

COMPARISON OF TWO RAPID DNA EXTRACTION PROTOCOLS FOR GYMNOSPERMS FOR APPLICATION IN POPULATION GENETIC AND PHYLOGENETIC STUDIES

Christoph Sperisen, Felix Gugerli, Urs Buechler & Gábor Mátyás¹

Eidgenössische Forschungsanstalt WSL, Zürcherstrasse 111, CH-8903 Birmensdorf, Switzerland

¹ Kinderspital Zürich, Universität Zürich, Abteilung für Stoffwechsel und Molekulare Pädiatrie, Steinwiesstrasse 75, CH-8032 Zürich, Switzerland

Received December 8, 1999; accepted February 29, 2000

ABSTRACT

Population genetic and phylogenetic analyses of plant species are often limited by time-consuming DNA extraction and purification procedures. We developed a rapid protocol for the isolation of genomic DNA from gymnosperms using silica-based membranes in a 96-well plate format. This protocol yields high-quality DNA as evidenced by PCR-amplification of chloroplast DNA and RAPD-PCR analyses. The DNA quality was higher than that observed for DNAs isolated using a one-tube extraction process.

Key words: chloroplast DNA, conifers, DNA extraction, gymnosperms, *trnL* intron, RAPD-PCR.

Rapid development of new genetic markers and the wide use of polymerase chain reaction (PCR) provide the basis for many population genetic, phylogeographic, and phylogenetic investigations. In many cases, DNA extraction has nowadays become the time limiting step in such studies, because many samples need to be analyzed for sufficient statistical power. It is therefore desirable to reduce the time as well as number of handling steps in DNA extraction protocols. However, high quality of DNA extracts is essential in order to successfully type genetic markers. Plants, unlike animals, often contain polysaccharides and secondary metabolites in their tissues, which may inhibit PCR-amplifications. DNA isolation of gymnosperms has shown to be especially difficult because of large amounts of, e.g., polyphenols, resins, and terpenoids (ZIEGENHAGEN *et al.* 1993). Here, we present a rapid DNA extraction protocol for gymnosperms using DNeasy silica-gel membranes in a 96-well plate format (QIAGEN, Hilden, Germany). The quality of the DNA extracts is verified by PCR-amplification of a chloroplast DNA marker and, since known to be sensitive to DNA quality, by random amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD)-PCR using a primer known to amplify across a wide range of taxa (FRITSCH *et al.* 1993; unpubl. data). We compare the PCR-reliability of these DNAs with DNA obtained from one-tube extractions using rapid one-step extraction (ROSE) buffer (STEINER *et al.* 1995).

We selected 32 species of as many different gymno-

sperm genera that covered a wide taxonomic range (Table 1). For the DNeasy extraction, we prepared three replicates of fresh needle tissue (100 mg) per species in 2-mL Eppendorf tubes that contained two 5-mm stainless steel beads. After lyophilizing the samples, they were ground to a fine powder using a shaking mill MM2000 (Retsch, Haan, Germany) at full speed for 2 min. We added 800 μ L extraction buffer (100 mM sodiumacetate, 50 mM EDTA, 500 mM NaCl, 2 % (w/v) PVP, 1.4 % (w/v) SDS; pH 5.5; ZIEGENHAGEN *et al.* 1993), including 1 % (w/v) sodium bisulfite, to each sample and incubated the samples in a shaking water bath at 65 °C for 30 min. After adding 200 μ L of 3 M potassium acetate (pH 5.2), we incubated the samples on ice for 30 min, and centrifuged them at 20000 \times g for 30 min. For each sample, we added 420 μ L of the supernatant to 210 μ L of Buffer AP3 (QIAGEN) in a collection-microtube rack of 96 (1.1 ml tubes; QIAGEN), mixed the solution thoroughly, and added 440 μ L of pure ethanol. Each sample was then loaded onto the DNeasy 96-well plate (DNeasy 96 Tissue Kit), which was placed on a square-well block, and sealed it with adhesive tape permeable to air. We centrifuged the samples at 6000 \times g (Sigma 4K15 Centrifuge, QIAGEN Plate Rotor 2 \times 96) for 20 min¹ and washed the filters twice with 500 μ L Buffer AW (QIAGEN), centrifuging at 6000 \times g for 4 min both times. Ethanol residues were

¹ In two species, remaining solution had to be removed

Table 1. DNA was extracted from 32 gymnosperm species using either the DNeasy or ROSE buffer protocol. For each species, the table indicates average DNA yields in μg (\pm SD) per 100 mg fresh tissue obtained from three replicate samples using the DNeasy protocol, and compares the DNA quality resulting from both methods as indicated by the number of replicate samples (*) leading to successful amplification in PCR and RAPD-PCR. Plant material originated from the arboretum of WSL, Birmensdorf, and the Botanic Garden, Zürich.

