PRIMER NOTE Development and characterization of microsatellite loci in the endangered oyster mussel *Epioblasma capsaeformis* (Bivalvia: Unionidae)

JESS W. JONES,* MELANIE CULVER,† VICTOR DAVID,‡ JENNIFER STRUTHERS,*

NATHAN A. JOHNSON* RICHARD J. NEVES, STEPHEN J. O'BRIEN‡ and ERIC M. HALLERMAN* *College of Natural Resources, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA, †School of Renewable Natural Resources, University of Arizona, Tucson, AR 85721, USA, ‡Laboratory of Genomic Diversity and National Cancer Institute–FCRDC, Frederick, MD 21702–1201, USA, §Virginia Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, ¶ U.S. Geological Survey, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State, University, Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA

Abstract

Primers for 10 polymorphic microsatellite loci were developed and characterized for the endangered oyster mussel *Epioblasma capsaeformis* from the Clinch River, Tennessee. Microsatellite loci also were tested in four other populations or species. Amplification was successful for most loci in these closely related endangered species or populations; therefore, a high level of flanking sequence similarity was inferred for this group of species and populations. Allelic diversity ranged from nine to 20 alleles/locus, and averaged 13.6/locus. This study demonstrated the feasibility of using polymerase chain reaction (PCR) primers to amplify microsatellite loci across freshwater mussel species to conduct population genetics studies.

Keywords: DNA, Epioblasma, freshwater mussel, microsatellites

Received 7 May 2004; revision received 9 July 2004; accepted 9 July 2004

North America contains the greatest diversity of freshwater mussels in the world, including nearly 300 species. However, the mollusk superfamily Unionoida is the most imperiled group of animals in the United States, with 213 species (72%) listed as endangered, threatened, or of special concern (Williams *et al.* 1993). Most of the endangerment is caused by habitat loss or destruction affecting the natural structure and function of free-flowing rivers. Without immediate efforts to recover imperiled species in U.S. watersheds, the extinction of additional species is likely. To address the threat of species losses, biologists have

Correspondence: Jess Jones. Fax: 1-540-231-7580; E-mail: vtaquaculture@hotmail.com

The Unit is supported jointly by the U.S. Geological Survey, Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, Wildlife Management Institute, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health and Human Services, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. developed techniques to propagate and culture endangered freshwater mussels for release of juveniles into rivers to augment or restore populations. However, recovery activities of many species will require genetic analysis of source and recipient populations to help manage species recovery.

Samples of mantle tissue were collected from the following species and locations: (i) *Epioblasma capsaeformis* in the Clinch River, Hancock Co., TN, and Duck River, Maury, Co., TN; (ii) *Epioblasma florentina walkeri* in the upper Clinch River, Tazewell Co., VA, and Big South Fork Cumberland River, Scott County, TN; and (iii) *Epioblasma torulosa rangiana* from the Allegheny River, Venango County, PA. A small piece of mantle tissue (20–30 mg) was collected nonlethally from six to 20 live mussels from each population. Tissues were preserved in 95% ethanol and stored at –20 °C prior to DNA extraction. Total genomic DNA was isolated from ~20 mg of fresh mantle tissue using the Purgene DNA extraction kit (Gentra Systems, Inc., Minneapolis, MN, USA). DNA concentration was determined by flourescence assay (Hoefer TKO 1000 Flourometer, Hoefer Scientific Instruments, San Fransisco, CA), and its quality was visually inspected in a 0.8% agarose gel.

