

## Dispelling the Myths: How Well Do Multiple Competitive PCR Products From 16S rDNA Reflect the Structures of Microbial Communities?

Julia Brüggemann,<sup>1</sup> Yun-Juan Chang,<sup>1</sup> George Kowalchuk,<sup>2</sup> Sarah Macnaughton,<sup>1</sup> Merja Itävaara,<sup>3</sup> Elizabeth Kline,<sup>1</sup> David White,<sup>1</sup> and John Stephen<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Center for Environmental Biotechnology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, <sup>2</sup> Netherlands Institute of Ecology, Center for Terrestrial Ecology, The Netherlands, <sup>3</sup> VTT Biotechnology and Food Research, Espoo, Finland, <sup>4</sup> Microbial Insights Inc., Rockford, TN

Profiling of microbial communities by PCR-based cloning-free methods targeting 16S rDNA to identify the numerically dominant species in ecologically important habitats has grown rapidly in popularity since its inception in 1993 (Muyzer et al. 1993). The question of how well such profiles reflect the relative abundance and cell densities of the target organisms has been tackled several times with encouraging results. Muyzer et al. (1993) demonstrated that dilution of template to extinction did not effect the patterns of major bands. Felske et al. (1998) used real-time PCR and thermal gradient gel electrophoresis (TGGE) to demonstrate that the relative abundance of products in complex mixtures did not change dramatically during amplification. Using denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis (DGGE), we have recently shown similar results with the analysis of constructed communities inoculated into a microbially diverse topsoil (Stephen et al. 1999). However, these and other studies have failed to convince many workers that the PCR reaction is not fundamentally flawed when used to analyze complex template mixtures. A commonly voiced opinion, but one that is rarely published, is that the behavior of the PCR is too unpredictable for the results to be accepted in the absence of other supporting data. In this study, we report the use of the DCode™ universal mutation detection system in DGGE mode to evaluate a competitive standard for inclusion in samples of known and unknown composition, demonstrate the use of this method to count known numbers of cells in laboratory mixtures, and estimate the errors induced when attempting to count *Desulfovibrio vulgaris* cells inoculated into a complex and previously uncharacterized environmental setting. The 16S rDNA copy number/genome is currently unknown for any of the test cells used here, as is the case for unknown environmental organisms.

### Methods

#### Construction of Standard

DGGE, TTGE, and TGGE separate molecules by melting point differences. Consequently, we chose as a standard (for use with the PCR primers described in Farrelly et al. (1995)), 16S rDNA from the X-endosymbiont of the psyllid *Anomonura mori* (Fukatsu and Nikoh 1998), which has a lower melting point than any 16S rDNA molecule detected in environmental samples aside from of insect symbiont studies. The fragment of interest was amplified using the appropriate primers and cloned into pCR II-TOPO (Invitrogen Corporation). The plasmid was linearized by cutting in the vector sequence with restriction endonuclease EcoRI, and quantified by DNA dye-binding fluorescence (VersaFluor™ fluorometer, Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.) prior to use.

#### Cell Counting

The following species were grown as described previously (Stephen et al. 1999): *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* FRD-1, *Shewanella putrefaciens* 200, *Sphingomonas aromaticivorans* B0695, *Alcaligenes eutrophus* CH34, and *D. vulgaris* Hildenborough. Cells were enumerated microscopically following acridine orange staining by three researchers and the results averaged.

#### DNA Extraction, PCR, and DGGE

Extraction of DNA from cultured cells, compost, and seeded compost by bead-milling in the presence of CRSR Red (Bio 101) has also been previously described (Stephen et al. 1999), except that 0.5 ml of pooled stationary-phase culture or 0.25 g of compost were substituted for soil. PCR was for the number of cycles specified in the figure legends using the parameters described in Muyzer et al. (1993) and a Gene Cycler™ thermal cycler (Bio-Rad) with 1.25 µl Expand polymerase (Roche). DGGE was performed using the DCode system (Bio-Rad) with 1.5 mm thick, 8% acrylamide/bis-acrylamide gel (37.5:1, Bio-Rad) in 0.5x Tris-acetate-EDTA buffer (TAE; Bio-Rad) between 15 and 70% denaturant concentration at a constant temperature of 60°C for 16 hr at 40 V. Staining and destaining of gels have been described in Kowalchuk et al. (1997).


### Image Analysis

Gels were imaged using the Gel Doc<sup>®</sup> 1000 system (Bio-Rad) and band intensities were measured using the accompanying software.


### Results and Discussion

An initial experiment compared the efficiency of amplification of the standard fragment to several cloned 16S rRNA genes under multiple competitive conditions for 35 cycles (Figure 1). These experiments revealed minor differences in amplification efficiencies between the target molecules, but the differences did not exceed 4-fold for any pair of molecules. In the second experiment, for each of the five cell types, the number of cells, inferred from relative band intensities of the standard relative to each cell-derived PCR fragment, was compared to the number established using microscopy before cell lysis. This study demonstrated that comparison of the band intensities generated an error approximately 2-fold too high by comparison to actual cell counts in this highly characterized system (Figure 2). In the following experiment, *D. vulgaris* cells were added to compost at  $5 \times 10^8$ /g prior to DNA extraction. Aliquots of the extracted DNA were mixed with varying copy numbers of the standard fragment prior to PCR amplification and DGGE analysis.


