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Vouchering DNA-barcoded specimens: test of a nondestructive extraction protocol for terrestrial arthropods

DANIEL L. ROWLEY,* JONATHAN A. CODDINGTON,†§ MICHAEL W. GATES,‡§ ALLEN L. NORRBOM,§ RONALD A. OCHOA,§ NATAĽIA J. VANDENBERG‡§ and MATTHEW H. GREENSTONE*†

*United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Insect Biocontrol Laboratory, Bldg. 011 A, Room 214, BARC-West, Beltsville, Maryland 20705, USA, †Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C., USA, ‡United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Systematic Entomology Laboratory, Beltsville, Maryland, USA

Abstract

Morphology-based keys support accurate identification of many taxa. However, identification can be difficult for taxa that are either not well studied, very small, members of cryptic species complexes, or represented by immature stages. For such cases, DNA barcodes may provide diagnostic characters. Ecologists and evolutionary biologists deposit museum vouchers to document the species studied in their research. If DNA barcodes are to be used for identification, then both the DNA and the specimen from which it was extracted should be vouched. We describe a protocol for the nondestructive extraction of DNA from terrestrial arthropods, using as examples members of the orders Acarina, Araneae, Coleoptera, Diptera, and Hymenoptera chosen to represent the ranges in size, overall sclerotization, and delicacy of key morphological characters in the group. We successfully extracted sequenceable DNA from all species after 1–4 h of immersion in extraction buffer. The extracted carcasses, processed and imaged using protocols standard for the taxon, were distinguishable from closely related species, and adequate as morphological vouchers. We provide links from the carcasses and DNA vouchers to image (MorphBank) and sequence (GenBank) databases.
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Introduction

The correct identification of species is essential to the performance of ecological and evolutionary research. Morphology-based keys support accurate identification of many taxa. However, for taxa that are not well studied, or for which distinguishing morphological characters have not been discerned, identification can be difficult. Accurate identification is especially problematic for very small organisms, for members of cryptic species complexes, and for eggs and other immature stages (Toft 1983; Cockburn 1990; Sperling & Hickey 1994; Brunner et al. 2002; Chen et al. 2002; Armstrong & Ball 2005; Ball et al. 2005; Greenstone et al. 2005; Barber & Boyce 2006; Grosjean et al. 2006). For such situations, species-specific fragments of DNA, known as DNA barcodes (Hebert et al. 2002), may provide a new source of characters for species-level identification.

Besides providing new characters for hitherto poorly known groups, the study of DNA sequence data has enabled new insights into the ecology and phylogenetic relationships of well-studied taxa, including the largest phylum of organisms, Arthropoda (e.g. Paskewitz & Collins 1990; Brower 1999; Anderson et al. 2000; Gleson et al. 2000; Wells & Sperling 2001; Brunner et al. 2002; Chen et al. 2002, 2006; Jarman et al. 2002; Besansky et al. 2003; Ball et al. 2005; Barrett & Hebert 2005; Greenstone et al. 2005, 2007; Hogg & Hebert 2005; Mitchell et al. 2005; Monoghan et al. 2005; Ball & Armstrong 2006; Barber & Boyce 2006; Greenstone 2006; Hajibaba et al. 2006; Kaila & Ståhls 2006). An important
part of this enterprise is the deposition of sequences into publicly accessible sequence databases, the most comprehensive of which is GenBank (Benson et al. 2007). However, GenBank contains numerous errors, some of which are due to misidentification of the species whose DNA has been sequenced (Harris 2003; Vigalys 2003). Ecologists and evolutionary biologists routinely deposit museum specimens, referred to as vouchers, to document the species studied in their research (Thomas 1994). If DNA barcodes are to be used for identification, then the DNA as well as the specimen from which it was extracted should be vouchedered (Hafner 1994). This would make it possible to determine whether the organism from which the DNA was extracted had been correctly identified in the first place.

Unfortunately, many protocols for DNA extraction, especially for small specimens, require crushing of the entire sample, precluding deposition of the carcass as a museum voucher (Whitfield & Cameron 2003). Another approach, for sufficiently large, bilaterally symmetric animals, is to remove a single appendage for DNA extraction (Starks & Peters 2002). However, if there are appendage-specific characters essential for species identification, subsequent loss of the remaining appendage of the pair, during shipment or routine examination, would render the rest of the specimen useless as a voucher. Alternatively, the removed appendage, if essentially intact, could be curated with the rest of the specimen, but this is tedious and introduces opportunities for mix-ups.

