

SEP

POLIBOTÁNICA

ISSN 1405-2768

ISSN 2395-9525



Núm. 61

Ciencia y
Tecnología

Secretaría de Ciencia, Humanidades,
Tecnología e Innovación

Enero 2026



Enero 2026

Núm. 61

POLIBOTÁNICA



PÁG.

CONTENIDO

- 1 La familia *Buxaceae* en México
The *Buxaceae* family in Mexico
Rafael Fernández N. | María de la Luz Arreguín Sánchez
- 23 Riqueza de epífitas vasculares en la reserva El Peñón, municipio de Valle de Bravo, Estado de México, México
Vascular epiphyte richness in The Peñón reserve, municipality of Valle de Bravo, Estado de México, Mexico
Ivonne Gomez | Bruno Téllez | Adolfo Espejo-Serna | Ana Rosa López-Ferrari
- 55 Variación de umbrales dnbr y rbr en la detección de incendios forestales en el área Iztaccíhuatl-Popocatepetl México
Variation of dnbr and rbr thresholds in forest fire detection in the Iztaccíhuatl-Popocatepetl area, Mexico
Ederson Steven Cobo Muelas | Pablito Marcelo López Serrano | Daniel José Vega Nieva | Jose Javier Corral Rivas | José López García | Lilia de Lourdes Manzo Delgado
- 75 Dinámica fenológica mensual de especies de bosque mixto.
Monthly phenological dynamics of mixed forest species.
Cynthia Judith Carranza Ojeda | Juan Antonio Reyes Agüero | Carlos Alfonso Muñoz Robles | Anuschka Van't Hooft | Jorge Alberto Flores Cano | José Villanueva Díaz
- 101 Servicios ecosistémicos de provisión en comunidades de pueblos Otomí y Matlazincas del Estado de México, México
Provision of ecosystem services in indigenous communities in the State of Mexico, Mexico
Laura White-Olascoaga | David García-Mondragón | Carmen Zepeda-Gómez
- 115 Comparación de tasas de respiración del suelo en ecosistemas agrícola, agostadero y urbano en una zona semiárida en Juárez, Chihuahua, México
Comparison of soil respiration rates in agricultural, rangeland, and urban ecosystems at semiarid areas in Juárez, Chihuahua, Mexico
Juan Pedro Flores Margez | Alejandra Valles Rodríguez | Pedro Osuna Avila | Dolores Adilene Garcia Gonzalez
- 133 Caracterización ecológica de la zona de proliferación del hongo blanco de pino (*Tricholoma mesoamericanum*) en “El Guajolote” Hidalgo, México
Ecological characterization of the fruiting area of the pine white mushroom (*Tricholoma mesoamericanum*) in “El Guajolote” Hidalgo, Mexico
Alvaro Alfonso Reyes Grimaldo | Ramón Razo Zárate | Oscar Arce Cervantes | Magdalena Martínez Reyes | Jesús Pérez Moreno | Rodrigo Rodríguez Laguna
- 145 Influencia de la variabilidad climática y del fenómeno ENOS en el crecimiento radial de *Pinus rzedowskii* y *P. martinezii* en Michoacán, México
Influence of climate variability and the ENSO phenomenon on the radial growth of *Pinus rzedowskii* and *P. martinezii* in Michoacán, Mexico
Ulises Manzanilla Quiñones | Patricia Delgado Valerio | Teodoro Carlón Allende
- 165 Caracteres morfométricos y patrones de germinación de semillas de *Pinus pseudostrobus* Lindl. de diferentes procedencias
Morphometric characteristics and germination patterns of *Pinus pseudostrobus* Lindl. seeds from different sources
Daniel Madrigal González | Nahum Modesto Sánchez-Vargas | Mariela Gómez-Romero | María Dolores Uribe-Salas | Alejandro Martínez-Palacios | Selene Ramos-Ortiz
- 181 Germinación de *Ormosia macrocalyx* Ducke (Fabaceae), árbol nativo en peligro de extinción
Germination of *Ormosia macrocalyx* Ducke (Fabaceae), an endangered native tree
Brenda Karina Pozo Gómez | Carolina Orantes García | Dulce María Pozo Gómez | Alma Gabriela Verdugo Valdez | María Silvia Sánchez Cortés | Rubén Antonio Moreno Moreno
- 193 Propagación in vitro de callos de morera (*Morus alba* L.) como alternativa alimenticia para larvas de gusanos de seda (*Bombyx mori*)
In vitro propagation of *Morus alba* L. calli as an alternative feed for silkworm (*Bombyx mori*) larvae
Alma Rosa Hernández Rojas | José Luis Rodríguez-de la O | Alejandro Rodríguez-Ortega | Elvis García-López | Manuel Hernández-Hernández | Jessica Lizbeth Sebastián-Nicolás | Rosita Deny Romero-Santos
- 205 Mejoras en un método comercial de extracción de ADN para obtener extractos de ácido nucleico de alta calidad a partir de yemas vegetativas de *Populus tremuloides* Michx.
Improvements to a commercial DNA extraction method for high-quality nucleic acid extractions from *Populus tremuloides* Michx. vegetative buds
Cecilia Gutierrez | Marcelo Barraza Salas | Ilga Mercedes Porth | Christian Wehenkel
- 221 Crecimiento de plántulas de *Laelia autumnalis* y *Encyclia cordigera* en función de la concentración de sacarosa y carbón activado.
Growth of *Laelia autumnalis* and *Encyclia cordigera* seedlings as a function of sucrose and activated charcoal concentration
Marcela Cabañas Rodríguez | María Andrade Rodríguez | Oscar Gabriel Villegas Torres | Iran Alia Tejacal | Porfirio Juarez López | José Antonio Chávez García
- 235 Dinámica fenológica mensual de especies de bosque mixto
Monthly phenological dynamics of mixed forest species
Andrea Cecilia Acosta-Hernández | Eduardo Daniel Vivar Vivar | Marin Pompa-García

