



Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand). This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library

[Thesis Consent Form](#)

**The Retention of Picoplankton by the Pacific Oyster,
Crassostrea gigas, and Implications for Oyster Culture**

Andrew Harwood Bell

**A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The University of Auckland, 2005**

Abstract

Pacific oyster (*Crassostrea gigas*) farming in New Zealand has reached a point where the pressures on resources appear likely to constrain current, and future, development. To maintain industry growth, security of juvenile oyster (spat) supply and productivity gains within the existing farm leases, are becoming industry imperatives. The use of hatchery technology could achieve both of these requirements, but it is expensive to establish and maintain. The additional expense of a hatchery could be offset by the establishment of, for example, a selective breeding program to enhance oyster productivity and/or marketability. Consequently a pilot-scale oyster hatchery facility was constructed to investigate the potential for establishing hatchery production of Pacific oysters in New Zealand.

This study showed that in the pilot-scale hatchery, oysters could be successfully spawned from in-season broodstock, the eggs fertilised and the resultant larvae reared through to settlement for on-growing to adult size. This process was successful for both oysters selected for morphological characteristics and those which were not. On-growing of the resultant stock indicated growth rate could be normal relative to wild caught oysters spat, although data was limited by the small scale of the experiment. However, an investigation of broodstock conditioning, to achieve out-of-season spawning, was less successful. Disease occurred and condition was lost in some broodstock, suggesting they were enduring stress within the conditioning system. The microalgal food supply was examined but the clearance rate of the microalgal species suggested they were an acceptable feed supply which agreed with previous reports of successful conditioning techniques. Comparing the pilot-scale facility in this study with descriptions of facilities which reported successful broodstock conditioning suggested that the use of a microfiltered recirculating water supply, as opposed to the more common flow-through, natural seawater systems containing a range of small size particles, limited necessary nutrient and/or maturation factors and may have had a significant impact on conditioning.

The nanoplanktonic ($< 10 \mu\text{m}$), food resource, which includes key microalgal species such as *Chaetoceros* spp. and *Isochrysis* spp., is generally considered the primary food resource for suspension feeding bivalves, including *C. gigas*. However, the picoplanktonic fraction ($< 3 \mu\text{m}$) can provide the largest proportion of this food resource in the water column in terms of abundance and biomass. Consequently, an investigation of the *in situ* retention of picoplankton populations (picoeukaryotes, *Synechococcus*-type cyanobacteria and heterotrophic bacteria) by oysters was undertaken. Flow cytometry was used to quantify the picoplankton populations in water samples taken from the inhalant and exhalant feeding currents of individual oysters, allowing retention efficiency of the particles to be calculated. Five picoplankton populations were identifiable by flow cytometry (picoeukaryotes, heterotrophic bacteria and 3 populations tentatively identified as cyanobacteria) and accounted for a large proportion (up to 97 %) of the estimated available carbon (picoplankton + microalgae) in Kerikeri Inlet water. Generally the heterotrophic bacteria accounted for the largest proportion of the biomass with up to $564 \pm 51 \text{ ng C ml}^{-1}$.

Retention of each picoplankton population was found to be variable and not directly related to particle concentration. Cyanobacteria (Cy2 population) were retained with the greatest efficiency (up to $42 \pm 4.4 \%$), followed by heterotrophic bacteria (up to $38 \pm 4.5 \%$) and picoeukaryotes (up to $12 \pm 3.8 \%$). Overall more picoplankton biomass was retained during the summer months, of which the heterotrophic bacteria made the largest contribution in either cell number or estimated carbon retained. Tracking of the condition and constituent fractions (glycogen, lipid and protein) of the subject oysters showed that in the summer months, post-spawn, these levels were lowest, indicating a period of nutritional stress. This appeared to suggest that *C. gigas* was able to alter its retention efficiency to expand the range of particles captured, and consequently the available nutrient pool. The retention of greater quantities of heterotrophic bacteria may allow for the acquisition of essential nutrients required for growth and later gametogenesis (such as B vitamins). However, it is also possible that the heterotrophic bacteria mediate access to otherwise inaccessible, or inefficiently accessed, nutrient resources through their degradation of, for example, crystalline cellulose.

