Accepted Manuscript

Flow cytometric bacterial cell counts challenge conventional heterotrophic plate counts for routine microbiological drinking water monitoring

S. Van Nevel, S. Koetzsch, C.R. Proctor, M.D. Besmer, E.I. Prest, J.S. Vrouwenvelder, A. Knezev, N. Boon, F. Hammes

PII: S0043-1354(17)30072-6

DOI: [10.1016/j.watres.2017.01.065](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2017.01.065)

Reference: WR 12666

To appear in: *Water Research*

Received Date: 1 August 2016

Revised Date: 30 January 2017

Accepted Date: 31 January 2017

Please cite this article as: Van Nevel, S., Koetzsch, S., Proctor, C.R., Besmer, M.D., Prest, E.I., Vrouwenvelder, J.S., Knezev, A., Boon, N., Hammes, F., Flow cytometric bacterial cell counts challenge conventional heterotrophic plate counts for routine microbiological drinking water monitoring, *Water Research* (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.watres.2017.01.065.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Flow cytometric bacterial cell counts challenge conventional heterotrophic plate counts for routine microbiological drinking water monitoring

S. Van Nevel¹, S. Koetzsch², C. R. Proctor^{2,3}, M. D. Besmer², E. I. Prest⁴, J. S. Vrouwenvelder^{4,5,6}, A. Knezev⁷, N. Boon^{1§}, F. Hammes^{2*§}

¹Center for Microbial Ecology and Technology (CMET), Ghent University, Coupure Links 653, B-9000 Gent, Belgium

²Eawag, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Überlandstrasse 133, CH-8600 Dübendorf, Switzerland

³Department of Environmental Systems Science, Institute of Biogeochemistry and Pollutant Dynamics, ETH Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

⁴Department of Biotechnology, Faculty of Applied Sciences, Delft University of Technology, Van der Maasweg 9, 2629 HZ Delft, The Netherlands

⁵Wetsus, Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Water Technology, Oostergoweg 9, 8911 MA Leeuwarden, The Netherlands

⁶King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Water Desalination and Reuse Center (WDRC), Division of Biological and Environmental Science and Engineering (BESE), Thuwal 23955-6900, Saudi Arabia

⁷Het Waterlaboratorium, J.W. Lucasweg 2, 2031 BE Haarlem, The Netherlands

§ Shared last author

* Correspondence to: Frederik Hammes, Eawag, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology; Überlandstrasse 133, CH-8600 Dübendorf, Switzerland; phone: +41 (0)58 765 51 52; fax: +41 (0)58 765 55 47; E-mail: frederik.hammes@eawag.ch Webpage: www.eawag.ch.

Abstract

Drinking water utilities and researchers continue to rely on the century-old heterotrophic plate counts (HPC) method for routine assessment of general microbiological water quality. Bacterial cell counting with flow cytometry (FCM) is one of a number of alternative methods that challenge this status quo and provide an opportunity for improved water quality monitoring. After more than a decade of application in drinking water research, FCM methodology is optimised and established for routine application, supported by a considerable amount of data from multiple full-scale studies. Bacterial cell concentrations obtained by FCM enable quantification of the entire bacterial community instead of the minute fraction of cultivable bacteria detected with HPC (typically < 1 % of all bacteria). FCM measurements are reproducible with relative standard deviations below 3 % and can be available within 15 minutes of samples arriving in the laboratory. High throughput sample processing and complete automation are feasible and FCM analysis is arguably less expensive than HPC when measuring more than 15 water samples per day, depending on the laboratory and selected staining procedure(s). Moreover, many studies have shown FCM total (TCC) and intact (ICC) cell concentrations to be reliable and robust process variables, responsive to changes in the bacterial abundance and relevant for characterising and monitoring drinking water treatment and distribution systems. The purpose of this critical review is to initiate a constructive discussion on whether FCM could replace HPC in routine water quality monitoring. We argue that FCM provides a faster, more descriptive and more representative quantification of bacterial abundance in drinking water.

Keywords: cultivation; microbiological drinking water quality; flow cytometry (FCM); heterotrophic plate counts (HPC); routine water monitoring;

1. Introduction

Drinking water treatment and distribution systems are designed and operated to safeguard the hygienic quality and ensure the aesthetic quality of the water from source to tap. With this in mind, monitoring is a non-negotiable and legislated requirement worldwide. There is a recognised and accepted need to monitor, characterise and understand the general microbiological performance/response of individual treatment steps, especially under changing environmental and operational conditions (Reasoner, 1990; Lautenschlager et al., 2013; Pinto et al., 2012). There is furthermore the need to monitor the general microbiological behaviour of treated water during distribution, particularly to detect potential contamination or deterioration due to biologically unstable water or distribution systems (Prest et al., 2016; Pinto et al., 2014). From a water utility perspective, microbiological methods used for such general water quality monitoring would ideally meet the criteria of being relevant, simple, reliable, rapid and cost-effective.

Heterotrophic plate counts (HPC) is the descriptive term for a group of similar methods used routinely by water utilities for general microbiological monitoring of drinking water. The method enumerates a variety of heterotrophic bacteria that are cultivable on semi-solid nutrient-rich media under defined incubation conditions (Allen et al., 2004; Rice et al., 2012; Gensberger et al., 2015). The basic HPC method was proposed well over a century ago (Koch, 1881) and was for a considerable time regarded as indicative of the hygienic quality of drinking water (Sartory, 2004). However, during the 1980's and 1990's it was decisively concluded that HPC measurements have no hygienic relevance (WHO, 2003; Sartory, 2004). Increasingly, HPC was regarded as a process variable to monitor a range of events and/or processes relevant to the general microbiological quality of drinking water in treatment and distribution systems (Reasoner, 1990; WHO, 2003; Sartory, 2004). For most of the previous century, HPC was regarded as the best available technology for drinking water process monitoring, and HPC data contributed towards considerable advances in our understanding of drinking water microbiology (Chowdhury, 2012).

In the last two decades, a number of powerful quantitative and molecular methods have emerged for water analysis (e.g., adenosine tri-phosphate (ATP) analysis, flow cytometry (FCM), 16S rRNA gene amplification and sequencing). Application of these new techniques showed that bacterial communities in drinking water were vastly more abundant and complex than what was previously understood from research based on cultivation-dependent methods (Berry et al., 2006; Hoefel et al., 2003). Current evidence suggests that the drinking water microbiome consists of as many as 9'000 distinct taxa, with total numbers ranging between 1'000 – 500'000 bacteria mL⁻¹ (Proctor and Hammes, 2015; Bautista-de los Santos et al., 2016).

FCM is one exciting “new” method capable of rapidly and accurately counting and characterising practically all bacteria in drinking water. FCM has already been used for microbiological characterisation and quantification in natural aquatic habitats for several decades (Legendre and Yentsch, 1989; Trouseillier et al., 1993), but was only recently introduced as a method for drinking water analysis (Hoefel et al., 2003, 2005a, 2005b; Hammes et al., 2008). All early drinking water FCM studies immediately confirmed the growing awareness of the considerable numerical divide between the total bacteria and the fraction of cultivable bacteria in drinking water (Hoefel et al., 2003; Hammes et al., 2008). Multiple drinking water studies comparing FCM and HPC data argued that FCM is more meaningful for use as a process variable, and questioned the future relevance of HPC measurements (Hoefel et al., 2005a; Hammes et al., 2008; Ho et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2013a; Gillespie et al., 2014).

Here we evaluate the last 15 years of FCM developments and applications in the field of drinking water analysis, and we argue that routine HPC analysis no longer qualifies as the best available technology for the above-stated criteria of relevance, simplicity, reliability, speed and cost-effectiveness. The purpose of this critical review is to initiate a constructive discussion on whether FCM can and should replace HPC as the primary process variable in routine microbiological water quality monitoring. We approached this by briefly assessing the history, advantages and disadvantages of HPC as a process variable, followed by a consideration of several alternative methods that may be suitable as alternatives. We then argue the case

for FCM as the method of choice, covering both the advantages and disadvantages of the methodology. We also compare FCM to HPC and ATP with extensive data sets collected over the last decade and outline how FCM could be applied as a monitoring method in the future.

2. Enumeration of bacteria by HPC

2.1. 130 years of HPC development and application

Around 1850, John Snow demonstrated the relationship between cholera prevalence and water consumption from a certain well and concluded (without knowing the causative agent) that drinking water was the transmitter of the disease (Sedlak, 2014). At that time, smell, appearance, taste and basic chemical analysis were the only tools available to water utilities for assessing drinking water quality (Payment et al., 2003). This changed considerably after Robert Koch published his gelatine plate method in 1881, for the first time offering the possibility to isolate and cultivate pure bacterial colonies and to enumerate bacteria (Koch, 1881). In the following years, the method was improved by replacing gelatine with agar, and was applied routinely to full-scale treatment systems for assessing particle filtration efficacy and microbiological water quality (Frankland and Frankland, 1894; Payment et al., 2003; Reasoner, 2004). In the same period, Koch proposed a limit of 100 colony forming units per millilitre (cfu mL^{-1}) for preventing cholera outbreaks (Koch, 1893; Exner et al., 2003). During the 130 years following its first publication (Koch, 1881), the HPC method underwent a range of modifications including new media compositions and different incubation times and temperatures (Sartory, 2004; Reasoner, 2004). In the context of drinking water routine monitoring, these modifications were aimed towards detecting the largest possible fraction of bacteria in a given sample (Frankland and Frankland, 1894; Reasoner and Geldreich, 1985). As a consequence of the numerous method modifications, standardised HPC methods cover a wide range of conditions, including different media formulations like plate count agar (PCA) or R2A-agar (see Table S1), different incubation temperatures ranging from 20 °C to 40 °C and incubation times ranging from hours to weeks (WHO, 2003;

Allen et al., 2004; Rice et al., 2012). These variations are not inconsequential: It is well known that variations in incubation conditions affect the number and composition of bacteria recovered (LeChevallier et al., 1980; Reasoner and Geldreich, 1985; Reasoner, 1990; Gensberger et al., 2015). Nevertheless, even with these modifications, Koch's original HPC method and proposed limits associated with it are essentially still present in drinking water legislation worldwide (Table 1).

Operational limits for HPC are still regularly incorporated in drinking water legislation (Table 1). Maximum values range from 20 to 500 cfu mL⁻¹ depending on the country and the sampling location (Allen et al., 2004). In some countries, maximum values are increasingly replaced by a guideline stating that '*no abnormal change (NAC)*' should be detected, although guidelines are not clear on how NAC is defined. Some countries have only very recently changed their HPC guidelines. Compared to one decade ago, the European Union, Canada and Australia for example have excluded their HPC upper limit in drinking water legislation (Radcliff, 2003), even though individual EU countries still maintain HPC upper limit guideline values (Table 1).

2.2. Advantages and applications of HPC

One major advantage of HPC data is that a positive result is an undeniable indicator of viability for the cells that formed colonies. Given the well-known lack of silver-bullet methods distinguishing between life and death in bacteria, the ability to identify viable organisms should not be underestimated (Hammes et al., 2011). In addition, changing the incubation conditions enables researchers to isolate different types of organisms as pure cultures, which has through the years facilitated detailed characterisations of numerous drinking water bacteria. Moreover, HPC methods are relatively low cost, simplistic and operators can compare HPC data to more than a century of historical data worldwide to aid interpretation and decision-making (Douterelo et al., 2014).

The application of HPC as an important variable for monitoring a wide range of microbiologically relevant

events and processes in drinking water treatment and distribution systems has been reviewed and discussed extensively in the works of Reasoner (1990), Sartory (2004), Allen *et al.* (2004) and Chowdhury (2012) (Table 2). Some specific examples include: (i) assessment of chlorine *disinfection* efficacy (e.g. LeChevallier *et al.*, 1984); (ii) studying the bacteriological activity in *biofiltration* systems (e.g., Camper *et al.*, 1986); (iii) tracking microbiological changes as a result of *regrowth* and *biological instability* of drinking water (e.g., Francisque *et al.*, 2009; Uhl and Schaule, 2004; Prest *et al.*, 2016a); (iv) quantifying batch growth of bacteria during incubation (i.e. *stagnation*) of nano-filtered drinking water (Liikanen *et al.*, 2003) and unfiltered drinking water (Uhl and Schaule, 2004), and during overnight stagnation in *building plumbing* (e.g., Pepper *et al.*, 2004; Lautenschlager *et al.*, 2010). Based on evidence such as these, the same WHO expert meeting that found that HPC values have no hygienic relevance (above), concluded that HPC can be used to monitor a range of relevant microbiological processes in drinking water (WHO, 2003). It is, however, important to note that the WHO proposes no specific guidelines (i.e., methods, thresholds, interpretations) on monitoring HPC in drinking water.

2.3. Disadvantages: what is HPC missing?

HPC has basic drawbacks in that it is time and labour consuming and the time-to-result ranges between 2 and 10 days, which is not ideal for fast decision-making and reactions to problems. Moreover, we argue below that data from routine HPC methods represent neither the abundance nor the composition of bacteria in drinking water, thus seriously drawing into question the value of this method as a relevant process variable.

