An Improved Method for Protein Extraction from Minuscule Quantities of Fungal Biomass

Akhila Krishnaswamy¹ · Natasha Barnes^{1,2} · Nikita P. Lotlikar¹ · Samir R. Damare¹

Received: 30 October 2017 / Accepted: 20 June 2018 / Published online: 26 June 2018
© Association of Microbiologists of India 2018

Abstract Filamentous fungi are ubiquitous eukaryotes having chitin as a major constituent of the cell wall. Chitin is tough to lyse due to which the intracellular fungal proteins are not readily accessible. The problem is further enhanced when the biomass to be analyzed for protein studies is too little due to the extreme experimental parameters under consideration such as increased or lowered pH, temperature, hydrostatic pressure, nutrients, etc. The method described here is capable of obtaining proteins from minuscule quantities of biomass (~5 mg lyophilized biomass). In this study, different lysing conditions and varied composition of extraction buffers were tried to obtain maximum protein of high quality. Lysis with zirconium beads in a combination buffer system (Tris–MgCl₂ buffer, urea buffer I and urea buffer II) was best for extracting proteins from the fungal isolates used. The protocol described here provides for a simple and quick method for extraction of high-quality proteins from very less biomass that could be extended to other tough to lyse biological material also.

Keywords Fungi · Homogenizer · Biomass · Protein · Zirconium beads

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12088-018-0752-y>) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Samir R. Damare
samir@nio.org

¹ Biological Oceanography Division, CSIR-National Institute of Oceanography, Dona Paula, Goa 403004, India

² Present Address: Department of Biology, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong

Protein extraction is the most critical step of proteomic studies, which often differs with the type of organism and requires thorough standardization to obtain good quality proteins for analysis. Extraction of proteins from filamentous fungi has always posed challenges due to the robust, chitinous cell wall. Although liquid nitrogen crushing of fungal mycelia is the most commonly used method for extracting proteins [1–3], it has limitations when the amount of biomass is less [4, 5]. The problem of less biomass arises when biomass build-up reduces drastically as a result of the experimental parameters, for example, the extreme conditions of temperature, pressure, pH, etc. Despite the limitation of biomass quantity, an improved method of extraction of intracellular proteins from biomass as less as 5 mg (dry weight), without the need of liquid nitrogen based homogenization is described in this work. Various lysing methods and extraction buffers were evaluated to extract proteins using lyophilized biomass of *Aspergillus terreus* (Strain #A4636). The efficiency of the standardized method is demonstrated in terms of the quantity and quality of the extracted proteins as viewed on the SDS–polyacrylamide gel.

To check the efficiency of the standardized protocol, eight randomly chosen fungal isolates from eight different genera, isolated from different marine habitats, oyster mushroom, and one unidentified filamentous fungus were used. Fungal cultures were grown in modified Czapek Dox broth (CDB—sucrose replaced with 5% glucose and prepared in seawater) for 6–7 days at room temperature (28 °C, static conditions), the biomass harvested, washed to remove residual seawater and media, lyophilized, and stored in airtight container till used for protein extraction. *Pleurotus ostreatus* was grown on Czapek Dox agar for

12 days at room temperature, the mycelia were harvested, and all the steps described above were followed.

It was reported that lyophilized biomass gave better protein profiles than wet biomass [2], hence lyophilized fungal biomass was used for entire analysis. To ascertain the best lysing condition, different methods of homogenization were tried such as sonication and vortexing with glass beads, mechanical disruption using FastPrep homogenizer (FastPrep®24, MP Biomedicals, USA) with lysing matrix A (MP Biomedicals, USA) and zirconium beads (D6006, Zymo Research, USA) (Table 1). Five hundred μ L of each extraction buffer and 5 μ L of 100 X Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (PIC, Serva #39104) were added to the lyophilized biomass for protein extraction individually. All the homogenizations using FastPrep homogenizer were performed at 6.5 m/s for 60 s. In case of single buffer extractions (S. no. 1, 2 and 3, Table 1), homogenization was performed twice with a rest time of 5 min, while for multi-buffer extractions (S. no. 4 and 5, Table 1), homogenization was performed twice for the first buffer (rest time of 5 min) followed by single homogenization for the remaining two buffers with the same biomass/pellet. The homogenized lysate tube was centrifuged

at 14,000 rpm, 4 °C for 15 min and the supernatant was collected. In case of multi-buffer extraction, supernatants were collected in a single tube.

