



Review

Current status and topical issues on the use of eDNA-based targeted detection of rare animal species




Sofia Duarte*, Luara Simões, Filipe O. Costa

*Centre of Molecular and Environmental Biology (CBMA) and ARNET-Aquatic Research Network, Department of Biology, University of Minho, Campus de Gualtar, 4710-057 Braga, Portugal**Institute of Science and Innovation for Bio-Sustainability (IB-S), University of Minho, Campus de Gualtar, 4710-057 Braga, Portugal*

HIGHLIGHTS

- eDNA-based targeted detection is a valuable tool for detecting rare animal species.
- Aquatic ecosystems are the most targeted using eDNA-based specific detection.
- eDNA-based targeted detection is mostly employed to monitor rare endangered fish.
- Less attention has been given to factors affecting eDNA shedding rates.
- Specificity, intraspecific variation, or species hybridization are still major issues.

GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT



ARTICLE INFO

Editor: Daniel Wunderlin

Keywords:

eDNA-based tools
Endangered and invasive species
Species-specific assays
Environmental factors effects

ABSTRACT

Animal detection through DNA present in environmental samples (eDNA) is a valuable tool for detecting rare species, that are difficult to observe and monitor. eDNA-based tools are underpinned by molecular evolutionary principles, key to devising tools to efficiently single out a targeted species from an environmental sample. Here, we present a comprehensive review of the use of eDNA-based methods for the detection of targeted animal species, such as rare, endangered, or invasive species, through the analysis of 549 publications (2008–2022). Aquatic ecosystems have been the most surveyed, in particular, freshwaters (74 %), and to a less extent marine (14 %) and terrestrial systems (10 %). Vertebrates, in particular, fish (38 %), and endangered species, have been the focus of most of these studies, and Cytb and COI are the most employed markers. Among invertebrates, assays have been mainly designed for Mollusca and Crustacea species (21 %), in particular, to target invasive species, and COI the most employed marker. Targeted molecular approaches, in particular qPCR, have been the most adopted (75 %), while eDNA metabarcoding has been rarely used to target single or few species (approx. 6 %). However, less attention has been given in these studies to the effects of environmental factors on the amount of shed DNA, the differential amount of shed DNA among species, or the sensitivity of the markers developed, which may impact the design of the assays, particularly to warrant the required detection level and avoid false negatives and positives. The accuracy of the assays will also depend on the availability of genetic data and vouchered tissue or DNA samples from closely related species to assess both marker and primers' specificity. In

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: sduarte@bio.uminho.pt (S. Duarte).

addition, eDNA-based assays developed for a particular species may have to be refined for use in a new geographic area taking into account site-specific populations, as well as any intraspecific variation.

1. Introduction

Biodiversity plays a key role in maintaining the integrity of ecosystems, by providing important services such as nutrient recycling, climate regulation, and erosion control, as well as in helping to process waste products and in promoting tourism through nature enjoyment (Dudgeon et al., 2006). In addition, aquatic and terrestrial organisms are sources of atmospheric oxygen, food, and many raw materials crucial for life maintenance (Dudgeon et al., 2006). Biodiversity monitoring is, thus, essential for assessing ecosystem health, in particular, to signal population declines in endemic or endangered species or to provide early detection of invasive species, as well as to detect changes in the range of native species in response to climate changes, which are crucial to providing guidelines for more effective management of natural resources (Navarro et al., 2017).

Species monitoring has been relying customarily on species visualization or capture and identification of specimens through diagnostic morphological characters (Qu and Stewart, 2019). For instance, aquatic vertebrates' surveillance programs traditionally employ nets or electro-fishing gear (Yu et al., 2022). However, this is a process that can be laborious, time-consuming, and deficient in taxonomic discrimination capacity, in particular for organisms low on distinctive morphological features, such as the case of some invertebrate fauna. In addition, when the targets are rare species, i.e., species with small populations sizes, or elusive species, the detection probabilities are typically low in any ecosystem and a greater sampling effort is needed to maximize the chances of species detection, which is not always feasible (Delgado, 2022; Goldberg et al., 2011; Jerde et al., 2011; Ma et al., 2022; Sgarbi et al., 2020). Although the term "rare species" is commonly associated with indigenous endangered species, non-indigenous species can be considered rare species as well, namely early in the invasion process when their population sizes are still small (Ficetola et al., 2008; Goldberg et al., 2011; Jerde et al., 2011).

The adoption of more sensitive and non-invasive methods, with higher detection capacity, can be particularly advantageous in the case of rare species detection. Methods that rely on the use of environmental DNA (eDNA) have been placed at the forefront for their great potential in biodiversity monitoring (Ficetola et al., 2008; Jerde et al., 2011; Leese et al., 2016, 2018). In addition, contrarily to customary invasive approaches, eDNA sampling minimizes or avoids any disturbance to the target and co-occurring species and sampled habitat. Environmental DNA is obtained directly from environmental samples (i.e., water, soil, sediments, air) and can exist mainly in two forms: either in whole small organisms, such as microbes, single-celled algae, meiofauna, and zooplankton or in sloughed-off cellular material that is released by larger organisms into the environment through faeces, urine, mucous, gametes, skin cells, among other particles (Pawlowski et al., 2020; Thomsen et al., 2012). Once eDNA is shed into the environment, its persistence may vary from hours to weeks in temperate waters, to several months or years in soil, caves, permafrost, or sediments (Baillie et al., 2019; Barnes et al., 2014). However, recently shed cellular material is still presumed to be the predominant source of eDNA, and detection of the target sequence is indicative of the organism's presence in the sampled system, under most circumstances (Thomsen and Willerslev, 2015).

Species detection through eDNA has been mainly achieved using two following approaches: i) targeted species detection, where specific primers are used for detection of single or few species using a PCR platform (Ficetola et al., 2008; Goldberg et al., 2011; Jerde et al., 2011; Wood et al., 2019b) and ii) community-level detection, where a complete inventory of the species, within a given ecosystem or habitat, is

accomplished using either broad-spectrum or taxonomic group-specific primers, in combination with high throughput sequencing (HTS), i.e., eDNA metabarcoding (Taberlet et al., 2012a, 2012b). In the latter case, abundant, rare, endangered, and invasive species or the diversity of a specific taxon (e.g., fish) will be concurrently assessed. The high sensitivity of eDNA-based detection and the greater probability of tracking rare species in their habitat, typically results in higher species richness estimates, associated with lower sampling costs and survey times, compared with classical surveys (Belle et al., 2019; Coble et al., 2019; Pawlowski et al., 2018; Taberlet et al., 2012a, 2012b; Xia et al., 2021). In addition, species that are present even at low abundances, such as the case of rare species, can be efficiently detected (Thomsen and Willerslev, 2015).

While the application of eDNA metabarcoding is increasing significantly, whereas studies applying single species detection are declining (Schenekar, 2023), targeted species detection is still the best strategic approach for detecting one or a few species at a specific location and time, increasing the likelihood of detection (Morisette et al., 2020). In addition, targeted detection is particularly advantageous for "finding the needle in the haystack" and when the target is of high risk if it goes undetected (Harper et al., 2018b; Morisette et al., 2020). For instance, to detect an invasive species early in the invasion process, knowing the characteristics of the target species and being in the right place, at the right time, and using the most appropriate tools increases the chances of successfully addressing a bioinvasion, in an effective and cost-efficient manner (Morisette et al., 2020). In addition, when using community-level assessments such as eDNA metabarcoding, the co-occurrence of abundant species can reduce the probabilities of rare species detection (Gargan et al., 2022; Harper et al., 2018b; Rojahn et al., 2021).

Since the pioneer studies of Ficetola et al. (2008), Goldberg et al. (2011), Jerde et al. (2011), among others, consisting on the targeted detection of invasive and rare animal species, that the employment of eDNA-based tools for monitoring species of conservation interest has been rising dramatically (Belle et al., 2019; Bohmann et al., 2014; Rees et al., 2014; Thomsen et al., 2012). Thus, given the considerable amount of information already existing, an appraisal of the use of eDNA-based targeted detection is timely and much needed. To that end, we conducted a comprehensive review to analyse what geographic regions and ecosystems have been mostly surveyed, the taxonomic groups that have been targeted and species status (i.e., endangered or invasive), the platforms employed, as well as the DNA markers and length, and assays that have been already implemented by environmental managers to support conservation-related decisions. In addition, we also assessed potential gaps and biases, as well as the greatest challenges that are still to be addressed, and recommend future development in the context of biological conservation.

2. Methods

We performed a literature search by querying the Web of Science for articles in which eDNA-based tools were used for detecting rare species, on July 1st, 2022. The search was limited to titles, abstracts, and keywords (search by topic), that contained the terms "environmental DNA" OR "eDNA" and terms categorizing the target groups, namely "rare" OR "elusive" OR "endangered" OR "threatened" OR "imperiled" OR "imperilled" OR "vulnerable" OR "invasive". The search retrieved 1049 articles, published between 2006 and 2022 (until 30th June). In addition, a search was conducted in the journal "Environmental DNA", a recent peer-reviewed journal (2019) that is not yet indexed in the Web of Science, although it has a very relevant scope for this review. For this search the same terms categorizing the target groups specified above

were used. The search retrieved 276 articles published between 1st May 2019 and 30th June 2022. After individual inspection, we retained 549 articles published between 2008 and 2022 (Tables S1, S2) for conducting our analysis, namely 460 articles from the Web of Science (Table S1) and 89 articles from the journal "Environmental DNA" (Table S2). Papers that were not primary research articles (e.g., reviews) or surveyed the biodiversity of whole communities using eDNA metabarcoding were excluded from the analysis. Furthermore, studies were included in the analysis only if they specified that the aim was to target one or a few rare/elusive species. Since our survey is focused on animals, studies aiming at other taxonomic groups such as plants, fungi, bacteria, and protists, among others, were also excluded.

From each selected publication we retrieved the following information: i) the geographic area/country, ii) the environment (e.g., terrestrial, freshwater, and marine), iii) the type of environmental sample (e.g., water, sediment, soil, among others), iv) if the study was conducted in the field or a controlled environment (e.g., aquarium, mesocosms, lab), v) the targeted species, the respective taxonomic classification and species category (i.e., endangered, invasive), vi) the targeted molecular markers and segments length (bp) and vii) the platforms employed (e.g., cPCR, qPCR) (Tables S1, S2). We did not analyse in detail all protocols used through the analytical chain of eDNA-based targeted detection (i.e., sampling, eDNA capture, eDNA extraction protocols), since these have been already the target of previous reviews (Doi et al., 2021; Kumar et al., 2020; Lear et al., 2018; Rees et al., 2014; Shu et al., 2020; Tsuji et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2021).

3. Results and discussion

In spite of our efforts to conduct an exhaustive literature search, we cannot warrant that eventually some papers might have escaped our notice. Nevertheless, with nearly 550 publications inspected, we anticipate that any missing papers would not have any major impact in our main findings. Most of the original publications retrieved from the initial list in the Web of Science search belonged to the categories of Ecology, Biodiversity Conservation, Environmental Sciences, and Marine and Freshwater Biology (Fig. S1). A detailed analysis of the 549 articles retained, indicated that papers addressing the use of eDNA-based tools for the targeted detection of rare animal species have been published in 125 scientific journals (Tables S1, S2), but only 26 journals have been selected in >1 % of the publications (at least 6 publications) (Fig. S2). The most frequently selected journal was Environmental DNA (89 publications), followed by PLoS ONE (54 publications) and Conservation Genetics Resources (27) (Fig. S2, Tables S1, S2).

Since the pioneer study of Ficetola et al. (2008), which developed a species-specific assay for detecting the invasive bullfrog using water eDNA collected in French wetlands, the number of publications addressing eDNA-targeted detection in biological conservation studies has grown rapidly, with a particularly steep trend from 2016 onwards (Fig. 1). Indeed, the number of publications increased at a rate of 7.2 papers/year between 2008 and 2015, while a rate of 77.3 papers/year was found between 2016 and 2022 (Fig. 1), which is congruent with the increasing adoption of eDNA-based tools in the last few years (e.g., Bernatchez, 2019; Minamoto, 2022; Nordstrom et al., 2022; Schenekar, 2023).

3.1. eDNA-based targeted detection of rare animal species has been applied mainly in aquatic ecosystems of the Northern Hemisphere

Most of the studies analysed in the current review have been conducted in a single geographic region targeting species with restrictive distributions (e.g., Fukumoto et al., 2015; Neice and McRae, 2021; Padgett-Stewart et al., 2016; Westhoff et al., 2022; Wilcox et al., 2014) (Fig. 2A, Tables S1, S2). A few have been conducted in multiple countries, but within a single continent (Agersnap et al., 2017; De Ventura et al., 2017; Rusch et al., 2020; Schneider et al., 2016; Thomsen et al.,




Fig. 1. Total number of publications per year (insert) and the cumulative number of publications using eDNA-based targeted detection of rare animal species ($n = 549$).

2012), while very few have been intercontinental (Meekan et al., 2017; Ribani et al., 2020; Takeuchi et al., 2019). Most of the studies have been performed in North America (48 %), Europe (23 %), Asia (15 %) and Oceania (10 %) demonstrating a bias towards the northern hemisphere, in what respects the adoption of these tools (Fig. 2B, Tables S1, S2). The geographic bias towards the Northern hemisphere has been previously documented before (Belle et al., 2019; Coble et al., 2019; Duarte et al., 2021a, 2021b; Nordstrom et al., 2022; Schenekar, 2023).

It has been pointed out that the lack of studies in the southern hemisphere is mostly due to socioeconomic constraints and a lack of supporting infrastructures required for eDNA-based monitoring implementation in global South countries, in particular in African countries (Belle et al., 2019; Schenekar, 2023). In addition, the higher number of existing legal frameworks in Northern regions such as the Water Framework Directive (WFD) (Council Directive 2000/60/EC) and Habitats Directive in Europe (Council Directive 92/43/EEC) or the Endangered Species Act and National Invasive Species Act in North America, requiring regular biomonitoring programs, may also help to explain the higher adoption of eDNA-based tools in these geographic regions.

Aquatic ecosystems have been the most surveyed, in particular, freshwaters (74 %), and to a less extent marine (14 %) and terrestrial systems (10 %) (Fig. 2C), a pattern that has been found in the different geographic regions surveyed, with some few exceptions (e.g., in North and South America and Africa, terrestrial ecosystems have been more surveyed than marine ecosystems), while multiple typologies of ecosystems have been surveyed only in approximately 2 % of the studies, e.g., freshwaters and marine (Kasai et al., 2020; Lehman et al., 2022); marine and terrestrial (Farrell et al., 2022; Steinmetz et al., 2021) (Fig. 2). This is not surprising since freshwater ecosystems are considered the most imperilled habitats in the world (Reid et al., 2019), and at least in temperate regions they have been subject of intensive monitoring due to legal requirements, as already above-mentioned. In these ecosystems, most studies have been conducted in rivers and small streams (Castañeda et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2016; Mizumoto et al., 2020; Piggott, 2017; Riaz et al., 2020; Rodgers et al., 2020), lentic ponds (Adams et al., 2019; Geerts et al., 2018; Harper et al., 2018b) and lakes (Johansson et al., 2020; Kamoroff and Goldberg, 2018), to a small extent in reservoirs and dams (Nakao et al., 2023; Sepulveda et al., 2022, 2019), channels (Beauclerc et al., 2019; Díaz-Ferguson et al., 2014),




Fig. 2. Geographic distribution of the 549 studies, separated by the environment surveyed (A) and geographic regions (B) and environments surveyed in the 549 publications (C), in %. FW: freshwater ecosystems, MAR: marine ecosystems, TER: terrestrial ecosystems, MUL: multiple ecosystems.




Fig. 3. Types of samples used in the 549 publications using targeted assays for detecting rare animal species separated by the environment surveyed and % of each sample type used in the total number of publications (numbers above bars). FW: freshwater ecosystems, MAR: marine ecosystems, TER: terrestrial ecosystems, MUL: multiple ecosystems.

caves and springs (DiStefano et al., 2020; Vörös et al., 2017) and aquacultures (Deutschmann et al., 2019; Ladell et al., 2019) (Tables S1, S2).

Although marine ecosystems and diversity are also under threat, in comparison to freshwaters these have been much less targeted, in part due to their vastness and inaccessibility, and high complexity, which made the targeted detection of rare species using eDNA highly challenging to implement (Suarez-Bregua et al., 2022). In addition, dedicated studies are still needed to understand how environmental factors (e.g., temperature, currents, tides, depth, stratification, and salinity) affect eDNA distribution and persistence dynamics in the marine environment, to optimize/support both sampling and results interpretation (Collins et al., 2018; Suarez-Bregua et al., 2022). In marine ecosystems, most studies have been conducted in coastal areas or estuaries (Crane et al., 2021; Ellis et al., 2022; Miralles et al., 2019, 2016; Yip et al., 2021), coastal lagoons (Ardura et al., 2017; Muñoz-Colmenero et al., 2018), aquacultures (Brand et al., 2022; Matejusova et al., 2021) and harbours and recreational marinas (Kim et al., 2018; Matejusova et al., 2021; Wood et al., 2017), whereas fewer have been conducted in the open sea (Catanese et al., 2022; Gargan et al., 2022; Wada et al., 2020) (Tables S1, S2).

Despite eDNA-based monitoring has been highly used in terrestrial ecosystems for assessing soil microbial communities through metabarcoding, studies are scarce on what concerns eDNA-based targeted detection of rare animal species, as indicated by our review. The surveyed habitats were variable and included farms (Macgregor et al., 2021; Maslo et al., 2017), temporary wetlands (Feist et al., 2022; Schumer et al., 2019; Tarof et al., 2021), soil ecosystems (Kucherenko et al., 2018; Yasashimoto et al., 2021), bromeliads tanks or tree holes (Barata, 2021; Mullin et al., 2022; Torresdal et al., 2017), among others e.g., honey samples (Utzeri et al., 2021), roadside drains (Smart et al., 2015) (Tables S1, S2).

