

# Successful DNA amplification of DNA from non-destructive buccal swabbing in Vespertilionid and Rhinolophid bats

Morgan Hughes

[m.hughes3@wlv.ac.uk](mailto:m.hughes3@wlv.ac.uk)

University of Wolverhampton

Scott K Brown

University of Exeter

Rémi Martin

University of Wolverhampton

Christopher H Young

University of Wolverhampton

Simon Maddock

University of Wolverhampton

---

## Method Article

**Keywords:** Conservation, population genetics, sampling techniques, buccal swabbing

**Posted Date:** May 17th, 2022

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1642453/v1>

**License:**  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

**Additional Declarations:** No competing interests reported.

---

**Version of Record:** A version of this preprint was published at Conservation Genetics Resources on March 22nd, 2024. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12686-024-01352-8>.

# Abstract

Acquiring DNA from wild bats (Mammalia: Chiroptera) is typically undertaken utilizing highly invasive (but non-lethal) sampling techniques comprising wing biopsies and occasional blood samples. While non-invasive sampling is possible through the extraction of DNA from faecal samples, it is not always possible to acquire samples from individual bats whilst conducting fieldwork, and as such, this method is primarily applicable to roost occupancy identification. Similarly, wing swabbing is liable to cross-contamination from roost mates. Here we present the first use of oral (buccal) swabbing for successful, species-resolution DNA sequencing of Vespertilionidae and Rhinolophidae in 10 bat species (nine Vespertilionidae and one Rhinolophidae) from the UK.

## Text

The use of genetic sampling for conservation ecology is becoming prevalent and may be particularly important for vulnerable taxa such as bats (Mammalia: Chiroptera). When studying Chiroptera, the most common technique for obtaining DNA samples is wing biopsies (Manjerovic et al., 2015; Player et al., 2017) and occasionally blood sampling (Walker et al., 2016; Russo et al., 2017). Wing biopsies are problematic, as they require extensive training and, in some areas, permits which are difficult or prohibitively expensive to attain. Additionally, biopsies have been shown to have slow healing rates prior to and during hibernation (Player et al., 2017) and are thus less viable in temperate areas. Consequently, the emphasis on demonstrating the efficacy of non-invasive techniques for obtaining DNA samples is increasingly important (Boston et al. 2012).

Collection of faecal samples (Puechmaille et al., 2007; Walker et al., 2016) and wing swabs (Walker et al., 2016; Player et al., 2017) have been used as non-invasive methods in bats, but each has drawbacks. Most bat species form colonies and whilst collection of faeces from roosts can identify species (or multiple species), in order to collect an individual bat's faecal sample, surveyors must hold each bat captive until it produces a faecal pellet, and there is potential for cross-contamination of samples from holding bags. Wing swabbing has potential for cross-contamination from roost mates (which may not be the same species) (Player et al., 2017).

Oral (buccal) swabbing has been used as a less invasive DNA sampling procedure in many vertebrate groups, including birds (Handel et al., 2006; Vilstrup et al., 2018), reptiles (Miller, 2006; Beebee, 2008) amphibians (Pidancier et al., 2003; Maddock et al., 2014) and small mammals (Naim et al., 2012). As far as we are aware, few studies have used buccal swabbing in bats, comprising Ramirez (2011) who successfully used buccal swabs to extract DNA from the *Leptonycteris yerbabuena* (Phyllostomidae), and Corthals et al. (2015) who used buccal brushes to collect epithelial cells from members of the families Mormoopidae and Phyllostomidae, successfully amplifying DNA. However, the technique of Corthals et al. (2015) was invasive as they used brushes rather than swabs for long sampling periods (60 seconds), frequently causing bleeding in the mouths of bats. The only published work on the use of buccal swabs to extract DNA from the Vespertilionidae is that of a single oral swab from *Myotis*

*californicus* (Walker et al. 2016) which was successfully amplified to Genus level only. Here we report a species-level, non-invasive buccal swabbing sampling method for bat DNA for Vespertilionidae and Rhinolophidae. Samples were extracted from swabs of 24 individual bats comprising ten species in five genera (*Myotis daubentonii*, *Myotis mystacinus*, *Myotis nattereri*, *Nyctalus leisleri*, *Nyctalus noctula*, *Pipistrellus nathusii*, *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*, *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*, *Plecotus auritus* and *Rhinolophus hipposideros*).