PÁG.

CONTENIDO

- 259 Efecto de hongos micorrízicos arbusculares sobre la supervivencia y el crecimiento de plantas de *Dalbergia congestiflora* propagadas in vitro y por semilla en condiciones de invernadero
Effect of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on the survival and growth of *Dalbergia congestiflora* plants propagated in vitro and from seed under greenhouse conditions
Enrique Ambríz | Carlos Juan Alvarado López | Yoshira López Antonio | Hebert Jair Barrales Cureño | Rafael Salgado Garciglia | Alejandra Hernández García
- 273 Crioconservación de explantes florales encapsulados de cacao (*Theobroma cacao* L.) mediante deshidratación y vitrificación
Cryopreservation of encapsulated floral explants of cacao (*Theobroma cacao* L.) by dehydration and vitrification
Eliud Rodríguez Olivera | Leobardo Iracheta Donjuan | José Luis Rodríguez de la O | Carlos Hugo Avendaño Arrazate
- 295 Análisis de la diversidad genética en cacao (*Theobroma cacao* L.) y pataxte (*T. bicolor* Humb. & Bonpl.) de los estados de Tabasco y Chiapas, México
Genetic diversity analysis in cocoa (*Theobroma cacao* L.) and pataxte (*T. bicolor* Humb. & Bonpl.) from Tabasco and Chiapas, Mexico
Fernanda Sarahi Hernández Montes | Guadalupe Concepción Rodríguez Castillejos | Guillermo Castañón Nájera | Octelina Ruiz Castillo | Christian Asur Christian Asur | Hernán Wenceslao Araujo Torres | Régulo Ruíz Salazar
- 311 Respuesta morfogénica de *Agave angustifolia* al gradiente auxina-citocinina durante el desarrollo de embriones somáticos indirectos
Morphogenetic response of *Agave angustifolia* to the auxin-cytokinin gradient during the development of indirect somatic embryos
Jesús-Ignacio Reyes-Díaz | Rosa María Nava-Becerril | Amaury-Martín Arzate-Fernández
- 329 Efecto del ácido salicílico en el incremento de biomasa y azúcares reductores en *Agave cupreata* y *Agave salmiana*
Effect of salicylic acid on increase of biomass and reducing sugars in *Agave cupreata* and *Agave salmiana*
Hilda Guadalupe GARCÍA NÚÑEZ | Amaury Martín Arzate-Fernández | Ana María Roque-Otero | Martín Rubí-Arriaga | Aurelio Domínguez-López
- 343 Contribución al conocimiento tradicional sobre el uso y manejo de los recursos vegetales en el municipio de Malinalco, Estado de México, México.
Contribution to traditional knowledge of plant resource use and management in Malinalco, State of Mexico, Mexico
Margarita Micaela Avila Uribe | Blanca Margarita Berdeja-Martínez | Ana María Mora-Rocha | Yajaira Cerón-Reyes | Karla Mariela Hernández-Sánchez | María Eugenia Ordorica Vargas | Lidia Cevallos-Villanueva
- 365 La agrobiodiversidad del agroecosistema traspatio como estrategia contra la pobreza extrema en Platón Sánchez, Veracruz, México
Agrobiodiversity in the backyard agroecosystem as a strategy against extreme poverty in Platon Sanchez, Veracruz, Mexico
Rubén Purroy-Vásquez | Gregorio Hernández-Salinas | Jorge Armida-Lozano | Alejandro Llaguno-Aguñaga | Karla Lissete Silva-Martínez | Nicolás Francisco Mateo-Díaz
- 385 Quelites entre cocineras tradicionales nahuas y totonacas de la Sierra Norte de Puebla, México
Quelites among nahua and totonac traditional cooks from the Northern Sierra of Puebla, Mexico
Victoria Ortiz-Trápala | Heike Vibrans | María Edelmira Linares-Mazari | Diego Flores-Sánchez
- 409 *Litsea glaucescens* y *Clinopodium macrostemon* recursos forestales no maderables en mercados tradicionales de los Valles Centrales de Oaxaca
Litsea glaucescens and *Clinopodium macrostemon* non-timber forest resources in traditional markets of the Central Valleys of Oaxaca
Domitila Jarquín-Rosales | Gisela Virginia Campos Angeles | Valentín José Reyes-Hernández | Salvador Lozano-Trejo | Juan José Alpuche-Osorno | Gerardo Rodríguez-Ortiz
- 427 Sistemas verticales rústicos para la producción de alimentos en espacios limitados: un aporte a la seguridad alimentaria familiar
Rustic vertical home gardens for food production in limited spaces: a contribution to household food security
Pablo Yax-Lopez | Kevin Manolo Noriega Elías | Jorge Rubén Sosof Vásquez
- 443 Orquídeas silvestres comercializadas en cinco mercados tradicionales de Oaxaca, México
Wild orchids sold in five traditional markets in Oaxaca, Mexico
María Hipólita Santos Escamilla | Gisela Virginia Campos Angeles | José Cruz Carrillo Rodríguez | Nancy Gabriela Molina Luna
- 457 Proceso artesanal de elaboración de jabón de corozo (*Attalea butyracea* (Mutis ex L.F.) Wess. Boer) en la región de la Chontalpa, Tabasco, México
Artisanal process of making corozo soap (*Attalea butyracea* (Mutis ex L.F.) Wess. Boer) in the Chontalpa region, Tabasco, Mexico
Elsa Chávez García
- 479 La comercialización de plantas del bosque tropical caducifolio y su importancia cultural en el centro de México
The commercialization of tropical deciduous forest plants and their cultural importance in central Mexico
Ofelia Sotelo Caro | Alejandro Flores Palacios | Susana Valencia Díaz | David Osvaldo Salinas Sánchez | Rodolfo Figueroa Brito

