



eDNA and specific primers for early detection of invasive species – A case study on the bivalve *Rangia cuneata*, currently spreading in Europe



Alba Ardura^{a, b, *}, Anastasija Zaiko^{b, c}, Jose L. Martinez^d, Aurelija Samuliovienė^b, Anna Semenova^e, Eva Garcia-Vazquez^a

^a Department of Functional Biology, University of Oviedo, C/ Julian Claveria s/n, 33006 Oviedo, Spain

^b Marine Science and Technology Centre, Klaipeda University, H. Manto 84, LT 92294 Klaipeda, Lithuania

^c Coastal and Freshwater Group, Cawthron Institute, 98 Halifax Street East, 7010 Nelson, New Zealand

^d Unit of DNA Analysis, Scientific-Technical Services, University of Oviedo, Edificio Severo Ochoa, Campus del Cristo, 33006 Oviedo, Spain

^e Atlantic Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography, Kaliningrad, Russia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 12 November 2014

Received in revised form

28 September 2015

Accepted 28 September 2015

Available online 1 October 2015

Keywords:

Baltic Sea

Non-indigenous species

Species-specific marker

Rangia cuneata

eDNA

Vistula Lagoon

ABSTRACT

Intense human activities facilitate the successful spread and establishment of non-indigenous aquatic organisms in marine and freshwater ecosystems. In some cases such intrusions result in noticeable and adverse changes in the recipient environments. In the Baltic Sea, the discovery and rapid initial spread of the North American wedge clam *Rangia cuneata* represents a new wave of invasion which may trigger unpredictable changes of the local benthic communities. In this study we present a species-specific DNA-based marker developed *in silico* and experimentally tested on environmental samples. Marker specificity and sensitivity were assessed *in vitro* from water samples containing different mixtures of the target species and other five bivalves currently present in the region: the native *Cerastoderma glaucum*, *Macoma balthica* and *Mytilus trossulus*, the invasive *Dreissena polymorpha* and the cryptogenic *Mya arenaria*. Cross-species amplification was not found in any case. The method allows to detecting at least 0.4 ng of *R. cuneata* DNA per µl, and 0.1 g of tissue per liter of water. Finally, the marker performance was assessed in water samples from the Baltic Sea and Vistula Lagoon. The coincidence between independent visual observations of *R. cuneata* and positive PCR amplification of the marker from the water samples confirmed the efficiency of this highly reproducible, fast, and technically easy method. *R. cuneata* traces can be detected from environmental DNA even when the population is sparse and small, enabling rapid management responses and allowing to track the invasion dynamics.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Marine alien species are global drivers of the ecosystem change, and a threat to native biodiversity and marine resources (Molnar et al., 2008). Many aquatic communities are impaired by the uncontrolled spread of invaders (Horgan and Mills, 1997; Molnar et al., 2008), and activities such as aquaculture, fishing and shellfish

harvesting may be severely affected (e.g. Hayes and Sliwa, 2003; Neill et al., 2006). Even food security, human health and economy are threatened by biological invasions in many regions (Nuñez and Pauchard, 2010).

In this context, the emphasis is put on preventive measures such as risk assessments and early detection of potential marine pests (Behrens et al., 2005; Delaney et al., 2008). Every new invasion is enlisted by scientists and managers, and efforts are focused on explaining its impact the recipient ecosystem, predicting the invasion outcome and preventing (if possible) from further spread. However, new invasions are often detected years after introduction when populations are too abundant and widespread to allow eradication (Geller et al., 1997; Freire et al., 2014). Moreover, when invasions are declared few effective tools are available for national

* Corresponding author. Department of Functional Biology, University of Oviedo, C/ Julian Claveria s/n, 33006 Oviedo, Spain.

E-mail addresses: alarguti@hotmail.com (A. Ardura), anastasija@corpi.ku.lt (A. Zaiko), secuenciacion@spi.uniovi.es (J.L. Martinez), aurelija@corpi.ku.lt (A. Samuliovienė), a.semenowa@gmail.com (A. Semenova), egv@uniovi.es (E. Garcia-Vazquez).

agencies to control them and minimize their effects on the ecosystem health and economy (Olenin et al., 2011; Pochon et al., 2013).

A new introduction of alien species detected in Europe in the last decade was *Rangia cuneata*, a clam that inhabits low salinity waters (Parker, 1966). It is native to the Gulf of Mexico where it is found predominantly in estuaries. The first record of this species out of America was in the harbor of Antwerp, Belgium (Verween et al., 2006). A few small individuals were found in 2005, but from February 2006 onwards many individuals were found in the pipes of the cooling water system of an industrial plant (Verween et al., 2006). The extremely rapid spread of this species was confirmed soon in other regions of Europe. Only four years later, *R. cuneata* was recorded in the Vistula Lagoon of the Baltic Sea (September 2010), and in 2011 this clam had invaded a large area of the bay with up to 4040 individuals/m² in the areas adjacent to the Kaliningrad Sea channel (Rudinskaya and Gusev, 2012). The introduction of *R. cuneata* into the Vistula Lagoon was attributed to ballast waters of ships coming from areas where these clams were naturalized (Verween et al., 2006; Rudinskaya and Gusev, 2012). The species may become a trigger of adverse transformations in the local benthic communities of the Baltic Sea (Rudinskaya and Gusev, 2012). It advances very rapidly, since in May 2013 several small individuals of *R. cuneata* were already found in benthic samples from the Lithuanian coast (Solovjeva, 2014).