2.3.1. Abundance

Right from the start (Frankland and Frankland, 1885) and throughout the development of HPC methods (Reasoner and Geldreich, 1985), there was a strong focus on establishing HPC methods capable of detecting the largest possible fraction of bacteria in a water sample. Reasoner and Geldreich (1985) noted that “*it seems appropriate to use a medium that will provide the highest estimate (of viable bacteria) possible to*

188 follow changes in bacterial quality of water related to treatment or water quality degradation in the
189 distribution system". However, already in the late 19th century some of the first microbiologists realised
190 that the number of colonies growing on agar plates was not reflecting the real number of bacteria present
191 in the water sample observed with direct microscopy (Winterberg, 1898; Amann, 1911). Although branded
192 'non-selective' and clearly intended to recover a wide range of microorganisms from water, HPC media and
193 methods are highly selective for bacteria growing under the specific incubation conditions (Allen et al.,
194 2004; Gensberger et al., 2015). As Frankland and Frankland (1894) aptly stated: "*It might be supposed that*
195 *it would be easy to find a medium which would suit the requirements of all micro-organisms [...] but, as a*
196 *matter of fact [...] media which are suitable for the growth of some are utterly unsuitable for the cultivation*
197 *of others*". Early comparisons showed that microscopic counts were detecting up to 150 times more
198 bacterial cells compared to HPC (Amann, 1911). By the mid-20th century, this was universally recognised
199 (Lewis et al., 2010) and later branded '*The Great Plate Count Anomaly*' (Staley and Konopka, 1985). More
200 recent estimations of the fraction of the total bacterial community detected by HPC are usually lower than
201 a few percent in drinking water. For example, values of 0.01 % (WHO, 2003), 0.001 – 6.5 % (Hammes et al.,
202 2008) and 0.05 – 8.3 % (Burtscher et al., 2009) have been reported in recent literature, depending on the
203 water sample origin and on the applied HPC and total cell count methods.

204
205 Multiple studies have examined the so-called '*unseen majority*', referring to the major part of the bacteria
206 not detected with conventional HPC methods but observed with microscopy, FCM, next generation
207 sequencing and other cultivation-independent methods. Seminal reviews on the topic are available for
208 more detailed information (Kell et al., 1998; Bogosian and Bourneuf, 2001; Green and Keller 2006; Oliver,
209 2010; Epstein, 2013), but the overall consensus is that, apart from lethally injured or dead bacteria, this
210 '*unseen majority*' consists of two basic groups: (i) bacteria belonging to strains that are regarded as
211 cultivable but for some reason enter into a so-called '*viable but not cultivable*' (VBNC) state (Bogosian and
212 Bourneuf, 2001) and (ii) the so-called '*uncultivable bacteria*', which are simply not cultivable by
213 conventional HPC methods.

215 First of all, it is not reasonable to argue that most bacteria in drinking water are lethally injured or dead.
216 Several studies have examined the fraction of intact, active and respiring bacteria in drinking water. In non-
217 chlorinated drinking water, 20 – 70 % of the total cells detected with FCM after SYBR Green I staining were
218 demonstrated to be active (esterase activity measured with CFDA staining and FCM) and 70 – 80 % of the
219 cells had intact membranes (measured with propidium iodide staining and FCM) (Berney et al., 2008; Helmi
220 et al., 2014a). When chlorine residual was lost in a chlorinated system, samples contained 50 – 60 % cells
221 with intact membranes (Kahlisch et al., 2012). Chlorinated tap water samples have also shown an increase
222 in intact cells and ATP, a measure for active biomass, during extended network residence times
223 (Nescerecka et al., 2014), indicating regrowth of living cells. While no single method is viewed as conclusive
224 when assessing the viability and activity of complex microbiological communities (Hammes et al., 2011),
225 these high percentages consistently indicate that the majority of cells are alive.

226
227 With respect to the VBNC state, it has been shown that normally cultivable bacteria can remain undetected
228 by HPC due to the presence of injured cells, which may recover and regain cultivability. Another
229 explanation is dormant cells (also referred to as resting cells or persisters), which are physiologically in a
230 VBNC state due to adverse environmental conditions, but can get activated at more favourable conditions
231 or even at random moments and then become cultivable again (Kell et al., 1998; Bogosian and Bourneuf
232 2001; Oliver, 2005; Epstein, 2013).

233
234 Uncultivable bacteria that are not detected with conventional HPC methods have been the subject of
235 considerable discussion. One proposed explanation for so-called uncultivability is the presence of excessive
236 nutrient concentrations in any type of HPC medium compared to drinking water. For example, R2A-agar,
237 often suggested to be low in nutrients and therefore more suitable for cultivating drinking water bacteria
238 (Reasoner and Geldreich, 1985), has an organic carbon concentration up to 800 times in excess of drinking
239 water (Hammes et al., 2008). Efforts for optimizing bacterial growth conditions, including the adaptation of
240 macro- and micronutrients, relieving oxidative stress, the use of synthetic environments mimicking the
241 natural conditions and new cultivation techniques, enabled the growth of some previously uncultivable

bacterial species (Kaeberlein et al., 2002; Rappe et al., 2002; Sangwan et al., 2005; Wang et al., 2009; D'Onofrio et al., 2010). However, millions of different microbiological species are thought to exist and over 99 % have never been cultivated (Achtman and Wagner, 2008; D'Onofrio et al., 2010).

2.3.2. Composition

Multiple studies have identified HPC isolates in order to better understand the hygienic and/or practical relevance of HPC data (e.g., LeChevallier et al., 1980; Reasoner, 1990; Allen et al., 2004; Gensberger et al., 2015). For example, LeChevallier *et al.* (1980) concluded that chlorination selected for gram-positive genera and that distributed drinking water comprised up to 30 % opportunistic pathogens. These studies all identified a broad variety of genera and showed that different organisms were isolated based on sample origin and HPC incubation conditions. However, during the last two decades it has become clear that cultivation-isolation based methods completely underestimate the complexity of the drinking water microbiome (Proctor and Hammes, 2015; Bautista-de los Santos et al., 2016). Unfortunately, only a few studies have directly compared the composition of HPC isolates with the total community composition based on 16S rRNA amplification (Farnleitner et al., 2004; Burtscher et al., 2009). Burtscher *et al.* (2009) concluded that 16S profiles after HPC isolation and directly from water samples differed completely, and showed that the dominant HPC community comprised primarily copiotrophic bacteria while the dominant drinking water community comprised typical oligotrophic aquatic bacteria.

In summary, there is agreement in literature that HPC data vastly underestimate the actual bacterial concentrations in drinking water, and there is some clear evidence that the bacteria detected on HPC plates are not the dominant species in water samples. Moreover, there exists to our knowledge no clear evidence that this small cultivable fraction of bacteria detected by HPC is properly and consistently representative for behaviour of the entire bacterial community in any given water, and for that matter relevant to the challenges in the various application areas of treatment and distribution systems (Table 2). This point is underscored, for example, in the context of bacterial regrowth during distribution. A recent book by leading

drinking water experts, focussing solely on regrowth problems, concluded unequivocally that: “HPC, in combination with the standard of 100 cfu mL⁻¹, is not suited for assessing the level of microbial growth in distribution systems” (van der Kooij and Veenendaal, 2014) and “HPC [...] are not ideal parameters for regrowth assessment” (van der Kooij and van der Wielen, 2014b).

3. Alternative methods for bacterial quantification are available

Given the differences between various HPC regulations and guidelines (Table 1), the very large and inconsistent difference between the number and composition of bacteria detected with HPC and the actual bacterial content of drinking water (above), and the complex challenges for which process variables are needed (Table 2), it is imperative to question whether HPC is still the way to go for routine microbiological water analysis in the 21st century. Drinking water utilities and researchers clearly need accurate and reliable methods to quantify and characterise microbiological changes during treatment and distribution (Table 2; Prest et al., 2016b), so abolishment of HPC methods without a suitable replacement would in itself be a serious step backwards. For bacterial (re)growth during drinking water distribution, van der Kooij and van der Wielen (2014b) stated that “*assessment and monitoring of the level of microbial regrowth requires a method for the quantification of the biomass of all active bacteria*” and suggested as examples ATP, total cell concentrations and the total DNA concentration in samples. In fact, since the early establishment of HPC, a suite of other methods has been developed to quantify bacteria in order to study/monitor general microbiological quality of drinking water. Table 3 compares six of these methods, but it is acknowledged that several more alternatives exist (Lopez-Roldan et al., 2013). Microscopy cell counting is an established methodology and can be combined with a broad range of fluorescent and non-fluorescent dyes (e.g., DAPI, acridine orange) and probes (e.g., labelled antibodies) to assess total bacteria, viable bacteria or specific bacterial sub-groups. Aside from some automated approaches (Zeder and Pernthaler, 2009), microscopy is far too labour-intensive and operator-subjective for routine application and is therefore used predominantly as a research tool. Molecular assays, such as 16S-rRNA quantitative real-time PCR (qPCR),

can serve as indirect measurements of absolute bacterial counting by measuring the abundance of 16S rRNA gene copies in extracted DNA (Nadkarni et al., 2002; Hoefel et al., 2005b). When the same approach is applied to extracted RNA, the information can serve as viability assay, and with more specific primers, it can target bacterial sub-groups. While continuous and rapid progress is being made in this field, routine application is currently limited by time-intensive nucleic acid extraction steps, PCR amplification bias and difficulties with respect to viability assessment (Nocker et al., 2007). Moreover, recent data suggests that current 16S-based approaches may not accurately represent the full extent of diversity in the system (Hug et al., 2016). To overcome PCR bias, it is also possible to simply quantify the total amount of extracted DNA or RNA, but this approach is less sensitive than PCR methods and still subject to nucleic acid extraction biases (Hwang et al., 2012; Salter et al., 2014). Measurement of ATP is a noteworthy alternative method, which is fast, relatively simple and representative of all viable organisms in a water sample (Hammes et al., 2010a; van der Wielen and van der Kooij, 2010). ATP analysis has been championed for several decades as a cultivation-independent measure of viable biomass in general (Holm-Hansen and Booth, 1966; Karl, 1980), and more recently specifically for drinking water and biofilm quantification (van der Kooij et al., 2003; Vrouwenvelder et al., 2008; Hammes et al., 2010a; van der Wielen and van der Kooij, 2010; Nescerecka et al., 2016b; Magic-Knezev and van der Kooij, 2004). However, routine application of ATP analysis is currently limited by a lack of standardised comparable methods and interference from inorganic compounds in the water (e.g., iron, manganese) as well as non-bacterial and/or extracellular ATP (Hammes et al., 2010a). Finally, FCM for measurement of bacterial cell concentrations has developed tremendously during the last decade (discussed below).

4. FCM cell concentrations as an alternative to HPC

FCM is a fast, accurate, quantitative and reproducible technique for counting the total number of bacteria when a general nucleic acid stain is used (Hammes et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2010; Prest et al., 2013) or the number of viable bacteria when combined with viability stains (Berney et al., 2008; Helmi et al., 2014b).

More recently, the technique was expanded towards creating FCM fingerprints of bacterial communities to allow more detailed characterisation of those bacterial communities (De Roy et al., 2012; Prest et al., 2013; Koch et al., 2014). It is argued here that FCM cell concentrations can replace HPC as a suitable process variable for routine drinking water analysis due to the (i) high level of information, (ii) high accuracy and reproducibility, (iii) speed and automation possibilities and (iv) overall reasonable costs compared to other methods (Figure 1).

4.1. Historical FCM developments with respect to drinking water analysis

FCM characterises and quantifies individual suspended particles by passing them one by one through a light source, typically a laser beam (Figure 1). Fluorescent particles are excited by the light source and emit light at a higher wavelength (Shapiro, 2003) (Figure 1). Particles of interest can either be autofluorescent (*e.g.* algae that contain chlorophyll), or be made fluorescent, such as bacteria after staining with fluorescent dyes (*e.g.*, SYBR Green I) (Hammes and Egli, 2010). FCM was initially applied for the analysis of mammalian cells, but in 1977 it was introduced by microbiologists to characterise suspended bacteria (Bailey et al., 1977; Paau et al., 1977). The method was at first not broadly used in microbiology due to expensive instrumentation and technical difficulties stemming from the small size of bacteria compared to mammalian cells (Wang et al., 2010). However, developments in hardware performance, costs and ease of handling and the concomitant emergence of novel stains for specific bacterial features finally made FCM more popular in microbiology from the 1990s onwards (Hammes and Egli, 2010). To our knowledge, Vesey *et al.* (1991) applied FCM for the first time for drinking water analysis for detecting *Cryptosporidium* oocysts, while Appenzeller *et al.* (2002) reported the first FCM-based detection of bacteria in drinking water, studying the sorption of *E. coli* on FeOOH. One year later, Hoefel *et al.* (2003) applied FCM for detecting the physiologically active bacterial community in drinking water and highlighted the difference in orders of magnitude between HPC and FCM data. Research applying FCM in drinking water now includes an extensive range of studies. For example, FCM was used for the characterisation of water treatment processes (Hammes et al., 2008; Ho et al., 2012; Van Nevel et al., 2012; Vital et al., 2012; Helmi et al.,

2014b), specific disinfection processes (Phe et al., 2005; Ramseier et al., 2011; Wert et al., 2013) and viability assessment (Pianetti et al., 2005; Berney et al., 2008). Regrowth and biological stability were studied in both chlorinated and non-chlorinated drinking water distribution networks (Hoefel et al., 2005a, 2005b; Vital et al., 2012; Lautenschlager et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2013a; Prest et al., 2013; Gillespie et al., 2014; Nescerecka et al., 2014; Wen et al., 2014; Van Nevel et al., 2016) and building/premises plumbing (Lautenschlager et al., 2010; Lipphaus et al., 2014). Measurements of assimilable organic carbon were performed with FCM as the bacterial enumeration method (Hammes and Egli, 2005; Van Nevel et al., 2013a). Specific pathogens were detected and pathogen growth potential was assessed with FCM (Vital et al., 2007, 2010; Yang et al., 2010; Keserue et al., 2012; Van Nevel et al., 2013a). Finally, FCM has been used for studying drinking water bacterial ecology, by detecting changes in the community composition and creating FCM fingerprints (i.e. statistical interpretations of raw FCM data) of specific water samples (Kahlisch et al., 2010; De Roy et al., 2012; Douterelo et al., 2014; Prest et al., 2014).