Protein yield from sonicated biomass was very less (Table 1), as high-intensity sonication breaks the mycelia into smaller filaments but does not rupture the cell wall, thereby not releasing all the proteins [6]. Zirconium beads provided the best lysis of fungal mycelia, which reflected in the protein levels obtained (Table 1). Maximum yield of proteins with zirconium bead lysis could be due to their spiky-surface that aids in cell wall lysis; in addition, they are neutral in charge and higher in density (almost double as compared to glass beads of the same size) [7].

Constituents of extraction buffers in this study were selected based on their function. The Tris–HCl solution used in this method was chosen to maintain the ionic strength of the medium [8]. Detergents such as SDS and CHAPS control hydrophobic-hydrophilic interactions easing solubilization, while urea and thiourea increase the solubility of hydrophobic peptides by altering their structure [9]. The ratio between urea and thiourea varies typically from 9:0, 8:1, 7:2 to 6:3, as the combined strength of urea and thiourea in the buffer, should not exceed 9 M

Table 1 Details of different methods of lysis and the extraction buffers used for protein extraction from lyophilized biomass of *Aspergillus terreus* #A4636

S. no.	Buffer name	Buffer composition	Method of lysis	Type of beads	Protein concentration (μ g/mL)
1	TE buffer	10 mM Tris–HCl/EDTA buffer (TE buffer) + 5 μ L of 0.7 M β -mercaptoethanol	Sonication (5 min) and vortexing (60 min)	Glass beads (0.125–0.25 mm $\varnothing$)	< 2
2	Yeast breaking buffer (YBB)	YBB buffer (MP FastPrep protein isolation kit, Cat 116550600) + 5 μ L of 0.7 M β -mercaptoethanol	FastPrep Homogenization (6.5 m/s for 60 s)	Lysing matrix A (MP Biomedicals, USA 6.223 mm $\varnothing$)	< 2
3	Urea with SDS	1.5% SDS, 9 M urea, 25 mM Tris–HCl [pH 6.8], 10 mM EDTA and 0.7 M β -mercaptoethanol [modified from [14]]	FastPrep homogenization (6.5 m/s for 60 s)	Zirconium (0.1 mm $\varnothing$)	549
4	Tris–glycine buffer	Tris–glycine @ pH 8.3 (3 g Tris, 14.4 g glycine in 1L deionized water, SDS running buffer) [1] + urea buffer I (9 M urea, 4% CHAPS, 100 mM DTT—prepared in 40 mM Tris–HCl pH 8.0) [modified from [3], [9]] + urea buffer II (6 M urea, 3 M thiourea, 4% CHAPS, 100 mM DTT—prepared in 40 mM Tris–HCl pH 8.0) [15]	FastPrep homogenization (6.5 m/s for 60 s)	Zirconium (0.1 mm $\varnothing$)	251
5	Tris–MgCl ₂ buffer	(Buffer 1) Tris–MgCl ₂ @ pH 8.3 (0.5 M Tris–HCl, 2% CHAPS, 20 mM MgCl ₂ , 2% DTT) [16] + (buffer 2) urea I buffer (9 M urea, 4% CHAPS, 100 mM DTT—prepared in 40 mM Tris–HCl pH 8.0), + (buffer 3) urea II buffer (6 M urea, 3 M thiourea, 4% CHAPS, 100 mM DTT—prepared in 40 mM Tris–HCl pH 8.0) [15]	FastPrep Homogenization (6.5 m/s for 60 s)	Zirconium (0.1 mm $\varnothing$)	1752