Buccal swabs were taken from bats during ongoing monitoring (bat box and trapping) programmes in the West Midlands, UK. All surveys adhered to standard UK (Collins 2016) or European (Battersby 2010) guidelines, using standard methodology (Kunz and Kurta 1988; Barlow 1999). Bats were identified as per Dietz and Kiefer (2014). Animals were handled whilst wearing clean, disposable latex gloves which were changed between bats. A Dryswab™ Mini Σ-Swab® tip 78mm sterile, polyurethane swab (MW943; Medical Wire & Equipment Co., Corsham, UK) was used for each bat. Samples were obtained by encouraging the bat to gape, inserting the swab into the bat's mouth and rotating for 20 seconds, concentrating on the cheeks and the tongue. No bleeding was caused with this swab type and duration. Each swab tip was immediately placed in a 2ml screw-top vial filled with 100% molecular grade ethanol and transferred to a -20°C freezer within six hours. Individuals were marked with non-toxic chalk paint to avoid duplicate sampling if re-captured.

DNA was extracted using Qiagen DNeasy® Blood and Tissue Kits, following manufacturer's instructions, except lysing was at 56°C for 30 minutes, vortexing at 15 and 30 minutes and utilising only 100µl of buffer AE to suspend final DNA extracts. We quantified 2µl of extracted DNA elutions using a Thermo Scientific™ NanoDrop™ 2000/2000c spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA USA). Individuals of each species were amplified using PCR for the non-coding 16s rRNA (16s) mitochondrial marker using the primers 16sAL (5'-CGCCTGTTT ATCACG-3') and 16sBH (5'-CCGGTCTGAACTCAGATC ACG-3' (Palumbi et al., 1991) as they are universal for most tetrapods, and thus would identify cross-contamination from other organisms (e.g., humans). Reaction volumes for PCR at 25µl were: 12.5µl of MyTaq™ Red Mix, 6.5µl of ddH<sub>2</sub>O, 1µl each of the forward and reverse primers (10µM) and 4µl of template DNA. Cycling was undertaken using a Techne Prime Thermal Cycler; conditions were: denature at 94°C for 60s; followed by 35 cycles of 94°C for 30s, 50°C for 30s, and 72°C for 30s; and final extension of 72°C for 5 min. PCRs were assessed for successful amplification with a 1% agarose gel and were then prepared for sequencing using the BigDye™ Terminator v3.1 cycle sequencing kit. Sequencing took place on the University of Wolverhampton's in-house ABI Applied Biosystems 3500XL DNA analyser. Sequences were analysed and checked using Geneious Prime v 2022.1.1 (Biomatters Ltd., 2022) and species identity checked using NCBI nucleotide BLAST searches (National Centre for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), 1988).

DNA yields shown in Nanodrop analyses were low for all samples and were undetectable in many (Table 1), however Nanodrop values are unreliable for quantification of very low DNA yields. Despite low yields, successful amplifications were achieved for all individuals of all species in the study and BLAST searches supported species ID.

Table 1

Quantities of DNA extracted and PCR success. Nucleic Acid Concentration, A260/A280 resultant from Nanodrop analysis; Query length and maximum percentage Blast Match.

