CaSS | Forensic and Scientific Services
A CLINICAL AND STATEWIDE SERVICE



Project 11. Report on the Validation of a manual method for Extracting DNA using the DNA IQ™ System

August 2008

Automation and LIMS Implementation Project Team,

DNA Analysis

Forensic And Scientific Services

Clinical and Scientific Services

Queensland Health

safe | sustainable | appropriate

Queensland Government
Queensland Health

CaSS | Forensic and Scientific Services
A CLINICAL AND STATEWIDE SERVICE

Project 11. Report on the Validation of a Manual Method for Extracting DNA using the DNA IQ™ System

Nurthen, T., Hlinka, V., Muharam, I., Gallagher, B., Lundie, G., Iannuzzi, C., Ientile, V.
Automation/LIMS Implementation Project, DNA Analysis FSS (August 2008)

1. Abstract

The DNA IQ™ system was found to be the most suitable kit for extracting cell and blood samples that are analysed in DNA Analysis FSS (refer to Project 9). This DNA extraction system, based on magnetic bead technology, was found to generate results that were comparable or better than the current Chelex®-100 protocol. We have validated a manual DNA IQ™ method for extracting DNA from forensic samples, and incorporated studies on sensitivity and consistency, inhibition, substrate type, substrate size, and mixture studies. This manual DNA IQ™ method is suitable for verification on the automated MultiPROBE® II PLUS HT EX extraction platforms.

2. Introduction

A previous evaluation of various DNA extraction systems that were designed specifically for forensic samples was performed in order to select a suitable extraction technology for extracting various sample types that are processed in DNA Analysis FSS. DNA IQ™ was identified as a suitable kit for extracting forensic samples, and was found to outperform both the current Chelex®-100 protocol and also all the other kits evaluated. The results of the evaluation are reported in Project 9 (Gallagher *et al*., 2007a).

DNA purification with silica matrices, either in membrane- or bead-form, commonly uses the affinity of DNA for silica without the need for hazardous organic reagents. However, these systems tend to require extensive washing to remove the guanidium-based lysis buffer. The DNA IQ™ system uses a novel paramagnetic resin for DNA isolation (Promega Corp., 2006). The DNA IQ™ System's basic chemistry is similar to other silica-based DNA isolation technologies, except that the specific nature of the paramagnetic resin, coupled with the formulation of the lysis buffer, is unique. In the DNA IQ™ System, negatively-charged DNA molecules have a high affinity for the positively-charged paramagnetic resin under high salt conditions supplied by the lysis buffer. Once DNA is bound to the magnetic resin, and the resin is immobilised by a magnet, the sample can be washed using an alcohol/aqueous buffer mixture. The high alcohol content of the wash buffer aids to maintain the DNA-resin complex in low-salt conditions, while the aqueous component functions to wash away residual lysis buffer and any inhibitors or non-DNA contaminants such as cellular debris and protein residues. DNA is released from the resin by using a low ionic strength elution buffer, and the purified DNA can be used directly in downstream applications such as PCR.

For samples that are in excess (e.g. reference samples), DNA IQ™ resin will only isolate up to a total of approximately 100ng of DNA due to bead saturation (Huston, 2002).

3. Aim

To validate a manual method for DNA extraction of blood and cell stains on forensic samples using the DNA IQ™ system (Promega Corp., Madison, WI, USA).

4. Equipment and Materials

- DNA IQ™ System (Promega Corp., Madison, WI, USA); 100 samples, Cat.# DC6701), which includes:
    - 0.9mL Resin
    - 40mL Lysis Buffer
    - 30mL 2X Wash Buffer
    - 15mL Elution Buffer
- TNE buffer (10mM Tris, 100mM NaCl, 1mM EDTA, pH 8.0)
- MagneSphere® Magnetic Separation Stand, 12-position (Cat.# Z5342) (Promega Corp., Madison, WI, USA)
- DNA IQ™ Spin Baskets (Cat.# V1221) (Promega Corp., Madison, WI, USA)
- Microtube 1.5mL (Cat.# V1231) (Promega Corp., Madison, WI, USA)
- 95-100% ethanol
- Isopropyl alcohol
- 1M DTT (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA)
- Proteinase K (20mg/mL) (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA)
- 20% SDS (Biorad, Hercules, CA, USA)
- 0.9% saline solution (Baxter Healthcare, Old Toongabbie, NSW, Australia)
- ThermoMixer Comfort (Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany)
- Vortex mixer
- Bench top centrifuge
- Cytobrush® Plus Cell Collector (Cooper Surgical, Inc., Trumbull, CT, USA)
- FTA® Classic Cards (Whatman plc, Maidstone, Kent, UK)
- Rayon (155C) and cotton (164C) plain dry swabs (Copan Italia S.p.A., Brescia, Italy)
- Vacuette® K2EDTA blood collection tubes (Greiner Bio-One GmbH, Frickenhausen, Germany)
- Sticky tape (BDF tesa tape Australia Pty Ltd)
- Tannic acid $C_{76}H_{52}O_{46}$ FW1701.25 (Selby's BDH, Lab Reagent >~90%)
- Urea NH_2CONH_2 FW60.06 (BDH, Molecular Biology Grade ~99.5%)
- Indigo carmine $C_{16}H_8N_2Na_2O_8S_2$ FW466.35 PN 131164-100G (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA)
- Humic acid sodium salt PN H167520-100G (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA)
- Used car motor oil, SW20/SAE50 (Caltex)
- Various clothing materials, including:
    - Best & Less Pacific Cliff, White cotton shirt, XXL
    - Big W Classic Denim, Men's Blue denim jeans, 112
    - Private Encounters, off-white nylon cami, size 14
    - Clan Laird, blue 100% wool kilt
    - Millers Essentials, blue 100% polyester camisole, size 10
    - Unknown, teal green 100% lycra swimwear
    - Leather Belt, brown