Microsatellite loci were isolated using a modified nonradioactive capture-hybridization method (Refseth et al. 1997; Sarno et al. 2000). Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplification conditions followed those of Eackles & King (2002) and consisted of 100 ng of genomic DNA, 1× PCR buffer (Perkin Elmer), 2 mM MgCl₂, 250 μM dNTPs, 0.5 μM each primer, and 1.0 U AmpliTaq DNA polymerase [Perkin-Elmer Applied Biosystems (ABI)] in a total volume of 20 µL. PCR thermal cycling conditions were as follows: 94 °C for 2 min; followed by 35 cycles of 94 °C for 40 s, 58 °C for 40 s, and 72 °C for 1 min; followed by a final extension at 72 °C for 1 min; and a hold at 4 °C (Eackles & King 2002). Microsatellite loci initially were examined for polymorphism using a 7% polyacrylamide silver stained gel. Exact allele size was determined by labelling primers of selected loci with fluorescent dye, followed by separation of dye-labelled PCR products on an Applied Biosystems (ABI) 3100 automated sequencer using a ROX 400 (Perkin Elmer) internal size standard. The GENOTYPER (ABI) software determined allele size, and POPGENE32 was used to determine heterozygosity values, perform Chi-square tests for Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium and test for linkage disequilibria for each locus.

Of 24 primer pairs tested, only 10 primer pairs amplified microsatellite DNA loci. The name of each locus, primer sequences, primer melting temperature, repeat motif of each locus, base pair size range of alleles/locus, number of alleles/locus, observed heterozygosity ($H_{\rm O}$), and expected heterozygosity ($H_{\rm E}$) for a combined analysis of all five populations are reported in Table 1. Allelic diversity ranged from nine to 20 alleles/locus, and averaged 13.6 alleles/locus, while average expected heterozygosity ($H_{\rm E}$) per locus ranged from 0.78 to 0.92, and averaged 0.86. Cross amplification also was conducted separately for each population (Table 2).

Significant deviations from HWE ($\alpha = 0.05$), primarily showing deficiencies of heterozygotes, were observed at *Ecap1–9* (Table 1), and at various loci in all five populations (Table 2). Linkage disequilibria (LD) ($\alpha = 0.05$) were observed at 13 pairs of alleles in *E. capsaeformis* (CR); zero pairs in *E. capsaeformis* (DR); 1 in *E. f. walkeri* (BSF); 1 in *E. f. walkeri* (IC); and zero in *E. t. rangiana* (AR). Deviations from HWE and LD could be the result of null alleles, recent population bottlenecks or significant levels of close inbreeding, perhaps due to hermaphroditic reproduction, which is known to occur in populations of unionids (van der Schalie 1970).

We have described the development and characteristics of 10 microsatellite primer pairs designed from DNA of the endangered oyster mussel *Epioblasma capsaeformis*, collected

Table 1 Characteristics of 10 microsatellite DNA loci developed using DNA from the endangered oyster mussel (*Epioblasma capsaeformis*). The size range of alleles/locus, number of alleles/locus, observed heterozygosity (H_0), and expected heterozygosity (H_E) represent combined data and analysis from the following species and populations: 1) *E. capsaeformis*, Clinch River, TN; 2) *E. capsaeformis*, Duck River, TN; 3) *E. florentina walkeri*, Indian Creek, upper Clinch River, VA; 4) *E. florentina walkeri*, Big South Fork Cumberland River, TN; and 5) *E. torulosa rangiana*, Allegheny River, PA

