Optimisation of DNA extraction from the Algerian traditional date Product « Btana » for bacterial diversity analysis by Pyrosequencing technology Abekhti Abdelkader, Bernard Taminiou, Georges Daube

Laboratory of food microbiology, Departement of food science, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Liège university

Study objectif:

In food microbiology, a handful of protocols have been developed for the purification of crude DNA from food matrices to study their microbial diversity. The effectiveness of DNA extraction depends on food properties, particularly their contents of complex molecules that often co-extracted with DNA or inhibiting its amplification like organic carbon, proteins, pigments. Other contaminants might arise with the extraction method undergone. So it is crucial to choice adequate methods that provide an unbiased isolated **DNA** for reflecting true representation of the microbial community.

Therefore we have evaluated three methods for quality and yield of the extracted DNA from 11 Btana samples. The DNA extraction protocols followed involved combinations of mechanical, chemical and enzymatic lysing procedures. Two protocols (B, C) were a modified CTAB protocol, and one protocol (A) was a commercial kit widely used in DNA extraction (DNeasy, QIAGEN). DNA extracts were further purified with Nucleospin purification kit, amplified with 16S rRNA primers by conventional PCR and run on agarose gel electrophoresis. Extracted DNA was used for downstream analysis with 454 Roch pyrosequencer.





Results and discussion

Table; DNA yield and purity of the eleven Btana sample recorder with three protocols A, B, C

		Crud DNA			Purified DNA(Nucleospin)				method			
		DNA (ng/µl)	A260/280	AMP	DNA (ng/µl)	A260/280	Recovery rate	AMP	C	DNA (ng/µl)	A260/280	AMP
	1	$12,6 \pm 0.85$	$1,13 \pm 0,05$	+	3,45±0,07	3,43 ±1.24	27,38%	+		3,95±0,64	$2,15\pm0,25$	14
	2	12,70±0,14	$1,49 \pm 0,04$	1.4	5,50±0.14	2,20 ±0.02	43,31%	+		9,00±0,00	1,24±1,02	-
13	3	$13,20 \pm 0,57$	$1,42 \pm 0,00$	1.41	$5,05 \pm 0.07$	3,29 ±0.40	38,26%	+		9,55±0,21	$2,26 \pm 0,00$	+
	4	$17,45 \pm 0,35$	1,83 ±0,14	+	7,30 ±0.42	3,69 ±0.17	41,83%	+		9,00±0,14	$2,35 \pm 0,14$	-
	5	$13,05 \pm 0,07$	1,98 ±0,86	+	7,90±0,42	$1,62 \pm 0.01$	60,54%	+		4,40±0,28	$1,98 \pm 0,04$	+
	6	13,20±0,85	$1,24 \pm 0,01$	-	6,10±0,28	$2,11 \pm 0.03$	46,21%	+		6,85±0,21	$2,08 \pm 0,20$	+
	7	5,70±3,39	2,05±1,44	+	1,45±0.21	9,88±8.97	25,44%	+		$1,7 \pm 0.28$	1	-
	8	7,45±0,07	1,62 ±0,11	+	1,65±0.64	$2,59 \pm 0.82$	22,15%	+		2,2 ±0.0	1	-
	9	17,90±0,28	$1,05 \pm 0,06$	+	$1,75 \pm 1.06$	$1,26 \pm 0.11$	9,78%	+		$2,25 \pm 0.07$	1,95±0.35	-
	10	28,60 ±0,42	$1,58 \pm 0,01$	+	4,80 ±1.98	2,05±0.28	16,78%	+		5,2 ±0.14	$1,97 \pm 0.18$	-
	11	7,80 ±0,00	$1,74 \pm 0,10$	+	0,90 ±0.57	$1,53 \pm 0.40$	11,54%	+		29+014	4 89 +1 05	12
	1	145,80 ±2,26	$1,90 \pm 0,01$		\$2,10 ±0,85	$2,23 \pm 0,03$	56,31%	+	Protocol A (DNe	asy)		01010104
	2	\$3,80 ±1,13	$2,04 \pm 0,00$	+	37,20 ±0,57	$2,35 \pm 0.01$	44,39%	+				
	3	437,10±1,13	$2,03 \pm 0,00$		344,40 ±1,84	$2,15\pm0,00$	78,79%	+				≈ ₩ • ₩ •
	4	36,40 ±0,00	$1,66 \pm 0,01$		21,20 ±0,28	$2,65 \pm 0.05$	58,24%	+	M 1d 2d 3d 4d	5d 6d 7d 8d 9d 10d	11d 1d _p 2d _p 3d _p 4d _p 5d _p 6d _p	d _p 8d _p 9d _p 10d _p
	5	57,50 ±0,57	$1,76 \pm 0,00$	-	40,80 ±1,56	$2,28 \pm 0,02$	70,96%	+	Protocol B (CTA	B)		
	6	168,50±8,06	$2,28\pm0,13$	+	108,90 ±0,28	$2,25\pm0,00$	64,63%	+				
	7	43,30 ±1,27	$1,71 \pm 0.04$	+	22,75±1,06	$2,50 \pm 0,03$	52,54%	+			*****	
3	8	44,30 ±0,71	0,98 ±0,02	-	4,05±0,92	6,09 ±2,05	9,14%	+	M 1c 2c 3c 4c	5c 6c 7c 8c 9c 10c 11c	1cp 2cp 3cp 4cp 5cp 6cp 7cp 8	c _p 9c _p 10c _p 11c _p
	9	30,60 ±2,83	$0,93 \pm 0,01$	+	5,05±2,19	$1,55\pm0,10$	16,50%	+	Protocol C (CTA	B-DNeasy)		
	10	40,85±0,07	$1,33 \pm 0,00$		14,85±0,35	$2,59 \pm 0,11$	36,35%	+		0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		
	11	15,50 ±0,42	$1,06 \pm 0,01$	+	$0,3 \pm 0.00$	3,84+-0,00	0,00%	-	l de			