5. Methods

5.1 Cell and blood collection

Buccal cells were collected using a modified Cytobrush® protocol (Mulot *et al*., 2005; Satia-Abouta *et al*., 2002). Four donors were chosen. Each donor was asked to brush the inside of one cheek for one minute. Then, with another Cytobrush®, the other cheek was also sampled. The cells collected on the brush where then resuspended in 2mL of 0.9% saline solution. Multiple collections were taken on different days.

Whole blood was collected from three donors by a phlebotomist as per standard collection procedures in EDTA tubes. Blood samples were refrigerated until spotting onto substrate and cell-counting step.

Table 1 lists the donor sample ID's.

Table 1. List of donor samples used for validating a manual DNA IQ™ method.

Donor ID
Cell samples
D1
D2
D3
D4
Blood samples
D1
D2
D3

5.2 Cell counting

Buccal cell suspensions were diluted using 0.9% saline solution to create a 1/10 dilution of the original sample prior to submitting for cell counting. All counts were performed by the Cytology Department, RBWH (QIS 15393).

Blood cell counting was performed on a 1mL aliquot of the original sample also by the Cytology Department, RBWH (QIS 15393).

5.3 Sensitivity, Reproducibility (Linearity) and Yield

Sensitivity and reproducibility of the DNA IQ™ kit was assessed using dilutions of cell and blood samples.

For cell samples, dilutions were made using a sample from donor 4, diluted in 0.9% saline solution. The dilutions used were:

- Neat
- $^{1}/_{10}$
- $^{1}/_{100}$
- $^{1}/_{1000}$

For blood samples, dilutions were made using a sample from donor 2, diluted in 0.9% saline solution. The dilutions used were:

- Neat
- $^{1}/_{10}$
- $^{1}/_{100}$
- $^{1}/_{1000}$

Mock samples were created from rayon and cotton swabs using the above dilutions. The swab heads were removed from the shaft using sterilised scalpel and tweezers. Swab heads were then cut into quarters and each quarter was then added to separate sterile 1.5mL tubes. To each quarter swab, 30µL of each neat sample or dilution was added to create a total of five replicates. Samples were dried using a ThermoMixer set at 56°C over 2 hours in a Class II biohazard cabinet.

5.4 Inhibition challenge

Quartered cotton swabs in sterile 1.5mL tubes were spotted with 30µL of neat cell suspension and were dried after each addition on a ThermoMixer as described previously. Neat blood samples were also created using the same method.

All the inhibitors except for the motor oil were obtained in powder form. Before making any liquid solution of the powdered inhibitors, research was conducted to determine the likely level of each inhibitor normally encountered in the environment (Hlinka *et al*., 2007). Each solution was made at concentrations based on the information obtained (Table 2).

Table 2. Concentrations of various inhibitors used in the inhibition study.

Inhibitor	**Excess/Neat Solution**	**Mass**	**Volume H_2O**	**Final inhibitor concentration**
Tannic acid	Excess	600mg	500µL	0.705M
	Neat	200mg	500µL	0.235M
Humic acid	Excess	1g	5mL	20% (w/v)
	Neat	0.1g	5mL	2% (w/v)
Indigo carmine	Excess	0.47g	10mL	100mM
	Neat	0.047g	10mL	10mM
Urea	Excess	0.06g	1mL	1M
	Neat	0.021g	1mL	0.33M

A total of 30µL of each solution containing specified concentrations of various inhibitors was applied to the buccal cell and blood swabs prepared above. The only exception was motor oil, where only 15µL was added to the cell and blood swabs respectively. Each inhibitor sample was replicated in quadruplicate and left to dry overnight in a Class II biohazard cabinet.

To another set of prepared cell and blood swabs, an excess of each inhibitor was applied in quadruplicate for each inhibitor and allowed to dry overnight. This process was achieved by applying another solution of inhibitor exceeding the normal level (Hlinka *et al*., 2007).

5.5 Substrates

Swabs

Four cotton and four rayon swab quarters in sterile 1.5mL tubes were loaded with 30µL of neat cell or blood sample and were extracted once the sample had dried on the swab.