POLIBOTÁNICA

Núm. 61

ISSN electrónico: 2395-9525

Enero 2026

Portada



Sistema de cultivo vertical integrado por módulos contenedores uniformes que albergan diversas especies herbáceas y foliares. La disposición estratificada optimiza el uso del espacio y favorece la eficiencia en la captación de luz, mientras que la heterogeneidad morfológica de las plantas evidencia la plasticidad fenotípica asociada a condiciones de cultivo intensivo en ambientes urbanos. Este sistema representa una forma de infraestructura verde orientada a la producción vegetal sustentable y a la mejora microclimática en entornos metropolitanos.

BA vertical cultivation system composed of uniform container modules housing a variety of herbaceous and foliage plant species. The stratified arrangement optimizes space use and enhances light capture efficiency, while the morphological heterogeneity of the plants reflects phenotypic plasticity under intensive cultivation conditions in urban environments. This system represents a form of green infrastructure aimed at sustainable plant production and microclimate improvement in metropolitan settings.

por/by
Rafael Fernández Nava

REVISTA BOTÁNICA INTERNACIONAL DEL INSTITUTO POLITÉCNICO NACIONAL

EDITOR EN JEFE

Rafael Fernández Nava

EDITORA ASOCIADA

María de la Luz Arreguín Sánchez

COMITÉ EDITORIAL INTERNACIONAL

Christiane Anderson
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan, US

Delia Fernández González
Universidad de León
León, España

Heike Vibrans
Colegio de Postgraduados
Estado de México, México

José Angel Villarreal Quintanilla
Universidad Autónoma Agraria Antonio Narro
Saltillo, Coahuila, México

Hugo Cota Sánchez
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

Luis Gerardo Zepeda Vallejo
Instituto Politécnico Nacional
Ciudad de México, México

Fernando Chiang Cabrera
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Ciudad de México, México

Claude Sastre
Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle
Paris, Francia

Thomas F. Daniel
California Academy of Sciences
San Francisco, California, US

Mauricio Velayos Rodríguez
Real Jardín Botánico
Madrid, España

Francisco de Asis Dos Santos
Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana
Feira de Santana, Brasil

Noemí Waksman de Torres
Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León
Monterrey, NL, México

Carlos Fabián Vargas Mendoza
Instituto Politécnico Nacional
Ciudad de México, México

Julieta Carranza Velázquez
Universidad de Costa Rica
San Pedro, Costa Rica

José Luis Godínez Ortega
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Ciudad de México, México

Tom Wendt
University of Texas
Austin, Texas, US

José Manuel Rico Ordaz
Universidad de Oviedo
Oviedo, España

Edith V. Gómez Sosa
Instituto de Botánica Darwinion
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Edith V. Gómez Sosa
Instituto de Botánica Darwinion
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Juan Ramón Zapata Morales
Universidad de Guanajuato
Guanajuato, México

Jorge Llorente Bousquets
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Ciudad de México, México

DISEÑO Y FORMACIÓN ELECTRÓNICA

Luz Elena Tejeda Hernández

OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEM Y TECNOLOGÍAS DE LA INFORMACIÓN

Pedro Aráoz Palomino

POLIBOTÁNICA, revista botánica internacional del Instituto Politécnico Nacional, incluye exclusivamente artículos que representen los resultados de investigaciones originales en el área. Tiene una periodicidad de dos números al año, con distribución y Comité Editorial Internacional.