Consequently, the microbial flora associated with the oyster gut was investigated. An initial investigation, cultivating bacteria from gut contents, showed considerable variability in the numbers of colonies present within and between samples, but was inconclusive for identifying differences in species diversity. Using culture independent histological and 16S rDNA PCR/RFLP techniques to investigate the oyster gut microflora a spirochaete flora, commonly associated with bivalve crystalline styles, was clearly present. Molecular analyses provided evidence of other bacterial in the gut. A signature RFLP band pattern was found in oysters at low tide and this generally reoccurred in oysters that had been immersed for varying lengths of time up to high tide. However, the signature RFLP pattern became more dilute as immersion time/potential feeding time extended.

The isolation of culturable bacteria from the oyster gut allowed characterisation and identification of a subset of the oyster gut microflora. 16S rDNA sequence analysis from selected isolates showed a predominance of *Vibrio* spp. These bacteria had previously been associated with marine molluscs, including as symbionts. Characterisation of these and other isolates from oyster gut showed a diversity of attributes including the ability to degrade cellulose. This suggests the bacterial production of enzymes, such as cellulases, which have been reported by other researchers as being present in ineffectual or low native levels in oysters. Consequently the bacterial presence in the oyster gut may be essential to efficient nutrient acquisition.

The results of these investigations have highlighted the potential importance of the heterotrophic bacteria to *C. gigas*. To date, bacteria have received relatively little attention in terms of their potential nutritive contribution to oysters, primarily due to observations that they are retained with low efficiency. However, even at low retention efficiencies the potential nutritive contribution is large due to the available abundances of heterotrophic bacteria. While the mechanisms and controls of bivalve suspension feeding have yet to be fully elucidated, the published literature indicates that selective mechanisms are available to bivalves including *C. gigas* and this current research

suggests that even pico-sized particles, retained with apparently low efficiency, can be subject to selection. The importance of the heterotrophic bacteria to *C. gigas* requires further investigation as it will have implications for not only hatchery production, but also farm management, public health and environmental impact monitoring.

Acknowledgments

While a thesis feels like a very personal and isolated journey none can be completed without so many people providing assistance, be it physical, emotional, scientific or financial. This thesis is no different and the following is but a subset of those who I owe so much gratitude to. Anyone who I have not specifically listed is no less appreciated.

Thanks to Associate Professor Gillian Lewis and Professor Rufus Wells for academic supervision.

Thanks to Sanford Ltd and Bay Oysters Ltd who, in conjunction with Technology New Zealand (HLF 701, BYOL 0001) and the Seafood Research Laboratory, Crop and Food Research, initiated and funded this project.

From Sanford Ltd and Bay Oysters Ltd I would particularly like to thank T. Borrell, S. Brown, V. Thirkell, R. Pokae and the rest of the farm crews in Kerikeri and Kaeo.

From the Seafood Research Laboratory many thanks to R. Wong, G. Fletcher, G. Summers, M. Leonard, M. Johansson, T. Lee, I. Kurtovic and O. Drean.

Thanks to all those at NIWA who were so helpful, especially J. Hall, and A. Cumming in Hamilton, P. Redfearn, R. Hickman and S. Allen at Mahunga Bay.

Thanks for the practical help from A. Janke and team at the Cawthron Institute hatchery, Nelson.

There are many at the University of Auckland who particularly deserve my gratitude including support staff (Beryl, Ian, Adrian, and Liz), fellow students (Kelly & Tony, Raechel & Tony, Stephanie, Tamara) and academics (S. Turner, D. Brunton, M. Anderson).

I would particularly like to thank P. Gribben, M. Johansson and C. Moyes for their friendship and support throughout the entire process.

Heartfelt thanks to my wife Tracey Bootten who has made an invaluable contribution through the last years.