Water has been by far the most sampled in all types of surveyed ecosystems (>80 % of the samples), as a result of most of the assays

being designed for aquatic or semi-aquatic species (Fig. 3, Tables S1, S2). In water, eDNA can be distributed both dissolved and attached to suspended particles, which can eventually settle down into sediment layers. However, sediments have been less used as a source of eDNA (approx. 3 % of the studies, Fig. 3). In terrestrial ecosystems it is difficult to find equivalent substrate types that effectively can capture rare animal species on land. In these ecosystems, soil (1.5 %) (Matthias et al., 2021; Neice and McRae, 2021; Yasashimoto et al., 2021), faeces and urine (2.3 %) (Steinmetz et al., 2021; Walker et al., 2017) or surfaces (2.8 %), such as from plants or traps (Butterwort et al., 2022; Feist et al., 2022; Valentin et al., 2020), have been sampled as eDNA sources (Fig. 3). Other less used substrates include gut contents (Keskin, 2016), blood from invertebrates feeding on vertebrate species (e.g., leech blood parasiting turtles, Farrell et al., 2022, or mammals, Nguyen et al., 2021), air (Serrao et al., 2021), tracks samples (Franklin et al., 2019) or body fluids (Valentin et al., 2021).

3.2. Fish and endangered species have been the main focus of eDNA-based targeted detection

Among the 549 studies, the taxonomic group for which the majority of targeted detection assays have been designed or employed is Chordata (approx. 67 %) (Fig. 4). The targeted assays within Chordata have predominantly been adopted for the classes of Actinopterygii (38 %) and Amphibia (14 %) (Fig. 4). This is not surprising since a taxonomic bias towards fish has been previously observed in freshwater eDNA research (Belle et al., 2019), due to the high socioeconomic value of most species, which include both globally invasive and endangered species. In comparison, although the importance of several groups in biomonitoring (e.g., Arthropoda, Mollusca, and Annelida) or as invasive species or pests, invertebrates have been much less targeted using eDNA-based specific assays. Among invertebrate fauna, assays have been mainly designed for Mollusca (approx. 12 %) and Arthropoda: Crustacea (approx. 9 %). In freshwaters, a previous study on 272 peer-reviewed articles, published between 2005 and 2018, revealed that the targets of eDNA research about aquatic conservation were dominated by fish, followed by amphibians and molluscs, while freshwater arthropods were underrepresented in their estimated species richness (Belle et al., 2019),

which corroborates well with the results found in the current review. These findings are also in concordance with the fact that the investment per species is much higher for vertebrates in comparison to invertebrates, for example, in LIFE projects (EU's funding instrument for the environment and climate action) (Mammola et al., 2020).

Most studies have designed assays for the detection of species within one single phylum (>95 %), e.g., Chordata: Amphibia (Fukumoto et al., 2015; McKee et al., 2015); Chordata: Actinopterygii (Clusa and García-Vázquez, 2018; Jerde et al., 2013; Roy et al., 2018); Mollusca (Cho et al., 2016); Arthropoda: Crustacea (Troth et al., 2020); Chordata: Mammalia (Iso-Touru et al., 2021); Chordata: Reptilia (Farrell et al., 2022), whereas few have designed assays for targeting species belonging to multiple taxonomic groups (<5 % of the studies) (Bronnenhuber and Wilson, 2013; Sepulveda et al., 2019; Thomsen et al., 2012; Wood et al., 2019b) (Fig. 4).

Most studies targeted a single species (approx. 69 %) or 2 species (approx. 16 %), while few have targeted >5 species (<5 %) (Fig. 5A). A total of 496 different species have been targeted on these publications (Tables S1, S2) and the taxonomic groups for which more assays have been designed are Chordata: Actinopterygii (185 species), Chordata: Amphibia (85 species), Mollusca (62 species) and Arthropoda: Crustacea (37 species) (Fig. 5B).

Endangered species (which we considered species classified in the studies as Endangered, Critically Endangered, Vulnerable, Threatened, Imperilled, and of Special concern) have been the target of most studies in particular within Actinopterygii, Amphibia, Reptilia, Mammalia, Elasmobranchii and Mollusca (264 species) (Fig. 5B, C). The high focus on endangered species can be explained by the great interest in mapping and understanding their distribution, which is crucial for conservation management. In addition, most endangered species are often rare, with small population sizes and patchy distribution patterns; therefore, making these species suitable targets for the specific detection using eDNA-based assays. eDNA-based targeted detection can indeed be used as an important supplementary tool, especially in habitats and for species particularly challenging to survey (e.g., deep and turbid waters, large rivers and fast-flowing waters, aquatic species that burrow into the substrate, such as freshwater mussels or very elusive terrestrial animal species, such as wild cats or other carnivores) (Franklin et al., 2019;




Fig. 4. Taxonomic groups for which the targeted detection assays have been designed or employed in the 549 studies for detecting rare animal species, separated by the environment surveyed and % in the total number of publications (numbers above bars). FW: freshwater ecosystems, MAR: marine ecosystems, TER: terrestrial ecosystems, MUL: multiple ecosystems.




Fig. 5. Number and % of publications versus the number of targeted species on each publication (A), number of targeted species and status per taxonomic group surveyed (B) and in general, in the 549 publications (C), and most targeted species (at least in 6 publications, >1%) (D). * Species that have different statuses depending on the geographic region surveyed (e.g., endangered or invasive). END, endangered; INV, invasive; PAT/PAR, pathogen or parasite; RAR/ELU, rare or elusive; NA, not specified.

Parsons et al., 2018; Stoeckle et al., 2021; Strickland and Roberts, 2019; Sugiura et al., 2021; Williams et al., 2017) or where monitoring using classical methods are forbidden due to the possibility in leading to habitat alterations and/or destruction (Boon et al., 2019).

A high proportion of the species surveyed had the status of Invasive (141 species), in particular among the invertebrate taxonomic groups (Fig. 5B, C). Top-rank species that have been the focus of more studies using targeted assays are all invasive species in several regions of the world, in particular, the silver carp *Hypophthalmichthys molitrix* (Valenciennes, 1844) and the bighead carp *H. nobilis* (Richardson, 1845), the zebra mussel *Dreissena polymorpha* (Pallas, 1771), the signal crayfish *Pacifastacus leniusculus* (Dana, 1852) and the Common carp *Cyprinus carpio* Linnaeus, 1758, which have been the focus of >15, out of the 549 publications (Fig. 5D). *Cyprinus carpio* and *D. polymorpha* belong to the list of the 100 worst invasive alien species in the world (e.g., http://www.iucngisd.org/gisd/100_worst.php, accessed on 09th February 2023), and other species, such as the silver and the bighead carps, are well known for provoking several negative ecological and economic impacts (e.g., in the Mississippi and Laurentian Great Lakes in North America) (Jerde et al., 2013).

On the other hand, among invertebrate taxa, a lower number of studies have been targeting pathogenic or parasitic animals, such as

small crustaceans, cnidarians, nematodes, or Platyhelminthes (Fig. 5B, C). Micro-eukaryotic parasites are particularly challenging to detect and characterize due to their small size (typically <1 μm), as well as their intracellular or intra-organellar nature, and occurrence at low densities (Bass et al., 2015). DNA-based tools can indeed circumvent some of these barriers. However, they can also face challenges such as the fact of parasitic or pathogenic DNA being present in very small amounts in ecosystems, and in some cases, access to this DNA may require disruption of robust cysts or egg cases (Bass et al., 2015), probably explaining their lower adoption.

3.3. COI has been the most used genetic marker in the targeted detection of rare animal species

Most DNA markers in these targeted assays were designed to target regions within the mitochondrial genome (Fig. 6), namely the Cytochrome c oxidase subunit I gene (COI) and the Cytochrome b gene (Cytb) in vertebrate animals (>400 cases) (Fig. 6A), while within invertebrate species there was a clear dominance of the use of the COI region for designing the assays (>200 cases) (Fig. 6B). Group specificity of mitochondrial sequences, uniparental nature of inheritance, lack of recombination, relatively small genome, and a large number of copies in cells,




Fig. 6. DNA markers that have been mostly employed in eDNA-based targeted detection of vertebrate (A) and invertebrate (B) animal rare species, in the 549 publications. NA: not specified.

make the mitochondrial genes well suited for analysing degraded genetic material (Ballard and Whitlock, 2004; Salas et al., 2007). In addition, oxidative processes that take place in the mitochondria and the lack of repair mechanisms lead to mutations in mitochondrial DNA. In particular, the sequences of the genes that code for elements of the respiratory chain, such as Cytb and COI, accumulate specific mutations which made them to vary considerably between species (Blaxter, 2003; Kumar et al., 2019; Linacre and Lee, 2016), which justifies their greater performance in targeted assays, in comparison to other markers.

Other commonly analysed mitochondrial DNA fragments include the ribosomal 12S RNA and 16S RNA genes and the control region or D-loop, which contain hypervariable regions (Habza-Kowalska et al., 2020) (Fig. 6A). In addition, we also found NADH genes to be widely used in particular for designing targeted assays for vertebrate animal species (Fig. 6A). These genes encode the NADH dehydrogenase subunits of respiratory complex I, that catalyse the oxidation of NADH by ubiquinone, and at least NADH2 has been useful to reveal genetic variation and diversity within bird species (Astuti and Prijono, 2016) (Fig. 6A).

On the other hand, nuclear markers have been much less adopted (Fig. 6). In fact, eukaryotic cells can contain up to several hundred mitochondria, but only one nucleus, and thus, can carry hundreds to thousands of copies of mitochondrial DNA versus only one nuclear genome with only two copies per nuclear gene. Among nuclear genes, the internal transcribed spacer region (ITS) of the nuclear ribosomal DNA has been employed for designing a few assays targeting invertebrate species (Fig. 6B). The ITS region contains two variable non-coding regions nested within the rDNA repeat, between the highly conserved small subunit, 5.8S, and the small and large subunits rRNA genes (Devi et al., 2022). In addition, the nuclear ribosomal DNA repeat is also available in thousands of copies in the nuclear genome (Warmerdam and Wolthuis, 2019), which facilitates its detection and is also a suitable target for the analysis of degraded genetic material. In particular, the ITS2 region has sufficient variability to distinguish closely related species (Yao et al., 2010). In the particular case of fish, nuclear DNA markers may be useful as an alternative or as an additional marker in species identification (Piggott, 2016) and potentially to delineate species boundaries and detect hybridization, which cannot be detected with mitochondrial DNA markers alone (Hardy et al., 2011; Ward et al., 2009).

Most developed assays targeted small amplicons (<200 bp, Tables S1, S2). Since eDNA is usually degraded, a short amplicon would increase the possibility of detection by PCR. In addition, it is

hypothesized that longer fragments have more potential attack points for enzymes, and other factors, thus, degrading faster (Deagle et al., 2006). In addition, in qPCR-based eDNA studies, which as indicated by our review is the most used platform (see below), the recommended amplicon size for a TaqMan probe is <150 bp. Increasing marker length may decrease amplification success (Harper et al., 2020; Valsecchi et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2018). For instance, Wei et al. (2018) found that within COI, the qPCR copy number using a shorter marker was 12.1 times higher than the obtained using a longer marker (126 bp versus 358 bp), when targeting a benthic amphipod on sediment eDNA. Similar conclusions were reached by Harper et al. (2020) when targeting green turtle eDNA in water (253 bp versus 488 bp, for D-loop) or by Valsecchi et al. (2022) (71 and 146 bp versus 216 bp, within 12S and 16S rRNA genes, respectively), for Mediterranean monk seal eDNA obtained from several sources. The use of small DNA fragments (90–120 bp) has been previously recommended to reach higher copy numbers (Rees et al., 2014; Saito and Doi, 2021a), since eDNA degradation is accelerated in longer segments. On the other hand, no difference in performance was found when comparing 12 species-specific primer pairs producing amplicons from the Cytb gene of the Yangtze finless porpoise, ranging from 76 to 249 bp (Ma et al., 2016); by Piggott (2016) on the detection of the endangered Macquarie perch in water eDNA (78–390 bp) or by Kirtane et al. (2021) (135 versus 292 bp) on the winter flounder eDNA decay rates.

3.4. Quantitative PCR has been the most adopted platform in rare animal species detection

Three main platforms have been adopted in studies aiming at the targeted detection of rare animal species: quantitative PCR (qPCR), conventional PCR (cPCR), and digital droplet PCR (ddPCR). Quantitative PCR was used in more than half of the publications (>400 publications, approx. 75 %), followed by conventional PCR, which has been employed in particular in earlier studies (Dejean et al., 2011; Ficetola et al., 2008; Goldberg et al., 2011; Jerde et al., 2011) and digital droplet PCR, adopted in more recent publications (Brand et al., 2022; Thalinger et al., 2019; Wood et al., 2020a, 2019b) (Fig. 7). However, it should be noted that the period of availability of the ddPCR technology is much shorter than the other two platforms (only since 2011). Whereas cPCR based-assays strictly test for the presence or absence of a species, through the visualization of the expected PCR-amplicon band in an agarose gel, both qPCR and ddPCR provide also a quantitative estimate,




Fig. 7. Platforms employed in eDNA-based targeted detection of rare animal species in the 549 publications examined.

enabling the quantification of the amount of the target species DNA in the environmental sample. In qPCR, the amplification products are continuously detected in the course of the reaction, due to the intercalation of a fluorescent dye or a specific probe labelled fluorescently (i.e., species-specific) in the amplification process. The amount of DNA is estimated through the use of a standard curve (using known amounts of target DNA), where the qPCR signal measurement is based on a Ct value (threshold cycle), corresponding to the point where the fluorescent signal exceeds a threshold. On the other hand, the microfluidics-based ddPCR consists of the partition of the PCR solution containing the DNA template into thousands of discrete droplets, where a PCR reaction occurs (Whale et al., 2012). Each droplet can contain either DNA molecules of the target ("1") or not ("0"), which will lead respectively to the presence or absence of a fluorescent signal. After multiple cycles, samples are checked for fluorescence and the positive fraction recorded (the sum of all "1") accurately indicates the initial amount of template DNA.

In our review, we found that few studies have directly compared the sensitivity of the three platforms in the detection of rare animal species (Mauvisseau et al., 2019; Nathan et al., 2014; Qu and Stewart, 2019). While conventional PCR is the less sensitive platform, it has the advantage of being much cheaper, faster, and simpler, it can be carried out in any laboratory supplied with basic molecular biology equipment (i.e., a standard thermocycler, and a gel casting system) (Amberg et al., 2015; De Ventura et al., 2017; Nathan et al., 2014; Qu and Stewart, 2019; Valsecchi et al., 2022; Wilcox et al., 2013; Williams et al., 2017; Xia et al., 2018a). In addition, it may be sufficient, and reliable as well, in situations where researchers and/or environmental managers only require data on the presence or absence of target species or in places with limited infrastructures (De Ventura et al., 2017; Nathan et al.,

2014). For instance, De Ventura et al. (2017) found cPCR less prone to false positives and negatives (since it has lower sensitivity) than qPCR.

While both qPCR and ddPCR have been found to produce either similar estimates of DNA concentrations (Nathan et al., 2014) or strong relationships between marker copy numbers and abundances (Wood et al., 2019b), most studies found ddPCR more sensitive than qPCR. This may be because in ddPCR each sample is partitioned into 15,000–20,000 microfluidic droplets (see above), where the amplification reaction occurs independently and concentrations of PCR inhibitors can be strongly reduced (Banks et al., 2021; Brys et al., 2021; Doi et al., 2015; Hunter et al., 2017; Jerde et al., 2016; Mauvisseau et al., 2019; Williams et al., 2017; Wood et al., 2019a).

On the other hand, eDNA metabarcoding has been rarely employed in the targeted detection of rare animal species (Aylward et al., 2018; Balasingham et al., 2018; Crane et al., 2021; Marshall et al., 2022; Peterson et al., 2022; Rojahn et al., 2021; Stepien et al., 2019). In this approach, sequences belonging to multiple species are obtained from complex environmental samples via HTS, using short regions of one or a few marker genes, which are targeted with broad-spectrum or group-specific primers (Deiner et al., 2017; Taberlet et al., 2012a). Comparisons between metabarcoding and targeted approaches indicated that qPCR or cPCR or ddPCR are more sensitive in the detection of single species or a small set of species, in particular when the target DNA occurs at low densities (Banks et al., 2021; Blackman et al., 2020, 2018; Bylemans et al., 2019; Harper et al., 2018a; Moss et al., 2022; Roy et al., 2018). For instance, qPCR was highly effective in detecting the invasive tunicate *Didemnum vexillum* Kott, 2002 from seawater eDNA, whereas metabarcoding was unable to recover it, even at locations where it is known to be present, but detected several other established invasive species (Gargan et al., 2022). DNA metabarcoding prime application is for characterizing the taxonomic composition of whole communities, which can be particularly advantageous when several target species need to be simultaneously detected and identified (Roy et al., 2018; Thomsen et al., 2012), but it is less effective for sensitive and cost-effective screening of specific species (Roy et al., 2018). The choice between active versus passive surveillance for rare species depends on the study-specific aims. Active surveillance is highly sensitive in detecting rare DNA, while passive surveillance has the potential to identify unforeseen species, including early detection of invasive species. Therefore, employing a combination of active and passive surveillance using the same eDNA sample can provide significant advantages in invasive species management (Blackman et al., 2020; Simmons et al., 2016). Nevertheless, a few targeted metabarcoding assays have been already employed to simultaneously identify and distinguish closely related species [e.g., *D. polymorpha* and *D. rostriformis* (Deshayes, 1838) (Marshall and Stepien, 2019); *Hippocampus subelongatus* Castelnau, 1873 and *H. breviceps* Peters, 1869 (Nester et al., 2020)], as well as their phylogenetically-close relatives, and even to probe their population genetic structure across temporal and spatial scales (Marshall and Stepien, 2019).

