

1 **Not your average environmental DNA methods paper: Evaluating the effects of**  
2 **sampling, preservation, and extraction methods and target species yields**

3 Elizabeth Andruszkiewicz Allan<sup>1†</sup>, Ryan P. Kelly<sup>1</sup>, Megan R. Shaffer<sup>1</sup>, Kim M. Parsons<sup>2</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup> University of Washington, School of Marine and Environmental Affairs, 3737 Brooklyn Ave  
5 NE, Seattle, WA 98105, U.S.A.

6 <sup>2</sup> Conservation Biology Division, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fish-  
7 eries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E,  
8 Seattle, WA 98112, U.S.A.

9 <sup>†</sup> Corresponding author: [eallan@uw.edu](mailto:eallan@uw.edu)

10 Manuscript type: Original Article

11 Open Research Statement: Data are already published and publicly available, with those  
12 publications properly cited in this submission. The repository for code can be found at:  
13 [https://github.com/eandrusz/MURI\\_Mod1\\_Needle\\_Haystack](https://github.com/eandrusz/MURI_Mod1_Needle_Haystack)

14 *Keywords: environmental DNA, quantitative PCR, methods, filter pore size, preservation,*  
15 *extraction*

## 16 Abstract

17 There are many decisions to be made when sampling for eDNA analysis, whether using a  
18 targeted, single-species assay or a community-based metabarcoding. Of the entire workflow  
19 from sampling water to bioinformatic analyses, the first steps in the process of collecting water,  
20 filtering it, and preserving the filter membranes represent major decision points upon which  
21 the success of downstream processes depend. Though many previous studies have compared  
22 water volume filtered, filter pore size, and preservation and extraction methods, the conclusions  
23 are often that they produce different results, but it is unclear which is the optimal approach  
24 for a given purpose. Here, we investigate (1) the volume of water filtered and the filter pore  
25 size and (2) the preservation method and extraction method of samples with a specific lens  
26 on how these choices impact the detection of a single targeted species (Atlantic bottlenose  
27 dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus*, via qPCR, although in principle these findings apply to single-  
28 species assays more generally). We find that larger pore size filters (5  $\mu\text{m}$  vs. 1  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and larger  
29 volumes of water (3 L vs. 1 L) maximize the ratio of amplifiable target DNA to total DNA.  
30 We also find that maximizing total DNA yield during extraction (phenol chloroform vs. two  
31 commercial kits) does not always increase target detection likely due to the concentration  
32 of inhibitors and co-extraction of off-target DNA. We also comment on variation including  
33 technical and biological variability between replicates, finding that by homogenizing source  
34 water before filtering removes much of the biological variation. Finally, we present a statistical  
35 model that allows for inclusion of data from samples collected and processed in different ways,  
36 enabling researchers to change protocols or include data from other field sampling efforts,  
37 thereby opening up more possibilities to extend datasets and analyses.

## 38 Introduction

39 Since the first applications of detecting environmental DNA (eDNA) in water samples, many  
40 papers have been written comparing methodological choices in eDNA sample processing. Most  
41 of these have used more general primers to look at many species using a metabarcoding ap-  
42 proach (Deiner et al. 2015a, Djurhuus et al. 2017a, Majaneva et al. 2018, Li et al. 2018a,  
43 Deiner et al. 2018, Coutant et al. 2021, e.g., Bizzozzero et al. 2024, Bowen et al. 2024, Liu  
44 et al. 2024). The results of such methods comparisons often demonstrate small differences  
45 between either richness or relative abundance of taxa detected but it is unclear which is the  
46 “right” or “best” protocol. Other comparisons look at maximizing total DNA, assuming that  
47 more total DNA will yield more target DNA. However, this may not always be true and may  
48 vary with the target taxa (i.e., microbes vs. metazoans). Fewer papers have investigated the  
49 effect of methodological choices on a single target species (Liang and Keeley 2013, Eichmiller  
50 et al. 2016a, Minamoto et al. 2016a, Spens et al. 2017, Hinlo et al. 2017, Capo et al. 2020a,  
51 Mauvisseau et al. 2021a, Fukuzawa et al. 2023, García et al. 2024a) and to our knowledge, no  
52 papers have discussed how to combine data collected from different collection and processing  
53 protocols. Here, we focus on the first stages of sample collection and processing by comparing  
54 the volume of water sampled, the filter pore size, preservation method, and extraction method  
55 for a single target vertebrate species, bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*).

56 In early proof-of-concept eDNA studies, the volume of water collected ranged from very small  
57 volumes (e.g., 15 mL (Foote et al. 2012)) to much larger volumes as it was unclear what was  
58 required for this new application and tool (see (Takahashi et al. 2023a) for review). Studies  
59 using metabarcoding approaches revealed a positive correlation between the number of unique  
60 species detected and the volume of water filters up to a certain point (i.e., species accumulation  
61 curves) (Bessey et al. 2020). In studies employing a single targeted species approach (i.e. qPCR  
62 or dPCR or ddPCR), larger volumes of water filtered resulted in more reliable detection of the

target species (Liang and Keeley 2013, Capo et al. 2020b). A recent review paper found that ~40% of studies use 1 L of water (Takahashi et al. 2023b), which seems to strike the balance of maximizing probability of detection while working within the bounds of what is practical, but little has been done to quantify or understand the relationship between concentrating more target DNA alongside more non-target DNA. Additionally, the effects of inhibition, whether by chemical inhibitors alone or from large amounts of non-target DNA, are poorly understood but are expected to increase with increasing volume of water filtered or decreasing filter pore size.

Though the field of eDNA analysis is relatively new, the concepts are not new and have been used for decades for other applications, primarily for detecting and characterizing microbial community composition from various environments (Ogram et al. 1987). This resulted in most methodological choices stemming from the microbial field as well. In particular, the pore size of the filter used to capture DNA for microbial work must be extremely small and therefore in eDNA field sampling, the most common pore size filter still used is 0.45  $\mu\text{m}$  (Tsuji et al. 2019). This pore size might work very well for capturing bacteria, but if the target taxa are macroorganisms rather than microbes, the target will be co-captured along with many more off-target microbes and thus make it more difficult to detect as the macroorganisms are now a rarer target (Power et al. 2023a). Therefore, this may not be the best choice but it has been used by default for many years in eDNA studies.