Finally I would like to thank all of the family who have provided so much support over the course of my PhD. The greater Bell, McLeod and Bootten families alike have always offered encouragement and support in whatever way possible and you cannot ask for anymore than that. My closest family (Bruce, Margaret and Stuart) have continued to support me throughout this venture despite the significant trials they have had to face through the same period. Thus,

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents, Bruce and Margaret

Table of Contents

| | |
|------------------------|------|
| Abstract..... | ii |
| Acknowledgements..... | v |
| Table of Contents..... | vi |
| List of Figures..... | x |
| List of Tables..... | xiii |
| Abbreviations..... | xv |

1.0 General Introduction

| | |
|---|----|
| 1.1 Background..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Biology, Life History and Ecology of <i>Crassostrea gigas</i> | 2 |
| 1.2.1 General biology..... | 2 |
| 1.2.2 Life history characteristics..... | 5 |
| 1.2.3 Ecology..... | 6 |
| 1.3 Feeding and Digestion..... | 7 |
| 1.3.1 Feeding currents and regulation..... | 7 |
| 1.3.2 Particle capture..... | 9 |
| 1.3.3 Retention efficiency and particle selection..... | 10 |
| 1.3.4 Ingestion and digestion..... | 13 |
| 1.3.5 Bacteria and the digestive process..... | 15 |
| 1.4 Aims..... | 17 |

2.0 Investigation of Pacific Oyster Breeding and Conditioning

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.1 Introduction..... | 18 |
| 2.1.1 Oyster farming in New Zealand..... | 18 |
| 2.1.2 Hatchery technology..... | 20 |
| 2.1.3 Aims..... | 26 |
| 2.2 Materials and Methods..... | 27 |
| 2.2.1 Hatchery..... | 27 |
| 2.2.1.1 Physical description..... | 27 |
| 2.2.1.2 Microalgal species and culture..... | 28 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 2.2.2 Oyster breeding and husbandry | 29 |
| 2.2.2.1 Broodstock collection..... | 29 |
| 2.2.2.2 Spawning and fertilisation..... | 29 |
| 2.2.2.3 Larval rearing and settlement | 30 |
| 2.2.2.4 On-growing of spat..... | 32 |
| 2.2.3 Conditioning of broodstock | 32 |
| 2.2.4 Clearance of microalgae from suspension | 34 |
| 2.3 Results..... | 36 |
| 2.3.1 Spawning and husbandry of oysters | 36 |
| 2.3.2 Broodstock conditioning..... | 37 |
| 2.3.3 Clearance of microalgal feed species from suspension | 40 |
| 2.4 Discussion | 42 |
| 2.4.1 Oyster breeding and husbandry | 42 |
| 2.4.2 Conditioning of broodstock | 44 |
| 2.4.3 Food quality | 49 |
| 2.4.4 Physical hatchery and methodology | 51 |
| 2.4.5 Conclusions | 52 |

3.0 Seasonal Variation in the Retention of Picoplankton by *Crassostrea gigas*.

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.1 Introduction..... | 54 |
| 3.2 Materials and Methods..... | 59 |
| 3.2.1 Sample collection | 59 |
| 3.2.1.1 <i>In situ</i> sampling of feeding currents | 59 |
| 3.2.1.2 Microalgal data..... | 64 |
| 3.2.1.3 Oyster sample collection for condition indexing..... | 64 |
| 3.2.1.4 Additional data | 64 |
| 3.2.2 Sample analysis | 65 |
| 3.2.2.1 Picoplankton identification and enumeration | 65 |
| 3.2.2.2 Biomass estimation | 66 |
| 3.2.2.3 Oyster condition index analysis | 67 |
| 3.2.3 Statistical analysis..... | 69 |
| 3.2.3.1 <i>In situ</i> feeding data | 69 |
| 3.2.3.2 Oyster condition index data..... | 70 |
| 3.3 Results..... | 71 |
| 3.3.1 Sea surface temperature and rainfall..... | 71 |
| 3.3.2 Temporal ecology of picoplankton populations | 72 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.3.3 Microalgal abundance..... | 75 |
| 3.3.4 Identification of feeding currents..... | 77 |
| 3.3.5 Retention efficiency of picoplankton populations | 77 |
| 3.3.6 Oyster condition | 79 |
| 3.3.7 Condition index and retention efficiency..... | 81 |
| 3.4 Discussion..... | 83 |
| 3.4.1 Picoplankton ecology | 83 |
| 3.4.2 Retention efficiency..... | 86 |

