


# Hake 2019 Survey

## eDNA from the 2019 Hake cruise, eulachon

### Sampling and processing to date.

In total we have processed qPCR for pacific hake, pacific lamprey, and eulachon from 134 CTD stations representing 653 station-depth combinations for 1304 individual 2.5L water samples.




## Inhibition


There are a lot of samples that show signs of inhibition. They are concentrated in the surface samples. Here are the inhibition by station-depths and depth categories. ‘Completely inhibited’ means zero PCR replicates from any water sample at that station-depth combination have amplified within the PCR parameters. ‘Not inhibited’ indicates that no PCR from that station-depth has evidence of inhibition. Insert language about non-template controls, how inhibition is identified.

Depth Category (m)	Total	Not_inhibited	Partially_inhibited	Completely_inhibited
0	130	20	43	67
25	23	19	3	1
50	128	102	21	5
100	107	102	5	0
150	103	100	3	0
200	1	1	0	0
300	84	80	4	0
500	75	72	1	2
TOTAL	651	496	80	75

We can look at the patterns of inhibition spatially and by depth.





Here are some larger plot of just a few shallow depths. Inhibition is clearly strongest at the surface, but beyond depth there is no obvious pattern of inhibition among the samples. Perhaps there is a hint of inhibition in the offshore edges of the transects at the 50 and 100m depths, but it is not a strong pattern.



## Standards

The standards used in the qPCR assay look pretty reasonable good. Each color represents a different PCR plate. They are pretty much on top of each other.







## Controls

There are two main types of control: field negative control and extraction controls. The extraction controls have never produced any measurable amount of DNA, so we will ignore them for now.

Thus far we have analyzed 35 samples out of a total of 53 field negative samples. Out of the 35, 0 have detectable amounts ( $> 20 \text{ Copies } L^{-1}$ ) of eulachon DNA. In general the amount of detected eulachon DNA is pretty much zero.




We can look at the temporal pattern of the control values too. This will be more informative when we have more samples analyzed.




## Eulachon eDNA


We can first ask if the distribution of estimated DNA compare to the values present in the field samples. The vast majority of samples have effectively 0 eulachon DNA.



Let's make some plots of the spatial distribution of eulachon DNA. I think the









## Acoustic Data.

There is no acoustic information for eulachon.


## eDNA transects.

Here are a few plots from individual transects. Coast is on the right side of the graph. NOTE: SIZE OF THE POINTS ARE NOT IDENTICAL ACROSS THE PANELS. Ole is trying to fix this.






Transect 65; Latitude 45.1



Transect 67; Latitude 45.4



This is a plot of median (plus interquartile range) for eulachon DNA concentration by the water depth category. Shallower sites are on the shelf (same data with two different x-axes, plotted)