Tapelifts

Two donors were sampled using the tape most commonly used within the laboratory (BDF tesa tape). Strips of tape were firmly applied to the inside of the fore arm and lifted off. This process was then repeated until the tape was no longer adhesive. The tape was wrapped around sticky-side-in, forming a cylinder shape, and placed in a sterile 1.5mL tube. These samples were created in quadruplicate. Tape was not used as a substrate in the blood validation.

Fabric

The material types tested included:

- Denim jeans;

- White 100% cotton shirt;
- Blue 100% wool kilt;
- Teal green 100% lycra swimwear;
- White 100% nylon camisole;
- Blue 100% polyester camisole; and
- Brown 100% woven leather belt.

All material types except leather were sampled and ten 2.5cm x 2.5cm pieces were cut from each material and washed in 10% bleach following an in-house washing method to remove any contaminating DNA from outside the laboratory (Gallagher *et al*., 2007b). As for the leather, one strand of the leather weave was cut from the belt and washed following the same method. Once dry, the material was then cut into 0.5cm x 0.5cm pieces using sterile techniques, placed in 1.5mL tubes and 30µL of both cell sample and blood was applied to separate pieces. Each substrate sample was created in quadruplicate and dried on a ThermoMixer set at 56°C over 2 hours in a Class II biohazard cabinet.

Gum
Two types of chewing gum were chosen: (1) Wriggley's Extra White (peppermint flavour) and (2) Wriggley's Extra Green (spearmint flavour). The donor was asked to chew the gum for 30 minutes and dispose of the gum into a clip-seal plastic bag. The gum was then air dried in a Falcon tube overnight before it was frozen for roughly an hour before cutting into 3mm x 3mm x 3mm pieces and placed into sterile 1.5mL tubes. Gum substrates were not assessed for blood samples.

Cigarette butts
Two brands of cigarettes were smoked all the way through and then the butts collected. The filter paper of the butt was cut into 0.5mm^2 pieces and placed into sterile 1.5mL tubes. Cigarette butts were not assessed for blood samples.

FTA® Classic Card punches
Eight sterile 1.5mL tubes, each containing four 3.2mm FTA® Classic Card punches, were spotted with 30µL of cells or blood before being dried on a ThermoMixer. Four replicates contained sample from one donor, the other remaining four replicate tubes had a different donor sample added.

5.6 Mixture studies

Buccal cells and whole blood were obtained from a male and female donor. Dilutions were made using 0.9% saline solution to ensure that the cell concentration was equal. Dilutions were then performed on the male sample to obtain the correct ratios.

Mock samples were created using the following ratios of female to male:
- 1:1,
- 1:2,
- 1:10,
- 1:25,
- 1:50 and
- 1:100.

A total of 30µL of the female component was spotted first on to a quarter of a cotton swab in a sterile 1.5mL tube and dried on a ThermoMixer before adding another 30µL of the male component. Samples were created in quadruplicate for all ratios, for both cell and blood samples.

5.7 Substrate size

Various sizes of material were cut from a white cotton shirt:

- 0.5cm x 0.5cm,
- 1cm x 1cm,
- 2cm x 2cm.

Each piece of material was stored in individual, sterile 1.5mL tubes and 30µL of cell sample was added to the material and allowed to dry on a ThermoMixer. The same process was followed for blood samples. Five replicates were made for each sample type.

5.8 Extraction using the DNA IQ™ System (Promega Corp.) `

The manual DNA IQ™ method used was based on an automated protocol developed by the Centre of Forensic Sciences (CFS) in Toronto, Ontario (PerkinElmer, 2004). A Proteinase K – SDS Extraction Buffer was made as per the recommended protocol. The 1x Extraction Buffer for one sample consisted of:

277.5µL TNE buffer
15µL Proteinase K (20mg/mL)
7.5µL 20% SDS

The TNE buffer consisted of:

1.211g Tris (10mM Tris)
2mL 0.5M EDTA (1mM EDTA)
5.844g NaCl (100mM NaCl)

The adapted manual DNA IQ™ protocol is described below:

1. Set one ThermoMixer at 37°C and another at 65°C.

2. Ensure that appropriately sized samples are contained in a sterile 1.5mL tube. For every sample, prepare three set of labelled tubes: spin baskets (for every tube except the extraction control), 2mL SSI tubes and Nunc™ tubes.

3. Prepare Extraction Buffer and add 300µL to each tube. Close the lid and vortex before incubating the tubes at 37°C on the ThermoMixer at 1000rpm for 45 minutes.

4. Remove the tubes from the ThermoMixer and transfer the substrate to a DNA IQ™ Spin Basket seated in a labelled 1.5mL Microtube using autoclaved twirling sticks. Then transfer the liquid to a labelled 2mL SSI sterile screw cap tube.

5. Centrifuge the spin basket on a benchtop centrifuge at room temperature for 2 minutes at its maximum speed. Once completed, remove the spin basket and collect the remaining solution and pool with the original extract in the 2mL SSI sterile screw cap tube, then vortex.

6. Add 550 µL of Lysis Buffer to each tube.

7. Dispense 50µL of DNA IQ™ Resin – Lysis Buffer solution (7µL Resin in 43µL Lysis Buffer) to each tube. Invert the resin tube regularly to keep the beads suspended while dispensing to obtain uniform results.