Latitude	Longitude	Family	Species	Conc.	260/280	BLAST Ident.
52.520493	-1.9665904	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Myotis daubentonii</i>	-	2.05	95.83%
52.520493	-1.9665904	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Myotis daubentonii</i>	-	3.27	97.93%
52.582097	-1.8617896	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>	-	2.49	100.00%
52.561178	-1.9372785	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>	1	1	95.15%
52.561178	-1.9372785	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>	1.7	0.93	100.00%
52.568248	-1.8438631	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>	3.5	1.04	99.06%
52.568474	-1.844305	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>	-	1.56	94.56%
52.548494	-1.9224905	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Myotis nattereri</i>	-	2.88	99.35%
52.548683	-1.9224164	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Myotis nattereri</i>	-	3.07	96.73%
52.568474	-1.844305	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Nyctalus leisleri</i>	-	1.7	94.81%
52.507699	-1.7848493	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Nyctalus leisleri</i>	5.1	1.68	96.34%
52.507699	-1.7848493	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Nyctalus leisleri</i>	2.7	1.74	99.16%
52.561288	-1.9396238	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>	-	1.57	96.64%
52.561315	-1.9399483	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>	-	2	96.10%
52.520925	-1.9675186	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Pipistrellus nathusii</i>	-	1.94	100.00%
52.523269	-2.0399716	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	-	-	100.00%
52.524284	-2.0411664	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	-	1.73	95.98%
52.653792	-1.9393787	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	-	2.16	94.59%
52.653792	-1.9393787	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	-	1.85	99.38%
52.653792	-1.9393787	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	-	1.87	100.00%
52.561169	-1.9372638	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Plecotus auritus</i>	-	1.7	94.31%
52.562277	-1.9399912	<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	<i>Plecotus auritus</i>	-	3.67	99.28%
52.515240	-2.0774818	<i>Rhinolophidae</i>	<i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i>	-	1.55	96.54%

Latitude	Longitude	Family	Species	Conc.	260/280	BLAST Ident.
52.515204	-2.0775849	<i>Rhinolophidae</i>	<i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i>	1.6	1.67	98.51%
- denotes no discernible yield						

We have demonstrated that it is possible to obtain DNA from ten Vespertilionidae and one Rhinolophidae species using a buccal swabbing method that provides enough DNA concentration to generate Sanger sequence data. This method requires field training and specific swab types but can readily be learned and applied by anyone with competency in handling wild bats. It precludes the need for other, more invasive methods. Further work is required to determine whether oral swabbing can be utilised for other genetic methods (e.g., microsatellite analyses).

## Declarations

*Acknowledgments:* The authors thank Natural England for provision of research project licences, volunteers from the Birmingham and Black Country Bat Group's Urban Bat Project for assistance with fieldwork, and Wolverhampton Council, Walsall Council, Dudley Zoological Gardens, RSPB Sandwell Valley, Sandwell Council, Sutton Park Rangers, Sara Diss and Dave Murray, and the Merrions Wood Trust for site access to conduct fieldwork.

*Funding:* Author Morgan Hughes has received research support (tuition fees) from Network Rail. We also wish to thank the University of Wolverhampton's RIF4 scheme for partially funding this work. No other funds, grants, or other support were received during the preparation of this manuscript.

*Competing Interests:* The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

*Data Availability:* The datasets (gene sequences) generated during this study will be made available in the Genbank repository. After acceptance, Genbank numbers will be included in Table 1.

## References

1. Barlow, K. (1999) *Expedition Field Techniques*. London, Royal Geographical Society.
2. Battersby, J. (2010) *Guidelines for Surveillance and Monitoring of European Bats*. Bonn.
3. Beebee, T. J. C. (2008) Buccal swabbing as a source of DNA from squamate reptiles. *Conservation Genetics*. **9**(4), pp. 1087–1088.
4. Biomatters Ltd. (2022) Geneious Prime. [online].Biomatters Ltd. Available at: <www.geneious.com>.
5. Boston, E. S. M., Puechmaille, S. J., Scott, D. D., Buckley, D. J., Lundy, M. G., Montgomery, I. W., Prodöhl, P. A. and Teeling, E. C. (2012) Empirical Assessment of Non-Invasive Population Genetics in Bats: Comparison of DNA Quality from Faecal and Tissue Samples. *Acta Chiropterologica* [online]. **14**(1), pp. 45–52. Available at: <http://www.bioone.org/doi/abs/10.3161/150811012X654259>.

6. Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* .3rd ed London, Bat Conservation Trust.
7. Corthals, A., Martin, A., Warsi, O. M. and Woller-skar, M. (2015) From the Field to the Lab: Best Practices for Field Preservation of Bat Specimens for Molecular Analyses. *PJlos One*. **10**(3), pp. 1–12.
8. Dietz, C. and Kiefer, A. (2014) *Bats of Britain and Europe* .London, Bloomsbury Natural History.
9. Handel, C. M., Pajot, L. M., Talbot, S. L. and Sage, G. K. (2006) Use of Buccal Swabs for Sampling DNA from Nestling and Adult Birds. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*. **34**(4), pp. 1094–1100.
10. Kunz, T. H. and Kurta, A. (1988) *Ecological and Behavioural Methods for the Study of Bats* .Kunz, T. H. (ed.) Boston, Smithsonian.
11. Maddock, S. T., Lewis, C. J., Wilkinson, M., Day, J. J., Morel, C., Marcel, T. K. and Gower, D. J. (2014) Non-lethal DNA sampling for caecilian amphibians. *Herpetological Journal*. **24**(October), pp. 255–260.
12. Manjerovic, M. B., Green, M. L., Miller, A. N., Novakofski, J. and Mateus-Pinilla, N. E. (2015) Trash to treasure: assessing viability of wing biopsies for use in bat genetic research. *Conservation Genetics Resources*. **7**(2), pp. 325–327.
13. Miller, H. C. (2006) Cloacal and buccal swabs are a reliable source of DNA for microsatellite genotyping of reptiles. *Conservation Genetics*. **7**(6), pp. 1001–1003.
14. Naim, D., Telfer, S., Tatman, S., Bird, S., Kemp, S. J., Hughes, R. and Watts, P. C. (2012) Patterns of genetic divergence among populations of the common dormouse, *Muscardinus avellanarius* in the UK. *Molecular Biology Reports*. **39**(2), pp. 1205–1215.
15. National Centre for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) (1988) National Library of Medicine. [online]. [Accessed 12 April 2022]. Available at: <<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>>.
16. Pidancier, N., Miquel, C. and Miaud, C. (2003) Buccal swabs as a non-destructive tissue sampling method for DNA analysis in amphibians. *Herpetological Journal*. **13**(4), pp. 175–178.
17. Player, D., Lausen, C., Zaitlin, B., Harrison, J., Paetkau, D. and Harmston, E. (2017) An alternative minimally invasive technique for genetic sampling of bats: Wing swabs yield species identification. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*. **41**(3), pp. 590–596.
18. Puechmaille, S. J., Mathy, G. and Petit, E. J. (2007) Good DNA from bat droppings. *Acta Chiropterologica*. **9**(1), pp. 269–276.
19. Ramirez, J. (2011) Population genetic structure of the lesser long-nosed bat (*Leptonycteris yerbabuenae*) in Arizona and Mexico. .p. 89.
20. Russo, D., Ancillotto, L., Hughes, A. C., Galimberti, A. and Mori, E. (2017) Collection of voucher specimens for bat research: conservation, ethical implications, reduction, and alternatives. *Mammal Review*. **47**(4), pp. 237–246.
21. Vilstrup, J. T., Mullins, T. D., Miller, M. P., McDearman, W., Walters, J. R. and Haig, S. M. (2018) A simplified field protocol for genetic sampling of birds using buccal swabs. *The Wilson Journal of*

*Ornithology*. **130**(1), pp. 326–334.

22. Walker, F. M., Williamson, C. H. D., Sanchez, D. E., Sobek, C. J. and Chambers, C. L. (2016) Species from feces: Order-wide identification of chiroptera from guano and other non-invasive genetic samples. *PLoS ONE*. **11**(9), pp. 1–22.