Similarly, the optimal DNA extraction methods for microorganisms DNA may be very different than those for macroorganisms. For example, phenol-chloroform-isoamyl extractions are known to maximize total DNA recovery (Ramón-Laca et al. 2021a), but the total DNA recovered may include non-target taxa (i.e., bacteria) that then overwhelm one or more non-microbial target taxa in the DNA extract. In a recent review of eDNA methodology, Tsuji et al. (2019) found that over 75% of papers used a commercial kit for eDNA extraction. Again, the

majority of studies comparing pore size, preservation method, and extraction method compare multi-species detection via metabarcoding, finding slight differences that may or may not be correlated with target taxa (Turner et al. 2014, Deiner et al. 2015b, Eichmiller et al. 2016b, Minamoto et al. 2016b, Djurhuus et al. 2017b, Li et al. 2018b, Kumar et al. 2019, Mauvisseau et al. 2021b, García et al. 2024b, Rodriguez et al. n.d.). However, it is never abundantly clear which is the “optimal” protocol.

Part of what makes it difficult to assess and compare different protocols is underlying variability between samples. Here, we define biological replicates as replicate water samples / filters taken from the same environment and technical replicates as replicate reactions for a given molecular analysis (e.g., qPCR) from the same water sample / filter. True biological variability will result in biological replicates generating slightly different results so without accounting for this, it can be difficult to attribute observed differences to either protocols or biological variability. This is very common in presence / absence metabarcoding results of many species, but it is also true for a single species in a quantitative assay such as quantitative PCR (qPCR) or digital or droplet digital PCR (dPCR or ddPCR). Although biological replicates taken next to each other may give slightly different results due to irreducible sampling variance, often comparisons of methods do not explicitly separate biological variability from methodological variability. A few other studies have looked specifically at how variability (as measured by coefficient of variability) can be impacted by methodology as well (Eichmiller et al. 2015, Minamoto et al. 2016a, Mauvisseau et al. 2021c). Here we isolate technical/biological variability and method variability and also look at homogenized versus non-homogenized water to further investigate how different biological replicates are when source water is well mixed versus grab samples.

Finally, it is very common that researchers are interested in combining results from samples collected or processed in different ways. Whether combining data from different published papers or across different experiments where protocols have evolved or adapted over time, the best way

to integrate qPCR data across datasets with differing field or laboratory protocols has been challenging. However, given a set of samples collected from a common pool but subsequently treated differently, it becomes possible to isolate the effects of different methodological choices on a defined outcome (here, target-species eDNA concentration), and derive a straightforward model to “correct” observed concentrations for different methodological choices. This shows precisely how different protocol choices affect eDNA quantification and importantly allows for comparison across datasets by accounting for, rather than ignoring, the differences.

## Methods

Two sets of experiments were conducted for this study (Table 1). In the first, the volume of water filtered and filter pore size varied while the preservation and extraction methods remained constant. This experiment also used homogenized source water to reduce true biological variability in replicate samples and specifically measure the effect of the difference in volume filtered and filter pore size. The second set of experiments held volume filtered and filter pore size constant while varying the type of preservation and the extraction method. Here, source water was not homogenized and true biological variability (i.e., bottle to bottle variation) is both observed and included. After DNA extraction, all extracts from both experiments followed the same procedures for total DNA quantification, assessment for inhibition, and quantification of target DNA via quantitative PCR (qPCR).

Table 1: Details on the two marine eDNA field campaigns conducted in this study.

	Campaign 1	Campaign 2
Date	September 2022	February 2023
Environment	Net enclosure open to environment, ~15°C	Closed, recirculating, filtered pool, ~20°C

	Campaign 1	Campaign 2
Number of dolphins present at time of sampling	3	1
Collection and filtration details	Filtration occurred 4 hours after collection	Collection and filtration in situ (i.e., 0 hour lag)
Homogenization	Yes	No
Volume filtered (L)	1, 3	3
Pore size of filter ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	1, 5	5
Preservation method	Longmire's buffer	Longmire's buffer, -80°C, RNAShield, Desiccation
Extraction method	Phenol-chloroform-isoamyl (PCI)	PCI, Qiagen Blood and Tissue, Zymo Miniprep

### 131 **Field sampling, filtration, preservation, extraction**

#### 132 **Campaign 1: Pore size and volume comparison**

133 Water samples were collected in Hood Canal near Bangor, Washington in September 2022 from  
134 a netted enclosure containing a small, managed population of Atlantic bottlenose dolphins  
135 (*Tursiops truncatus*). A total of 70 L of water was collected on site in large, clean carboys.  
136 Water was transported from the sampling site to the NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center  
137 (NWFSC) for processing, with an elapsed time of approximately 3 hours.

138 At the lab, carboys were well mixed to homogenize the source water before splitting it into  
139 individual samples. Samples were assigned to a volume filtered treatment (1 L or 3 L) and a

pore size treatment (1  $\mu\text{m}$  or 5  $\mu\text{m}$ ), for a total of four treatments, each with three biological replicates (i.e., filters). All filter membranes were 47 mm diameter mixed cellulose ester (MCE) and water was filtered using a vacuum manifold and sterile, single use filter funnels. After filtration, filters were transferred with sterile forceps and to 5 ml tubes containing 2 ml of Longmire’s buffer (Renshaw et al. 2015) and stored at room temperature for 2 months until DNA extraction. All filters were extracted using a phase lock protocol for phenol-chloroform-isoamyl DNA purification (see Ramón-Laca et al. (2021b) for detailed protocol). Total DNA was quantified via a Qubit fluorometer.

## **Campaign 2: Preservation and extraction comparison**

For the samples where preservation and extraction varied, water was collected in February 2023 from a closed pool with recirculating water and a filtration system with one dolphin inhabiting the pool at the time of sampling. Water samples were filtered on site *in situ* using a Smith Root Citizen Science sampler. For each water sample, 3 L of water was filtered onto a 5  $\mu\text{m}$  pore size 47 mm diameter MCE self-preserving Smith Root filter (Thomas et al. 2019). A total of 45 filters were collected over a time period of approximately 1 hour. The self-preserving filters were transported back to NOAA NWFSC within approximately 3 hours, where samples were randomized across the time of collection to various preservation treatments (n = 4 total; Longmire’s buffer, -80°C freezer, desiccation via self-preserving at room temperature, and Zymo DNA/RNA Shield) and extraction method (n = 3 total; phenol-chloroform-isoamyl alcohol, Qiagen Blood and Tissue Kit, Zymo Mini Prep Kit). Kits were scaled up accordingly to process 2 mL of preservative. Two combinations of preservation and extraction was not completed (Longmire’s buffer with Qiagen Blood and Tissue and Longmire’s buffer with Zymo Mini Prep Kit), resulting in not a full factorial design but 10 combinations of the two treatments. All samples were preserved for 3 months before being extracted. Total DNA of all extracts were quantified via a Qubit fluorometer.