Monfort and Baleux (1992) compared fluorescence microscopy with FCM total cell concentrations (TCC) and concluded that FCM is reliable to enumerate bacteria in both pure cultures and natural samples. In order to distinguish bacteria from abiotic particles, various general nucleic acid stains have been tested (Wang et al., 2010), and the stains SYBR Green I, SYBR Green II and SYTO 9 were found to deliver high quality results for total bacterial cell counting in fresh water environments (Lebaron et al., 1998; Hammes et al., 2008). While different stains would in theory serve the purpose, a recent extensive standardisation of the FCM-TCC method was based on SYBR Green I, and this standardised method was accepted as a guideline method into Swiss drinking water legislation (SLMB, 2012; Prest et al., 2013). As major advantages, the FCM-TCC method was shown to be *fast* (10 minutes staining time, < 1 minutes analysis time), *accurate* (< 3 % relative standard deviation on all measurements), *reproducible* (<7 % variability between different laboratories) and suitable for *high throughput* processing (SLMB, 2012; Prest et al., 2013; Van Nevel et al., 2013b) (Figure 1).

4.2. FCM provides relevant quantitative process information

The consensus application value of HPC as a routine drinking water variable is the enumeration of bacteria, either for evaluating/monitoring treatment processes (e.g., filtration or disinfection efficiency) or for assessing the general microbiological quality of raw and treated water (Section 2; Table 2). Here we argue that multiple pilot scale and full-scale studies have demonstrated that for every HPC application-area (Table 2) there are several examples where FCM performed equally or better in providing accurate quantitative and qualitative information that is relevant to the process and/or system under investigation. Table 2 highlights selected FCM studies and specific examples that are presented in the Supplementary Information (SI) and discussed below.

Source water contamination: FCM analysis of temporal fluctuations in source water was reported previously (Besmer et al., 2014, 2016a, 2016b; Kötzsch and Sinreich, 2014; Besmer and Hammes, 2016) and is illustrated in Figure 2 and Example S1. In many of these examples, high frequency online FCM was used over extended time periods to quantify dry weather baseline values and microbiological changes caused by regional precipitation events with respect to their frequency and magnitude. Figure 2 shows a specific example from a karstic spring, which is vulnerable to precipitation-induced contamination. The spring was sampled hourly in the 24 hours immediately following a precipitation event (15.4 mm in 24 h), which increased spring discharge from 1'260 L min⁻¹ to 1'400 L min⁻¹ within hours of the event. The increased spring discharge coincided with a substantial increase in FCM-TCC from 1.4 x 10⁵ cells mL⁻¹ to a maximum of 3.7 x 10⁵ cells mL⁻¹. The FCM data gives a clear quantitative and qualitative description of the microbiological response in the spring with respect to the temporal evolution and magnitude. In contrast, the HPC data fluctuated on hourly time scales between 200 and 2'000 cfu mL⁻¹, neither describing the trend, nor the magnitude of the microbiological response in the spring to the precipitation event.

Monitoring treatment processes: FCM was used to characterise drinking water treatment processes in a large number of studies (e.g., Hoefel et al., 2005a, 2005b; Hammes et al., 2008, 2010b; Ho et al., 2012; Vital et al., 2012; Lautenschlager et al., 2014; Helmi et al., 2014b; Example S2). In studies by Hammes *et al.*

(2008, 2010b) and in Example S2 (a subset of data from Vital *et al.* (2012)), disinfection through ozonation was not correctly measured with routine HPC analysis, due in part to low cultivability of bacteria in the source water, but could clearly be shown with FCM-TCC. Helmi *et al.* (2014b) measured increased bacterial abundance after activated carbon filtration with different FCM methods, but these increases went undetected in some cases with routine HPC methods. Similar changes in bacterial numbers with various biofiltration steps were further elucidated in Hammes *et al.* (2010b), Velten *et al.* (2011) and Vital *et al.* (2012). In one of the clearest examples of treatment characterisations, Ho *et al.* (2012) monitored raw water and the microbiological performance of four different drinking water treatment options on pilot scale during 12 months. In that study, HPC data showed no difference between the different treatment options. In stark contrast, the FCM data clearly characterised the significant differences between the treatment options, which led the authors to conclude that “[...] FCM was shown to be a better monitoring tool than HPCs, which allowed for more definitive comparisons to be made between each of the treatment streams” (Ho *et al.*, 2012).

Growth/instability during distribution: FCM characterisation of distributed drinking water was reported in Hoefel *et al.* (2005a), Vital *et al.* (2012), Lautenschlager *et al.* (2013), Nescerecka *et al.* (2014), van Nevel *et al.* (2016) and Prest *et al.* (2016a) and is illustrated in Examples S3 – S4. In an early study, Hoefel *et al.* (2005a) described bacterial increases in excess of 1×10^5 cells mL⁻¹ measured with FCM during distribution of chloraminated drinking water, which went undetected with conventional HPC measurements. These authors concluded that their data “[...] casts doubt on the use of HPC data as an indicator of distribution system integrity following a loss of chloramine residual caused by ammonia-oxidizing bacteria” (Hoefel *et al.*, 2005a). In a similar vein, Nescerecka *et al.* (2014) demonstrated substantial microbiological growth from about 1×10^4 cells mL⁻¹ up to 4×10^5 cells mL⁻¹ during distribution of unstable chlorinated drinking water with FCM after viability staining (measuring intact cells after SYBR Green I and propidium iodide staining). A subset of this data is shown in Example S3, showing that routine HPC measurements failed to recognise the magnitude of instability in that particular system, exceeding the guideline value of 100 cfu mL⁻¹ in only one of 39 samples. A recent 2-year study of a full-scale distribution system without residual chlorine (Prest *et*

al., 2016a; Example S4) revealed a distinct seasonal variation in flow cytometric intact cell concentration (FCM-ICC) data from about 5×10^4 cells mL^{-1} up to 2×10^5 cells mL^{-1} . Routine HPC measurements corroborated the increased bacterial numbers in summer, but failed to quantify the magnitude of change in the system. In fact, HPC numbers exceeded the Dutch standard of 100 cfu mL^{-1} only twice in the entire measurement period (Example S4). More importantly, the FCM data enabled the researchers to pinpoint the final biological filters in the treatment plant as the primary source of change, and growth during distribution as the secondary source (Prest et al., 2016a). In a final example, Gillespie *et al.* (2014) studied biological stability in chlorinated and chloraminated drinking water distributions and reported a correlation between free chlorine concentrations and FCM-ICC data. Interestingly, while we do not recommend here that FCM replace faecal indicator monitoring, these authors observed that most samples that tested positive for coliforms also showed elevated FCM-ICC values and concluded that FCM measurements are a potentially complementary tool for detecting quality failures in systems with residual disinfectants.

Water storage and building plumbing: FCM studies of bacteriological changes during drinking water storage and/or stagnation prior to consumption include Siebel *et al.* (2008), Wang *et al.* (2008), Lautenschlager *et al.* (2010), Mimoso *et al.* (2015), Lipphaus *et al.* (2014) and Gillespie *et al.* (2014). Mimoso *et al.* (2015) used online FCM to characterise bacterial growth during stagnation of gravity driven membrane filtered river water. The high frequency FCM data enabled accurate and detailed quantification of the rate and extent of bacterial growth, mirroring similar FCM studies for bottled water (Wang et al., 2008) and older HPC growth studies (e.g., Uhl and Schaule, 2004; Reasoner, 1990). On the building plumbing level, Lautenschlager *et al.* (2010) quantified the extent of bacterial increases following overnight stagnation of non-chlorinated drinking water in residential households. This study demonstrated considerable increases in all microbiological variables (i.e. FCM, ATP and HPC), although HPC did not detect the magnitude of change measured with FCM and ATP (Lautenschlager et al., 2010). As a final example, Lipphaus *et al.* (2014) studied multiple taps in residential and office building plumbing systems receiving chlorinated drinking water, using FCM viability analysis (SYBR green I and propidium iodide staining). The authors showed elevated cell concentrations in taps that were infrequently used, and washout from single taps as a function of water

use. Example S5 shows FCM and HPC data for a similar washout study from a drinking water tap during daily use.

In the above section we described several examples where straightforward FCM analysis was in our opinion equal or superior to HPC analysis as a process variable and indicator of general microbiological water quality. This does not diminish in any way the extended history of HPC applications in water quality monitoring. There may well also be cases where specific focus on a sub-group of bacteria provides insights into small microbiological changes that will go undetected with a total cell concentration measurement approach (Vital et al., 2012). With respect to FCM applications, there is an on-going need to systematically document the use of FCM data (e.g., case studies in SI) and particularly to link microbiological changes observed with FCM to specific events and/or problems (e.g., system malfunctioning, consumer complaints). In this regard, it is recognised that the current data sets are dominated by studies from drinking water systems without residual disinfectants, and additional studies on chlorinated systems are needed to fill this gap.

4.3. Added qualitative value of FCM: fingerprinting and community interpretations

Apart from the combination of FCM with various fluorescent dyes and the determination of TCC and ICC (section 5.1), the fluorescence and scatter detectors deliver information that can be used for a more detailed analysis by creating a microbiological fingerprint of the water. Essentially, these FCM fingerprinting methods are statistical analyses of multivariate FCM data (e.g., size, fluorescent colour, fluorescence intensity) that varies in complexity and which represents the distribution of raw data in FCM plots (De Roy et al., 2012; Prest et al., 2013). Such FCM fingerprinting methods are sensitive for detecting small changes and shifts within the bacterial community, which are overlooked by enumeration alone (De Roy et al., 2012; Prest et al., 2013; Koch et al., 2014; Prest et al., 2014). For example, Prest *et al.* (2013) detected the contamination of drinking water by 4 % wastewater effluent bacteria, based on the combination of FCM cell concentrations and a basic FCM fingerprinting method (quantifying high (HNA) and low (LNA) nucleic

acid content bacteria), and showed in a separate study (Prest et al., 2014) that changes in the microbiological community composition by 16S rRNA gene analysis can be detected early through changes in the FCM fingerprint, a method further elucidated by Props et al. (2016). De Roy et al. (2012) likewise used advanced fingerprinting methods to detect the bacterial physiology adaptations within three hours after minor nutrient addition in drinking water. Finally, Van Nevel et al. (2016) examined the biological stability of a drinking water network, where certain water samples showed elevated FCM cell concentrations. The application of fingerprinting methods to these samples suggested that bacterial growth was taking place to a large extent in the household taps rather than in the drinking water network (Van Nevel et al., 2016). With respect to FCM fingerprinting methods, the challenge is to establish methodological toolboxes that are sensitive and robust, standardized, applicable to FCM data generated with different instrument types, broadly available and sufficiently easy to apply by non-specialist users.

High-throughput amplicon sequencing is currently a popular method for microbiological community profiling, with increasing applications in drinking water monitoring and characterisation (Burtscher et al., 2009; Pinto et al., 2012, 2014; Prest et al., 2014). One inherent limitation to such community profiling is that data are presented as relative abundances, and differences in cell concentrations between samples are not considered (Props et al., 2016). Needless to say, the latter information can completely alter the interpretation of a community profiling dataset. A number of studies have combined sequencing data (relative abundance) with FCM-TCC (total absolute abundance) to derive and compare sample-specific absolute taxon abundances (specific absolute abundance). For example, Lautenschlager et al. (2013) attributed minor biological instability in a non-chlorinated drinking water distribution system to a 20 %-increase in the specific absolute abundance of *Comamonadaceae*. Prest et al. (2014) used the same approach to quantify the absolute abundance increase of some phyla (e.g., Proteobacteria) and decrease of others (e.g., Bacteroidetes) during full-scale distribution of non-chlorinated drinking water. The use of the two methods in concert enhances interpretation of bacterial dynamics in drinking water systems. Combining multiple methods also offers a potential starting point to develop a multi-disciplinary theoretical framework for bacterial growth and other dynamic processes in drinking water treatment and distribution

systems.

4.4. FCM is reproducible

From a statistical perspective, HPC only counts between 0 and 300 colonies in a well-chosen dilution, while FCM analysis usually collects between 50 and 20'000 events for drinking water sample analysis (Hammes et al., 2008). HPC analysis often shows relative standard deviations of 30 % up to 100 % (Hammes et al., 2008; Prest et al., 2013). In stark contrast, the inter-laboratory and instrument variability are < 7 % for FCM (SLMB, 2012), or even < 2.5% for a single operator and instrument (Prest et al., 2013) (see also Figure 3). Finally, FCM results are mutually comparable when measured with a standardised method, while HPC methods already have heavily differentiated over the years, hindering comparison between laboratories (Reasoner, 2004; SLMB, 2012).