4.0 Investigation of the Bacterial Microflora of the Oyster Gut

| | |
|--|-----|
| 4.1 Introduction..... | 95 |
| 4.2 Materials and Methods..... | 99 |
| 4.2.1 General | 99 |
| 4.2.2 Comparison of the culturable gut microflora of wild and hatchery oysters | 99 |
| 4.2.3 Pilot investigation of the occurrence of gut microflora in wild oysters | 100 |
| 4.2.3.1 Molecular investigation of gut microflora..... | 100 |
| 4.2.3.2 Histological investigation of gut microflora..... | 101 |
| 4.2.4 Temporal variation in bacterial presence and diversity in the oyster gut..... | 101 |
| 4.2.4.1 Sample collection and processing | 101 |
| 4.2.4.1.1 Oysters | 101 |
| 4.2.4.1.2 Seawater concentration | 103 |
| 4.2.4.1.3 Oysters sampled for their crystalline style | 104 |
| 4.2.4.2 Histological analysis | 105 |
| 4.2.4.3 Molecular analysis..... | 106 |
| 4.2.4.3.1 DNA extraction | 106 |
| 4.2.4.3.2 PCR..... | 106 |
| 4.2.4.3.3 PAGE analysis | 107 |
| 4.2.4.3.4 RFLP | 108 |
| 4.2.5 Characterisation of the culturable bacteria from the guts of wild oysters..... | 109 |
| 4.2.5.1 Oyster sampling | 109 |
| 4.2.5.2 Bacterial isolation and culture | 109 |
| 4.2.5.3 Biochemical profiling of isolates | 111 |
| 4.2.5.4 Molecular identification of isolates | 111 |
| 4.2.5.4.1 DNA extraction from cultures..... | 111 |
| 4.2.5.4.2 Sequencing and identification..... | 112 |
| 4.3 Results..... | 113 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 4.3.1 Comparison of culturable gut microflora in hatchery and farmed oysters..... | 113 |
| 4.3.2 Pilot scale investigation of oyster gut bacteria | 114 |
| 4.3.2.1 Histological analysis | 114 |
| 4.3.2.2 Molecular analysis..... | 116 |
| 4.3.3 Temporal variation in bacterial presence and diversity in the oyster gut..... | 117 |
| 4.3.3.1 Histological analysis | 117 |
| 4.3.3.2 Molecular analysis..... | 120 |
| 4.3.4 Characterisation of oyster gut bacteria | 121 |
| 4.4 Discussion | 125 |

5.0 General Discussion.....132

Appendices

| | |
|---|-----|
| Appendix 2.1 Hatchery Details | 139 |
| Appendix 2.2 Composition of Guillard's F/2 Microalgal Culture Medium | 142 |
| Appendix 2.3 Procedures for the Culture of Microalgae | 143 |
| Appendix 3.1 Microalgal Species, their Biovolume and Carbon Content | 145 |
| Appendix 3.2 Post-hoc Tukey Analysis of ANOVA of Picoplankton | 147 |
| Appendix 4.1 Staining Protocols for Histological Sections | 149 |
| Appendix 4.2 Gram Staining of Bacterial Isolates | 151 |
| Appendix 4.3 Colony Counts from Samples of Farmed and Hatchery Oysters..... | 152 |
| Appendix 4.4 Determinative Assays for the Characterisation of Oyster Gut Microflora | 153 |