R. cuneata has also a history of invasions outside Europe. It was transported from its natal region in the Gulf of Mexico to the NW Atlantic accompanying *Crassostrea virginica* stocks introduced in Chesapeake Bay (Pfitzenmeyer and Drobeck, 1964). It has thrived there and (in concurrence with other invaders) has adversely altered the ecosystem (e.g. Ruiz et al., 1999). It is highly tolerant to harsh environmental conditions, thus it has a greater probability of being transported alive and settle down in new environments than other less tolerant aquatic species (Valentine and Sklenar, 2004; Wakida-Kusunoki and MacKenzie, 2004; Wolff, 1999). Environmental conditions unfavorable for many native species have triggered sudden outbursts of *R. cuneata* in the recipient ecosystem (Kerckhof et al., 2007; Verween et al., 2006).

From the current climate change that is inducing changes in species distributions (Parmesan and Yohe, 2003; Hijmans and Graham, 2006; Seo et al., 2009), and the high tolerance to adverse conditions of *R. cuneata*, it can be a good candidate for the World's "black list" of invaders. It is already recognized as highly invasive by the Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG database: www.issg.org/; DAISIE database: www.europe-aliens.org/). Therefore, detecting its occurrence at a low density prior full settlement is crucial to increase the effectiveness of eradication or containment measures (Jerde et al., 2011).

The traditional sampling methods are insufficient for early detecting new invasions, especially in aquatic environments where organisms are not always visible and can be hidden underwater. Several studies demonstrate the efficiency of environmental DNA (eDNA) as a tool for species detection in aquatic environments (Ficetola et al., 2008; Dejean et al., 2011; Jerde et al., 2011; Taberlet et al., 2012; Thomsen et al., 2012). DNA extracted directly from water and sediment samples contains exfoliated cells, small eggs and larvae that can be overlooked in routine surveys. Species-specific molecular markers can be PCR-amplified from eDNA allowing to the detection of organisms of interest, such as threatened species (Thomsen et al., 2012) and pests from early invasion fronts (Jerde et al., 2011). Other sophisticated molecular methods for detection of marine invertebrate larvae involve robotized processes or *in situ* hybridization (Pradillon et al., 2007; Jones et al., 2008).

The objective of the present study was to develop and test the

species-specific molecular markers for early detection and distribution assessment of *R. cuneata* from environmental samples. The aim was to create a PCR-based method for analyzing eDNA with normal (unlabeled) primers and PCR products directly visualized in agarose gel. The possible applications of the species-specific markers for biosecurity and monitoring issues were also discussed in the current account.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Mollusk and water samples

Five *R. cuneata* adult specimens around 2 cm length were collected from the Vistula Lagoon in May 2013, which is its current distribution area within the Baltic Sea (Fig. 1). They were identified *de visu* by experts and served for reference sequencing and experimental work. The morphotaxonomical identification of the *R. cuneata* mollusks was conducted as described in Rudinskaya and Gusev (2012) (Fig. 1). Briefly, diagnostic features that differentiate the species from other Baltic mollusks are the tilt and the position of the shell tops, the shell top bent inside and shifted toward the front part of the shell. Although these traits are not fully developed in young specimens, they are clear enough for distinguishing *R. cuneata* from the rest of common bivalve species inhabiting brackish waters of the Baltic Sea. For the experiments on specificity and sensitivity of the new marker, other five bivalve mollusk species present in the area and having planktonic larvae were sampled from the Lithuanian coast of the Baltic Sea and the Curonian Lagoon: the native *Cerastoderma glaucum*, *Macoma balthica*, *Mytilus trossulus*; the already established invader *Dreissena polymorpha* and cryptogenic *Mya arenaria*. Five voucher adults from each species were sampled.

Environmental samples were collected in duplicate from Lithuanian coastal zone (close to locations where *R. cuneata* was previously observed) on May 20 and September 2, 2014 (Fig. 2,



Fig. 1. *Rangia cuneata* specimen, from World Register of Marine Species (WORMS, www.marinespecies.org).



Fig. 2. Map of the sampling area. Sampling sites in Vistula Lagoon (Stations 1, 3, 4, 7 and 9) and in the Baltic Sea in the Lithuanian coast (Juodkrante and Nida).

Table 1). Additionally 9 samples were collected from 5 monitoring stations within the Vistula Lagoon on June 4 and July 22, 2014. Taking into account, that repeated or even continuous spawning of *R. cuneata* has been reported at water temperature exceeding 15 °C and salinities below 15 PSU (Fairbanks, 1963; Cain, 1972) the sampling dates and locations were selected as presumably favorable for the larvae occurrence. Samples from the coastal zone were collected with the WP2 plankton net (5 m length, 100 µm mesh size), vertically towed 5–10 m, depending on the depth. Samples from the Vistula lagoon were collected using 6 L discrete water sampler from 3 depths (surface, intermediate and near-bottom) and concentrated by filtering through 70 µm mesh. One sample from every location and depth was analyzed *de visu* by an expert taxonomist, in order to verify the presence of *R. cuneata* larvae. Another sample was vacuum-filtered through 0.12 µm Nuclepore™ membrane, and preserved thereafter with 96% ethanol for the future bulk DNA extraction.

