

## ORIGINAL ARTICLE

## Environmental DNA

Dedicated to the study and use of environmental DNA for basic and applied sciences

WILEY

# Optimized DNA isolation from marine sponges for natural sampler DNA metabarcoding

Lynsey R. Harper<sup>1,2</sup>  | Erika F. Neave<sup>1,3</sup> | Graham S. Sellers<sup>4</sup> | Alice V. Cunnington<sup>1</sup> |  
 María Belén Arias<sup>3</sup> | Jamie Craggs<sup>3</sup> | Barry MacDonald<sup>5</sup> |  
 Ana Riesgo<sup>3,6</sup> | Stefano Mariani<sup>1</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>School of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK

<sup>2</sup>NatureMetrics Ltd, Surrey Research Park, Guildford, UK

<sup>3</sup>Department of Life Sciences, The Natural History Museum, London, UK

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biological and Marine Sciences, University of Hull, Kingston upon Hull, UK

<sup>5</sup>Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada

<sup>6</sup>Department of Biodiversity and Evolutionary Biology, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales (CSIC), Madrid, Spain

## Correspondence

Stefano Mariani, School of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool L3 3AF, UK.  
 Email: [s.mariani@ljmu.ac.uk](mailto:s.mariani@ljmu.ac.uk)

## Funding information

Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo, Grant/Award Number: 2019-74200143; Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Grant/Award Number: 202030E006; Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, Grant/Award Number: RYC2018-024247-I; Natural Environment Research Council, Grant/Award Number: NE/T007028/1

## Abstract

Marine sponges have recently been recognized as natural samplers of environmental DNA (eDNA) due to their effective water filtration and their ubiquitous, sessile, and regenerative nature. However, laboratory workflows for metabarcoding of sponge tissue have not been optimized to ensure that these natural samplers achieve their full potential for community survey. We used a phased approach to investigate the influence of DNA isolation procedures on the biodiversity information recovered from sponges. In Phase 1, we compared three treatments of residual ethanol preservative in sponge tissue alongside five DNA extraction protocols. The results of Phase 1 informed which ethanol treatment and DNA extraction protocol should be used in Phase 2, where we assessed the effect of starting tissue mass on extraction success and whether homogenization of sponge tissue is required. Phase 1 results indicated that ethanol preservative may contain unique and/or additional biodiversity information to that present in sponge tissue, but blotting tissue dry generally recovered more taxa and generated more sequence reads from the wild sponge species. Tissue extraction protocols performed best in terms of DNA concentration, taxon richness, and proportional read counts, but the non-commercial tissue protocol was selected for Phase 2 due to cost-efficiency and greater recovery of target taxa. In Phase 2 overall, we found that homogenization may not be required for sponge tissue and more starting material does not necessarily improve taxon detection. These results combined provide an optimized DNA isolation procedure for sponges to enhance marine biodiversity assessment using natural sampler DNA metabarcoding.

## KEYWORDS

biodiversity, DNA extraction, environmental DNA, fish, marine, natural samplers, Porifera, vertebrates

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

The emergence of environmental DNA (eDNA) analysis signaled a new age of biodiversity monitoring, facilitating faster, non-invasive, cost-efficient, and comprehensive surveys for single species and whole communities than was previously thought possible (Deiner et al., 2017; Lawson Handley, 2015; Miya, 2021). Such has been the rapid, exponential growth of this field in the last decade (Thalinger et al., 2021; Tsuji et al., 2019) that it is now beginning to branch. In addition to the now relatively standard analyses of aquatic eDNA and soil/sediment eDNA, studies have been published on species detection using eDNA extracted from snow (Franklin et al., 2019; Kinoshita et al., 2019) and air (Clare et al., 2021; Lynggaard et al., 2022; Roger et al., 2022). Innovative research has also demonstrated that water can be used to aggregate eDNA deposited on plants (Valentin et al., 2020) or fishing nets (Russo et al., 2020) for species detection. Less closely intertwined but stemming from the same roots is natural sampler DNA (nsDNA) (Siegenthaler et al., 2019), which refers to the analysis of DNA collected by live organisms. This is not a novel concept as researchers have been analyzing the DNA present in feces and gut contents of consumers (Nørgaard et al., 2021; Pompanon et al., 2012) and hematophagous insects (Massey et al., 2021; Schnell et al., 2012) for years, but more creative applications are now being explored, including flowers and cow dung as samplers of insect assemblages (Harper et al., 2022; Sigsgaard et al., 2020; Thomsen & Sigsgaard, 2019), dung beetles as samplers of mammal communities (Drinkwater et al., 2021), and sponges as samplers of marine biodiversity (Jeunen et al., 2021; Mariani et al., 2019; Turon et al., 2020).

Marine sponges can filter thousands of liters of water in a single day (Gökalp et al., 2020), vastly exceeding the volume that could be collected with artificial devices for aquatic eDNA metabarcoding. As water is filtered, particles are trapped and concentrated in sponge tissue until digestion or excretion, meaning that a biopsy can be taken to provide DNA for metabarcoding analysis (Jeunen et al., 2021; Mariani et al., 2019; Turon et al., 2020). Sponge nsDNA metabarcoding offers several advantages over aquatic eDNA metabarcoding. The high-tech robotics being used to sample large volumes of water for aquatic eDNA (e.g., automated underwater vehicles) are expensive to build and operate, are ineffective for inaccessible and/or complex habitats, and often target a limited set of taxa (Mariani et al., 2019). Although passive filtration has been explored as an alternative to active filtration using peristaltic or vacuum pumps, they require long submergence times and have saturation limits (Bessey, Gao, et al., 2021; Bessey, Jarman, et al., 2021; Kirtane et al., 2020). Sponges are present in nearly every aquatic habitat, and sample collection is inexpensive and nondestructive with minimal environmental impact. Provided that biopsies are not destructive and conducted carefully, sponges will regenerate quickly. Therefore, sponges offer a low-tech, affordable, and standardized method of surveying marine biodiversity and could serve as long-term monitoring stations (Mariani et al., 2019). However, there is much work to be done before sponges can be reliably and routinely used in community surveys, specifically sampling and laboratory protocols (Jeunen et al., 2021).

Two sponge natural sampler DNA studies to date (Mariani et al., 2019; Turon et al., 2020) utilized samples from existing collections and extracted DNA from tissue with commercial kits. The other study (Jeunen et al., 2021) compared dive surveys and aquatic eDNA to sponge tissue and the ethanol used to preserve sponge tissue, and also extracted DNA using a commercial kit. It remains undetermined whether certain sponge species are better samplers than others and if this is related to phenotype. The spatial extent of biodiversity information recovered by a single sponge is yet to be ascertained along with the optimal mass/volume for biopsies to maximize data generation without being lethal to the sponge sampled (Mariani et al., 2019). The influence of DNA extraction method on biodiversity detection from sponge tissues is unknown (Jeunen et al., 2021), but this has been found to affect detection success with aquatic eDNA (Deiner et al., 2018; Jeunen et al., 2019), bulk invertebrates (Hermans et al., 2018; Majaneva et al., 2018) and fecal samples (Kaunisto et al., 2017). Furthermore, it has not been investigated if samples should be homogenized to ensure DNA is evenly distributed throughout the sample prior to extraction, similar to bulk invertebrate and fecal samples (Gosselin et al., 2017; Pereira-da-Conceicao et al., 2020). The optimal amount of starting material to maximize species recovery without introducing PCR inhibitors is also unknown, but using larger amounts of soil was found to improve invertebrate detection (Kirse et al., 2021).

Here, we focus on the influence of laboratory workflows on the performance of sponge natural sampler DNA metabarcoding, specifically DNA isolation procedures. We used a phased approach with three sponge species to investigate whether residual ethanol preservative, DNA extraction protocol, type of starting material, and amount of starting material influence sponge nsDNA metabarcoding performance using the following extraction success criteria: (1) total DNA yield, (2) target DNA concentration, (3) taxon richness, (4) proportional read counts, and (5) community composition. In Phase 1, we compared three treatments of residual ethanol preservative in sponge tissue (no removal, removal via blotting, and removal via centrifugation) alongside five DNA extraction protocols, including commercial kits and non-commercial protocols. Using the optimal ethanol treatment and DNA extraction protocol from Phase 1, we compared different volumes of homogenized sponge tissue to different weights of dried sponge tissue. We synthesize the results from each experimental phase to provide an optimized DNA isolation procedure for sponge tissue to enhance marine biodiversity assessment using natural sampler DNA metabarcoding.

## 2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 | Workspace and decontamination procedures

A unidirectional workflow was used for sample processing. Sponge tissue was stored and handled in a laboratory dedicated to the processing of environmental samples with low DNA concentrations. Prepared PCR reactions were transported to separate laboratories

for: the addition of PCR-positive controls, PCR amplification, gel electrophoresis, library preparation, and storage; and library quality checks, quantification, and sequencing. Bench space and non-immersible equipment in all laboratories were sterilized before and after use by wiping with a fresh paper towel and 10% v/v bleach solution (made using Cleanline thin bleach containing 4.53% sodium hypochlorite), followed by 70% v/v ethanol solution. Immersible equipment was sterilized in a 10% v/v bleach bath for at least 10 min, then immersed in a 5% v/v Lipsol detergent bath and rinsed with deionized water. Bleach and Lipsol detergent baths were changed weekly or daily during periods of heavy use. Stainless steel 5 mm beads (Qiagen) were additionally sterilized by heating at 220°C for 3 h. Plastics and hoods were sterilized with UV light for at least 30 min. Full details of decontamination procedures are provided in [Supporting Information](#).

## 2.2 | Sponge selection

For this experiment, we used samples from three marine sponges that are the focus of ongoing research employing nsDNA metabarcoding: (1) an invasive sponge, *Lendenfeldia chondrodes* (Galitz et al., 2018), present in the aquarium facility of the Horniman Museum and Gardens, London, (2) *Vazella pourtalesii*, which is a siliceous sponge that colonizes hydroacoustic moorings in Nova Scotia, Canada, and (3) *Phakellia ventilabrum*, which is a Bubarid sponge that forms relatively dense aggregations on rock-sand habitats and is broadly distributed across the North Atlantic. *L. chondrodes* provided an opportunity to groundtruth sDNA metabarcoding in a controlled tank environment with 25 species of known abundance, whereas *V. pourtalesii* and *P. ventilabrum* were collected from natural marine environments with more diverse species assemblages and differed in phenotype as well as filtration efficiency. *L. chondrodes* and *V. pourtalesii* were used in Phase 1, whereas *V. pourtalesii* and *P. ventilabrum* were used in Phase 2 due to the greater amounts of starting material required for DNA extraction.

## 2.3 | Sponge collection

All sponges were detached from their substrate using a sterile diving knife or sterile disposable surgical scalpel (Swann-Morton No. 21, Fisher Scientific, UK) while wearing disposable gloves. Individuals of *L. chondrodes* were small thus an ~1 cm<sup>3</sup> biopsy was taken. Each biopsy was placed in a 2 ml DNA LoBind tube (Eppendorf, Fisher Scientific) containing 1 ml of molecular grade 100% ethanol (Fisher Scientific) and stored at -20°C for transport to Liverpool John Moores University (LJMU). At LJMU, forceps were used to transfer each biopsy to a new 2 ml DNA LoBind tube containing 1 ml of molecular grade 100% ethanol as water present in the tissue may have diluted the original ethanol. Samples were stored at -20°C for 3 months until DNA extraction. As *V. pourtalesii* colonizes hydroacoustic moorings, samples were collected during mooring retrieval

undertaken by Ocean Tracking Network and Fisheries and Oceans Canada in July 2021. Whole individuals were removed from the moorings, placed in sterile pots containing 500 ml of molecular grade 100% ethanol, and stored at -20°C once research vessels returned to shore. The ethanol in each pot was changed twice before samples were shipped to LJMU and stored at -20°C for 3 months until DNA extraction. For *P. ventilabrum*, an ~5 cm<sup>3</sup> biopsy was taken from each individual sampled from Rockall Bank (coordinates: 57.1705, -13.638) at 185–189 m depth in May 2018, then placed in a 50 ml falcon tube containing 25 ml of 100% ethanol and stored at 4°C. Again, the ethanol was changed twice before samples were shipped to LJMU in January 2021, where they were stored at -20°C for 3 months until DNA extraction.