Todos los artículos enviados a la revista para su posible publicación son sometidos por lo menos a un par de árbitros, reconocidos especialistas nacionales o internacionales que los revisan y evalúan y son los que finalmente recomiendan la pertinencia o no de la publicación del artículo, cabe destacar que este es el medio con que contamos para cuidar el nivel y la calidad de los trabajos publicados.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS AUTORES PARA LA PUBLICACIÓN DE TRABAJOS

Se aceptarán aquellos originales que se ajusten a las prescripciones siguientes:

POLIBOTÁNICA incluye exclusivamente artículos que representen los resultados de investigaciones originales que no hayan sido publicados.

1. El autor deberá anexar una carta membretada y firmada dirigida al Editor, donde se presente el manuscrito, así como la indicación de que el trabajo es original e inédito, ya que no se aceptan trabajos publicados o presentados anterior o simultáneamente en otra revista, circunstancia que el autor(es) deberá declarar expresamente en la carta de presentación de su artículo.
2. Al quedar aceptado un trabajo, su autor no podrá ya enviarlo a ninguna otra revista nacional o extranjera.
3. Los artículos deberán estar escritos en español, inglés, francés o portugués. En el caso de estar escritos en otros idiomas diferentes al español, deberá incluirse un amplio resumen en este idioma.
4. Como parte de los requisitos del CONACYT, POLIBOTÁNICA ahora usa la plataforma del Open Journal System (OJS); para la gestión de los artículos sometidos a la misma. Así que le solicitamos de la manera más atenta sea tan amable de registrarse y enviar su artículo en la siguiente liga: www.polibotanica.mx/ojs/index.php/polibotanica
 - a) cargar el trabajo en archivo electrónico de office-word, no hay un máximo de páginas con las siguientes características:
 - b) en páginas tamaño carta, letra times new roman 12 puntos a doble espacio y 2 cm por margen
5. Las figuras, imágenes, gráficas del trabajo deben estar incluidas en el documento de Word original:
 - a) en formato jpg
 - b) con una resolución mínima de 300 dpi y un tamaño mínimo de 140 mm de ancho
 - c) las letras deben estar perfectamente legibles y contrastadas
6. Todo trabajo deberá ir encabezado por:
 - a) Un título tanto en español como en inglés que exprese claramente el problema a que se refiere. El formato para el título es: negritas, tamaño 14 y centrado;
 - b) El nombre del autor o autores, con sus iniciales correspondientes, sin expresión de títulos o grados académicos. El formato para los autores es: alineados a la izquierda, cada uno en un párrafo distinto y tamaño 12. Cada autor debe tener un número en formato superíndice indicando a qué afiliación pertenece;
 - c) La designación del laboratorio e institución donde se realizó el trabajo. La(s) afiliación(es) debe(n) estar abajo del grupo de autores. Cada afiliación deberá estar en un párrafo y tamaño

12. Al inicio de cada afiliación estará el número en superíndice que lo relaciona con uno o más autor/es.

d) El autor para correspondencia deberá estar en el siguiente párrafo, alineado a la izquierda, tamaño 12.

7. Todo trabajo deberá estar formado por los siguientes capítulos:

a) RESUMEN y ABSTRACT. Palabras clave y Key Words. El resumen debe venir después de la afiliación de los autores, alineado a la izquierda, tamaño 12. La palabra “Resumen: / Abstract:” debe venir en negritas y con dos puntos. El texto del resumen debe empezar en el párrafo siguiente, tamaño 12 y justificado. El texto “Palabras clave / Key Words:” debe venir en negritas seguido de dos puntos. Cada una de las palabras clave deben estar separadas por coma o punto y coma, finalizadas por punto.

b) INTRODUCCIÓN y MÉTODOS empleados. Cuando se trate de técnicas o métodos ya conocidos, solamente se les mencionará por la cita de la publicación original en la que se dieron a conocer. El formato para todas las secciones en esta lista es: negritas, tamaño 16 y centrado.

c) RESULTADOS obtenidos. Presentación acompañada del número necesario de gráficas, tablas, figuras o diagramas de tamaño muy cercano al que tendrá su reproducción impresa (19 x 14 cm).

d) DISCUSIÓN concisa de los resultados obtenidos, limitada a lo que sea original y a otros datos relacionados directamente y que se consideren nuevos.

e) CONCLUSIONES.