Multiplex approaches have been less adopted but can be more cost-effective than DNA metabarcoding when the target is a few a priori well-known species (Jo et al., 2020b; King et al., 2022; Robinson et al., 2018b, 2018a; Rodgers et al., 2020; Tsuji et al., 2018; Wozney and Wilson, 2017) (Tables S1, S2). The use of multiplex designs can allow the simultaneous detection of numerous species, reducing processing and handling times, as well as the risk of contamination, lowering costs and reducing the amount of DNA extract required for testing (Rodgers et al., 2020; Wozney and Wilson, 2017). For instance, Robinson et al. (2018a) developed a multiplex assay for the simultaneous detection of the invasive signal crayfish, the endangered white-clawed crayfish, and the crayfish plague pathogen using eDNA, allowing assessing of potential contributing factors to native crayfish decline with greater sensitivity, specificity, and efficiency than trapping, or single-species assays. High-throughput quantitative PCR (HT-qPCR), in which large numbers (e.g., thousands) of individual reactions are run in parallel using

microfluidic or assay-printed plates to assay samples simultaneously across different primer-probe sets, may provide analyses of similar sensitivity and specificity and less laborious, than single-species eDNA-based-qPCR analyses and at a lower cost per taxon than metabarcoding. HT-qPCR has already proved highly efficient in the simultaneous detection of several trout species in samples collected from Rattlesnake Creek basin in Western Montana (USA) (Wilcox et al., 2020).

Multiplex assays may also involve the use of different genetic markers, which may significantly improve the specificity of the assay and organism detection (Evans et al., 2016) or to better differentiate highly genetically similar species (Catanese et al., 2022). For example, Farrington et al. (2015) showed that the use of multiple highly sensitive markers maximized detection rates of the invasive silver and bighead carps, greatly improving the resolution of already implemented assays in eDNA-based surveillance programs.

Recently developed genome editing tools that were originally set up for clinical diagnostic applications, such as recombinase polymerase amplification coupled to CRISPR-Cas technology (Chen et al., 2018), have potential advantages over other widely employed techniques (e.g., qPCR). Main merits include a higher ability to distinguish sympatric taxa, reduced sensitivity to inhibitors, and greater adaptability for rapid on-site detection (Williams et al., 2019, 2021). Successful applications so far involved eDNA-based detection of Atlantic salmon in Irish (Williams et al., 2019) and Canadian rivers (Williams et al., 2021).

3.5. Challenges for detecting rare animal species through eDNA-based targeted surveys

3.5.1. Environmental factors effects

Most of the experiments dedicated to the targeted detection of rare animal species have been conducted in the field (approx. 70 %) (Fukumoto et al., 2015; Miralles et al., 2016; Sepulveda et al., 2019; Wood et al., 2019a) (Fig. 8, Tables S1, S2). On the other hand, only 18 % of the studies were performed both in the field and also under controlled environments (i.e. mesocosms, aquariums, lab tanks, and artificial ponds, among others) (Dejean et al., 2011; Ito and Shibaike, 2021; Ladell et al., 2019; Matejusova et al., 2021; Mauvisseau et al., 2018; Mizumoto et al., 2018; Takeuchi et al., 2019; Troth et al., 2020; Turner et al., 2015; Yoshitake et al., 2019), and an even lower percentage was conducted exclusively under controlled conditions (11 %) (Jerde et al., 2016; Mizumoto et al., 2018; Seymour et al., 2018; Stoeckle et al., 2017) (Fig. 8, Tables S1, S2).

Experiments conducted under controlled conditions are extremely important to analyse in more detail: i) the amount and integrity of shed DNA; ii) dynamics of eDNA persistence, degradation, and transport, and iii) how taxa, sample type (i.e., water, soil or sediment) and ecosystem-specific factors (e.g., temperature, UV radiation, pH, presence of PCR inhibitors, salinity, among others) can affect i) and ii) (Table S3).ii)iii)iv)v)

Few studies have directly measured how much eDNA an organism sheds into the environment over time (e.g., Jo et al., 2020a; Kirtane et al., 2021; Klymus et al., 2015; Sassoubre et al., 2016; Thomsen et al., 2012), and most of these studies have been focussed on freshwater ecosystems (Fig. 8A) and fish species (Fig. 8B, Table S3). eDNA shedding rates have been found to depend on several factors (Fig. 9, Table S3), such as:

- i) **type of organism or characteristics of the species under analysis** (Goldberg et al., 2011; Thomsen et al., 2012), with animals with a hard or keratinized carapace (e.g., reptiles, large invertebrates with exoskeletons or shells, mussels with closed valves) shedding less eDNA than higher-secretion animals (e.g. presence of mucus and scales) (Adams et al., 2019; Danziger et al., 2022; Danziger and Frederich, 2022; Nordstrom et al., 2022), which might in part explain the higher adoption of these

tools for the detection of fish and amphibians (Figs. 4 and 5). For instance, in controlled experiments, the shed DNA from painted turtles was detected in water samples only from the highest-density, suggesting that detection in field samples using eDNA may be particularly difficult (Adams et al., 2019; Raemy and Ursenbacher, 2018). On the other hand, although most authors did not find any differences in detection rates among different fish species (Barnes et al., 2021; Kirtane et al., 2021; Sassoubre et al., 2016), significant differences were found by Caza-Allard et al. (2022) for three freshwater fishes (brown bullhead, tench, and yellow perch), probably due to distinct external characteristics that could influence the origin or state of eDNA produced (e.g., presence of mucus, presence of scales, different scales types).

- ii) **number/density or biomass of organisms**, with numerous authors finding positive correlations between species biomass, density and detection probability and efficiency, e.g., fish (Brys et al., 2021; Dejean et al., 2011; Díaz-Ferguson et al., 2014; Jo et al., 2020a; Karlsson et al., 2022; Mizumoto et al., 2018; Robinson et al., 2019; Sassoubre et al., 2016; Schloesser et al., 2018; Skinner et al., 2020); amphibians (Breton et al., 2022; Dejean et al., 2011; Goldberg et al., 2011); reptiles (Adams et al., 2019; Tarof et al., 2021); molluscs (Blackman et al., 2020; Goldberg et al., 2013; Ito and Shibaike, 2021; Mauvisseau et al., 2017; Miralles et al., 2019; Xia et al., 2018b) or crustaceans (Baudry et al., 2021; Harper et al., 2018a; Sint et al., 2022); but with no correlations or weak correlations being also found in some other studies, e.g., reptiles (Raemy and Ursenbacher, 2018), crustaceans (Danziger et al., 2022), molluscs (Sugawara et al., 2022), and cnidarians (Bolte et al., 2021);
- iii) **organism size and developmental stage**, with fish eDNA release rates being found to be higher in adults than in juveniles (Maruyama et al., 2014; Mizumoto et al., 2018), but no effect was found when eDNA concentration is adjusted taking into account total biomass (Mizumoto et al., 2018). For crustaceans, the presence of eggs increased eDNA concentrations per unit of mass (Crane et al., 2021; Dunn et al., 2017) and DNA concentrations have been found to be strongly correlated with crayfish size (Sint et al., 2022). The amount of eDNA shed by organisms can increase during breeding periods (Spear et al., 2015) and may vary considerably through time among individuals maintained under the same conditions (Klymus et al., 2015; Pilliod et al., 2014; Strickler et al., 2015). On the other hand, fertilized eggs have been found to shed little eDNA prior to hatching, but a significant and positive relationship between the number of hatched eggs and eDNA concentrations have been found for Chinook Salmon (Ostberg and Chase, 2022). In addition, the distribution of mass across individuals within a population may influence population-level eDNA production rates (Yates et al., 2021);
- iv) **water temperature**; in general, high temperatures have been reported to either produce higher eDNA shedding rates for fish species (16 °C versus 8 and 24 °C, Caza-Allard et al., 2022; 28 °C versus 13, 18 and 23 °C, Jo et al., 2020a; 35 °C versus 23 and 29 °C, Robson et al., 2016), for amphibians (30 °C versus 25 °C and 35 °C, Villacorta-Rath et al., 2020) or to not have any effect (fish: 19 versus 25 versus 31 °C) (Klymus et al., 2015);
- v) **other factors**, that although less studied, have been shown to influence eDNA shedding rates. For instance, **exposure to stress** (Pilliod et al., 2014) or **organism activity** (Klymus et al., 2015; Sint et al., 2022) have been found to increase eDNA shedding rates in amphibians (Pilliod et al., 2014), fish (Klymus et al., 2015) and crayfish (Sint et al., 2022), respectively. Therefore, high eDNA shedding rates might be also found in seasons of higher nutrition and/or activity (summer and spring). On the other hand, the presence of natural substances and substrates such as humic acids (Capo et al., 2021), sediments (Stoeckle et al., 2017), clay or topsoil (Buxton et al., 2017), the presence of other

organisms (e.g., algae) (Stoeckle et al., 2017), filter-feeders (Mächler et al., 2018), the water pH (Tsuiji et al., 2017) and current velocity (Malekian et al., 2018) can affect eDNA release or reduce the detection probability of the target organisms.

Seymour et al. (2018) defined eDNA persistence dynamics as the relationship between physical, abiotic, or biotic factors and the degradation and localized detection of eDNA in natural ecosystems. In addition, detection probability depends on the ratio between the DNA released by the organism, and the DNA degraded by environmental factors (Dejean et al., 2011) and settled, such as temperature (Kasai et al., 2020; Lance et al., 2017; Nevers et al., 2018; Strickler et al., 2015), water conductivity and dissolved solids (Tarof et al., 2021), UV radiation (Day et al., 2019; Strickler et al., 2015), acidity (Seymour et al., 2018), microbial load (Lance et al., 2017), which have been found to reduce eDNA half-life and accelerate degradation (Fig. 9, Table S3). In addition, the environmental sample type chosen can also strongly influence species detectability. For instance, target eDNA concentrations have been found to be higher in sediments than in water (Kusanke et al., 2020; Nevers et al., 2020; Turner et al., 2015) (Table S3). In addition, sediment sampling may greatly increase the chances of detecting benthic-dwelling organisms, spending most of their life near the bottom of water bodies, e.g., Weatherfish (Kusanke et al., 2020) or sea lamprey larvae (Baltazar-Soares et al., 2022). However, eDNA has been found also to persist for longer periods or in higher concentrations in sediments (Sakata et al., 2020) than DNA that is dissolved or suspended in water, mostly due to particle settling and/or retarded degradation of sediment-adsorbed DNA molecules (Turner et al., 2015). One way to increase the chances of benthic species detection may be to sample water near the bottom (Lor et al., 2020; Xia et al., 2018b), while surface sampling might be more adequate to detect species spending most of their life cycle at the surface (Moyer et al., 2014). However, within an ecosystem, the habitat type selected may also strongly influence species detection (Preece et al., 2021). While the detection of freshwater mussels in surface waters worked well in rivers; in pools or runs, these were less likely to capture mussel eDNA (Preece et al., 2021). In terrestrial samples, the choice of the sample type can be also very critical when dealing with rare species, probably due to a patchier distribution of eDNA. For instance, although eDNA from the terrestrial and small-bodied eastern red-backed salamander was positively detected in skin swabs and faecal samples, no eDNA was found in soil samples collected directly underneath wild-caught living salamanders (Walker et al., 2017). In addition, in soils, eDNA may persist longer and experience slower degradation in cooler environments with neutral or slightly alkaline pH, not experiencing high UV-B exposure or heavy rainfall. Thus, persistence and detection of eDNA might be better for burrow dwelling animals (Katz et al., 2021).

Although in most controlled studies eDNA detectability has been found to decrease with time after removal of the source DNA species, the rate of subsequent eDNA decay might be highly variable among different animals: 48 to 120 h for striped bass (Skinner et al., 2020); up to 3 days for cane toad (Villacorta-Rath et al., 2020); up to 5 days for wood frog and northern leopard frog tadpoles (Breton et al., 2022); up to 7 days for the signal crayfish (Harper et al., 2018a); up to 174 h for Atlantic sturgeon (Plough et al., 2021); 21 to 44 days for the New Zealand mud snail (Goldberg et al., 2013); <1 month for the American bullfrog and the Siberian sturgeon (Dejean et al., 2011); at least 1 month for the Bighead carp (after carcasses deposition) (Table S3). However, eDNA persistence has been also shown to be highly dependent on organisms' density (Dejean et al., 2011; Goldberg et al., 2013; Harper et al., 2018a). For instance, Harper et al. (2018a) were able to detect signal crayfish DNA 7 days after organisms' removal in high-density tanks, but only after 72 h in low-density tanks. In addition, controlled studies indicated that positive eDNA detections can also be achieved with dead organisms: fish carcasses (Kamoroff and Goldberg, 2018); crustaceans' carcasses (Curtis and Larson, 2020) or molluscs empty shells (Rasmussen et al.,

2021), but the distance from the source seems to reduce the chances of detection, decreasing the probability of getting false positives (experiments with fish species in cages and with molluscs) (Dunker et al., 2016; Robinson et al., 2019; Xia et al., 2018a). The study by Blackman et al. (2020) found that the most significant predictor of quagga mussel DNA copy number and relative read count was the distance from the source population, even more than density. Even so, previous findings pointed out that for non-benthic species eDNA can be patchily distributed horizontally, even at a small spatial scale of tens to hundreds of meters (Eichmiller et al., 2014) and persist over relatively large distances from the established populations of the target organisms in natural river systems (few meters to several km; Deiner and Altermatt, 2014; Laporte et al., 2020; Preece et al., 2021; Wood et al., 2020b). For example, Laramie et al. (2015) did not find any consistent relationship between stream distance and eDNA concentrations of the chinook salmon. In addition, the transport of eDNA via predatory species (e.g., piscivorous birds) or deposition in slime residues and predator faeces can also be effective sources of eDNA, eventually leading to false positives in unpopulated habitats (Guilfoyle et al., 2017; Merkes et al., 2014).

In marine and terrestrial systems, controlled studies on eDNA persistence have been rarer. Marine systems present a set of features that differ from freshwaters, in what respects eDNA stability. Several studies indicate that eDNA degrades generally faster in marine systems (Sassoubre et al., 2016; Thomsen et al., 2012), however, in laboratory trials after organisms' removal, the DNA of the Mediterranean fanworm and the club tunicate was still detectable up to 94 h (Wood et al., 2020a) and up to 9 days after jellyfish removal (Bolte et al., 2021). In addition, Saito and Doi (2021b) found eDNA to similarly decrease exponentially in both sea and pond samples. On the other hand, experiments with terrestrial snakes also demonstrated that eDNA declined up to approximately one week after organism removal (Kucherenko et al., 2018; Ratsch et al., 2020; Walker et al., 2017), but was still amplifiable after 7 days in controlled experiments with DNA from a terrestrial small bodied salamander (Walker et al., 2017).

3.5.2. Closely related and co-occurring species, species hybridization and intra-genetic variation

The accuracy of the targeted assays for detecting rare animal species strongly depends on the availability of genetic data from closely related co-occurring species. Such data is crucial to assess assays' genetic markers and primers' specificity. Lack of sufficient specificity can result in both false positive and negative results, particularly in the presence of abundant and related species (Wilcox et al., 2014). In addition, closely-related species may hybridize (Antognazza et al., 2019; Farley et al., 2018; Fukumoto et al., 2015), which can further complicate the design of specific assays able to distinguish hybrids from non-hybrids, because of the maternal inheritance of mitochondrial DNA. This might be circumvented by using nuclear genes, but often the most popular nuclear targets currently available have an insufficient taxonomic resolution. The case is even more problematic when the target endemic species is closely related to an invasive exotic species (Fukumoto et al., 2015). For instance, a DNA-based survey for giant salamanders *Andrias japonicus* (Temminck, 1836) in the Katsura River basin performed by the Kyoto City Government in 2012, revealed that only 25 out of 125 captured individuals were pure endemic species, 6 were exotic [Chinese giant salamander, *Andrias davidianus* (Blanchard, 1871)], and 76 were hybrids (Fukumoto et al., 2015).

Designing highly species-specific primers for closely related species can be challenging since they can share high homology in the mitochondrial sequences. One way of increasing specificity is to use blocking primers (Wilcox et al., 2014). For instance, the addition of a blocking primer substantially increased assay specificity, without compromising sensitivity or quantification ability in a study using a purpose-designed TaqMan assay for eDNA detection of the endangered bull trout [*Salvelinus confluentus* (Suckley, 1859)] in the presence of the closely related and more abundant lake trout [*S. namaycush* (Walbaum, 1792)] (Wilcox




Fig. 8. Type of study in publications using targeted assays for detecting rare animal species separated by the environment surveyed and % of publications using each type of study (numbers above bars) (A) and taxonomic groups that have been addressed in controlled studies (B). FW: freshwater ecosystems, MAR: marine ecosystems, TER: terrestrial ecosystems, MUL: multiple ecosystems, NA: not specified.




Fig. 9. Factors affecting species detectability through eDNA.

et al., 2014).

Other issues that can further complicate the design of species-specific eDNA assays are intraspecific polymorphisms and ambiguous taxonomic status of the target species (Dugal et al., 2022; Serrao et al., 2021; Utzeri et al., 2021; Wilcox et al., 2015; Yoshitake et al., 2019). Wilcox et al. (2015) developed qPCR assays to distinguish westslope cutthroat trout [*Oncorhynchus clarkii lewisi* (Girard, 1856)], Yellowstone cutthroat trout [*O. clarkii bouvieri* (Jordan & Gilbert, 1883)], and rainbow trout

[*O. mykiss* (Walbaum, 1792)], which are of conservation interest both as native species and as invasive species across each other's native ranges. The authors found that local polymorphisms within westslope cutthroat trout and rainbow trout posed a challenge to designing eDNA-based assays that are generally employed across the range of these widely-distributed species. In addition, in Europe, the existence of different genetic lineages within the Louisiana crawfish (Oficialdegui et al., 2019) was probably the main reason that led to the failure of eDNA probes to

detect target populations in France (Mauvisseau et al., 2018; Tréguier et al., 2014) and that had previously worked well with the less variable Chinese populations (Cai et al., 2017). For instance, to take into account intra-specific genetic variability, Serrao et al. (2021) developed three assays to detect big brown bats eDNA for eastern, western, and southern North America and were highly successful in detecting very low concentrations of bat eDNA from air, water, and soil in different geographic regions. In addition, previously developed assays that work at a particular geographic location could be unsuitable for species detection at other places due to matches with the sequences of co-occurring species (Ogata et al., 2022). Thus, these case studies reveal that eDNA-based assays developed for a particular species may have to be refined taking into account site-specific genotypes.