## 2.4 | DNA extraction

### 2.4.1 | Phase 1

Three *L. chondrodes* samples and three *V. pourtalesii* samples (each from different moorings) were used in Phase 1 (Figure 1). Each sample from each sponge was subjected to a different ethanol treatment as ethanol is known to interact with chemicals used during DNA extraction and inhibit PCR amplification, but residual ethanol preservative may be present in porous sponge tissue. The ethanol treatments were (1) no removal of residual ethanol (wet treatment), (2) removal of residual ethanol by blotting sponge tissue against filter paper inside a petri dish (blot treatment), and (3) biopsies were transferred to a new 2 ml DNA LoBind tube and centrifuged for 1 min at maximum speed, following which the ethanol was removed with a pipette and centrifugation repeated until no more ethanol was observed (spin treatment). After each ethanol treatment, samples were cut into small pieces within a petri dish using dissection scissors. Pieces were added to a weigh boat until a maximum weight of 500 mg was observed. Each subsample was transferred to a high-impact 2 ml screw cap microtube (Starlab) containing a 5 mm stainless steel bead, and twice the amount of 1× TE buffer to tissue weight was added to each microtube (e.g., 500 µl to 250 mg). This resulted in 20–30 subsamples per *V. pourtalesii* sample. Each *L. chondrodes* sample weighed ~500 mg individually thus no subsamples were required. The (sub) samples were homogenized on a Qiagen TissueLyser II for 2 min at maximum speed. Using a 1000 µl pipette tip, the homogenate from each subsample was pooled in a 15 ml falcon tube corresponding to each original sample. Twelve 200 µl aliquots of each *V. pourtalesii* sample and 12 50 µl aliquots of each *L. chondrodes* sample (Figure 1) were transferred to individual 2 ml DNA LoBind tubes and frozen at -20°C alongside the homogenized samples.

The aliquots were used as the starting material for extraction with three commercial and two non-commercial DNA extraction protocols: (1) Qiagen DNeasy PowerSoil Kit (QPS), (2) Qiagen DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit (QBT), (3) Qiagen DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit and post-extraction inhibitor removal with the Zymo Research OneStep™ PCR Inhibitor Removal Kit (QBT-ZYMO), (4)




FIGURE 1 Flow diagram illustrating the laboratory workflow for the phased experiment.

Mu-DNA soil protocol (MUS), and (5) Mu-DNA tissue protocol (MUT) with an added inhibitor removal step (Sellers et al., 2018) (Figure 1). The QPS, QBT, MUS, and MUT protocols were used on three aliquots of each sample ( $n = 72$ ) following the manufacturer's instructions or steps outlined in Sellers et al. (2018) with one

modification. Elution buffer (100  $\mu$ l) was added to each spin column and incubated for 5 min at room temperature before centrifugation for 1 min at 10,000 g, then the eluate was collected and added to the same spin column again for incubation for 5 min at room temperature before centrifugation for 1 min at 10,000 g. An extraction blank



(extraction buffers only) was processed alongside samples for each extraction protocol ( $n = 4$ ).

The extracts resulting from QBT extraction were halved (Figure 1), and one-half was processed with the Zymo Research OneStep™ PCR Inhibitor Removal Kit (Cambridge Bioscience) for the QBT-ZYMO protocol ( $n = 19$ ). Notably, three preps from the OneStep™ PCR Inhibitor Removal Kit failed, resulting in only 16 extracts for the QBT-ZYMO protocol (Figure 1). A 25  $\mu$ l and 5  $\mu$ l aliquot of each extract ( $n = 92$ ) were transferred to PCR strip tubes (Starlab). All original DNA extracts and 25  $\mu$ l aliquots were frozen at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  until PCR preparation. A Nanodrop was used to measure DNA purity and a Qubit™ 4 Fluorometer (Thermo Scientific) with Qubit™ dsDNA HS Assay Kit (Fisher Scientific) was used to measure total DNA yield from the 5  $\mu$ l aliquots, which were subsequently discarded.

## 2.4.2 | Phase 2

Three *V. pourtalesii* samples (each from different moorings) and five *P. ventilabrum* samples (four from one location and one from another location) were used in Phase 2 (Figure 1). Based on the findings of Phase 1 (see Section 3), all samples were blotted against filter paper in a petri dish to remove residual ethanol preservative and extracted with the MUT protocol. Samples from each sponge species were halved ( $n = 12$ ), with each half being used to provide either dry tissue or homogenate as the starting material (Figure 1). Homogenization of each sample was performed as described in Phase 1. Three dry tissue weights and three homogenate volumes were compared in triplicate for each sample ( $n = 108$ ), and the volume of Lysis Master Mix (1 ml contains 730  $\mu$ l of Lysis Solution, 250  $\mu$ l of Tissue Lysis Additive, and 20  $\mu$ l of Proteinase K) for the MUT protocol was adjusted proportionately: (1) 50 mg and 100  $\mu$ l ( $\approx 50$  mg) to 300  $\mu$ l of Lysis Master Mix, (2) 100 mg and 200  $\mu$ l ( $\approx 100$  mg) to 600  $\mu$ l of Lysis Master Mix, and (3) 500 mg and 1000  $\mu$ l ( $\approx 500$  mg) to 1 ml of Lysis Master Mix. Extraction followed the steps outlined in Sellers et al. (2018) with the same modification for elution as Phase 1. Notably, there was not enough tissue for some samples to obtain triplicate 500 mg weights or 1000  $\mu$ l volumes, even when samples collected from the same location were used as replicates (PHAK4, PHAK5), resulting in 105 DNA extracts. An extraction blank (extraction buffers only) was included for each round of extractions ( $n = 4$ ) (Figure 1). A 25  $\mu$ l and 5  $\mu$ l aliquot of each extract ( $n = 109$ ) were transferred to PCR strip tubes (Starlab). All original DNA extracts and 25  $\mu$ l aliquots were frozen at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  until PCR preparation. A nanodrop was used to measure DNA purity, and a Qubit™ 4 Fluorometer was used to measure total DNA yield.

## 2.5 | PCR amplification and library preparation

DNA extracts were PCR amplified using the Tele02 primers (F: 5'-AAACTCGTGCCAGCCACC-3', R: 5'-GGGTATCTAATCCCAGTTTG-3') which target a  $\sim 167$  bp fragment of the mitochondrial

12S ribosomal RNA (rRNA) gene and achieved  $>98\%$  teleost species detection when tested in silico (Taberlet et al., 2018). Although the primers were designed to target teleost fish, mammal and bird DNA may also amplify (Mariani et al., 2021). To ease sample demultiplexing and mitigate cross-contamination and/or tag switching during sequencing, each sample was PCR amplified using the locus primers attached to a unique 8 bp tag shared by the forward and reverse primer. Each tag ( $n = 96$ ) differed by at least three base pairs from other tags and included 2–4 degenerate bases (Ns) at the beginning of the tag sequence to improve clustering during initial sequencing. For Phase 2, samples were processed in two batches to facilitate the use of the same tags in different pools for adapter ligation.

Each sample was PCR amplified in triplicate using 20  $\mu$ l reactions consisting of 10  $\mu$ l of MyFi™ Mix (Meridian Bioscience), 1  $\mu$ l of each forward and reverse primer (10  $\mu\text{M}$ ; Eurofins), 0.16  $\mu$ l of Bovine Serum Albumin (20 mg/mL, Thermo Scientific), 5.84  $\mu$ l of UltraPure™ Distilled Water (Invitrogen), and 2  $\mu$ l of DNA template. Two PCR positive controls (iridescent catfish, *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus*, tissue DNA at 0.05 ng/ $\mu$ l) and two PCR negative controls (molecular grade water) were included in each PCR run (up to 96 reactions). PCR was performed on a T100 Thermal Cycler (Bio-Rad Laboratories Ltd) with the following profile:  $95^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 10 min, followed by 40 cycles of  $95^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 30 s,  $60^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 45 s, and  $72^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 30 s, and final elongation at  $72^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 5 min. PCR products were run on a 2% agarose gel, made with 150 ml of 1 $\times$  TBE buffer (Invitrogen, UK), 3 g of agarose powder (Fisher Scientific), and 1.5  $\mu$ l of SYBR™ Safe DNA Gel Stain (Invitrogen), at 100 V for 40 min using 1  $\mu$ l of PCR product to 1  $\mu$ l of 10 $\times$  BlueJuice™ Gel Loading Buffer (Invitrogen). Gels were visualized with a Bio-Rad Gel Doc™ EZ Imaging System.

PCR replicates for each sample were pooled prior to purification with Mag-Bind® Total Pure NGS Beads (Omega Bio-tek Inc.), following the double-size selection protocol established by Bronner et al. (2009). Ratios of 1 $\times$  and 0.6 $\times$  magnetic beads to 30  $\mu$ l of PCR product were used. Eluted DNA (20  $\mu$ l) was stored at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  until quantification using a Qubit™ 4 Fluorometer. Purified samples were normalized and pooled in equimolar concentration. Phase 1 consisted of one pool of 96 samples/controls. Phase 2 required two pools - the first consisted of 65 samples/controls from Phase 2 and the second consisted of 40 samples/controls from Phase 2 and 25 samples/controls from other projects. Sample pools were purified using the aforementioned bead ratios and elution in 25  $\mu$ l, then concentrated using a 1 $\times$  bead ratio and elution in 45  $\mu$ l.

End repair, adapter ligation, and PCR were performed using the NEXTFLEX® Rapid DNA-Seq Kit 2.0 for Illumina® Platforms (PerkinElmer) according to the manufacturer's protocol. An Agilent 2200 TapeStation and High Sensitivity D1000 ScreenTape (Agilent Technologies) indicated secondary product remained, thus gel extraction was performed on each pool using the GeneJET Gel Extraction Kit (Thermo Scientific) with elution in 20  $\mu$ l. Each pool was quantified using quantitative PCR (qPCR) on a Rotor-Gene Q (Qiagen) with the NEBNext® Library Quant Kit for Illumina® (New England Biolabs) and diluted to 1 nM. For Phase 2, 6  $\mu$ l of each pool was combined into one library. The final libraries and PhiX Control

were quantified using qPCR before the Phase 1 library was sequenced at 50 pM with 10% PhiX Control and the Phase 2 library was sequenced at 60 pM with 10% PhiX Control on an Illumina® iSeq™ 100 using iSeq™ 100 i1 Reagent v2 (300 cycles) (Illumina Inc.).

## 2.6 | Bioinformatics

### 2.6.1 | Reference databases

Sequence data were processed in two batches to facilitate taxonomic assignment against different reference databases. Sequences for *L. chondrodes* samples and associated controls were compared against a reference database for the aquarium fish species, the PCR positive control, and common domestic species (human *Homo sapiens*, cow *Bos taurus*, pig *Sus scrofa*, chicken *Gallus gallus*, sheep *Ovis aries*, dog *Canis lupus*, and cat *Felis catus*). Sequences for *V. pourtalesii* and *P. ventilabrum* samples and associated controls were compared against a marine vertebrate reference database, the PCR positive control, and common domestic species. Full details of database creation can be found in the [Supporting Information](#).

