

"Establishment of monitoring system for viral pollution of water"

A thesis
Submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Science "Microbiology"

Sherif Nagy Abdou Abd-Elmaksoud

B.Sc. in Microbiology (2002) M.Sc. in Microbiology (2008)

Supervisors

Prof. Dr. Ahmed B. Barakat

Professor of Virology, Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University, Egypt

Prof. Dr. Nagwa A. El-Esnawy

Professor of Virology, Department of Water Pollution, Environmental Research Division, National Research Centre, Egypt

Dr. Hussam El-Din A. Ghanem

Assistant Prof. of Microbiology, Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University, Egypt

Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University 2014



Faculty of Science, Department of Microbiology

Approval Sheet

Thesis Title: "Establishment of monitoring system for viral pollution of water"

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy in Science "Microbiology"

Name of student: Sherif Nagy Abdou Abd-Elmaksoud

This thesis for Ph.D. degree has been approved by:

Supervisors Approved

Prof. Dr. Ahmed Barakat Barakat

Prof. Dr. Nagwa A. El-Esnawy

Dr. Hussam El-Din A. Ghanem

Examination committee

Prof. Dr. Ali Fahmy Mohammed Prof. of Virology - Head of Applied Research Unit- Vacsera

Prof. Dr. Gamal Abdel Aziz Othman

Prof. of Microbiology- Faculty of Science

Al-Zagazeik University

Prof. Dr. Ahmed Barakat Barakat Prof. of Virology -Department of Microbiology-

Faculty of Science - Ain Shams University

Date of Examination: 29 / 11 / 2014

Head of Microbiology Dean of Faculty of Science Department

Acknowledgments

First of all thanks to ALLAH for every blessing he gave me and for helping me finish this work.

I would like to express my deepest respect and sincere gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Ahmed Barakat** for the valuable advice, precious guidance since my undergraduate studies and until the progress of this work.

I am greatly indebted and expressing my sincere appreciation to **Prof. Dr. Nagwa EL-Esnawy** for providing all the facilities, endless help, innovation supervision, and suggestions, which were a great asset to this work.

My deepest thanks go to **Dr. Hussam A. Ghanem**, for his advice during my study. Appreciation also goes to my advisors in Virology lab, University of Arizona, USA; **Prof. Dr. Charles Gerba** and **Akrum Tamimi** for their support throughout my thesis.

I would like also to thank everyone who has provided me with assistance and advice in my virology labs in the National Research Centre and in University of Arizona, USA.

Dedication

To my parents, I thank you both, because you taught me how to be both brave and patience, thus enabling me to push forward. I have been blessed to have you as my parents. Thank you for all your love and care you giving to me and my brothers.

To my brothers for all your kindness and encouragement words that helped me during all my studies.

To each one of my precious and loving children Omar, Mohamed and Ali.

And finally to my lovely wife Asmaa, to whom I am so thankful for her love, care, support, encouragement and understanding.

This thesis has not been previously submitted for any degree at this or any other university

Signed

Sherif Abd-Elmaksoud

Table of Contents

| No. | | Title | Page |
|---------------------|------------|--|------|
| Acknowledges. | | | I |
| Table of Cont. | | | IV |
| List | of Figures | | VI |
| List | of Tables | | VII |
| List of Abbs. | | | VIII |
| Chap | ter One | Introduction | 1 |
| | | Aim of Work | 8 |
| Chap | ter Two | Literature Review | 9 |
| | 1. | Primary virus Concentration methods | 11 |
| | 1.1. | Concentration based on ionic charge | 11 |
| | | (adsorption/elution) | |
| | 1.1.1. | Electronegative filters | 12 |
| | 1.1.2. | Electropositive filters | 14 |
| | 1.2. | Ultrafiltration | 19 |
| | 1.3. | Ultracentrifugation | 21 |
| | 2. | Secondary concentration | 22 |
| | 3. | Virus Detection Methods | 23 |
| | 3.1. | Cell culture assays | 24 |
| | 3.2. | Molecular assays | 25 |
| | 4. | Disinfection | 30 |
| | 4.1. | Chlorine | 32 |
| | 4.2. | Ozone | 33 |
| | 4.3. | Ultraviolet | 34 |
| Chap | ter Three | Materials and Methods | 36 |
| | Part 1 | Glass Wool Study | 36 |
| | Part 2 | BGM and PLC cell lines comparative study | 43 |
| | Part 3 | Disinfection Studies | 48 |
| Chapter Four | | Results and Discussion | 55 |
| | Part 1 | Glass Wool Study | 55 |

| Part 2 | BGM and PLC cell lines comparative study | 64 |
|---------------------|--|----|
| Part 3 | Disinfection Studies | 72 |
| Chapter Five | Summary and Recommendations | 78 |
| | References | 81 |
| | Arabic summary | |
| | | |