Species	Family	Yield [μg] (mean \pm SD)	CpDNA-PCR		RAPD-PCR	
			DNeasy	ROSE	DNeasy	ROSE
<i>Cycas circinalis</i> L. ¹⁾	Cycadaceae	28.6 \pm 29.8	***	***	***	
<i>Ginkgo biloba</i> L.	Ginkgoaceae	19.6 \pm 1.3	***	***	***	
<i>Gnetum gnemon</i> L. ¹⁾	Gnetaceae	33.7 \pm 1.1	***	***	***	
<i>Ephedra distachya</i> ssp. <i>helvetica</i> L. ¹⁾	Ephedraceae	36.8 \pm 4.1	***	**	***	
<i>Abies alba</i> Mill.	Pinaceae	23.1 \pm 2.2	***	**	***	
<i>Cedrus atlantica</i> (Endl.) Manetti ex Carr.	Pinaceae	19.8 \pm 2.2	***	***	***	
<i>Larix decidua</i> Mill.	Pinaceae	31.1 \pm 5.1	***	**	***	
<i>Picea abies</i> (L.) Karst.	Pinaceae	18.4 \pm 2.5	***	***	***	**
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i> L.	Pinaceae	36.6 \pm 4.2	***	***	***	**
<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> (Mirb.) Franco	Pinaceae	15.2 \pm 3.4	***	**	***	***
<i>Tsuga canadensis</i> (L.) Carr.	Pinaceae	20.8 \pm 0.6	***	***	***	
<i>Podocarpus lawrencei</i> Hook. f. ¹⁾	Podocarpaceae	17.2 \pm 2.8	***	*	***	
<i>Agathis brownii</i> L. H. Bailey ¹⁾	Araucariaceae	11.1 \pm 3.2	***		***	
<i>Araucaria angustifolia</i> (Bertol.) Kuntze ¹⁾	Araucariaceae	21.4 \pm 5.3	***		***	
<i>Sciadopitys verticillata</i> (Thunb.) Schinz & Zucc. ¹⁾	Sciadopitaceae	13.4 \pm 1.6	***	***	***	
<i>Taxus baccata</i> L.	Taxaceae	25.1 \pm 2.7	***	***	***	
<i>Torreya nucifera</i> (L.) Schinz & Zucc. ¹⁾	Taxaceae	35.1 \pm 2.7	***	***	***	***
<i>Cephalotaxus harringtonia</i> var. <i>drupacea</i> (Forbes) K. Koch ¹⁾	Cephalotaxaceae	39.5 \pm 2.2	***	***	***	***
<i>Cryptomeria japonica</i> (L. f.) D. Don	Taxodiaceae	9.1 \pm 1.7	***			
<i>Cunninghamia lanceolata</i> (Lamb.) Hook ¹⁾	Taxodiaceae	22.1 \pm 3.7	***		***	
<i>Metasequoia glyptostroboides</i> Hu & Cheng	Taxodiaceae	13.2 \pm 2.2	***	*	***	
<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i> (D. Don) Endl. ¹⁾	Taxodiaceae	34.5 \pm 9.5	***	*	***	
<i>Sequoiadendron giganteum</i> (Lindl.) Buchh.	Taxodiaceae	17.7 \pm 2.0	***	**	***	
<i>Taxodium distichum</i> (L.) A. Rich. ¹⁾	Taxodiaceae	33.5 \pm 1.9	***		***	
<i>Callitris preissii</i> Miq. ¹⁾	Cupressaceae	33.7 \pm 6.1	***	***	***	
<i>Calocedrus decurrens</i> (Torrey) Florin	Cupressaceae	23.7 \pm 2.6	***	***	***	
<i>Cupressocyparis</i> \times <i>leylandii</i> Dallimore & A. B. Jackson ¹⁾	Cupressaceae	16.1 \pm 1.1	***	**	***	
<i>Cupressus arizonica</i> Greene ¹⁾	Cupressaceae	36.5 \pm 7.9	***	***	***	
<i>Tetraclinis articulata</i> (Vahl) Masters	Cupressaceae	23.1 \pm 4.8	***		***	
<i>Thuja plicata</i> Donn ex D. Don	Cupressaceae	19.7 \pm 2.1	***	*	***	
<i>Thujopsis dolabrata</i> Schinz & Zucc. ¹⁾	Cupressaceae	8.3 \pm 2.5	***		***	
<i>Widdringtonia cedarbergensis</i> J. A. Marsh ¹⁾	Cupressaceae	13.8 \pm 7.5	***		***	

¹⁾ Plant material received from Botanic Garden, Zürich

allowed to evaporate at 70 °C for 5 min before we eluted the DNAs into a sterilized collection-microtube

rack (QIAGEN) by twice adding 100 μL TE buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl, pH 9.0; 1 mM EDTA) and centrifuging at 6000 \times g for 2 min. TE buffer was preheated at 70 °C, and samples were left to dissolve off the filters at 70 °C for 5 min before centrifugation.

We used an expandable multichannel pipette (Matrix Impact2; Integra Biosciences, Wallisellen, Switzerland) which allowed transfer of solutions from widely spaced 2-mL Eppendorf tubes in racks to microtiter format. The time taken for the extraction protocol can

be reduced by pulverizing lyophilized samples directly in racked microtubes (see Steiner *et al.* 1995). Furthermore, incubation time on ice and, depending on the species, centrifugation times may be significantly shorter. On the other hand, the purity of the extracts was improved by adding dichloromethane (or chloroform) to the samples before DNA precipitation (unpublished data).

Visual inspection of genomic DNA on agarose gels revealed no evidence of degraded DNA (except in *Gnetum gnemon*) or high amounts of RNA (Fig. 1). We determined DNA concentration fluorometrically (DyNA Quant 200; Hoefer Pharmacia Biotec, Düben