4. Final considerations

As demonstrated by the current review, thanks to the high sensitivity in the detection of rare and elusive animal species, eDNA-based approaches evolved rapidly, and have been extensively applied for conservation and management purposes. Indeed, studies made so far have shown the great potential of eDNA-based species-specific detection to: i) increase and improve the data available on the presence/absence or occurrence of rare species (i.e., site occupancy), leading to a better understanding of present and historical patterns of species distribution (Boyd et al., 2020; Collins et al., 2019; Macgregor et al., 2021; Pitt et al., 2017; Sigsgaard et al., 2015; Tingley et al., 2019; Turner et al., 2015), ii) evaluate the success of restoration implementation efforts of endangered species (Budd et al., 2021; Feist et al., 2022; Goldberg et al., 2018; Hempel et al., 2020; Hossack et al., 2022; Kamoroff and Goldberg, 2018; Wineland et al., 2019), iii) early detect non-indigenous and invasive species (Créach et al., 2022; Koel et al., 2020; Sepulveda et al., 2019), iv) confirm eradication of invaders, namely where positive eDNA detections can trigger more in-depth sampling to find invasive specimens and remove them before native species reintroductions, or to postpone native species re-introductions, while invasives are still in place (Bylemans et al., 2016; Carim et al., 2020; Dunker et al., 2016; Furlan et al., 2019; García-Díaz et al., 2017; Miralles et al., 2016; Robinson et al., 2019; Schumer et al., 2019); v) construct exclusion barriers to prevent invasives spread (Bylemans et al., 2016; Carim et al., 2020; Hunter et al., 2019; Miralles et al., 2016) and vi) better estimate range limits, of both endangered or invasive species (e.g., Gargan et al., 2022; Rose et al., 2019; Westhoff et al., 2022). However, it remains less clear how results have been translated into management actions (Sepulveda et al., 2019), but for some species eDNA-based detection is already in place, aiding in decision-making (Biggs et al., 2015; Laramie et al., 2015). For instance, DNA-based protocols have been employed as a trigger in the surveillance of the bighead and silver carps *H. nobilis* and *H. molitrix*, in the Great Lakes region (USA and Canada), where positive eDNA detections that follow a standard and very rigorous operating procedure prompt intensive molecular and nonmolecular monitoring to locate the fish populations. In addition, the great crested newt *Triturus cristatus* (Laurienti, 1768) is the first species to be routinely monitored using eDNA (approved by Natural England in 2014), with the specific assay being offered as a commercial service by several ecological consultancies in the UK. Indeed, developers can even be prohibited from interventions in wetlands where there have been positive eDNA detections of the great crested newt (Harper et al., 2018b).

The relatively large proportion of methodological development studies we recorded, highlights the suboptimal status of many assays and reinforces the continuing need for further adjustment, validation, and optimization of eDNA techniques, from sampling, through laboratory protocols and up to data analyses. Among other precautions, it is fundamental to take into account the particular characteristics of the target species and survey sites since the dynamics of eDNA might differ drastically among taxa, study systems, and across climatic zones, and therefore, thinly customized system-specific assays are required (Harper

et al., 2019; Sales et al., 2021). In addition, beyond testing specificity, sensitivity (minimum eDNA concentration required for the species to be detected) of newly developed assays must also be optimized and verified in natural conditions to reduce the detection uncertainty. However, in a recent review Xia et al. (2021) found that for most studies using newly designed markers (82.4 %), researchers did not screen their chosen markers for sensitivity, with almost half of the studies not reporting the limit of detection of the assays. Indeed, for legal implementation end-users need to recognize the power and limitations of existing tools, to know how eDNA-based targeted detection works, what are the limitations, and what can offer to environmental managers in comparison with well-established monitoring methods (Darling, 2019). It is also vital that managers know how to use the tool in the most appropriate way, how to interpret the results, and how these can influence decisions. To this end, the availability of well-established manuals on best practices and decision-support frameworks, that account for error minimization and quantification (Bruce et al., 2021; Darling, 2019; Sepulveda et al., 2020), will contribute to higher adoption and implementation of these tools in regular monitoring, and ultimately for more accurate monitoring and conservation of rare animal species.

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitenv.2023.166675>.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Sofia Duarte: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft. **Luara Simões:** Data curation, Writing – review & editing. **Filipe O. Costa:** Funding acquisition, Project administration, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

All data used in this manuscript is available in the supplementary material attached.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the project “River2Ocean – Socio-ecological and biotechnological solutions for the conservation and valorization of aquatic biodiversity in the Minho Region” (NORTE-01-0145-FEDER-000068), co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), through Programa Operacional Regional do Norte (NORTE 2020) and by the “Contrato-Programa” UIDB/04050/2020, funded by national funds through the Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT I.P.). Financial support granted by the FCT to SD (CEECIND/00667/2017) and by the project ATLANTIDA (NORTE-01-0145-FEDER-000040), funded by Programa Operacional Regional do Norte (NORTE2020) to LS, is also acknowledged. We are also grateful to two reviewers for comments and suggestions that greatly improved the manuscript.

References

- Adams, C., Hoekstra, L., Muell, M., Janzen, F., 2019. A brief review of non-avian reptile environmental DNA (eDNA), with a case study of painted turtle (*Chrysemys picta*) eDNA under field conditions. *Diversity* 11, 50. <https://doi.org/10.3390/d11040050>.
- Agersnap, S., Larsen, W.B., Knudsen, S.W., Strand, D., Thomsen, P.F., Hesselsøe, M., Mortensen, P.B., Vrålstad, T., Möller, P.R., 2017. Monitoring of noble, signal and

- narrow-clawed crayfish using environmental DNA from freshwater samples. PLoS ONE 12, e0179261. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179261>.
- Amberg, J.J., Grace McCalla, S., Monroe, E., Lance, R., Baerwaldt, K., Gaikowski, M.P., 2015. Improving efficiency and reliability of environmental DNA analysis for silver carp. J. Great Lakes Res. 41, 367–373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jglr.2015.02.009>.
- Antognazza, C.M., Britton, J.R., Potter, C., Franklin, E., Hardouin, E.A., Gutmann Roberts, C., Aprahamian, M., Andreou, D., 2019. Environmental DNA as a non-invasive sampling tool to detect the spawning distribution of European anadromous shads (*Alosa* spp.). Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshwat. Ecosyst. 29, 148–152. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3010>.
- Ardura, A., Zaiko, A., Borrell, Y.J., Samuloviene, A., Garcia-Vazquez, E., 2017. Novel tools for early detection of a global aquatic invasive, the zebra mussel *Dreissena polymorpha*: detection of *Dreissena polymorpha* from eDNA. Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshwat. Ecosyst. 27, 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2655>.
- Atutti, D., Prijono, S.N., 2016. Nucleotide variation in the NADH dehydrogenase subunit 2 gene sequences of lorikeet (genus *Trichoglossus*) birds from Sulawesi Island. Presented at the towards the sustainable use of biodiversity in a changing environment: from basic to applied research. In: Proceeding of the 4th International Conference on Biological Science, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, p. 020014. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4953488>.
- Aylward, M.L., Sullivan, A.P., Perry, G.H., Johnson, S.E., Louis, E.E., 2018. An environmental DNA sampling method for aye-ayes from their feeding traces. Ecol. Evol. 8, 9229–9240. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4341>.
- Baillie, S.M., McGowan, C., May-McNally, S., Leggatt, R., Sutherland, B.J.G., Robinson, S., 2019. Environmental DNA and its applications to Fisheries and Oceans Canada: national needs and priorities. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 3329.
- Balasingham, K.D., Walter, R.P., Mandrak, N.E., Heath, D.D., 2018. Environmental DNA detection of rare and invasive fish species in two Great Lakes tributaries. Mol. Ecol. 27, 112–127. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14395>.
- Ballard, J.W.O., Whitlock, M.C., 2004. The incomplete natural history of mitochondria. Mol. Ecol. 13, 729–744. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-294X.2003.02063.x>.
- Baltazar-Soares, M., Pinder, A.C., Harrison, A.J., Oliver, W., Picken, J., Britton, J.R., Andreou, D., 2022. A noninvasive eDNA tool for detecting sea lamprey larvae in river sediments: analytical validation and field testing in a low-abundance ecosystem. J. Fish Biol. 100, 1455–1463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.15056>.
- Banks, J.C., Kelly, L.T., Falleiros, R., Rojahn, J., Gabrielson, R., Clapcott, J., 2021. Detecting the pest fish, *Gambusia affinis* from environmental DNA in New Zealand: a comparison of methods. N. Z. J. Zool. 48, 202–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03014223.2020.1858880>.
- Barata, I., 2021. Comparison of eDNA and visual surveys for rare and cryptic bromeliad-dwelling frogs. Herpetol. J. 1–9 <https://doi.org/10.33256/hj31.1.19>.
- Barnes, M.A., Turner, C.R., Jerde, C.L., Renshaw, M.A., Chadderton, W.L., Lodge, D.M., 2014. Environmental conditions influence eDNA persistence in aquatic systems. Environ. Sci. Technol. 48, 1819–1827. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es404734p>.
- Barnes, M.A., Chadderton, W.L., Jerde, C.L., Mahon, A.R., Turner, C.R., Lodge, D.M., 2021. Environmental conditions influence eDNA particle size distribution in aquatic systems. Environ. DNA 3, 643–653. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.160>.
- Bass, D., Stentiford, G.D., Littlewood, D.T.J., Hartikainen, H., 2015. Diverse applications of environmental DNA methods in parasitology. Trends Parasitol. 31, 499–513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2015.06.013>.
- Baudry, T., Mauvisseau, Q., Goft, J.-P., Arqué, A., Delaunay, C., Smith-Ravin, J., Sweet, M., Grandjean, F., 2021. Mapping a super-invader in a biodiversity hotspot, an eDNA-based success story. Ecol. Indic. 126, 107637. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107637>.
- Beaulerc, K., Woynsey, K., Smith, C., Wilson, C., 2019. Development of quantitative PCR primers and probes for environmental DNA detection of amphibians in Ontario. Conserv. Genet. Resour. 11, 43–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-017-0962-3>.
- Belle, C.C., Stoeckle, B.C., Geist, J., 2019. Taxonomic and geographical representation of freshwater environmental DNA research in aquatic conservation. Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshwat. Ecosyst. 29, 1996–2009. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3208>.
- Bernatchez, L., 2019. Welcome to environmental DNA! Environ. DNA 1, 3–4. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.18>.
- Biggs, J., Ewald, N., Valentini, A., Gaboriaud, C., Dejean, T., Griffiths, R.A., Foster, J., Wilkinson, J.W., Arnell, A., Brotherton, P., Williams, P., Dunn, F., 2015. Using eDNA to develop a national citizen science-based monitoring programme for the great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*). Biol. Conserv. 183, 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.029>.
- Blackman, R.C., Häneling, B., Lawson-Handley, L., 2018. The use of environmental DNA as an early warning tool in the detection of new freshwater invasive non-native species. CABI Rev. 2018, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1079/PAVSNNR201813010>.
- Blackman, R.C., Ling, K.K.S., Harper, L.R., Shum, P., Häneling, B., Lawson-Handley, L., 2020. Targeted and passive environmental DNA approaches outperform established methods for detection of quagga mussels, *Dreissena rostriformis bugensis* in flowing water. Ecol. Evol. 10, 13248–13259. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ee3.6921>.
- Blaxter, M., 2003. Counting angels with DNA. Nature 421, 122–123. <https://doi.org/10.1038/421122a>.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2014.04.003>.
- Bolte, B., Goldsbury, J., Huerlimann, R., Jerry, D., Kingsford, M., 2021. Validation of eDNA as a viable method of detection for dangerous cubozoan jellyfish. Environ. DNA 3, 769–779. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.181>.
- Boon, P.J., Cooksley, S.L., Geist, J., Killeen, I.J., Moorkens, E.A., Sime, I., 2019. Developing a standard approach for monitoring freshwater pearl mussel (*Margaritifera margaritifera*) populations in European rivers. Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshwat. Ecosyst. 29, 1365–1379. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3016>.
- Boyd, S.H., Niemiller, K.D.K., Dooley, K.E., Nix, J., Niemiller, M.L., 2020. Using environmental DNA methods to survey for rare groundwater fauna: detection of an endangered endemic cave crayfish in northern Alabama. PLoS ONE 15, e0242741. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242741>.
- Brand, S.C., Jeffs, A.G., Von Ammon, U., Zaiko, A., 2022. Assessing the presence, settlement and growth of the invasive Mediterranean fanworm, *Sabella spallanzanii*, on mussel farms. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 554, 151767. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2022.151767>.
- Breton, B.A., Beatty, L., Bennett, A.M., Kyle, C.J., Lesbarrères, D., Vilaça, S.T., Wikstrom, M.J.H., Wilson, C.C., Murray, D.L., 2022. Testing the effectiveness of environmental DNA (eDNA) to quantify larval amphibian abundance. Environ. DNA 4, 1229–1240. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.332>.
- Bronnenhuber, J.E., Wilson, C.C., 2013. Combining species-specific COI primers with environmental DNA analysis for targeted detection of rare freshwater species. Conserv. Genet. Resour. 5, 971–975. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-013-9946-0>.
- Bruce, K., Blackman, R., Bourlat, S.J., Hellström, A.M., Bakker, J., Bista, I., Bohmann, K., Bouchez, A., Brys, R., Clark, K., Elbrecht, V., Fazi, S., Fonseca, V., Häneling, B., Leese, F., Mächler, E., Mahon, A.R., Meissner, K., Parksep, K., Pawłowski, J., Schmidt Yáñez, P., Seymour, M., Thaler, B., Valentini, A., Woodcock, P., Traugott, M., Vasselon, V., Deiner, K., 2021. A Practical Guide to DNA-based Methods for Biodiversity Assessment. Pensoft Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.3897/ab.e68634>.
- Brys, R., Halfmaerten, D., Neyrinck, S., Mauvisseau, Q., Auwerx, J., Sweet, M., Mergeay, J., 2021. Reliable eDNA detection and quantification of the European weather loach (*Misgurnus fossilis*). J. Fish Biol. 98, 399–414. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.14315>.
- Budd, A.M., Cooper, M.K., Port, A.L., Schilz, T., Mills, M.S., Deinhart, M.E., Huerlimann, R., Strugnell, J.M., 2021. First detection of critically endangered scalloped hammerhead sharks (*Sphyrna lewini*) in Guam, Micronesia, in five decades using environmental DNA. Ecol. Indic. 127, 107649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107649>.
- Butterwort, V., Dansby, H., Zink, F.A., Tembrok, L.R., Gilligan, T.M., Godoy, A., Braswell, W.E., Kawahara, A.Y., 2022. A DNA extraction method for insects from sticky traps: targeting a low abundance pest, *Phthorimaea absoluta* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae), in mixed species communities. J. Econ. Entomol. 115, 844–851. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/toac046>.
- Buxton, A.S., Groombridge, J.J., Griffiths, R.A., 2017. Is the detection of aquatic environmental DNA influenced by substrate type? PLoS ONE 12, e0183371. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0183371>.
- Bylemans, J., Furlan, E.M., Pearce, L., Daly, T., Gleeson, D.M., 2016. Improving the containment of a freshwater invader using environmental DNA (eDNA) based monitoring. Biol. Invasions 18, 3081–3089. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-016-1203-5>.
- Bylemans, J., Gleeson, D.M., Duncan, R.P., Hardy, C.M., Furlan, E.M., 2019. A performance evaluation of targeted eDNA and eDNA metabarcoding analyses for freshwater fishes. Environ. DNA 1, 402–414. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.41>.
- Cai, W., Ma, Z., Yang, C., Wang, L., Wang, W., Zhao, G., Geng, Y., Yu, D.W., 2017. Using eDNA to detect the distribution and density of invasive crayfish in the Honghe-Hani rice terrace World Heritage site. PLoS ONE 12, e0177724. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177724>.
- Capo, E., Spong, G., Koizumi, S., Puts, I., Olajos, F., Königsson, H., Karlsson, J., Byström, P., 2021. Droplet digital PCR applied to environmental DNA, a promising method to estimate fish population abundance from humic-rich aquatic ecosystems. Environ. DNA 3, 343–352. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.115>.
- Carim, K.J., Bean, N.J., Connor, J.M., Baker, W.P., Jaeger, M., Ruggles, M.P., McKelvey, K.S., Franklin, T.W., Young, M.K., Schwartz, M.K., 2020. Environmental DNA sampling informs fish eradication efforts: case studies and lessons learned. N. Am. J. Fish Manag. 40, 488–508. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nafm.10428>.
- Castaneda, R.A., Van Nynatten, A., Crookes, S., Ellender, B.R., Heath, D.D., MacIsaac, H. J., Mandrak, N.E., Weyl, O.L.F., 2020. Detecting native freshwater fishes using novel non-invasive methods. Front. Environ. Sci. 8, 29. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2020.00029>.
- Catanese, G., Tena-Medialdea, J., Dajković, M.A.B., Mičić, M., García-March, J.R., 2022. An incubation water eDNA method for a non-destructive rapid molecular identification of *Pinna nobilis* and *Pinna rudis* bivalve juveniles. MethodsX 9, 101708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2022.101708>.
- Caza-Allard, I., Laporte, M., Côté, G., April, J., Bernatchez, L., 2022. Effect of biotic and abiotic factors on the production and degradation of fish environmental DNA: an experimental evaluation. Environ. DNA 4, 453–468. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.266>.
- Chen, J.S., Ma, E., Harrington, L.B., Da Costa, M., Tian, X., Palefsky, J.M., Doudna, J.A., 2018. CRISPR-Cas12a target binding unleashes indiscriminate single-stranded DNase activity. Science 360, 436–439. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aar6245>.
- Cho, A., Morris, T., Wilson, C., Freeland, J., 2016. Development of species-specific primers with potential for amplifying eDNA from imperilled freshwater unionid mussels. Genome 59, 1141–1149. <https://doi.org/10.1139/gen-2015-0196>.
- Clusa, L., García-Vázquez, E., 2018. A simple, rapid method for detecting seven common invasive fish species in Europe from environmental DNA. Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshwat. Ecosyst. 28, 619–629. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2890>.
- Coble, A.A., Flinders, C.A., Homyack, J.A., Penaluna, B.E., Cronn, R.C., Weitemier, K., 2019. eDNA as a tool for identifying freshwater species in sustainable forestry: a critical review and potential future applications. Sci. Total Environ. 649, 1157–1170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.08.370>.

