studies based on PCR is the referring to genome equivalents and not to infectious viruses.[36]

The modelling results for the faecal indicators were generally in agreement with the measured concentrations in source water (Table 1). In some cases, the simulated concentrations of faecal indicators were lower than the measured concentrations. This underestimation can be explained by the fact that only the influence of the regular discharges from the WWTPs was studied, not of other faecal sources. For example, on-site sewer systems may also contribute to the faecal load into the river because of often poor treatment. While the modelling results for NoV for the baseline scenario

352   were in agreement with the measured concentrations (Table 1), the modelling results for the worst

353   case scenario indicated that the concentrations at the water intakes could be much higher than the

354   measured NoV genome concentrations. The plausibility of the modelling results for NoV is supported

355   by the modelling results for faecal indicators.

356   A limitation of this modelling approach is that it was assumed that microorganisms were not

357   attached to particles. Particle – microorganism interactions as well as sedimentation and

358   resuspension are complex and site-specific processes.[37-39] Due to the lack of data for the study area,

359   these processes were not included in the model, in order not to increase uncertainty. The decay of

360   NoV was neglected, since the transport time in the river is short, and NoV is highly resistant to

361   environmental degradation in water.[7, 23-24] The validity of this approach was confirmed by the

362   sensitivity analysis (Table S6).

363   Outbreaks related to drinking water contaminated with NoV[40-41] result in suffering for patients and

364   high costs for the community.[40] Quantitative microbial risk assessment that is widely used to analyse

365   and inform the management of the drinking water supply system,[42-43] requires the data on pathogen

366   concentrations in source water. The monitoring project showed that measurements of the NoV

367   genome concentrations in source water, while useful as input for risk assessment, may not provide

368   the complete picture, due to a relatively low frequency of measurements, and many concentrations

369   below the limits of quantification and detection. To address the limitations of monitoring and

370   analytical methods, the measured data can be supplemented by the results of hydrodynamic

371   modelling.[20, 22, 44] This study demonstrated that the modelling approach can be very useful to

372   describe the NoV genome concentration in source water. The modelling results provided insights

373   that the NoV genome concentrations at the water intakes may occasionally be much higher than the

374   concentrations measured during the monitoring project. Moreover, the modelling approach

375   emphasises the importance of knowing the contamination sources in the catchment; this is in

376 agreement with the recommendations by the World Health Organisation on mitigating the risks close

377 to the contamination source.[25]

Acknowledgements

390 Supporting Information available: details regarding the sampling programme, norovirus analyses,

391 hydrodynamic modelling, measured microbial concentrations in wastewater, simulated microbial

392 concentrations in source water. This information is available free of charge via the Internet at

393 http://pubs.acs.org.

References

395   (1) Teunis, P. F.; Moe, C. L.; Liu, P.; Miller, S. E.; Lindesmith, L.; Baric, R. S.;
396 Le Pendu, J.; Calderon, R. L. Norwalk virus: how infectious is it? *J. Med. Virol.* **2008,** *80* (8), 1468-76.
397   (2) Atmar, R. L.; Opekun, A. R.; Gilger, M. A.; Estes, M. K.; Crawford, S. E.;
398 Neill, F. H.; Graham, D. Y. Norwalk virus shedding after experimental human infection. *Emerg Infect*
399 *Dis* **2008,** *14* (10), 1553-7.
400   (3) Parrino, T. A.; Schreiber, D. S.; Trier, J. S.; Kapikian, A. Z.; Blacklow, N. R.
401 Clinical immunity in acute gastroenteritis caused by Norwalk agent. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **1977,** *297* (2), 86-
402 9.