Bibliography 159

List of Figures

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----|
| Figure 1.1 | General orientation of a Pacific oyster with the top shell and upper mantle removed | 3 |
| Figure 1.2 | Simplified life-cycle of the Pacific oyster (<i>Crassostrea gigas</i>)..... | 6 |
| Figure 1.3 | Location of the inhalant and exhalant feeding currents in a Pacific oyster | 8 |
| Figure 2.1 | An overview of the processes for the hatchery production of Pacific oysters (<i>Crassostrea gigas</i>). | 21 |
| Figure 2.2 | Floor plan of the pilot-scale hatchery at the Mt Albert Research Centre..... | 27 |
| Figure 2.3 | Location of Kerikeri Inlet and Whangaroa Harbour where on-growing and broodstock collections were made | 31 |
| Figure 2.4 | Average oyster condition index as a function of days held in the conditioning system..... | 38 |
| Figure 2.5 | Oyster clearance rate for each microalgal species after six hours | 41 |
| Figure 2.6 | The proportion of each microalgal species cleared from suspension by oysters after six hours | 41 |
| Figure 3.1 | The location of the Bay Oysters Ltd/Sanford Ltd oyster farming leases in Kerikeri Inlet..... | 58 |
| Figure 3.2 | Oysters on a wooden growing stick showing the density and mud accumulation | 60 |
| Figure 3.3 | Diagram of the flow-through tank setup on a barge for the purpose of sampling feeding oysters..... | 61 |
| Figure 3.4 | The flow-through tank system with three dozen oysters distributed in the oyster tray. | 62 |
| Figure 3.5 | Sampling of water from the exhalant (A) and inhalant (B) feeding currents of a Pacific oyster (<i>Crassostrea gigas</i>). | 63 |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|----|
| Figure 3.6 | Rainfall in Kerikeri Inlet as total for the month and for the 7 days prior to sampling. | 71 |
| Figure 3.7 | Photomicrographs of seawater samples with (A) and without (B) the addition of the nucleic acid stain SYBR Green I..... | 72 |
| Figure 3.8 | Representative density plots of picoeukaryote, cyanobacteria and heterotrophic bacteria populations showing seasonal variation..... | 73 |
| Figure 3.9 | Monthly mean ambient cell concentrations of picoplankton populations (picoeukaryotes, cyanobacteria and heterotrophic bacteria) from June 2001 to October 2002 | 74 |
| Figure 3.10 | Total microalgal cell numbers averaged for each month from the Kerikeri Delivery Centre Ltd microalgal monitoring data for years 1998 – 2001 | 76 |
| Figure 3.11 | Proportion of monthly estimated total carbon attributed to microalgae, picoeukaryotes, cyanobacteria and heterotrophic bacteria..... | 76 |
| Figure 3.12 | Feeding currents visualised with Fluorescein dye..... | 77 |
| Figure 3.13 | Monthly mean retention efficiency for picoeukaryotes, cyanobacteria and heterotrophic bacteria..... | 78 |
| Figure 3.14 | Average monthly levels of glycogen, protein, lipid, expressed as constituent fraction indices and biometric condition index | 80 |
| Figure 3.15 | Retention efficiency of picoeukaryotes, cyanobacteria and heterotrophic bacteria in relation to the condition index of the individual oysters sampled | 81 |
| Figure 3.16 | Retention efficiency as a function of glycogen and protein constituent fraction indices for individual oysters | 82 |
| Figure 3.17 | Data redrawn from Dinamani (1987) showing the correlation between sea surface temperature and the proportion of oysters either spawning or spawned..... | 90 |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|-----|
| Figure 3.18 | Estimated contribution of picoplankton populations to the carbon requirement of Pacific oysters. | 92 |
| Figure 4.1 | Diagram of the filter and pump setup for the concentration of seawater samples..... | 103 |
| Figure 4.2 | Pacific oyster with the top shell and upper mantle removed showing the location of the hand sections made for histological analysis | 105 |
| Figure 4.3 | Representations of the three sections (anterior, middle and posterior) made from each oyster sampled showing the location of the gut lumen, style sac and digestive diverticular | 115 |
| Figure 4.4 | RFLP banding pattern from <i>Hae</i> III digest of 16S rDNA amplified by PCR from DNA extracted from the gut of Pacific oysters in the pilot study | 116 |
| Figure 4.5 | Photomicrograph of <i>Cristispira</i> -like spirochaetes in a gut lumen..... | 118 |
| Figure 4.6 | Photomicrograph of spirochaetes in the outer laminates of a freshly isolated crystalline style | 118 |
| Figure 4.7 | Photomicrograph of a typical section through the style lumen from a posterior section..... | 119 |
| Figure 4.8 | Photomicrograph of a typical “crescent shaped” lumen showing “food debris” (brown) and the ciliated lumen wall | 119 |
| Figure 4.9 | Photomicrograph of bacterial rods found amongst food debris in a gut lumen. | 120 |
| Figure 4.10 | RFLP pattern from <i>Hae</i> III digestion of PCR amplified, 16S rDNA extracted from the gut of Pacific oysters | 121 |
| Figure 4.11 | Examples of starch plates that have been stained with I ₂ /KI solution (Table 4.1). | 122 |
| Figure A2.1 | Floor plan of pilot scale hatchery at the Mt Albert Research Centre | 139 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-----|
| Table 1.1 | Morphological characteristics of four oyster species. | 4 |
| Table 2.1 | Nutritional analysis of the different microalgal species used in the pilot scale hatchery | 22 |
| Table 2.2 | Microalgal species used in the clearance rate experiments. | 34 |
| Table 2.3 | Average size and density of hatchery-produced spat on leaving the hatchery (Month 0) and in subsequent months. | 37 |
| Table 2.4 | Summary of the success of conditioning broodstock oysters in a recirculating seawater system. | 39 |
| Table 3.1 | Published retention efficiencies of various food items by oysters. | 55 |
| Table 4.1 | Solutions used in the extraction of DNA from samples. | 102 |
| Table 4.2 | Primer sequences for amplification of 16S rDNA. | 106 |
| Table 4.3 | Master mix for PCR amplification of DNA extracted from oyster gut | 107 |
| Table 4.4 | Composition of polyacrylamide gels. | 108 |
| Table 4.5 | Media used for the culturing, isolating and determining nutrient utilisation, of bacteria from samples of oyster gut. | 110 |
| Table 4.6 | Presumptive identifications of isolates from samples of hatchery seawater, the gut of hatchery conditioned oysters or wild oysters. | 113 |
| Table 4.7 | Occurrence of bacteria in histological sections taken in the pilot-scale investigation. | 114 |
| Table 4.8 | Occurrence of bacteria in histological sections from the broader investigation. | 117 |
| Table 4.9 | Phenotypic characters of the 10 isolated bacteria sequenced. | 123 |
| Table 4.10 | Results of the BLAST search (Altschul <i>et al.</i> 1997) of sequences derived from the PCR amplification of 16S rDNA from each isolate. | 124 |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----|
| Table A2.1 | Composition of the stock solutions used in the F/2 culture medium..... | 142 |
| Table A3.1 | Microalgal species enumerated by the Cawthron Institute for the Kerikeri Delivery Centre Ltd..... | 145 |
| Table A3.2 | Significant differences between months for ambient concentrations and retention efficiencies of picoeukaryotes. | 147 |
| Table A3.3 | Significant differences between months for ambient concentrations and retention efficiencies of cyanobacterial population 1. | 147 |
| Table A3.4 | Significant differences between months for ambient concentrations and retention efficiencies of cyanobacterial population 2..... | 147 |
| Table A3.5 | Significant differences between months for ambient concentrations and retention efficiencies of cyanobacterial population 3..... | 148 |
| Table A3.6 | Significant differences between months for ambient concentrations and retention efficiencies of heterotrophic bacteria. | 148 |
| Table A4.1 | Number of colonies counted on agar plates of different media types inoculated with 100 µl of dilute oyster gut content or seawater. | 152 |
| Table A4.2 | Colony morphology, cell descriptions, growth and utilisation of different media for all isolates | 153 |
| Table A4.3 | Results of the reactions on the api 20E identification strip after 24 hours incubation..... | 157 |