- Collins, M.K., Spear, S.F., Groves, J.D., Williams, L.A., Kuchta, S.R., 2019. Searching for a salamander: distribution and habitat of the mudpuppy (*Necturus maculosus*) in Southeast Ohio using eDNA as a rapid assessment technique. Am. Midl. Nat. 182, 191. <https://doi.org/10.1674/0003-0031-182.2.191>.
- Collins, R.A., Wangensteen, O.S., O'Gorman, E.J., Mariani, S., Sims, D.W., Genner, M.J., 2018. Persistence of environmental DNA in marine systems. Commun. Biol. 1, 185. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-018-0192-6>.
- Crane, L.C., Goldstein, J.S., Thomas, D.W., Rexroth, K.S., Watts, A.W., 2021. Effects of life stage on eDNA detection of the invasive European green crab (*Carcinus maenas*) in estuarine systems. Ecol. Indic. 124, 107412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107412>.
- Créach, V., Derveaux, S., Owen, K.R., Pitois, S., Antajan, E., 2022. Use of environmental DNA in early detection of *Mnemiopsis leidyi* in UK coastal waters. Biol. Invasions 24, 415–424. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-021-02650-0>.
- Curtis, A.N., Larson, E.R., 2020. No evidence that crayfish carcasses produce detectable environmental DNA (eDNA) in a stream enclosure experiment. PeerJ 8, e9333. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.9333>.
- Danziger, A.M., Frederich, M., 2022. Challenges in eDNA detection of the invasive European green crab, *Carcinus maenas*. Biol. Invasions 24, 1881–1894. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-022-02757-y>.
- Danziger, A.M., Olson, Z.H., Frederich, M., 2022. Limitations of eDNA analysis for *Carcinus maenas* abundance estimations. BMC Ecol. Evol. 22, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-022-01969-z>.
- Darling, J.A., 2019. How to learn to stop worrying and love environmental DNA monitoring. Aquat. Ecosyst. Health Manag. 22, 440–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14634988.2019.1682912>.
- Day, K., Campbell, H., Fisher, A., Gibb, K., Hill, B., Rose, A., Jarman, S., 2019. Development and validation of an environmental DNA test for the endangered Gouldian finch. Endanger. Species Res. 40, 171–182. <https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00987>.
- De Ventura, L., Kopp, K., Seppälä, K., Jokela, J., 2017. Tracing the quagga mussel invasion along the Rhine river system using eDNA markers: early detection and surveillance of invasive zebra and quagga mussels. Manag. Biol. Invasions 8, 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2017.8.1.10>.
- Deagle, B.E., Eveson, J.P., Jarman, S.N., 2006. Quantification of damage in DNA recovered from highly degraded samples – a case study on DNA in faeces. Front. Zool. 3, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1742-9994-3-11>.
- Deinert, K., Altermatt, F., 2014. Transport distance of invertebrate environmental DNA in a natural river. PLoS ONE 9, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0088786>.
- Deinert, K., Bik, H.M., Mächler, E., Seymour, M., Lacoursière-Roussel, A., Altermatt, F., Creer, S., Bista, I., Lodge, D.M., Vere, N., Pfrender, M.E., Bernatchez, L., 2017. Environmental DNA metabarcoding: transforming how we survey animal and plant communities. Mol. Ecol. 26, 5872–5895. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14350>.
- Dejean, T., Valentini, A., Duparc, A., Pellier-Cuit, S., Pompanon, F., Taberlet, P., Miaud, C., 2011. Persistence of environmental DNA in freshwater ecosystems. PLoS ONE 6, e23398. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0023398>.
- Delgado, R., 2022. Detecting target species: with how many samples? R. Soc. Open Sci. 9, 220046. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.220046>.
- Deutschmann, B., Müller, A.-K., Hollert, H., Brinkmann, M., 2019. Assessing the fate of brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) environmental DNA in a natural stream using a sensitive and specific dual-labelled probe. Sci. Total Environ. 655, 321–327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.11.247>.
- Devi, M.L., Thorat, S.S., Devi, K.K., Sharma, K.C., Singh, Y.D., Mishra, A., Das, S., 2022. Internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region of nuclear ribosomal DNA as a suitable DNA barcode for identification of *Zanthoxylum armatum* DC. from Manipur. Mol. Biotechnol. 64, 1454–1467. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12033-022-00518-9>.
- Díaz-Ferguson, E., Herod, J., Galvez, J., Moyer, G., 2014. Development of molecular markers for eDNA detection of the invasive African jewelfish (*Hemichromis letourneuxi*): a new tool for monitoring aquatic invasive species in National Wildlife Refuges. Manag. Biol. Invasions 5, 121–131. <https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2014.5.2.05>.
- Di Stefano, R.J., Ashley, D., Brewer, S.K., Mouser, J.B., Niemiller, M., 2020. Preliminary investigation of the critically imperiled Caney Mountain cave crayfish *Orconectes stygocaneyi* (Hobbs III, 2001) (Decapoda: Cambaridae) in Missouri, USA. Freshw. Crayfish 25, 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.5869/fc.2020.v25-1.047>.
- Doi, H., Takahara, T., Minamoto, T., Matsuhashi, S., Uchii, K., Yamanaka, H., 2015. Droplet digital polymerase chain reaction (PCR) outperforms real-time PCR in the detection of environmental DNA from an invasive fish species. Environ. Sci. Technol. 49, 5601–5608. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b00253>.
- Doi, H., Minamoto, T., Takahara, T., Tsuji, S., Uchii, K., Yamanaka, H., 2021. Compilation of real-time PCR conditions toward the standardization of environmental DNA methods. Ecol. Res. 36, 379–388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1703.12217>.
- Duarte, S., Leite, B., Feio, M., Costa, F., Filipe, A., 2021a. Integration of DNA-based approaches in aquatic ecological assessment using benthic macroinvertebrates. Water 13, 331. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w13030331>.
- Duarte, S., Vieira, P.E., Lavrador, A.S., Costa, F.O., 2021b. Status and prospects of marine NIS detection and monitoring through (e)DNA metabarcoding. Sci. Total Environ. 751, 141729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141729>.
- Dudgeon, D., Arthington, A.H., Gessner, M.O., Kawabata, Z.-I., Knowler, D.J., Lévéque, C., Naiman, R.J., Prieur-Richard, A.-H., Soto, D., Stiassny, M.L.J., Sullivan, C.A., 2006. Freshwater biodiversity: importance, threats, status and conservation challenges. Biol. Rev. 81, 163. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1464793105006950>.
- Dugal, L., Thomas, L., Jensen, M.R., Sigsgaard, E.E., Simpson, T., Jarman, S., Thomsen, P., Meekan, M., 2022. Individual haplotyping of whale sharks from seawater environmental DNA. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 22, 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13451>.
- Dunker, K.J., Sepulveda, A.J., Massengill, R.L., Olsen, J.B., Russ, O.L., Wenburg, J.K., Antonovich, A., 2016. Potential of environmental DNA to evaluate Northern Pike (*Esox lucius*) eradication efforts: an experimental test and case study. PLoS ONE 11, e0162277. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162277>.
- Dunn, N., Priestley, V., Herreira, A., Arnold, R., Savolainen, V., 2017. Behavior and season affect crayfish detection and density inference using environmental DNA. Ecol. Evol. 7, 7777–7785. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eece.3.3316>.
- Eichmiller, J.J., Bajer, P.G., Sorensen, P.W., 2014. The relationship between the distribution of common carp and their environmental DNA in a small lake. PLoS ONE 9, e112611. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0112611>.
- Ellis, M.R., Clark, Z.S.R., Trembl, E.A., Brown, M.S., Matthews, T.G., Pocklington, J.B., Stafford-Bell, R.E., Bott, N.J., Nai, Y.H., Miller, A.D., Sherman, C.D.H., 2022. Detecting marine pests using environmental DNA and biophysical models. Sci. Total Environ. 816, 151666. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151666>.
- Evans, N.T., Olds, B.P., Renshaw, M.A., Turner, C.R., Li, Y., Jerde, C.L., Mahon, A.R., Pfrender, M.E., Lamberti, G.A., Lodge, D.M., 2016. Quantification of mesocosm fish and amphibian species diversity via environmental DNA metabarcoding. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 16, 29–41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12433>.
- Farley, N.J., Vasquez, A.A., Kik, R., David, S.R., Katailiha, A.S., Walker, X.N., Ram, J.L., 2018. Primer designs for identification and environmental DNA (eDNA) detection of gars. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 147, 687–695. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tafs.10043>.
- Farrell, J.A., Whitmore, L., Mashkour, N., Rollinson, Ramia, D.R., Thomas, R.S., Eastman, C.B., Burkhalter, B., Yetsko, K., Mott, C., Wood, L., Zirklebach, B., Meers, L., Kleinsasser, P., Stock, S., Libert, E., Herren, R., Eastman, S., Crowder, W., Bovery, C., Anderson, D., Godfrey, D., Condon, N., Duffy, D.J., 2022. Detection and population genomics of sea turtle species via noninvasive environmental DNA analysis of nesting beach sand tracks and oceanic water. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 22, 2471–2493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13617>.
- Farrington, H.L., Edwards, C.E., Guan, X., Carr, M.R., Baerwaldt, K., Lance, R.F., 2015. Mitochondrial genome sequencing and development of genetic markers for the detection of DNA of invasive Bighead and Silver Carp (*Hypophthalmichthys nobilis* and *H. molitrix*) in environmental water samples from the United States. PLoS ONE 10, e0117803. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0117803>.
- Feist, S.M., Guan, X., Malmfeldt, M.P., Lance, R.F., 2022. Two novel qPCR assays to enhance black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis*) eDNA surveys in the United States. Conserv. Genet. Resour. 14, 321–329. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-022-01279-y>.
- Ficetola, G.F., Miaud, C., Pompanon, F., Taberlet, P., 2008. Species detection using environmental DNA from water samples. Biol. Lett. 4, 423–425. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2008.0118>.
- Franklin, T.W., McKelvey, K.S., Golding, J.D., Mason, D.H., Dysthe, J.C., Pilgrim, K.L., Squires, J.R., Aubrey, K.B., Long, R.A., Greaves, S.E., Raley, C.M., Jackson, S., MacKay, P., Lisbon, J., Sauder, J.D., Pruss, M.T., Heffington, D., Schwartz, M.K., 2019. Using environmental DNA methods to improve winter surveys for rare carnivores: DNA from snow and improved noninvasive techniques. Biol. Conserv. 229, 50–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bioco.2018.11.006>.
- Fukumoto, S., Ushimaru, A., Minamoto, T., 2015. A basin-scale application of environmental DNA assessment for rare endemic species and closely related exotic species in rivers: a case study of giant salamanders in Japan. J. Appl. Ecol. 52, 358–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12392>.
- Furlan, E.M., Gleeson, D., Wisniewski, C., Yick, J., Duncan, R.P., 2019. eDNA surveys to detect species at very low densities: a case study of European carp eradication in Tasmania, Australia. J. Appl. Ecol. 56, 2505–2517. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13485>.
- García-Díaz, P., Ramsey, D.S.I., Woolnough, A.P., Franch, M., Llorente, G.A., Montori, A., Buenoixa, X., Larrinaga, A.R., Lasceve, M., Álvarez, A., Traverso, J.M., Valdés, A., Crespo, A., Rada, V., Ayllón, E., Sancho, V., Lacomba, J.I., Bataller, J.V., Lizana, M., 2017. Challenges in confirming eradication success of invasive red-eared sliders. Biol. Invasions 19, 2739–2750. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-017-1480-7>.
- Gargan, L.M., Brooks, P.R., Vye, S.R., Ironside, J.E., Jenkins, S.R., Crowe, T.P., Carlsson, J., 2022. The use of environmental DNA metabarcoding and quantitative PCR for molecular detection of marine invasive non-native species associated with artificial structures. Biol. Invasions 24, 635–648. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-021-02672-8>.
- Geerts, A.N., Boets, P., Van Den Heede, S., Goethals, P., Van Der Heyden, C., 2018. A search for standardized protocols to detect alien invasive crayfish based on environmental DNA (eDNA): a lab and field evaluation. Ecol. Indic. 84, 564–572. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.08.068>.
- Goldberg, C.S., Pilliod, D.S., Arkle, R.S., Waits, L.P., 2011. Molecular detection of vertebrates in stream water: a demonstration using Rocky Mountain tailed frogs and Idaho Giant Salamanders. PLoS ONE 6, e22746. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0022746>.
- Goldberg, C.S., Sepulveda, A., Ray, A., Baumgardt, J., Waits, L.P., 2013. Environmental DNA as a new method for early detection of New Zealand mudsnails (*Potamopyrgus antipodarum*). Freshw. Sci. 32, 792–800. <https://doi.org/10.1899/13-046.1>.
- Goldberg, C.S., Strickler, K.M., Fremier, A.K., 2018. Degradation and dispersion limit environmental DNA detection of rare amphibians in wetlands: increasing efficacy of sampling designs. Sci. Total Environ. 633, 695–703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.02.295>.
- Guilfoyle, M.P., Farrington, H.L., Lance, R.F., Hanson-Dorr, K.C., Dorr, B.S., Fischer, R.A., 2017. Movement of *Hypophthalmichthys* DNA in the Illinois river watershed by the double-crested cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*). Waterbirds 40, 63–68. <https://doi.org/10.1675/063.040.0109>.

