A121 Recovering DNA Profiles From Low Quantity and Low Quality Forensic Samples

Linda Le, Kimberly C. Clabaugh, BS, and Andrew Chang, San Jose State University, Forensic Science Department, One Washington Square, San Jose, CA 95129; Marissa R.D. Meininger, 10492C Dougherty Avenue, Morgan Hill, CA 95037; Michael D. Coble, PhD, Odile M. Loreille, PhD, and Melissa Scheible, MFS, Armed Forces DNA Identification Laboratory, 1413 Research Boulevard, Building 101, Rockville, MD 20850; Rolf Muller, PhD, Biomatrica, Incorporated, 5627 Oberlin Drive, Suite 120, San Diego, CA 92130; Margaret C. Kline, MS, NIST, 100 Bureau Drive, Building 227 Room B226, MS 8311, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8311; and Steven B. Lee, PhD, San Jose State University, 1 Washington Square, Macquarrie Hall 521, San Jose, CA 95192*

After attending this presentation, attendees will learn how the use of reagent PCRboostTM (Biomatrica, San Diego, CA) can optimize methods for recovering DNA profiles from low quality and low quantity forensic samples.

This presentation will impact the forensic community by explaining why millions of biological samples, including cells, viruses, and DNA/RNA, are stored every year for diagnostics, research and forensics. Forensic evidence samples such as hairs, bones, teeth and sexual assault evidence may contain less than 100 pg of DNA. Low DNA yields may be due to damage or degradation, small cell numbers found in low copy number (LCN) or 'touch' samples, oligospermic or aspermic perpetrators, or low male DNA from extended interval postcoital samples in sexual assault cases. Trace biological evidence including fingerprints also provide low yields. Optimal methods for recovering DNA profiles from these types of low quality and low quantity forensic samples is critical to downstream analysis or re-testing.

Successful forensic analysis depends on the ability to identify and individualize biological evidence. Many forensic evidence samples such as hairs, bones, teeth and sexual assault evidence often contain less than 100 pg of DNA.[1,2] Low DNA yields may be due to damage or degradation,[1,2] small cell numbers found in low copy number (LCN) or 'touch' samples,[1-5] oligospermic[6] or aspermic perpetrators,[7] or low male DNA from extended interval post-coital samples in sexual assault cases.[8] Trace biological evidence, including fingerprints, also provide low yields of DNA.[9-11] Degradation is another factor that can contribute to further damage compromised sample types, including those derived from ancient or degraded bones or teeth.[12,13] Degradation results in reduction or loss of the structural integrity of cells and proteins, which in turn affects the quantity and quality of recovered nuclear and mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA). Sub-optimal storage can also detrimentally affect sample integrity. Reduction in DNA recovery has been observed with refrigerated liquid DNA extracts and also those exposed to multiple freeze-thaw cycles; the loss may be exacerbated by the use of certain microfuge tubes.[14,15] Therefore, the development of optimal methods is critical for successful recovery of DNA profiles from these types of low quality and quantity forensic samples, particularly if downstream analysis or re-testing is necessary.

Low yields or loss of DNA due to these and other factors may preclude or diminish the ability to test LCN crime scene samples using current STR methods, thus mtDNA testing is typically dictated for low quantity samples suffering from advanced states of degradation. Forensic PCR protocols typically specify 1.0 ng of DNA for optimal amplification.[16] However, the quantity and quality of template DNA from typical low copy forensic samples falls below this requirement. Furthermore, samples may also contain inhibitors to PCR that co-extract with the DNA, resulting in sub-optimal amplification reactions providing partial profiles or no typing, thereby greatly reducing the probative value of the samples. Modifications to existing amplification and typing protocols (e.g., mini amplicons, whole genome amplification and LCN protocols) to increase the DNA signal are currently being investigated to increase the analytical success rate of challenged samples.[17-19] However, complete forensic DNA profiles are not always achieved when the samples are extremely low quantity and quality.

A method was recently reported where inclusion of a novel reagent, PCRboost™ (Biomatrica, Inc.) was able to enhance amplification 5-fold or more of challenging and difficult to amplify samples. This study aims to evaluate the use of PCRboost for forensic DNA analysis to enhance amplification and recovery of forensic DNA profiles from low quantity and low quality samples.

This study will be conducted in three phases: (1) Amplification of control DNA (including 9947a) using serial dilutions down to pg amounts; various formulations of PCRboost will also be evaluated, (2) Amplification of damaged, degraded and low copy DNA samples including non- probative bone and teeth samples, and (3) Amplification of DNA containing varying amounts of inhibitors. Other experiments including amplification of mixtures will also be performed. Results from preliminary experiments conducted by members of an inter-laboratory consortium will be presented.

Amplicons from multiplex STR and/or mtDNA amplification will be assessed by capillary electrophoreisis using the Applied Biosystems 310 or 3130 genetic analyzer. Analysis of the data will be performed using the new GeneMapper ID software from Applied Biosystems. Assessment of qualitative and quantitative data of all

 ** Presenting Author*

samples will be evaluated using GMID software. Analyses of the replicates of each set of data will be performed and statistical analysis will be done to rigorously evaluate and assess any differences between control and test samples with and without PCRboost.