### 2.6.2 | Data processing and taxonomic assignment

Sequence data were automatically demultiplexed to separate (forward and reverse) fastq files per library using the onboard Illumina MiSeq Reporter software. Library sequence reads were further demultiplexed to sample using a custom Python script. *Tapirs*, a reproducible workflow for the analysis of DNA metabarcoding data (<https://github.com/EvoHull/Tapirs>) was used for processing and taxonomic assignment of demultiplexed sequence reads. *Tapirs* uses the *Snakemake* workflow manager (Köster & Rahmann, 2012) and a *conda* virtual environment to ensure software compatibility.

Raw reads were quality trimmed from the tail with a 5bp sliding window (qualifying phred score of Q30 and an average window phred score of Q30) using *fastp* (Chen et al., 2018), allowing no more than 40% of the final trimmed read bases to be below Q30. Poly X/G tail trimming (≥5bp) removed any remaining Illumina iSeq™ 100 sequencing artifacts. Primers were removed by trimming the first 18 and 20bp of the forward and reverse reads respectively. Reads were then tail-cropped to a maximum length of 150bp and reads shorter than 90bp were discarded. Sequence read pairs were merged into single reads using *fastp*, provided there was a minimum overlap of 20bp, no more than 5% mismatches, and no more than five mismatched bases between pairs. Only forward reads were kept from read pairs that failed to be merged. A final length filter removed any reads longer than 200bp to ensure sequence lengths approximated the expected fragment size (~167bp). Redundant sequences were removed by clustering at 100% read identity and length (-derep\_fulllength) in *VSEARCH* (Rognes et al., 2016). Clusters represented by less than three sequences were omitted from further processing. Reads were further clustered (-cluster\_unoise) to remove

redundancies due to sequencing errors (retaining all cluster sizes). Retained sequences were screened for chimeric sequences with *VSEARCH* (-uchime3\_denovo).

The final clustered, non-redundant query sequences were then compared against the corresponding reference database using *BLAST* (Zhang et al., 2000). Taxonomic identity was assigned using a custom majority lowest common ancestor (MLCA) approach based on the top 2% query *BLAST* hit bit scores, with at least 90% query coverage. A minimum *BLAST* hit identity filter of 80% was used for *L. chondrodes* samples and the aquarium fish reference database, whereas a minimum identity of 98% was used for *V. pourtalesii* and *P. ventilabrum* samples and the marine vertebrate reference database. Of these filtered hits for both batches, 80% of unique taxonomic lineages therein had to agree at descending taxonomic rank (domain, phylum, class, order, family, genus, species) for it to be assigned a taxonomic identity. If a query had a single *BLAST* hit, it was assigned directly to this taxon only if it met all previous MLCA criteria. Read counts assigned to each taxonomic identity were calculated from query cluster sizes. The lowest taxonomic rank was to species and assignments higher than order were classed as unassigned.

## 2.7 | Data analysis

### 2.7.1 | Data set refinement

Taxonically assigned data were combined for downstream processing in R v3.6.3 (R Core Team, 2020). All plots were produced using the packages *ggplot2* v3.3.6 (Wickham, 2016) and *ggpubr* v0.4.0 (Kassambara, 2020). We split the data into Phase 1 (comparison of ethanol treatments and DNA extraction protocols) and Phase 2 (comparison of types and amounts of starting material). Assignments were corrected: family and genera containing a single species were reassigned to that species, species were reassigned to domestic subspecies, and misassignments were corrected. Manual reassignment duplicated some assignments thus the read count data for these assignments were merged. Proportional read counts for each taxon were calculated from the total read counts per sample. Taxon-specific sequence thresholds (i.e., maximum sequence frequency for each taxon detected in process controls) were applied to the sponge samples to mitigate cross-contamination and false positives (Figure S1). A second sequence threshold (0.01%) was applied to the sponge samples to mitigate low noise detections. Higher taxonomic assignments, iridescent catfish (PCR positive control), human, domestic species, and terrestrial species were then removed. Taxonomic assignments remaining in the refined data set were predominantly of species resolution and considered true positives (Figure S2).

### 2.7.2 | Data summaries

We examined overall fish and mammal taxon richness and read counts across samples processed with each ethanol treatment and

DNA extraction protocol in Phase 1 (Figure S3) and samples of each type and amount of starting material in Phase 2 (Figure S4) for each sponge species. We also examined detection consistency across extraction replicates, in terms of taxon richness and a number of replicates each taxon was detected in, for samples processed with each ethanol treatment and DNA extraction protocol in Phase 1 (Figure S5) and samples of each type and amount of starting material in Phase 2 (Figure S6) for each sponge species.

### 2.7.3 | Statistical analysis

We compared total DNA yield, post-PCR DNA concentration, taxon richness, and proportional read counts of individual samples according to ethanol treatment and DNA extraction protocol for Phase 1, and according to type and amount of starting material for Phase 2. Only fish detections were used to compare extraction protocols and ethanol treatments in terms of taxon richness, proportional read counts, and community similarity as the metabarcoding primers used were designed to target fish. The data were not normally distributed and the assumptions of a two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were violated, thus statistical treatment followed Generalized Linear Models (GLMs) with Quasi-Poisson error family or Gaussian error family (for total DNA yield and post-PCR concentration), Poisson error family and the log-link function or negative binomial error family (for taxon richness), or binomial error family (for proportional read counts). If a significant effect was found using the *drop1* function from the package *stats* v3.6.3, multiple pairwise comparisons were performed using the *pairs* function from the package *emmeans* v1.7.2 (Lenth, 2022). Where assumptions of GLMs were violated, the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test from the package *stats* was used, and multiple pairwise comparisons were performed using the non-parametric Dunn's test (*p* values adjusted with the Benjamini-Hochberg method) from the package *FSA* v0.9.1 (Ogle et al., 2021). In Phase 1, data were split by ethanol treatment to compare extraction protocols and/or vice versa, where significant effects were found using GLMs. In Phase 2, data were split by type of starting material to compare amounts of starting material and/or vice versa, where significant effects were found using GLMs.

The package *betapart* v1.5.6 (Baselga & Orme, 2012) was used to estimate total beta diversity, partitioned by nestedness-resultant (i.e., community dissimilarity due to taxon subsets) and turnover (i.e., community dissimilarity due to taxon replacement), across samples in Phases 1 and 2 with the *beta.multi* function. Total beta diversity and its two components (Jaccard dissimilarity) were estimated for sponge samples in both phases using the *beta.pair* function. For total beta diversity and both partitions, we calculated the average distance of group members to the group centroid in multivariate space using the *betadisper* function in the package *vegan* v2.5-7 (Oksanen et al., 2020). This was done for each group of samples within ethanol treatments and DNA extraction protocols in Phase 1 and within types and amounts of starting material in Phase 2. The distances of group members to the group

centroid were subjected to an ANOVA to test for homogeneity of multivariate dispersions (MVDISP), that is, whether the dispersions of one or more groups were different, prior to permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA). Community dissimilarity for total beta diversity and both partitions was visualized with Non-metric Multidimensional Scaling (NMDS) using the *metaMDS* function with 1000 permutations and tested statistically with PERMANOVA using the function *adonis* in the package *vegan*. The PERMANOVA included an interaction term between ethanol treatment and DNA extraction protocol for Phase 1 and an interaction term between type and amount of starting material for Phase 2. Pre-defined cut-off values were used for effect size, where PERMANOVA results were interpreted as moderate and strong effects if  $R^2 > 0.09$  and  $R^2 > 0.25$ , respectively. These values are broadly equivalent to correlation coefficients of  $r = 0.3$  and  $0.5$  which represent moderate and strong effects accordingly (Macher et al., 2018; Nakagawa & Cuthill, 2007).

## 3 | RESULTS

### 3.1 | Sequencing performance

The Phase 1 library generated 3,757,770 raw sequence reads, of which 3,532,041 remained after quality control and merging. Following dereplication, denoising, and chimera detection, 2,995,356 reads (average read count 31,201 per sample including controls) remained for taxonomic assignment. The Phase 2 library generated 3,005,701 raw sequence reads, of which 2,879,596 remained after quality control and merging. Following dereplication, denoising, and chimera detection, 2,170,282 reads (average read count 16,823 per sample including controls) remained for taxonomic assignment. For *L. chondrodes* samples, 85.05% of the remaining reads were taxonomically assigned, whereas 15.95% could not be assigned to any taxonomic rank. For *P. ventilabrum* and *V. pourtalesii* samples, 78.87% of the remaining reads were taxonomically assigned, whereas 21.13% could not be assigned to any taxonomic rank. Contamination was restricted to human DNA in one extraction blank and one PCR negative control in Phase 1, but naturally occurring marine species were also detected in extraction blanks and PCR positive controls in Phase 2. Before data set refinement, 29 taxa were identified in Phase 1 and 94 taxa were identified in Phase 2. After data set refinement, 18 taxa were identified in Phase 1, and 49 taxa were identified in Phase 2 (Figure S2).

For simplicity, we only report significant results from the final statistical analyses applied to the data. Full results from all statistical tests, including non-significant results and violations of model assumptions, are detailed in the Supporting Information. Statistical comparisons were not performed for DNA purity due to a lack of variation in A260/A280 (Figure 2c) and A260/A230 (Figure 2d) ratios between ethanol treatments, extraction protocols, types of starting material, and amounts of starting material.

## 3.2 | Phase 1: Ethanol treatment and DNA extraction protocol

### 3.2.1 | Total DNA yield

For *L. chondrodes*, total DNA yield significantly differed between extraction protocols for the spin ethanol treatment (Kruskal–Wallis test:  $H_4 = 11.314$ ,  $p = 0.023$ ) and between ethanol treatments for the QBT (Kruskal–Wallis test:  $H_2 = 7.200$ ,  $p = 0.027$ ) and MUT (Kruskal–Wallis test:  $H_2 = 7.261$ ,  $p = 0.027$ ) protocols. For the spin treatment, none of the Dunn's test adjusted  $p$  values were significant, but the largest differences in effect size were observed between the QBT and MUS protocols ( $Z = -2.749$ ,  $p = 0.060$ ), the QBT and MUT protocols ( $Z = -2.107$ ,  $p = 0.117$ ), and the QBT and QPS protocols ( $Z = 2.565$ ,  $p = 0.052$ ). For both the QBT and MUT protocols, the spin treatment produced lower total DNA yields than the wet treatment (QBT:  $Z = -2.683$ ,  $p = 0.022$ ; MUT:  $Z = -2.695$ ,  $p = 0.021$ ) (Figure 2a). With *V. pourtalesii*, total DNA yield significantly differed between extraction protocols for the wet (Kruskal–Wallis test:  $H_4 = 13.233$ ,  $p = 0.010$ ) and blot (Kruskal–Wallis test:  $H_4 = 11.833$ ,  $p = 0.019$ ) ethanol treatments. The QBT protocol produced higher total DNA yields than the QPS protocol with the wet ethanol treatment (Dunn's test:  $Z = 3.286$ ,  $p = 0.010$ ) and the MUT protocol with the blot treatment (Dunn's test:  $Z = -2.921$ ,  $p = 0.035$ ) (Figure 2a). For both sponges, the QBT protocol produced higher total DNA yields than other extraction protocols with the blot and wet ethanol treatments.

### 3.2.2 | Post-PCR DNA concentration

For *L. chondrodes*, ethanol treatment influenced post-PCR DNA concentration with the MUS protocol (Kruskal–Wallis test:  $H_2 = 6.006$ ,  $p = 0.050$ ), where the spin treatment produced lower post-PCR DNA concentrations than the wet treatment (Dunn's test:  $Z = -2.395$ ,  $p = 0.050$ ) (Figure 2b). For *V. pourtalesii*, post-PCR DNA concentration was positively influenced by the MUT (GLM:  $0.669 \pm 0.327$ ,  $t = 2.044$ ,  $p = 0.048$ ) and QBT (GLM:  $1.005 \pm 0.311$ ,  $t = 3.229$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ) protocols, but the MUT protocol ( $12.13 \pm 2.31$  ng/ $\mu$ l) produced lower post-PCR DNA concentrations than the QBT protocol ( $16.97 \pm 2.74$  ng/ $\mu$ l; pairwise comparison:  $Z = -3.229$ ,  $p = 0.011$ ) (Figure 2b). Therefore, although the spin treatment tended to yield generally lower post-PCR DNA concentrations, differences did not appear to be substantial or consistent across sponges.