- Habza-Kowalska, E., Grela, M., Gryzińska, M., Listos, P., 2020. Molecular techniques for detecting food adulteration. *Med. Weter.* 75 <https://doi.org/10.21521/mw.6261>, 6260–2020.
- Hardy, C.M., Adams, M., Jerry, D.R., Court, L.N., Morgan, M.J., Hartley, D.M., 2011. DNA barcoding to support conservation: species identification, genetic structure and biogeography of fishes in the Murray - Darling River Basin, Australia. *Mar. Freshw. Res.* 62, 887. <https://doi.org/10.1071/MF11027>.
- Harper, K., Anucha, P., Turnbull, J., Bean, C., Leaver, M., 2018a. Searching for a signal: environmental DNA (eDNA) for the detection of invasive signal crayfish, *Pacifastacus leniusculus* (Dana, 1852). *Manag. Biol. Invasions* 9, 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2018.9.2.07>.
- Harper, K.J., Goodwin, K.D., Harper, L.R., LaCasella, E.L., Frey, A., Dutton, P.H., 2020. Finding crush: environmental DNA analysis as a tool for tracking the green sea turtle *Chelonia mydas* in a marine estuary. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 6, 810. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00810>.
- Harper, L.R., Lawson Handley, L., Hahn, C., Boonham, N., Rees, H.C., Gough, K.C., Lewis, E., Adams, I.P., Brotherton, P., Phillips, S., Häfnerling, B., 2018b. Needle in a haystack? A comparison of eDNA metabarcoding and targeted qPCR for detection of the great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*). *Ecol. Evol.* 8, 6330–6341. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4013>.
- Harper, L.R., Buxton, A.S., Rees, H.C., Bruce, K., Brys, R., Halfmaerten, D., Read, D.S., Watson, H.V., Sayer, C.D., Jones, E.P., Priestley, V., Mächler, E., Múrria, C., Garcés-Pastor, S., Medupin, C., Burgess, K., Benson, G., Boonham, N., Griffiths, R.A., Lawson Handley, L., Häfnerling, B., 2019. Prospects and challenges of environmental DNA (eDNA) monitoring in freshwater ponds. *Hydrobiologia* 826, 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-018-3750-5>.
- Hempel, C.A., Peinert, B., Beermann, A.J., Elbrecht, V., Macher, J.-N., Macher, T.-H., Jacobs, G., Leese, F., 2020. Using environmental DNA to monitor the reintroduction success of the Rhine Sculpin (*Cottus rhinanus*) in a restored stream. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 8, 81. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2020.00081>.
- Hossack, B.R., Howell, P.E., Owens, A.K., Cobos, C., Goldberg, C.S., Hall, D., Hedwall, S., MacVean, S.K., MacCaffery, M., McCall, A.H., Mosley, C.D., Oja, E.B., Rorabaugh, J. C., Sigafus, B.H., Sredl, M.J., 2022. Identifying factors linked with persistence of reintroduced populations: lessons learned from 25 years of amphibian translocations. *Glob. Ecol. Conserv.* 35, e02078. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2022.e02078>.
- Hunter, M.E., Dorazio, R.M., Butterfield, J.S.S., Meigs-Friend, G., Nico, L.G., Ferrante, J. A., 2017. Detection limits of quantitative and digital PCR assays and their influence in presence-absence surveys of environmental DNA. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* 17, 221–229. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12619>.
- Hunter, M.E., Meigs-Friend, G., Ferrante, J.A., Smith, B.J., Hart, K.M., 2019. Efficacy of eDNA as an early detection indicator for Burmese pythons in the ARM Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge in the greater Everglades ecosystem. *Ecol. Indic.* 102, 617–622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.02.058>.
- Iso-Touru, T., Tabell, J., Virta, A., Kauhala, K., 2021. A non-invasive, DNA-based method for beaver species identification in Finland. *Wildl. Biol.* 2021 <https://doi.org/10.2981/wlb.00808>.
- Ito, K., Shibaike, H., 2021. Use of environmental DNA to survey the distribution of the invasive mussel *Limnoperna fortunei* in farm ponds. *Plankton Benthos Res.* 16, 100–108. <https://doi.org/10.3800/pbr.16.100>.
- Jerde, C.L., Mahon, A.R., Chadderton, W.L., Lodge, D.M., 2011. “Sight-unseen” detection of rare aquatic species using environmental DNA: eDNA surveillance of rare aquatic species. *Conserv. Lett.* 4, 150–157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2010.00158.x>.
- Jerde, C.L., Chadderton, W.L., Mahon, A.R., Renshaw, M.A., Corush, J., Budny, M.L., Mysorekar, S., Lodge, D.M., 2013. Detection of Asian carp DNA as part of a Great Lakes basin-wide surveillance program. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 70, 522–526. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2012-0478>.
- Jerde, C.L., Olds, B.P., Shogren, A.J., Andruszkiewicz, E.A., Mahon, A.R., Bolster, D., Tank, J.L., 2016. Influence of stream bottom substrate on retention and transport of vertebrate environmental DNA. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 50, 8770–8779. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b01761>.
- Jo, T., Arimoto, M., Murakami, H., Masuda, R., Minamoto, T., 2020a. Estimating shedding and decay rates of environmental nuclear DNA with relation to water temperature and biomass. *Environ. DNA* 2, 140–151. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.51>.
- Jo, T., Fukuoka, A., Uchida, K., Ushimaru, A., Minamoto, T., 2020b. Multiplex real-time PCR enables the simultaneous detection of environmental DNA from freshwater fishes: a case study of three exotic and three threatened native fishes in Japan. *Biol. Invasions* 22, 455–471. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-019-02102-w>.
- Johansson, M.L., Lavigne, S.Y., Ramcharan, C.W., Heath, D.D., MacIsaac, H.J., 2020. Detecting a spreading non-indigenous species using multiple methodologies. *Lake Reserv. Manag.* 36, 432–443. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402381.2020.1797957>.
- Kamoroff, C., Goldberg, C.S., 2018. An issue of life or death: using eDNA to detect viable individuals in wilderness restoration. *Freshw. Sci.* 37, 685–696. <https://doi.org/10.1086/699203>.
- Karlsson, E., Ogonowski, M., Sundblad, G., Sundin, J., Svensson, O., Nousiainen, I., Vasemägi, A., 2022. Strong positive relationships between eDNA concentrations and biomass in juvenile and adult pike (*Esox lucius*) under controlled conditions: implications for monitoring. *Environ. DNA* 4, 881–893. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.298>.
- Kasai, A., Takada, S., Yamazaki, A., Masuda, R., Yamanaka, H., 2020. The effect of temperature on environmental DNA degradation of Japanese eel. *Fish. Sci.* 86, 465–471. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12562-020-01409-1>.
- Katz, A.D., Harper, L.R., Sternhagen, E.C., Pearce, S.E., Melder, C.A., Sperry, J.H., Davis, M.A., 2021. Environmental DNA is effective in detecting the federally threatened Louisiana Pine snake (*Pituophis ruthveni*). *Environ. DNA* 3, 409–425. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.126>.
- Keskin, E., 2016. Molecular evidence for the predation of critically endangered endemic *Aphanias transgrediens* from the stomach contents of world wide invasive *Gambusia affinis*. *Mitochondrial DNA* 27, 1210–1215. <https://doi.org/10.3109/19401736.2014.945526>.
- Kim, P., Kim, D., Yoon, T.J., Shin, S., 2018. Early detection of marine invasive species, *Bugula neritina* (Bryozoa: Cheilostomatida), using species-specific primers and environmental DNA analysis in Korea. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 139, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenres.2018.04.015>.
- King, A.C., Krieg, R., Weston, A., Zenker, A.K., 2022. Using eDNA to simultaneously detect the distribution of native and invasive crayfish within an entire country. *J. Environ. Manag.* 302, 113929. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.113929>.
- Kirtane, A., Wieczorek, D., Noji, T., Baskin, L., Ober, C., Plosica, R., Chenoweth, A., Lynch, K., Sassioubre, L., 2021. Quantification of environmental DNA (eDNA) shedding and decay rates for three commercially harvested fish species and comparison between eDNA detection and trawl catches. *Environ. DNA* 3, 1142–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.236>.
- Klymus, K.E., Richter, C.A., Chapman, D.C., Paukert, C., 2015. Quantification of eDNA shedding rates from invasive bighead carp *Hypophthalmichthys nobilis* and silver carp *Hypophthalmichthys molitrix*. *Biol. Conserv.* 183, 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.020>.
- Koel, T.M., Detjens, C.R., Zale, A.V., 2020. Two ocean pass: an alternative hypothesis for the invasion of Yellowstone Lake by Lake Trout, and implications for future invasions. *Water* 12, 1629. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w12061629>.
- Kucherenko, A., Herman, J.E., Iii, E.M.E., Urakawa, H., 2018. Terrestrial snake environmental DNA accumulation and degradation dynamics and its environmental application. *Herpetologica* 74, 38–49. <https://doi.org/10.1655/Herpetologica-D-16-00088>.
- Kumar, G., Ebble, J.E., Gaither, M.R., 2020. A practical guide to sample preservation and pre-PCR processing of aquatic environmental DNA. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* 20, 29–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13107>.
- Kumar, V., Chandra, K., Kundu, S., Tyagi, K., Amin Laskar, B., Singha, D., Chakrabarty, R., Pakrashi, A., 2019. Utility of mitochondrial DNA in wildlife forensic science: reliable identification of confiscated materials from Eastern India. *Mitochondrial DNA B* 4, 583–588. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23802359.2018.1561216>.
- Kusanke, L.M., Pantelait, J., Stoll, S., Korte, E., Sünger, E., Schulz, R., Theissinger, K., 2020. Detection of the endangered European weather loach (*Misgurnus fossilis*) via water and sediment samples: testing multiple eDNA workflows. *Ecol. Evol.* 10, 8331–8344. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.6540>.
- Ladel, B.A., Waller, L.R., McCalla, S.G., Erickson, R.A., Amberg, J.J., 2019. Ethanol and sodium acetate as a preservation method to delay degradation of environmental DNA. *Conserv. Genet. Resour.* 11, 83–88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-017-0955-2>.
- Lance, R., Klymus, K., Richter, C., Guan, X., Farrington, H., Carr, M., Thompson, N., Chapman, D., Baerwaldt, K., 2017. Experimental observations on the decay of environmental DNA from bighead and silver carps. *Manag. Biol. Invasions* 8, 343–359. <https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2017.8.3.08>.
- Laporte, M., Bougas, B., Côté, G., Champoux, O., Paradis, Y., Morin, J., Bernatchez, L., 2020. Caged fish experiment and hydrodynamic bidimensional modeling highlight the importance to consider 2D dispersion in fluvial environmental DNA studies. *Environ. DNA* 2, 362–372. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.88>.
- Laramie, M.B., Pilliod, D.S., Goldberg, C.S., 2015. Characterizing the distribution of an endangered salmonid using environmental DNA analysis. *Biol. Conserv.* 183, 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.025>.
- Lear, G., Dickie, I., Banks, J., Boyer, S., Buckley, H., Buckley, T., Cruickshank, R., Dopiede, H.A., Handley, K., Hermans, S., Kamke, J., Lee, C., MacDiarmid, R., Morales, S., Orlovich, D., Smissen, R., Wood, J., Holdaway, R., 2018. Methods for the extraction, storage, amplification and sequencing of DNA from environmental samples. *N. Z. J. Ecol.* 42, 10. <https://doi.org/10.20417/nzjecol.42.9>.
- Leese, F., Altermatt, F., Bouchez, A., Eberle, T., Hering, D., Meissner, K., Mergen, P., Pawlowski, J., Piggott, J., Rimet, F., Steinke, D., Taberlet, P., Weigand, A., Abarenkov, K., Beja, P., Bervoets, L., Björnsdóttir, S., Boets, P., Boggero, A., Hellström, M., et al., 2016. DNAAqua-Net: developing new genetic tools for bioassessment and monitoring of aquatic ecosystems in Europe. *Res. Ideas Outcomes* 2, e11321. <https://doi.org/10.3897/rio.2.e11321>.
- Leese, F., Bouchez, A., Abarenkov, K., Altermatt, F., Borja, Á., Bruce, K., Ekrem, T., Ciampor, F., Čiamporová-Zaťovičová, Z., Costa, F.O., Duarte, S., Elbrecht, V., Fontaneto, D., Franc, A., Geiger, M.F., Hering, D., Kahlert, M., Kalamujić Stroli, B., Kelly, M., Keskin, E., Liska, I., Mergen, P., Meissner, K., Pawlowski, J., Penev, L., Reyjol, Y., Rotter, A., Steinke, D., van der Wal, B., Vitecek, S., Zimmermann, J., Weigand, A.M., 2018. Chapter two - why we need sustainable networks bridging countries, disciplines, cultures and generations for Aquatic Biomonitoring 2.0: a perspective derived from the DNAAqua-Net COST Action. In: Bohan, D.A., Dumbrell, A.J., Woodward, G., Jackson, M. (Eds.), *Advances in Ecological Research, Next Generation Biomonitoring: Part 1*. Academic Press, pp. 63–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.aecr.2018.01.001>.
- Lehman, R.N., Poulakis, G.R., Scharer, R.M., Hendon, J.M., Court, A.G., Wooley, A.K., Williams, A.M., Ajemian, M.J., Hadden, J.P., Beal, J.L., McCallister, M.P., Phillips, N. M., 2022. Environmental DNA evidence of the critically endangered smalltooth sawfish, *Pristis pectinata*, in historically occupied US waters. *Aquat. Conserv.* 32, 42–54. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3721>.
- Linacre, A., Lee, J.C.-I., 2016. Species determination: the role and use of the cytochrome b gene. In: Goodwin, W. (Ed.), *Forensic DNA Typing Protocols*. Springer New York,

- New York, NY, pp. 287–296 (Methods in Molecular Biology). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3597-0_20.
- Lor, Y., Schreier, T.M., Waller, D.L., Merkes, C.M., 2020. Using environmental DNA (eDNA) to detect the endangered Spectaclecase mussel (*Margaritifera monodonta*). *Freshw. Sci.* 39, 837–847. <https://doi.org/10.1086/711673>.
- Ma, H., Stewart, K., Lougheed, S., Zheng, J., Wang, Y., Zhao, J., 2016. Characterization, optimization, and validation of environmental DNA (eDNA) markers to detect an endangered aquatic mammal. *Conserv. Genet. Resour.* 8, 561–568. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-016-0597-9>.
- Ma, K.C.K., McKinsey, C.W., Johnson, L.E., 2022. Detecting rare species with passive sampling tools: optimizing the duration and frequency of sampling for benthic taxa. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 9, 809327 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.809327>.
- Macgregor, L.F., Greenlees, M., de Bruyn, M., Shine, R., 2021. An invasion in slow motion: the spread of invasive cane toads (*Rhinella marina*) into cooler climates in southern Australia. *Biol. Invasions* 23, 3565–3581. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-021-02597-2>.
- Mächler, E., Osathanunkul, M., Altermatt, F., 2018. Shedding light on eDNA: neither natural levels of UV radiation nor the presence of a filter feeder affect eDNA-based detection of aquatic organisms. *PLoS ONE* 13, e0195529. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195529>.
- Malekian, M., Sadeghi, P., Goudarzi, F., 2018. Assessment of environmental DNA for detection of an imperiled amphibian, the luristan newt (*Neurergus kaiseri*, Schmidt 1952). *Herpetol. Conserv. Biol.* 13, 175–182.
- Mammola, S., Riccardi, N., Prié, V., Correia, R., Cardoso, P., Lopes-Lima, M., Sousa, R., 2020. Towards a taxonomically unbiased European Union biodiversity strategy for 2030. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 287, 20202166. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.2166>.
- Marshall, N.T., Stepien, C.A., 2019. Invasion genetics from eDNA and thousands of larvae: a targeted metabarcoding assay that distinguishes species and population variation of zebra and quagga mussels. *Ecol. Evol.* 9, 3515–3538. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4985>.
- Marshall, N.T., Symonds, D.E., Dean, C.A., Schumer, G., Fleece, W.C., 2022. Evaluating environmental DNA metabarcoding as a survey tool for unionid mussel assessments. *Freshw. Biol.* 67, 1483–1507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13955>.
- Maruyama, A., Nakamura, K., Yamanaka, H., Kondoh, M., Minamoto, T., 2014. The release rate of environmental DNA from juvenile and adult fish. *PLoS ONE* 9, e114639. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0114639>.
- Maslo, B., Valentín, R., Leu, K., Kerwin, K., Hamilton, G.C., Bevan, A., Fefferman, N.H., Fonseca, D.M., 2017. Chirosurveillance: the use of native bats to detect invasive agricultural pests. *PLoS ONE* 12, e0173321. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0173321>.
- Matejusova, I., Graham, J., Bland, F., Lacaze, J.-P., Herman, G., Brown, L., Dalgarno, E., Bishop, J.D., Kakkonen, J.E., Smith, K.F., Douglas, A., 2021. Environmental DNA based surveillance for the highly invasive Carpet Sea squirt *Didemnum vexillum*: a targeted single-species approach. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 8, 728456 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.728456>.
- Matthias, L., Allison, M.J., Maslovat, C.Y., Hobbs, J., Helbing, C.C., 2021. Improving ecological surveys for the detection of cryptic, fossorial snakes using eDNA on and under artificial cover objects. *Ecol. Indic.* 131, 108187 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.108187>.
- Mauvisseau, Q., Parrondo, M., Fernández, M.P., García, L., Martínez, J.L., García-Vázquez, E., Borrell, Y.J., 2017. On the way for detecting and quantifying elusive species in the sea: the *Octopus vulgaris* case study. *Fish. Res.* 191, 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2017.02.023>.
- Mauvisseau, Q., Coignet, A., Delaunay, C., Pinet, F., Bouchon, D., Souty-Grosset, C., 2018. Environmental DNA as an efficient tool for detecting invasive crayfishes in freshwater ponds. *Hydrobiologia* 805, 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-017-3288-y>.
- Mauvisseau, Q., Davy-Bowker, J., Bulling, M., Brys, R., Neyrinck, S., Troth, C., Sweet, M., 2019. Combining ddPCR and environmental DNA to improve detection capabilities of a critically endangered freshwater invertebrate. *Sci. Rep.* 9, 14064. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-50571-9>.
- McKee, A.M., Spear, S.F., Pierson, T.W., 2015. The effect of dilution and the use of a post-extraction nucleic acid purification column on the accuracy, precision, and inhibition of environmental DNA samples. *Biol. Conserv.* 183, 70–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.031>.
- Meekan, M., Austin, C.M., Tan, M.H., Wei, N.-W.V., Miller, A., Pierce, S.J., Rowat, D., Stevens, G., Davies, T.K., Ponzo, A., Gan, H.M., 2017. iDNA at sea: recovery of whale shark (*Rhincodon typus*) mitochondrial DNA sequences from the whale shark copepod (*Pandarus rhinoceronicus*) confirms global population structure. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 4, 420. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2017.00420>.
- Merkes, C.M., McCalla, S.G., Jensen, N.R., Gaikowski, M.P., Amberg, J.J., 2014. Persistence of DNA in carcasses, slime and avian feces may affect interpretation of environmental DNA data. *PLoS ONE* 9, e113346. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0113346>.
- Minamoto, T., 2022. Environmental DNA analysis for macro-organisms: species distribution and more. *DNA Res.* 29, dsac018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/dnares/dsac018>.
- Miralles, L., Dopico, E., Devlo-Delva, F., Garcia-Vazquez, E., 2016. Controlling populations of invasive pygmy mussel (*Xenostrobus securis*) through citizen science and environmental DNA. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 110, 127–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.06.072>.
- Miralles, L., Parrondo, M., Hernández De Rojas, A., García-Vazquez, E., Borrell, Y.J., 2019. Development and validation of eDNA markers for the detection of *Crepidula fornicate* in environmental samples. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 146, 827–830. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.07.050>.
- Mizumoto, H., Urabe, H., Kanbe, T., Fukushima, M., Araki, H., 2018. Establishing an environmental DNA method to detect and estimate the biomass of Sakhalin taimen, a critically endangered Asian salmonid. *Limnology* 19, 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10201-017-0535-x>.
- Mizumoto, H., Mitsuzuka, T., Araki, H., 2020. An environmental DNA survey on distribution of an endangered salmonid species, *Parahucho perryi*, in Hokkaido, Japan. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 8, 569425 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2020.569425>.
- Morissette, J.T., Reaser, J.K., Cook, G.L., Irvine, K.M., Roy, H.E., 2020. Right place, Right time, Right tool: guidance for using target analysis to increase the likelihood of invasive species detection. *Biol. Invasions* 22, 67–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-019-02145-z>.
- Moss, W.E., Harper, L.R., Davis, M.A., Goldberg, C.S., Smith, M.M., Johnson, P.T.J., 2022. Navigating the trade-offs between environmental DNA and conventional field surveys for improved amphibian monitoring. *Ecosphere* 13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs.2.3941>.
- Moyer, G.R., Díaz-Ferguson, E., Hill, J.E., Shea, C., 2014. Assessing environmental DNA detection in controlled lentic systems. *PLoS ONE* 9, e103767. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0103767>.
- Mullin, K.E., Barata, I.M., Dawson, J., Orozco-terWengel, P., 2022. First extraction of eDNA from tree hole water to detect tree frogs: a simple field method piloted in Madagascar. *Conserv. Genet. Resour.* 14, 99–107. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-021-01245-0>.
- Muñoz-Colmenero, M., Ardura, A., Clusa, L., Miralles, L., Gower, F., Zaiko, A., García-Vázquez, E., 2018. New specific molecular marker detects *Ficopomatus enigmaticus* from water eDNA before positive results of conventional sampling. *J. Nat. Conserv.* 43, 173–178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2017.12.004>.
- Nakao, R., Miyata, R., Nakamura, N., Muramatsu, M., Okamura, H., Imamura, F., Akamatsu, Y., 2023. Development of environmental DNA chip for monitoring the invasive alien fishes in dam reservoirs. *Landscape Ecol. Eng.* 19, 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11355-022-00513-x>.
- Nathan, L.M., Simmons, M., Wegleitner, B.J., Jerde, C.L., Mahon, A.R., 2014. Quantifying environmental DNA signals for aquatic invasive species across multiple detection platforms. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 48, 12800–12806. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es5034052>.
- Navarro, L.M., Fernández, N., Guerra, C., Guralnick, R., Kissling, W.D., Londoño, M.C., Muller-Karger, F., Turak, E., Balvanera, P., Costello, M.J., Delavaud, A., El Serafy, G., Ferrier, S., Geijzendorffer, I., Geller, G.N., Jetz, W., Kim, E.-S., Kim, H., Martin, C.S., McGeoch, M.A., Mwampamba, T.H., Nel, J.L., Nicholson, E., Pettorelli, N., Schaepman, M.E., Skidmore, A., Sousa Pinto, I., Vergara, S., Vihervaaara, P., Xu, H., Yahara, T., Gill, M., Pereira, H.M., 2017. Monitoring biodiversity change through effective global coordination. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 29, 158–169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2018.02.005>.
- Neice, A.A., McRae, S.B., 2021. An eDNA diagnostic test to detect a rare, secretive marsh bird. *Glob. Ecol. Conserv.* 27, e01529 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2021.e01529>.
- Nester, G.M., De Brauwer, M., Koziol, A., West, K.M., DiBattista, J.D., White, N.E., Power, M., Heydenreich, M.J., Harvey, E., Bunce, M., 2020. Development and evaluation of fish eDNA metabarcoding assays facilitate the detection of cryptic seahorse taxa (family: Syngnathidae). *Environ. DNA* 2, 614–626. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn.393>.
- Nevers, M.B., Byappanahalli, M.N., Morris, C.C., Shively, D., Przybyla-Kelly, K., Spoljaric, A.M., Dickey, J., Roseman, E.F., 2018. Environmental DNA (eDNA): a tool for quantifying the abundant but elusive round goby (*Neogobius melanostomus*). *PLoS ONE* 13, e0191720. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0191720>.
- Nevers, M.B., Przybyla-Kelly, K., Shively, D., Morris, C.C., Dickey, J., Byappanahalli, M.N., 2020. Influence of sediment and stream transport on detecting a source of environmental DNA. *PLoS ONE* 15, e0244086. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0244086>.
- Nguyen, T.V., Tilker, A., Nguyen, A., Hörig, L., Axtner, J., Schmidt, A., Le, M., Nguyen, A.H.Q., Rawson, B.M., Wilting, A., Fickel, J., 2021. Using terrestrial leeches to assess the genetic diversity of an elusive species: the Annamite striped rabbit *Nesolagus timminsi*. *Environ. DNA* 3, 780–791. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn.3182>.
- Nordstrom, B., Mitchell, N., Byrne, M., Jarman, S., 2022. A review of applications of environmental DNA for reptile conservation and management. *Ecol. Evol.* 12, e8995 <https://doi.org/10.1002/edc.3895>.
- Oficialdegui, F.J., Clavero, M., Sánchez, M.I., Green, A.J., Boyero, L., Michot, T.C., Klose, K., Kawai, T., Lejeusne, C., 2019. Unravelling the global invasion routes of a worldwide invader, the red swamp crayfish (*Procambarus clarkii*). *Freshw. Biol.* 64, 1382–1400. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13312>.
- Ogata, S., Doi, H., Igawa, T., Komaki, S., Takahara, T., 2022. Environmental DNA methods for detecting two invasive alien species (American bullfrog and red swamp crayfish) in Japanese ponds. *Ecol. Res.* 37, 701–710. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1703.12341>.
- Ostberg, C.O., Chase, D.M., 2022. Ontogeny of eDNA shedding during early development in Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). *Environ. DNA* 4, 339–348. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn.3258>.
- Padgett-Stewart, T.M., Wilcox, T.M., Carim, K.J., McKelvey, K.S., Young, M.K., Schwartz, M.K., 2016. An eDNA assay for river otter detection: a tool for surveying a semi-aquatic mammal. *Conserv. Genet. Resour.* 8, 5–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-015-0511-x>.
- Parsons, K.M., Everett, M., Dahlheim, M., Park, L., 2018. Water, water everywhere: environmental DNA can unlock population structure in elusive marine species. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* 5, 180537 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.180537>.
- Pawlowski, J., Kelly-Quinn, M., Altermatt, F., Apothéloz-Perret-Gentil, L., Beja, P., Boggero, A., Borja, A., Bouchez, A., Cordier, T., Domaizon, I., Feio, M.J., Filipe, A.F., Fornaroli, R., Graf, W., Herder, J., van der Hoorn, B., Iwan Jones, J., Sagová-