References:

1 P. Gill. Application of low copy number DNA profiling, Croat Med. J. 42 (2001) 229–232.

2 P. Gill, J. Whitaker, C. Flaxman, N. Brown, J. Buckleton, An investigation of the rigor of interpretation rules for STRs derived from less than 100 pg of DNA, Forensic Sci. Int. 112 (2000) 17–40.

3 M. Phipps, S. Petricevic The tendency of individuals to transfer DNA to handled items Forensic Science International 2006. Article in Press, Corrected Proof - Downloaded 03-16-07 from http://www.sciencedirect.com.libaccess.sjlibrary.org/sciencedoi:10. 1016/j.forsciint.2006.07.010

4 A. Lowe, C. Murray, J. Whitaker, G. Tully, P. Gill. The propensity of individuals to deposit DNA and secondary transfer of low level DNA from individuals to inert surfaces. Forensic Sci. Int. 129 (2002) 25– 34.

5 R.A. Wickenheiser, Trace DNA: a review, discussion of theory, and application of the transfer of trace quantities of DNA through skin contact, J. Forensic Sci. 47 (3) (2002) 442–450.

6 J.G. Shewale, S.C. Sikka, E. Schneida, S.K. Sinha, DNA profiling of azoospermic semen samples from vasectomized males by using YPLEX 6 amplification kit, J. Forensic Sci. 48 (2003) 127–129.

7 I. Sibille, C. Duverneuil, G. Lorin de la Grandmaison, K. Guerrouache, F. Teissiere, M. Durigon, P. de Mazancourt, Y-STR DNA amplifcation as biological evidence in sexually assaulted female victims with no cytological detection of spermatozoa, Forensic Sci. Int. 125 (2002) 212–216.

8 A. Hall, J. Ballantyne, Novel Y-STR typing strategies reveal the genetic profile of the semen donor in extended interval post-coital cervicovaginal samples, Forensic Sci. Int. 136 (2003) 58–72.

9 R.A. van Oorschot, M.K. Jones, DNA Fingerprints from Fingerprints, Nature 387 (1997) 767.

10 M.M. Schulz, W. Reichert, Archived or directly swabbed latent fingerprints as a DNA source for STR typing, Forensic Sci. Int. 127 (2002) 128–130.

11 M.K. Balogh, J. Burger, K. Bender, P.M. Schneider, K.W. Alt, STR genotyping and mtDNA sequencing of latent fingerprint on paper, Forensic Sci. Int. 137 (2003) 188–195.

12 Paabo, S. P. H Poinar, D Serre, V. Jaenicke-Despres, J Hebler, N Rohland, M Kuch, J Krause, L Vigilant, and M Hofreiter. Genetic Analyses from Ancient DNA. Annu. Rev. Genet. 2004. 38:645–79

13 O'Rourke, DH. , M.G. Hayes, and SW. Carlyle. Ancient DNA studies in physical anthropology. Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2000. 29:217–42

14 Larsen, K and S. Lee. 2005. Optimization Strategies for DNA storage. Poster presented at the 16th Annual International Symposium on Human Identification. 26-29 September 2005. Grapevine, TX. http://www.promega.com/geneticidproc/ussymp16proc/abstracts.ht m

15 Gaillard C. and Strauss F. Eliminating DNA loss and denaturation during storage in plastic microtubes. American Clinical Laboratory (March 2001) 52-54.

16 P.J. Collins, PJ, L.K. Hennessy, LK, C.S. Leibelt, CS, R.K. Roby, RK, D.J. Reeder, DJ, and P.A. Foxall, PA. Developmental Validation of a Single-Tube Amplification of the 13 CODIS STR Loci, D2S1338, D19S433 and Amelogenin; The AmpfℓSTR Identifiler PCR Amplification Kit. J. Forensic Sci. 49(6), 1-13., 2004

17 A.D. Kloosterman, P. Kersbergen, Efficacy and limits of genotyping low copy number (LCN) DNA samples by multiplex PCR of STR loci, J. Soc. Biol. 197 (4) (2003) 351–359.

18 KN. Ballantyne, R.A.H. van Oorschot and R. J. Mitchell. Comparison of two whole genome amplification methods for STR genotyping of LCN and degraded DNA samples Forensic Science International, Volume 166, Issue 1, 14 February 2007, Pages 35-41: EK. Hanson and J. Ballantyne. Whole genome amplification strategy for forensic genetic analysis using single or few cell equivalents of genomic DNA. Analytical Biochemistry, Volume 346, Issue 2, 15 November 2005, Pages 246-257

19 Opel KL, Chung DT, Drabek J, Tatarek NE, Jantz LM, McCord BR. The application of miniplex primer sets in the analysis of degraded DNA from human skeletal remains. J Forensic Sci. 2006 Mar;51(2):351-6.

DNA, PCRBoost, Forensic Samples

 ** Presenting Author*