2.2. DNA extraction

Total DNA was extracted from foot muscle of five individuals per species employing a method based on silica gel columns (QIAamp DNA Mini kit, Qiagen), following manufacturer's instructions. The tubes were stored at 4 °C for immediate DNA analysis, and aliquots were frozen at –20 °C for long-time preservation.

eDNA was extracted from the filters using the PowerWater DNA Isolation kit (MoBio Laboratories Inc., Carlsbad, CA) following manufacturer's recommendations.

Table 1
Environmental samples (locations, dates and abiotic conditions).

	Date	Location	Sample code	Water temperature, °C	Salinity, PSU	Latitude	Longitude
Baltic coast	2014 05 20	Juodkrante	BS1.1	5.54	7.3	55°32'57.49"	21°07'14.28"
	2014 05 20	Nida	BS2.1	5.21	7.3	55°18'11.72"	21°00'05.75"
	2014 09 02	Juodkrante	BS1.2	17.43	7.00	55°32'57.49"	21°07'14.28"
	2014 09 02	Nida	BS2.2	17.48	7.00	55°18'11.72"	21°00'05.75"
Vistula Lagoon	2014 06 04	Station 1	V1.1	17.28	3.7	54°39'32.02"	20°10'34.36"
		Station 3	V2.1	17.85	4.0	54°34'52.00"	20°02'26.68"
		Station 7	V3.1	17.65	4.3	54°31'32.33"	19°56'17.32"
		Station 9	V4.1	17.31	4.2	54°34'19.42"	19°51'47.04"
	2014 07 22	Station 1	V1.2	22.66	4.3	54°39'32.02"	20°10'34.36"
		Station 3	V2.2	23.41	4.9	54°34'52.00"	20°02'26.68"
		Station 4	V5.2	23.12	4.9	54°40'08.82"	19°59'23.92"
		Station 7	V3.2	23.89	4.2	54°31'32.33"	19°56'17.32"
		Station 9	V4.2	23.43	4.9	54°34'19.42"	19°51'47.04"

DNA was quantified in agarose gel comparing with DNA mass ladder (Perfect 100 bp DNA Ladder from EURx) and with an absorbance method (BioPhotometer by Eppendorf).

2.3. Design of species-specific primers

The design of the species-specific primers was based on reference nucleotide sequences of 16S rDNA obtained from GenBank, plus the sequences obtained from the mollusk samples as described below. To design the new primers, sequences were aligned using the ClustalW tool (Thompson et al., 1994) included in the BioEdit Sequence Alignment Editor software (Hall, 1999). A region within the 16S rRNA gene conserved in *R. cuneata* but with different nucleotide sequence in the rest of considered species was searched. Such a region, which is located within the region amplified by Palumbi (1996) with the primers 16Sar and 16Sbr, was employed for designing a *R. cuneata* specific forward primer. As reverse primer we have used the generalist 16Sbr described by Palumbi (1996), so that the region amplified with the new primer is nested within the region described by Palumbi (1996).

2.4. PCR amplification and sequencing

The amplification reaction of the longer 16S rDNA fragment employing the primers 16Sar and 16Sbr described by Palumbi (1996) was performed in a total volume of 20 µl, with Promega (Madison, WI), Buffer 1×, 2.5 mM MgCl₂, 0.25 mM dNTPs, 20 pmol of each primer, approximately 20 ng of template DNA and 1 U of DNA Taq polymerase (Promega), and the following PCR conditions: initial denaturing at 95 °C for 5 min, 35 cycles of denaturing at 94 °C for 1 min, annealing at 55 °C for 1 min, extension at 72 °C for 2 min and final extension at 72 °C for 7 min.

For the new species-specific primers the PCR conditions were the same except for the annealing temperature that was 50 °C.

PCR products were visualized under UV light on a 1% agarose gel stained with SimplySafe™ from EURx.

Sequencing was performed by the DNA sequencing service MacroGen Europe.

The sequences obtained were compared with international databases employing the program BLASTn within the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>) for confirming species identification.

2.5. Marker validation in vitro and in field samples

For determining the specificity of the newly designed primers, DNAs of different mollusk species were mixed in different proportions (Table 2).

Table 2

Results of the serial dilutions of *Rangia cuneata* DNA; with DNA mixture from the other five mollusks species analyzed (upper part), and in distilled water (bottom part). Number 1 in serial dilutions corresponds to 50 ng/μl of *Rangia cuneata* and 0 is the negative control (no *Rangia cuneata* DNA). The table presents the different results of PCR amplifications (+: positive and -: negative) with *Rangia cuneata* primers, described in this work, and with universal primers described by Palumbi (1996).