### 3.2.3 | Taxon richness

Taxon richness was visualized according to each extraction replicate of each sample (Figure 3) and according to overall richness per sample (Figure 4a), with the latter compared statistically. Only the MUS and QBT extraction protocols produced incidental mammal detections (Figure 3). Using a GLM, neither extraction protocol nor

ethanol treatment was found to influence fish taxon richness for *L. chondrodes*, but model assumptions were met. For *V. pourtalesii*, no effect of extraction protocol on fish taxon richness was found using Kruskal–Wallis test (Figure 4a). For both sponges, neither extraction protocol nor ethanol treatment influenced fish taxon richness.

### 3.2.4 | Proportional read counts


Proportional read counts significantly differed between ethanol treatments with the MUS (Kruskal–Wallis test:  $H_2 = 6.161$ ,  $p = 0.046$ ) and QPS (Kruskal–Wallis test:  $H_2 = 6.006$ ,  $p = 0.050$ ) protocols for *L. chondrodes*. The wet treatment produced higher proportional read counts than the spin treatment with the MUS protocol (Dunn's test:  $Z = -2.426$ ,  $p = 0.046$ ), and than the blot treatment with the QPS protocol (Dunn's test:  $Z = -2.395$ ,  $p = 0.050$ ) (Figure 4b). For *V. pourtalesii*, no effect of extraction protocol on proportional read counts was found, but proportional read counts significantly differed between ethanol treatments with the QBT-ZYMO protocol (Kruskal–Wallis test:  $H_2 = 7.624$ ,  $p = 0.022$ ), where the blot treatment produced higher proportional read counts than the spin (Dunn's test:  $Z = 2.391$ ,  $p = 0.025$ ) or wet (Dunn's test:  $Z = 2.391$ ,  $p = 0.050$ ) treatments (Figure 4b). Therefore, different extraction protocols and different ethanol treatments performed best in terms of proportional read counts for each sponge.

### 3.2.5 | Community composition

MVDS differed between DNA extraction protocols for total beta diversity for *V. pourtalesii*, but not either partition for *V. pourtalesii* or *L. chondrodes* (Table 1). MVDS differed between ethanol treatments for total beta diversity and the turnover component for *L. chondrodes*, and for the nestedness-resultant component of beta diversity for *V. pourtalesii*. DNA extraction protocol alone did not influence beta diversity for either sponge species (Table 2; Figure 4ci–iii). Ethanol treatment had a strong positive influence on turnover and total beta diversity of communities detected from *L. chondrodes* but did not influence beta diversity for *V. pourtalesii* (Table 2; Figure 4ci–iii). DNA extraction protocol combined with ethanol treatment also had a moderately positive effect on turnover and total beta diversity for *L. chondrodes* (Table 2; Figure 4ci–iii). Therefore, taxa detected from *L. chondrodes* with one ethanol treatment were replaced by different taxa detected with other ethanol treatments, although this finding should be interpreted with caution due to MVDS heterogeneity.


## 3.3 | Phase 2: Treatment and amount of sponge tissue

Based on Phase 1, blotting sponge tissue dry after ethanol preservation followed by DNA extraction with the MUT protocol appeared to



**FIGURE 2** Box plots summarizing (a) total DNA yield, (b) post-PCR DNA concentration, (c) A260/280 ratios, and (d) A260/A230 ratios for each sample from each sponge species processed with each ethanol treatment (blot, spin, wet) and each DNA extraction protocol (MUS, MUT, QBT, QBT-ZYMO, and QPS). LEN: *Lendenfeldia chondrodes*; VAZ: *Vazella pourtalesii*.





**FIGURE 3** Bubble plot summarizing proportional read counts for each taxon and detection consistency across extraction replicates for samples from each sponge species that was processed with each ethanol treatment (blot, spin, and wet) and DNA extraction protocol (MUS, MUT, QBT, QBT-ZYMO, and QPS). LEN: *Lendenfeldia chondrodes*; VAZ: *Vazella pourtalesii*.

be the best combination for extracting DNA from tissue of naturally occurring marine sponges like *V. pourtalesii*. Therefore, this procedure was selected for Phase 2.

### 3.3.1 | Total DNA yield

Using GLMs, the amount of starting material influenced total DNA yield for both *P. ventilabrum* ( $F_2 = 16.485$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and *V. pourtalesii* ( $F_2 = 3.795$ ,  $p = 0.030$ ), but the type of starting material influenced total DNA yield for *P. ventilabrum* only ( $F_1 = 14.641$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Model assumptions were met for *P. ventilabrum*. Total DNA yield was higher using homogenized tissue ( $0.460 \pm 0.120$ ,  $t = 3.840$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and increased as the amount of starting material increased (amount 2:  $0.451 \pm 0.136$ ,  $t = 3.321$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ; amount 3:  $0.981 \pm 0.165$ ,  $t = 5.931$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Dried tissue ( $30.30 \pm 2.81$  ng/ $\mu$ l) produced lower total DNA yields than homogenate ( $48.00 \pm 3.82$  ng/ $\mu$ l;  $Z = -3.840$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Amount 3 ( $63.10 \pm 7.96$  ng/ $\mu$ l) produced higher total DNA yields than amount 2 ( $37.10 \pm 3.18$  ng/ $\mu$ l;  $Z = -3.474$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ) or amount 1 ( $23.70 \pm 2.53$  ng/ $\mu$ l;  $Z = -5.931$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Amount 1 also produced lower total DNA yields than amount 2 ( $Z = -3.321$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ) (Figure 5a). Model assumptions were not met for *V. pourtalesii* thus Kruskal–Wallis test was applied,


but the amount of starting material was not found to influence total DNA yield. For both sponges, the amount of starting material appeared to influence total DNA yield, whereas the type of starting material may have a more variable effect.

### 3.3.2 | Post-PCR DNA concentration

Using GLMs, the amount of starting material did not influence post-PCR DNA concentration for either *P. ventilabrum* or *V. pourtalesii*, and the type of starting material influenced post-PCR DNA concentration for *P. ventilabrum* only ( $F_1 = 5.054$ ,  $p = 0.031$ ). Model assumptions for *P. ventilabrum* were violated thus Kruskal–Wallis test was applied, but no effect of the type of starting material was found (Figure 5b). For both sponges, neither type nor amount of starting material appeared to impact post-PCR DNA concentration.

### 3.3.3 | Taxon richness

Taxon richness was visualized according to each extraction replicate of each sample (Figure 6) and according to overall richness



**FIGURE 4** Differences in fish taxon richness (a), proportional read counts (b), and community similarity (c), including turnover (i) and nestedness-resultant (ii) components of total beta diversity (iii), for samples processed with each ethanol treatment (blot, spin, wet) and each DNA extraction protocol (MUS, MUT, QBT, QBT-ZYMO, and QPS). LEN: *Lendenfeldia chondrodes*; VAZ: *Vazella pourtalesii*.

per sample (Figure 7a), with the latter compared statistically. *V. pourtalesii* produced more incidental mammal detections than *P. ventilabrum* (Figure 6). Using GLMs, neither type nor amount of starting material was found to influence fish taxon richness for *P. ventilabrum* and type of starting material influenced fish taxon richness for *V. pourtalesii* only ( $\chi^2_1 = 6.451$ ,  $p = 0.011$ ). The type of starting material had a positive influence on taxon richness ( $0.476 \pm 0.190$ ,  $t = 2.514$ ,  $p = 0.012$ ), where taxon richness was higher using homogenate ( $2.780 \pm 0.334$ ) than dried tissue ( $1.720 \pm 0.253$ ;  $Z = -2.514$ ,  $p = 0.012$ ) (Figure 6a). Therefore, the amount of starting material did not influence fish taxon richness for either sponge, but the type of starting material may be an important consideration for some sponges.

### 3.3.4 | Proportional read counts

Using GLMs, neither type nor amount of starting material was found to influence fish proportional read counts for *P. ventilabrum*, and only amount of starting material influenced fish proportional read counts for *V. pourtalesii* ( $F_2 = 3.266$ ,  $p = 0.047$ ). Model assumptions for *V.*

*pourtalesii* were violated thus Kruskal–Wallis test was applied, but no effect of amount of starting material was found (Figure 6b). For both sponges, there was no clear effect of type or amount of starting material on proportional read counts.

### 3.3.5 | Community composition

MVDISP did not differ between types of starting material for total beta diversity or its partitions for either sponge. MVDISP did not differ between amounts of starting material for total beta diversity or its partitions for *V. pourtalesii* but did differ between amounts for total beta diversity and turnover for *P. ventilabrum* (Table 3). For *P. ventilabrum*, the amount of starting material influenced turnover and total beta diversity, but the type of starting material did not influence beta diversity (Table 4; Figure 7c–iii). For *V. pourtalesii*, the type of starting material influenced turnover and total beta diversity, but the amount of starting material did not influence beta diversity (Table 4; Figure 7c–iii). Therefore, taxa detected with one type or amount of starting material were replaced by different taxa detected with the other type (*V. pourtalesii*) or amounts (*P. ventilabrum*) of starting

**TABLE 1** Summary of analyses statistically comparing homogeneity of multivariate dispersions (MVDISP) between the communities (ANOVA) produced by different extraction protocols and ethanol treatments.

	Mean distance to centroid ± SE	df	F	p
<i>Lendenfeldia chondrodes</i>				
DNA extraction protocol				
Turnover				
MUT (100.00%)	0.375±0.268	4	0.059	0.993
MUS (100.00%)	0.333±0.267			
QBT (96.92%)	0.446±0.276			
QBT-ZYMO (88.89%)	0.413±0.054			
QPS (96.55%)	0.429±0.286			
Nestedness-resultant				
MUT (0.00%)	4.939×10 <sup>-9</sup> ±4.647×10 <sup>-17</sup>	4	2.013	0.118
MUS (0.00%)	9.697×10 <sup>-9</sup> ±2.341×10 <sup>-16</sup>			
QBT (3.08%)	0.091±0.015			
QBT-ZYMO (11.11%)	0.110±0.046			
QPS (3.45%)	8.700×10 <sup>-9</sup> ±1.361×10 <sup>-16</sup>			
Total beta diversity				
MUT (100.00%)	0.375±0.268	4	0.132	0.969
MUS (100.00%)	0.333±0.267			
QBT (100.00%)	0.500±0.199			
QBT-ZYMO (100.00%)	0.413±0.053			
QPS (100.00%)	0.429±0.286			
Ethanol treatment				
Turnover				
Blot (96.73%)	0.500±0.286	2	12.343	<0.001
Spin (0.00%)	2.363×10 <sup>-9</sup> ±7.259×10 <sup>-17</sup>			
Wet (0.00%)	1.129×10 <sup>-9</sup> ±1.784×10 <sup>-17</sup>			
Nestedness-resultant				
Blot (3.27%)	3.833×10 <sup>-6</sup> ±2.959×10 <sup>-11</sup>	2	0.294	0.747
Spin (100.00%)	0.039±0.019			
Wet (100.00%)	0.036±0.018			
Total beta diversity				
Blot (100.00%)	0.500±0.286	2	8.593	0.001
Spin (100.00%)	0.039±0.019			
Wet (100.00%)	0.036±0.018			
<i>Vazella pourtalesii</i>				
DNA extraction protocol				
Turnover				
MUT (98.52%)	0.572±0.077	4	2.595	0.101
MUS (100.00%)	0.500±0.000			
QBT (100.00%)	0.607±1.257×10 <sup>-4</sup>			
QBT-ZYMO (100.00%)	0.575±2.280×10 <sup>-5</sup>			
QPS	0.000			
Nestedness-resultant				