8. Vortex each tube for 3 seconds at high speed then place in a multitube shaker set at 1200rpm to incubate at room temperature for 5 minutes.

9. Vortex each tube for 2 seconds at high speed before placing the tubes in the magnetic stand. Separation will occur instantly.

   Note: If resin does not form a distinct pellet on the side of the tube, or if the pellet has accidentally mixed with the solution while in the stand, vortex the tube and quickly place back in the stand.

10. Carefully remove and discard all of the solution without disturbing the resin pellet on the side of the tube. If some resin is drawn up in tip, gently expel resin back into tube to allow re-separation.

11. Remove the tube from the magnetic stand; add 125µL of prepared Lysis Buffer and vortex for 2 seconds at high speed.

12. Return tube to the magnetic stand, allow for separation and then remove and discard the Lysis Buffer.

13. Remove tube from the magnetic stand; add 100µL of prepared 1X Wash Buffer and vortex for 2 seconds at high speed.

14. Return tube to the magnetic stand, allow for separation and then remove and discard all Wash Buffer.

15. Repeat Steps 13 to 14 two more times for a total of three washes. Be sure that all of the solution has been removed after the last wash.

16. In a biohazard cabinet, place the lids of the tubes upside down on a Kimwipe, in their respective order, and the tubes into a plastic rack, and air-dry the resin for 5-15 minutes at room temperature. Do not dry for more than 20 minutes, as this may inhibit removal of DNA. Once dry, screw on the lids.

17. To each samples then add 50µL of Elution Buffer very gently on the top of the magnetic pellet. Do not mix.

18. Close the lid and then incubate the tubes in the ThermoMixer at 65°C for 3 minutes with no shaking and another 3 minutes shaking at 1100 rpm.

19. Remove the tubes and vortex for 2 seconds at high speed. Immediately place the tube in the magnetic stand. Tubes must remain hot until placed in the magnetic stand or yield will decrease.

20. Carefully transfer the supernatant containing the DNA to the respective labelled Nunc™ tubes.

21. Repeat step 17 to 20, transferring the supernatant to the appropriate Nunc™ tube. The final volume after the second elution should be approximately 95µL.

    Note: DNA can be stored at 4°C for short-term storage or at -20 or -70°C for long-term storage.

5.9 DNA quantitation

All DNA extracts were quantified using the Quantifiler™ Human DNA Quantitation kit (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA) as per QIS 19977. Reaction setup was performed on the MultiPROBE® II PLUS HT EX (PerkinElmer) pre-PCR platform.

5.10 PCR amplification

DNA extracts were amplified using the AmpFℓSTR® Profiler Plus® kit (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA) as per QIS 19976. Reaction setup was performed on the MultiPROBE® II PLUS HT EX (PerkinElmer) pre-PCR platform.

5.11 Capillary electrophoresis and fragment analysis

PCR product was prepared for capillary electrophoresis using the manual 9+1 protocol (refer to Project 15 and QIS 19978). Capillary electrophoresis was performed on an ABI Prism® 3100 Genetic Analyzer (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA, USA) under the following conditions: 3kV injection voltage, 10 sec injection time, 15kV run voltage, 100µA run current, and 45min run time. Data Collection Software version 1.1 was used to collect raw data from the ABI Prism® 3100 Genetic Analyzer. Fragment size analysis was performed using GeneScan 3.7.1. Allele designation was performed using Genotyper 3.7, with thresholds for heterozygous and homozygous peaks at 150 and 300 RFU respectively. The allelic imbalance threshold is 70%.

6. Results and Discussion

6.1 Donor sample cell counts

Aliquots of buccal cell samples were counted at Cytology Department (RBWH) to determine the concentration of viable cells, in order to better estimate the number of cells at any particular dilution. A white cell count was not performed on all the blood samples, and therefore an estimate on the number of nucleated cells could not be determined.

6.2 Sensitivity, consistency and yield

To ensure the reliability and integrity of results for samples containing small amounts of DNA, a sensitivity study was conducted to determine the lowest concentration of DNA that provides reliable results. A consistency study was combined into the sensitivity experiment to determine the maximum acceptable difference between the results obtained. All samples were extracted in identical conditions by the same operator at the same time to minimise variability.

The cell sample used for the experiments was from donor sample 4A, which was counted to be around 3,680 nucleated cells (x 10^6/L). The blood sample used was from donor 6A, which was counted to be around 2,540 nucleated cells (x 10^6/L). The estimated amount of DNA present in each dilution is outlined in Table 3.

Table 3. Amount of DNA in each dilution, as calculated from the cell count.

Sample type	Dilution factor	Number of cells (/µL)	gDNA (ng/µL)	Theoretical total DNA on swab (ng)
Cells	Neat	3680	23.552	706.56000
	1/10	368	2.3552	70.65600
	1/100	36.8	0.23552	7.06560
	1/1000	3.68	0.023552	0.07656
Blood	Neat	2540	16.256	487.68000
	1/10	254	1.6256	48.76800
	1/100	25.4	0.16256	4.87680
	1/1000	2.54	0.016256	0.48768

The DNA yields resulted from extracting the above cell dilutions using the DNA IQ™ System is outlined in Table 4. Blood samples produced higher yields compared to cell samples. On average, blood samples on cotton swabs generated the highest yields. Cell samples on rayon and cotton swabs generated similar yields. All blood dilutions down to 1/1000 produced quantitation results, but cell samples only produced reliable quantitation results down to 1/100 dilution, possibly due to the effects of cell clumping.