List of Figures

| Figure no. | | Title | Page |
|------------|-----|---|------|
| Figure | (A) | Glass wool filtration | 38 |
| Figure | (B) | Uninfected cell culture | 45 |
| Figure | (C) | Infected cell culture with CPE | 45 |
| Figure | (D) | Handheld ultraviolet device | 49 |
| Figure | (1) | Summary of Glass Wool Filter recovery percentage. | 63 |
| Figure | (2) | Percent of samples Showed CPE in Cell culture | 69 |
| Figure | (3) | Percent of Positive sample by ICC-PCR. | 70 |
| Figure | (4) | Percent of Positive Samples in Raw Sludge and Class B biosolids using BGM and PLC cell lines | 71 |

List of Tables

| Table no. | | Title | Page |
|-----------|-----|--|------|
| | | | |
| Table | (A) | QPCR primers and probes. | 41 |
| Table | (1) | Glass wool filter recovery of bovine-origin pathogens in water and ANOVA results for differences in recovery among pathogen types for a given water turbidity level. Bold P-values indicate statistically different recovery efficiencies. | 61 |
| Table | (2) | All pairwise comparisons of glass wool filter recovery efficiencies by pathogen type. Bold table rows indicate statistically different recovery efficiencies between pathogen pairs. | 62 |
| Table | (3) | Cell culture and PCR Results for detection of enteric viruses in Biosolids. | 68 |
| Table | (4) | Removal of test organisms by the handheld UV water treatment device. | 72 |
| Table | (5) | Inactivation of viruses by bleach (Reduction log10) after 30 min. | 75 |

List of Abbreviations

ANOVA Analysis of variations

ATCC American Type Culture Collection

Bp Base pairs

BEG beef extract-glycine buffer BGM Buffalo Green Monkey

BVDV bovine viral diarrhea virus

CPE Cytopathic effect

cDNA Complementary DNA CFU Colony forming unit DNA Deoxyribonucleic acid

dNTP Deoxynucleotide triphosphate EDTA Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid

FBS Fetal bovine serum

FCSV final concentrated sample volumes

HGV hepatitis G virus

ICC/PCR Integrated Cell Culture PCR

MA104 Rhesus monkey epithelial cell line

MEM Minimum essential medium

MPN Most Probable Number

NTU Nephelometric turbidity units NSF National Sanitation Foundation

NLV Norwalk like viruses

PLC Primary Liver carcinoma

PFU Plaque Forming Unit

PBS Phosphate buffer saline

PCR Polymerase chain reaction

PVC polyvinylchloride

qPCR Quantitative polymerase chain reaction

RT Reverse transcriptase

RNA Ribonucleic Acid

rpm Revolutions per minute

TCVA Total Culturable Viral Assay

TCID₅₀ 50% Tissue Culture Infective Dose

TDS Total dissolved solids

Tris Hydroxymethyl amino methane

TOC Total organic carbon

USEPA United State Environmental Protection agency

UV Ultraviolet

(v/v) Volume per volume

WHO World Health Organization

(w/v) Weight per volume

xg Relative centrifuge force

Chapter I

Introduction

Waterborne diseases are still a major problem in the world today, causing millions of deaths each year. While water treatment has significantly reduced waterborne disease in the United States, it is still estimated that 19.5 million cases occur annually (Reynolds et al., 2008). The majority of waterborne viruses are transmitted via the fecal-oral route, including the enteroviruses (e.g., echoviruses and Coxsackieviruses), adenoviruses (Types 40 and 41), human caliciviruses (noroviruses), and hepatitis A virus, among others. Illness is initiated upon ingestion of these microorganisms from contaminated water sources. Exposure to low numbers (1 to 10 infectious units) may lead to virus replication within the digestive tract and infection (Haas et al., 1993). A wide variety of clinical outcomes have been documented ranging from asymptomatic carrier states to life-threatening gastroenteritis, meningitis, febrile illness, paralysis, and acute hepatitis (Moe, 2002).

