

Identification, distribution and diet of Tasmanian predators inferred by scat DNA

Elodie Modave

Bachelor of geography, Geomatics and Geometrology and Master of Biology of
Organisms and Ecology – Université de Liège - Belgium

Institute for Applied Ecology

Faculty of Education, Science, Technology and Mathematics

University of Canberra, ACT, 2601, Australia

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy at the University of Canberra - Australia

September 2017

ABSTRACT

Species interactions within an ecosystem can appear in many ways and because of this variety, changes to one species can have cascading effects on other species or the environment. The outcomes of these interactions can be direct or indirect and happen at the intra or inter-specific level and studying them in more depth can provide greater understanding of network functions in a geographic area. Organism interactions in an ecological community are often difficult to measure and study because of the multitude of processes happening simultaneously. Nonetheless, DNA-based techniques are available to explore some of the interactions occurring in nature.

In this thesis, I focus on the Tasmanian faunal interactions. This provides a real-life example of an ecosystem that has been subjected to considerable change in its faunal assemblage in the past century owing mainly to invasive species (Chapter 1).

I investigate the identity, the distribution and the vertebrate diet of mammal predators in Tasmania: *Sarcophilus harrisii* (Tasmanian devil), *Dasyurus viverrinus* (eastern quoll), *Dasyurus maculatus* (spotted-tailed quoll), *Felis catus* (feral cat) and *Canis lupus familiaris* (dog). I aim to explore predator dynamics that evolved among them such as the effect of invasive species through direct predation, competition or niche utilisation.

The need to identify, detect and monitor species can be achieved by analysing the DNA left by species in the environment. This provides a non-invasive technique to explore interactions among a cryptic, rare and threatened assemblage of species. By extracting eDNA (environmental DNA) from trace samples, sequencing and correctly identifying the species it belongs to, I can obtain a wide range of information without the need to directly interfering with the multitude of species under study. The limiting factors of dealing with DNA can be overcome with new technologies and the costs are less extravagant than a few decades ago.

Scats (i.e. faeces) provide a valuable source of eDNA and genetic information that they contain can persist for up to a few months in the environment, even when subjected to weather. This provides information about multiple predators and prey that can be discriminated in the laboratory, as well, as scats are a mixture of species DNA. Scats, combined with GPS localisations, provide single tools to evaluate interactions about predators relating to their environment, other predators and their prey. Because our target species, the predators in Tasmania, are relatively big in size, finding their faecal material in the landscape is relatively simple and DNA extraction has been made easier with the development of specialised kits.

I was able to develop a mini-barcode on the 12S rRNA mitochondrial gene region to identify the six large to medium-sized carnivores of Australia from scats (chapter 2). I used bioinformatics to develop the best primers from a range of sequences included in a reference DNA database. The amplification success of the mini-barcode was assessed using known tissue samples and tested in the laboratory for its sensitivity using a serial dilution of tissue samples from the Tasmanian predator species. To examine its sensitivity further, I applied the mini-barcode to DNA extracted from known captive animal scats collected in 2011 and correct identification was recorded for all successfully sequenced portions of DNA.

This barcode was applied on *ca.* 1500 field-collected scats to model predator distribution in Tasmania (chapter 3) using several species distribution modeling methods. My data suggested that dogs did not influence the distribution of any species but were negatively influenced by devils. The devils and cats influenced negatively the distribution of each other and both influenced negatively the distribution of eastern quolls. Devils were mainly restricted to rainforests and eucalypt forests and woodlands, and cat scats were found mainly in non-eucalypt forests and woodlands. No habitat preference could be determined for quolls

or dogs, and spotted-tailed quolls were removed from the study, owing to the small sample size.