Here we present and evaluate a protocol for the non-destructive extraction of mitochondrial DNA from terrestrial arthropods, using as our subjects a variety of animals chosen to be representative of the ranges in size, overall sclerotization, and delicacy of key morphological characters in this diverse group. On the basis of our intimate knowledge of their systematics and taxonomy, we selected five species from two arachnid and three insect orders of great ecological significance in terrestrial ecosystems.

Materials and methods

Taxa

Tenuipalpidae is a cosmopolitan mite family comprising more than 800 phytophagous species in 32 genera. Because they are small (200–300 µm), slow moving, and exhibit cryptic colouration and stationary behaviour, tenuipalpids are very difficult to recognize, collect, and identify in the field (Jeppson et al. 1975). Having another tool to help distinguish closely related species is therefore of utmost importance. The red palm mite, Raoiella indica Hirst (Acari: Tenuipalpidae), is a new invasive pest in the Americas that infests coconuts, bananas, and several ornamental plants (Flechtmann & Etienne 2004). Raoiella contains several species that are not well known or are poorly described. The genus is defined by the shape of the dorsal setae; R. indica is distinguished from its congers by the size of the dorsal setae.

The basilica spider, Macynogeia lemniscata (Walckenaer) (Araneae: Araneidae), belongs to a New World genus comprising about a dozen species (Levi 1980; Platnick 2006); as with spiders generally, congeners are distinguished primarily on the basis of subtle morphological differences in the genitalia.

The pink ladybug, Coleomegilla maculata (De Geer) (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae), is a common denizen of row crops in eastern North America; the genus is restricted to the New World and is most diverse in the tropics and subtropics. The limits between Coleomegilla and the related genera Naemia, Para naemia and Eumegilla are in need of clarification and the subject of a forthcoming revision (N.J.V., J. Obrycki, J.A. Giorgi, and W. Steiner, in progress). Genitalia and colour patterns in this group are conservative, and often appear very similar among related taxa. Naemia can generally be recognized by the fact that the elytral spots are connected longitudinally, but some specimens from the northern and southern limits of the range have disconnected spots and may be mistaken for Coleomegilla (see Fig. 3C). These look-alikes are most easily separated by the form of the tarsal claw, simple and scythe-like in Naemia (Fig. 3F) but bearing a large quadrate tooth in Coleomegilla (Fig. 3D, E).

Delphinia picta (Fabricius) (Diptera: Ulidiidae) is a ubiquitous saprophage in eastern North America with larvae that feed primarily on decaying vegetation. Ulidiids are closely related to fruit flies (Tephritidae), a group that includes numerous agricultural pests, and the key characters for distinguishing species within both families are similar. These include wing patterns, body colour patterns, number and positions of setae (chaetotaxy), microtrichia patterns, and genital morphology.

Eurytoma rhois Crosby (Hymenoptera: Eurytomidae) belongs to the most commonly collected genus of the family Eurytomidae (Hymenoptera), a cosmopolitan family of phytophagous and entomophagous parasitic wasps. The key diagnostic features for E. rhois concern relative sizes of sclerites and the propodeal surface sculpture.

Collection of arthropods

A variety of methods, some of them taxon-specific, are used to collect and preserve terrestrial arthropods (US Department of Agriculture 1986; Aguiar & Sharkov 1997; Noyes 1998; Triplehorn & Johnson 2004). Because all specimens were to be extracted in an aqueous buffer, all were collected into EtOH, regardless of customary methods of preservation for the taxon. We selected an EtOH
Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) conditions and components are given in Table 1.