The results of one analysis terminated after various cycles (during log-linear amplification, early plateau, and after 25 cycles of plateau) are shown in Figure 3. The ratio of standard PCR product to *D. vulgaris* product remained constant up to 20 cycles. Errors in the counting of cell number, estimated by comparison of the standard PCR-DGGE band to that of the *D. vulgaris* band in this highly complex system, increased with increasing cycle number (Figure 4). After a total of 50 cycles, *D. vulgaris* cell count estimates based on comparison with the standard were 50-fold too high. Such



**Fig 1. DGGE analysis of multiple competitive PCR products of cloned 16S rDNA fragments.** All components of the reaction remained detectable when present at 2% of the initial template mixture after 35 cycles and did not deviate significantly from this value. Amplification efficiencies of templates at higher concentrations did vary slightly, the most obvious bias being against the standard, recovery of which was reproducibly slightly less than half of the expected proportion at all starting concentrations.




**Fig 2. DGGE analysis of multiple competitive PCR products from mixed genomic DNA spiked with known quantities of standard after 35 cycles of amplification.** Estimation of cell numbers from the  $10^5$  spike generated values approximately 2-fold higher than that expected by microscopic counting prior to cell lysis. The lower recovery of the standard was compensated for by multiplying its signal 2.3-fold prior to band intensity comparison.



**Fig 3. Quantitative multiple competitive PCR-DGGE analysis of *D. vulgaris* spiked into compost.** PCR reactions were terminated after the number of cycles indicated prior to DGGE. PCR employed less than 1 ng of template DNA. The effect of PCR cycle number on the ratio of standard to *D. vulgaris* amplification products is shown in Figure 4. A-C, *Bacillus* sp.; D,  $\gamma$ -proteobacterium; E,  $\beta$ -proteobacterium.

a cycle number is extreme: at more common numbers of PCR cycles, the error was quite reasonable, for example, at 25 cycles (5 following log-linear phase), the error was approximately 5-fold. These errors were mostly attributable to decreasing intensity of the standard product, which correlated with an increase in the amount of single-stranded DNA. It is possible that the low  $T_m$  of this molecule strongly reduced its ability to reanneal faithfully during these nonamplifying cycles. During log-linear amplification, and with prior knowledge of the relative amplification efficiencies of the two molecules in a multiple competitive setting, the error was negligible.

Considering that even dominant environmental bacteria are typically completely unculturable under current technologies (Felske 1999), such errors in the estimation of their numbers are not excessive even if analysis of products during log-linear amplification cannot be guaranteed. Earlier evidence that PCR-DGGE patterns reflect the relative abundance of organisms in



**Fig 4. Changes in band intensities with cycle number.** Various exposures of the image in Figure 3 were employed in compiling this data. The ratio of standard to *D. vulgaris* products remained constant up to 20 cycles at 1.4 (expected ratio), at which point log-linear amplification of the standard ceased. Errors in the ratio between these products increased to 0.2 after an additional 30 cycles. ◆, competitive standard; ■, *D. vulgaris*.

a sample is supported. It follows that, if the template number of one sequence is known, those of others can be estimated by image analysis of the DGGE banding pattern. Notably, bands A, B, and C in Figure 3 represented gram-positive organisms (*Bacillus* sp., data not shown), which are generally hard to lyse, but were nonetheless easily detected in the presence of more than  $10^8$  cultured gram-negative *D. vulgaris* cells/gram of sample and similar numbers of indigenous proteobacteria.

Clearly, there are problems in using a method such as this in estimating numbers of environmental bacteria. Other than uncertainties over lysis efficiency, additional errors in translating band intensity to cell number are introduced by differing rRNA gene copy numbers between species (Farrelly 1995). The quality of match between primers and template and the effect of target flanking regions is a further matter of concern in interpreting such data (Hansen et al. 1998, Polz and Cavanaugh 1998). Furthermore, it is common for an apparently single DGGE band to carry more than one sequence; therefore, band excision and recovery of a legible sequence are required to demonstrate that the product is largely dominated by a single sequence (Garcia-Delgado et al. 1998). Nonetheless, results suggest that the behavior of the PCR reaction in a multiple-competitive setting is reliable enough that the effects can be established to estimate the number of molecules present. The ratio of *D. vulgaris* product to standard under a wide variety of test conditions remained constant at about 2.5, strongly suggesting that correction factors can be established when the aim is to monitor the fate of known organisms represented by full-length clones in environmental samples. Although our knowledge of the vast majority of environmental bacteria consists only of 16S rDNA sequences (Muyzer et al. 1993 and references cited therein), this construct and analytical approach may represent a useful quantitative addition to microbial community profiling. Such an approach may be most appropriate when cell growth rates are high, thus minimizing interference from free DNA (Lorenz and Wackemagel 1987). With the above qualifications,

our results support the contention that profiles of bacterial communities generated by PCR-based methods are a reasonable estimation of dominant in situ community structure. The inclusion of an internal standard with unusual denaturant sensitivity, as demonstrated here, provides a quantitative dimension to this method when real-time PCR facilities are not available.