The large discrepancy between HPC and FCM reproducibility and accuracy is demonstrated in Figure 3. In this particular example, two raw water samples (groundwater and spring water), a sample from the effluent of a drinking water treatment plant and a drinking water sample from a household tap (all non-chlorinated water samples), were measured independently in triplicate by three different accredited routine laboratories (Koetzsch et al., 2012). All three laboratories used identical methods: FCM-TCC was measured with SYBR Green I staining as described in (SLMB, 2012; Prest et al., 2013) and HPC was measured according to Swiss guidelines (PCA, 30 °C, 72 h). The results showed that only 0.005 % (range = 0.0035 % - 0.0084 %) of the total bacterial cells were detected on average by HPC methods, while the HPC values and reproducibility were so low that no clear differences between different water samples could be detected (relative standard deviation, RSD = 88 %) (Figure 3). In contrast to cultivation, the FCM-TCC results had a RSD as low as 6.9 %, and allowed clear discrimination between all four water samples (Figure 3). This data emphasises the need for standardisation, especially with respect to future routine application of FCM in the water industry (SLMB, 2012; Prest et al., 2013; Nescerecka et al., 2016a).

4.5. FCM speed, automation and online analysis potential

The usefulness of any monitoring variable is heavily influenced by the time from sample collection to when results are available. HPC incubation usually takes several days. For example, the incubation times for HPC agar plates described in '*Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater*' (Rice et al., 2012) range from 2 to 7 days. However, by the time these results are available, the drinking water of concern has spread throughout the distribution network and has been consumed widely. In contrast, FCM results can be available within 15 minutes after sampling, enabling immediate action and identification of problematic samples for further investigation or remediation steps. Moreover, automated multi-well plate analysis, which is a feature on nearly all modern FCM instruments, easily allows the measurement of up to 500 samples within a day with only one operator and one instrument (Van Nevel et al., 2013b). This enables researchers and utilities to rapidly screen considerably larger numbers of samples with the same or even less labour input than was feasible with conventional cultivation-based methods.

Many dynamic processes and events in drinking water treatment and distribution systems occur on short time-scales (minutes-to-hours), and conventional grab sampling and cultivation-based analysis approaches fail to correctly detect and characterise such dynamics. Online analysis is the obvious solution to this, and a variety of online microbiological tools and sensors have been developed during the last few years (Lopez-Roldan et al., 2013). Recent developments in fully automated online technology allow continuous FCM measurements for several subsequent weeks (Hammes et al., 2012; Brognaux et al., 2013, Besmer et al., 2014). For example, Besmer *et al.* (2016a, 2016b) and Besmer and Hammes (2016) characterised precipitation-induced fluctuations in raw water and operationally induced fluctuations in treated water at high temporal resolution, resulting in total sample numbers in the thousands – far in excess of what is remotely possible with conventional sampling and analysis tools (Example S1). This enabled a detailed characterization of the bacterial baseline concentrations and fluctuations in specific systems on a level of detail not previously possible, and also demonstrated the potential for early warning systems and strategic sampling strategy design (Besmer et al., 2016a, 2016b; Besmer and Hammes, 2016).

4.6. FCM analysis can be cost-beneficial

A final argument for selecting any method for application in routine laboratories is incontrovertibly the cost. A cost comparison for HPC versus FCM was done recently (Helmi et al., 2014b), which showed higher cost of FCM compared to HPC for 100 samples. However, for the purpose of this review the comparison was revised based on our in-house instrumentation and protocols for FCM, as well as information from a routine laboratory for HPC analysis, including all amortization, consumables, quality control and labour costs (Table S2). The FCM cost was estimated at \$214 per day for 100 samples processed, compared to \$1'030 for the same number of analyses with HPC. The initial FCM hardware investment is considerable, but automation and low consumable use can keep per sample costs minimal. In the case of HPC, the initial investment is lower, but the procedure is labour-intensive, making the cost increase for HPC almost linear to number of samples. Both methods would cost \$155 per day for a daily processing of 15 samples, and FCM becomes more profitable for any higher number of water samples. It should be noted that both comparisons (Helmi et al., 2014b) are based entirely on high-income countries, where labour costs are decisive. For low-income countries, the high initial investment for FCM may be more demanding, and labour costs for HPC would be less. However, FCM instrumentation costs have been steadily decreasing during the last decade with the development of simplistic bench-top systems and increased market competition.

5. Arguments against FCM methods

Every analytical method faces some drawbacks. Challenges for FCM discussed below include: (i) the difficulties in distinguishing between viable and non-viable bacteria, (ii) subjective data analysis and (iii) problems in dealing with bacterial aggregates and clusters.

5.1. Detecting disinfection: how dead is dead?

A critical counter-argument against FCM-TCC is the inclusion of dead cells in the enumeration. Disinfection (e.g., chlorination) is common in drinking water treatment worldwide and in such a case the use of FCM-TCC provides limited information and can lead to erroneous conclusions. Viability staining (e.g., for membrane integrity, membrane potential or metabolic activity) combined with FCM can serve as an alternative (Berney et al., 2008; Helmi et al., 2014b). A broad range of viability stains for different bacterial targets exist (e.g., SYTOX Green for damaged membranes and carboxyfluorescein diacetate (CFDA) for esterase enzyme activity), providing information that is regarded as indicators of bacterial viability and/or activity (Hammes et al., 2011).

As a straightforward viability marker for drinking water, we propose the use of membrane integrity, since it measures a cellular property that is targeted by conventional disinfection based on chlorine and ozone (Ramseier et al., 2011). Moreover, severe membrane damage is viewed as a conservative indicator of cell death (Lisle et al., 1999; Berney et al., 2008) and is therefore arguably a safe indicator for disinfection efficiency (Ramseier et al., 2011). The combined use of propidium iodide with SYBR Green I offers the possibility for FCM assessment of bacterial cell membrane integrity, allowing discrimination between cells with intact and damaged membranes (Figure 4) (Berney et al., 2008; Vital et al., 2012). This FCM-ICC is recommended as additional measurements to FCM-TCC whenever disinfection is applied during treatment or when residual disinfectant is maintained in distribution. Recently, the use of FCM-ICC methodology showed instability and growth of bacteria in different chlorinated drinking water distribution networks (Nescerecka et al., 2014; Gillespie et al., 2014) and on the household level (Lipphaus et al., 2014).

One specific challenge to the use of FCM-ICC is the evaluation of UV-C-disinfection. The primary mode of action of UV-C-disinfection is nucleic acid damage; the formation of pyrimidine dimers and other photoproducts of the nucleic acids inhibit replication and transcription and thereby prevents the bacteria

from multiplication (Villarino et al., 2003; Hijnen et al., 2006). However, during low/moderate UV-C disinfection, the bacterial membranes remain intact (Nocker et al., 2007), making this damage undetectable by propidium iodide staining. In this specific case, HPC analysis will regard these cells as dead, and has an advantage over FCM.

A large number of viability dyes are commercially available and have been tested in various research settings (Berney et al., 2008; Helmi et al., 2014a). The future challenge in this field is to select dyes based on (i) the mechanism of cellular death that is evaluated (e.g., chlorination permeabilising cells) and (ii) the mechanistic action of the dye (e.g., penetrating permeabilised cells). Only with these two aspects matched appropriately, can one establish meaningful standardised protocols (Nescerecka et al., 2016a).

5.2. Is FCM quantification subjective and user-specific?

An often-mentioned critique towards FCM quantification for routine monitoring is the use of variable instrument settings and the need for manual gating to separate the bacterial signals from the background (De Roy et al., 2012; Aghaeepour et al., 2013; Prest et al., 2013). Until recently, this gating strategy was subjective and mainly based on personal experience of the operator, which is a serious disadvantage for standardised analysis. However, several strategies emerged recently to address this issue. Firstly, Prest *et al.* (2013) combined an optimised and fixed staining protocol with a fixed gating strategy (i.e. no need for manual gate adjustments by the operator) to acquire stable and reproducible results. Secondly, an increasing number of researchers are working on circumventing gating entirely by doing a gating-independent statistical processing (including cluster recognition) of the data (De Roy et al., 2012; Aghaeepour et al., 2013; Koch et al., 2014). Widespread application will require further work to establish gating strategies that are sensible, independent of user-bias or instrument-bias and easily applicable to FCM data generated with different instruments.

5.3. Cell clumps, clusters and aggregates

647

648 FCM analysis detects single cells and/or bacterial aggregates, but does not necessarily discriminate
649 between the two, which is a disadvantage that is shared with HPC (Shapiro, 2003). As a consequence, the
650 presence of clumps of sloughed biofilm or colonised suspended particles will potentially lead to under-
651 counting of bacteria (van der Kooij and van der Wielen, 2014a). To address this problem, some authors
652 applied mild sonication to break up bacterial aggregates in wastewater and biofilm samples and validated
653 their procedure using microscopic techniques (Foladori et al., 2010; Ma et al., 2013). However, it is clear
654 that sonication based approaches have to be tested and validated extensively to find the optimal sonication
655 dose for every specific matrix. For example, an activated sludge sample requires a higher sonication dose
656 compared to a settled wastewater sample (Ma et al., 2013), while excess sonication damages bacterial cells
657 (Buesing and Gessner, 2002) and thereby affects viability measurements. Routine application of a
658 sonication step to all samples would also increase the time requirements for the FCM procedure and
659 thereby partly counteract one of the main advantages of FCM. Bulk analysis methods such as ATP-analysis
660 or nucleic-acid-based molecular methods in theory do not face this problem and can be applied even when
661 clumps and clusters are part of the samples (Liu et al., 2013b).

662

663

664 6. FCM data do not correlate with HPC data

665

666 The data above highlighted a numerical discrepancy of several orders of magnitude between FCM and HPC
667 values and good correlations between FCM and HPC data should not be expected. However, Hoefel *et al.*
668 (2003) correctly argued that if a statistical relationship between FCM and HPC data existed, it would
669 facilitate easier incorporation of rapid FCM methods in the routine water analysis sector. Along these lines,
670 a host of studies compared the findings from new/rapid methods with HPC data, usually reporting poor
671 correlations (e.g., Hoefel et al., 2003; Siebel et al., 2008; Burtscher et al., 2009; Nescerecka et al., 2014).
672 These studies were often limited in amount of data and variety of water samples. Thus, for the purpose of
673 this review, the largest dataset ($n > 1'800$) to date was compiled comparing HPC results with FCM results

for a variety of water samples spanning a decade of drinking water research. The dataset consists of groundwater and surface water used for the production of drinking water, samples collected during water treatment, finished drinking water and samples of drinking water networks and household installations, from both chlorinated and non-chlorinated waters from four European countries. HPC values were measured using the routine methods prescribed by the different local drinking water legislation, namely The Netherlands (PCA, 22 °C, 72 h), Switzerland (PCA, 30 °C, 72 h), Latvia (PCA, 36 °C, 72 h) and Belgium (YEA, 22 °C, 68h). While not identical, we believe that these HPC methods were sufficiently similar to enable detection of correlations and trends should they exist. FCM-TCC was in all cases based on SYBR Green I staining as described by Hammes *et al.* (2008) or Prest *et al.* (2013), FCM-ICC was based on an additional viability staining with propidium iodide for membrane integrity, as described by Nescerecka *et al.* (2014) or Van Nevel *et al.* (2013b). The dataset comprises unpublished data from accredited drinking water analysis laboratories in Switzerland and The Netherlands (1'467 data points) as well as from published data (355 data points) (Koetzsch and Sinreich, 2014; Nescerecka *et al.*, 2014; Prest *et al.*, 2014; Sinreich *et al.*, 2014) and on-going research projects (1'138 data points).

The overall dataset shows extremely weak correlation between either FCM-TCC and HPC (Kendall correlation test: $R^2 < 0.1$; $p < 0.001$, $\tau = 0.20$) or FCM-ICC and HPC (Kendall correlation test: $R^2 < 0.1$; $p < 0.001$, $\tau = 0.25$) (Figure 5). On average, less than 1 out of 3'000 cells (or 0.032 %) detected with FCM was detected by HPC. These correlations did not improve substantially when the data was clustered by country/method, by chlorinated or non-chlorinated water type, or by source water or drinking water (data not shown). While the poor correlations were not particularly surprising considering the large numerical discrepancy between HPC and FCM data, it raises a problematic issue. We discussed above that HPC and FCM methods are used for the same purpose in drinking water monitoring (Table 2; Section 4). Hence, the lack of any meaningful correlation between these two variables suggests that they do not provide the same information and thus should not be used for the same purpose. One may argue that the methods provide different (and potentially complimentary) information and can be used in concert with each other. However, given the practical and financial constraints faced by water utilities and routine laboratories, it is

highly unlikely that the combined use of two microbiological methods for general water quality analysis would find sufficient traction beyond a transitional period.