## **Inhibition testing and target DNA quantification**

All samples were assessed for inhibition by using an internal positive control (IPC) assay that was multiplexed with the target DNA assay by utilizing two different reporters. The IPC assay used was TaqMan Exogenous Internal Positive Control Reagents (EXO-IPC) (Applied Biosystems, USA). The IPC was included in all environmental samples and also in no template controls (NTC). Samples were deemed inhibited if the difference in mean Ct value of the IPC measured in the sample and the mean Ct value of the IPC measured in the sample was greater than 0.5. Inhibited samples were diluted and re-run until the delta Ct was less than 0.5.

Target DNA (*T. truncatus*) was quantified using a regionally-specific assay (Brasseale et al. n.d.) targeting a 80 base pair fragment of the cytochrome B gene region using a synthetic gBlock (IDT) as a standard curve from 100,000 copies/ $\mu$ L to 1 copy/ $\mu$ L in a ten-fold dilution series. All samples were run in triplicate and each plate contained three no template controls (NTCs). The forward primer sequence was 5'-TTATTCTTCCATTCATCATCAC-3', the reverse primer sequence was 5'-GTGGGGTTGTTGGATCCTGT-3', and the probe sequence was JUN-GAATAGTAGGTGAACGGCTGCCA-QSY. Each reaction contained, per 10  $\mu$ L reaction: 5  $\mu$ L of TaqMan Gene Expression Master Mix (Applied Biosystems), 0.4  $\mu$ L of 10  $\mu$ M forward primer, 0.4  $\mu$ L of 10  $\mu$ M reverse primer, 0.2  $\mu$ L of 10  $\mu$ M probe, 2  $\mu$ L of DNase/RNase free water and 2  $\mu$ L of DNA. Reactions were with an initial denaturation of 95C for 10 min, followed by 45 cycles of denaturation (94C for 15 sec) and annealing/extension (60C for 1 min).

## **Optimizing the target-to-total DNA ratio**

Our metric of interest is the ratio of target DNA (as measured by qPCR) to total DNA (as measured by Qubit). The units of target DNA are copies per volume whereas total DNA is

188 mass per volume. We converted the total DNA from mass to copy number by using the length  
 189 of the fragment, the average mass of each base pair, and Avogadro's number (Equation 1).  
 190 This gives us the concentration in copy/ $\mu$ L if all the total DNA in the extract were 80 base  
 191 pair fragments. Rather than using the exact molecular weight of the target DNA, we use an  
 192 average molecular mass of a DNA base pair (618 g/mole) given that we know that all genomic  
 193 DNA is not target DNA. This allows us to make a ratio by having both quantities in the same  
 194 units, using:

$$C_{totalDNA}[copies/\mu L] = \frac{C_{totalDNA}[ng/\mu L] * 6.022 * 10^{23}[copy/mol]}{MW[g/mol] * 10^9[ng/g]}$$

195 Then the ratio of target to total DNA is calculated simply by:

$$Ratio = \frac{C_{targetDNA}[copy/\mu L]}{C_{totalDNA}[copy/\mu L]}$$

## 196 **Linear models to compare different methodological choices**

197 Here, we present two linear models to quantify how different methodological choices (volume  
 198 filtered, filter pore size, preservation method, extraction method) impact target quantification.  
 199 Given that for each field campaign, the water sampled all comes from a common pool, we  
 200 can attribute the differences in target quantification to (1) sampling variability, and (2) the  
 201 differences in methodological choices in collection and processing. Because we did not have a  
 202 full factorial sampling design over our two field campaigns, we developed two closely related  
 203 models: one predicting concentration as a function of volume filtered and pore size, and the  
 204 other predicting concentration as a function of preservation and extraction methods.

205 In both models, (log) observations of concentrations of target DNA are treated hierarchically,  
 206 with observations from technical replicate  $i$ , bottle  $j$ , treatment  $k$ , and campaign  $m$  drawn  
 207 from a nested series of normal distributions:

$$y_{ijkm} \sim N(\mu_{jkm}, \sigma)$$

208

$$\mu_{jkm} \sim N(\theta_{km}, \tau)$$

209

$$\theta_{km} \sim N(\phi_m, \nu)$$

210 where  $\mu_{jkm}$  is the mean of each biological replicate (i.e., bottle-level mean) and  $\sigma$  is the  
 211 standard deviation among technical replicates within a biological replicate. Bottle-level means  
 212 are in turn treated as samples from a treatment-level distribution of mean  $\theta_{km}$  and standard  
 213 deviation  $\tau$ . Finally, all treatment-level means are treated as draws from a campaign-level  
 214 (overall) distribution of mean  $\phi_m$  and standard deviation  $\nu$ .

215

216 We first model the effects of volume filtered and pore size filter across two field campaigns  
 217 as:

$$\theta_{km} = \beta X$$

218 where  $\beta$  is a vector of regression coefficients having the same length as  $\theta$ , and  $X$  is the design  
 219 matrix mapping different combinations of volume filtered and pore size (i.e., treatments) to  
 220 the data.

221 The second model is identical, but for treatments of different preservation and extraction  
 222 methods, and having only a single campaign, such that it requires only the first two hierarchical

223 levels.

224 The priors for both models were the same and were as follows (Equations 5-8):

$$\mu_{jkm} \sim N(0, 10)$$

225

$$\sigma \sim \text{gamma}(1, 1)$$

226

$$\tau \sim \text{gamma}(1, 1)$$

227

$$\beta \sim N(0, 5)$$

228 The models were both implemented in RStan.

## 229 Results

### 230 Total DNA, target DNA, ratio of target to total DNA

231 For the samples collected in Campaign 1, we compared volume filtered and filter pore size  
232 (Table 2, Figure 1). Given the same volume of water filtered, the 1  $\mu\text{m}$  filters had higher total  
233 and target DNA as compared to the 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filters. Given the same pore size, the 1 L filters had  
234 less total and target DNA than the 3 L filter. However, the 1  $\mu\text{m}$  filters with 3x volume filtered  
235 had more than 3x total DNA (340% of mean value) and more than 3x target DNA (434% of  
236 mean value). The 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filters showed a similar pattern with the 3x volume samples having  
237 more than 3x total DNA (325% of mean value), but showed much more than 3x target DNA  
238 (514% of mean value). When converting these to ratios of target to total DNA, 1  $\mu\text{m}$  filters  
239 were lower than 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filters and the 1 L samples were lower than the 3 L samples, resulting  
240 in the 5  $\mu\text{m}$  and 3 L filter having the highest ratio of target to total DNA.