This research was supported by NASA, the U.S. Department of Energy NABIR program, and the U.S. National Science Foundation. This study has been published in *J Microbiol Methods* 40, 111–123 (2000).

## References

- Farrelly V et al. (1995). Effect of genome size and rnn gene copy number on PCR amplification of 16S rRNA genes from a mixture of bacterial species. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 61, 2798–2801.
- Felske A (1999). Reviewing the DA001-files: a 16S rRNA chase on suspect #X99967, a *Bacillus* and Dutch underground activist. *J Microbiol Methods* 36, 77–93.
- Felske A et al. (1998). Quantification of 16S rRNAs in complex bacterial communities by multiple competitive reverse transcription-PCR in temperature gradient gel electrophoresis fingerprints. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 64, 4581–4587.
- Fukatsu T and Nikoh N (1998). Two intracellular symbiotic bacteria from the mulberry psyllid *Anomaneura mori* (Insecta, Homoptera). *Appl Environ Microbiol* 64, 3599–3606.
- Garcia-Delgado M et al. (1998). Higher sensitivity of denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis than sequencing in the detection of mutations in DNA from tumor samples. *Biotechniques* 24, 72–76.
- Hansen MC et al. (1998). Biased 16S rDNA PCR amplification caused by interference from DNA flanking the template region. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 26, 141–149.
- Kowalchuk GA et al. (1997). Analysis of ammonia-oxidizing bacteria of the beta subdivision of the class Proteobacteria in coastal sand dunes using denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis and sequencing of PCR-amplified 16S rDNA fragments. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 63, 1489–1497.
- Lorenz MG and Wackemagel VV (1987). Adsorption of DNA to sand and variable degradation rates of adsorbed DNA. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 53, 2948–2952.
- Muyzer G et al. (1993). Profiling of microbial populations by denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis analysis of polymerase chain reaction amplified genes coding for 16S rRNA. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 59, 695–700.
- Polz MF and Cavanaugh CM (1998). Bias in template-to-product ratios in multitemplate PCR. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 64, 3724–3730.
- Stephen JR et al. (1999). Fate of a mixture of five metal resistant bacteria introduced into pristine and heavy-metal-contaminated soil microcosms assessed by DGGE. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 18, 1118–1123.
- Practice of the polymerase chain reaction (PCR) may require a license. Notice regarding Bio-Rad thermal cyclers and real-time systems: Purchase of this instrument conveys a limited non-transferable immunity from suit for the purchaser's own internal research and development and for use in applied fields other than Human In Vitro Diagnostics under one or more of U.S. Patents Nos. 5,656,493, 5,333,675, 5,475,610 (claims 1, 44, 158, 160–163 and 167 only), and 6,703,236 (claims 1–7 only), or corresponding claims in their non-U.S. counterparts, owned by Applied Biosystems Corporation. No right is conveyed expressly, by implication or by estoppel under any other patent claim, such as claims to apparatus, reagents, kits, or methods such as 5' nuclease methods. Further information on purchasing licenses may be obtained by contacting the Director of Licensing, Applied Biosystems, 850 Lincoln Centre Drive, Foster City, California 94404, USA.
- Information in this tech note was current as of the date of writing (1999) and not necessarily the date this version (rev C, 2008) was published.



**Bio-Rad  
Laboratories, Inc.**

Life Science  
Group

---

**Web site** [www.bio-rad.com](http://www.bio-rad.com) **USA** 800 4BIORAD **Australia** 61 02 9914 2800 **Austria** 01 877 89 01 **Belgium** 09 385 55 11 **Brazil** 55 21 3237 9400  
**Canada** 905 364 3435 **China** 86 21 6426 0808 **Czech Republic** 420 241 430 532 **Denmark** 44 52 10 00 **Finland** 09 804 22 00 **France** 01 47 95 69 65  
**Germany** 089 318 84 0 **Greece** 30 210 777 4396 **Hong Kong** 852 2789 3300 **Hungary** 36 1 455 8800 **India** 91 124 4029300 **Israel** 03 963 6050  
**Italy** 39 02 216091 **Japan** 03 6361 7000 **Korea** 82 2 3473 4460 **Mexico** 52 555 488 7670 **The Netherlands** 0318 540666 **New Zealand** 0508 805 500  
**Norway** 23 38 41 30 **Poland** 48 22 331 99 99 **Portugal** 351 21 472 7700 **Russia** 7 495 721 14 04 **Singapore** 65 6415 3188 **South Africa** 27 861 246 723  
**Spain** 34 91 590 5200 **Sweden** 08 555 12700 **Switzerland** 061 717 95 55 **Taiwan** 886 2 2578 7189 **United Kingdom** 020 8328 2000

---