ESPECIFICACIONES DE FORMATO PARA EL CUERPO DEL TRABAJO

1. Secciones/Subtítulos de párrafo: Fuente tamaño 16, centrado, en negritas, con la primera letra en mayúscula.
2. Subsecciones/Subtítulos de párrafo secundarios : Fuente tamaño 14, centrado, en negritas, con la primera letra en mayúscula. Cuando existan subsecciones de subsección formatear en tamaño 13 negrita y centrado.
3. Cuerpo del texto: Fuente tamaño 12, justificado. NO debe haber saltos de línea entre párrafos.
4. Las notas de pie de página deben estar al final de cada página, fuente tamaño 12 justificadas.
5. Cita textual con mas de tres líneas: Fuente tamaño 12, margen izquierdo de 4 cm.
6. Título de imágenes: Fuente tamaño 12, centrado y en negritas, separado por dos puntos de su descripción. Descripción de las imágenes: tamaño 12.
7. Notas al pie de las imágenes: Fuente tamaño 12 y centradas con respecto a la imagen, la primera letra debe estar en mayúsculas.
8. Imágenes: deben estar en el cuerpo del texto, insertadas en formato png o jpg, a por lo menos 300 dpi de resolución y centradas. Las imagenes deben estar en línea con el texto. Se consideran imágenes: gráficos, cuadros, fotografías, diagramas y, en algunos casos, tablas y ecuaciones.
9. Tablas de tipo texto: El título de las columnas de las tablas debe estar en negritas y los datos del cuerpo de la tabla con fuente normal. Los nombres científicos deben estar en *italicas*. Se recomienda utilizar las Tablas como imágenes, estas deberán de ir centradas (a por lo menos 300 dpi de resolución).
10. Notas al pie de la tabla: Fuente tamaño 12 y centradas con respecto a la tabla, la primera letra debe estar en mayúsculas.
11. Ecuaciones pueden estar en Mathtype 1 o en imagen. En este último caso, seguir instrucciones del punto 8.
12. Citas del tipo autor y año deben estar entre paréntesis, con el apellido del autor seguido por el año (Souza, 2007), primera letra en mayúscula.

- 8. LITERATURA CITADA,** Se tomara como base el Estilo APA para las Referencias Bibliográficas, formada por las referencias mencionadas en el texto del trabajo y en orden alfabético. Es obligatorio utilizar Mendeley® (software bibliográfico). El propósito de utilizar este tipo de software es asegurar que los datos contenidos en las referencias están correctamente estructurados y corresponden a las citas del cuerpo del texto.

ESTRUCTURA Y FORMATO DE LOS AGRADECIMIENTOS Y REFERENCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

1. Los Agradecimientos deberán estar después de la última sección del cuerpo del texto. Esta información debe tener como título la palabra “Agradecimientos”, o su equivalente en otro idioma, en negritas, tamaño 12 y centrado. El texto de esta información debe estar en tamaño 12 justificado.
2. Las Referencias bibliográficas deben estar en orden alfabético sin salto de línea de párrafo, alineados a la izquierda, en tamaño 12.
3. Apéndices, anexos, glosarios y otros materiales deben incluirse después de las referencias bibliográficas. En caso de que estos materiales sean extensos deberán ser creados como archivos PDF.

9. REVISIÓN Y PUBLICACIÓN

Todos los artículos enviados a la revista para su posible publicación serán sometidos a una revisión “doble ciego”, se enviarán por lo menos a un par de árbitros, reconocidos especialistas nacionales o internacionales que los revisarán y evaluarán y serán los que finalmente recomienden la pertinencia o no de la publicación del artículo, cabe destacar que este es el medio con que contamos para cuidar el nivel y la calidad de los trabajos publicados.

Una vez aceptado el trabajo, se cobrarán al autor(es) \$299 por página más IVA, independientemente del número de fotografías que contenga.

PUBLICATION GUIDELINES

POLIBOTÁNICA, an international botanical journal supported by the National Polytechnic Institute, only publishes material resulting of original research in the botanic area. It has a periodicity of two issues per year with international distribution and an international Editorial Committee.

All articles submitted to POLIBOTÁNICA for publication are reviewed by at least a couple of referees. National or international recognized experts will evaluate all submitted materials in order to recommend the appropriateness or otherwise of a publication. Therefore, the quality of published papers in POLIBOTÁNICA is of the highest international standards.

FOR PUBLICATION OF ARTICLES

Originals that comply with the following requirements will be accepted:

1. POLIBOTÁNICA includes only items that represent the results of original research which have not been published. The author should attach an official and signed letter to Editor stating that the work is original and unpublished. We do not accept articles published or presented before or simultaneously in another journal, a fact that the author (s) must expressly declare in the letter.
2. When an article has been accepted, the author can no longer send it to a different national or foreign journal.
3. Articles should be written in Spanish, English, French or Portuguese. In the case of be written in

languages other than Spanish, it should include an abstract in English.

4. The article ought to be sent to the POLIBOTÁNICA's Open Journal System <http://www.polibotanica.mx/ojs> in an office-word file without a maximum number of pages with the following features:

a) on letter-size pages, Times New Roman font type, 12-point font size, double-spaced and 2 cm margin

5. The figures, images, graphics in the article must be attached as follows:

a) in jpg format

b) with a minimum resolution of 300 dpi and a minimum size of 140 mm wide

c) all characters must be legible and contrasted

6. All articles must include:

a) a title in both Spanish and English that clearly express the problem referred to. The format for this section is: bold, font size 14 and centered.;

b) the name of the author or authors, with their initials, no titles and no academic degrees. The format for this section is: font size 12, aligned to the left, each name in a different paragraph but without spaces in-between and a superscript number indicating the affiliation;

c) complete affiliations of all authors (including laboratory or research institution). The format for this section is: font size 12, aligned to the left, each name in a different paragraph but without spaces in-between and a superscript number at the beginning of the affiliation;

d) correspondence author should be in the next paragraph, font size 12 and aligned to the left.