As these viruses are excreted in high numbers within fecal matter by infected persons (10⁶ per gram of excreta), they are subsequently present in elevated numbers in raw sewage water (Gerba et al., 1978). These viruses cannot always be effectively eliminated by current methods of sewage treatment (Van den

Berg et al., 2005) and consequently cause viral contamination of the environment from treated as well as untreated wastewater. Other examples of indirect routes are run-off from manure used in agriculture. There is also direct fecal contamination of the environment from humans and animals, for example by bathers or by defecation of free-range or wild animals onto soil or surface waters. The resulting viral contamination of sea and coastal water, rivers and other surface waters, groundwaters, and irrigated vegetables and fruit is associated with subsequent risks of reintroduction of the viral pathogens into human and animal populations (La Rosa et al., 2007). In the latter scenario, however, viruses are often present in lower numbers, making their detection difficult (Farrah et al., 1976). Therefore, a concentration step must be implemented whereby large volumes of water ranging from hundreds to thousands of liters are passed through filters to capture the microorganisms.

A variety of filter devices have been evaluated over the course of several decades for their capacity to concentrate enteric viruses and include electronegative (Fuhrman *et al.*, 2005) and electropositive pleated filters (Chapron *et al.*, 2000), glass wool (Lambertini *et al.*, 2008), ultrafilters (Polaczyk *et al.*, 2008), and ultracentrifugation (Mehnert *et al.*, 1997).

While these devices have proven effective for the capture of viruses from water, several are either impractical for application with more turbid natural surface waters (e.g., ultrafilters), or are costly (e.g., 1MDS electropositive filter, CUNO, Meriden, CT,

~\$180 each). Both electronegative and electropositive filters are widely used today; however, electronegative filters are not ideal for large-scale water sampling as they require acidification of the water and the addition of mutivalent cationic salts to the water prior to filtration (Wallis et al., 1972).

Development of an inexpensive and efficient system for concentrating, eluting, and re-concentrating pathogenic viruses from drinking water and surface waters is very important for accurate detection and identification of human enteric viruses in environmental waters and help in proper monitoring of microbial quality in order to avoid health hazards of infection by these viruses.

Sodocalcic glass wool offers a promising alternative as an adsorptive material for virus concentration. Glass wool, held together by a binding agent and coated with mineral oil, provides both hydrophobic and electropositive sites for adsorption of microorganisms. Viruses are usually negatively charged in water at near neutral pH and readily adsorbed to the positively charged glass wool fibers (Environment Agency, 2000). The fibers are inexpensive, require no water conditioning outside of pH adjustment in some circumstances and can be applied in the field for on-site filtration and concentration (Wyn-Jones and Sellwood, 2001). Glass wool has been shown to be effective for the concentration of human enteric viruses from wastewater (Gantzer et al., 1997), drinking water (Lambertini et al., 2008), groundwater (Ehlers et al., 2005), river water (Albinana-

Gimenez *et al.*, **2009**), and reservoirs (**Deboosere**, *et al.*, **2011**). However, only a handful of studies have attempted to quantify how effective glass wool is for concentrating viruses (**Environment Agency**, **2000**), and these examined only enteroviruses and rotavirus.

Cell culture is the most commonly use method for the isolation of infectious viruses from water (Pepper et al., 2000). The Buffalo green monkey kidney (BGM) cell line is very sensitive to infection by poliovirus and coxsackievirus B and is the most common cell line used for the detection of such viruses in water (Dahling, 1991). The BGM cell line recommended for the total culturable viral assay (TCVA) is the standard method for the enumeration of viruses from water (US.EPA, 1995). The TCVA depends on the ability of the viruses to propagate in BGM cells and create morphological changes or cytopathic effects (CPE) that can be identified and quantified. The combination of the BGM cell line with other cell lines such as A549, human colon adenocarcinoma (Caco- 2), and primary liver carcinoma (PLC/PRF/5) lines for the monitoring of viruses in water has been reported to increase the sensitivity for the detection of adenoviruses, coxsackie A viruses, echoviruses and astroviruses, or other viruses that do not grow effectively on BGM cells (Sedmak et al., 2005). PLC/PRF/5 is a more efficient cell line for the propagation of adenoviruses 40 and 41 than Graham 293, Chang, KB, and A549 (Grabow et al., 1992). In addition, the