The commercial DNA extraction kit Denasy (A) allowed a moderate DNA amounts ranging from 5,70 to 28,60 ng/µl (P<0.05). DNA quality verified with 260/280 nm ratio showed a satisfactory purity, however 6 samples present a very low values; 1 (1,13), 2 (1,49), 3(1,42), 6 (1.24), 9(1,05.), 10 (1,58). A substantial amount of DNA (69.8%) was lost by purification but DNA purity was ameliorated as all samples were successfully amplified.

	Protocol A (DNeasy)	Protocol B (CTAB)	Protocol C (CTAB-DNeasy)	Protocol A P (DNeasy)	Protocol B P (CTAB)	
DNA (ng/µl)	13,60 ± 1.9a	100,6 ± 63.65b	$5,\!182\pm0.9\mathrm{a}$	$4,168 \pm 0.74\mathrm{a}$	$61,94 \pm 30.04a$	
Do260/280	$1,56 \pm 0.1a$	1,607±0.14a	2,61 ±0.63a	$3,059 \pm 0.72 \mathrm{a}$	$2,422 \pm 0.42 \mathrm{a}$	
Amplification (positive samples/11)	8	5	3	n	10	

DNA yields using CTAB protocol (B) along with NaCl treatment record a concentration ranged from 18,80 ng/µl to 437 ng/µl and varied strongly according to the samples (P<0,05). The resulted yield is higher than those obtained using all other methods. A great lost of yield (55.65%) was observed after purification as stated by ANOVA matched pairs test (P<0.05). The ratio A260/A280 was slightly increased after purification in some samples.

Protocol C produced the most poor yields ranged between 1,7-9,55 ng/µl (P=0.0002). Amplification was partially successful with 3 samples only (3, 5, 6). DNA purification brought no efficiency in amplification (except for sample 2) by contrast a substantial DNA yields were lost as well as failure in amplification of the previously amplified sample before purification (3, 5, 6).



The commercial kit Dneasy was expected to perform better in DNA yield and quality as well as for PCR reaction. Nevertheless, it was failed in isolating DNA with purity and yield as high as the modified CTAB method (B). It seemed to be better than the previous protocol (B and C) in elimination of PCR inhibitors compounds from DNA extract and was the most suitable for PCR amplification. The modified CTAB method (B) gave a much better yield in DNA, compared to the other methods.

CTAB-DNeasy protocol gave low recoveries may be because of a lack of efficiency of the cell lysis, decrease of the efficiency of spin columns by polysaccharide contamination.

purification with Nucleospin enhanced the quality of the DNA thanks to the elimination of interfering substances that could be coextracted with DNA and could affect PCR, however it seemed to be also deleterious for DNA recovery.