7. All work should be composed of the following chapters:

a) RESUMEN and ABSTRACT. Palabras clave y Key Words. The format for this section is: bold, font size 12 and centered. Both words (RESUMEN: and ABSTRACT:) must include a colon, be in bold and aligned to the left. The body of the abstract must be justified and in font size 12. Both palabras clave: and keywords: must include a colon, be in bold and aligned to the left. Keywords must be separated by a comma or semicolon, must be justified and in font size 12.

b) INTRODUCTION y METHODS. In the case of techniques or methods that are already known, they were mentioned only by appointment of the original publication in which they were released.

c) RESULTS. Accompanied with presentation of the required number of graphs, tables, figures or diagrams very close to the size which will be printed (19 x 14 cm).

d) DISCUSSION. A concise discussion of the results obtained, limited to what is original and other related directly and considered new data.

e) CONCLUSIONS. The format for sections Introduction, Results, Discussion and Conclusions is: bold, font size 16 and centered.

FORMAT SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE BODY OF WORK

1. Sections: Font size 16, centered, bold, with the first letter capitalized.
2. Subsections / Secondary Subtitles: Font size 14, centered, bold, with the first letter capitalized. When there are second grade subsections format in size 13 bold and centered.
3. Body: Font size 12, justified. There should NOT be line breaks between paragraphs.
4. Footnotes should be at the bottom of each page, font size 12 and justified.
5. Textual quotation with more than three lines: Source size 12, left margin of 4 cm.
6. Image Title: Font size 12, centered and bold, separated by two points from its description. Description of the images: size 12.
7. Images Footnotes: Font size 12 and centered with respect to the image, the first letter must be in capital letters.
8. Images: must be in the body of the text, inserted in png or jpg format, at least 300 dpi resolution and centered. Images should be in line with the text. Graphs, charts, photographs, diagrams and, in some cases, tables and equations are considered images.
9. Text Tables: Only The title of the columns of the tables must be in bold. Scientific names must be in italics. It is recommended to use the Tables as images, they should be centered (at least 300 dpi resolution).
10. Footnotes: Font size 12 and centered with respect to the table, the first letter must be in upper case.
11. Equations can be in Mathtype 1 or in image. In the latter case, follow the instructions in point 8.
12. Quotations of the author and year type must be in parentheses, with the author's last name followed by the year (Souza, 2007), first letter in capital letters.

8. LITERATURE CITED. All references must be cited using the APA stile. POLIBOTÁNICA requires the use of Mendeley® (free reference manager) for the entire bibliography.

STRUCTURE AND FORMAT OF ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

1. Acknowledgments must be after the last section of the body of the text. This information should be titled the word "Acknowledgments", or its equivalent in another language, in bold, size 12 and centered. The text of this information must be in size 12 justified.
2. Bibliographical references should be in alphabetical order without paragraph line jump, aligned to the left, in size 12.
3. Appendices, annexes, glossaries and other materials should be included after the bibliographic references. If these materials are extensive they should be created as PDF files.

9. REVIEW AND PUBLICATION

All articles submitted to the journal for publication will undergo a review "double-blind", they will be sent at least a couple of referees, recognized national or international experts that reviewed and evaluated and will be finally recommended the relevance or the publication of the article, it is noteworthy that this is the means that we have to take care of the level and quality of published articles.

Once accepted the article, the author will be charged \$15 USD per text page, regardless of how many pictures it contains.

Toda correspondencia relacionada con la revista deberá ser dirigida a:

Dr. Rafael Fernández Nava
Editor en Jefe de

POLIBOTÁNICA

Departamento de Botánica
Escuela Nacional de Ciencias Biológicas, Instituto Politécnico Nacional
Apdo. Postal 17-564, CP 11410, Ciudad de México

Correo electrónico:
polibotanica@gmail.com
rfernand@ipn.mx

Dirección Web
http://www.polibotanica.mx

POLIBOTÁNICA es una revista indexada en:

CRMICYT - Sistema de Clasificación de Revistas Mexicanas de Ciencia y Tecnología

SciELO - Scientific Electronic Library Online.

Google Académico - Google Scholar.

DOAJ, Directorio de Revistas de Acceso Público.

Dialnet portal de difusión de la producción científica hispana.

REDIB Red Iberoamericana de Innovación y Conocimiento Científico.

LATINDEX, Sistema regional de información en línea para revistas científicas de América Latina, el Caribe, España y Portugal.

PERIODICA, Índice de Revistas Latinoamericanas en Ciencias.