DNA mixture	<i>Rangia cuneata</i> primers		Universal primers	
	Serial dilutions of <i>Rangia cuneata</i> DNA	PCR amplification	Serial dilutions of <i>Rangia cuneata</i> DNA	PCR amplification
<i>Rangia cuneata</i> in variable concentrations; 50 ng/μl of each <i>Cerastoderma glaucum</i> , <i>Dreissena polymorpha</i> , <i>Macoma balthica</i> , <i>Mya arenaria</i> , <i>Mytilus trossulus</i>	1	+	1	+
	1:5	+	1:5	+
	1:25	+	1:10	+
	1:125	+	1:50	+
	1:625	–	1:100	+
	1:3125	–	1:500	+
	1:15,625	–	1:1000	+
Only <i>Rangia cuneata</i>	0	–	0	–
	1	+	1	+
	1:5	+	1:5	+
	1:25	+	1:10	+
	1:125	+	1:50	+
	1:625	–	1:100	+
	1:3125	–	1:500	–
	1:15625	–	1:1000	–

In bold, the dilution in the detection limit.

The sensitivity of the primers was experimentally assayed from successive dilutions of *R. cuneata* DNA in distilled water (Table 2).

For the utility of the new primers in environmental samples, three experimental simulated communities were set up dissolving *R. cuneata* tissue (foot muscle) desiccated and manually grinded in water samples as it follows (Table 3):

- 5 mg dry weight of *R. cuneata* in 50 ml of distilled water.
- 5 mg dry weight of *R. cuneata* in 50 ml of marine water from the Ria of Aviles (Bay of Biscay, North Spain). The area is covered of blue mussels *Mytilus galloprovincialis* (density: >1000/square meter).
- Negative community control 1: 50 ml marine water (same site and sampling time as above).
- Negative control with distilled water.

Additionally, water samples (1 L) from two locations within the Baltic Sea coast and five within Vistula Lagoon (Fig. 2) were taken in 2014 for amplification of the developed marker.

Linear regression model with a robust fitting algorithm was applied to relate the yielded *R. cuneata* amplification product quantities to the abundances of the visually observed larvae in the samples (implemented in the R v3 statistical computing environment).

3. Results

3.1. Primer designed and its performance

A total of 25 16S rDNA sequences representing the 25 different

species were retrieved from the GenBank (Supplementary Table 1). They corresponded to a wide range of marine taxonomic groups, including algae, invertebrates and vertebrates. In addition, longer 16SrDNA sequences obtained by PCR with Palumbi (1996) primers for the six analyzed mollusk species were also considered. They were 470 bp long, and were submitted to GenBank where they are available with the accession numbers KP052743–KP052753; correspond to *Cerastoderma glaucum*, *D. polymorpha*, four different haplotypes of *M. balthica*, *M. arenaria*, *M. trossulus* and three different haplotypes of *R. cuneata*.

Designed forward primer within the amplified 16SrDNA region can hybridize only with *R. cuneata* DNA at 50 °C of annealing temperature, since that region has a different nucleotide composition from the rest of the considered species (see an alignment of several sequences showing the *R. cuneata* specific region in Fig. 3).

The sequence of the new forward primer designed was:

RC-16Sar: 5'-AAATTTCTTCTAATGATGTGAGG-3'

Employing the primer 16Sbr described by Palumbi (1996) as the reverse primer, the pair flanks a region of 205 base pairs (bp) (Fig. 3). The alignment with the sequences of the closest species that are available in GenBank (*Pseudocardium sachalinense* KP090053, *Tresus capax* KC429311, *Spisula solida* JF808191, *Tresus keenae* JX399585, *Meropesta nicobarica* JN674570) shows that, although they are taxonomically close to each other, there are clear differences at sequence level, especially in the *R. cuneata*-specific primer region (Fig. 4).

In DNA extracted from *R. cuneata* voucher specimens the new pair of primers provided clear and clean positive amplification. Only one PCR product of the expected size was obtained, with no secondary bands (Fig. 5). The sequences obtained from the

Table 3

Marker validation in Simulated Communities. PCR results (+: positive and -: negative) with *Rangia cuneata* primers and with universal primers described by Palumbi (1996) in different samples: 5 mg of dry weight of *Rangia cuneata* (Rc) in 50 ml of distilled water and in marine water from Ria de Aviles (North Spain), one control with 50 ml of the same marine water without *Rangia cuneata* and one negative control only with distilled water.

	PCR amplification	
	<i>Rangia cuneata</i> primers	Universal primers
5 mg Rc/50 ml distilled water	+	+
5 mg Rc/50 ml marine water	+	+
50 ml marine water	–	+
Negative control with distilled water	–	–




Fig. 3. *Rangia cuneata*-specific primer design. Alignment obtained from ClustalW tool included in BioEdit software. Upper part: alignment between different sequences of *Rangia cuneata* including one from GenBank (KC429310). Bottom part: alignment between 6 different mollusks species: *Cerastoderma glaucum*, *Dreissena polymorpha*, *Mya arenaria*, *Macoma balthica*, *Mytilus trossulus* and *Rangia cuneata*.




Fig. 4. Alignment obtained with ClustalW tool included in BioEdit software, for 16S ribosomal RNA genes of different species taxonomically close to *Rangia cuneata* available in GenBank.

amplicons provided high identity when aligned with 16SrDNA of *R. cuneata* (Fig. 3), hence proving the amplicons corresponded to the target DNA region.