Table 4. DNA quantitation data for diluted cell and blood samples on rayon and cotton substrates.

Sample type	Dilution factor	Theoretical Input DNA (ng)	Rayon swab yield (ng)	Alleles	Cotton swab yield (ng)	Alleles	Rayon average yield (ng)	Rayon Std Dev	Recovery Rayon (%)	Cotton average yield (ng)	Cotton Std Dev	Recovery Cotton (%)
Cells	Neat	706.56000	110.0000	18	117.0000	18	134.5400	41.30	19.04	95.2800	32.69	13.48
			130.0000	18	124.0000	18						
			160.0000	18	46.8000	18						
			83.7000	7	76.6000	18						
			189.0000	17	112.0000	18						
	1/10	70.65600	10.1000	18	12.8000	18	10.4520	1.44	14.79	10.4820	2.52	14.84
			12.7000	18	6.3100	18						
			9.5500	18	11.5000	18						
			9.0100	18	10.1000	18						
			10.9000	18	11.7000	18						
	1/100	7.06560	0.6350	0	0.0000	0	0.9254	0.64	13.10	0.1270	0.18	1.80
			0.4930	0	0.0000	0						
			1.4000	5	0.2770	0						
			1.7900	14	0.3580	0						
			0.3090	0	0.0000	0						
	1/1000	0.7656	0.0000	0	0.3630	0	0.0166	0.04	2.17	0.0726	0.16	9.48
			0.0000	0	0.0000	0						
			0.0000	0	0.0000	0						
			0.0831	0	0.0000	0						
			0.0000	0	0.0000	0						
Blood	Neat	487.68000	216.0000	18	718.0000	18	317.0000	102.36	65.00	447.0000	196.46	91.66
			447.0000	18	297.0000	18						
			215.0000	18	595.0000	18						
			383.0000	7	326.0000	18						
			324.0000	18	299.0000	18						
	1/10	48.76800	113.0000	18	126.0000	18	124.7800	28.10	255.86	97.6600	21.66	200.25
			107.0000	18	91.9000	18						
			145.0000	18	75.4000	18						
			95.9000	18	81.0000	18						
			163.0000	18	114.0000	18						
	1/100	4.87680	14.3000	18	15.9000	18	12.4800	1.62	255.91	16.7600	4.69	343.67
			12.5000	13	12.1000	18						
			13.2000	18	20.8000	18						
			9.9000	18	22.4000	18						
			12.5000	18	12.6000	18						
	1/1000	0.48768	0.7300	18	2.3700	18	0.8894	0.20	182.37	3.0200	0.85	619.26
			0.6990	18	3.1300	18						
			1.1800	18	3.6300	18						
			0.8670	18	1.9700	18						
			0.9710	18	4.0000	18						

The average yield observed within cell and blood samples on either rayon or cotton swabs were comparable (Figure 1). Some inconsistencies were present in cell samples at the lower dilutions of 1/100 and 1/1000 due to unreliable quantitation data at these low dilutions. Blood samples were found to generate higher average yields than cell samples and gave unexpectedly higher recovery values, despite the fact that the input DNA amount was 2-fold higher for cells compared to blood samples (Table 4). This discrepancy may have arisen from inconsistencies in cell suspension uniformity during dilutions of the original cell or blood sample, resulting in inaccurate estimates for average cell concentrations.



Figure 1. Average yields as observed in the sensitivity study. The yields for cell and blood samples, on two different swab types, were comparable as indicated by overlapping lines on the graph.

The dilution factor was, however, accurately reflected in the average yield for the various dilutions as displayed in Table 4 and Figure 2. An exception to this was the average yields for the neat dilutions (Figure 2). DNA IQ™ isolates a maximum of 100ng DNA as the resin is present in excess, and the system becomes more efficient with samples containing less than 50ng of DNA. Because the amount of DNA was in excess in neat samples, the observed yields varied from sample-to-sample. According to the manufacturer, the DNA IQ™ Database Protocol should be used for samples containing more than 100ng DNA to result in more consistent concentrations between the samples (Huston, 2002).

All five replicates for each neat dilution displayed the highest yields for each dilution series, as expected (Figure 2). For blood samples on rayon and cotton swabs, yields were still around 1ng for samples at the 1/1000 dilution (Figure 3).



Figure 2. DNA yields (ng) observed for the sensitivity study. As expected, neat samples provided the highest yields. Yields were obtained down to 1/1000 for blood samples and 1/100 for cell samples.



Figure 3. DNA yields (ng) observed for the sensitivity study, at the 1/1000 dilution.