Here, the 1  $\mu\text{m}$  filters captured more total DNA than 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filters did, presumably across a range of particle sizes; we assume that the material captured on a 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filter is a subset of the material on a 1  $\mu\text{m}$  filter, with the larger pore size selecting for larger particles and not capturing particles  $< 5 \mu\text{m}$  (at least initially; at some point as the filter clogs it will have an effective pore size smaller than 5  $\mu\text{m}$  and capture smaller particles). To the extent that our target eDNA fragment – from vertebrate mtDNA – is more likely to occur in larger particles (due to the size of mammalian cells, etc), we expect and observe a larger target:total ratio with 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filters (Power et al. 2023b).

We also found that the level of inhibition was higher in the 3 L samples versus the 1 L samples given the same pore size and was about the same in 1  $\mu\text{m}$  versus 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filters given the same volume filtered (Supplemental Figures 1 and 2).

Table 2: Volume and Pore Size Experiment Results. For two volumes filtered and two pore sizes, the mean and standard deviation of total DNA (ng/ $\mu\text{L}$ ) and target DNA (copies/ $\mu\text{L}$ ) recovered, and the ratio of mean target to total DNA.

Volume filtered (L)	Filter pore size ( $\mu\text{m}$ )	Mean		Standard		Ratio tar- get:total DNA
		Mean total DNA (ng/ L)	Standard deviation total DNA	target DNA (copies/ L)	deviation target DNA	
1	1	51.4	3.93	7172	1030	1.14e-07
1	5	39.9	6.08	5908	879	1.22e-07
3	1	175	20.7	31191	2294	1.48e-07
3	5	127	11.6	30385	1540	1.99e-07






Figure 1: Total DNA, Target DNA, and Ratio from Volume and Pore Size Experiment. Panel A shows total DNA recovery (ng/ $\mu$ L) as a function of volume of water filtered and filter pore size. Panel B shows target DNA (copies/ $\mu$ L) as a function of volume of water filtered and filter pore size. Panel C shows the ratio of target to total DNA as a function of volume of water filtered and filter pore size.

252 For the second campaign comparing preservation and extraction methods, the total DNA  
253 varied across methods, with PCI extractions having consistently higher yields than either kit  
254 across preservation methods (Figure 2). However, target DNA was similar across preservation  
255 and extraction methods. The resulting ratio of target to total DNA exhibits the opposite  
256 trend of the total DNA yield, where PCI has the lowest ratio, then the Qiagen kit, and finally  
257 the Zymo kit with the highest ratio (i.e., the most desirable for a particular targeted assay).  
258 For all samples extracted with the Zymo kit, the Zymo DNA/RNA Shield had the highest  
259 ratio of the three preservatives tested. We found that the samples preserved in Longmire's  
260 and extracted with PCI both had higher total DNA and required larger dilutions to remove  
261 inhibition as measured by the internal positive control (Supplemental Figures 3 and 4).

### A Total DNA



### B Target DNA



### C Ratio Target:Total DNA




Figure 2: Preservation and extraction total DNA (Panel A), target DNA (Panel B), and ratio of target:total DNA (Panel C).



## Biological variability with homogenized and non-homogenized samples

In the first campaign, a large volume of water was collected and homogenized before splitting into the different treatments of pore size and volume filtered. In the second campaign, individual water samples were grabbed from the source (well mixed, relatively small pool) but not homogenized before filtering. In both experiments, the coefficient of variation between technical replicates (Figure 3, X markers) was less than the coefficient of variation between biological replicates (Figure 3, colored circles), which was less than the coefficient of variation between treatments (Figure 3, dashed lines; except in two sets of biological replicates). For the volume and pore size experiment, we also calculated the coefficient of variation assuming a linear increase in concentration with volume filtered (Figure 3, Panel A, dotted line). The coefficient of variation across treatments in the homogenized water in Campaign 1 (pore size and volume) and adjusting for the volume filtered was 0.24, compared to a coefficient of variation of 0.35 across treatments in Campaign 2. For the homogenized samples, the mean coefficient of variation between biological replicates was 0.1, whereas the mean coefficient of variation between biological replicates in the non-homogenized samples was 0.2 (Figure 3). The observed biological variability did not seem to be related to the methodological choices (Figure 3). Given how close the biological variability was to the variability across treatments especially in the preservation and extraction experiment, the linear models are particularly helpful to distinguish sources of variability.




Figure 3: Coefficient of variation (CV) of target DNA between technical replicates (Xs) and biological replicates (circles) in homogenized water from Campaign 1 (Panel A) and non-homogenized water from Campaign 2 (Panel B). Dashed lines show the coefficient of variation from all samples across all treatments. In Panel A, the dashed line shows all treatments but the dotted line shows the coefficient of variation if the concentrations are adjusted for the volume filtered in the experiment.

## Models to combine samples processed with different methods

Our two sets of experiments provided an opportunity to use two models to combine samples with different methodological choices from the same common reality (e.g., different pore size and volume filtered in the first experiment and different preservation and extraction methods in the second experiment). Because in a single campaign, the samples came from the same source water (and in the case of the first experiment, the source water was homogenized), we can assess how the different methodological choices affect differences in target DNA recovery through the use of linear models.

## Pore size and volume sampled

The first linear model was used to investigate the effects of different filter pore sizes and volumes on target DNA concentrations (Table 3, Figure 4, Supplemental Figure 5). Each campaign has its own intercept, reflecting the two different concentrations of target DNA in the underlying pools of water sampled for each campaign. We quantified different treatment effects relative to the base case of filtering 1 L through a filter of 1  $\mu\text{m}$  pore size; the coefficients for the effects of different treatments reflect departures from this baseline method. As with any similar analysis of variance (ANOVA), the choice of reference condition is arbitrary and does not affect the conclusions and 1 L filtered.

We find no meaningful marginal effect of changing from 1  $\mu\text{m}$  to 5  $\mu\text{m}$  pore size, after controlling for volume filtered (Table 3), but do see a greater-than-expected increase in target concentration by increasing sampling effort from 1 L to 3 L of water filtered. Rather than a linear increase with volume filtered (i.e., a parameter value of 1), we find an estimated scaling factor of 1.43 (95% posterior CI: 1.14 – 1.71).