DNA extraction protocol

Each specimen was removed from the 80% EtOH, allowed to air dry, and placed in a 1.5-mL microfuge tube with forceps that had been soaked in 0.5% NaClO. Depending upon the size of the specimen, 100, 200, or 400 µL of a GuSCN-based extraction buffer, originally developed to extract DNA from mammalian teeth and bones (Rohland et al. 2004), was added to the tube, which was then placed in a 60 °C water bath for 1, 2, or 4 h. The extraction buffer was removed to a clean tube and the DNA was precipitated by addition of a volume of isopropanol equal to the volume of the extraction buffer in which the specimen had been incubated. The sample was stored overnight at ~20 °C and centrifuged at 4 °C for 20 min at 13 000 g. After a single rinse in 70% EtOH, the DNA was vacuum-dried, resuspended in a volume of 0.1× TE pH 8.0 equal to that of the extraction buffer, and stored at ~20 °C. Four individuals of each taxon were subjected to each extraction interval, and two were used as controls that went through all procedures except extraction. Two additional DNA samples of each species, extracted by conventional means from whole-body homogenates (Greenstone et al. 2005), were provided for reference.

Following extraction, the extracted arthropod carcasses and unextracted controls were again immersed in 80% EtOH and stored at 4 °C until prepared for imaging.

PCR and sequencing

Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) conditions and components were as described in Greenstone et al. (2005), with 5–6 µL of the DNA extract used in the reaction. DNA of all species was amplified with cytochrome oxidase I (COI) primers C1-J-1751 and C1-N-2191, as well as C1-J-2195 and C1-N-2568 (Simon et al. 1994), with expected amplicon sizes of 488 and 421 bp, respectively. 

The DNA of each taxon was subjected to each extraction interval, and two were used as controls that went through all procedures except extraction. Two additional DNA samples of each species, extracted by conventional means from whole-body homogenates (Greenstone et al. 2005), were provided for reference.

Following extraction, the extracted arthropod carcasses and unextracted controls were again immersed in 80% EtOH and stored at 4 °C until prepared for imaging.

Deposition of morphological vouchers, specimen images, DNA vouchers, and DNA sequences

Extracted arthropod carcasses were deposited as morphological vouchers, prepared according to standard museum practices, in the Insect and Mite National Collection of the Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History (NMNHENTM) in Washington, D.C.; the companion DNA samples were deposited in the NMNHENTM Tissue Collection. Accession numbers for both carcasses and DNA are provided in Table 1. DNA sequences were deposited in GenBank and images in MorphBank; their accession numbers are also given in Table 1.

Results and discussion

When the GuSCN-based buffer we used was employed to extract DNA from vertebrate teeth and bones, it did not affect the appearance of the specimens, other than to cause them to ‘appear a little cleaner’ (Rohland et al. 2004). Its
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>DNA extraction treatment</th>
<th>MorphBank no.</th>
<th>NMNH-ENTM no.</th>
<th>GenBank no.</th>
<th>Locality, habitat, collection dates, collectors, and GPS coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Raoiella indica</em> Hirst (ACARI: Tenuipalpidae)</td>
<td>4-h GuSCN</td>
<td>137781, 137782</td>
<td>00530938</td>
<td>00530920</td>
<td>EF185151 Saint Lucia, West Indies, Castries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00530918</td>
<td>EF185151 On coconut palm (<em>Cocos nucifera</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>137780</td>
<td>00530939</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 September 2005; Coll.: R. Ochoa &amp; G. Mathurian 13.900000; 60.833333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mecynogea lemniscata</em> (Walckenaer)</td>
<td>2-h GuSCN</td>
<td>00447378</td>
<td>00530922</td>
<td>EF185153</td>
<td>Maryland, Howard CO, Ellict City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araneae:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understorey of deciduous forest remnant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araneidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Delphinia picta</em> (Fabricius) Diptera: Ulidiidae</td>
<td>2-h GuSCN</td>
<td>137705</td>
<td>00447380</td>
<td>00530924</td>
<td>DQ029239 22 July 2006; Coll.: A. Greenstone &amp; M. Greenstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00530925</td>
<td>EF185150 Georgia, Dekalb CO, Atlanta,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>137793</td>
<td>00529373</td>
<td>00530921</td>
<td>EF185150 3310 Buford Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>137788</td>
<td>00530935</td>
<td>00530940</td>
<td>EF185150 May 2005; Coll.: J. Orr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>137789</td>
<td>00530936</td>
<td>00530941</td>
<td>EF185150 33.834931; 84.318761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Coleomegilla maculata</em> (De Geer) Coleoptera: Coccinellidae</td>
<td>1-h GuSCN</td>
<td>137791</td>
<td>00530937</td>
<td>00530912</td>
<td>EF185150 Maryland, Prince Georges CO, Beltsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>137795</td>
<td>00529374</td>
<td>00530913</td>
<td>EF185150 Laboratory colony, originally from potato fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>00529370</td>
<td>00530926</td>
<td>EF192134</td>
<td>Maryland, Prince Georges CO, Beltsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>00529371</td>
<td>00530927</td>
<td>EF192134</td>
<td>Laboratory colony, originally from potato fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Naemia</em> sp. Coleoptera: Coccinellidae</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>137827</td>
<td>00529379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Naemia seriata</em> (Melsheimer) Coleoptera: Coccinellidae</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>137860</td>
<td>00529380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eurytoma rhois</em> Crosby Hymenoptera: Eurytomidae</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>135292–135295</td>
<td>00529377</td>
<td>00530934</td>
<td>EF192134 Maryland, Prince Georges CO, Beltsville Potato fields 3 July 2005; Coll.: D. Rowley &amp; M. Greenstone 39.033333; 76.927500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-h GuSCN</td>
<td>135296–135299</td>
<td>00530930</td>
<td>00530914</td>
<td>EF192134 Nova Scotia, Canada, Granville Beach On <em>Spartina</em> sp. 6 August 2006; Coll.: C.Majka &amp; B. Maybank. 44.752031; 65.520858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>00530931</td>
<td>00530915</td>
<td>EF192134</td>
<td>Maryland, Talbot Georges CO, Wittman On <em>Spartina</em> sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-h GuSCN</td>
<td>135297–135299</td>
<td>00530932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>135298–135299</td>
<td>00530933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-h GuSCN</td>
<td>135299–135299</td>
<td>00530934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>135300–135300</td>
<td>00530935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-h GuSCN</td>
<td>135301–135301</td>
<td>00530936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>135302–135302</td>
<td>00530937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effects on the terrestrial arthropods studied here ranged from slight discoloration to slight-to-moderate distortion of surface features.