7. FCM data correlate strongly with intracellular ATP data

Although FCM and HPC did not have a strong correlation due to the constraints and bias of the plating method, cultivation-independent methods should, in theory, be complimentary or in agreement. ATP measurement is one such method that is often promoted for drinking water analysis (Hammes et al., 2010a; van der Wielen and van der Kooij, 2010); Nescerecka et al., 2016b) and intracellular ATP data was previously shown to correlate strongly with FCM-ICC data (Hammes et al., 2010a). This correlation occurs even though these two independent methods differ considerably. ATP is a bulk measurement of the ATP molecule that is unique to all living organisms, while FCM is a single cell method that distinguishes viability states in bacteria based on the reaction of fluorescent dyes with the cells (Figure 4). Some studies argued that ATP measurements are less sensitive than FCM to small changes (Liu et al., 2013a), but more useful when particles, clusters and/or biofilms are measured (Liu et al., 2013b). For the purpose of this review we compared FCM-ICC and intracellular ATP measurements, based on a large dataset ($n = 1'441$) of samples collected over a decade from different water types in different studies (Figure 6). This dataset is a subset of the data shown in Figure 5. To enable comparison, intracellular ATP analysis of all samples shown here was done according to a similar protocol with reagents from a single supplier (for details, see Hammes *et al.* (2010a) and Prest *et al.* (2014)), and all FCM-ICC analysis was done with the same protocol (described above). Statistical analysis confirmed the strong correlation between ATP and FCM-ICC ($p < 0.001$ according to the Kendall correlation test, $\tau = 0.60$; $R^2 = 0.73$ for linear regression). While some correlations between FCM data and intracellular ATP data have been shown in previous studies (e.g., Nescerecka et al., 2014), such a large collection of data from diverse samples and studies has not. Both intracellular ATP and FCM-ICC measurements were previously argued to represent the majority of viable bacteria in drinking water (Hammes et al., 2010a; van der Wielen and van der Kooij, 2010). The overall correlation strongly suggests

that both these cultivation-independent variables may well be used for the same purpose and that conversion factors can be employed to broadly relate intracellular ATP data with bacterial cell concentrations (or vice versa) when only one method is used.

8. Applying FCM for routine microbiological water monitoring

FCM cell concentrations can be used in routine monitoring, similarly to HPC, as a meaningful process variable. For a water utility, this would typically mean characterising spatial variability (e.g., source, treatment steps and various locations in the network) (e.g., Vital et al., 2012; Nescerecka et al., 2014) as well as short and long-term temporal variability (e.g., hours, days, weeks, months per location) (e.g., Ho et al., 2012; Besmer and Hammes, 2016) and detect potential problematic situations. However, due to the range of different factors (source water type, treatment processes, environmental conditions) that affect microorganisms in water, it does not make sense to set a universal absolute upper limit for FCM cell concentrations. We argue that it would make more sense to set the operational goal to “no abnormal change”, as is currently the case for HPC in many countries (Table 1). This requires the establishment of a baseline of bacterial concentrations that can be expected in normal situations and as well as of the natural fluctuations occurring in a given system (Besmer et al., 2014). This baseline value will be dependent on (i) raw water source: surface water has usually considerably higher cell concentrations compared to spring- and groundwater (Leclerc, 2003), (ii) treatment plant design: for example biological filtration is known for elevating cell concentrations (Hammes et al., 2008), (iii) use of final disinfection and a disinfectant residual, which lowers (intact) cell concentrations (e.g., Hoefel et al., 2003), (iv) seasonal variations, whereby groundwater tends to be more stable over time than spring and surface water (Richardson et al., 2009; Pinto et al., 2014; Prest et al., 2016a). Proper baseline establishment requires extensive, long term monitoring and in turn allows accurate detection of deviations (Besmer et al., 2014; Besmer et al., 2016a), which should be evaluated both in relative and absolute changes in bacterial cell numbers. For example, an increase from 5'000 to 55'000 cells mL⁻¹ (i.e. 1'100 % increase) may be considered by some as more

755 alarming than an increase from 100'000 to 150'000 cells mL⁻¹ (i.e. 50 % increase), although the absolute
756 increase (50'000 cells mL⁻¹) was in fact identical. On the other hand, bacteria growth in a distribution
757 network from 5'000 to 10'000 cells mL⁻¹ is the same relative increase (100 % increase) as growth from
758 100'000 to 200'000 cells mL⁻¹ (100 % increase). However, based on a conversion factor of 10⁷ bacteria
759 grown per µg of carbon (Van Nevel et al., 2013a), only 0.5 µg-C L⁻¹ is needed for the first situation but 20-
760 times more assimilable organic carbon (ca. 10 µg-C L⁻¹) would be required for the second example,
761 suggesting the latter situation is considerably more alarming from a biological stability perspective. While
762 we expressly do not want to propose upper FCM limit values for drinking water here, the large data set
763 from multiple studies presented in Figure 5 suggests that drinking water typically does not exceed a value
764 of 5 x 10⁵ cells mL⁻¹. The latter value is higher than 95 % of the data in Figure 5, excluding all raw water
765 samples.

766
767 Although universal threshold/guideline values may not be sensible for FCM data, we believe that
768 individualised, utility-specific limits to support decision-making could be established after detailed
769 monitoring of the particular systems. Implementation of FCM by water utilities would therefore require
770 several years (e.g. minimum two years) of parallel FCM and HPC measurements, thereby building-up a solid
771 database and gaining confidence in the FCM data from their own system. This effort is, however,
772 worthwhile given the considerable advantages of FCM in comparison with HPC as discussed in this review.

9. Conclusions

HPC played an important role in drinking water management and general microbiological quality control over the past century, but this review questions whether HPC is still the best available technology for process and general water quality monitoring. We argue that FCM cell counting is a suitable alternative to replace HPC for routine microbiological drinking water monitoring for the following 8 reasons:

1. *Abundance*: HPC detects considerably less than 1 % of the total bacteria in a water sample and often does not detect the dominant species, while FCM detects all bacteria that are present;
2. *Relevance*: Multiple studies showed that FCM is a meaningful process variable, providing relevant information on various drinking water treatment processes and microbiological water quality changes during distribution – the same application areas where HPC is routinely used;
3. *Speed*: FCM results can be available within 15 minutes of samples arriving in the laboratory, while HPC incubation typically requires 2 – 7 days;
4. *Reproducibility*: Inter-laboratory FCM comparisons have relative standard deviations on cell concentrations below 10 %, while single operator measurements have relative standard deviations below 3 %;
5. *Flexibility*: In addition to absolute cell numbers, FCM can provide information on bacterial viability and bacterial identity based on different fluorescent dyes and probes;
6. *Added value*: Multivariate FCM data can be used to create a unique flow cytometric fingerprint of the bacterial community, which improves rapid detection of small changes to that community;
7. *Costs*: Depending on labour costs and preferred instruments, FCM costs are equal or lower than those of HPC from about 15 water samples or more per day;
8. *Automation*: FCM offers easy automation options, opening exciting doors on the prospect of fully automated online FCM analysis.

Acknowledgements

Sam van Nevel was supported by the project grant no. G.0808.10N and the travel grant V424114N of the FWO Flanders and the Inter-University Attraction Pole (IUAP) 'μ-manager' funded by the Belgian Science Policy (BELSPO, 305 P7/25); Emmanuelle Prest and Hans Vrouwenvelder were supported by funding from King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST) and Evides Waterbedrijf; the Inter-University Attraction Pole (IUAP) 'μ-manager' funded by the Belgian Science Policy (BELSPO, 305 P7/25); Caitlin Proctor was supported by MERMAID, a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Initial Training Network, under grant number 607492. We thank Alina Nescerecka, the Kantonal Laboratory Zürich, Industrielle Werke Basel – Wasserlabor (IWB) and Pidpa for the shared data, Lisa Neu for literature support and Synthia Maes for the critical reading of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Achtman, M. and M. Wagner (2008). "Microbial diversity and the genetic nature of microbial species." Nat Rev Micro **6**(6): 431-440.
- Aghaeepour, N., G. Finak, H. Hoos, T. R. Mosmann, R. Brinkman, R. Gottardo and R. H. Scheuermann (2013). "Critical assessment of automated flow cytometry data analysis techniques." Nat Methods **10**(3): 228-238.
- Allen, M. J., S. C. Edberg and D. J. Reasoner (2004). "Heterotrophic plate count bacteria—what is their significance in drinking water?" Int J Food Microbiol **92**(3): 265-274.
- Amann, J. (1911). "Die direkte Zählung der Wasserbakterien mittels des Ultramikroskops." Zentralblatt für Bakteriologie, Parasitenkunde, Infektionskrankheiten und Hygiene **29**: 381-384.
- Anonymous (2012). The Microbiology of Drinking Water (2012) – Part 7 – Methods for the enumeration of heterotrophic bacteria. Methods for the Examination of Waters and Associated Materials. Nottingham: Environment Agency.
- Appenzeller, B. M., Y. B. Duval, F. Thomas and J. C. Block (2002). "Influence of phosphate on bacterial adhesion onto iron oxyhydroxide in drinking water." Environ Sci Technol **36**(4): 646-652.
- Bailey, J. E., J. Fazel-Makjlessi, D. N. McQuitty, Y. N. Lee, J. C. Allred and J. A. Oro (1977). "Characterization of bacterial growth by means of flow microfluorometry." Science **198**(4322): 1175-1176.
- Bautista-de los Santos QM, Schroeder JL, Sevilano-Rivera MC, Sungthong R, Ijaz UZ, Sloan WT, *et al.* (2016). Emerging investigators series: microbial communities in full-scale drinking water distribution systems - a meta-analysis. Environ Sci Res Technol **2**: 631–644.
- Berney, M., M. Vital, I. Huelshoff, H.-U. Weilenmann, T. Egli and F. Hammes (2008). "Rapid, cultivation-independent assessment of microbial viability in drinking water." Water Res **42**(14): 4010-4018.
- Berry D, Xi C, Raskin L. (2006). "Microbial ecology of drinking water distribution systems." Curr Opin Biotechnol **17**: 297–302.
- Besmer, M. D., D. G. Weissbrodt, B. E. Kratochvil, J. A. Sigrist, M. S. Weyland and F. Hammes (2014). "The feasibility of automated online flow cytometry for in-situ monitoring of microbial dynamics in aquatic ecosystems." Front Microbiol **5**: 265.
- Besmer MD, Epting J, Page RM, Sigrist JA, Huggenberger P, Hammes F, *et al.* (2016a). "Online flow cytometry reveals microbial dynamics influenced by concurrent natural and operational events in groundwater used for drinking water treatment." Sci Rep **6**: 38462.
- Besmer, M. D., Sigrist, J. A., Hammes, F., & Auckenthaler, A. (2016b). "Online-Durchflusszytometrie in der Praxis. Fenster in die Welt mikrobiologischer Dynamiken in Wasser - von der Quelle bis zum Wasserhahn." Aqua & Gas, **(7)**, 73-77.
- Besmer, M.D. and Hammes, F. (2016) "Short-term microbial dynamics in a drinking water plant treating groundwater with occasional high microbial loads." Water Res, **107**, 11-18.

- 844 Bogosian, G. and E. V. Bourneuf (2001). "A matter of bacterial life and death." EMBO Rep **2**(9): 770-774.
- 845 Brognaux, A., S. Han, S. J. Sorensen, F. Lebeau, P. Thonart and F. Delvigne (2013). "A low-cost,
846 multiplexable, automated flow cytometry procedure for the characterization of microbial stress dynamics
847 in bioreactors." Microb Cell Fact **12**: 100.
- 848 Buesing, N. and M. O. Gessner (2002). "Comparison of detachment procedures for direct counts of bacteria
849 associated with sediment particles, plant litter and epiphytic biofilms." Aquatic Microbial Ecology **27**(1): 29-
850 36.
- 851 Bundesministerium der Justiz und für Verbraucherschutz (2013). Verordnung über die Qualität von Wasser
852 für den menschlichen Gebrauch (Trinkwasserverordnung - TrinkwV 2001) (Update 2013).
- 853 Burtscher, M., F. Zibuschka, R. Mach, G. Lindner and A. Farnleitner (2009). "Heterotrophic plate count vs. in
854 situ bacterial 16S rRNA gene amplicon profiles from drinking water reveal completely different
855 communities with distinct spatial and temporal allocations in a distribution net." Water SA **35**: 495-504.
- 856 Camper, A.K., LeChevallier, M.W., Broadaway, S.C., McFeters, G.A.. (1986.) "Bacteria associated with
857 granular activated carbon particles in drinking water." Appl. Environ. Microbiol. **52**, 434–8.
- 858 Chowdhury, S. (2012). "Heterotrophic bacteria in drinking water distribution system: a review." Environ
859 Monit Assess **184**: 6087–6137.
- 860 D'Onofrio, A., J. M. Crawford, E. J. Stewart, K. Witt, E. Gavrish, S. Epstein, J. Clardy and K. Lewis (2010).
861 "Siderophores from neighboring organisms promote the growth of uncultured bacteria." Chem Biol **17**(3):
862 254-264.
- 863 De Roy, K., L. Clement, O. Thas, Y. Wang and N. Boon (2012). "Flow cytometry for fast microbial community
864 fingerprinting." Water Res **46**(3): 907-919.
- 865 Douterelo, I., J. B. Boxall, P. Deines, R. Sekar, K. E. Fish and C. A. Biggs (2014). "Methodological approaches
866 for studying the microbial ecology of drinking water distribution systems." Water Res **65c**: 134-156.
- 867 EDI (2014). Hygieneverordnung des EDI (HyV) vom 23. November 2005 (Stand am 1. Januar 2014).
868 Eidgenössische Departement des Innern.
- 869 Epstein, S. S. (2013). "The phenomenon of microbial uncultivability." Curr Opin Microbiol **16**(5): 636-642.
- 870 Exner, M., V. Vacanta and J. Gebel (2003). Public health aspects of the role of HPC - an introduction.
871 Heterotrophic Plate Counts and Drinking-water Safety - The Significance of HPCs for Water Quality and
872 Human Health. J. Bartram, J. A. Cotruvo, M. Exner, C. R. Fricker and A. Glasmacher. London, IWA Publishing
873 on behalf of the World Health Organisation.
- 874 Farnleitner AH, Zibuschka F, Burtscher MM, Lindner G, Reischer G, Mach RL. (2004). "Eubacterial 16S-rDNA
875 amplicon profiling: a rapid technique for comparison and differentiation of heterotrophic plate count
876 communities from drinking water." Int J Food Microbiol **92**: 333–345.
- 877 Foladori, P., L. Bruni, S. Tamburini and G. Ziglio (2010). "Direct quantification of bacterial biomass in
878 influent, effluent and activated sludge of wastewater treatment plants by using flow cytometry." Water Res