Finally, I identified the vertebrate prey intake from more than 170 Tasmanian predator scats by applying two mitochondrial barcodes, 12SV5 and 16SMam and conclude on a vertebrate diet for Tasmanian devil, eastern and spotted-tailed quoll, cat and dog (chapter 4). I found that cats have a wide diet which includes small to medium-sized vertebrates, compared to the other predators in this study while devils had a more specific diet, feeding mainly on five native prey taxa. The two quolls could not be discriminated with these two barcodes, but applying the mini-barcode developed in Chapter 2, amplifying a different short region from the 12S rRNA gene, on the scats identified as “quoll” (genus level only), I could distinguish them at species level. They had similar restricted diet feeding mainly on possums, pademelons and wallabies and separated their diet by size with the eastern quoll preying on smaller prey in general. Finally, dogs were also feeding on native wildlife such as half of their diet consisted of native mammals and half was livestock/dog food. Overall, I detected between nine (for quolls) and 31 (for cats) different prey items per predator with a total of 44 prey taxa identified within 176 scats and showed the value of using scat metabarcoding for future detection and/or monitoring surveys.

I determined that using scats, considerable information about identity, distribution and diet was obtained by retrieving DNA from trace samples enabling the detection of interactions among species relating to their environments. Tools are now available to detect possibly rare Tasmanian species without going into the trouble of trapping or observing them directly and enabling management solutions to be developed based on the type of information gathered with them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF APPENDICES	xvi
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS LINKED WITH THIS THESIS	xvii

CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
Detecting a species.....	1
Using scats as a source of eDNA	3
Reliability in identifying a species from DNA	4
Tasmania	6
Analysis of diet	9
AIMS AND STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS	10
Description of chapters	11

CHAPTER 2: A SINGLE MINI-BARCODE TEST TO SCREEN FOR AUSTRALIAN MAMMALIAN PREDATORS FROM ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES

CHAPTER 2: A SINGLE MINI-BARCODE TEST TO SCREEN FOR AUSTRALIAN MAMMALIAN PREDATORS FROM ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES	15
ABSTRACT.....	15
Keywords	16
BACKGROUND	16
DATA DESCRIPTION	20
RESULTS	21
Development of a new mammal mini-barcode	21
Bioinformatic evaluation of the mini-barcode	22
Evaluation of the amplification success and sensitivity of the <i>AusPreda_12S</i> primers	24
Evaluation of amplification success from trace samples using known-origin scats	27
DISCUSSION	32
Considerations when working with scats.....	34
Conservation implications	35
Future work.....	35
METHODS	36
Selection of a candidate marker gene	36
Development of a reference database for the 12S rRNA gene	37

Development of primers for the mini-barcode.....	38
Bioinformatic evaluation of the mini-barcode.....	41
Evaluation of the amplification success and sensitivity of the <i>AusPreda_12S</i> primers	42
Evaluation of amplification success from trace samples using known-origin scats.....	43
Availability of supporting data and material	44
List of abbreviations	44

CHAPTER 3: HABITAT MODELING OF PREDATORS IN TASMANIA INFERRED BY GENETIC MONITORING OF SCATS: PRESENCE-ONLY OR PRESENCE-ABSENCE DATA?

ABSTRACT.....	45
INTRODUCTION	46
Factors affecting species distribution.....	48
Detection of species with eDNA.....	48
Models of Tasmanian predators.....	49
The presence-absence versus presence-only data conflict.....	49
Native and introduced predators in Tasmania	50
Habitat suitability models for Tasmanian predators	52
MATERIAL AND METHODS.....	54
Field work.....	54
Samples selection.....	55
DNA extraction.....	55
PCR amplification.....	56
Sequencing.....	57
Predator identification.....	57
Patterns of co-occurrence of predators – First model: species interactions only.....	58
Species distribution modeling in R – Second model: scats as presence-absence data	59
MaxEnt – Third model: scats as presence-only data	65
MaxEnt - Third model: atlas data	65
RESULTS	66
Sequencing and predator identification	66
Patterns of co-occurrence of predators – First model: species interactions only.....	67
Species distribution modeling in R – Second model: scats as presence-absence data	69
<i>Devil model</i>	71
<i>Cat model</i>	71