| Locus | Primer Sequence (5'-3') | Melting Temp. °C | Repeat Motif | Size Range (bp) | No. of Alleles | H _O | $H_{\rm E}$ | HWE <i>P-</i> value | GenBank Accession Number | |
|--------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Ecap1 | F: tgcatcatatgaaatgtgttcg | 59.4 | (AG) ₁₇ (GT) ₁₇ | 146-190 | 20 | 0.54 | 0.89 | <i>P</i> < 0.001 | AY650389 | |
| , | R: TCAGCATATTTCAAAGCAAACA | 58.5 | 1, 1, | | | | | | | |
| Ecap2 | F: ATCCTCAGGT TGGTGGTCAG | 60.0 | (GT) ₁₄ | 107-129 | 9 | 0.33 | 0.80 | P < 0.001 | AY650390 | |
| | R: TTTGAAAACCTTGTGATTGGC | 60.0 | | | | | | | | |
| ЕсарЗ | F: GGATGATGGGGAAAATAGATG | 59.7 | (GT) ₁₅ | 236-286 | 7 | 0.46 | 0.90 | P < 0.001 | AY650391 | |
| | R: tgcaacattacctgccttcca | 60.3 | 10 | | | | | | | |
| Ecap4 | F: ATGCCCCAGTGCTAGACATT | 60.1 | (CA) ₁₀ | 98-120 | 10 | 0.45 | 0.83 | P < 0.001 | AY650392 | |
| | R: AGAACAAAACACCCGTGTCC | 59.9 | 10 | | | | | | | |
| Ecap5 | F: TTTGAACACATTCGCCTCAG | 59.8 | (GT) ₂₉ | 176-224 | 20 | 0.55 | 0.92 | P < 0.001 | AY650393 | |
| | R: GAATTTGCCTCATCAGCCAC | 60.6 | | | | | | | | |
| Ecap6 | F: GATTTTGATTTTACGCTCCTGG | 60.0 | (GT) ₂₂ | 186-240 | 13 | 0.31 | 0.78 | P < 0.001 | AY650394 | |
| | R: ggttagtgttaggagtgaccgg | 59.9 | | | | | | | | |
| Ecap7 | F: ACGAAAAATGTTGTCATCCATT | 58.4 | (CA) ₂₅ | 106-130 | 12 | 0.59 | 0.87 | P < 0.05 | AY650395 | |
| | R: gcctagacgacaagcaaacc | 59.9 | | | | | | | | |
| Ecap8 | F: tgcagacatcgtagcgatatg | 59.9 | (CA) ₁₅ | 127-159 | 11 | 0.35 | 0.88 | P < 0.001 | AY650396 | |
| | R: ATTTCCAGTTGCAAGTCTCATT | 57.9 | | | | | | | | |
| Ecap9 | F: AAAAAGGTGTGGAGAGAGATGG | 59.6 | (GT) ₁₈ | 130-162 | 12 | 0.55 | 0.84 | P < 0.001 | AY650397 | |
| | R: CCACTCTGCAGATATCGTATCG | 59.8 | | | | | | | | |
| Ecap10 | F: ACACTGCAGACATCGTAGCG | 60.1 | (AC) ₂₀ | 115-143 | 12 | 0.72 | 0.87 | P = 0.200 | AY650398 | |
| - | R: TCACATACTTTGGGGACTTTCA | 59.5 | | | | | | | | |

| 1 | esis. However, the actual number o | of individuals type varied slightly | $(\pm 1-2 \text{ individuals})$ for some of the e | rence of each population and number of xamined loci. *** means no amplification inced |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Epioblasma capsaeformis | Epioblasma capsaeformis | Epioblasma florentina | Epioblasma florentina | Epioblasma torulosa rangiana |

