

COMPARISON OF BUCCAL CELL COLLECTION METHODS

Amanda M. Kleist¹, Tammy Pruet Northrup¹, Darrel J. Oubre, Jr.¹, Natasha H. Poe¹, Alyson Saadi¹, Amanda C. Sozer, Ph.D.², Mark Tourre¹, Janaki Vaidyanathan¹, Joanie B. Wilson¹, and Pat Wojtkiewicz, Ph.D.³

¹Louisiana State Police Crime Laboratory, Baton Rouge, LA

²DNA Technology Consulting Services, LLC, Fairfax Station, VA

³North Louisiana Criminalistics Laboratory, Shreveport, LA

Buccal swabs rather than blood samples are becoming the preferred method of DNA sample collection for high volume DNA profiling laboratories because of the minimized health risks, the relative ease of collection and shipping, as well as low costs associated with this method of collection. Currently, collecting an adequate buccal cell sample in a simple, fast, consistent and cost-efficient manner, while retaining the ability to store the sample, is one of the biggest challenges facing DNA profiling programs. With the anticipation of collecting over 100,000 buccal samples per year in Louisiana, a study was undertaken to compare the consistency and effectiveness of available buccal cell sampling methods and devices. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the DNA yield, the ability to obtain a successful profile, and the efficiency of sample storage using various buccal cell collection methods in order to select the most effective collection method for the State of Louisiana. Nine different collection methods were used to collect buccal cells from sixteen subjects over a five-week collection period using a collection scheme designed to minimize variability of other factors which might influence buccal cell yield. Collection methods included the Omni Swab collector, Bode Buccal DNA collector, and the Fitzco SampactTM Swab collection device. Additionally, Pur-Wraps[®] sterile Dacron[®] polyester-tipped applicator, sterile foam-tipped applicator, and sterile foam-tipped applicator transferred to Whatman[®] Indicating FTA[®] Micro Card were collected. Three collections were also performed using the Pur-Wraps[®] sterile cotton-tipped applicator. These methods included one individual collection, one that was transferred to Whatman[®] FTA[®] Micro Card, and one that was transferred to Whatman[®] Indicating FTA[®] Micro Card. The samples were extracted according to a standard protocol which utilized the QIAamp[®] DNA Mini Kit (Qiagen Inc.). The amount of DNA recovered was determined by both QuantiBlot[®] and QuantifilerTM Human DNA Quantitation Kits (Applied Biosystems). The samples were amplified with the AmpFISTR[®] Profiler PlusTM and AmpFISTR[®] CofilerTM PCR Amplification Kits. Profiles were generated on the ABI Prism[®] 3100 Genetic Analyzer and evaluated using Genescan[®] analysis software (version 3.7.1) and Genotyper[®] (version 3.7) according to laboratory protocols. A comparison of DNA yields, reliability and reproducibility of DNA profiles, quality of profiles, and ease of storage among the different collection methods will be presented.