3.2. Specificity and sensitivity of the designed primer

R. cuneata-specific primers yielded positive PCR amplifications of one single band (approx. 200 bp) when *R. cuneata* was present in a sample. Cross-amplification was not found in any case (Fig. 4); *M. arenaria* does not appear on the picture but it did not yield positive amplification with *R. cuneata* primers in any assay. The results of the serial dilutions of *R. cuneata* DNA (Table 2) revealed positive PCR with *R. cuneata*-specific primers down to 1:125 (Table 2, Fig. 6). Hence we conclude that the detection limit with the new primer and PCR product visualization in agarose gel is 0.4 ng/μl DNA. The universal primer pairs of Palumbi (1996) exhibited a similar sensitivity, giving positive amplification at 1:100 dilution.

In experimental DNA mixtures (Table 2), *R. cuneata*-specific primers exhibited the same sensitivity as for *R. cuneata* DNA alone: 1:125. With Palumbi (1996) primers positive PCR amplification was obtained from all the samples, as expected. The amplicon was approximately 500 bp that is the expected size (Figs. 5 and 7).

3.3. Marker validation

In vitro experiments with eDNA samples (simulated communities) validated the performance of primers (Table 3). In the

simulated community containing *R. cuneata* tissue, the *R. cuneata* primers (Fig. 7) provided positive results for both distilled water (RD) and natural marine water (RM) from Ria of Aviles (1 mg dry weight per 10 ml of water). In the negative control without *R. cuneata* tissue (MW) amplification was not found, as expected since *R. cuneata* is not present in Asturias coast yet (Table 3).

Regarding the field water samples, PCR amplification with *R. cuneata* specific primers was positive for five samples from the Vistula Lagoon and none from the Baltic coast (Fig. 8), independently from eDNA concentration (Table 4). False positives were not found. Five true positives (positive PCR amplification and *R. cuneata* larvae observed *de visu*), four true negatives (no PCR amplification and no *R. cuneata* larvae observed *de visu*) and four false negatives (three samples of the second semester and one of the first semester from areas with observed *R. cuneata* larvae) were obtained. The Chi-square value of the contingency table corresponding to these results is 3.62, with a P-value of 0.057 (marginally significant) for 1 d.f. For universal primers (Palumbi, 1996), as expected, we got positive results from all water samples analyzed (Fig. 6-right).

As evidenced from the fitted linear regression model (Supplementary Fig. 1), the amount of the *R. cuneata* DNA product yielded from the positive amplifications in eDNA samples significantly correlated with the larvae abundances reported from the visual analysis of the replicate samples from the same areas ($r = 0.88$, $p < 0.001$). No significant correlation ($r = -0.37$, $p = 0.21$) with the total eDNA concentration was found.




Fig. 5. a) Agarose gel of PCR products with universal primers (Palumbi, 1996) from *C. glaucum* (CG), *D. polymorpha* (DP), *M. balthica* (MA), *M. trossulus* (MT) and *Rangia cuneata* (RC). NC: negative control. Marker: Low DNA Mass Ladder. b) Agarose gel of PCR products with *Rangia cuneata*-specific primers from *C. glaucum* (CG), *D. polymorpha* (DP), *M. balthica* (MA), *M. trossulus* (MT) and *Rangia cuneata* (RC). NC: negative control. Marker: Low DNA Mass Ladder.




Fig. 6. a) Agarose gel of PCR products obtained with *Rangia cuneata*-specific primers. RD: *Rangia cuneata* in distilled water, RM: *Rangia cuneata* in marine water from Ria de Aviles (North Spain), MW: marine water from Ria de Aviles (North Spain) without *Rangia cuneata*. NC: negative control. M: DNA size marker 100 bp ladder. Positive results can be visualized with white arrows. b) Agarose gel of PCR products obtained with universal Palumbi primers (1996). RD: *Rangia cuneata* in distilled water, RM: *Rangia cuneata* in marine water from Ria de Aviles (North Spain), MW: marine water from Ria de Aviles (North Spain) without *Rangia cuneata*. NC: negative control. M: DNA size marker 100 bp ladder. Positive results can be visualized with white arrows.




Fig. 7. a) Agarose gel of PCR products obtained with *Rangia cuneata*-specific primers. Upper part: Serial dilutions 1:5 to 1:15,625 of *Rangia cuneata* in distilled water (1–7). NC: negative control. Marker: DNA size marker 100 bp ladder. Bottom part: Serial dilutions 1:5 to 1:15,625 of *Rangia cuneata* together with 50 ng/μl of each other 5 mollusks (1–7). Marker: DNA size marker 100 bp ladder. b) Agarose gel of PCR products obtained with Universal primers (Palumbi, 1996). Upper part: Serial dilutions 1:5 to 1:1000 of *Rangia cuneata* in distilled water (1–7). NC: negative control. Marker: DNA size marker 100 bp ladder. Bottom part: Serial dilutions 1:5 to 1:1000 of *Rangia cuneata* with 50 ng/μl of each other 5 mollusks (1–7). Marker: DNA size marker 100 bp ladder.