<i>Eastern quoll model</i>	71
<i>Dog model</i>	72
MaxEnt – Third model: scats as presence-only data	74
MaxEnt - Third model: atlas data	76
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	78
Comparison of models using scat data, atlas data and literature	78
Limitations	82
Application of SDMs built with scat data.....	86

CHAPTER 4: METABARCODING OF SCATS AS A TOOL FOR THE DETECTION AND MONITORING OF VERTEBRATE PREDATORS AND THEIR PREY 87

ABSTRACT.....	87
INTRODUCTION	88
METHODS	95
Building a reference database	97
Field work	99
Samples selection.....	99
DNA extraction.....	100
qPCR to assess extraction dilutions	100
qPCR with MID tagged primers	101
AMPure cleaning	102
Sequencing.....	103
Bioinformatic analyses.....	103
Predator identification tested against identification obtained using other primers.....	105
Selecting the closest relative when an identified taxon is non-Tasmanian	105
Determining the vertebrate diet of each predator.....	106
Determining the vertebrate diet based on a predator location	106
Detection of a rare prey.....	107
Confirming the identity of species using DNA and range obtained from atlas data	107
RESULTS	108
Samples selection.....	108
DNA extraction and qPCR to assess extraction dilutions.....	110
qPCR with MID tagged primers	110
AMPure cleaning	110
Bioinformatic analyses.....	110

Predator identification tested against identification obtained using other primers.....	111
Selecting the closest relative when an identified taxon is non-Tasmanian.....	112
Determining the vertebrate diet of each predator and based on a predator location.....	113
Detection of a rare prey.....	120
Confirming the identity of species using DNA and range obtained from atlas data	122
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	123
Predator diets obtained with this study and comparison with other published studies.....	125
Limitations of the metabarcoding technique.....	129
Detecting rare species	129
Impact of invasive predators on native prey	130
Limits of detection using DNA.....	131
Primer sets used in this study and their limitation	131
Future studies	132
CHAPTER 5: GENERAL CONCLUSION.....	133
Key findings.....	133
Importance of using non-invasive samples.....	137
Importance for conservation – management implications and new insights gained from this thesis	137
Future studies and further work	138
APPENDICES	141-200
REFERENCES	201-218

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This experiment was filled with personal growth, friendships, professional learning and achievements. I am proud today to have found the courage and motivation to accomplish a PhD.

First, I would like to thank my supervisor team, Stephen Sarre, Anna MacDonald and Bernd Gruber, for all their help, useful comments, support, guidance, fun and kindness all along my candidature. I am grateful for the opportunity to have been chosen and trusted to embark on this journey with you. I would also like to thank my previous supervisor from the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment Tasmania (DPIPWE), Stephen Harris for his comments, help, care and sympathy as well. Thanks to Cat Campbell as well who shared the same project as me as a PhD student too for her advices, laughs, field work company, and everything else that was related to the project and beyond. I would like to thank Elise Dewar and Candida Barclay from DPIPWE that helps with the project, as well as other people that helped all along the way: Arthur Georges, Aaron Adamack, Peter Unmack, Elise Furlan, Sumaiya Quasim, Llara Weaver, Jim Richley, Megan Hamilton, Iylani (Nur) Ramlee and all the volunteers that helped us in the field.

I would like to thank the Institute for Applied Ecology for their help with all the administrative tasks and the making sure of the well-being of PhD students in general (office temperature!, barbecues, dinners ...), Barbara Harriss, Ross Thompson, Liz Drummond, Grant Collett, Susan Ward, Em Carlson, Helen Thomas and Jane Ebner. Thanks also to all the other PhD students and others from the IAE that help me not only with my work but with building new friendships in a place where I arrive not knowing anyone: Cat Campbell, Rheyda Hinlo, Jonas Bylemans, Adrian Dusting, Suman, Foyez Shams, Shayer Alam, Alan Couch, Sally Hatton, Teresa Gonzalez, Yasmin Cross, Alissa Monk, Rob Ubrihien, Daniela

Cortez, Dorjee, Anthony Davidson, Andrew O'Reilly-Nugent, Rakhi Palit, Alex Henderson, Margarita Medina, Matt Young and last but not least, Angelica Lopez.