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

	Mean distance to centroid $\pm$ SE	df	F	p
MUT (1.48%)	0.077 $\pm$ 0.006	4	2.192	0.143
MUS (0.00%)	0.000 $\pm$ 0.000			
QBT (0.00%)	2.229 $\times 10^{-5} \pm 6.799 \times 10^{-10}$			
QBT-ZYMO (0.00%)	8.603 $\times 10^{-9} \pm 2.220 \times 10^{-16}$			
QPS	0.000			
Total beta diversity				
MUT (100.00%)	0.593 $\pm$ 0.030	4	6.920	<b>0.006</b>
MUS (100.00%)	0.500 $\pm$ 0.000			
QBT (100.00%)	0.612 $\pm 4.313 \times 10^{-7}$			
QBT-ZYMO (100.00%)	0.577 $\pm 3.140 \times 10^{-9}$			
QPS	0.000			
Ethanol treatment				
Turnover				
Blot (99.36%)	0.635 $\pm$ 0.009	2	1.862	0.198
Spin (99.20%)	0.586 $\pm$ 0.026			
Wet (94.29%)	0.352 $\pm$ 0.200			
Nestedness-resultant				
Blot (0.64%)	4.453 $\times 10^{-9} \pm 1.388 \times 10^{-16}$	2	6.450	<b>0.012</b>
Spin (0.80%)	0.077 $\pm$ 0.006			
Wet (5.71%)	0.223 $\pm$ 0.037			
Total beta diversity				
Blot (100.00%)	0.635 $\pm$ 0.009	2	1.045	0.382
Spin (100.00%)	0.602 $\pm$ 0.015			
Wet (100.00%)	0.506 $\pm$ 0.045			

Note: Relative contributions of taxon turnover and nestedness-resultant to total beta diversity (Jaccard dissimilarity) for each protocol and treatment are given in brackets. Significance level is  $p$ -values < 0.05 for bold values.

material, although the latter should be interpreted with caution due to MVDISP heterogeneity.

## 4 | DISCUSSION

We have illustrated how the performance of sponge nsDNA metabarcoding can be affected by DNA isolation procedures, specifically treatment to remove residual ethanol prior to DNA extraction, DNA extraction protocol, type of starting material, and amount of starting material. These effects can also be sponge-specific. Our experiments have provided an optimized DNA isolation procedure that will inform the development and application of sponge natural sampler DNA metabarcoding for aquatic biodiversity assessment.

### 4.1 | Phase 1: Ethanol treatment and DNA extraction protocol

The QBT and MUT extraction protocols outperformed others for different ethanol treatments of sponge tissue in terms of total DNA yield

and post-PCR DNA concentration. Lower DNA purity was observed with the MUT and QBT-ZYMO protocols for the wet ethanol treatments of *V. pourtalesii* tissue and *L. chondrodes* tissue, respectively, but otherwise, extraction protocols produced consistent purity ratios. The extraction protocol was not found to influence fish taxon richness, proportional read counts, or community composition (arguably the most important extraction success criteria) for either sponge species.

The spin ethanol treatment produced lower total DNA yields and post-PCR DNA concentrations with certain extraction protocols for *L. chondrodes*, but no differences were observed between ethanol treatments for *V. pourtalesii*. Ethanol treatment did not influence fish taxon richness for either sponge species but did influence fish proportional read counts with certain extraction protocols, where the wet or blot treatments produced higher fish proportional read counts than the spin treatment. Ethanol treatment influenced the community composition of *L. chondrodes* tissue but not *V. pourtalesii* tissue, where different taxa were detected in *L. chondrodes* tissue with different ethanol treatments.

DNA extraction protocols have been found to influence the performance of metabarcoding across sample types and habitats (Deiner et al., 2018; Gerdali et al., 2019; Jeunen et al., 2019; Johnson

**TABLE 2** Results of PERMANOVA used to compare variation in community composition produced by different extraction protocols and ethanol treatments, individually and combined.

	df	F	R <sup>2</sup>	p	Stress
<i>Lendenfeldia chondrodes</i>					
Turnover					
DNA extraction protocol	4	2.782	0.060	0.047	0
Ethanol treatment	2	67.309	0.720	<b>0.001</b>	
DNA extraction protocol: Ethanol treatment	7	2.883	0.108	<b>0.022</b>	
Nestedness-resultant					
DNA extraction protocol	4	0.670	0.122	0.570	0
Ethanol treatment	2	-2.124	-0.193	0.952	
DNA extraction protocol: Ethanol treatment	7	0.361	0.115	0.704	
Total beta diversity					
DNA extraction protocol	4	2.152	0.063	0.095	0
Ethanol treatment	2	46.617	0.677	<b>0.001</b>	
DNA extraction protocol: Ethanol treatment	7	2.132	0.108	<b>0.049</b>	
<i>Vazella pourtalesii</i>					
Turnover					
DNA extraction protocol	4	0.733	0.234	0.948	0
Ethanol treatment	2	1.008	0.161	0.445	
DNA extraction protocol: Ethanol treatment	3	0.861	0.206	0.679	
Nestedness-resultant					
DNA extraction protocol	4	$-2.911 \times 10^{-15}$	0.879	0.900	$3.547 \times 10^{-5}$
Ethanol treatment	2	$2.083 \times 10^{-15}$	-0.314	0.163	
DNA extraction protocol: Ethanol treatment	3	$-1.924 \times 10^{-15}$	0.436	0.819	
Total beta diversity					
DNA extraction protocol	4	0.814	0.252	0.872	0
Ethanol treatment	2	0.951	0.147	0.538	
DNA extraction protocol: Ethanol treatment	3	0.914	0.213	0.643	


Note: Significance level is  $p$ -values < 0.05 for bold values.

et al., 2019; Sanches & Schreier, 2020), thus it was not surprising that this also turned out to be the case for sponge tissue. All extraction protocols produced some biodiversity information, but some protocols were more effective than others, which has implications for the detection of rare and/or low-density species in diverse and complex marine systems using sponge natural sampler DNA metabarcoding. Our findings echo those of Sellers et al. (2018), where the Mu-DNA protocols were comparable to or outperformed commercial kits, and other studies found the QBT protocol produced higher DNA yield than other commercial kits and unbranded extraction protocols (Deiner et al., 2018; Hinlo et al., 2017; Jeunen et al., 2019). Mu-DNA is advantageous due to adaptability and cost-efficiency. Although an inhibitor removal step is not included in the tissue protocol published by Sellers et al. (2018), it can be added from the soil or water


protocols, which is desirable for obtaining high DNA yields while removing inhibitors (Jeunen et al., 2019). A QBT extraction costs four times as much as a MUT extraction (Sellers et al., 2018) and requires a commercial post-extraction inhibitor removal kit (e.g., Zymo Research) to remove potential PCR inhibitors. Reduced cost means that the Mu-DNA protocols are more scalable for large projects and buffer volumes can be adjusted proportionately to the amount of starting material without quickly depleting budgets.

Residual ethanol in tissue can retain unique DNA that may leech from the tissue into ethanol (Derycke et al., 2021; Jeunen et al., 2019; Marquina et al., 2019; Persaud et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021; Zizka et al., 2018) but also react with buffers used for DNA extraction and/or inhibit PCR amplification downstream (Schrader et al., 2012). Our DNA concentration results seem to






**FIGURE 5** Box plots summarizing (a) total DNA yield, (b) post-PCR DNA concentration, (c) A260/280 ratios, and (d) A260/A230 ratios for each sample from each sponge species processed using different types and amounts (1, 2, 3; see Figure 1 for volumes and weights used) of starting material. PHAK, *Phakellia ventilabrum*; VAZ, *Vazella pourtalesii*.



**FIGURE 6** Bubble plots summarizing proportional read counts for each taxon and detection consistency across extraction replicates for different types and amounts (1, 2, 3; see Figure 1 for volumes and weights used) of starting material from (a) *Vazella pourtalesii* (VAZ) and (b) *Phakellia ventilabrum* (PHAK).

indicate that residual ethanol contained DNA unique and/or additional to that present in sponge tissue (at least for *L. chondrodes*) as higher total DNA yields and post-PCR DNA concentrations were observed with the wet ethanol treatment. However, this did not translate to higher fish taxon richness, and conflicting effects were found for fish proportional read counts from each sponge species, where the wet ethanol treatment generated higher proportional read counts for *L. chondrodes* and the blot ethanol treatment produced higher proportional read counts for *V. pourtalesii*.

Beta diversity analyses also indicated that different taxa were detected using different ethanol treatments for *L. chondrodes*. This reaffirms findings of studies on bulk invertebrate samples (Derycke et al., 2021; Persaud et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021; Zizka et al., 2018) and marine sponges (Jeunen et al., 2019), where eDNA from ethanol preservative detected different taxa to DNA from tissue, although eDNA from ethanol preservative generally detected more taxa than bulk invertebrate tissue but fewer taxa than marine sponge tissue.



**FIGURE 7** Differences in taxon richness (a), proportional read counts (b), and community similarity (c), including turnover (i) and nestedness-resultant (ii) components of total beta diversity (iii), for fish detected in samples of each type and amount (1, 2, 3; see Figure 1 for volumes and weights used) of starting material from each sponge species. PHAK: *Phakellia ventilabrum*; VAZ: *Vazella pourtalesii*.

Sponge species, extraction protocol, and ethanol treatments appear to have specific interactions and effects on total DNA yield, DNA purity, target DNA concentration, taxon recovery, and sequence generation. This has been observed for aquatic eDNA in terms of filter material and extraction protocol (Deiner et al., 2017), although other studies have suggested that these aspects of the eDNA workflow do not interact with each other (Sanches & Schreier, 2020). A more elaborate experiment incorporating numerous individuals of different sponge species would be required to test this hypothesis. Based on our results, we recommend that these future studies focus on comparing tissue-based extraction protocols and DNA extraction from ethanol alone versus sponge tissue alone versus ethanol and sponge tissue combined. For the purposes of experimental Phase 2 in the present study, blotting sponge tissue dry after ethanol preservation followed by DNA extraction with the MUT protocol appeared to be the best combination for extracting DNA from tissue of naturally occurring marine sponges like *V. pourtalesii*.

## 4.2 | Phase 2: Treatment and amount of sponge tissue

Homogenized tissue produced higher total DNA yields for *P. ventilabrum* tissue but not *V. pourtalesii* tissue. DNA from homogenized tissue from both sponge species was of lower purity. The type of starting material did not influence post-PCR DNA concentration for either sponge species. Homogenized tissue resulted in higher fish taxon richness for *V. pourtalesii*, although not *P. ventilabrum*, and the type of starting material did not influence fish proportional read counts for either sponge species. Different communities were observed using different types of starting material for *V. pourtalesii*, but community composition from homogenate and dried tissue was highly consistent for *P. ventilabrum*.

Larger amounts of starting material produced higher total DNA yields for *P. ventilabrum* tissue but not *V. pourtalesii* tissue. DNA purity was consistent across different amounts of starting material for

**TABLE 3** Results of ANOVA used to compare the homogeneity of multivariate dispersions (MVDISP) between the communities produced by different types and amounts of starting material.