4. Discussion

The species-specific marker designed in this study was sensitive and accurate. It could be recommended as a useful tool to detect the presence of *R. cuneata* DNA, even at low concentration and in complex samples containing other species. It has been successfully amplified from real environmental water samples when *R. cuneata* is present (Vistula Lagoon), but not from the Baltic coastal samples




Fig. 8. Agarose gel of PCR products obtained with *Rangia cuneata*-specific primers in water samples from Vistula Lagoon and Baltic Sea. Positive results can be visualized with white arrows. Marker: DNA size marker 100 bp ladder. NC: negative control.

where the species has not been detected *de visu*. Cross-amplification with other mollusk species phylogenetically close to *R. cuneata* (e.g. *M. arenaria*) was not detected. These results suggest that these specific markers are robust and cost-efficient for detecting this species from eDNA. This method, could complement traditional monitoring approaches, as also proposed by other authors (Taberlet et al., 2012; Thomsen et al., 2012). It is a practical solution when the visual census gives low-quality results (e.g. for detecting a new-coming scarce species) and/or requires a huge sampling effort (e.g. for sparsely distributed marine species). This is particularly important in the current moment of diminishing budgets, when national monitoring networks carefully consider survey expenses and aim at cost-effective approaches (Aylagas et al., 2014).

Another advantage of this technique is that the target DNA fragment is very short (around 200 bp) and can thus be PCR amplified even from degraded DNA. This is very important for early species detection because short DNA fragments can persist in the environment for a relatively long time. For example, DNA fragments of approximately 400 bp persist for up to one week at 18 °C in lake water (Matsui et al., 2001).

Massive (high-throughput) sequencing techniques can also generate PCR products with universal primers from environmental samples or degraded substrates, but require extensive data analysis (Hofreiter et al., 2003; Willerslev et al., 2003; Taberlet et al., 2007). In contrast, the method employed here detects the presence of the target species DNA from the water samples using PCR and a simple electrophoresis in agarose gel, without any other data analysis. This is a good and convenient approach when the target species is known (e.g. next-coming alien species from the adjacent aquatic regions), and the focus is put on its detection rather than general biodiversity assessment. The suggested method is reproducible, fast, and cost-efficient (Leung et al., 2002). Moreover, it does not require any taxonomical expertise (particularly essential when identifying the species at a larval stage) or phylogenetic knowledge. To perform the test only basic technical skills in PCR and gel electrophoresis are needed.

The sensitivity of this marker (0.4 ng/μl of DNA as resulted from the simulation experiments) is comparable to other methodologies based on NGS approaches (Pochon et al., 2013). As verified from the *R. cuneata* larvae abundance, the marker was able to detect the species when it was above 1900 individual/m³ (Table 4). This is a fair result for the benthic populations established in the area with abundances up to 5000 individual/m² (Rudinskaya and Gusev, 2012). The positive and strong correlation between the estimated quantity of PCR product and *R. cuneata* larvae densities suggests that the marker is sensitive to the abundance of the target species. This may have further implications since it could provide some

Table 4
Marker validation in field water samples from Baltic Sea and Vistula Lagoon. Date of the recollection, abbreviation of each sample, DNA concentration of each one (ng/μl), concentration of *Rangia cuneata* PCR product obtained with *Rangia cuneata*-specific primers (ng/μl) and *Rangia cuneata* observed larvae density.

Location	<i>Rangia cuneata</i> larvae density, ind/m ³	Sample 1st semester 2014		Sample 2nd semester 2014	
		DNA conc. (ng/μl)	<i>Rangia cuneata</i> PCR product (ng/μl)	DNA conc. (ng/μl)	<i>Rangia cuneata</i> PCR product (ng/μl)
BS1	Not detected	447	No	269	No
BS2	Not detected	677	No	238	No
V1	6791	41	50	45	No
V2	3058	25	50	29	No
V3	1168	11	No	33	No
V4	1946	14	6	29	20
V5	20,262	—	—	35	40

preliminary metrics, e.g. for the environmental assessment or monitoring within the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. Further development of this marker would include assaying other visualization methodologies more sensitive than agarose gels, like RT-PCR or primers labeled with fluorochromes.

More studies on the detection limits of this marker in the field would be necessary, since eDNA methodology has some limitations (e.g. Bohmann et al., 2014). For example, false negatives can happen if the PCR protocol (and/or the primers designed) fails to anneal on different haplotypes in case of intraspecific polymorphism. In our study we did not find positive PCR amplification from Lithuanian coastal samples, although some *R. cuneata* adults have been detected nearby recently (Solovjeva, 2014). It is not a false negative because *R. cuneata* larvae were not visually detected in the samples, which is totally consistent with eDNA results. The absence of larvae in a zone where adults have been detected could be explained in different ways. Perhaps that coastal population is not self-sustainable yet (e.g. individuals are too sparse to reproduce effectively). Moreover, both adult spawning and larvae lifetime may vary in estuarine and open sea waters (Fairbanks, 1963; Chanley, 1965), and our sampling events did not coincide with larvae occurrence in the zone (e.g. the water temperature in May was lower than that indicated in literature as suitable for *R. cuneata* spawning). On the other hand, the sampling methodology used here was not the optimal for retaining small larvae, since *R. cuneata* larvae size might vary between 5 and 175 μm (for height-length-thickness dimensions) and can be missed by the standard plankton net applied for the regional zooplankton monitoring program (100 μm mesh size). In a program specifically designed for monitoring *R. cuneata*, smaller mesh size would be desirable for sampling nets.