- Mareckova, M., Moritz, C., Barquín, J., Piggott, J.J., Pinna, M., Rimet, F., Rinkevich, B., Sousa-Santos, C., Specchia, V., Trobajo, R., Vasselon, V., Vitecek, S., Zimmerman, J., Weigand, A., Leese, F., Kahlert, M., 2018. The future of biotic indices in the ecogenomic era: integrating (e)DNA metabarcoding in biological assessment of aquatic ecosystems. *Sci. Total Environ.* 637–638, 1295–1310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.05.002>.
- Pawlowski, J., Apothéloz-Perret-Gentil, L., Altermatt, F., 2020. Environmental DNA: What's behind the term? Clarifying the terminology and recommendations for its future use in biomonitoring. *Mol. Ecol.* 29, 4258–4264. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15643>.
- Peterson, G.S., Hoffman, J.C., Trebitz, A.S., Hatzenbuhler, C.I., Myers, J.T., Ross, J.E., Okum, S.L., Pilgrim, E.M., 2022. Early detection monitoring for non-indigenous fishes; comparison of survey approaches during two species introductions in a Great Lakes port. *Biol. Invasions* 24, 463–478. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-021-02655-9>.
- Piggott, M.P., 2016. Evaluating the effects of laboratory protocols on eDNA detection probability for an endangered freshwater fish. *Ecol. Evol.* 6, 2739–2750. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.2083>.
- Piggott, M.P., 2017. An environmental DNA assay for detecting Macquarie perch, *Macquaria australasica*. *Conserv. Genet. Resour.* 9, 257–259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-016-0666-0>.
- Pilliard, D.S., Goldberg, C.S., Arkle, R.S., Waits, L.P., 2014. Factors influencing detection of eDNA from a stream-dwelling amphibian. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* 14, 109–116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12159>.
- Pitt, A.L., Shinskie, J.L., Tavano, J.J., Hartzell, S.M., Delahunt, T., Spear, S.F., 2017. Decline of a giant salamander assessed with historical records, environmental DNA and multi-scale habitat data. *Freshw. Biol.* 62, 967–976. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12917>.
- Plough, L.V., Bunch, A.J., Lee, B.B., Fitzgerald, C.L., Stence, C.P., Richardson, B., 2021. Development and testing of an environmental DNA (eDNA) assay for endangered Atlantic sturgeon to assess its potential as a monitoring and management tool. *Environ. DNA* 3, 800–814. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.186>.
- Preece, E.P., Bryan, M., Mapes, S.M., Wademan, C., Dorazio, R., 2021. Monitoring for freshwater mussel presence in rivers using environmental DNA. *Environ. DNA* 3, 591–604. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.156>.
- Qu, C., Stewart, K.A., 2019. Evaluating monitoring options for conservation: comparing traditional and environmental DNA tools for a critically endangered mammal. *Sci. Nat.* 106, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00114-019-1605-1>.
- Raemy, M., Ursenbacher, S., 2018. Detection of the European pond turtle (*Emys orbicularis*) by environmental DNA: is eDNA adequate for reptiles? *Amphibia-Reptilia* 39, 135–143. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685381-17000025>.
- Rasmussen, J.J., Andersen, L.W., Johnsen, T.J., Thaulow, J., d'Auriac, M.A., Thomsen, S.N., Hesselsøe, M., 2021. Dead or alive — old empty shells do not prompt false-positive results in environmental DNA surveys targeting the freshwater pearl mussel (*Margaritifera margaritifera* L.). *Aquat. Conserv.* 31, 2506–2514. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.3677>.
- Ratsch, R., Kingsbury, B.A., Jordan, M.A., 2020. Exploration of environmental DNA (eDNA) to detect Kirtland's snake (*Clonophis kirtlandii*). *Animals* 10, 1057. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10061057>.
- Rees, H.C., Maddison, B.C., Middelitch, D.J., Patmore, J.R.M., Gough, K.C., 2014. REVIEW: the detection of aquatic animal species using environmental DNA - a review of eDNA as a survey tool in ecology. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 51, 1450–1459. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12306>.
- Reid, A.J., Carlson, A.K., Creed, I.F., Eliason, E.J., Gell, P.A., Johnson, P.T.J., Kidd, K.A., MacCormack, T.J., Olden, J.D., Ormerod, S.J., Smol, J.P., Taylor, W.W., Tockner, K., Vermaire, J.C., Dudgeon, D., Cooke, S.J., 2019. Emerging threats and persistent conservation challenges for freshwater biodiversity. *Biol. Rev.* 94, 849–873. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12480>.
- Riaz, M., Wittwer, C., Nowak, C., Cocchiariello, B., 2020. An environmental DNA assay for the detection of the regionally endangered freshwater fish *Alburnoides bipunctatus* in Germany. *Conserv. Genet. Resour.* 12, 41–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-018-1063-7>.
- Ribani, A., Utzteri, V.J., Taurisano, V., Fontanesi, L., 2020. Honey as a source of environmental DNA for the detection and monitoring of honey bee pathogens and parasites. *Vet. Sci.* 7, 113. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vetsci7030113>.
- Robinson, A.T., Paroz, Y.M., Clement, M.J., Franklin, T.W., Dysthe, J.C., Young, M.K., McKelvey, K.S., Carim, K.J., 2019. Environmental DNA sampling of small-bodied minnows: performance relative to location, species, and traditional sampling. *N. Am. J. Fish Manag.* 39, 1073–1085. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nafm.10344>.
- Robinson, C.V., Uren Webster, T.M., Cable, J., James, J., Consuegra, S., 2018a. Simultaneous detection of invasive signal crayfish, endangered white-clawed crayfish and the crayfish plague pathogen using environmental DNA. *Biol. Conserv.* 222, 241–252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.04.009>.
- Robinson, C.V., Uren Webster, T.M., Consuegra, S., 2018b. Data on optimisation of a multiplex HRM-qPCR assay for native and invasive crayfish as well as the crayfish plague in four river catchments. *Data Br.* 19, 1092–1109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2018.05.134>.
- Robson, H.L.A., Noble, T.H., Saunders, R.J., Robson, S.K.A., Burrows, D.W., Jerry, D.R., 2016. Fine-tuning for the tropics: application of eDNA technology for invasive fish detection in tropical freshwater ecosystems. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* 16, 922–932. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12505>.
- Rodgers, T.W., Dysthe, J.C., Tait, C., Franklin, T.W., Schwartz, M.K., Mock, K.E., 2020. Detection of 4 imperiled western North American freshwater mussel species from environmental DNA with multiplex qPCR assays. *Freshw. Sci.* 39, 762–772. <https://doi.org/10.1086/710570>.
- Rojahn, J., Pearce, L., Gleeson, D.M., Duncan, R.P., Gilligan, D.M., Bylemans, J., 2021. The value of quantitative environmental DNA analyses for the management of invasive and endangered native fish. *Freshw. Biol.* 66, 1619–1629. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13779>.
- Rose, J.P., Wademan, C., Weir, S., Wood, J.S., Todd, B.D., 2019. Traditional trapping methods outperform eDNA sampling for introduced semi-aquatic snakes. *PLoS ONE* 14, e0219244. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0219244>.
- Roy, M., Belliveau, V., Mandrak, N.E., Gagné, N., 2018. Development of environmental DNA (eDNA) methods for detecting high-risk freshwater fishes in live trade in Canada. *Biol. Invasions* 20, 299–314. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-017-1532-z>.
- Rusch, J.C., Mojžišová, M., Strand, D.A., Svobodová, J., Vrálstad, T., Petrusk, A., 2020. Simultaneous detection of native and invasive crayfish and *Aphanomyces astaci* from environmental DNA samples in a wide range of habitats in Central Europe. *NeoBiota* 58, 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.3897/neobiota.58.49358>.
- Saito, T., Doi, H., 2021a. A model and simulation of the influence of temperature and amplicon length on environmental DNA degradation rates: a meta-analysis approach. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 9, 623831. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2021.623831>.
- Saito, T., Doi, H., 2021b. Degradation modelling of water environmental DNA: experiments on multiple DNA sources in pond and seawater. *Environ. DNA* 3, 850–860. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.192>.
- Sakata, M.K., Yamamoto, S., Gotoh, R.O., Miya, M., Yamanaka, H., Minamoto, T., 2020. Sedimentary eDNA provides different information on timescale and fish species composition compared with aqueous eDNA. *Environ. DNA* 2, 505–518. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.75>.
- Salas, A., Bandelt, H.-J., Macaulay, V., Richards, M.B., 2007. Phylogeographic investigations: the role of trees in forensic genetics. *Forensic Sci. Int.* 168, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2006.05.037>.
- Sales, N.G., Wangenstein, O.S., Carvalho, D.C., Deiner, K., Præbel, K., Coscia, I., McDevitt, A.D., Mariani, S., 2021. Space-time dynamics in monitoring neotropical fish communities using eDNA metabarcoding. *Sci. Total Environ.* 754, 142096. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142096>.
- Sassoubre, L.M., Yamahara, K.M., Gardner, L.D., Block, B.A., Boehm, A.B., 2016. Quantification of environmental DNA (eDNA) shedding and decay rates for three marine fish. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 50, 10456–10464. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acest.6b03114>.
- Schenekar, T., 2023. The current state of eDNA research in freshwater ecosystems: are we shifting from the developmental phase to standard application in biomonitoring? *Hydrobiologia* 850, 1263–1282. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-022-04891-z>.
- Schloesser, N.A., Merkes, C.M., Rees, C.B., Amberg, J.J., Steeves, T.B., Docker, M.F., 2018. Correlating sea lamprey density with environmental DNA detections in the lab. *Manag. Biol. Invasions* 9, 483–495. <https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2018.9.4.11>.
- Schneider, J., Valentini, A., Dejean, T., Montarsi, F., Taberlet, P., Glaizot, O., Fumagalli, L., 2016. Detection of invasive mosquito vectors using environmental DNA (eDNA) from water samples. *PLoS ONE* 11, e0162493. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162493>.
- Schumer, G., Crowley, K., Maltz, E., Johnston, M., Anders, P., Blankenship, S., 2019. Utilizing environmental DNA for fish eradication effectiveness monitoring in streams. *Biol. Invasions* 21, 3415–3426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-019-02056-z>.
- Sepulveda, A., Smith, D., O'Donnell, K., Owens, N., White, B., Richter, C., Merkes, C., Wolf, S., Rau, M., Neilson, M., Daniel, W., Dumoulin, C., Hunter, M., 2022. Using structured decision making to evaluate potential management responses to detection of dreissenid mussel (*Dreissena* spp.) environmental DNA. *Manag. Biol. Invasions* 13, 344–368. <https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2022.13.2.06>.
- Sepulveda, A.J., Schmidt, C., Amberg, J., Hutchins, P., Stratton, C., Mebane, C., Laramie, M.B., Pilliod, D.S., 2019. Adding invasive species biosurveillance to the U. S. Geological Survey streamgage network. *Ecosphere* 10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs.2843>.
- Sepulveda, A.J., Nelson, N.M., Jerde, C.L., Luikart, G., 2020. Are environmental DNA methods ready for aquatic invasive species management? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 35, 668–678. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.03.011>.
- Serrao, N.R., Weckworth, J.K., McKelvey, K.S., Dysthe, J.C., Schwartz, M.K., 2021. Molecular genetic analysis of air, water, and soil to detect big brown bats in North America. *Biol. Conserv.* 261, 109252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.109252>.
- Seymour, M., Durance, I., Cosby, B.J., Ransom-Jones, E., Deiner, K., Ormerod, S.J., Colbourne, J.K., Wilgar, G., Carvalho, G.R., De Bruyn, M., Edwards, F., Emmett, B.A., Bik, H.M., Creer, S., 2018. Acidity promotes degradation of multi-species environmental DNA in lotic mesocosms. *Commun. Biol.* 1, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43003-017-0005-3>.
- Sgarbi, L.F., Bini, L.M., Heino, J., Jyrkkäkallio-Mikkola, J., Landeiro, V.L., Santos, E.P., Schneek, F., Siqueira, T., Sooinen, J., Tolonen, K.T., Melo, A.S., 2020. Sampling effort and information quality provided by rare and common species in estimating assemblage structure. *Ecol. Indic.* 110, 105937. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.105937>.
- Shu, L., Ludwig, A., Peng, Z., 2020. Standards for methods utilizing environmental DNA for detection of fish species. *Genes* 11, 296. <https://doi.org/10.3390/genes11030296>.
- Sigsgaard, E.E., Carl, H., Møller, P.R., Thomsen, P.F., 2015. Monitoring the near-extinct European weather loach in Denmark based on environmental DNA from water samples. *Biol. Conserv.* 183, 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.023>.
- Simmons, M., Tucker, A., Chadderton, W.L., Jerde, C.L., Mahon, A.R., 2016. Active and passive environmental DNA surveillance of aquatic invasive species. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 73, 76–83. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2015-0262>.