Fig. 1 Mycelial protein profiles of *Aspergillus terreus* #A4636 obtained using FastPrep homogenizer lysing and different buffers. Lane 1: protein molecular weight marker (PMW-Medium, Merck, India); lane 2: YBB buffer, # A4636; lane 3: YBB buffer, # MTCC479; lane 4: urea buffer, #A4636 (with SDS); lane 5: urea buffer, #A4636 (with IPG buffer); lane 6: Tris–glycine combination buffer, #A4636; lane 7: standardized buffer, #A4636; lane 8: standardized buffer, #MTCC 479 (*A. terreus* strain); lane 9: urea buffer, #MTCC 479 (with IPG buffer); lane 10: Tris–glycine combination buffer, #MTCC 479

Table 2 Fungal isolates used in the study and proteins obtained from the lyophilized biomass (~ 5 mg) by the standardised method^a as quantified by Qubit assay kit

Fungal isolates used	Protein concentration (mg/mL)
<i>Sarocladium strictum</i>	3.14
<i>Cladosporium cladosporioides</i>	2.78
<i>Hortaea werneckii</i>	3.6
<i>Acremonium alternatum</i>	3.66
<i>Purpureocillium lilacinum</i>	2.48
<i>Penicillium citrinum</i>	1.04
<i>Engyodontium</i> sp.	1.028
<i>Aspergillus flavus</i>	2.42
Unidentified filamentous fungus	2.35
<i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i>	3.84

^aLysing with zirconium beads using FastPrep homogenizer and Tris–MgCl₂ 3-buffer system

since at higher concentrations, urea and thiourea crystallize [10]. DTT is preferred since it is a di-thiol as compared to mono-thiol β -mercaptoethanol [11]. Magnesium chloride aids in stabilization of the extracted proteins [12].

Proteins obtained from first two methods (S.No. 1 and 2, Table 1) using TE and YBB buffers were too less ($> 2 \mu\text{g/mL}$). Tris–MgCl₂ 3-buffer system (Table 1, S. no. 5) yielded maximum proteins from lyophilized biomass of *A. terreus*, during standardization of the method. Figure 1 is

representing the quality of proteins obtained using different methods tried with lyophilized biomass of *A. terreus* #4636, with lane 6 showing the best protein profile. Tris–MgCl₂ 3-buffer system and FastPrep homogenization with zirconium beads were evaluated for its efficiency for protein extraction from different fungal isolates (Table 2). The method worked well for all the fungal cultures tested in this study, with the protein concentrations obtained above 1 mg/mL (Table 2).

It has been reported that the activity of proteases is very high in fungi, especially as mycelium ages [12]. When mycelium lyses, proteolysis starts dynamically, which could be stopped by addition of protease inhibitors and by working at low temperatures [1]. In this method, protease inhibitor cocktail (PIC) was added along with lysing buffer and lysed contents were intermittently cooled in ice (5 min) between homogenization pulses to neutralize the effect of proteases released during lysis. The intermittent cooling in ice also helped to nullify the heat generated during homogenization.

It was not possible to extract proteins from 5 mg biomass using conventional liquid nitrogen crushing in pestle and motor. Hence no relative quantity of protein extracted by liquid nitrogen crushing could be mentioned. Instead, comparison with previous studies of protein extractions using liquid nitrogen is reported in Table 3, which shows that recovery of proteins with respect to biomass employed using this method is quite high.

Quantification of the desalted protein extracts (done using BioSpin chromatography columns, BioRad, USA) was performed using Qubit Assay kit (Invitrogen, Q33211 USA) as per manufacturer's protocol. Desalting of proteins helps in removal of salts and other chemicals from the extraction buffers. The desalted protein extracts were electrophoresed using SDS-PAGE to check the quality and the yield of extracted proteins on 12% resolving gel with 6% stacking gel at a constant voltage of 90 V for one h and 45 min. Hundred μg of protein extracts were loaded in each well. The gel was stained using silver staining method [13] (Fig. 2). The quality of the proteins obtained was good as evident from the SDS–polyacrylamide gel with distinct bands seen in almost all the lanes (Fig. 2).