The new marker is especially timely because *R. cuneata* is currently starting to spread in the Baltic Sea. It could be applied for monitoring the species invasion dynamics, e.g. for defining the abundance and distribution range of this species within the bio-pollution assessment (Olenin et al., 2007). In conclusion, we recommend the application of eDNA-based species-specific markers for screening environmental samples and complementing routine monitoring tools. The approach may help to improve the management of biological invasions because with a more efficient early detection, adequate response measures will be earlier adopted and be likely more effective.

Acknowledgments

This study was funded by the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (MINECO, Spain), Reference CGL2013-42415-R; the DEVOTES (DEVELOPMENT OF innovative TOOLS for understanding marine biodiversity and assessing Good Environmental Status) project funded by the European Union under the 7th Framework Programme, 'The Ocean of Tomorrow' Theme (Grant Agreement No. 308392), www.devotes-project.eu and BIO-C3 (Biodiversity

changed investigating causes, consequences and management implications) Project within the BONUS, the joint Baltic Sea Research and Development programme, funded by the EU 7th Framework Programme and Research Council of Lithuania (Grant Agreement No. BONUS-1/2014), www.bio-c3.eu/. A.A. holds a regional postdoctoral Marie Curie grants COFUND-CLARIN.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data related to this article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2015.09.013>.

References

- Aylagas, E., Borja, A., Rodrigues-Ezpeleta, N., 2014. Environmental status assessment using DNA metabarcoding: towards a genetic based marine biotic index (gAMBI). *PLoS One* 9, e90529.
- Behrens, H.L., Leppäkoski, E., Olenin, S., 2005. Ballast Water Risk Assessment Guidelines for the North Sea and Baltic Sea. Nordtest Technical Report TR 587, p. 36.
- Bohmann, K., Evans, A., Gilbert, M.T.P., Carvalho, G.R., Creer, S., Knapp, M., Yu, D.W., de Bruyn, M., 2014. Environmental DNA for wildlife biology and biodiversity monitoring. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 29, 358–367.
- Cain, T.D., 1972. The Reproductive Cycle and Larval Tolerances of *Rangia cuneata* in the James River, Virginia. PhD dissertation. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, p. 250.
- Chanley, P., 1965. Larval development of the brackish water mactrid clam, *Rangia cuneata*. *Chesap. Sci.* 6 (4), 209–213.
- Dejean, T., Valentini, A., Duparc, A., Pellerin-Cuit, S., Pompanon, F., Taberlet, P., Miaud, C., 2011. Persistence of environmental DNA in freshwater ecosystems. *PLoS One* 6 (8), e23398.
- Delaney, D.G., Sperling, C.D., Adams, C.S., Leung, B., 2008. Marine invasive species: validation of citizen science and implications for national monitoring networks. *Biol. Invasions* 10, 117–128.
- Fairbanks, L.D., 1963. Bionomographic studies of the clam *Rangia cuneata* Gray. *Tulane Stud. Zool.* 10, 3–47.
- Ficetola, et al., 2008. Species detection using environmental DNA from water samples. *Biol. Lett.* 4, 423–425.
- Freire, M., Genzano, G.N., Neumann-Leitao, S., Perez, C.D., 2014. The non-indigenous medusa *Blackfordia virginica* (Hydrozoa, Leptothecata) in tropical Brazil: 50 years of unnoticed presence. *Biol. Invasions* 16, 1–5.
- Geller, J.B., Walton, E.D., Grosholz, E.D., Ruiz, G.M., 1997. Cryptic invasions of the crab *Carcinus* detected by molecular phylogeography. *Mol. Ecol.* 6, 901–906.
- Hall, A., 1999. BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for Windows 95/98/NT. *Nucleic Acids Symp. Ser.* 41, 95–98.
- Hayes, K.R., Sliwa, C., 2003. Identifying potential marine pests – a deductive approach applied to Australia. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 46, 91.
- Hijmans, R.J., Graham, C.H., 2006. The ability of climate envelope models to predict the effect of climate change on species distributions. *Glob. Change Biol.* 12, 2272–2281.
- Hofreiter, M., Betancourt, J.L., Pelliza Sbriller, A., Markgraf, V., McDonald, H.G., 2003. Phylogeny, diet, and habitat of an extinct ground sloth from Cuchillo Curá, Neuquén Province, southwest Argentina. *Quat. Res.* 59, 364–378.
- Horgan, M.J., Mills, E.L., 1997. Clearance rates and filtering activity of zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*): implications for freshwater lakes. *Can. J. Fish Aquat. Sci.* 54 (2), 249–255.
- Jerde, C.L., Mahon, A.R., Chadderton, W.L., Lodge, D.M., 2011. "Sight-unseen" detection of rare aquatic species using environmental DNA. *Conserv. Lett.* 4, 150–157.
- Jones, W.J., Preston, C.M., Marin III, R., Scholin, C.A., Vrijenhoek, R.C., 2008. A robotic molecular method for in situ detection of marine invertebrate larvae. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* 8, 540–550.

