



Conference Abstract

Applications of environmental DNA methods for charophyte biodiversity

Petra Nowak[‡], Christina Wiebe[‡], Rolf Karez[§], Hendrik Schubert[‡]

‡ University of Rostock, Rostock, Germany

§ State Agency for Agriculture, Environment and Rural Areas, Schleswig-Holstein, Flintbek, Germany

Corresponding author: Petra Nowak (petra.nowak@uni-rostock.de)

Received: 24 Feb 2021 | Published: 04 Mar 2021

Citation: Nowak P, Wiebe C, Karez R, Schubert H (2021) Applications of environmental DNA methods for charophyte biodiversity. ARPHA Conference Abstracts 4: e64944. https://doi.org/10.3897/aca.4.e64944

Abstract

The use of environmental DNA (eDNA) for qualitative species inventories offers great potential as a cost-effective tool for species identification. This requires that the target species release DNA, reference information is available and detection methods exist. Environmental DNA analyses are currently used routinely to inventory fish fauna (Wang et al. 2021), molluscs (Klymus et al. 2017) or insects (Uchida et al. 2020). For other groups, such as macrophytes, there is not much information available (Scriver et al. 2015). In plants, identifying suitable eDNA markers been much more challenging, as no single DNA region has been accepted for the purposes of barcoding.

Within this project, we assessed if stoneworts (Charophytes, Characeae) can be detected by using eDNA analysis and if it can be used to support macrophyte monitoring. Charophytes are macroscopic green algae which, because of their role as habitat engineers, are of special importance for aquatic ecosystems. Many charophyte species are bound to clean, nutrient-poor fresh and brackish waters (e.g. Melzer 1999) and are regarded bioindicators for water quality by national and international directives (e.g. Habitats Directive, EU Water Framework Directive). Being sensitive to anthropogenic pressures, a drastic decline in populations with increasing eutrophication has been reported (Sand-Jensen et al. 2017). However, the diversity of Characeae is often underestimated due to difficulties in morphological determination, and the genetic identification of charophytes has been established only in the recent few years (e.g. Nowak et al. 2016).

[©] Nowak P et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

We assessed the potential utility of eDNA to document the diversity of charophyte species. eDNA from a fresh water lake (Dreetzsee, Germany, 2018) and from a brackish water site (Darß-Zingst Lagoon System, Germany, 2018) was extracted from filtered or ethanolprecipitated water samples, and we designed and tested eDNA markers based on four regions of the chloroplast genome - *atp*B, *rbc*L, *psb*C, and *matK*. Of the four regions, *matK* and *rbc*L were most likely to amplify DNA from charophyte species. Both sites exhibit a diverse charophyte flora, which we successfully could identify to species/group level by eDNA analysis.

In a current study, the developed eDNA markers are used to scrutinize the charophyte population of the Schlei estuary (Germany, Schleswig-Holstein). Since conventional monitoring can only be carried out once a year at a few sites, Characeae have not been observed in recent years, or only very sporadically. As it is not possible to survey the entire Schlei, especially due to high water turbidity, the eDNA methodology is tested to assess the presence of Characeae species.

Keywords

environmental DNA; Characeae; plants; biodiversity

Presenting author

Petra Nowak

Presented at

1st DNAQUA International Conference (March 9-11, 2021)

References

- Klymus KE, Marshall NT, Stepien CA (2017) Environmental DNA (eDNA) metabarcoding assays to detect invasive invertebrate species in the Great Lakes. PloS one 12 (5): e0177643. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177643</u>
- Melzer A (1999) Aquatic macrophytes as tools for lake management. Hydrobiologia 395/396: 181-190.
- Nowak P, Schubert H, Schaible R (2016) Molecular evaluation of the validity of the morphological characters of three Swedish *Chara* sections: Chara, Grovesia, and Desvauxia (Charales, Charophyceae). Aquatic Botany 134 (1): 113-119. <u>https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.aquabot.2016.08.001</u>
- Sand-Jensen K, Bruun HH, Baastrup-Spohr L (2017) Decade-long time delays in nutrient and plant species dynamics during eutrophication and re-oligotrophication of Lake Fure 1900-2015. Journal of Ecology 105 (3): 690-700. <u>https://doi.org/</u> <u>10.1111/1365-2745.12715</u>

- Scriver M, Marinich A, Wilson C, Freeland J (2015) Development of species-specific environmental DNA (eDNA) markers for invasive aquatic plants. Aquatic Botany 122: 27-31. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2015.01.003</u>
- Uchida N, Kubota K, Aita S, Kazama S (2020) Aquatic insect community structure revealed by eDNA metabarcoding derives indices for environmental assessment. PeerJ 8: e9176. <u>https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.9176</u>
- Wang S, Yan Z, Hänfling B, Zheng X, Wang P, Fan J, Li J (2021) Methodology of fish eDNA and its applications in ecology and environment. Science of The Total Environment 755: 142622. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142622</u>