	Mean distance to centroid $\pm$ SE	df	F	p
<i>Phakellia ventilabrum</i>				
Type of starting material				
Turnover				
Dried tissue (85.02%)	0.115 $\pm$ 0.021	1	0.172	0.681
Homogenate (88.16%)	0.131 $\pm$ 0.010			
Nestedness-resultant				
Dried tissue (14.98%)	0.074 $\pm$ 0.004	1	1.729	0.196
Homogenate (11.84%)	0.051 $\pm$ 0.002			
Total beta diversity				
Dried tissue (100.00%)	0.165 $\pm$ 0.026	1	0.059	0.809
Homogenate (100.00%)	0.175 $\pm$ 0.011			
Amount of starting material				
Turnover		2	6.141	<b>0.005</b>
1 (79.35%)	0.106 $\pm$ 0.005			
2 (79.46%)	0.096 $\pm$ 0.004			
3 (92.15%)	0.247 $\pm$ 0.038			
Nestedness-resultant				
1 (20.65%)	0.073 $\pm$ 0.005	2	0.425	0.657
2 (20.54%)	0.059 $\pm$ 0.002			
3 (7.85%)	0.049 $\pm$ 0.002			
Total beta diversity				
1 (100.00%)	0.153 $\pm$ 0.009	2	4.898	<b>0.013</b>
2 (100.00%)	0.137 $\pm$ 0.005			
3 (100.00%)	0.287 $\pm$ 0.030			
<i>Vazella pourtalesii</i>				
Type of starting material				
Turnover				
Dried tissue (97.03%)	0.489 $\pm$ 0.059	1	0.327	0.570
Homogenate (96.63%)	0.451 $\pm$ 0.046			
Nestedness-resultant				
Dried tissue (2.97%)	0.146 $\pm$ 0.019	1	0.696	0.409
Homogenate (3.37%)	0.186 $\pm$ 0.035			
Total beta diversity				
Dried tissue (100.00%)	0.569 $\pm$ 0.024	1	0.143	0.707
Homogenate (100.00%)	0.554 $\pm$ 0.014			

(Continues)

**TABLE 3** (Continued)

	Mean distance to centroid $\pm$ SE	df	F	p
Amount of starting material				
Turnover				
1 (96.29%)	0.513 $\pm$ 0.025	2	0.165	0.849
2 (97.05%)	0.477 $\pm$ 0.055			
3 (95.02%)	0.480 $\pm$ 0.044			
Nestedness-resultant				
1 (3.71%)	0.132 $\pm$ 0.010	2	0.645	0.530
2 (2.95%)	0.177 $\pm$ 0.030			
3 (4.98%)	0.115 $\pm$ 0.037			
Total beta diversity				
1 (100.00%)	0.569 $\pm$ 0.015	2	0.022	0.978
2 (100.00%)	0.563 $\pm$ 0.021			
3 (100.00%)	0.559 $\pm$ 0.012			

Note: Relative contributions of taxon turnover and nestedness-resultant to total beta diversity (Jaccard dissimilarity) for each type and amount of starting material are given in brackets. Significance level is *p*-values < 0.05 for bold values.

both sponge species. The amount of starting material did not influence post-PCR DNA concentration, fish taxon richness or fish proportional read counts for either sponge species. However, different communities were observed using different amounts of starting material for *P. ventilabrum*, but not for *V. pourtalesii*.

Homogenization is often used with complex sample types to account for the uneven distribution of organisms/DNA throughout the sample by facilitating the release of DNA via bead beating, blending, or vortexing but introduces contamination risk via more handling of samples and reusable equipment (Gosselin et al., 2017; Hestetun et al., 2021; Marquina et al., 2019; Pereira-da-Conceicao et al., 2020; Zizka et al., 2022). Until now, the distribution of eDNA in marine sponge tissue and whether homogenization was required was unknown. Our results suggest that eDNA has a relatively even distribution in sponge tissue. The type of starting material did not influence fish taxon richness for *P. ventilabrum* or fish proportional read counts for either sponge species. Although higher taxon richness was observed with homogenized *V. pourtalesii* tissue, the gains were marginal compared with dried *V. pourtalesii* tissue. A homogeneous distribution of eDNA in sponge tissue offers additional advantages to using these natural samplers for marine biodiversity assessment over aquatic eDNA which can exhibit substantial spatial heterogeneity (Bruce et al., 2021). Dried tissue appears to be sufficient for taxon recovery and would avoid the contamination risk associated with homogenization. However, the accumulation and degradation rates of eDNA in sponge tissues still require investigation to quantify temporal variation in eDNA signals from these natural samplers compared to aquatic eDNA (Jeunen et al., 2021), which may differ by target taxa and habitat (Harrison et al., 2019). This has recently been done in an artificial setting (Cai et al., 2022), but must also be investigated in natural habitats.

**TABLE 4** Results of PERMANOVA used to compare variation in community composition according to type and amount of starting material, individually and combined.

	df	F	R <sup>2</sup>	p	Stress
<i>Phakellia ventilabrum</i>					
Turnover					
Type of starting material	1	1.917	0.034	0.165	0.065
Amount of starting material	2	7.513	0.269	<b>0.002</b>	
Type of starting material: Amount of starting material	2	1.981	0.071	0.140	
Nestedness-resultant					
Type of starting material	1	1.941	0.054	0.178	0.045
Amount of starting material	2	0.385	0.021	0.689	
Type of starting material: Amount of starting material	2	−0.756	−0.042	0.991	
Total beta diversity					
Type of starting material	1	1.323	0.026	0.299	0.075
Amount of starting material	2	5.571	0.220	<b>0.001</b>	
Type of starting material: Amount of starting material	2	1.638	0.065	0.152	
<i>Vazella pourtalesii</i>					
Turnover					
Type of starting material	1	3.058	0.067	<b>0.011</b>	0.119
Amount of starting material	2	0.664	0.029	0.745	
Type of starting material: Amount of starting material	2	0.507	0.022	0.863	
Nestedness-resultant					
Type of starting material	1	−6.207	−0.145	0.998	0.189
Amount of starting material	2	2.410	0.113	0.232	
Type of starting material: Amount of starting material	2	2.105	0.098	0.259	
Total beta diversity					
Type of starting material	1	2.055	0.045	<b>0.017</b>	0.113
Amount of starting material	2	1.026	0.045	0.410	
Type of starting material: Amount of starting material	2	0.751	0.033	0.841	

Note: Significance level is *p*-values < 0.05 for bold values.

Total DNA yield increased as the volume of homogenate and weight of dry tissue increased. This relationship was expected (bar the risk of introducing inhibitors by using too much tissue for DNA extraction) as using more starting material was found to improve detection success for metabarcoding of bulk invertebrate (Zizka et al., 2022) and soil (Kirse et al., 2021) samples. However, more starting material did not result in higher fish taxon recovery or fish proportional read counts, which were consistent across volumes of homogenate and weights of dried tissue. Different amounts of starting material also produced similar communities for *V. pourtalesii*, although different communities were observed with different amounts of *P. ventilabrum* tissue. Therefore, there seems to be little benefit to using more starting materials in sponge natural sampler DNA metabarcoding as more complex extraction procedures are required to handle larger quantities of tissue. Instead, it may be more advantageous to invest effort in performing more extraction

replicates with smaller amounts of starting material (Hestetun et al., 2021; Lanzén et al., 2017).

### 4.3 | Future directions

Our findings have advanced the field of sponge nsDNA metabarcoding and emphasize the importance of sequencing samples used in comparisons of DNA extraction procedures rather than relying only on DNA concentration or purity values and gel images. Nevertheless, a number of unanswered questions remain. The sample size used in our study for each sponge, ethanol treatment, and DNA extraction protocol as well as the type and amount of starting material was small due to the various permutations of DNA extraction methods being investigated and the available budget. Thousands of sponges occupy marine systems at every depth and latitude across the globe



(Morganti et al., 2021). They can vary in shape, size, and hardness giving rise to variable characteristics, including height, diameter, depth, growth form (free-standing, encrusting, tubular, massive), substrate (hard rock, soft sediment, animal, floating debris), spicules (spongin fiber, calcium carbonate, silica), color, symmetry (radial symmetry or asymmetrical), body plan (Asconoid, Syconoid, Leuconoid), and number and cross-sectional area of oscula. They also differ in terms of reproduction (sexual or asexual), feeding (carnivorous or herbivorous), defence (toxicity or boring activity), disease (fungi, viruses, cyanobacteria), and symbionts (fish, shrimps, plants, bacteria, algae) (Kahn et al., 2015; Kandler et al., 2019; Morganti et al., 2021). Only by pooling empirical natural sampler DNA-inferred taxon inventories from a variety of wild sponges in natural settings will it be possible to gauge a more comprehensive understanding of the robustness and reliability of this approach across habitats and geographical regions.

Different sponges may not have the same pumping and filtration efficiency or even have viable tissue for DNA extraction due to microbial loads and PCR inhibitors (Cai et al., 2022). Therefore, future research must identify the best natural samplers in both benthic and pelagic habitats from those sponges that are accessible and can withstand repeat sampling as well as understand how different sponge characteristics influence eDNA recovery (Jeunen et al., 2021; Mariani et al., 2019). The spatial and temporal resolution of sponge natural sampler DNA under different environmental conditions and across seasons must be investigated as we do not know the spatial extent or recency of eDNA trapped in sponge tissue (Turon et al., 2020) and whether eDNA in sponge tissue is affected by the same factors that hasten the degradation of aquatic eDNA (e.g., temperature, pH, salinity, microbial activity), but these factors are known to influence the pumping and filtration action of sponges (Gökalp et al., 2020; Morganti et al., 2021). It is also undetermined whether sponges exhibit selectivity for eDNA particles of different sizes akin to filter membranes used for aquatic eDNA (Turner et al., 2014) and the sampling effort (whether replicates from the same individual or replicates from different individuals) required for sponges to achieve set species detection probabilities (Turon et al., 2020).

In addition to these biological considerations, there are further technical considerations for sponge natural sampler DNA metabarcoding. Many species were only detected in one extraction replicate performed on tissue from wild *V. pourtalesii* specimens, emphasizing the potential stochasticity of sponge tissue and the need for extraction replicates, similar to sediment (Hestetun et al., 2021; Lanzén et al., 2017) and bulk invertebrate samples (Elbrecht & Steinke, 2018). Marker and primer choice are crucial to metabarcoding success. Existing sponge natural sampler DNA studies have focused on 12S and 16S rRNA primers for the detection of fish (Jeunen et al., 2021; Mariani et al., 2019; Turon et al., 2020), but as future studies diverge and other markers are explored, primers that minimize non-target amplification (Collins et al., 2019) and blocking primers (Boessenkool et al., 2012) to prevent amplification of DNA from the sponge itself could become essential (Jeunen et al., 2021).

Finally, sequencing depth may play an important role in the detection of low-concentration eDNA signals in sponge tissue, whether these represent species that are rare, small, or release less DNA into the environment. Very few studies have compared sequencing platforms for metabarcoding, but comparisons have been made for the popular Illumina MiSeq with the larger Illumina NovaSeq (Singer et al., 2019) and with the smaller Illumina iSeq 100 (Nakao et al., 2021). The Illumina NovaSeq detected more species from seawater than the Illumina MiSeq, and higher sequencing depth was also found to improve species detection from sediment (Lanzén et al., 2017) and fecal (Alberdi et al., 2018) samples with metabarcoding. However, species detection rates and community composition were highly similar between the Illumina MiSeq and Illumina iSeq 100 (Nakao et al., 2021). Given these disparities, future studies should carefully consider sequencing depth for natural sampler DNA metabarcoding when testing the performance of new natural samplers and addressing the outstanding questions identified here.

These biological and technical considerations are well exemplified by *L. chondrodes* in our study which detected 4 of 25 (after data set refinement) or 11 of 25 (before data set refinement) species present in the aquarium tank. The sponge individuals were relatively young, having regrown over a few weeks after attempts to remove the sponge from the aquarium tank. This should have been enough time for eDNA to accumulate in the tissues of these sponges (Cai et al., 2022), but they may not have reached a large enough size to adequately pump and filter eDNA from the volume of water held in the tank. Furthermore, it is unknown whether bacterial symbionts, such as those observed in *L. chondrodes* (Galitz et al., 2018), influence the pumping and filtration efficiency of sponges, although results from Cai et al. (2022) appear to suggest that symbiotic load may influence eDNA capture and persistence in sponge tissue. The BLAST identity for taxonomic assignment also had to be reduced to 80% in order to recover more species known to be present in the aquarium tank. This suggests that the primers used may have an insufficient taxonomic resolution to discriminate between tropical fish species, namely members of the families Acanthuridae, Chaetodontidae, Labridae, Pomacanthidae, Serranidae, and Siganidae.