The method of protein extraction described here is a rapid protocol (requiring around 20 min, excluding the time required for lyophilization) to obtain sufficient quantity of high-quality proteins. This method nullifies the disadvantage of biomass availability for protein extractions, thereby opening up avenues to study protein profiles of samples/organisms which are difficult to cultivate or sparsely obtained.

Table 3 Comparison of protein yields obtained from different methods reported in the literature with the method reported in this study

S. no.	Biomass quantity	Wet/dry biomass	Method	Protein concentration/yield	References
1	500 mg	Dry	Pestle and mortar grinding (mycelium stored in – 20 °C, freeze-dried before grinding) French press in case of yeasts <i>Buffer</i> : Tris–glycine buffer (3 g trizma, 14.4 g glycine and 1L deionized water, pH 8.3)	15–100 mg/mL	[1]
2	1 g	Dry	Mechanical grinding with liquid nitrogen on the freeze-dried sample, stored in – 20 °C <i>Buffer 1</i> : TCA-acetone extraction procedure <i>Buffer 2</i> : Phosphate buffer extraction	56.46 mg/g dry weight (buffer 1) 43.19 mg/g dry weight (buffer 2)	[2]
3	100 mg	Dry	Pestle and mortar grinding of mycelia frozen in liquid nitrogen, lyophilized over night <i>Buffer</i> : 6 different buffers were used for standardization	Not available	[3]
4	Not mentioned	Wet	Liquid nitrogen freezing followed by mechanical grinding <i>Buffer</i> : 7 M urea, 2 M thiourea, 4% CHAPS, 0.8% IPG buffer, 20 mM DTT	Not available	[17]
5	~ 5 mg	Dry (lyophilized)	Bead-beating homogenization <i>Buffer</i> : Tris–MgCl ₂ , urea buffer I, urea buffer II	1.04–3.66 mg/mL corresponding to 208–732 mg/g dry weight of biomass	Present study

Fig. 2 SDS-PAGE profile of proteins extracted from nine different fungal cultures using the optimized Tris–MgCl₂ buffer FastPrep homogenization with zirconia beads. Lane 1: protein molecular weight marker (PMW-Medium, Merck, India), lane 2: *Sarocladium strictum*, lane 3: *Cladosporium cladosporioides*, lane 4: *Hortaea werneckii*, lane 5: *Acremonium alternatum*, lane 6: *Purpureocillium lilacinum*, lane 7: *Penicillium citrinum*, lane 8: *Engyodontium* sp., lane 9: *Aspergillus flavus*, lane 10: unidentified filamentous fungal isolate

Acknowledgements Authors thank Director, CSIR-NIO for the infrastructure and other facilities. The first author is thankful to Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) for her stipend under the project YSA 1228. The authors are grateful for the research funds received under the CSIR funded project PSC0206. The authors acknowledge the help of Ms. Shruti Shah for testing the robustness of protocol for basidiomycete fungus. The authors thank anonymous

reviewers for suggestions to improve the MS substantially. The work is part of the doctoral thesis to be submitted to Goa University at Department of Microbiology. This is CSIR-NIO Contribution Number 6252.