The diagnostic shapes of the dorsal setae and other characteristics of *Raoiella indica* were readily observable in the extracted specimens (Fig. 1). Spider genitalia are in most cases highly sclerotized and thus resistant to most chemical treatments: our DNA extraction protocol had no visible effect on the morphology of the female genitalia of *Mecynogea lemniscata* (Fig. 2), but did leave a flocculent precipitate on most of the specimens (Fig. 2A). This precipitate could be removed manually, but might pose a problem for some kinds of morphological research, such as examination of spinneret spigots (which typically are not species-specific).

In *Coleomegilla maculata*, the cuticle became more translucent, lost the saturated red or pink tones, and tended to brown after extraction (Fig. 3A, B). However, the black pigment that forms the dorsal maculae seems to be quite stable, so that the colour pattern could be easily assessed even in the specimens that underwent 4 h of extraction (not shown), and distinguished from those of *Naemia* sp. (Fig. 3B, C). After DNA extraction, the claw of *C. maculata* was sometimes more flaccid, but still clearly exhibited the diagnostic large quadrate tooth (Fig. 3D, E). Generally, the pronotal shape was not altered by extraction, with the exception of one of the 4-h specimens, where the disk buckled (not shown). The thick portions of the legs retained their shape well, but the narrow last tarsal segment sometimes became droopy. Problems with structural integrity could be minimized by placing the specimen on its back to prevent the abdomen from folding down, and carefully positioning key structures and providing temporary support until dry. Limiting extraction time to 1 h decreased the severity of this effect.

There was no visible effect of the extraction on colour pattern or cuticular structures of *Delphinia picta* (Fig. 4); genitalic morphology was also not affected (not shown). Specimens that were dried after extraction using critical
point drying or after transfer from alcohol to ethyl acetate shrivelled to varying degrees (Fig. 4A, B), somewhat less in the critical-point-dried material. In some cases, this limited the study of chaetotaxy and colour and microtrichial patterns of various parts of the body, particularly the thorax. Extracted specimens often were unevenly covered with a powdery whitish precipitate that sometimes partially obscured surface features. This sometimes made it difficult to observe microtrichia patterns or other surface characters. The wings of the *D. picta* specimens were virtually indistinguishable regardless of treatment (Fig. 4D–F).