Table 3: Model Parameters for Volume and Pore Size Experiment. Coefficients in bold are meaningfully different than zero.

Parameter	Mean Estimate	Standard Deviation	2.5% CI	97.5% CI	Effective Sample Size	R hat
Campaign 1	8.81	0.134	8.55	9.09	2859	1.002
Campaign 2	11.2	0.271	10.6	11.7	2626	1.002
Pore Size 5 $\mu\text{m}$	-0.0937	0.157	-0.409	0.214	3157	1.001
Log Volume	<b>1.43</b>	0.140	1.14	1.71	3456	1.000




Figure 4: Volume and Pore Size Linear Model Results. The model uses technical replicates (grey x's) to generate biological replicate, or bottle, means (blue circles), and bottle means are then fed into treatment means (yellow circles). Error bars show 2.5% and 97.5% confidence intervals.

## Preservation and extraction methods

Here, the source water was the same for all samples so there is a single intercept, which represents preservation by  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  and extraction by PCI (i.e., the base case for treatment type); again, the coefficients for treatment effects indicate deviation from those methodological choices (Table 4, Figure 5, Supplemental Figure 6). We find no meaningful effects of preservation or extraction method – including interactions among a subset of these – on our target eDNA concentration, with one exception: desiccation as a preservation method yielded systematically less target eDNA than other methods (mean posterior coefficient estimate =  $-0.894$ , 95% posterior CI  $-1.37$  to  $-0.429$ ). Desiccation retains approximately 40% of target eDNA relative to what would be retained by preserving filters at  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  immediately after filtering. Across a broad range of methodological choices, our results suggest roughly even performance in recovery of target DNA with only a few departures.

Table 4: Model Parameters for Preservation and Extraction Experiment. Coefficients in bold are meaningfully different than zero.

Parameter	Mean Estimate	Standard Deviation	2.5% CI	97.5% CI	Effective Sample Size	R hat
(Intercept)	12.8	0.166	12.5	13.1	1060	1.001
Desiccation	<b>-0.894</b>	0.239	-1.37	-0.429	1313	1.001
Shield	-0.330	0.236	-0.807	0.133	1323	1.000
Longmires	-0.130	0.234	-0.593	0.320	1721	1.000
Qiagen	0.195	0.238	-0.281	0.660	1274	1.000
Zymo	0.105	0.236	-0.365	0.555	1307	1.001
Desiccation / Qiagen	0.167	0.339	-0.492	0.840	1544	1.000
Shield / Qiagen	-0.00194	0.337	-0.673	0.672	1528	1.000
Desiccation / Zymo	0.400	0.333	-0.261	1.05	1626	1.001
Shield / Zymo	0.124	0.337	-0.523	0.821	1554	1.001




Figure 5: Preservation and Extraction Linear Model Results. The model uses technical replicates (grey x's) to generate biological replicate, or bottle, means (blue circles), and bottle means are then fed into treatment means (yellow circles). Error bars show 2.5% and 97.5% confidence intervals.

### Harmonizing samples across different protocols

Therefore, for a given sample that was preserved or extracted one way, we can then calculate an adjusted concentration to reflect what the concentration likely would have been given a different preservation or extraction method. For example, if we wanted to combine the data from Campaign 1 with the data from Campaign 2, we would take the intercept for Campaign 1 (8.81), add -0.0937 for the 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filter pore size and add  $1.43 \cdot \log(3)$  for the volume filtered and have a log DNA concentration of 10.29 copies/ $\mu\text{L}$ , which was preserved in Longmire's

and extracted via PCI. If we wanted to make this value comparable to the water sampled in Campaign 2 (which was 3L filtered on 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filter with the intercept as  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  and PCI), we would take the intercept 12.8 and add -0.130 for the switch of preservation from  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  to Longmires to get a log DNA concentration of 12.67 copies/ $\mu\text{L}$ . Moving those out of log space, we can compare 29,436 copies/ $\mu\text{L}$  from Campaign 1 to 318,062 copies/ $\mu\text{L}$  in Campaign 2. Now we can quantitatively compare these concentrations because we have modeled the effects of different treatments explicitly. We can do this for any observational data where we have the combination of methods in our matrix and can translate.

## Discussion

### More DNA is not always better

The natural inclination is to maximize capture of all DNA in order to capture more target DNA, either by using a smaller pore size filter or using a different extraction protocol. However, here we demonstrate that the metric to maximize is really the ratio of target to total DNA rather than total DNA. In other words, by using a filter with a smaller pore size or extracting more DNA via PCI rather than a commercial kit, there is more total DNA but a similar amount of target DNA, which ultimately makes the target a smaller percentage of the total DNA. By having a rare target in a larger pool of off-target DNA, other issues can arise associated with the concentration of various inhibitors. In both experiments, we demonstrate that the optimal methods for maximizing total DNA capture do not maximize the ratio of target to total DNA.

In the volume and pore size experiment, we found that the amount of total DNA scaled approximately as expected with the volume of water filtered given the same pore size filter (for 1  $\mu\text{m}$  filters, 3 L water samples had 340% the amount of total DNA as 1 L samples and



for 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filters 3 L had 318% of 1 L). However for target DNA for both pore size filters, the more target DNA was concentrated with larger volumes of water than expected (434% with 3x volume for 1  $\mu\text{m}$  filters and 514% with 3x volume for 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filters), a factor that can increase in importance for rare target species. Here, we demonstrate that collecting larger volumes of water will obviously result in higher concentrations of target DNA, but given the same volume of water collected, the smaller pore size filters (1  $\mu\text{m}$ ) collected more total DNA and more target DNA than the larger pore size filters (5  $\mu\text{m}$ ), but the ratio of target to total DNA was higher for the larger pore size filters (5  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and for the larger volume samples (3 L vs. 1 L), resulting in the highest ratio being 3 L of water filtered on a 5  $\mu\text{m}$  filter.

In the preservation and extraction experiment, given the same preservative, the PCI extractions maximized total DNA recovery, followed by the Qiagen Blood and Tissue Kit, while the Zymo kit recovered the lowest amount of total DNA. The amount of total DNA given the same extraction method but varying preservative varied with the  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  generally having the highest recovery except for Longmire's with the PCI extractions. In terms of target DNA, yields were the same order of magnitude with the  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  preservation having higher yield and lower variability than other preservatives and desiccation having lower yield and higher variability. However, because the target quantities were similar across preservation and extraction but the total DNA quantities varied, the pattern of the ratio of target to total DNA has the opposite pattern as the total DNA above, where PCI now has the lowest ratio for each preservative and the highest combination of preservative / extraction is DNA/RNA Shield with the Zymo extraction kit. It should be noted that this had the lowest total DNA yield, again emphasizing that more total DNA is not the metric for optimization but the ratio of target to total DNA.