- Sint, D., Kolp, B., Rennstam Rubbmark, O., Füreder, L., Traugott, M., 2022. The amount of environmental DNA increases with freshwater crayfish density and over time. Environ. DNA 4, 417–424. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.249>.
- Skinner, M., Murdoch, M., Loewa-Quintana, T., Crookes, S., Hanner, R., 2020. A mesocosm comparison of laboratory-based and on-site eDNA solutions for detection and quantification of striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) in marine ecosystems. Environ. DNA 2, 298–308. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.61>.
- Smart, A.S., Tingley, R., Weeks, A.R., Van Rooyen, A.R., McCarthy, M.A., 2015. Environmental DNA sampling is more sensitive than a traditional survey technique for detecting an aquatic invader. Ecol. Appl. 25, 1944–1952. <https://doi.org/10.1890/14-1751.1>.
- Spear, S.F., Groves, J.D., Williams, L.A., Waits, L.P., 2015. Using environmental DNA methods to improve detectability in a hellbender (*Cryptobranchus alleganiensis*) monitoring program. Biol. Conserv. 183, 38–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.016>.
- Steinmetz, K., Murphy, S., Ó Cathdha, O., Barnett, J., Mirimin, L., 2021. Enabling pinniped conservation by means of non-invasive genetic population analysis. Conserv. Genet. Resour. 13, 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-020-01182-4>.
- Stepien, C.A., Snyder, M.R., Elz, A.E., 2019. Invasion genetics of the silver carp *Hypophthalmichthys molitrix* across North America: differentiation of fronts, introgression, and eDNA metabarcoding detection. PLoS ONE 14, e0203012. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0203012>.
- Stoeckle, B.C., Beggel, S., Cerwinka, A.F., Motivans, E., Kuehn, R., Geist, J., 2017. A systematic approach to evaluate the influence of environmental conditions on eDNA detection success in aquatic ecosystems. PLoS ONE 12, e0189119. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189119>.
- Stoeckle, B.C., Beggel, S., Kuehn, R., Geist, J., 2021. Influence of stream characteristics and population size on downstream transport of freshwater mollusk environmental DNA. Freshw. Sci. 40, 191–201. <https://doi.org/10.1086/713015>.
- Strickland, G.J., Roberts, J.H., 2019. Utility of eDNA and occupancy models for monitoring an endangered fish across diverse riverine habitats. Hydrobiologia 826, 129–144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-018-3723-8>.
- Strickler, K.M., Fremier, A.K., Goldberg, C.S., 2015. Quantifying effects of UV-B, temperature, and pH on eDNA degradation in aquatic microcosms. Biol. Conserv. 183, 85–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.038>.
- Suarez-Bregua, P., Alvarez-González, M., Parsons, K.M., Rothlant, J., Pierce, G.J., Saavedra, C., 2022. Environmental DNA (eDNA) for monitoring marine mammals: challenges and opportunities. Front. Mar. Sci. 9, 987774. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.987774>.
- Sugawara, K., Sasaki, Y., Okano, K., Watanabe, M., Miyata, N., 2022. Application of EDNA for monitoring freshwater bivalve *Nodularia nipponensis* and its glochidium larvae. Environ. DNA 4, 908–919. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.304>.
- Sugiura, K., Tomita, S., Minamoto, T., Mishina, T., Iwata, A., Abe, T., Yamamoto, S., Watanabe, K., 2021. Characterizing the spatial and temporal occurrence patterns of the endangered botiid loach *Parabotia curtus* by environmental DNA analysis using a newly developed species-specific primer set. Ichthyol. Res. 68, 152–157. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10228-020-00756-4>.
- Taberlet, P., Coissac, E., Hajibabaei, M., Rieseberg, L.H., 2012a. Environmental DNA. Mol. Ecol. 21, 1789–1793. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2012.05542.x>.
- Taberlet, P., Coissac, E., Pompanon, F., Brochmann, C., Willerslev, E., 2012b. Towards next-generation biodiversity assessment using DNA metabarcoding. Mol. Ecol. 21, 2045–2050. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2012.05470.x>.
- Takeuchi, A., Watanabe, S., Yamamoto, S., Miller, M., Fukuba, T., Miwa, T., Okino, T., Minamoto, T., Tsukamoto, K., 2019. First use of oceanic environmental DNA to study the spawning ecology of the Japanese eel *Anguilla japonica*. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 609, 187–196. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps12828>.
- Tarof, S.A., Crookes, S., Moxley, K., Hathaway, J., Cameron, G., Hanner, R.H., 2021. Environmental DNA bioassays corroborate field data for detection of overwintering species at risk Blanding's turtles (*Emydoidea blandingii*). Genome 64, 299–310. <https://doi.org/10.1139/gen-2020-0043>.
- Thalinger, B., Wolf, E., Traugott, M., Wanzenböck, J., 2019. Monitoring spawning migrations of potamodromous fish species via eDNA. Sci. Rep. 9, 15388. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-51398-0>.
- Thomsen, P.F., Willerslev, E., 2015. Environmental DNA – an emerging tool in conservation for monitoring past and present biodiversity. Biol. Conserv. 183, 4–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.019>.
- Thomsen, P.F., Kielgast, J., Iversen, L.L., Wiuf, C., Rasmussen, M., Gilbert, M.T.P., Orlando, L., Willerslev, E., 2012. Monitoring endangered freshwater biodiversity using environmental DNA. Mol. Ecol. 21, 2565–2573. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2011.05418.x>.
- Tingley, R., Greenlees, M., Oertel, S., van Rooyen, A.R., Weeks, A.R., 2019. Environmental DNA sampling as a surveillance tool for cane toad *Rhinella marina* introductions on offshore islands. Biol. Invasions 21, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-018-1810-4>.
- Torresdal, J.D., Farrell, A.D., Goldberg, C.S., 2017. Environmental DNA detection of the Golden tree frog (*Phyllomedusa auratus*) in bromeliads. PLoS ONE 12, e0168787. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0168787>.
- Tréguier, A., Paillisson, J.-M., Dejean, T., Valentini, A., Schlaepfer, M.A., Roussel, J.-M., 2014. Environmental DNA surveillance for invertebrate species: advantages and technical limitations to detect invasive crayfish *Procambarus clarkii* in freshwater ponds. J. Appl. Ecol. 51, 871–879. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12262>.
- Troth, C.R., Burian, A., Mauvisseau, Q., Bulling, M., Nightingale, J., Mauvisseau, C., Sweet, M.J., 2020. Development and application of eDNA-based tools for the conservation of white-clawed crayfish. Sci. Total Environ. 748, 141394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141394>.
- Tsuji, S., Yamanaka, H., Minamoto, T., 2017. Effects of water pH and proteinase K treatment on the yield of environmental DNA from water samples. Limnology 18, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10201-016-0483-x>.
- Tsuji, S., Iguchi, Y., Shibata, N., Teramura, I., Kitagawa, T., Yamanaka, H., 2018. Real-time multiplex PCR for simultaneous detection of multiple species from environmental DNA: an application on two Japanese medaka species. Sci. Rep. 8, 9138. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-27434-w>.
- Tsuji, S., Takahara, T., Doi, H., Shibata, N., Yamanaka, H., 2019. The detection of aquatic macroorganisms using environmental DNA analysis—a review of methods for collection, extraction, and detection. Environ. DNA 1, 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.21>.
- Turner, C.R., Uy, K.L., Everhart, R.C., 2015. Fish environmental DNA is more concentrated in aquatic sediments than surface water. Biol. Conserv. 183, 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.11.017>.
- Utzeri, V.J., Ribani, A., Taurisano, V., Banqué, C.H.I., Fontanesi, L., 2021. Distribution of the main *Apis mellifera* mitochondrial DNA lineages in Italy assessed using an environmental DNA approach. Insects 12, 620. <https://doi.org/10.3390/insects12070620>.
- Valentini, R.E., Fonseca, D.M., Gable, S., Kyle, K.E., Hamilton, G.C., Nielsen, A.L., Lockwood, J.L., 2020. Moving eDNA surveys onto land: strategies for active eDNA aggregation to detect invasive forest insects. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 20, 746–755. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13151>.
- Valentini, R.E., Kyle, K.E., Allen, M.C., Welbourne, D.J., Lockwood, J.L., 2021. The state, transport, and fate of aboveground terrestrial arthropod eDNA. Environ. DNA 3, 1081–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.229>.
- Valsecchi, E., Coppola, E., Pires, R., Parmegiani, A., Casiraghi, M., Galli, P., Bruno, A., 2022. A species-specific qPCR assay provides novel insight into range expansion of the Mediterranean monk seal (*Monachus monachus*) by means of eDNA analysis. Biodivers. Conserv. 31, 1175–1196. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-022-02382-0>.
- Villacorta-Rath, C., Adekunle, A.I., Edmunds, R.C., Strugnell, J.M., Schwarzkopf, L., Burrows, D., 2020. Can environmental DNA be used to detect first arrivals of the cane toad, *Rhinella marina*, into novel locations? Environ. DNA 2, 635–646. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.114>.
- Vörös, J., Márton, O., Schmidt, B.R., Gál, J.T., Jelić, D., 2017. Surveying Europe's only cave-dwelling chordate species (*Proteus anguinus*) using environmental DNA. PLoS ONE 12, e0170945. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0170945>.
- Wada, T., Doi, H., Togaki, D., Kaida, R., Nagano, M., Katano, I., Suzuki, M., Ohtani, T., Mitsuhashi, H., 2020. Exploring a legendary giant squid: an environmental DNA approach. Mar. Biol. 167, 160. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-020-03773-z>.
- Walker, D.M., Leys, J.E., Dunham, K.E., Oliver, J.C., Schiller, E.E., Stephenson, K.S., Kimrey, J.T., Wooten, J., Rogers, M.W., 2017. Methodological considerations for detection of terrestrial small-body salamander eDNA and implications for biodiversity conservation. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 17, 1223–1230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12667>.
- Wang, S., Yan, Z., Häfling, B., Zheng, X., Wang, P., Fan, J., Li, J., 2021. Methodology of fish eDNA and its applications in ecology and environment. Sci. Total Environ. 755, 142622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142622>.
- Ward, R.D., Hanner, R., Hebert, P.D.N., 2009. The campaign to DNA barcode all fishes, FISH-BOL. J. Fish Biol. 74, 329–356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.2008.02080.x>.
- Warmerdam, D.O., Wolthuis, R.M.F., 2019. Keeping ribosomal DNA intact: a repeating challenge. Chromosom. Res. 27, 57–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10577-018-9594-z>.
- Wei, N., Nakajima, F., Tobino, T., 2018. Effects of treated sample weight and DNA marker length on sediment eDNA based detection of a benthic invertebrate. Ecol. Indic. 93, 267–273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.04.063>.
- Westhoff, J.T., Berkman, L.K., Klymus, K.E., Thompson, N.L., Richter, C.A., 2022. A comparison of eDNA and visual survey methods for detection of longnose darter *Percina nasuta* in Missouri. Fishes 7, 70. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fishes7020070>.
- Whale, A.S., Huggett, J.F., Cowen, S., Speirs, V., Shaw, J., Ellison, S., Foy, C.A., Scott, D.J., 2012. Comparison of microfluidic digital PCR and conventional quantitative PCR for measuring copy number variation. Nucleic Acids Res. 40, e82. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gks203>.
- Wilcox, T.M., McKelvey, K.S., Young, M.K., Jane, S.F., Lowe, W.H., Whiteley, A.R., Schwartz, M.K., 2013. Robust detection of rare species using environmental DNA: the importance of primer specificity. PLoS ONE 8, e59520. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059520>.
- Wilcox, T.M., Schwartz, M.K., McKelvey, K.S., Young, M.K., Lowe, W.H., 2014. A blocking primer increases specificity in environmental DNA detection of bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*). Conserv. Genet. Resour. 6, 283–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-013-0113-4>.
- Wilcox, T.M., Carim, K.J., McKelvey, K.S., Young, M.K., Schwartz, M.K., 2015. The dual challenges of generality and specificity when developing environmental DNA markers for species and subspecies of *Oncorhynchus*. PLoS ONE 10, e0142008. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0142008>.
- Wilcox, T.M., McKelvey, K.S., Young, M.K., Engkjer, C., Lance, R.F., Lahr, A., Eby, L.A., Schwartz, M.K., 2020. Parallel, targeted analysis of environmental samples via high-throughput quantitative PCR. Environ. DNA 2, 544–553. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.80>.
- Williams, K.E., Huyvaert, K.P., Piaggio, A.J., 2017. Clearing muddied waters: capture of environmental DNA from turbid waters. PLoS ONE 12, e0179282. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179282>.
- Williams, M., O'Grady, J., Ball, B., Carlsson, J., Eyo, E., McGinnity, P., Jennings, E., Regan, F., Parle-McDermott, A., 2019. The application of CRISPR-Cas for single species identification from environmental DNA. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 19, 1106–1114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13045>.

- Williams, M., Hernandez, C., O'Sullivan, A.M., April, J., Regan, F., Bernatchez, L., Parle-McDermott, A., 2021. Comparing CRISPR-Cas and qPCR eDNA assays for the detection of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). Environ. DNA 3, 297–304. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.174>.
- Wineland, S.M., Welch, S.M., Pauley, T.K., Apodaca, J.J., Olszack, M., Mosher, J.J., Holmes, J.N., Waldron, J.L., 2019. Using environmental DNA and occupancy modelling to identify drivers of eastern hellbender (*Cryptobranchus alleganiensis alleganiensis*) extirpation. Freshw. Biol. 64, 208–221. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13210>.
- Wood, S.A., Zaiko, A., Richter, I., Inglis, G.J., Pochon, X., 2017. Development of a real-time polymerase chain reaction assay for the detection of the invasive Mediterranean fanworm, *Sabellapallanzani*, in environmental samples. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 24, 17373–17382. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-017-9357-y>.
- Wood, S.A., Pochon, X., Laroche, O., Ammon, U., Adamson, J., Zaiko, A., 2019a. A comparison of droplet digital polymerase chain reaction (PCR), quantitative PCR and metabarcoding for species-specific detection in environmental DNA. Mol. Ecol. Resour. 19, 1407–1419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13055>.
- Wood, S.A., Pochon, X., Ming, W., von Ammon, U., Woods, C., Carter, M., Smith, M., Inglis, G., Zaiko, A., 2019b. Considerations for incorporating real-time PCR assays into routine marine biosecurity surveillance programmes: a case study targeting the Mediterranean fanworm (*Sabellapallanzani*) and club tunicate (*Styela clava*). Genome 62, 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.1139/gen-2018-0021>.
- Wood, S.A., Biessy, L., Latchford, J.L., Zaiko, A., Von Ammon, U., Audrezet, F., Cristescu, M.E., Pochon, X., 2020a. Release and degradation of environmental DNA and RNA in a marine system. Sci. Total Environ. 704, 135314 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135314>.
- Wood, Z.T., Erdman, B.F., York, G., Trial, J.G., Kinnison, M.T., 2020b. Experimental assessment of optimal lotic eDNA sampling and assay multiplexing for a critically endangered fish. Environ. DNA 2, 407–417. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.64>.
- Wozney, K.M., Wilson, C.C., 2017. Quantitative PCR multiplexes for simultaneous multispecies detection of Asian carp eDNA. J. Great Lakes Res. 43, 771–776. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jglr.2017.05.001>.
- Xia, Z., Johansson, M.L., Gao, Y., Zhang, L., Haffner, G.D., MacIsaac, H.J., Zhan, A., 2018a. Conventional versus real-time quantitative PCR for rare species detection. Ecol. Evol. 8, 11799–11807. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4636>.
- Xia, Z., Zhan, A., Gao, Y., Zhang, L., Haffner, G.D., MacIsaac, H.J., 2018b. Early detection of a highly invasive bivalve based on environmental DNA (eDNA). Biol. Invasions 20, 437–447. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-017-1545-7>.
- Xia, Z., Zhan, A., Johansson, M.L., DeRoy, E., Haffner, G.D., MacIsaac, H.J., 2021. Screening marker sensitivity: optimizing eDNA-based rare species detection. Divers. Distrib. 27, 1981–1988. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.13262>.
- Yao, H., Song, J., Liu, C., Luo, K., Han, J., Li, Y., Pang, X., Xu, H., Zhu, Y., Xiao, P., Chen, S., 2010. Use of ITS2 region as the universal DNA barcode for plants and animals. PLoS ONE 5, e13102. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0013102>.
- Yasashimoto, T., Sakata, M.K., Sakata, T., Nakajima, S., Ozaki, M., Minamoto, T., 2021. Environmental DNA detection of an invasive ant species (*Linepithema humile*) from soil samples. Sci. Rep. 11, 10712. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-89993-9>.
- Yates, M.C., Glaser, D.M., Post, J.R., Cristescu, M.E., Fraser, D.J., Derry, A.M., 2021. The relationship between eDNA particle concentration and organism abundance in nature is strengthened by allometric scaling. Mol. Ecol. 30, 3068–3082. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15543>.
- Yip, Z.T., Lim, C.S., Tay, Y.C., Tan, Y., Beng, S., Tun, K., Teo, S., Huang, D., 2021. Environmental DNA detection of the invasive mussel *Mytilus striatus* as a surveillance tool. Manag. Biol. Invasions 12, 578–598. <https://doi.org/10.3391/mbi.2021.12.3.05>.
- Yoshitake, K., Yoshinaga, T., Tanaka, C., Mizusawa, N., Reza, Md.S., Tsujimoto, A., Kobayashi, T., Watabe, S., 2019. HaCeD-Seq: a novel method for reliable and easy estimation about the fish population using haplotype count from eDNA. Mar. Biotechnol. 21, 813–820. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10126-019-09926-6>.
- Yu, T.-S., Ji, C.W., Park, Y.-S., Han, K.-H., Kwak, I.-S., 2022. Characterization of fish assemblages and standard length distributions among different sampling gears using an artificial neural network. Fishes 7, 275. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fishes7050275>.