## 5 | CONCLUSIONS

Our study represents another step forward in the development of sponge natural sampler DNA metabarcoding as a means to assess aquatic biodiversity and highlights how methodological choices (specifically DNA isolation procedures) can influence the taxa and subsequent communities recovered using this approach. Based on our results, we recommend blotting sponge tissue dry to remove ethanol preservative prior to extraction with a tissue-based protocol, whether commercial or non-commercial. However, we note that more extensive comparisons of eDNA in ethanol preservative only, sponge tissue only, and ethanol and sponge tissue combined extracted with tissue-based protocols would be worthwhile. Homogenization does not seem to be necessary for sponges, eliminating a time-consuming step

that presents a contamination risk. The amount of starting material did not substantially influence taxon recovery or community composition, but further comparisons of multiple extraction replicates with small amounts of sponge tissue versus a single extraction with a large amount of tissue are needed to determine whether the time is better invested in simpler but more numerous extractions or more complex but fewer extractions. With these additional comparative studies, we will have a comprehensive understanding of the optimal DNA isolation procedure for sponge nsDNA metabarcoding which future investigations, whether of a biological or technical nature, can draw upon to advance this growing field.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

S.M. and L.R.H. designed the study; J.C., A.R., and B.M. facilitated sample collection; L.R.H., E.F.N., and A.C. performed the laboratory work with guidance from G.S., M.B.A., and A.R.; G.S. performed the bioinformatic analyses; S.M. and A.R. obtained the funding; L.R.H. analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript, which all authors revised.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was funded by the UK Natural Environment Research Council grant NE/T007028/1. A.R. was also supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation grant (RYC2018-024247-I) and CSIC intramural grant (202030E006). M.B.A. was supported by the National Agency for Research and Development (ANID), fellowship program Postdoctorado en el extranjero/2019-74200143.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None declared.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Raw sequence reads have been archived on the NCBI Sequence Read Archive (BioProject: PRJNA854174; BioSamples: SAMN29421799–SAMN29421894 [Phase 1] and SAMN29444657–SAMN29444784 [Phase 2]; SRA accessions: SRR19906974–RR19907069 [Phase 1], and SRR19912485–SRR19912613 [Phase 2]). Scripts and corresponding data have been deposited in a dedicated Zenodo repository (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7264066>).

## ORCID

Lynsey R. Harper  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0923-1801>

Stefano Mariani  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5329-0553>

## REFERENCES

- Alberdi, A., Aizpurua, O., Gilbert, M. T. P., & Bohmann, K. (2018). Scrutinizing key steps for reliable metabarcoding of environmental samples. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 9, 134–147. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12849>
- Baselga, A., & Orme, C. D. L. (2012). betapart: An R package for the study of beta diversity: Betapart package. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 3, 808–812. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2012.00224.x>
- Bessey, C., Gao, Y., Truong, Y. B., Miller, H., Jarman, S. N., & Berry, O. (2021). Comparison of materials for rapid passive collection of environmental DNA. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.08.467842>
- Bessey, C., Jarman, S. N., Simpson, T., Miller, H., Stewart, T., Keesing, J. K., & Berry, O. (2021). Passive eDNA collection enhances aquatic biodiversity analysis. *Communications Biology*, 4, 236. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-021-01760-8>
- Boessenkool, S., Epp, L. S., Haile, J., Bellemain, E., Edwards, M., Coissac, E., Willerslev, E., & Brochmann, C. (2012). Blocking human contaminant DNA during PCR allows amplification of rare mammal species from sedimentary ancient DNA. *Molecular Ecology*, 21, 1806–1815. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2011.05306.x>
- Bronner, I. F., Quail, M. A., Turner, D. J., & Swerdlow, H. (2009). Improved protocols for Illumina sequencing. *Current Protocols in Human Genetics*, 18, 18.2.1–18.2.42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/047142905.hg1802s62>
- 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., Hänfling, B., Leese, F., Mächler, E., Mahon, A. R., Meissner, K., Panksep, K., ... Deiner, K. (2021). A practical guide to DNA-based methods for biodiversity assessment. *Advanced Books*. <https://doi.org/10.3897/ab.e68634>
- Cai, W., Harper, L. R., Neave, E. F., Shum, P., Craggs, J., Arias, M. B., Riesgo, A., & Mariani, S. (2022). Environmental DNA persistence and fish detection in captive sponges. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 22, 2956–2966. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13677>
- Chen, S., Zhou, Y., Chen, Y., & Gu, J. (2018). fastp: An ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor. *Bioinformatics*, 34, i884–i890. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty560>
- Clare, E. L., Economou, C. K., Faulkes, C. G., Gilbert, J. D., Bennett, F., Drinkwater, R., & Littlefair, J. E. (2021). eDNAir: Proof of concept that animal DNA can be collected from air sampling. *PeerJ*, 9, e11030. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.11030>
- Collins, R. A., Bakker, J., Wangenstein, O. S., Soto, A. Z., Corrigan, L., Sims, D. W., Genner, M. J., & Mariani, S. (2019). Non-specific amplification compromises environmental DNA metabarcoding with COI. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 1985–2001. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13276>
- Deiner, K., Bik, H. M., Mächler, E., Seymour, M., Lacoursière-Roussel, A., Altermatt, F., Creer, S., Bista, I., Lodge, D. M., de Vere, N., Pfrender, M. E., & Bernatchez, L. (2017). Environmental DNA metabarcoding: Transforming how we survey animal and plant communities. *Molecular Ecology*, 26, 5872–5895. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14350>
- Deiner, K., Lopez, J., Bourne, S., Holman, L., Seymour, M., Grey, E. K., Lacoursière, A., Li, Y., Renshaw, M. A., Pfrender, M. E., Rius, M., Bernatchez, L., & Lodge, D. M. (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. <https://doi.org/10.3897/mbmg.2.28963>
- Derycke, S., Maes, S., Van den Bulcke, L., Vanhollebeke, J., Wittrock, J., Hillewaert, H., Ampe, B., Haegeman, A., Hostens, K., & De Backer, A. (2021). Detection of macrobenthos species with metabarcoding is consistent in bulk DNA but dependent on body size and sclerotization in eDNA from the ethanol preservative. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 8, 637858. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.637858>
- Drinkwater, R., Williamson, J., Clare, E. L., Chung, A. Y. C., Rossiter, S. J., & Slade, E. (2021). Dung beetles as samplers of mammals in Malaysian Borneo—A test of high throughput metabarcoding of iDNA. *PeerJ*, 9, e11897. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.11897>
- Elbrecht, V., & Steinke, D. (2018). Scaling up DNA metabarcoding for freshwater macrozoobenthos monitoring. *Freshwater Biology*, 64, 380–387. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13220>

- Franklin, T. W., McKelvey, K. S., Golding, J. D., Mason, D. H., Dysthe, J. C., Pilgrim, K. L., Squires, J. R., Aubry, 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. *Biological Conservation*, 229, 50–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.11.006>
- Galitz, A., Cook, S. d. C., Ekins, M., Hooper, J. N. A., Naumann, P. T., de Voogd, N. J., Abdul Wahab, M., Wörheide, G., & Erpenbeck, D. (2018). Identification of an aquaculture poriferan “Pest with potential” and its phylogenetic implications. *PeerJ*, 6, e5586. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.5586>
- Geraldi, N. R., Díaz-Rúa, R., Shea, L. A., & Duarte, C. M. (2019). Performance of extraction methods for extracellular DNA from sediments across marine habitats. *Environmental DNA*, 4, e6372. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.48>
- Gökulp, M., Kooistra, T., Rocha, M. S., Silva, T. H., Osinga, R., Murk, A. J., & Wijgerde, T. (2020). The effect of depth on the morphology, bacterial clearance, and respiration of the Mediterranean sponge *Chondrosia reniformis* (Nardo, 1847). *Marine Drugs*, 18, 358. <https://doi.org/10.3390/md18070358>
- Gosselin, E. N., Lonsinger, R. C., & Waits, L. P. (2017). Comparing morphological and molecular diet analyses and fecal DNA sampling protocols for a terrestrial carnivore: Noninvasive diet analysis methodologies. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 41, 362–369. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wsb.749>
- Harper, L. R., Niemiller, M. L., Benito, J., Paddock, L. E., Knittle, E., Molano-Flores, B., & Davis, M. A. (2022). BeeDNA: Microfluidic environmental DNA metabarcoding as a tool for connecting plant and pollinator communities. *Environmental DNA*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.370>
- Harrison, J. B., Sunday, J. M., & Rogers, S. M. (2019). Predicting the fate of eDNA in the environment and implications for studying biodiversity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 286, 20191409. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.1409>
- Hermans, S. M., Buckley, H. L., & Lear, G. (2018). Optimal extraction methods for the simultaneous analysis of DNA from diverse organisms and sample types. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 18, 557–569. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12762>
- Hestetun, J. T., Lanzén, A., Skaar, K. S., & Dahlgren, T. G. (2021). The impact of DNA extract homogenization and replication on marine sediment metabarcoding diversity and heterogeneity. *Environmental DNA*, 3, 997–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.223>
- Hinlo, R., Gleeson, D., Lintermans, M., & Furlan, E. (2017). Methods to maximise recovery of environmental DNA from water samples. *PLoS One*, 12, e0179251. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179251>
- Jeunen, G.-J., Cane, J. S., Ferreira, S., Strano, F., von Ammon, U., Cross, H., Day, R., Hesseltine, S., Ellis, K., Urban, L., Pearson, N., Olmedo-Rojas, P., Kardailsky, A., Gemmell, N. J., & Lamare, M. (2021). Assessing the utility of marine filter feeders for environmental DNA (eDNA) biodiversity monitoring. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.21.473722>
- Jeunen, G.-J., Knapp, M., Spencer, H. G., Taylor, H. R., Lamare, M. D., Stat, M., Bunce, M., & Gemmell, N. J. (2019). Species-level biodiversity assessment using marine environmental DNA metabarcoding requires protocol optimization and standardization. *Ecology and Evolution*, 9, 1323–1335. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4843>
- Johnson, M. D., Cox, R. D., & Barnes, M. A. (2019). Analyzing airborne environmental DNA: A comparison of extraction methods, primer type, and trap type on the ability to detect airborne eDNA from terrestrial plant communities. *Environmental DNA*, 1, 176–185. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.19>
- Kahn, A. S., Yahel, G., Chu, J. W. F., Tunnicliffe, V., & Leys, S. P. (2015). Benthic grazing and carbon sequestration by deep-water glass sponge reefs. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 60, 78–88. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.10002>
- Kandler, N. M., Wooster, M. K., Leray, M., Knowlton, N., de Voogd, N. J., Paulay, G., & Berumen, M. L. (2019). Hyperdiverse macrofauna communities associated with a common sponge, *Stylissa carteri*, shift across ecological gradients in the Central Red Sea. *Diversity*, 11, 18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/d11020018>
- Kassambara, A. (2020). *ggpubr: 'ggplot2' based publication ready plots*. R package version 0.4.0. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpubr>
- Kaunisto, K. M., Roslin, T., Sääksjärvi, I. E., & Vesterinen, E. J. (2017). Pellets of proof: First glimpse of the dietary composition of adult odonates as revealed by metabarcoding of feces. *Ecology and Evolution*, 7, 8588–8598. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.3404>
- Kinoshita, G., Yonezawa, S., Murakami, S., & Isagi, Y. (2019). Environmental DNA collected from snow tracks is useful for identification of mammalian species. *Zoological Science*, 36, 198–207. <https://doi.org/10.2108/zs180172>
- Kirse, A., Bourlat, S. J., Langen, K., & Fonseca, V. G. (2021). Unearthing the potential of soil eDNA metabarcoding—Towards best practice advice for invertebrate biodiversity assessment. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 9, 630560. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2021.630560>
- Kirtane, A., Atkinson, J. D., & Sassoubre, L. M. (2020). Design and validation of passive environmental DNA samplers (PEDS) using granular activated carbon (GAC) and montmorillonite clay (MC). *Environmental Science & Technology*, 54, 11961–11970. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c01863>
- Köster, J., & Rahmann, S. (2012). Snakemake—A scalable bioinformatics workflow engine. *Bioinformatics*, 28, 2520–2522. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bts480>
- Lanzén, A., Lekang, K., Jonassen, I., Thompson, E. M., & Troedsson, C. (2017). DNA extraction replicates improve diversity and compositional dissimilarity in metabarcoding of eukaryotes in marine sediments. *PLoS One*, 12, e0179443. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179443>
- Lawson Handley, L. (2015). How will the “molecular revolution” contribute to biological recording? *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 115, 750–766. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bij.12516>
- Lenth, R. V. (2022). *emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-squares means*. R package version 1.7.2. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans>
- Lynggaard, C., Bertelsen, M. F., Jensen, C. V., Johnson, M. S., Frøslev, T. G., Olsen, M. T., & Bohmann, K. (2022). Airborne environmental DNA for terrestrial vertebrate community monitoring. *Current Biology*, 32, 701–707.e5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.12.014>
- Macher, J.-N., Vivancos, A., Piggott, J. J., Centeno, F. C., Matthaie, C. D., & Leese, F. (2018). Comparison of environmental DNA and bulk-sample metabarcoding using highly degenerate cytochrome c oxidase I primers. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 18, 1456–1468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12940>
- Majaneva, M., Diserud, O. H., Eagle, S. H. C., Hajibabaei, M., & Ekrem, T. (2018). Choice of DNA extraction method affects DNA metabarcoding of unsorted invertebrate bulk samples. *Metabarcoding and Metagenomics*, 2, e26664. <https://doi.org/10.3897/mbmg.2.26664>
- Mariani, S., Baillie, C., Colosimo, G., & Riesgo, A. (2019). Sponges as natural environmental DNA samplers. *Current Biology*, 29, PR401–PR402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.04.031>
- Mariani, S., Harper, L. R., Collins, R. A., Baillie, C., Wangenstein, O. S., McDevitt, A. D., Heddell-Cowie, M., & Genner, M. J. (2021). Estuarine molecular bycatch as a landscape-wide biomonitoring