**Ciencia y
Tecnología**

Secretaría de Ciencia, Humanidades,
Tecnología e Innovación



INSTITUTO POLITÉCNICO NACIONAL

Director General: *Dr. Arturo Reyes Sandoval*

Secretario General: *M. en C. Ismael Jaidar Monter*

Secretario Académico: *M. en E.N.A. María Isabel Rojas Ruíz*

Secretario de Innovación e Integración Social: *M.C.E. Yessica Gasca Castillo*

Secretario de Investigación y Posgrado: *Dra. Martha Leticia Vázquez González*

Secretario de Servicios Educativos: *Dr. Marco Antonio Sosa Palacios*

Secretario de Administración: *M. en C. Javier Tapia Santoyo*

Director de Educación Superior: *Lic. Tomás Huerta Hernández*

ESCUELA NACIONAL DE CIENCIAS BIOLÓGICAS

Director:

Dr. Isaac Juan Luna Romero

Subdirectora Académica:

Biol. Elizabeth Guarneros Banuelos

Jefe de la Sección de Estudios de Posgrado e Investigación:

Lic. Edgar Gregorio Cárcamo Villalobos

Subdirector de Servicios Educativos e Integración Social:

Biól. Gonzalo Galindo BecerriL

POLIBOTÁNICA, Año 30, No. 61, enero 2026, es una publicación semestral editada por el Instituto Politécnico Nacional, a través de la Escuela Nacional de Ciencias Biológicas. Unidad Profesional Lázaro Cárdenas, Prolongación de Carpio y Plan de Ayala s/n, Col. Santo Tomas C.P. 11340 Delegación Miguel Hidalgo México, D.F. Teléfono 57296000 ext. 62331. <http://www.herbario.encb.ipn.mx/>, Editor responsable: Rafael Fernández Nava. Reserva de Derechos al Uso Exclusivo del Título No. 04-2015-011309001300-203. ISSN impreso: 1405-2768, ISSN digital: 2395-9525, ambos otorgados por el Instituto Nacional del Derecho de Autor. Responsable de la última actualización de este número, Unidad de informática de la ENCB del IPN, Rafael Fernández Nava, Unidad Profesional Lázaro Cárdenas, Prolongación de Carpio y Plan de Ayala s/n, Col. Santo Tomas CP 11340 Delegación Miguel Hidalgo México, D.F.

Las opiniones expresadas por los autores no necesariamente reflejan la postura del editor de la publicación.

**Polibotánica**

ISSN electrónico: 2395-9525

polibotanica@gmail.com

Instituto Politécnico Nacional

México

<http://www.polibotanica.mx>

MEJORAS EN UN MÉTODO COMERCIAL DE EXTRACCIÓN DE ADN PARA OBTENER EXTRACTOS DE ÁCIDO NUCLEICO DE ALTA CALIDAD A PARTIR DE YEMAS VEGETATIVAS DE *Populus tremuloides* Michx.

IMPROVEMENTS TO A COMMERCIAL DNA EXTRACTION METHOD FOR HIGH-QUALITY NUCLEIC ACID EXTRACTIONS FROM *Populus tremuloides* Michx. VEGETATIVE BUDS

Gutierrez, C., M. Barraza Salas, I.M. Porth, C. WehenkelMEJORAS EN UN MÉTODO COMERCIAL DE EXTRACCIÓN DE ADN PARA OBTENER EXTRACTOS DE ÁCIDO NUCLEICO DE ALTA CALIDAD A PARTIR DE YEMAS VEGETATIVAS DE *Populus tremuloides* Michx.IMPROVEMENTS TO A COMMERCIAL DNA EXTRACTION METHOD FOR HIGH-QUALITY NUCLEIC ACID EXTRACTIONS FROM *Populus tremuloides* Michx. VEGETATIVE BUDS**Instituto Politécnico Nacional**

Núm. 61: 205-220 México. Enero 2026

DOI: 10.18387/polibotanica.61.12

Este es un artículo de acceso abierto bajo la licencia Creative Commons 4.0
Atribución-No Comercial (CC BY-NC 4.0 Internacional).

Mejoras en un método comercial de extracción de ADN para obtener extractos de ácido nucleico de alta calidad a partir de yemas vegetativas de *Populus tremuloides* Michx.

Improvements to a commercial DNA extraction method for high-quality nucleic acid extractions from *Populus tremuloides* Michx. vegetative buds

Cecilia Gutierrez, Marcelo Barraza Salas, Ilga Mercedes Porth, Christian Wehenkel

MEJORAS EN UN MÉTODO COMERCIAL DE EXTRACCIÓN DE ADN PARA OBTENER EXTRACTOS DE ÁCIDO NUCLEICO DE ALTA CALIDAD A PARTIR DE YEMAS VEGETATIVAS DE *Populus tremuloides* Michx.

