# Editorial

# It's barcoding Jim, but not as we know it

ROBERT H. CRUICKSHANK[1] & LARS MUNCK[2]

[1]*Department of Ecology, Faculty of Agriculture and Life Sciences, PO Box 84, Lincoln University, Lincoln 7647, Christchurch, New Zealand. E-mail: Rob.Cruickshank@lincoln.ac.nz*

[2]*Department of Food Science, Faculty of Life Sciences, Chemometrics and Spectroscopy Group, Quality and Technology, University of Copenhagen, Rolighedsvej 30, DK-1958 Frederiksberg C, Denmark.*

It has long been the dream of many ecologists that one day it will be possible to use a hand-held machine to identify biological specimens in the field (e.g. Janzen 2004). An analogy has been made with the so-called "tricorder" from the popular science fiction televison series *Star Trek* (Savolainen et al. 2005). This idea has arisen largely from the DNA barcoding community, who promote the use of a single universal DNA sequence (usually the mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase I (COI) gene) for species identification (Hebert et al. 2003). Such a device is typically imagined as using DNA as the basis for species determination. However, critics of this idea (e.g. Cameron et al. 2006) have argued that a DNA-based device would be impractical as tissue samples would need to be obtained as a source of DNA, which would necessitate handling the specimen. This suggests that the tricorder may not be such a good analogy; whereas, in *Star Trek*, the crew of the *USS Enterprise* merely had to point their tricorders at the organism in question, in reality, field-workers using a DNA-based system would have to obtain a tissue sample and load it into the machine in order to identify their specimen (Cameron et al. 2006, p.844).

A report in this issue of *Zootaxa* (Rodríguez-Fernández et al. 2011) suggests a possible alternative to DNA as the basis for a hand-held field identification device. Instead of DNA, Rodríguez-Fernández et al. use near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy to obtain physiochemical profiles of the phenotypes of nine species of flies from the genus *Neodexiopsis* (Diptera: Muscidae), and show that these profiles can be used to discriminate between these species with 100% accuracy. This method works by pointing beams of near infrared light, at monochromatic wavelengths, at a specimen and recording the reflected light to calculate the absorption spectrum. As different metabolites absorb light of different wavelengths, the reflected light contains information about the substances and structures of the insect, providing a fingerprint of the physiochemical state of the intact insect phenotype. No tissue samples are needed; indeed, it should even be possible to obtain in this way a profile of the dynamic metabolic stages over time from a live specimen.

Near-infrared technology is today widely used in the area of food and agriculture as a multi-meter to predict the chemical composition of foods such as wheat and barley by calibration with chemical analysis using soft (self-modeling) analytical models for multivariate data (chemometrics). A chemometric method, principal component analysis (PCA), was used by Rodríguez-Fernández et al. (2011) for classification of their insect spectra. It has been demonstrated in plant endosperm genotypes and mutants from barley that the fingerprint of a NIR spectrum from a unique barley endosperm individual represents a coarse-grained overview of the whole physiochemical composition of the "phenome" of this tissue (Munck et al. 2010). The method of scanning the specimen with a beam of light seems to be a much closer analogy to the concept of barcode scanning as used in shops and businesses, and to the notion of a hand-held tricorder as it was originally conceived. As the phenomic profile results from the sum total of all the metabolic processes occurring in the insect, it represents the combined effects of the entire genome, proteome and metabolome of all tissues (equal to the phenome) and is therefore likely to be as potentially representative of the unique autonomously developing individual as its total DNA sequence.

While the entomological application of these methods reported by Rodríguez-Fernández et al. consists of only a single case-study involving a small group of congeneric insects, it does represent an important proof-of-principle demonstration, sufficient to indicate that this technique is worthy of further investigation. Many questions remain; for example, can this method be generalized to other taxa? How big is the overlap between intra- and inter-specific variation? What do the metabolomic profiles of hybrids and individual mutants look like? What are the effects of

ontogeny, diet and other environmental variation? Ecological differences between conspecific individuals may complicate matters for species identification as they could lead to quite different metabolomic profiles, but this also raises the possibility that this technology could have other uses, such as identifying the geographical origin of a specimen (potentially useful in forensic or biosecurity contexts), or distinguishing between individuals feeding on different resources. The possibilities for using NIR spectroscopy in a range of different ecological applications seem almost endless. The barley mutant example of Munck et al (2010) demonstrates almost deterministic razor-sharp spectral endosperm reproducibility in a defined environment between homozygotic lines that have been bred separately for more that 20 years. The next necessary step towards realizing this dream is the validation of the method in a range of different contexts, including more challenging taxonomic problems in difficult species-complexes. This may reveal a potential role for NIR spectroscopy in species delimitation as well as specimen identification. There is significant scope for this technology to be miniaturised to the extent that it could be made portable, and, given these promising first steps, that alone should make it worth pursuing. Perhaps the real future of the tricorder rests not on a DNA-based device, but one that uses spectroscopy to obtain metabolomic profiles in a much less destructive and more user-friendly way?

## References

Cameron, S., Rubinoff, D. & Will, K. (2006) Who will actually use DNA barcoding and what will it cost? *Systematic Biology*, 55, 844–847.

Hebert, P.D.N., Cywinska, A., Ball, S.L. & deWaard, J.R. (2003) Biological identifications through DNA barcodes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B, Biological Sciences*, 270, 313–321.

Janzen, D.H. (2004) Now is the time. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B, Biological Sciences*, 359, 731–732.

Munck, L., Møller Jespersen, B., Rinnan, Å., Fast Seefeldt, H., Møller Engelsen, M. & Balling Engelsen, S.A. (2010) Physiochemical theory on the applicability of soft mathematical models – experimentally interpreted. *Journal of Chemometrics*, 24, 481–495.

Rodríguez-Fernández, J.I., De Carvalho, C.J.B., Pasquini, C., De Lima, K.M.G., Moura, M. & Arízaga, G.C.G. (2011) Barcoding without DNA? Species identification using near infrared spectroscopy. *Zootaxa*, 2933, 46–54.

Savolainen, V., Cowan, R.S., Vogler, A.P., Roderick, G.K. & Lane, R. (2005) Towards writing the encyclopedia of life: an introduction to DNA barcoding. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B, Biological Sciences*, 360, 1805–1811.