Abbreviations

S.I. (Système International d'unités) abbreviations for units and standard notations for chemical elements, formulae, and chemical abbreviations are used in this work. Other abbreviations used are listed below.

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|---|
| A_{xxx} | absorbance at xxx nm | PCR | Polymerase Chain Reaction |
| bp | base pairs | PEG | polyethylene glycol |
| cc | cubic centimetres | RFLP | restriction fragment length polymorphism |
| C.I. | colour index | rpm | revolutions per minute |
| dH ₂ O | sterile, glass distilled water | SDS | sodium dodecyl sulphate |
| dNTP | deoxyribonucleoside triphosphate | s.e. | standard error (sample) |
| EDTA | ethylenediamine-tetra-acetic-acid (disodium salt) | TBE | Tris-borate-EDTA-buffer |
| Exh | exhalant | TE | Tris-EDTA buffer |
| g | grams | TEMED | Tetramethylethylenediamine |
| g | acceleration due to gravity | Tris | [2-amino-2(hydroxymethyl) propane-1,3-diol, (tris)] |
| h | hour | Tris-HCl | Tris solution pH adjusted with HCl |
| Inh | inhalant | U | units of enzyme (manufacturer defined) |
| kb | kilobase pairs (1000 base pairs) | UV | ultraviolet light |
| kDa | kiloDaltons | v/v | volume:volume |
| l | litre(s) | w/v | weight:volume |
| M | molarity (moles litre ⁻¹) | | |
| MW | molecular weight | | |
| min | minute(s) | | |
| ml | millilitre(s) | | |
| N | normal (concentration) | | |