- Kerckhof, F., Haelters, J., Gollasch, J., 2007. Alien species in the marine and brackish ecosystem: the situation in Belgian waters. *Aquat. Invasions* 2 (3), 243–257.
- Leung, B., Lodge, D.M., Finnoff, D., Shogren, J.F., Lewis, M.A., Lamberti, G., 2002. An ounce of prevention or a pound of cure: bioeconomic risk analysis of invasive species. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 269, 2407–2413.
- Matsui, M., Honjo, M., Kawabata, Z., 2001. Estimation of the fate of dissolved DNA in thermally stratified lake water from the stability of exogenous plasmid DNA. *Aquat. Microb. Ecol.* 26, 95–102.
- Molnar, J.L., Gamboa, R.L., Revenga, C., Spalding, M.D., 2008. Assessing the global threat of invasive species to marine biodiversity. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 6 (9), 485–492.
- Neill, P.E., et al., 2006. Invasion of *Codium fragile* ssp. *tomentosoides* in northern Chile: a new threat for *Gracilaria* farming. *Aquaculture* 259, 202.
- Núñez, M., Pauchard, A., 2010. Biological invasions in developing and developed countries: does one model fit all? *Biol. Invasions* 12, 707.
- Olenin, S., Minchin, D., Daunys, D., 2007. Assessment of biopollution in aquatic ecosystems. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 55, 379–394.
- Olenin, M., et al., 2011. Recommendations on methods for the detection and control of biological pollution in marine coastal waters. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 62, 2598–2604.
- Palumbi, S.R., 1996. Nucleic acids II: the polymerase chain reaction. In: Hillis, D.M., Moritz, C., Mable, B.K. (Eds.), *Molecular Systematics*. Sinauer Associates, Inc, pp. 205–247.
- Parker, J.C., 1966. Bottom fauna study: distribution and relative abundance of *Rangia cuneata*. *Fish Wildl. Serv. Bureau Commer. Fish.* 246, 35–36.
- Parmesan, C., Yohe, G., 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems. *Nature* 421 (6918), 37–42.
- Pfitzenmeyer, H.T., Drobeck, K.G., 1964. The occurrence of the brackish water clam, *Rangia cuneata*, in the Poto_mac River, Maryland. *Chesapeake Sci.* 5 (4), 209–215.
- Pochon, X., Bott, N.J., Smith, L.F., Wood, S.A., 2013. Evaluating detection limits of next-generation sequencing for the surveillance and monitoring of international marine pests. *PLoS One* 8, e73935. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0073935>.
- Pradillon, F., Schmidt, A., Peplies, J., Dubilier, N., 2007. Species identification of marine invertebrate early stages by whole-larvae in situ hybridisation of 18S ribosomal RNA. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 333, 103–116.
- Rudinskaya, L.V., Gusev, A.A., 2012. Invasion of the North American wedge clam *Rangia cuneata* (G.B. Sowerby I, 1831) (Bivalvia: Mactridae) in the Vistula Lagoon of the Baltic Sea. *Russ. J. Biol. Invasions* 3 (3), 220–229.
- Ruiz, G.M., Fofonoff, P., Hines, A.H., Grosholz, E.D., 1999. Non-indigenous species as stressors in estuarine and marine communities. Assessing the impacts and interactions. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 44, 950–972.
- Seo, C., Thorne, J.H., Hannah, L., Thuiller, W., 2009. Scale effects in species distribution models: implications for conservation planning under climate change. *Biol. Lett.* 5 (1), 39–43.
- Solovjeva, S., 2014. Finding of New Mollusk Species *Rangia cuneata* (G.B.Sowerby I, 1831) (Bivalvia: Mactridae) in the Lithuanian Coastal Waters. *Environmental Protection Agency, Lithuania*. <http://gamta.lt/cms/index?rubricId=d42d35cd-63cd-4800-9cfd-86ef9f305dac> (in Lithuanian).
- Taberlet, P., et al., 2007. Power and limitations of the chloroplast trnL (UAA) intron for plant DNA barcoding. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 35, e14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkl938>.
- Taberlet, et al., 2012. Environmental DNA. *Mol. Ecol.* 21, 1789–1793.
- Thompson, J.D., Higgins, D.G., Gibson, T.J., 1994. ClustalW-improving the sensitivity of progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence weighting, position-specific gap penalties and weight matrix choice. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 22, 4673–4680.
- Thomsen, et al., 2012. Detection of a diverse Marine fish fauna using environmental DNA from seawater samples. *PLoS One* 7 (8), e41732.
- Valentine, J.F., Sklenar, S.A., 2004. Mobile-Tensaw Delta Hydrological Modifications Impact Study. Final Report to the Mobile Bay National Estuary Program, p. 139.
- Verween, A., Kerckhof, F., Vincx, M., Degraer, S., 2006. First European record of the invasive brackish water clam *Rangia cuneata* (G.B. Sowerby I, 1831) (Mollusca: Bivalvia). *Aquat. Invasions* 1 (4), 198–203.
- Wakida-Kusunoki, A.T., MacKenzie, C.L., 2004. Rangia and Marsh clams, *Rangia cuneata*, *R. flexuosa* and *Polymesoda caroliniana*, in Eastern Mexico: distribution, biology and ecology, and historical fisheries. *Mar. Fish. Rev.* 66 (3), 13–20.
- Willerslev, E., et al., 2003. Diverse plant and animal DNA from Holocene and Pleistocene sedimentary records. *Science* 300, 792–795.
- Wolff, W.J., 1999. Exotic invaders of the meso-oligohaline zone of estuaries in the Netherlands: why are there so many? *Helgol. Meeresunters* 52, 393–400.