403   (4)   van den Berg, H.; Lodder, W.; van der Poel, W.; Vennema, H.; de Roda
404 Husman, A. M. Genetic diversity of noroviruses in raw and treated sewage water. *Res. Microbiol.*
405 **2005,** *156* (4), 532-40.
406   (5)   Pusch, D.; Oh, D. Y.; Wolf, S.; Dumke, R.; Schroter-Bobsin, U.; Hohne,
407 M.; Roske, I.; Schreier, E. Detection of enteric viruses and bacterial indicators in German
408 environmental waters. *Arch. Virol.* **2005,** *150* (5), 929-47.
409   (6)   Blatchley, E. R., 3rd; Gong, W. L.; Alleman, J. E.; Rose, J. B.; Huffman, D.
410 E.; Otaki, M.; Lisle, J. T. Effects of wastewater disinfection on waterborne bacteria and viruses. *Water*
411 *Environ. Res.* **2007,** *79* (1), 81-92.
412   (7)   Seitz, S. R.; Leon, J. S.; Schwab, K. J.; Lyon, G. M.; Dowd, M.; McDaniels,
413 M.; Abdulhafid, G.; Fernandez, M. L.; Lindesmith, L. C.; Baric, R. S.; Moe, C. L. Norovirus infectivity in
414 humans and persistence in water. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2011,** *77* (19), 6884-6888.
415   (8)   Glass, R. I.; Parashar, U. D.; Estes, M. K. Norovirus gastroenteritis. *N.*
416 *Engl. J. Med.* **2009,** *361* (18), 1776-85.
417   (9)   Nenonen, N. P.; Hannoun, C.; Larsson, C. U.; Bergstrom, T. Marked
418 genomic diversity of norovirus genogroup I strains in a waterborne outbreak. *Appl. Environ.*
419 *Microbiol.* **2012,** *78* (6), 1846-52.
420   (10)   Haramoto, E.; Katayama, H.; Oguma, K.; Yamashita, H.; Tajima, A.;
421 Nakajima, H.; Ohgaki, S. Seasonal profiles of human noroviruses and indicator bacteria in a
422 wastewater treatment plant in Tokyo, Japan. *Water Sci. Technol.* **2006,** *54* (11-12), 301-8.
423   (11)   Horman, A.; Rimhanen-Finne, R.; Maunula, L.; von Bonsdorff, C. H.;
424 Torvela, N.; Heikinheimo, A.; Hanninen, M. L. Campylobacter spp., Giardia spp., Cryptosporidium
425 spp., noroviruses, and indicator organisms in surface water in southwestern Finland, 2000-2001.
426 *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2004,** *70* (1), 87-95.
427   (12)   Flannery, J.; Keaveney, S.; Rajko-Nenow, P.; O'Flaherty, V.; Dore, W.
428 Concentration of norovirus during wastewater treatment and its impact on oyster contamination.
429 *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2012,** *78* (9), 3400-6.
430   (13)   Havelaar, A. H.; van Olphen, M.; Drost, Y. C. F-specific RNA
431 bacteriophages are adequate model organisms for enteric viruses in fresh water. *Appl. Environ.*
432 *Microbiol.* **1993,** *59* (9), 2956-62.
433   (14)   Boehm, A. B.; Ashbolt, N. J.; Colford, J. M., Jr.; Dunbar, L. E.; Fleming, L.
434 E.; Gold, M. A.; Hansel, J. A.; Hunter, P. R.; Ichida, A. M.; McGee, C. D.; Soller, J. A.; Weisberg, S. B. A
435 sea change ahead for recreational water quality criteria. *J. Water Health* **2009,** *7* (1), 9-20.
436   (15)   Haas, C. N., Rose, J.B., Gerba, C.P. Quantitative Microbial Risk
437 Assessment. *John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, USA* **1999**.
438   (16)   Karim, M. R.; Pontius, F. W.; LeChevallier, M. W. Detection of
439 noroviruses in water--summary of an international workshop. *J. Infect. Dis.* **2004,** *189* (1), 21-8.
440   (17)   Hoyer, A. B.; Schladow, S. G.; Rueda, F. J. A hydrodynamics-based
441 approach to evaluating the risk of waterborne pathogens entering drinking water intakes in a large,
442 stratified lake. *Water Res.* **2015,** *83*, 227-236.
443   (18)   Liu, W. C.; Chan, W. T.; Young, C. C. Modeling fecal coliform
444 contamination in a tidal Danshuei River estuarine system. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2015,** *502*, 632-640.
445   (19)   Sokolova, E.; Pettersson, T. J. R.; Bergstedt, O.; Hermansson, M.
446 Hydrodynamic modelling of the microbial water quality in a drinking water source as input for risk
447 reduction management. *J. Hydrol.* **2013,** *497*, 15-23.
448   (20)   McBride, G. B.; Stott, R.; Papps, D.; Palliser, C.; Jenner, G.; Macdonald,
449 G. Estimating health risks to water users: Marrying hydrodynamic models and risk models. *Water*
450 *Practice and Technology* **2012,** *7* (4).
451   (21)   Sokolova, E.; Pettersson, T. J. R.; Bergstedt, O.; Hermansson, M.
452 Hydrodynamic Modelling of Microbial Water Quality in a Drinking Water Source. In *Urban*
453 *Environment*, Rauch, S.; Morrison, G.; Norra, S.; Schleicher, N., Eds. Springer Netherlands: 2013; pp
454 517-526.