Some hypotheses of the differences in total, target, and ratio of total to target DNA across different pore sizes, preservation, and extraction methods include consideration of the mechanisms of filtration and the combinations and compatibility of preservatives and extraction kits.

For the filter pore size, smaller pore sizes (here, 1  $\mu\text{m}$ ) will capture more bacteria which will contribute to the total DNA yield, but as in this study targeting dolphin DNA, are non-target. A larger pore size filter (here, 5  $\mu\text{m}$ ) will result in less capture of smaller organisms such as bacteria and will leave room for capturing more of the desired larger animal cells before the filter clogs or the designated volume has been filtered. It should be noted that this study was conducted in relatively shallow, near-shore, nutrient rich water. Deep sea or oligotrophic waters might concentrate less off-target DNA and the ratios found here are not necessarily portable to different environments.

**Even when collecting water while looking at a dolphin, we are still looking for a needle in a haystack.**

The metric we are interested in maximizing is the target to total DNA ratio, however it is worth noting the absolute values of that ratio, especially given how sampling was conducted. In both sets of experiments, dolphins were present while the water was being collected. The absolute concentration of dolphin DNA was high, as expected. To generate the ratio of target to total DNA, the total DNA concentration has to be converted from units of mass per volume as measured by the Qubit fluorescence reader to copies per volume to match the units of the target DNA concentration as measured by qPCR. This conversion requires a fragment length, which here we use the length of the fragment targeted by the qPCR assay. Therefore, the denominator used in the ratio can be thought of as the total number of fragments that could possibly be target (here, dolphin).

These percentages are very low. Even when sampling water while looking at the species of interest and using methods intended to maximize the target to total ratio (here, larger pore size filter and larger volume of water), the target is just 0.00001% of the total DNA. This corresponds relatively well with a recent study that used shotgun sequencing and found fish

394 to be 0.00004% of the total reads from a 1 L water sample taken from a reef in Australia and  
395 filtered on a 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  nylon filter, frozen at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$ , and extracted using the Qiagen Blood and  
396 Tissue Kit (Stat et al. 2017). In other words, the water sample has many things we are not  
397 interested in. In other words, water samples contain genetic material from many, many species  
398 that we are not interested in, and this is important to bear in mind within the context of very  
399 rare targets and the possibility of false negatives.

400 **There are many choices and most are just fine.**

401 Though the total DNA yield varied with preservative and extraction choice, the amount of  
402 target DNA recovered was similar across methodological choices. Some preservative and extrac-  
403 tion protocol combinations are less than ideal (i.e., desiccation with PCI), but most method-  
404 ological combinations perform similarly. When selecting a combination of preservation and  
405 extraction methods, it is important to keep in mind the mechanisms of the different preserva-  
406 tives. For example, Longmire’s buffer and DNA/RNA Shield are both lysis buffers, meaning  
407 that the DNA is actually preserved in the buffer and removed from the filter while the filter  
408 is submerged in the buffer. On the other hand, the self-preserving filters and storing filters in  
409 the  $-80^{\circ}\text{C}$  both work by desiccation and therefore the DNA is still on the filter when starting  
410 the extraction. Accordingly, as long as the extraction method is compatible with whether the  
411 DNA is still on the filter or in the buffer, there should not be large differences in target DNA  
412 yield. Again, the total DNA yield will differ based on extraction protocol (e.g., PCI will recover  
413 more total DNA), but the target DNA seems relatively robust to different preservation and  
414 extraction methods assuming compatibility between the two. This is also important as access  
415 to reagents and infrastructure like freezers may vary and logistical constraints may impact the  
416 decisions for preservation and extraction methods.

## Responsibly combining data from different methods

Particularly relevant for time series data or combining data from different projects, it is important to keep methods consistent. However, there are many reasons why one might want to combine data generated from different protocols. Here, we demonstrate the use of simple linear models to “correct” for different protocols and make data comparable. It is important to have a calibration experiment where all possible combinations of protocols are sampled from a common reality in order to make the corrections. However, once that has been done, this allows for extrapolating any scenario from the linear model for unknown samples. Importantly, any set of samples can be translated to the equivalent concentration of a different methodological choice. This is essential to responsibly combine quantitative data collected via different methods, thereby facilitating the generation of larger sample sizes and larger spatial and temporal coverage for exploring broad-scale hypotheses. Future work could look at doing something similar with different species-specific assays for the same target species and determining how portable these parameter estimates are in relation to different assays and other water samples, especially considering other environmental factors like turbidity, salinity, or other parameters that might affect portability.

## Conclusion

Many publications exist comparing results from different methodological choices in eDNA protocols. However, here we approached this methodological comparison with a very specific goal of defining the metric to maximize, the ratio of target DNA to total DNA for a single species quantitative assay. We find that while smaller pore size filters collect more total DNA, the target DNA is similar and therefore a larger pore size filter with larger volumes of water filtered maximizes the target to total DNA ratio recovered. We also find that while different preservatives and extraction methods vary, the variance tends to be reflected by larger

changes in total DNA yield rather than target DNA yield. Accordingly, we found that the extraction method with the highest target to total DNA ratio was from the commercially available kits rather than PCI. Finally, we introduce simple linear models to correct data sourced from samples with varying protocols, allowing researchers to utilize information from varying protocols in a responsible manner.

## Acknowledgements

This material is based upon research supported by the Office of Naval Research under Award Number (N00014-22-1-2719). The authors are grateful to U.S. Naval Base Kitsap-Bangor for logistic support. This study was supported through collaborative research efforts with the U.S. Navy’s Marine Mammal Program. Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

## References

- Bessey, C., S. N. Jarman, O. Berry, Y. S. Olsen, M. Bunce, T. Simpson, M. Power, J. McLaughlin, G. J. Edgar, and J. Keesing. 2020. [Maximizing fish detection with eDNA metabarcoding](#). *Environmental DNA* 2:493–504.
- Bizzozzero, M. R., F. Altermatt, R. Ciciarella, J.-C. Walser, E. P. Willems, and M. Krützen. 2024. [Enhancing environmental DNA metabarcoding from marine ecosystems: Impact of filter type, storage method, and storage time on the assessment of fish alpha and beta diversity](#). *Environmental DNA* 6:e570.
- Bowen, L., S. Waters, L. Rankin, K. Thorne, D. Gille, S. De La Cruz, I. Woo, L. Lewis, K. Karpenko, C. Dean, and G. Schumer. 2024. [A comparison of eDNA sampling methods in an estuarine environment on presence of longfin smelt \( \*Spirinchus thaleichthys\* \) and fish community composition](#). *Environmental DNA* 6:e560.