- 879 **44(13): 3807-3818.**
- 880 Francisque A., Rodriguez M.J., Miranda-Moreno L.F., Sadiq R. and Proulx F. (2009) "Modeling of
881 heterotrophic bacteria counts in a water distribution system." Water Res. **43(4): 1075–1087.**
- 882 Frankland, P. and G. C. T. Frankland (1894). Micro-organisms in water: their significance, identification and
883 removal. London, Longmans, Green.
- 884 Gensberger, E. T. Gössl, E.-M., Antonielli, L., Sessitsch, A. and T. Kostic (2015) "Effect of different
885 heterotrophic plate count methods on the estimation of the composition of the culturable microbial
886 community." PeerJ 3:e862.
- 887 Gillespie, S., P. Lipphaus, J. Green, S. Parsons, P. Weir, K. Juskowiak, B. Jefferson, P. Jarvis and A. Nocker
888 (2014). "Assessing microbiological water quality in drinking water distribution systems with disinfectant
889 residual using flow cytometry." Water Res **65:** 224-234.
- 890 Green, B. D. and M. Keller (2006). "Capturing the uncultivated majority." Curr Opin Biotechnol **17(3): 236-**
891 **240.**
- 892 Hammes, F., M. Berney and T. Egli (2011). "Cultivation-independent Assessment of Bacterial Viability." High
893 Resolution Microbial Single Cell Analytics **124:** 123-150.
- 894 Hammes, F., M. Berney, Y. Wang, M. Vital, O. Koester and T. Egli (2008). "Flow-cytometric total bacterial
895 cell counts as a descriptive microbiological parameter for drinking water treatment processes." Water Res
896 **42(1-2): 269-277.**
- 897 Hammes, F., T. Broger, H.-U. Weilenmann, M. Vital, J. Helbing, U. Bosshart, P. Huber, R. P. Odermatt and B.
898 Sonleitner (2012). "Development and laboratory-scale testing of a fully automated online flow cytometer
899 for drinking water analysis." Cytometry Part A **81A(6): 508-516.**
- 900 Hammes, F. and T. Egli (2010). "Cytometric methods for measuring bacteria in water: advantages, pitfalls
901 and applications." Anal Bioanal Chem **397(3): 1083-1095.**
- 902 Hammes, F., F. Goldschmidt, M. Vital, Y. Wang and T. Egli (2010a). "Measurement and interpretation of
903 microbial adenosine tri-phosphate (ATP) in aquatic environments." Water Res **44(13): 3915-3923.**
- 904 Hammes, F., C Berger, O Köster, T Egli (2010b) "Biological stability of drinking water without disinfectant
905 residuals: a case-study of the Zürich water supply system." J Water Supply Res T. **59:** 1. 31-40.
- 906 Hammes, F. A. and T. Egli (2005). "New method for assimilable organic carbon determination using flow-
907 cytometric enumeration and a natural microbial consortium as inoculum." Environ Sci Technol **39(9): 3289-**
908 **3294.**
- 909 Health Canada (2012). Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality-Summary Table. Water, Air and
910 Climate Change Bureau and Healthy Environments and Consumers Safety Branch. Ottawa, Ontario, Health
911 Canada.
- 912 Helmi, K., F. Barthod, G. Méheut, A. Henry, F. Poty, F. Laurent and N. Charni-Ben-Tabassi (2014a). "Methods
913 for microbiological quality assessment in drinking water: a comparative study." J Water Health **13:** 34.

- 914 Helmi, K., A. Watt, P. Jacob, I. Ben-Hadj-Salah, A. Henry, G. Méheut and N. Charni-Ben-Tabassi (2014b).
 915 "Monitoring of three drinking water treatment plants using flow cytometry." Wa Sci Technol **14**(5): 850-
 916 856.
- 917 Hijnen, W. A. M., E. F. Beerendonk and G. J. Medema (2006). "Inactivation credit of UV radiation for viruses,
 918 bacteria and protozoan (oo)cysts in water: A review." Water Res **40**(1): 3-22.
- 919 Ho, L., K. Braun, R. Fabris, D. Hoefel, J. Morran, P. Monis and M. Drikas (2012). "Comparison of drinking
 920 water treatment process streams for optimal bacteriological water quality." Water Res **46**(12): 3934-3942.
- 921 Hoefel, D., W. L. Grooby, P. T. Monis, S. Andrews and C. P. Saint (2003). "Enumeration of water-borne
 922 bacteria using viability assays and flow cytometry: a comparison to culture-based techniques." J Microbiol
 923 Meth **55**(3): 585-597.
- 924 Hoefel, D., P. T. Monis, W. L. Grooby, S. Andrews and C. P. Saint (2005a). "Culture-independent techniques
 925 for rapid detection of bacteria associated with loss of chloramine residual in a drinking water system." Appl
 926 Environ Microbiol **71**(11): 6479-6488.
- 927 Hoefel, D., P. T. Monis, W. L. Grooby, S. Andrews and C. P. Saint (2005b). "Profiling bacterial survival
 928 through a water treatment process and subsequent distribution system." J Appl Microbiol **99**: 175 - 186.
- 929 Holm-Hansen, O. and C. R. Booth (1966). "Measurement of adenosine triphosphate in the ocean and its
 930 ecological significance." Limnol Oceanogr **11**: 510-519.
- 931 Hug, L. A., B. J. Baker, K. Anantharaman, C. T. Brown, A. J. Probst, C. J. Castelle, C. N. Butterfield, A. W.
 932 Hernsdorf, Y. Amano, K. Ise, Y. Suzuki, N. Dudek, D. A. Relman, K. M. Finstad, R. Amundson, B. C. Thomas
 933 and J. F. Banfield (2016). "A new view of the tree of life." Nature Microbiology **1**: 1-6.
- 934 Hwang, C., Ling, F., Andersen, G.L., LeChevallier, M.W., Liu, W.-T., (2012). "Evaluation of methods for the
 935 extraction of DNA from drinking water distribution system biofilms." Microbes Environ. **27**, 9–18.
- 936 Infrastructuur en Milieu (2011). Besluit van 23 mei 2011, houdende bepalingen inzake de productie en
 937 distributie van drinkwater en de organisatie van de openbare drinkwatervoorziening (Drinkwaterbesluit).
- 938 Kaeberlein, T., K. Lewis and S. S. Epstein (2002). "Isolating "uncultivable" microorganisms in pure culture in
 939 a simulated natural environment." Science **296**(5570): 1127-1129.
- 940 Kahlisch, L., K. Henne, L. Grobe, I. Brettar and M. G. Hofle (2012). "Assessing the viability of bacterial species
 941 in drinking water by combined cellular and molecular analyses." Microb Ecol **63**(2): 383-397.
- 942 Kahlisch, L., K. Henne, L. Groebe, J. Draheim, M. G. Hofle and I. Brettar (2010). "Molecular analysis of the
 943 bacterial drinking water community with respect to live/dead status." Water Sci Technol **61**(1): 9-14.
- 944 Karl, D. M. (1980). "Cellular nucleotide measurements and applications in microbial ecology." Microbiol Rev
 945 **44**(4): 739-796.
- 946 Kell, D. B., A. S. Kaprelyants, D. H. Weichart, C. R. Harwood and M. R. Barer (1998). "Viability and activity in
 947 readily culturable bacteria: a review and discussion of the practical issues." Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek
 948 **73**(2): 169-187.

- 949 Keserue, H. A., A. Baumgartner, R. Felleisen and T. Egli (2012). "Rapid detection of total and viable
950 *Legionella pneumophila* in tap water by immunomagnetic separation, double fluorescent staining and flow
951 cytometry." Microb Biotechnol **5**(6): 753-763.
- 952 Koch, C., F. Harnisch, U. Schröder and S. Müller (2014). "Cytometric fingerprints: evaluation of new tools for
953 analyzing microbial community dynamics." Frontiers in Microbiology **5**.
- 954 Koch, R. (1881). "Zur Untersuchung von pathogenen Organismen." Mitteilungen des kaiserlichen
955 Gesundheitsamtes **1**: 1-48.
- 956 Koch, R. (1893). Wasserfiltration und Cholera. Gesammelte Werke, Bd 2 Teil 1. Leipzig 1912, Georg Thieme:
957 183-206.
- 958 Koetzsch, S., S. Alisch, T. Egli, F. Hammes, H. U. Weilenmann, L. Pfister and S. Karmann (2012).
959 Durchflussszytometrische Analyse von Wasserproben. . Sweizerisches Buch für Lebensmittel, Bundesamtes
960 für Gesundheit.
- 961 Koetzsch, S. and M. Sinreich (2014). "Zellzahlen zum Grundwasser. Bestimmung mittels
962 Durchflussszytometrie." Aqua & Gas **3**: 14-21.
- 963 Lautenschlager, K., N. Boon, Y. Y. Wang, T. Egli and F. Hammes (2010). "Overnight stagnation of drinking
964 water in household taps induces microbial growth and changes in community composition." Water Res
965 **44**(17): 4868-4877.
- 966 Lautenschlager, K., C. Hwang, W. T. Liu, N. Boon, O. Koster, H. Vrouwenvelder, T. Egli and F. Hammes
967 (2013). "A microbiology-based multi-parametric approach towards assessing biological stability in drinking
968 water distribution networks." Water Res **47**(9): 3015-3025.
- 969 Lautenschlager K, Hwang C, Ling F, Liu WT, Boon N, Koster O, *et al.* (2014). "Abundance and composition of
970 indigenous bacterial communities in a multi-step biofiltration-based drinking water treatment plant."
971 Water Res **62**: 40–52.
- 972 Lebaron, P., N. Parthuisot and P. Catala (1998). "Comparison of blue nucleic acid dyes for flow cytometric
973 enumeration of bacteria in aquatic systems." Appl Environ Microb **64**(5): 1725-1730.
- 974 LeChevallier, M. W., Hassenauer, T. S., Camper, A. L., & McFeters, G. A. (1984). "Disinfection of bacteria
975 attached to granular activated carbon." Appl Environ. Microbiol. **48**, 918–923.
- 976 LeChevallier, M.W., Seidler, R.J., Evans, T.M. (1980). "Enumeration and characterization of standard plate
977 count bacteria in chlorinated and raw water supplies." Appl. Environ. Microbiol. **40**, 922–30.
- 978 Leclerc, H. (2003). Relationships between common water bacteria and pathogens in drinking water.
979 Heterotrophic Plate counts and Drinking-water Safety. J. Bartram, J. A. Cotruvo, M. Exner, C. R. Fricker and
980 A. Glasmacher. London, IWA Publishing on behalf of the World Health Organisation.
- 981 Legendre L, Yentsch CM. (1989). "Overview of flow cytometry and image analysis in biological
982 oceanography and limnology." Cytometry **10**: 501–510.
- 983 Lewis, K., S. Epstein, A. D'Onofrio and L. L. Ling (2010). "Uncultured microorganisms as a source of

- 984 secondary metabolites." *J Antibiot (Tokyo)* **63**(8): 468-476.
- 985 Liikanen R, Miettinen I, Laukkanen R. (2003). "Selection of NF membrane to improve quality of chemically
986 treated surface water." *Water Res* **37**: 864–872.
- 987 Lipphaus, P., F. Hammes, S. Kotzsch, J. Green, S. Gillespie and A. Nocker (2014). "Microbiological tap water
988 profile of a medium-sized building and effect of water stagnation." *Environ Technol* **35**(5-8): 620-628.
- 989 Lisle, J. T., B. H. Pyle and G. A. McFeters (1999). "The use of multiple indices of physiological activity to
990 access viability in chlorine disinfected Escherichia coli O157:H7." *Lett Appl Microbiol* **29**(1): 42-47.
- 991 Liu, G., E. J. Van der Mark, J. Q. Verberk and J. C. Van Dijk (2013). "Flow cytometry total cell counts: a field
992 study assessing microbiological water quality and growth in unchlorinated drinking water distribution
993 systems." *Biomed Res Int* **2013**: 595872.
- 994 Liu G, Ling FQ, Magic-Knezev A, Liu WT, Verberk JQJC, Van Dijk JC. (2013a). "Quantification and
995 identification of particle-associated bacteria in unchlorinated drinking water from three treatment plants
996 by cultivation-independent methods." *Water Res* **47**: 3523–3533.
- 997 Lopez-Roldan, R. Tusell, P., Courtois, S. and J. L. Cortina (2013b) "On-line bacteriological detection in
998 water." *Trends in Analytical Chemistry* **44**: 46 - 56.
- 999 Ma, L., G. Mao, J. Liu, H. Yu, G. Gao and Y. Wang (2013). "Rapid quantification of bacteria and viruses in
1000 influent, settled water, activated sludge and effluent from a wastewater treatment plant using flow
1001 cytometry." *Water Sci Technol* **68**(8): 1763-1769.
- 1002 Magic-Knezev, A., van der Kooij, D., (2004). "Optimisation and significance of ATP analysis for measuring
1003 active biomass in granular activated carbon filters used in water treatment." *Water Res.* **38**(18), 3971-3979.
- 1004 Mimoso J, Pronk W, Morgenroth E, Hammes F. (2015). "Bacterial growth in batch-operated membrane
1005 filtration systems for drinking water treatment." *Sep Purif Technol* **156**: 165–174.
- 1006 Ministère de la santé et des solidarités (2007). Arrêté du 11 janvier 2007 relatif aux limites et références de
1007 qualité des eaux brutes et des eaux destinées à la consommation humaine mentionnées aux articles R.
1008 1321-2, R. 1321-2, R. 1321-7 et R. 1321-38 du code de la santé publique. Paris.
- 1009 Monfort, P. and B. Baleux (1992). "Comparison of flow cytometry and epifluorescence microscopy for
1010 counting bacteria in aquatic ecosystems." *Cytometry* **13**(2): 188-192.
- 1011 Nadkarni, M. A., F. E. Martin, N. A. Jacques and N. Hunter (2002). "Determination of bacterial load by real-
1012 time PCR using a broad-range (universal) probe and primers set." *Microbiology* **148**(Pt 1): 257-266.
- 1013 Nescerecka, A., J. Rubulis, M. Vital, T. Juhna and F. Hammes (2014). "Biological instability in a chlorinated
1014 drinking water distribution network." *PLoS One* **9**(5): e96354.
- 1015 Nescerecka, A., Hammes, F., Juhna, T. (2016a). "A pipeline for developing and testing staining protocols for
1016 flow cytometry, demonstrated with SYBR Green I and propidium iodide viability staining." *J. Microbiol.*
1017 *Methods* **131**, 172–180.