When amplified using a 9-locus STR system, all neat samples produced the expected full DNA profile (18/18 alleles), although one outlier was encountered for a cell rayon sample which produced a 7/18 partial profile (Table 4). For cell samples, full profiles could be obtained for samples that were diluted down to 1/10, with partial profiles generated from samples diluted to 1/100. For blood samples, full profiles were generally obtained from all dilutions down to 1/1000. Although two partial profiles were encountered in blood samples on rayon swabs, all blood cotton swabs produced full profiles at all dilutions.

The apparent discrepancy between the results for cell and blood samples can be attributed to inaccurate cell counts or non-uniform sample suspensions when creating the dilutions, as caused by cell clumping or cellular breakdown and precipitation.

For five replicates of each dilution, consistency was observed to vary depending on the dilution (Figure 4). Consistency, as an indication of reproducibility, was calculated as the percentage of the yield standard deviation over five replicates divided by the mean yield of all five replicates (%[SD_{yield} / $mean_{yield}$]). A value closer to 0% indicates minimal sample-to-sample variation and therefore the results are highly consistent. The mean combined reproducibility for all neat, 1/10, 1/100 and 1/1000 dilutions were 35.31%, 20.63%, 62.14% and 124.32% respectively (Figure 4), indicating that there was high reproducibility between the neat and 1/10 dilutions across the four sample types, and reduced reproducibility at the lower 1/100 and 1/1000 dilutions. Overall, the blood samples on rayon and cotton both exhibited high reproducibility across all dilutions at an average of 30.54% and 22.45% respectively (Figure 5). The cell rayon and cotton samples were more variable across all dilutions, producing lower reproducibility at an average of 84.23% and 105.19% respectively (Figure 5). The poor performance of the cell samples can be attributed to inconsistencies in quantitation data observed at the lower 1/100 and 1/1000 dilutions.



Figure 4. Reproducibility between replicates for cell and blood samples diluted down to 1/1000.

6.3 Inhibition

Forensic samples that are commonly submitted for DNA analysis often contain inhibitors. These inhibitors may inhibit or significantly reduce the efficiency of a DNA extraction system, either by interfering with cell lysis or interfering by nucleic acid degradation or capture, therefore manifesting as extraction inhibitors (Butler, 2005). Inhibitors can also co-extract with the DNA and inhibit downstream PCR amplification processes, therefore acting as PCR inhibitors (Butler, 2005). For example, inhibitors such as hemoglobin and indigo dye likely bind in the active site of the *Taq* DNA polymerase and prevent its proper functioning during PCR amplification.

For the inhibition study, five substances were chosen for their known ability to inhibit PCR and their likelihood of appearing in routine casework samples:

- Indigo carmine: a component of the blue-dye encountered in denim jeans (Shutler, *et al*., 1999).
- Tannic acid: a chemical used in the leather tanning process.
- Urea: a component of urine (Mahony *et al*., 1998).
- Humic acid: a component found in soil and soil products (Tsai and Olson, 1992).
- Motor oil: contains various hydrocarbons and ethanolic compounds that can inhibit PCR.



Figure 5. Effects of various inhibitors on quant value, IPC CT and number of resolved alleles.

The observed effects of these inhibitors at neat and excess concentrations on the ability to extract, quantify and amplify various DNA samples are graphed in Figure 5. Samples were quantified using the Quantifiler™ Human DNA Quantitation Kit (Applied Biosystems) as this kit includes a built-in inhibition detector. Reaction efficiency and the presence of inhibitors can be assessed based on the performance of the internal positive control (IPC), which is known to be detected in this laboratory at around 28 cycles.

The observations that were made include:

- Samples that were spiked with motor oil, urea and indigo carmine dye did not show inhibition as determined by the IPC, and resulted in quantifiable DNA templates after extraction using DNA IQ™. The average DNA concentration observed for all samples was around 1ng/µL. The majority of samples yielded full DNA profiles, with the exception of several cell samples that were treated with urea (both at excess and neat concentrations).
- Blood and cell samples that were spiked with tannic acid did not show inhibition in Quantifiler™, as the IPC performed as expected. However, almost no amplifiable template DNA could be quantified and the majority of samples did not produce DNA profiles. This suggests that the original template DNA was degraded by application of tannic acid to the sample. It should be mentioned at this point that the tannic acid used was in the form of a yellow-brown paste substance that was applied directly to the sample swabs. The tannic acid paste, even at the neat concentration, may have been strong enough to severely fragment DNA to result in non-amplifiable templates. It was observed that three blood samples (1 with tannic acid in excess and 2 with tannic acid at neat concentration) yielded partial profiles (between 4-16 reportable alleles), and none of the cell samples produced reportable alleles. This may be caused by: (1) the concentration of viable cells in the buccal cell samples was lower than blood samples; (2) the drying of the blood stain on the substrate may have created a better barrier to protect the blood components from the degradative effects of the tannic acid.
- Blood and cell samples that were treated with humic acid in excess appeared to retain inhibition after extraction using DNA IQ™. However, at neat concentration, the effect of the humic acid inhibitor was overcome and amplifiable DNA template was purified as demonstrated by high DNA concentration yields. Residual inhibition was still present at neat concentration, as evidenced by higher CT values for the IPC (closer to 30), but full profiles were still produced. For some cell samples with humic acid in excess, the Quantifiler™ data suggested full inhibition (undetermined IPC CT and quantitation results), but two samples resulted in full DNA profiles.
- All reagent blanks were undetermined, indicating the absence of contamination in the results.