- Brasseale, E., N. G. Adams, E. Allan, E. K. Jacobson, R. P. Kelly, O. R. Liu, S. Moore,  
M. Shaffer, J. Xiong, and K. Parsons. (n.d.). [Marine eDNA production and loss mechanisms.](#)
- Capo, E., G. Spong, H. Königsson, and P. Byström. 2020a. [Effects of filtration methods and water volume on the quantification of brown trout \( \*Salmo trutta\* \) and Arctic char \( \*Salvelinus alpinus\* \) eDNA concentrations via droplet digital PCR.](#) Environmental DNA 2:152–160.
- Capo, E., G. Spong, H. Königsson, and P. Byström. 2020b. [Effects of filtration methods and water volume on the quantification of brown trout \( \*Salmo trutta\* \) and Arctic char \( \*Salvelinus alpinus\* \) eDNA concentrations via droplet digital PCR.](#) Environmental DNA 2:152–160.
- Coutant, O., I. Cantera, K. Cilleros, T. Dejean, A. Valentini, J. Murienne, and S. Brosse. 2021. [Detecting fish assemblages with environmental DNA: Does protocol matter? Testing eDNA metabarcoding method robustness.](#) Environmental DNA 3:619–630.
- Deiner, K., J. Lopez, S. Bourne, L. Holman, M. Seymour, E. K. Grey, A. Lacoursière, Y. Li, M. A. Renshaw, M. E. Pfrender, M. Rius, L. Bernatchez, and D. M. Lodge. 2018. [Optimising the detection of marine taxonomic richness using environmental DNA metabarcoding: the effects of filter material, pore size and extraction method.](#) Metabarcoding and Metagenomics 2:e28963.
- Deiner, K., J.-C. Walser, E. Mächler, and F. Altermatt. 2015a. [Choice of capture and extraction methods affect detection of freshwater biodiversity from environmental DNA.](#) Biological Conservation 183:53–63.
- Deiner, K., J.-C. Walser, E. Mächler, and F. Altermatt. 2015b. [Choice of capture and extraction methods affect detection of freshwater biodiversity from environmental DNA.](#) Biological Conservation 183:53–63.
- Djurhuus, A., J. Port, C. J. Closek, K. M. Yamahara, O. Romero-Maraccini, K. R. Walz, D. B.

490 Goldsmith, R. Michisaki, M. Breitbart, A. B. Boehm, and F. P. Chavez. 2017a. [Evaluation](#)  
491 [of filtration and DNA extraction methods for environmental DNA biodiversity assessments](#)  
492 [across multiple trophic levels](#). *Frontiers in Marine Science* 4.

493 Djurhuus, A., J. Port, C. J. Closek, K. M. Yamahara, O. Romero-Maraccini, K. R. Walz, D. B.  
494 Goldsmith, R. Michisaki, M. Breitbart, A. B. Boehm, and F. P. Chavez. 2017b. [Evaluation](#)  
495 [of filtration and DNA extraction methods for environmental DNA biodiversity assessments](#)  
496 [across multiple trophic levels](#). *Frontiers in Marine Science* 4.

497 Eichmiller, J. J., L. M. Miller, and P. W. Sorensen. 2015. Optimizing techniques to capture  
498 and extract environmental DNA for detection and quantification of fish. *Molecular Ecology*  
499 *Resources* 16:5668.

500 Eichmiller, J. J., L. M. Miller, and P. W. Sorensen. 2016a. [Optimizing techniques to capture](#)  
501 [and extract environmental DNA for detection and quantification of fish](#). *Molecular Ecology*  
502 *Resources* 16:56–68.

503 Eichmiller, J. J., L. M. Miller, and P. W. Sorensen. 2016b. [Optimizing techniques to capture](#)  
504 [and extract environmental DNA for detection and quantification of fish](#). *Molecular Ecology*  
505 *Resources* 16:56–68.

506 Foote, A. D., P. F. Thomsen, S. Sveegaard, M. Wahlberg, J. Kielgast, L. A. Kyhn, A. B.  
507 Salling, A. Galatius, L. Orlando, and M. T. P. Gilbert. 2012. Investigating the potential  
508 use of environmental DNA (eDNA) for genetic monitoring of marine mammals. *PLOS*  
509 *ONE* 7:e417816.

510 Fukuzawa, T., H. Shirakura, N. Nishizawa, H. Nagata, Y. Kameda, and H. Doi. 2023. [En-](#)  
511 [vironmental DNA extraction method from water for a high and consistent DNA yield](#).  
512 *Environmental DNA* 5:627–633.

513 García, S. M., C. L. Chun, J. Dumke, G. J. A. Hansen, K. B. Quebedeaux, C. Rounds, A.  
514 Totsch, and E. R. Larson. 2024a. [Environmental DNA storage and extraction method](#)  
515 [affects detectability for multiple aquatic invasive species](#). *Environmental DNA* 6:e557.

- García, S. M., C. L. Chun, J. Dumke, G. J. A. Hansen, K. B. Quebedeaux, C. Rounds, A. Totsch, and E. R. Larson. 2024b. [Environmental DNA storage and extraction method affects detectability for multiple aquatic invasive species](#). *Environmental DNA* 6:e557.
- Hinlo, R., D. Gleeson, M. Lintermans, and E. Furlan. 2017. [Methods to maximise recovery of environmental DNA from water samples](#). *PLOS ONE* 12:e0179251.
- Kumar, G., J. E. Eble, and M. R. Gaither. 2019. [A practical guide to sample preservation and pre-PCR processing of aquatic environmental DNA](#). *Molecular Ecology Resources* 20:29–39.
- Li, J., L.-J. Lawson Handley, D. S. Read, and B. Hänfling. 2018a. [The effect of filtration method on the efficiency of environmental DNA capture and quantification via metabarcoding](#). *Molecular Ecology Resources* 18:1102–1114.
- Li, J., L.-J. Lawson Handley, D. S. Read, and B. Hänfling. 2018b. [The effect of filtration method on the efficiency of environmental DNA capture and quantification via metabarcoding](#). *Molecular Ecology Resources* 18:1102–1114.
- Liang, Z., and A. Keeley. 2013. [Filtration recovery of extracellular DNA from environmental water samples](#). *Environmental Science & Technology* 47:9324–9331.
- Liu, Q., J. Tan, M. Wang, N. Xin, R. Qi, and H. Wang. 2024. [Optimization of pore size and filter material for better enrichment of environmental DNA](#). *Frontiers in Environmental Science* 12:1422269.
- Majaneva, M., O. H. Diserud, S. H. C. Eagle, E. Boström, M. Hajibabaei, and T. Ekrem. 2018. [Environmental DNA filtration techniques affect recovered biodiversity](#). *Scientific Reports* 8:4682.
- Mauvisseu, Q., D. Halfmaerten, S. Neyrinck, A. Burian, and R. Brys. 2021a. [Effects of preservation strategies on environmental DNA detection and quantification using ddPCR](#). *Environmental DNA* 3:815–822.
- Mauvisseu, Q., D. Halfmaerten, S. Neyrinck, A. Burian, and R. Brys. 2021b. [Effects of](#)