- 1018 Nescerecka, A., Juhna, T., Hammes, F. (2016b). "Behavior and stability of adenosine triphosphate (ATP)
1019 during chlorine disinfection." Water Res. **101**, 490–497.
- 1020 NHMRC and NRMCMC (2011). Australian Drinking Water Guidelines Paper 6 National Water Quality
1021 Management Strategy. National Health and Medical Research Council and National Resource Management
1022 Ministerial Council. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.
- 1023 Nocker, A., K. E. Sossa and A. K. Camper (2007). "Molecular monitoring of disinfection efficacy using
1024 propidium monoazide in combination with quantitative PCR." J Microbiol Methods **70**(2): 252-260.
- 1025 Oliver, J. D. (2005). "The viable but nonculturable state in bacteria." J Microbiol **43 Spec No**: 93-100.
- 1026 Oliver, J. D. (2010). "Recent findings on the viable but nonculturable state in pathogenic bacteria." FEMS
1027 Microbiol Rev **34**(4): 415-425.
- 1028 Paa, A. S., J. R. Cowles and J. Oro (1977). "Flow-microfluorometric analysis of *Escherichia coli*, *Rhizobium*
1029 *meliloti*, and *Rhizobium japonicum* at different stages of the growth cycle." Can J Microbiol **23**(9): 1165-
1030 1169.
- 1031 Payment, P., D. P. Sartory and D. J. Reasoner (2003). The history and use of HPC in drinking-water quality
1032 management. Heterotrophic Plate Counts and Drinking-water Safety. J. Bartram, J. A. Cotruvo, M. Exner, C.
1033 R. Fricker and A. Glasmacher. London, IWA Publishing, World Health Organisation.
- 1034 Pepper, I. L., P. Rusin, D. R. Quintanar, C. Haney, K. L. Josephson, and C. P. Gerba. (2004). "Tracking the
1035 concentration of heterotrophic plate count bacteria from the source to the consumer's tap." Int J Food
1036 Microbiol **92**:289-95
- 1037 Phe, M. H., M. Dossot, H. Guilloteau and J. C. Block (2005). "Nucleic acid fluorochromes and flow cytometry
1038 prove useful in assessing the effect of chlorination on drinking water bacteria." Water Res **39**(15): 3618-
1039 3628.
- 1040 Pianetti, A., T. Falcioni, F. Bruscolini, L. Sabatini, E. Sisti and S. Papa (2005). "Determination of the viability of
1041 *Aeromonas hydrophila* in different types of water by flow cytometry, and comparison with classical
1042 methods." Appl Environ Microbiol **71**(12): 7948-7954.
- 1043 Pinto, A. J., J. Schroeder, M. Lunn, W. Sloan and L. Raskin (2014). "Spatial-temporal survey and occupancy-
1044 abundance modeling to predict bacterial community dynamics in the drinking water microbiome." MBio
1045 **5**(3): e01135-01114.
- 1046 Pinto, A. J., Xi, C., and L. Raskin (2012) "Bacterial community structure in the drinking water microbiome is
1047 governed by filtration processes." Environ Sci Technol **46**:8851-8859.
- 1048 Prest, E. I., J. El-Chakhtoura, F. Hammes, P. E. Saikaly, M. C. van Loosdrecht and J. S. Vrouwenvelder (2014).
1049 "Combining flow cytometry and 16S rRNA gene pyrosequencing: A promising approach for drinking water
1050 monitoring and characterization." Water Res **63**: 179-189.
- 1051 Prest, E. I., F. Hammes, S. Kotzsch, M. C. van Loosdrecht and J. S. Vrouwenvelder (2013). "Monitoring
1052 microbiological changes in drinking water systems using a fast and reproducible flow cytometric method."
1053 Water Res **47**(19): 7131-7142.

- 1054 Prest EI, Weissbrodt DG, Hammes F, van Loosdrecht MCM, Vrouwenvelder JS (2016a) "Long-Term Bacterial
1055 Dynamics in a Full-Scale Drinking Water Distribution System." PLoS ONE **11**(10): e0164445.
- 1056 Prest E.I., Hammes F., van Loosdrecht M.C.M., Vrouwenvelder J.S. (2016b) "Biological stability of drinking
1057 water: controlling factors, methods and challenges." Frontiers in Microbiology **7**:45.
- 1058 Proctor CR, Hammes F. (2015). "Drinking water microbiology—from measurement to management." Curr
1059 Opin Biotechnol **33**: 87–94.
- 1060 Props R, Kerckhof F-M, Rubbens P, De Vrieze J, Hernandez Sanabria E, Waegeman W, *et al.* (2016). Absolute
1061 quantification of microbial taxon abundances. ISME J. e-pub ahead of print, doi: 10.1038/ismej.2016.117.
- 1062 Radcliff, R. (2003). "International Drinking Water Regulations - The Developed World Sets the Standards."
1063 Retrieved Sept 18, 2014, from http://www.nesc.wvu.edu/ndwc/articles/ot/sp03/inter_dwregs.html.
- 1064 Ramseier, M. K., U. von Gunten, P. Freihofer and F. Hammes (2011). "Kinetics of membrane damage to high
1065 (HNA) and low (LNA) nucleic acid bacterial clusters in drinking water by ozone, chlorine, chlorine dioxide,
1066 monochloramine, ferrate(VI), and permanganate." Water Res **45**(3): 1490-1500.
- 1067 Rappe, M. S., S. A. Connon, K. L. Vergin and S. J. Giovannoni (2002). "Cultivation of the ubiquitous SAR11
1068 marine bacterioplankton clade." Nature **418**(6898): 630-633.
- 1069 Reasoner, D. J. (1990) Monitoring heterotrophic bacteria in potable water. In: Drinking water microbiology
1070 (Gordon A McFeters, Ed.). Springer-Verlag, New York.
- 1071 Reasoner, D. J. (2004). "Heterotrophic plate count methodology in the United States." Int J Food Microbiol
1072 **92**(3): 307-315.
- 1073 Reasoner, D. J. and E. E. Geldreich (1985). "A new medium for the enumeration and subculture of bacteria
1074 from potable water." Appl Environ Microbiol **49**(1): 1-7.
- 1075 Rice, E. W., R. B. Baird, A. D. Eaton and L. S. Clesceri (2012). Standard methods for the examination of water
1076 and wastewater - 22nd ed.. New York, American Public Health Association, American Water Works
1077 Association and Water Environment Federation.
- 1078 Richardson, H. Y., G. Nichols, C. Lane, I. R. Lake and P. R. Hunter (2009). "Microbiological surveillance of
1079 private water supplies in England: the impact of environmental and climate factors on water quality."
1080 Water Res **43**(8): 2159-2168.
- 1081 Salter, S.J., Cox, M.J., Turek, E.M., Calus, S.T., Cookson, W.O., Moffatt, M.F., Turner, P., Parkhill, J., Loman,
1082 N.J., Walker, A.W., (2014). "Reagent and laboratory contamination can critically impact sequence-based
1083 microbiome analyses." BMC Biol **12**, 87.
- 1084 Sangwan, P., S. Kovac, K. E. Davis, M. Sait and P. H. Janssen (2005). "Detection and cultivation of soil
1085 verrucomicrobia." Appl Environ Microbiol **71**(12): 8402-8410.
- 1086 Sartory, D. P. (2004) "Heterotrophic plate count monitoring of treated drinking water in the UK: a useful
1087 operational tool." Int J Food Microbiol **92**: 297 - 306.

- 1088 Sedlak, D. L. (2014). Water 4.0 - The past, present and future of the world's most vital resource, Yale
1089 University Press/New Haven & London.
- 1090 Shapiro, H. M. (2003). Practical Flow Cytometry, 4th edition. New York, Wiley-Liss.
- 1091 Siebel E, Wang Y, Egli T, Hammes F. (2008). Correlations between total cell concentration, total adenosine
1092 tri-phosphate concentration and heterotrophic plate counts during microbial monitoring of drinking water.
1093 Drink Water Eng Sci **1**: 1–6.
- 1094 Sinreich, M., M. Pronk and R. Kozel (2014). "Microbiological monitoring and classification of karst springs."
1095 Environmental Earth Sciences **71**(2): 563-572.
- 1096 SLMB (2012). Determining the total cell count and ratios of high and low nucleic acid content cells in
1097 freshwater using flow cytometry. Analysis method 333.1, Swiss food book. Federal Office of Public Health,
1098 Swiss Confederation.
- 1099 Staley, J. T. and A. Konopka (1985). "Measurement of in situ activities of nonphotosynthetic
1100 microorganisms in aquatic and terrestrial habitats." Annu Rev Microbiol **39**: 321-346.
- 1101 Trousellier, M., Courties, C., Vaquer, S. (1993) "Recent applications of flow cytometry in aquatic microbial
1102 ecology." Biol Cell. **78**, 111-121.
- 1103 Uhl W., Schaule G. (2004). Establishment of HPC(R2A) for regrowth control in non-chlorinated distribution
1104 systems. Int. J. Food Microbiol. **92**, 317–325.
- 1105 USEPA (2009). National Primary Drinking Water Regulations. United States Environmental Protection
1106 Agency.
- 1107 van der Kooij, D. and H. R. Veenendaal (2014). "Regrowth problems and biological stability assessment in
1108 the Netherlands." Microbial Growth in Drinking-Water Supplies. D. Van der Kooij and P. W. Van der Wielen.
1109 London, IWA Publishing.
- 1110 van der Kooij, D. and P. W. van der Wielen (2014a). General introduction. Microbial Growth in Drinking-
1111 Water Supplies. D. Van der Kooij and P. W. Van der Wielen. London, IWA Publishing.
- 1112 van der Kooij, D. and P. W. van der Wielen (2014b). "Research Needs. Microbial Growth in Drinking-Water
1113 Supplies." D. Van der Kooij and P. W. Van der Wielen. London, IWA Publishing.
- 1114 van der Kooij, D., J. S. Vrouwenvelder and H. R. Veenendaal (2003). "Elucidation and control of biofilm
1115 formation processes in water treatment and distribution using the Unified Biofilm Approach." Water Sci
1116 Technol **47**(5): 83-90.
- 1117 van der Wielen, P. W. J. J. and D. van der Kooij (2010). "Effect of water composition, distance and season on
1118 the adenosine triphosphate concentration in unchlorinated drinking water in the Netherlands." Water Res
1119 **44**(17): 4860-4867.
- 1120 Van Nevel, S., B. Buysschaert, B. De Gussemé and N. Boon (2016). "Flow cytometric examination of
1121 bacterial growth in a local drinking water network." Journal of Water and Environment **30**(1-2):167-176.