The results show that the DNA IQ™ system could be used to extract blood or cell samples that were spiked with motor oil, urea and indigo carmine at both excess and neat concentrations. Blood samples that contained humic acid in excess did not yield amplifiable template DNA, but 2 out of 4 cell samples with humic acid in excess appeared to produce full profiles. Samples that were exposed to tannic acid, at both neat and excess concentrations, resulted in non-amplifiable DNA, but the inhibitor was effectively washed out of the extract by DNA IQ™ as evidenced by the amplification of the IPC at the expected CT. Based on these results, we conclude that the DNA IQ™ system effectively removes inhibitors that are present in the original sample, resulting in a DNA extract that is of sufficient quality and is suitable for PCR amplification.

6.4 Substrates

The substrate types examined included: swabs (cotton and rayon), tapelifts, fabric (denim, cotton, wool, lycra, nylon, polyester, leather), gum, cigarette butts, and FTA® paper. Cell and blood materials were spotted on to the substrates and extracted using DNA IQ™. The results for the two different sample types are presented in Figures 6 and 7 below.



Figure 6. Number of reportable alleles and quantitation results for different substrate types containing cellular material.



Figure 7. Number of reportable alleles and quantitation results for different substrate types containing blood material.

For cell samples:

- Full DNA profiles (18/18 alleles) were obtained from samples on cotton and rayon swabs, gum, cigarette butts and FTA® paper.
- The quantitation results for most of these samples were less than 0.5ng/µL. For gum samples, the average quantitation result was 0.072ng/µL, and therefore a PCR amplification at maximum volume (20µL) resulted in a total input DNA amount of 1.44ng which is sufficient to result in a full DNA profile.
- Tapelift samples gave an average quantitation result of 0.006ng/µL (just 0.002ng/µL higher than the observed background), and yielded no reportable alleles at all.
- The performance of clothing substrates was variable.
    - Cells on denim yielded quantitation results less than 0.5ng/µL but only partial profiles (maximum 5 reportable alleles), although Quantifiler™ results did not indicate any inhibition of the IPC. The poor performance of these samples may have been a result of sample preparation due to cell clumping.
    - Cells on cotton, wool and nylon resulted in higher quantitation values than lycra, but all substrates generated a similar number of reportable alleles (mean = 14 alleles). Only 25% of samples generated full DNA profiles.
    - Three out of four samples on polyester produced high quantitation results (~2ng/µL) but all samples resulted in a full profile.
    - Cells on leather displayed an average quantitation result of 1.3ng/µL and generated more than 15 reportable alleles.

For blood samples:

- All substrate types generated full DNA profiles.
- On average, the DNA quantitation results for all blood samples was greater than those resulted from cell samples. This is as per expected and was observed previously (see Project 9 report), because the concentration of nucleated cells in the blood samples were hypothesised to be higher than the concentration of buccal cell samples.
- Because of processing error, data was not available for the following samples: Cotton Swab 4, FTA Donor B 1 and FTA Donor B 2.

The results above are initial amplification results that do not take into account any reworking options.

We found that samples on tapelift substrates performed the worst; however this was probably due to the sampling method devised for this experiment, which did not adequately sample a sufficient number of cells.

6.5 Mixture studies

A mixture study was performed as part of the validation, however the results are not presented in this document because the mixture ratio was found to be inaccurate because cell counts were not performed on the saliva samples. Therefore, little information could be deduced from these results.

6.6 Substrate size

Blood on cotton swabs produced full DNA profiles for all sample sizes, ranging from 0.5 x 0.5cm to 2.0 x 2.0cm (Figure 8). Cells on cotton swabs did not perform as well (Figure 8), possibly due to the nature of the cells and difficulties in obtaining full DNA profiles from cell samples as observed in previous experiments.

Although the same starting amount of sample was used, it was observed that the 0.5 x 0.5cm samples generated higher quantitation results (therefore, also higher yields) compared to the 2.0 x 2.0cm samples (Figure 8). It appears that extraction efficiency decreases as the substrate surface area increases. This may be due to insufficient mixing and distribution of the lysis buffer over a larger substrate surface area, causing insufficient lysis of cellular material. This observation is in line with other reports that the DNA IQ™ system works more efficiently with smaller samples (Promega, 2006). The resulting IPC CT fell within the narrow range of 27.91 – 28.43 (mean = 28.10), indicating that both small and larger samples resulted in DNA extracts of similar quality, but the overall yield was lower for larger substrates (Figure 8 & 9).



Figure 8. Results for blood and cell samples on cotton substrates of various sizes. All blood samples generated full profiles, but cell samples were more variable. The quantitation results for 0.5 x 0.5cm samples were higher than those for 2.0 x 2.0cm samples (blood r^2 = 0.9543*; cell r^2 = 0.9982; *Note: an outlier was removed from the calculation).