455   (22)   Sokolova, E.; Petterson, S. R.; Dienus, O.; Nyström, F.; Lindgren, P. E.;
456 Pettersson, T. J. R. Microbial risk assessment of drinking water based on hydrodynamic modelling of
457 pathogen concentrations in source water. *Sci.Total Environ.* **2015,** *526*, 177-186.
458   (23)   Bae, J.; Schwab, K. J. Evaluation of murine norovirus, feline calicivirus,
459 poliovirus, and MS2 as surrogates for human norovirus in a model of viral persistence in surface
460 water and groundwater. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2008,** *74* (2), 477-484.
461   (24)   Ngazoa, E. S.; Fliss, I.; Jean, J. Quantitative study of persistence of
462 human norovirus genome in water using TaqMan real-time RT-PCR. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2008,** *104* (3),
463 707-715.
464   (25)   WHO *Guidelines for drinking-water quality, fourth edition*. World Health
465 Organization: Geneva, 2011; p 541.
466   (26)   Mancini, J. L. Numerical estimates of coliform mortality rates under
467 various conditions. *Water Pollution Control Federation* **1978,** *50* (11), 2477-2484.
468   (27)   Sokolova, E.; Åström, J.; Pettersson, T. J. R.; Bergstedt, O.; Hermansson,
469 M. Decay of Bacteroidales genetic markers in relation to traditional fecal indicators for water quality
470 modeling of drinking water sources. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2012,** *46* (2), 892-900.
471   (28)   Laverick, M. A.; Wyn-Jones, A. P.; Carter, M. J. Quantitative RT-PCR for
472 the enumeration of noroviruses (Norwalk-like viruses) in water and sewage. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.*
473 **2004,** *39* (2), 127-36.
474   (29)   da Silva, A. K.; Le Saux, J. C.; Parnaudeau, S.; Pommepuy, M.; Elimelech,
475 M.; Le Guyader, F. S. Evaluation of removal of noroviruses during wastewater treatment, using real-
476 time reverse transcription-PCR: different behaviors of genogroups I and II. *Appl Environ Microbiol*
477 **2007,** *73* (24), 7891-7.
478   (30)   Nordgren, J.; Matussek, A.; Mattsson, A.; Svensson, L.; Lindgren, P. E.
479 Prevalence of norovirus and factors influencing virus concentrations during one year in a full-scale
480 wastewater treatment plant. *Water Res* **2009,** *43* (4), 1117-25.
481   (31)   Perez-Sautu, U.; Sano, D.; Guix, S.; Kasimir, G.; Pinto, R. M.; Bosch, A.
482 Human norovirus occurrence and diversity in the Llobregat river catchment, Spain. *Environ.*
483 *Microbiol.* **2012,** *14* (2), 494-502.
484   (32)   Westrell, T.; Teunis, P.; van den Berg, H.; Lodder, W.; Ketelaars, H.;
485 Stenstrom, T. A.; de Roda Husman, A. M. Short- and long-term variations of norovirus concentrations
486 in the Meuse river during a 2-year study period. *Water Res.* **2006,** *40* (14), 2613-20.
487   (33)   Mounts, A. W.; Ando, T.; Koopmans, M.; Bresee, J. S.; Noel, J.; Glass, R.
488 I. Cold weather seasonality of gastroenteritis associated with Norwalk-like viruses. *J. Infect. Dis.* **2000,**
489 *181 Suppl 2*, S284-7.
490   (34)   Albinana-Gimenez, N.; Clemente-Casares, P.; Calgua, B.; Huguet, J. M.;
491 Courtois, S.; Girones, R. Comparison of methods for concentrating human adenoviruses,
492 polyomavirus JC and noroviruses in source waters and drinking water using quantitative PCR. *J. Virol.*
493 *Methods* **2009,** *158* (1-2), 104-9.
494   (35)   Sano, D.; Fukushi, K.; Yoshida, Y.; Omura, T. Detection of enteric viruses
495 in municipal sewage sludge by a combination of the enzymatic virus elution method and RT-PCR.
496 *Water Res.* **2003,** *37* (14), 3490-8.
497   (36)   Straub, T. M.; Honer zu Bentrup, K.; Orosz-Coghlan, P.; Dohnalkova, A.;
498 Mayer, B. K.; Bartholomew, R. A.; Valdez, C. O.; Bruckner-Lea, C. J.; Gerba, C. P.; Abbaszadegan, M.;
499 Nickerson, C. A. In vitro cell culture infectivity assay for human noroviruses. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2007,**
500 *13* (3), 396-403.
501   (37)   Hipsey, M. R.; Antenucci, J. P.; Brookes, J. D. A generic, process-based
502 model of microbial pollution in aquatic systems. *Water Resour. Res.* **2008,** *44* (7).
503   (38)   De Brauwere, A.; Ouattara, N. K.; Servais, P. Modeling fecal indicator
504 bacteria concentrations in natural surface waters: A review. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Science*
505 *and Technology* **2014,** *44* (21), 2380-2453.