- 1122 Van Nevel, S., K. De Roy and N. Boon (2013a). "Bacterial invasion potential in water is determined by
1123 nutrient availability and the indigenous community." Fems Microbiol Ecol **85**(3): 593-603.
- 1124 Van Nevel, S., T. Hennebel, K. De Beuf, G. Du Laing, W. Verstraete and N. Boon (2012). "Transparent
1125 exopolymer particle removal in different drinking water production centers." Water Res **46**(11): 3603-3611.
- 1126 Van Nevel, S., S. Koetzsch, H. U. Weilenmann, N. Boon and F. Hammes (2013b). "Routine bacterial analysis
1127 with automated flow cytometry." J Microbiol Methods **94**(2): 73-76.
- 1128 Velten S, Boller M, Köster O, Helbing J, Weilenmann H-U, Hammes F. (2011). Development of biomass in a
1129 drinking water granular active carbon (GAC) filter. Water Res **45**: 6347-6354.
- 1130 Vesey, G., J. S. Slade and C. R. Fricker (1991). "Taking the eye strain out of environmental cryptosporidium
1131 analysis." Lett Appl Microbiol **13**(2): 62-65.
- 1132 Villarino, A., M. N. Rager, P. A. Grimont and O. M. Bouvet (2003). "Are UV-induced nonculturable
1133 *Escherichia coli* K-12 cells alive or dead?" Eur J Biochem **270**(12): 2689-2695.
- 1134 Vital, M., M. Dignum, A. Magic-Knezev, P. Ross, L. Rietveld and F. Hammes (2012). "Flow cytometry and
1135 adenosine tri-phosphate analysis: alternative possibilities to evaluate major bacteriological changes in
1136 drinking water treatment and distribution systems." Water Res **46**(15): 4665-4676.
- 1137 Vital, M., H. P. Fuechslin, F. Hammes and T. Egli (2007). "Growth of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 Ogawa Eltor in
1138 freshwater." Microbiology-SGM **153**: 1993-2001.
- 1139 Vital, M., D. Stucki, T. Egli and F. Hammes (2010). "Evaluating the Growth Potential of Pathogenic Bacteria
1140 in Water." Appl Environ Microb **76**(19): 6477-6484.
- 1141 VMM (2014). Algemeen Waterverkoopreglement. Vlaamse Milieumaatschappij.
- 1142 Vrouwenvelder, J. S., S. A. Manolarakis, J. P. van der Hoek, J. A. van Paassen, W. G. van der Meer, J. M. van
1143 Agtmaal, H. D. Prummel, J. C. Kruithof and M. C. van Loosdrecht (2008). "Quantitative biofouling diagnosis
1144 in full scale nanofiltration and reverse osmosis installations." Water Res **42**(19): 4856-4868.
- 1145 Wang, Y., F Hammes, T Egli (2008) "The impact of industrial-scale cartridge filtration on the native
1146 microbial communities from groundwater." Water Res. **42**: 16. 4319-4326.
- 1147 Wang, Y., F. Hammes, N. Boon, M. Chami and T. Egli (2009). "Isolation and characterization of low nucleic
1148 acid (LNA)-content bacteria." Isme j **3**(8): 889-902.
- 1149 Wang, Y., F. Hammes, K. De Roy, W. Verstraete and N. Boon (2010). "Past, present and future applications
1150 of flow cytometry in aquatic microbiology." Trends Biotechnol **28**(8): 416-424.
- 1151 Wen, G., J. Ma, T. L. Huang and T. Egli (2014). "Using coagulation to restrict microbial re-growth in tap
1152 water by phosphate limitation in water treatment." J Hazard Mater **280c**: 348-355.
- 1153 Wert, E. C., M. M. Dong and F. L. Rosario-Ortiz (2013). "Using digital flow cytometry to assess the
1154 degradation of three cyanobacteria species after oxidation processes." Water Res **47**(11): 3752-3761.

- 1155 WHO (2003). Expert Consensus. Heterotrophic Plate Counts and Drinking-water Safety - The Significance of
1156 HPCs for Water Quality and Human Health. J. Bartram, J. A. Cotruvo, M. Exner, C. R. Fricker and A.
1157 Glasmacher. London, IWA Publishing on behalf of the World Health Organisation.
- 1158 WHO (2003). Heterotrophic Plate Counts and Drinking-water Safety - The Significance of HPCs for Water
1159 Quality and Human Health. London, IWA Publishing on behalf of the World Health Organisation.
- 1160 Winterberg, H. (1898). "Zur Methodik der Bakterienzählung." Zeitschrift für Hygiene und
1161 Infektionskrankheiten **29**(1): 75-93.
- 1162 Yang, L., L. Wu, S. Zhu, Y. Long, W. Hang and X. Yan (2010). "Rapid, absolute, and simultaneous
1163 quantification of specific pathogenic strain and total bacterial cells using an ultrasensitive dual-color flow
1164 cytometer." Anal Chem **82**(3): 1109-1116.
- 1165 Zeder, M. and J. Pernthaler (2009). "Multispot live-image autofocusing for high-throughput microscopy of
1166 fluorescently stained bacteria." Cytometry A **75**(9): 781-788.
1167

1168 **Table 1:** An overview of the variety in drinking water legislation and guidelines with regard to HPC. For agar compositions, see Table S1.

Region	Media	Temp.	Time	Upper limit	Comment	Reference
United States	Plate Count Agar	48 h	35°C	< 500 cfu mL ⁻¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that values above limit interferes with coliform and <i>E. coli</i> recovery methods 	(USEPA 2009)
United Kingdom	Yeast extract Agar	22 °C 37 °C	68±4 h 44±4 h	NAC ^a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UK guidelines allow for the use of R2A agar when deemed necessary 	(Anonymous 2012)
France	Plate Count Agar	22 °C 36 °C	72 h 48 h	NAC NAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change should not to exceed 10-fold the “usual” results 	(Ministère de la santé et des solidarités 2007)
The Netherlands	Plate Count Agar	22 °C	72 h	100 cfu mL ⁻¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on yearly geometrical mean value. 	(Infrastructuur en Milieu 2011)
Germany A ^b	Low nutrient agar ^b	22±2 °C 36±2 °C	68±4 h 44±4 h	NAC NAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some German utilities still follow the older TrinkwV1990 guidelines with different media and specified limiting values 	TrinkwV 2001
Germany B	High nutrient agar	20±2 °C 36±1 °C	44±4 h 44±4 h	20 cfu mL ⁻¹ 100 cfu mL ⁻¹ 100 cfu mL ⁻¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After treatment At the tap 	TrinkwV 1990
Belgium	Yeast extract Agar	22±2 °C	68±4 h	NAC		(VMM 2014)
Switzerland	Plate Count Agar	30±1 °C	72±3 h	20 cfu mL ⁻¹ 300 cfu mL ⁻¹ 100 cfu mL ⁻¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After treatment In the network Untreated source (spring) water 	(EDI 2014) ISO 4833
Canada	Standard Methods Agar	35 °C	48 h	No limit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If used as an indicator, numbers should be established on a system-specific basis. 	(Health Canada 2012)
Australia	Yeast extract agar, R2A agar	20–22 °C 35–37 °C	72–120 h 24 – 48 h	No limit No limit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines allows flexibility regarding media and incubation conditions 	(NHMRC and NRMCC 2011)

1169 ^a NAC: no abnormal change.

1170 ^b The German TrinkwV2001 guidelines specify low nutrient agar (6 g L⁻¹ tryptone and 3 g L⁻¹ yeast extract). The older TrinkwV1990 guidelines use high nutrient agar (1 % beef
1171 extract and 1 % peptone).
1172

1173

Table 2: Microbiologically relevant processes and/or events in drinking water treatment and distribution systems and that are conventionally monitored with HPC methods¹. A selection of related FCM studies for each category is given, together with links to specific examples presented in the supplementary information section of this manuscript.

	Relevant process or event ¹	Selection of related FCM studies	Examples ²
Source	Detecting contamination of drinking water sources	Besmer et al. (2014, 2016a, b); Besmer and Hammes (2016)	Figure 1 Example S1
Treatment	Assessment of chemical disinfection efficacy	Hammes et al. (2008, 2010b); Vital et al., (2012)	Example S2
Treatment	Assessment of membrane filtration efficacy	Hammes et al. (2010b)	-
Treatment	Growth and/or detachment during biofiltration	Hammes et al. (2008, 2010b); Vital et al. (2012)	Example S2
Treatment	Operational influences on microbiological water quality	Besmer et al. (2016a, b)	-
Distribution	Temporal (in)stability in microbiological water quality	Prest et al. (2016); Besmer et al. (2016a, b); Nescerecka et al. (2014)	Example S4
Distribution	Spatial (in)stability in microbiological water quality	Nescerecka et al. (2014); Vital et al. (2012); Lautenschlager et al. (2013)	Example S3
Plumbing	Water quality deterioration in building plumbing	Lautenschlager et al. (2010); Lipphaus et al. (2014); Siebel et al. (2008)	Example S5
Storage	Bacterial growth in drinking water during storage	Mimoso et al. (2015); Wang et al. (2008)	-

¹ Adapted and expanded from Sartory (2004), WHO (2003), Reasoner (1990), Allen et al. (2004) and Chowdhury (2012).

² Examples are summarised in case study format in the supplementary information section.

Table 3: Overview of methods used for general bacterial quantification in drinking water.

Method	Measures	Principle	Viability	Labor	Time-to-result	Online	Reference
HPC	Cultivable bacteria	Growth	Yes	Medium	Days to weeks	No	Reasoner (1990)
FCM	Cell concentration	Staining	Yes ¹	Low	Minutes	Yes	Prest et al. (2013)
Microscopy	Cell concentration	Staining	Yes ¹	High	Minutes to hours	No	Burtscher et al. (2009)
ATP	ATP concentration	Enzymatic	Yes	Low	Minutes	Yes	Nescerecka et al. (2016b)
qPCR	16S rRNA gene copies	Gene amplification	Yes ²	High	Hours to Days	No	Lopez-Roldan et al. (2013)
Nucleic acid quantification	Total DNA/RNA	Fluorescence /Absorbance	Yes ²	High	Hours to Days	No	-

¹ Requires specific viability staining with dyes such as propidium iodide

² Quantifies viability when RNA is extracted and analysed

Figure legends

Figure 1: Overview of the main advantages of flow cytometry for drinking water monitoring. Abbreviations used: FCM – flow cytometry; TCC – total cell concentration; ICC – intact cell concentration; HPC – heterotrophic plate counts; RSD – relative standard deviation

Figure 2: Microbiological monitoring of a karstic spring following regional precipitation and subsequent increased spring discharge **(A)**. Samples collected hourly for 24 h were analysed with flow cytometry (FCM) for total cell concentrations (TCC; SYBR Green I staining) and with heterotrophic plate counts (HPC; PCA, 30 °C, 72 h) **(B)**.

Figure 3: Comparison of flow cytometric total cell concentration (FCM-TCC) and heterotrophic plate count (HPC) sensitivity and accuracy on four non-chlorinated water samples. Four water samples were analysed in triplicate by three routine laboratories using both HPC (PCA, 30 °C, 72 h) and FCM-TCC (SYBR Green I staining). Box plots show the median (solid line), the 25 and 75 percentiles (box), as well as the absolute data points (crosses). On average only 0.005 % of the total bacterial cells were detected by HPC (B), while FCM discriminated clearly between the different water samples (A). The cultivability of the samples, expressed as HPC cell count divided by FCM cell concentration, remained below 0.01 % (C). Figure redrafted from Koetzsch *et al.* (2012).

Figure 4: The principle of flow cytometric total cell concentration (FCM-TCC) and intact cell concentration (FCM-ICC) measurements. FCM-TCC is based on SYBR Green I, which enters and stains all bacterial cells with nucleic acids, independently of membrane integrity. FCM-ICC is based on dual staining with both SYBR Green I and propidium iodide, of which propidium iodide is only able to penetrate and stain bacterial cells with damaged cell membranes. Therefore, FCM-ICC enables the differentiation between bacterial cells with intact membranes and damaged bacterial cells.

1215 **Figure 5:** Comparison between flow cytometry total cell concentration (FCM-TCC) and heterotrophic plate
1216 count (HPC) results **(A)** and intact cell concentration (FCM-ICC) with HPC results **(B)** in a broad range of
1217 water samples. Samples originate from different (non)chlorinated water treatments, including source,
1218 treatment and distribution network samples (FCM-TCC: n = 3'675, FCM-ICC: n = 1'835). It is clear that the
1219 correlation between HPC and FCM-TCC or FCM-ICC is very weak ($R^2 < 0.1$ for linear regression in both
1220 cases).

1221
1222 **Figure 6:** The comparison of flow cytometry intact cell concentration (FCM-ICC) with intracellular adenosine
1223 tri-phosphate (ATP) concentrations in water samples. Samples originate from different chlorinated and
1224 non-chlorinated systems, including source, treatment and distribution network samples (n = 1'441). There
1225 is a clear correlation between both parameters, which is expected since both methods are a direct
1226 assessment of potentially viable bacterial cells, either intact or active.

1227

Relevant information

FCM-TCC and ICC data have been used extensively to monitor relevant bacterial changes during treatment and distribution.

Example: Hammes et al. (2008)

Rapid analysis

Less than 15 minutes is needed from the time when the sample reaches the laboratory until the final result is available.

Example: Prest et al. (2013)

Reproducible measurements

Single operator/instrument variability is < 3 % RSD; Multi operator/instrument variability is < 10 %.

Example: Prest et al. (2013)

Flexible staining

FCM can be combined with a variety of fluorescent dyes and probes targeting bacterial DNA content, different aspects of viability, activity and identity.

Example: Berney et al. (2007)

Low costs

FCM analysis can be cost-effective compared to HPC analysis when more than 15 samples per day are analyzed, based on hardware and labor costs.

Example: This paper

Multi-variable data

FCM measurements collect data on fluorescent color, intensity and light scattering (size) for every single particle.

Example: Hammes and Egli (2010)

FCM fingerprinting

A range of new statistical tools combines multivariate data to track changes in community composition with FCM.

Example: De Roy et al. (2012)

Automation potential

Online FCM enables detailed measurements of the frequency and magnitude of fluctuations in drinking water systems.

Example: Besmer et al. (2016)

Highlights

Routine drinking water monitoring still relies on heterotrophic plate counts (HPC)

Flow cytometry (FCM) is proposed as a better method for process monitoring

No good correlation was found between FCM and HPC data ($n = 3'675$)

Good correlations were found between FCM and ATP data ($n = 1'441$)

FCM advantages are: relevance, speed, accuracy, costs and automation potential