This project was funded by Project 1.L.21 of the Invasive Animals Cooperative Research Centre entitled “Mechanised Extraction and Next Generation Sequencing for the Analysis of Trace DNA in Predator Scats”, and would not have been possible without their scholarship. I would especially like to thank Tony Buckmaster, Andreas Glanznig and all the team behind the IA CRC for their support, annual camps and their financial contribution to several academic conferences and trainings. I met a lot of great friends at their annual camps such as Nadya Urakova, Michal Smielak, Aleona Swegen, Amy Iannella, Lana Harriott, Jessica Sparkes, Frances Zewe, Papor Barua and Natalie Banks. I would also like to acknowledge the NRM North (Tasmania) for giving me a grant entitled “Using eDNA to detect endangered New Holland mice in Tasmania” to be able to complete my metabarcoding study.

I would like to thank the staff from the Australian museum where I nearly spent two months in the Australian Centre for Wildlife Genomics under the supervision of Rebecca Johnson and Greta Frankham. There, I worked on rhinoceroses' horns and tiger bones, along with Greta, Anja Divljan, Kyle Ewart, Prue Armstrong, Scott Ginn, Melissa Danks and Siobhan Dennison.

On a more personal note, I would like to thank my family at home for their support and my new family here in Australia for all the weekend parties, dinner parties, barbecues, cat sharing, Christmases, drinks, and so on, Charlie and Liz and Jon and Angelica. You made a life outside of the PhD possible and enjoyable far from our families and friends. I would like to thank Murphy (my cat! That's the level of craziness I reached) for his company and presence, especially during the last couple of months of my thesis that I mostly spent at home

and I would also like to thank Bram for all his support (especially towards the end when I became a bundle of nerves!) and love. I am so happy of the new family we started in June of this year. To Bram and Chloé.

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1.1: Separation between mainland Australia and Tasmania, shoreline reconstruction of the Bass Strait modified from Lambeck and Chappell, 2001	8
FIGURE 2.1: Gel showing the amplification success using AusPreda_12S mini-barcode on 45 tissue samples	27
FIGURE 2.2: Results of the sliding window analysis conducted using the R package SPIDER for the 12S rRNA gene using a window size of 20 bp	40-41
FIGURE 3.1: Interactions between species and preferred habitat types based on a review of the literature	53
FIGURE 3.2: predictors used to build the species distribution models	62
FIGURE 3.3: Map of the 714 predator scats identified from a systematic survey	67
FIGURE 3.4: Plot obtained for the four negative co-occurrences analysed where the expected co-occurrence was bigger than 1	69
FIGURE 3.5: Interactions between species based on the outputs of cooccur	69
FIGURE 3.6: Confusion matrix for the devil model showing the accuracy of the model obtained using a GLMM. In this example, the accuracy is 89% representing a good value	70
FIGURE 3.7: Interactions between species and preferred habitat types based on the outputs of the GLMM using scat data	74
FIGURES 3.8: summary results of the devil model (A), cat model (B), eastern quoll model (C) and dog model (D) using MaxEnt and scat data	75
FIGURE 3.9: Interactions between species and preferred habitat types based on the outputs of MaxEnt using scat data	75
FIGURES 3.10: summary results of the devil model (A), cat model (B) and eastern quoll model (C) using MaxEnt and atlas data	77
FIGURE 3.11: Interactions between species and preferred habitat types based on the outputs of MaxEnt using atlas data	77
FIGURE 3.12: Interactions between species and preferred habitat types based on the combining outputs of the literature, Cooccur, GLMM and MaxEnt using scat or atlas data	82
FIGURE 4.1: Steps to follow to produce the libraries for metabarcoding	96
FIGURE 4.2: Trimming of low quality bases at the 3' end from single ended reads obtained from a MiSeq sequencer using Trimmomatic. Figure before (a) and after (b) treatment. The quality per base raised in the three runs. Illustrated example for run 1	104
FIGURE 4.3: Map of the location of the 287 scat samples selected for metabarcoding based on the model	109
FIGURES 4.4: Frequency of occurrence of prey in the scats of five Tasmanian predators: Tasmanian devil, <i>Sarcophilu harrisii</i> (92 scats), spotted-tailed quoll, <i>Dasyurus maculatus</i> (12 scats), eastern quoll, <i>Dasyurus viverrinus</i> (8 scats), feral cat, <i>Felis catus</i> (50 scats) and domestic dog, <i>Canis lupus familiaris</i> (14 scats)	115-117
FIGURE 4.5: Predator diet difference using a NMDS	118