506   (39)   Xagoraraki, I.; Yin, Z.; Svambayev, Z. Fate of viruses in water systems. *J.*
507 *Environ. Eng. ASCE* **2014,** *140* (7).
508   (40)   Larsson, C.; Andersson, Y.; Allestam, G.; Lindqvist, A.; Nenonen, N.;
509 Bergstedt, O. Epidemiology and estimated costs of a large waterborne outbreak of norovirus
510 infection in Sweden. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **2013**, 1-9.
511   (41)   Riera-Montes, M.; Brus Sjolander, K.; Allestam, G.; Hallin, E.; Hedlund, K.
512 O.; Lofdahl, M. Waterborne norovirus outbreak in a municipal drinking-water supply in Sweden.
513 *Epidemiol. Infect.* **2011,** *139* (12), 1928-35.
514   (42)   Medema, G.; Smeets, P. Quantitative risk assessment in the Water
515 Safety Plan: Case studies from drinking water practice. *Water Sci. Technol.: Water Supply* **2009,** *9*,
516 127-132.
517   (43)   Smeets, P. W. M. H.; Rietveld, L. C.; Van Dijk, J. C.; Medema, G. J.
518 Practical applications of quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) for water safety plans. *Water*
519 *Sci. Technol.* **2010,** *61* (6), 1561-1568.
520   (44)   Eregno, F. E.; Tryland, I.; Tjomsland, T.; Myrmel, M.; Robertson, L.;
521 Heistad, A. Quantitative microbial risk assessment combined with hydrodynamic modelling to
522 estimate the public health risk associated with bathing after rainfall events. *Science of the Total*
523 *Environment* **2016,** *548-549*, 270-279.

524

525