*Eurytoma rhois* exhibited setae that were slightly lighter in colour than the control after dehydration but prior to SEM. The key diagnostic features for *E. rhois*, relative sizes of sclerites and propodeal surface sculpture, were little affected by the DNA extraction process. The extracted specimen pictured, a male, had matted antennal setation (Fig. 5B). Setation on extracted material generally appeared to be abraded more easily (compare controls vs. extracted mesosoma and head, Fig. 5C, D, G, H). We do not know whether these setation artefacts were a direct result of the extraction or might be due to the transferral of extraction buffer into and out of the extraction tube.

Gels containing the amplified 421 and 488 bp PCR products from all specimens used in the study are shown in Fig. 6 (the 1070-bp *M. lemniscata* amplicons, used for sequencing, are not shown but gave similar results). Almost all *D. picta* and *C. maculata* specimens produced PCR products regardless of extraction time. *M. lemniscata* specimens were most effectively extracted after 2–4 h extraction, while *R. indica* and *E. rhois* tended to require the full 4 h for effective extraction.

Overall, our extraction protocol yielded DNA suitable for sequencing, with effects on the extracted carcass ranging from slight discoloration to slight-to-moderate distortion of surface features that did not prevent identification as to species and effective presentation as morphological vouchers. The flocculent precipitate noted on the *Mecynogea* and *Delphinia* specimens might be removed by more assiduous rinsing of the specimens following extraction. Other so-called nondestructive DNA extraction protocols have required breaches of the cuticle ranging from pin-pricks (Phillips & Simon 1995; Favret 2005) to amputation (Stark & Peters 2002) and even decapitation (Johnson et al. 2001) or more extensive disarticulation, slicing, and injection (Knölke et al. 2005; Barr & McPheron 2006). Although these
protocols may provide usable vouchers, they are more tedious and labour-intensive than our procedure, which requires only soaking the specimen in buffer. They also create opportunities for cross-contamination via the piercing or cutting instrument and, if structures that have been separated for extraction are rejoined in the voucher specimen, for creation of chimaeric morphological vouchers.

Cytochrome oxidase I is an effective barcoding sequence for arachnids and insects (Barrett & Hebert 2005; Greenstone et al. 2005). However, other genomic regions, including nuclear as well as mitochondrial sequences, have also proven useful for separating closely related arthropod taxa (Besansky et al. 1997; Chen et al. 2000, 2006; Gleeson et al. 2000; Bull et al. 2006; Greenstone 2006) and may therefore be used, by definition, as barcodes. Although we examined only mitochondrial sequences, there is no a priori reason not to expect our DNA extraction technique to be effective in extracting nuclear sequences as well.

Ongoing research on different preservation methods (e.g. Paabo et al. 2004; Mulligan 2005) may lead to protocols that cause less distortion, leaving more photogenic morphological vouchers following DNA extraction. In the meantime, use of our protocol to extract a series of specimens from 1 to 4 h should provide a number of individuals for which sequenceable DNA can be linked to a presentable morphological voucher. Optimized protocols would make joint vouchering of morphological specimens and the DNA extracted from them a routine part of DNA barcoding. This, coupled with hot-linked databases like MorphBank and GenBank, will improve the reliability and utility of barcoding by making it possible to view all pertinent attributes of a specimen — morphology, taxonomy, DNA sequence, voucher identity, and collection data — available simultaneously.
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Fig. 5 Eurytoma rhois morphological voucher. Unextracted control, left; extracted for 4 h, right. A and B, antenna; C and D, mesosoma; E and F, forewing; G and H, head.

Fig. 6 421 bp (A and B) and 488 bp (C and D) gels. Lanes 1, 16, 31, and 47, 100 bp ladder. Lane 46, no-DNA control. For A and C, lanes 2–15, Raisella indica; lanes 17–30, Mecynogea lenniscata; lanes 32–45, Coleomegilla maculata. For (B and D), lanes 2–15, Delphinia picta; lanes 17–30, Eurytoma rhois. For each species, the first two lanes are conventionally extracted DNA, the next four wells are 1-h extractions, the following four wells are 2-h extractions, and the last four wells are 4-h extractions.
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