FIGURE 4.6: Comparison of cat diets in three types of habitats: dry eucalypt forest and woodlands, scrub, heathland and coastal complexes and agricultural, urban and exotic vegetation	119
FIGURE 4.7: Map representing the seven instances where a long-nosed potoroo (<i>Potorous tridactylus</i>) was present in a scat	121
FIGURE 4.8: scat range versus the atlas data range for the long-nosed potoroo (<i>Potorous tridactylus</i>)	122
FIGURE 4.9: scat range versus the atlas data range for two predators and two prey	123

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 2.1: Summary of results of genetic distance-based evaluations of the <i>AusPreda_12S</i> mini-barcode	23
TABLE 2.2: Results of qPCR tests: determine amplification success of the <i>AusPreda_12S</i> mini-barcode from low template DNA	25-26
TABLE 2.3: PCR and DNA sequencing results from 57 known-origin scat samples screened using the <i>AusPreda_12S</i> mini-barcode	29-31
TABLE 2.4: PCR primers used in this study	38
TABLE 3.1: Co-occurrence table obtained for the four negative co-occurrence analysed where the expected co-occurrence was bigger than 1 using the package <i>cooccur</i> on R. The matrices represent the number of survey units in which each species was found to be absence (0) or presence (1) compared to an interacting species	68
TABLES 3.2: summary results of the devil model (a), cat model (b), eastern quoll model (c) and dog model (d), after removing non-significant predictors using a GLMMPQL	73
TABLE 4.1: Diet of target predators found in the literature	93
TABLE 4.2: PCR primers used in this study	99
TABLE 4.3: Diet of target predators found in this study	128

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX 2.1: Samples included in the 12S rRNA reference sequence database used for primer design	141-145
APPENDIX 2.2: R code for sliding windows analysis implemented using SPIDER	146
APPENDIX 2.3: R code for genetic distance based evaluation of the <i>AusPreda_12S</i> mini-barcode implemented using SPIDER	147-150
APPENDIX 2.4: Detailed results of genetic distance based evaluation of the <i>AusPreda_12S</i> mini-barcode	151-157
APPENDIX 2.5: Samples included in the laboratory evaluation of the <i>AusPreda_12S</i> mini-barcode	158-159
APPENDIX 2.6: Consensus sequences obtained from 53 known-origin scats by amplification with the <i>AusPreda_12S</i> mini-barcode	160-164
APPENDIX 3.1: Cooccur results with datasets from 2010 and 2014 separately	165
APPENDIX 3.2: R code for building an SDM for the Tasmanian predators	166-169
APPENDIX 3.3: 789 scats used for building the distribution model	170-187
APPENDIX 4.1: Information about the New Holland mouse that explain which scats were selected	188-189
APPENDIX 4.2: R code for the scats selection for metabarcoding	190-191
APPENDIX 4.3: Resulting diet from metabarcoding study per predator	192-200

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS LINKED WITH THIS THESIS

CHAPTER 2: A single mini-barcode test to screen for Australian mammalian predators from environmental samples	15
CHAPTER 3: Habitat modeling of predators in Tasmania inferred by genetic monitoring of scats: presence-only or presence-absence data?	45
CHAPTER 4: Metabarcoding of scats as a tool for the detection and monitoring of vertebrate predators and their prey	87