| | Epioblasma capsaeformis (Clinch) 20 | | | Epioblasma capsaeformis (Duck) 12 | | | Epioblasma florentina walkeri (upper Clinch) (8) | | | Epioblasma florentina walkeri (Cumberland) 14 | | | | Epioblasma torulosa rangiana (Allegheny) (6) H _E | | | | | | |
|--------|--|-------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|---|----------------|---------------|--|----------------|----------------|---------------|--|----------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|---------|
| Locus | Size range | No. of alleles | $H_{\rm O}$ | H _E | Size range | No. of alleles | H _O | H _E | Size range | No. of alleles | H _O | H _E | Size range | No. of alleles | H _O | H _E | Size range | No of alleles | H _O | H_{E} |
| Ecap1 | 146-190 | 17 | 0.89 | 0.94 | 156-160 | 3 | 0.42 | 0.52 | 174–176 | 2 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 154-166 | 6 | 0.69 | 0.82 | 150-160 | 6 | 0.17 | 0.89 |
| Ecap2 | 107-129 | 5 | 0.20 | 0.68 | 115-129 | 6 | 0.58 | 0.64 | 121-129 | 3 | 0.50 | 0.59 | 115-119 | 2 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 111-127 | 5 | 0.50 | 0.79 |
| ЕсарЗ | 264-286 | 9 | 0.50 | 0.89 | 278-280 | 2 | 0.25 | 0.52 | *** | | | 0 | 242-264 | 5 | 0.64 | 0.81 | 236-260 | 5 | 0.50 | 0.89 |
| Ecap4 | 100-120 | 8 | 0.42 | 0.74 | 102-110 | 5 | 0.50 | 0.70 | 102-112 | 4 | 0.50 | 0.65 | 98-110 | 4 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 102-112 | 4 | 0.50 | 0.65 |
| Ecap5 | 176-220 | 13 | 0.73 | 0.90 | 186-212 | 4 | 0.25 | 0.64 | 192-222 | 4 | 0.40 | 0.78 | 192-202 | 4 | 0.56 | 0.52 | 188-224 | 8 | 0.67 | 0.92 |
| Ecap6 | 216-240 | 7 | 0.47 | 0.76 | 230-236 | 3 | 0.25 | 0.54 | 232-234 | 2 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 234 | 1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 226-238 | 4 | 0.83 | 0.76 |
| Ecap7 | 106-130 | 11 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 114-130 | 6 | 0.50 | 0.67 | 110-122 | 2 | 0.25 | 0.54 | 114-128 | 6 | 0.50 | 0.58 | *** | 0 | | |
| Ecap8 | 127-155 | 7 | 0.47 | 0.77 | 131-159 | 5 | 0.40 | 0.73 | 133-141 | 2 | 0.33 | 0.30 | 137 | 1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 131-149 | 2 | 0.40 | 0.53 |
| Ecap9 | 134-162 | 10 | 0.89 | 0.88 | 136-148 | 5 | 0.80 | 0.81 | 136-138 | 2 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 136-138 | 2 | 0.08 | 0.23 | 130-150 | 5 | 0.40 | 0.84 |
| Ecap10 | 115–143 | 10 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 123–131 | 2 | 0.29 | 0.26 | 123–131 | 4 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 133–137 | 3 | 0.83 | 0.71 | 119–125 | 2 | 0.33 | 0.33 |

652 PRIMER NOTE

from the Clinch River, TN. These primer pairs have been used in a taxonomic study of species belonging to the genus *Epioblasma*, and represent only the second set of microsatellite primers to be published for freshwater mussels (Jones 2004). The first set of microsatellite primers was developed by Eackles & King (2002) for the endangered pink mucket *Lampsilis abrupta*. These authors developed primer pairs to amplify 15 loci in *L. abrupta*. We recommend that both sets of microsatellite primers be further screened using DNA from additional species in the freshwater mussel subfamily Lampsilinae to determine the applicability of these DNA loci for intraspecific population genetic studies.

References

Eackles SM, King TL (2002) Isolation and characterization of microsatellite loci in *Lampsilis abrupta* (Bivalvia: Unionidae) and cross-species amplification within the genus. *Molecular Ecology Notes*, **2**, 559–562.

- Jones JW (2004) An holistic approach to taxonomic evaluation of two closely related endangered freshwater mussel species, the oyster mussel (*Epioblasma capsaeformis*) and tan riffleshell (*Epioblasma florentina walkeri*). Thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.
- Refseth UH, Fangan BM, Jakobsen KS (1997) Hybridization capture of microsatellites directly from genomic DNA. *Electrophoresis*, 18, 1519–1523.
- Sarno RJ, David VA, Franklin WL, O'Brien SJ, Johnson WE (2000) Development of microsatellite markers in the guanaco, *Lama guanicoe*: utility for South American camelids. *Molecular Ecology*, 9, 1919–1952.
- van der Schalie H (1970) Hermaphroditism among North American freshwater mussels. *Malacologia*, **10**, 93–112.
- Williams JD, Warren ML, Cummings KS, Harris JL, Neves RJ (1993) Conservation status of freshwater mussels of the United States and Canada. *Fisheries*, **18**, 6–22.