542      [preservation strategies on environmental DNA detection and quantification using ddPCR.](#)  
543      [Environmental DNA 3:815–822.](#)

544      Mauvisseau, Q., D. Halfmaerten, S. Neyrinck, A. Burian, and R. Brys. 2021c. [Effects of](#)  
545      [preservation strategies on environmental DNA detection and quantification using ddPCR.](#)  
546      [Environmental DNA 3:815–822.](#)

547      Minamoto, T., T. Naka, K. Moji, and A. Maruyama. 2016a. [Techniques for the practical](#)  
548      [collection of environmental DNA: filter selection, preservation, and extraction.](#) *Limnology*  
549      17:23–32.

550      Minamoto, T., T. Naka, K. Moji, and A. Maruyama. 2016b. [Techniques for the practical](#)  
551      [collection of environmental DNA: filter selection, preservation, and extraction.](#) *Limnology*  
552      17:23–32.

553      Ogram, A., G. S. Sayler, and T. Barkay. 1987. [The extraction and purification of microbial](#)  
554      [DNA from sediments.](#) *Journal of Microbiological Methods* 7:57–66.

555      Power, H., M. Takahashi, S. Jarman, and O. Berry. 2023a. [What is environmental DNA?](#)  
556      [Environmental DNA 5:1743–1758.](#)

557      Power, H., M. Takahashi, S. Jarman, and O. Berry. 2023b. [What is environmental DNA?](#)  
558      [Environmental DNA 5:1743–1758.](#)

559      Ramón-Laca, A., A. Wells, and L. Park. 2021b. [A workflow for the relative quantification](#)  
560      [of multiple fish species from oceanic water samples using environmental DNA \(eDNA\) to](#)  
561      [support large-scale fishery surveys.](#) *PLOS ONE* 16:e0257773.

562      Ramón-Laca, A., A. Wells, and L. Park. 2021a. [A workflow for the relative quantification](#)  
563      [of multiple fish species from oceanic water samples using environmental DNA \(eDNA\) to](#)  
564      [support large-scale fishery surveys.](#) *PLOS ONE* 16:e0257773.

565      Renshaw, M. A., B. P. Olds, C. L. Jerde, M. M. McVeigh, and D. M. Lodge. 2015. [The](#)  
566      [room temperature preservation of filtered environmental DNA samples and assimilation](#)  
567      [into a phenol–chloroform–isoamyl alcohol DNA extraction.](#) *Molecular Ecology Resources*

15:168–176.

Rodriguez, L., L. De Bonis, J. McKee, J. A. McKenna, T. Urvois, E. Barbaccia, E. Dillane, C. Lanfredi, H. Hjellnes, A. Jung, E. Villa, A. Azzellino, J.-I. Westgaard, E. Quéméré, and B. Thalinger. (n.d.). [Comparing the efficiency of DNA extraction protocols across a multinational environmental DNA initiative.](#)

Spens, J., A. R. Evans, D. Halfmaerten, S. W. Knudsen, M. E. Sengupta, S. S. T. Mak, E. E. Sigsgaard, and M. Hellström. 2017. [Comparison of capture and storage methods for aqueous microbial eDNA using an optimized extraction protocol: advantage of enclosed filter.](#) *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 8:635–645.

Stat, M., M. J. Huggett, R. Bernasconi, J. D. DiBattista, T. E. Berry, S. J. Newman, E. S. Harvey, and M. Bunce. 2017. [Ecosystem biomonitoring with eDNA: metabarcoding across the tree of life in a tropical marine environment.](#) *Scientific Reports* 7:12240.

Takahashi, M., M. Saccò, J. H. Kestel, G. Nester, M. A. Campbell, M. van der Heyde, M. J. Heydenrych, D. J. Juszkievicz, P. Nevill, K. L. Dawkins, C. Bessey, K. Fernandes, H. Miller, M. Power, M. Mousavi-Derazmahalleh, J. P. Newton, N. E. White, Z. T. Richards, and M. E. Allentoft. 2023a. [Aquatic environmental DNA: A review of the macro-organismal biomonitoring revolution.](#) *Science of The Total Environment* 873:162322.

Takahashi, M., M. Saccò, J. H. Kestel, G. Nester, M. A. Campbell, M. van der Heyde, M. J. Heydenrych, D. J. Juszkievicz, P. Nevill, K. L. Dawkins, C. Bessey, K. Fernandes, H. Miller, M. Power, M. Mousavi-Derazmahalleh, J. P. Newton, N. E. White, Z. T. Richards, and M. E. Allentoft. 2023b. [Aquatic environmental DNA: A review of the macro-organismal biomonitoring revolution.](#) *Science of The Total Environment* 873:162322.

Thomas, A. C., P. L. Nguyen, J. Howard, and C. S. Goldberg. 2019. [A self-preserving, partially biodegradable eDNA filter.](#) *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 10:1136–1141.

Tsuji, S., T. Takahara, H. Doi, N. Shibata, and H. Yamanaka. 2019. [The detection of aquatic macroorganisms using environmental DNA analysis—A review of methods for collection,](#)

594        [extraction, and detection](#). *Environmental DNA* 1:99–108.

595    Turner, C. R., D. J. Miller, K. J. Coyne, and J. Corush. 2014. [Improved Methods for Capture,](#)

596        [Extraction, and Quantitative Assay of Environmental DNA from Asian Bigheaded Carp](#)

597        [\(Hypophthalmichthys spp.\)](#). *PLOS ONE* 9:e114329.