The Utility of Microbial Profiling for Identification of Trace Soil Samples



Ethan Smith, B.S.; Erin Grammer, M.S.; Melissa Meyers, M.S.; David Foran, Ph.D. Michigan State University Forensic Science Program

### Overview

- Background and Significance
  - Types of Evidence
  - Soil characterization & analysis techniques
- Research at Michigan State University
  - Meyers and Foran (2008)
  - Lenz and Foran (2010)
  - Smith and Foran (current)
- Conclusions

### **Background of Soil Analysis**

Used for over 100 years
 Georg Popp in 1904

Can associate person/object with location

 Can help determine possible locations for further investigation

# Soil Analysis Techniques

#### Physical/Chemical analysis

- Color, texture, and particle size
- Minerals, oxides, and elemental composition
- pH and organic content
- Animal and plant material (e.g. pollen)
- Advantages/Disadvantages
  - can be very discriminating
  - requires years of experience and training
  - can be time consuming

# Soil Analysis Techniques

#### Microbial analysis

- Denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis
- Amplified fragment length polymorphism
- Terminal-restriction fragment length polymorphism
- Real-time polymerase chain reaction (PCR)
- Advantages/Disadvantages
  - can also be very discriminating
  - not as much training required
  - can also be time consuming
  - sensitivity to temporal and spatial variability

### Soil Research at MSU

- Specific aims of research
  - Interhabitat variability
  - Intra-habitat variability
    - Temporal Variability
    - Spatial Variability
- Daubert/Frye challenges

#### Soil collected at 5 habitats



#### Agricultural Field



Woodlot



#### Sandy Woodlot



Marsh



Yard

#### Sample collection

- Main site every month Sep. 2004 Aug. 2005
- Samples10 ft from main site every 3 months
- Stored in -20°C freezer
- Incomplete extraction using UltraClean® Soil DNA Isolation Kit (MoBio)
- Complete extraction using PowerSoil® DNA Isolation Kit (MoBio)

 T-RFLP analysis – 16S rRNA gene -Assayed all bacteria present -ANOVA and **MANOVA** on similarity indices



#### Results

- Interhabitat variability
  - Habitats most different in March and most similar in October
  - Similarity indices among habitats differed based on month
- Intra-habitat temporal variability
  - More pronounced in the spring
  - Agricultural field had significant temporal variability
- Intra-habitat spatial variability
  - No significant difference based on distance from main collection site

 Used T-RFLP to analyze DNA extracts from Meyers and Foran (2008)

• Targeted recA gene of genus Rhizobium

 Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS)

Inter-habitat and temporal variability



• Intra-habitat spatial variability



#### December





#### • Pairwise comparisons and "unknowns"



- Relative abundance using real-time PCR
  - Different based on soil type
  - Can help differentiate habitats
- Results with statistical confidence

 Real-time PCR used in most crime laboratories

#### Soil collected at 4 habitats



#### **Agricultural Field**



Yard



#### Marsh



#### Woodlot

- Sample collection
  - Main site over a course of days, weeks, months
  - 10 inch core sample for depth study
- Stored in -20°C freezer
- Extracted DNA using PowerSoil® DNA Isolation Kit (MoBio)

- Screened for presence of bacterial groups targeting 16S rRNA gene
  - Primers designed with ARB software
  - Tested against control DNA
- Real-time PCR with Bio-Rad iQ<sup>TM</sup>5 thermocycler

### **Bacteria Amplified**

- Bradyrhizobium japonicum
   Symbiote with legumes
- Group 1 Acidobacteria
  - Abundant in many types of soil and vary with pH
- Genus Burkholderia
  - Commonly found in ground water and soil
  - Very complex taxonomy
- Genus Agrobacterium
  - Within the same family as Rhizobium

### **Bacteria Amplified**

	Habitats			
Bacteria	Ag Field	Marsh	Woodlot	Yard
B. japonicum	+	+	+	+
<i>Acidobacteria</i> Group 1	+	+	+	+
Genus <i>Burkholderia</i>	+	+	+	+
Genus Agrobacterium	+	+	-	+

### **Real-time PCR profile**

#### Marsh



#### **Statistics**

#### ADONIS

- Multivariate ANOVA based on dissimilarity
- p-value based on permutation tests
- NMDS
  - 95% confidence ellipses

### Interhabitat Variability

#### ADONIS

#### -Habitat as differentiating parameter

#### -p < 0.05

### NMDS: Interhabitat Variability

#### All Habitats

#### Woodlot vs. Marsh





### Intra-habitat Spatial Variability

ADONIS

- Depth as differentiating parameter

#### - No significant p-values for Ag Field or Woodlot



### **NMDS: Spatial Variability**

#### September

#### March





### Intra-habitat Temporal Variability

ADONIS

# Ag Field: p < 0.05</li>Could reflect rotation crop

#### -Marsh: p < 0.05

Wet environment sensitive to weather

### NMDS: Temporal Variability

#### All Habitats

#### Yard vs. Marsh





Complete separation in pairwise comparison

Interhabitat	Spatial	Temporal	
83%	50%	66%	

# **Conclusions of Soil Research**

- Meyers and Foran (2008)
   samples from same habitat were more similar
- Lenz and Foran (2010)

   visual representation using NMDS
   pairwise comparisons
- Smith and Foran (present)
  - statistical significance with ADONIS and confidence ellipses
  - pairwise comparisons

### Acknowledgements

#### **Contibuting Authors/Researchers**

Melissa Meyers Erin Grammer (Lenz) Dr. David Foran

#### Forensic Biology Lab at MSU

Stephen Gicale Cheryl Schaeper Jade McDaniel Beth Shattuck Shannon Peters Alicya Orlando Keiauda Tennant Sarah Thomasma Amanda Buszek

#### NIJ/FSF

Contributors to each project

Family and friends for their support

This project was supported by Award No. 2008-DN-BX-K216 from the FSF awarded by the National Institute of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this presentation are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.