Contribution of authors The idea was conceived by the corresponding author during the work on deep-sea fungal cultures, where obtaining biomass from fungi growing at elevated hydrostatic pressure is a challenge. The first author was involved in standardization of the method and drafting of the manuscript, and the work is part of her doctoral thesis to be submitted to Goa University. The second and third authors have validated the method by evaluating it for extraction from different fungal cultures. This is an original work by the authors and has not been published elsewhere either completely, in part, or in any other form. The manuscript has not been submitted to another journal. The results described here have been approved for publication by the responsible authority of the institute where the work was carried out, and all the persons entitled to authorship have been named.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Bridge PD, Kokubun T, Simmonds MSJ (2004) Protein extraction from fungi. Methods in molecular biology. In: Cutler (ed) Protein purification protocols, 2nd edn, vol 244. Humana Press Inc., New York, pp 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.1385/1-59259-655-x:37>

2. Lakshman DK, Natarajan SS, Lakshman S, Garrett WM, Dhar AK (2008) Optimized protein extraction methods for proteomic analysis of *Rhizoctonia solani*. *Mycologia* 100:867–875. <https://doi.org/10.3852/08-065>
3. Epperson LE, Martin SL (2011) Proteomic strategies to investigate adaptive processes. In: Eckersall PD, Whitfield PD (ed) *Methods in animal proteomics*. Wiley, Oxford, pp 189–209. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470960660.ch8>
4. Leite GM, Magan N, Medina Á (2012) Comparison of different bead-beating RNA extraction strategies: an optimized method for filamentous fungi. *J Microb Methods* 88:413–418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2012.01.011>
5. Gibbons LE, Brangs HCG, Burden DW (2014) Bead beating: a primer. *Ran Primers* 12:1–20
6. Herran NS, Lopez JLC, Perez JAS, Chisti Y (2008) Effects of ultrasound on the culture of *Aspergillus terreus*. *J Chem Technol Biotechnol* 83:593–600. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jctb.1821>
7. Hopkins TR (1991) Physical and chemical cell disruption for the recovery of intracellular proteins. *Bioprocess Technol* 12:57–83
8. El-Harakany AA, Halim FMA, Barakat AO (1984) Dissociation constants and related thermodynamic quantities of the protonated acid form of tris-(hydroxymethyl)-aminomethane in mixtures of 2-methoxyethanol and water at different temperatures. *J Electroanal Chem* 162:285–305. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0728\(84\)80171-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0728(84)80171-0)
9. Rabilloud T, Adessi C, Giraudel A, Lunardi J (1997) Improvement of the solubilization of proteins in two-dimensional electrophoresis with immobilized pH gradients. *Electrophoresis* 18:307–316. <https://doi.org/10.1002/elps.1150180303>
10. Berkelman T, Brubacher MG, Chang H (2004) Important factors influencing protein solubility for 2-D electrophoresis. *Bioradiations* 114:30–32 (**BioRad Laboratories Inc**)
11. Banasova M, Valachova K, Juranek I, Soltes L (2014) Dithiols as more effective than monothiols in protecting biomacromolecules from free-radical-mediated damage: in vitro oxidative degradation of high-molar-mass hyaluronan. *Chem Papers* 68:1428–1434. <https://doi.org/10.2478/s11696-014-0591-1>
12. Gordon A, Barbut S (1992) Effect of chloride salts on protein extraction and interfacial protein film formation in meat batters. *J Sci Food Agric* 58:227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.2740580211>
13. Heukeshovan J, Dernick R (1985) Simplified method for silver staining of proteins in polyacrylamide gels and the mechanism of silver staining. *Electrophoresis* 6:103–112. <https://doi.org/10.1002/elps.1150060302>
14. Oshero N, May GS (1998) Optimization of protein extraction from *Aspergillus nidulans* for gel electrophoresis. *Fun Gen Reports* 45:38–40. <https://doi.org/10.4148/1941-4765.1262>
15. Remelli W (2011) Framing the role of rhodanese-like proteins in cell redox balance in two bacterial model systems. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Milan
16. Bhadauria V, Peng YL (2010) Optimization of a protein extraction technique for fungal proteomics. *Ind J Microbiol* 50:127–131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12088-010-0072-3>
17. Bregar O, Mandelc S, Celar F, Javornik B (2012) Proteome analysis of the plant pathogenic fungus *Monilinia laxa* showing host specificity. *Food Technol Biotechnol* 50:326–333