Figure 9. Various sample sizes resulted in similar CT values for the IPC, indicating that IPC performance is not affected by sample size, and that one sample size does not display a level of inhibition that is different to another sample size.

7. Summary and Recommendations

Based on the findings of this validation report, we recommend:

1. To enable processing of cell and blood samples using the validated manual DNA IQ™ protocol, except for samples on tapelift substrates.
2. To design and verify an automated protocol of the validated DNA IQ™ method for use on the MultiPROBE® II PLUS HT EX platforms, for processing blood and cell samples.

8. Acknowledgements

We wish to thank the Cytology Department at the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital for assistance with the cell-counting protocols.

9. References

Butler JM (2005). Forensic DNA Typing: Biology, Technology, and Genetics of STR Markers, 2nd Edition. Elsevier: Burlington, MA, USA.

Gallagher B, Hlinka V, Iannuzzi C, Lundie G, Muharam I, Nurthen T, Ientile V (2007a). Project 9: Report on the Evaluation of Commercial DNA Extraction Chemistries [Laboratory Report]. DNA Analysis, FSS: Brisbane, QLD, Australia.

Gallagher B, Hlinka V, Muharam I, Iannuzzi C, Lundie G, Nurthen T, Ientile V (2007b). Mock sample creation for cell and blood samples [Laboratory Report]. DNA Analysis FSS: Brisbane, QLD, Australia.

Hlinka V, Gallagher B, Iannuzzi C, Lundie G, Muharam I, Nurthen T, Ientile V (2007). Evaluation of the effect of inhibitors as assessed by a silica-based DNA extraction method and real-time PCR [in preparation].

Huston K (2002). DNA IQ™ System "Frequently Asked Questions". *Profiles in DNA* 5(1):11-12.

Mahony J, Chong S, Jang D, Luinstra K, Faught M, Dalby D, Sellors J and Chernesky M (1998). Urine specimens from pregnant and nonpregnant women inhibitory to amplification of *Chlamydia trachomatis* nucleic acid by PCR, ligase chain reaction, and transcription-mediated amplification: identification of urinary substances associated with inhibition and removal of inhibitory activity. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 36:3122-3126.

Muharam I, McNevin A, Iannuzzi C, Nurthen T, Ientile V (2007). Project 15: Report on the verification of automated capillary electrophoresis setup using the MultiPROBE® II PLUS HT EX platform [Laboratory Report]. DNA Analysis, FSS: Brisbane, QLD, Australia.

Mulot C, Stücker I, Clavel J, Beaune P, Loriot M-A (2005). Collection of human genomic DNA from buccal cells for genetic studies: comparison between Cytobrush, mouthwash and treated card. *Journal of Biomedicine and Biotechnology* 2005(3):291-6.

PerkinElmer (2004). MultiPROBE II Liquid Handling Forensic Workstation Application Guide: Automated DNA IQ™ System for Mixed Casework Sample DNA Isolation [PN 8842157]. PerkinElmer Life and Analytical Sciences: Downers Grove, IL, USA.

Promega Corporation (2006). DNA IQ™ System – Small Sample Casework Protocol [PN TB296, Rev. 4/06]. Promega Corporation: Madison, WI.

QIS 15396 R4 (2007). Method for bronchoalveolar lavage (BAL) cell count and differential cell count. [Standard Operating Procedure]. Anatomical Pathology, RBWH: Brisbane, Australia.

QIS 19976 R1 (2007). Automated amplification of extracted DNA using the AmpFℓSTR® Profiler Plus® or AmpFℓSTR® COfiler® kit [Standard Operating Procedure]. DNA Analysis FSS: Coopers Plains, Brisbane, Australia.

QIS 19977 R1 (2007). Automated quantification of extracted DNA using the Quantifiler™ Human DNA Quantification Kit [Standard Operating Procedure]. DNA Analysis, FSS: Coopers Plains, Brisbane, Australia.

QIS 19978 R0 (2008). Capillary electrophoresis setup [Standard Operating Procedure]. DNA Analysis, FSS: Coopers Plains, Brisbane, Australia.

Satia-Abouta, King IB, Abouta JS, Thornquist MD, Bigler J, Patterson RE, Kristal AR, Shattuck AL, Potter JD, White E (2002). Buccal cell DNA yield, quality and collection costs: comparison of methods for large-scale studies. *Cancer, Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention* 11:1130-3.

Shutler GG, Gagnon P, Verret G, Kalyn H, Korkosh S, Johnston E and Halverson J (1999). Removal of a PCR inhibitor and resolution of DNA STR types in mixed human-canine stains from a five year old case. *Journal of Forensic Sciences* 44(3):623-626.

Tsai YL and Olson BH (1992). Rapid method for separation of bacterial DNA from humic substances in sediments for polymerase chain reaction. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 58(7):2292-2295.

Managing Scientist
DNA Analysis
Forensic and Scientific Services
PO Box 594, Archerfield QLD Australia 4108

Or by telephone (07) 3274 9169