- tool. *Biological Conservation*, 261, 109287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.109287>
- Marquina, D., Esparza-Salas, R., Roslin, T., & Ronquist, F. (2019). Establishing arthropod community composition using metabarcoding: Surprising inconsistencies between soil samples and preservative ethanol and homogenate from Malaise trap catches. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 19, 1516–1530. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13071>
- Massey, A. L., Bronzoni, R. V. d. M., da Silva, D. J. F., Allen, J., de Lazari, P. R., dos Santos Filho, M., Canale, G. R., Bernardo, C. S. S., Peres, C. A., & Levi, T. (2021). Invertebrates for vertebrate biodiversity monitoring: Comparisons using three insect taxa as iDNA samplers. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 22, 962–977. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13525>
- Miya, M. (2021). Environmental DNA metabarcoding: A novel method for biodiversity monitoring of marine fish communities. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, 14, 161–185. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-marine-041421-082251>
- Morganti, T. M., Ribes, M., Moskovich, R., Weisz, J. B., Yahel, G., & Coma, R. (2021). In situ pumping rate of 20 marine demosponges is a function of osculum area. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 8, 583188. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.583188>
- Nakagawa, S., & Cuthill, I. C. (2007). Effect size, confidence interval and statistical significance: A practical guide for biologists. *Biological Reviews*, 82, 591–605. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2007.00027.x>
- Nakao, R., Inui, R., Akamatsu, Y., Goto, M., Doi, H., & Matsuoka, S. (2021). Illumina iSeq 100 and MiSeq exhibit similar performance in freshwater fish environmental DNA metabarcoding. *Scientific Reports*, 11, 15763. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-95360-5>
- Nørgaard, L., Olesen, C. R., Trøjelsgaard, K., Pertoldi, C., Nielsen, J. L., Taberlet, P., Ruiz-González, A., De Barba, M., & Iacolina, L. (2021). eDNA metabarcoding for biodiversity assessment, generalist predators as sampling assistants. *Scientific Reports*, 11, 6820. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-85488-9>
- Ogle, D. H., Doll, J. C., Wheeler, P., & Dinno, A. (2021). FSA: Fisheries stock analysis. R package version 0.9.1. <https://github.com/droglenc/FSA>
- Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P. R., O'Hara, R. B., Simpson, G. L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M. H. H., Szoecs, E., & Wagner, H. (2020). *vegan: Community ecology package*. R package version 2.5-7. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan>
- Pereira-da-Conceicao, L., Elbrecht, V., Hall, A., Briscoe, A., Barber-James, H., & Price, B. (2020). Metabarcoding unsorted kick-samples facilitates macroinvertebrate-based biomonitoring with increased taxonomic resolution, while outperforming environmental DNA. *Environmental DNA*, 3, 353–371. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.116>
- Persaud, S. F., Cottenie, K., & Gleason, J. E. (2021). Ethanol eDNA reveals unique community composition of aquatic macroinvertebrates compared to bulk tissue metabarcoding in a biomonitoring sampling scheme. *Diversity*, 13, 34. <https://doi.org/10.3390/d13010034>
- Pompanon, F., Deagle, B. E., Symondson, W. O. C., Brown, D. S., Jarman, S. N., & Taberlet, P. (2012). Who is eating what: Diet assessment using next generation sequencing. *Molecular Ecology*, 21, 1931–1950. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2011.05403.x>
- R Core Team. (2022). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Roger, F., Ghanavi, H. R., Danielsson, N., Wahlberg, N., Löndahl, J., Pettersson, L. B., Andersson, G. K. S., Boke Olén, N., & Clough, Y. (2022). Airborne environmental DNA metabarcoding for the monitoring of terrestrial insects—A proof of concept from the field. *Environmental DNA*, 4, 790–807. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.290>
- Rognes, T., Flouri, T., Nichols, B., Quince, C., & Mahé, F. (2016). VSEARCH: A versatile open source tool for metagenomics. *PeerJ*, 4, e2584. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2584>
- Russo, T., Maiello, G., Talarico, L., Baillie, C., Colosimo, G., D'Andrea, L., Di Maio, F., Fiorentino, F., Franceschini, S., Garofalo, G., Scannella, D., Cataudella, S., & Mariani, S. (2020). All is fish that comes to the net: Metabarcoding for rapid fisheries catch assessment. *Ecological Applications*, 31, e02273. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.2273>
- Sanches, T. M., & Schreier, A. D. (2020). Optimizing an eDNA protocol for estuarine environments: Balancing sensitivity, cost and time. *PLoS One*, 15, e0233522. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233522>
- Schnell, I. B., Thomsen, P. F., Wilkinson, N., Rasmussen, M., Jensen, L. R. D., Willerslev, E., Bertelsen, M. F., & Gilbert, M. T. P. (2012). Screening mammal biodiversity using DNA from leeches. *Current Biology*, 22, R262–R263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.02.058>
- Schrader, C., Schielke, A., Ellerbroek, L., & John, R. (2012). PCR inhibitors – occurrence, properties and removal. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 113, 1014–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2012.05384.x>
- Sellers, G. S., Di Muri, C., Gómez, A., & Hänfling, B. (2018). Mu-DNA: A modular universal DNA extraction method adaptable for a wide range of sample types. *Metabarcoding and Metagenomics*, 2, e24556. <https://doi.org/10.3897/mbmg.2.24556>
- Siegenthaler, A., Wangenstein, O. S., Soto, A. Z., Benvenuto, C., Corrigan, L., & Mariani, S. (2019). Metabarcoding of shrimp stomach content: Harnessing a natural sampler for fish biodiversity monitoring. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 19, 206–220. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12956>
- Sigsgaard, E. E., Olsen, K., Hansen, M. D. D., Hansen, O. L. P., Høye, T. T., Svenning, J.-C., & Thomsen, P. F. (2020). Environmental DNA metabarcoding of cow dung reveals taxonomic and functional diversity of invertebrate assemblages. *Molecular Ecology*, 30, 3374–3389. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15734>
- Singer, G. A. C., Fahner, N. A., Barnes, J. G., McCarthy, A., & Hajibabaei, M. (2019). Comprehensive biodiversity analysis via ultra-deep patterned flow cell technology: A case study of eDNA metabarcoding seawater. *Scientific Reports*, 9, 5991. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-42455-9>
- Taberlet, P., Bonin, A., Zinger, L., & Coissac, E. (2018). *Environmental DNA: For biodiversity research and monitoring*. Oxford University Press.
- Thalinger, B., Deiner, K., Harper, L. R., Rees, H. C., Blackman, R. C., Sint, D., Traugott, M., Goldberg, C. S., & Bruce, K. (2021). A validation scale to determine the readiness of environmental DNA assays for routine species monitoring. *Environmental DNA*, 3, 823–836. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.189>
- Thomsen, P. F., & Sigsgaard, E. E. (2019). Environmental DNA metabarcoding of wild flowers reveals diverse communities of terrestrial arthropods. *Ecology and Evolution*, 9, 1665–1679. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.4809>
- 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. *Environmental DNA*, 1, 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.21>
- Turner, C. R., Barnes, M. A., Xu, C. C. Y., Jones, S. E., Jerde, C. L., & Lodge, D. M. (2014). Particle size distribution and optimal capture of aqueous microbial eDNA. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 5, 676–684. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12206>
- Turon, M., Angulo-Preckler, C., Antich, A., Præbel, K., & Wangenstein, O. S. (2020). More than expected from old sponge samples: A natural sampler DNA metabarcoding assessment of marine fish diversity in Nha Trang Bay (Vietnam). *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 7, 605148. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.605148>
- Valentin, 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. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 20, 746–755. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.13151>



- Wang, Y., Chen, K., Gao, J., Wang, M., Dong, J., Xie, Y., Giesy, J. P., Jin, X., & Wang, B. (2021). Environmental DNA of preservative ethanol performed better than water samples in detecting macroinvertebrate diversity using metabarcoding. *Diversity & Distributions*, 27, 1989–2002. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.13284>
- Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag.
- Zhang, Z., Schwartz, S., Wagner, L., & Miller, W. (2000). A greedy algorithm for aligning DNA sequences. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 7, 203–214. <https://doi.org/10.1089/10665270050081478>
- Zizka, V. M. A., Geiger, M. F., Hörren, T., Kirse, A., Noll, N. W., Schäffler, L., Scherges, A. M., & Sorg, M. (2022). Recommendations for tissue homogenisation and extraction in DNA metabarcoding of Malaise trap samples. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.25.477667>
- Zizka, V. M. A., Leese, F., Peinert, B., & Geiger, M. F. (2018). DNA metabarcoding from sample fixative as a quick and voucher-preserving biodiversity assessment method. *Genome*, 62, 122–136. <https://doi.org/10.1139/gen-2018-0048>

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

**How to cite this article:** Harper, L. R., Neave, E. F., Sellers, G. S., Cunnington, A. V., Arias, M. B., Craggs, J., MacDonald, B., Riesgo, A., & Mariani, S. (2023). Optimized DNA isolation from marine sponges for natural sampler DNA metabarcoding. *Environmental DNA*, 5, 438–461. <https://doi.org/10.1002/edn3.392>