The differences in range of DNA yield, from Btana samples using the same protocol, could be caused by variations in the number of microbial cell present per sample or by the range of complex contaminants that are present.

Conclusion

Date's product "Btana" contain high content of polysaccharides, carbohydrates and other metabolites that can co-precipitate with DNA and interfering with enzymatic reactions performed for DNA analysis.

According to our investigation, the best method for DNA extraction from "Btana" is the modified CTAB method, that had a good yield between amplification and recovery when samples were treated with high salt solution (5M NaCl). The improvement could be achieved with purification. It is less expensive than commercial kits but it is more time-consuming and somewhat labor intensive.

DNeasy kit is also very interesting tool, less laborious and time saving, however it should used with caution and more intention to not underestimate the bacterial richness in the date product "Btana".



Proteobacteria Order



Non culturing method applied in microbial field have opened an new area in comprehension the dynamic and structure of microbial community in traditional food to sustain their stability and to determine the effective microflora in the microbial actions that undergoing during traditional fermentation, however the study of microbial diversity with this cutting edge technology required at least a high DNA quality and quantity to

Pyresequencing analysis

Among the total OUT discovered, firmicutes represent more than 84.79% of total OTUs. Proteobacteria (10.61%) Actinobacteria (3.01%) and Bacteroidetes (1.14%). Minor phyla Cyanobacteria (0,16%), Candidate division TM7 (0,04%), Deinococcus-Thermus (0,03%), Chloroflexi (0,02%) and Acidobacteria (0,01%). (0.18%) of phyla are Unclassified.

Samples (B11. B2 B3 B6 B7 B8 B9 B10 B1) were broadly dominated by firmicutes phylum members (65,22%; 86,00%; 99,97%; 99,79%; 99,94%; 64,29%; 99,97%; 93,98%; 73,81%), but samples B4, B5 contain almost 46,60%; 26,63% of firmicutes respectively.

Firmicutes was dominated by Bacilli class mainly Bacailalles (76,81%) followed by Lactobacillales (20.71%) and clostridales (1.85%). two samples only are not dominated by Bacilalles (B6:0.32, B8:2.32%) other samples were highly dominated by Bacilalles (average 90.29%).

Detection of 605 species distributed between 201 genera. However, a small number of species are abundant, others are either singletons (224 singletons) or rare., and dominant above 5%.

-592 species, constituting an average of 97.85%, were considered rare(<1%), representing 19.85% of TPo. -Subdominant subgroup (1% < -<5%) account for 8 species (17.37%).

-Predominant species (>5%) accounted for 6 species and represent an abundance of 63.44% in TPo. -Bacillus was the most frequent genera present in all sample accounting for of 57 species level phylotypes. Only 8 Bacillus species were well represented and identified (B. aryabhattai, B.alkalitelluris, B.cereus, B.endophyticus, B.foraminis, B. licheniformis, B.jeotgali, B. korlensis, B. malacitensis, B. marisflavi, B.psychrosaccharolyticus, B.safensis, B. sp 13965, B. sp 19490, B. sp A24, B.BM-110, B.By231Ydz-fq, B.TDWCW2).



estimate the real richness microbial. Often it is need to begin with DNA extraction optimization and evaluation of the working protocol to chose the most reliable one for downstream application.

Figure: Histogramme of pyresequencing analysis of Btana sample at various taxonomic level

References:

Ibrahim A. Arif, Mohammad A. Bakir, Haseeb A. Khan *, Anis Ahamed, Ahmad H. Al Farhan, Ali A. Al Homaidan, Mohammad Al Sadoon, Ali H. Bahkali and Mohammad Shobrak. 2010. A Simple Method for DNA Extraction from Mature Date Palm Leaves: Impact of Sand Grinding and Composition of Lysis Buffer. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 2010, 11, 3149-3157. Jorge Gil C. Angeles, Antonio C. Laurena, And Evelyn Mae, Tecson-Mendoza 2005. Extraction of Genomic DNA From the Lipid-, Polysaccharide-, and Polyphenol-Rich Coconut (Cocos nuciferaL.). Plant Molecular Biology Reporter23:297a-297.

Porebski S, Bailey L, Baum B. Modification of a CTAB DNA extraction protocol for plants containing high polysaccharide and polyphenol components. Plant Mol Biol Rep 1997;15:8