IMPROVEMENTS TO A COMMERCIAL DNA EXTRACTION METHOD FOR HIGH-QUALITY NUCLEIC ACID EXTRACTIONS FROM *Populus tremuloides* Michx. VEGETATIVE BUDS

POLIBOTÁNICA

Instituto Politécnico Nacional

Núm. 61: 205-220. Enero 2026

DOI:
10.18387/polibotanica.61.12

Cecilia Nataly Gutiérrez-Contreras <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5827-7299>
Programa Institucional de Doctorado en Ciencias Agropecuarias y Forestales,
Universidad Juárez del Estado de Durango, Boulevard del Guadiana #501 Ciudad
Universitaria, CP 34160

Marcelo Barraza-Salas <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4076-4382>
Facultad de Ciencias Químicas, Universidad Juárez del Estado de Durango, González
de La Vega SN-SSERVIOS MULTIPLES, SARH, CP 34160

Ilga Mercedes Porth, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9344-6348>
Institut de biologie intégrative et des systèmes, Université Laval, Pavillon Charles-
Eugène Marchand, 10130 Avenue de la Médecine, G1V0A6
Quebec, Canada

Christian Wehenkel / wehenkel@ujed.mx 
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2341-5458>
Instituto de Silvicultura e Industria de la Madera,
Universidad Juárez del Estado de Durango,
Boulevard del Guadiana #501 Ciudad Universitaria, CP 34160

ABSTRACT: Quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) is a tree species of interest due to the potential discovery of an adaptive history in its genome, which is why the correct isolation of its DNA is essential. In this study, two extraction methods based on the NucleoSpin™ Plant II kit were investigated using vegetative buds from eight paired samples. Method 1 used buffer PL1, a homogenizer, and a 30-minute incubation with RNase; Method 2 employed buffer PL2, glass beads, and a 45-minute incubation with RNase. DNA quality and quantity were assessed by spectrophotometry, gel electrophoresis, and PCR amplification. A paired *t*-test revealed that Method 1 yielded a significantly higher DNA concentration than Method 2 (mean difference = 71.98 ng/μL; 95% CI 17.3–126.7; *p* = 0.017; *dz* = 1.10). In contrast, no significant differences in the 260/280 ratio were observed, either by the paired *t*-test (mean difference = 0.10; 95% CI -0.08–0.28; *p* = 0.219) or by the Wilcoxon signed-rank test (median difference = +0.02; 95% CI -0.01–0.295; *p* = 0.25). Method 1 produced higher yields but with DNA fragmentation visible on the gel, which may interfere with some analyses. Method 2 showed a lower concentration but slightly clearer bands on the gel, indicating better DNA integrity. PCR was successful in both cases, but the higher DNA integrity in Method 2 suggests that this method is more suitable for studies requiring intact DNA. Although Method 1 yields a larger amount, Method 2 is preferable when DNA integrity is critical for genomic analysis.

Key words: quaking aspen, isolation, PCR amplification, DNA integrity, genetics

RESUMEN: El álamo temblón (*Populus tremuloides*) es una especie arbórea de interés debido al potencial descubrimiento de una historia adaptativa en su genoma, por lo que el aislamiento correcto de su ADN resulta esencial. En este estudio se investigaron dos métodos de extracción basados en el kit NucleoSpin™ Plant II, utilizando yemas de

crecimiento de ocho muestras apareadas. El método 1 empleó el tampón PL1, un homogeneizador y una incubación de 30 minutos con RNasa; el método 2 utilizó el tampón PL2, perlas de vidrio y una incubación de 45 minutos con RNasa. La calidad y cantidad del ADN se evaluaron mediante espectrofotometría, electroforesis en gel y amplificación por PCR. Una prueba t apareada reveló que el método 1 produjo una concentración de ADN significativamente mayor que el método 2 (diferencia media = 71.98 ng/μL; IC 95%: 17.3–126.7; $p = 0.017$; $dz = 1.10$). En contraste, no se observaron diferencias significativas en la relación 260/280, ya fuera mediante la prueba t apareada (diferencia media = 0.10; IC 95%: -0.08–0.28; $p = 0.219$) o la prueba de rangos con signo de Wilcoxon (diferencia mediana = +0.02; IC 95%: -0.01–0.295; $p = 0.25$). El método 1 produjo mayores rendimientos, pero con fragmentación del ADN visible en el gel, lo que puede interferir en algunos análisis. El método 2 mostró una menor concentración, pero bandas ligeramente más definidas en el gel, lo que indica mejor integridad del ADN. La PCR fue exitosa en ambos casos, aunque la mayor integridad del ADN en el método 2 sugiere que este método es más adecuado para estudios que requieren ADN intacto. Aunque el método 1 genera una mayor cantidad, el método 2 es preferible cuando la integridad del ADN es crítica para el análisis genómico.

Palabras claves: álamo temblón, aislamiento, amplificación por PCR, integridad del ADN, genética

INTRODUCTION

DNA extraction is a critical step in molecular biology studies, particularly for species of ecological and evolutionary interest such as quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) (Goessen *et al.*, 2022). This species is widely distributed across North America, from Alaska to central Mexico, and plays a fundamental role in forest ecosystems due to its clonal reproduction and the presence of ancient DNA in some populations (Mittton & Grant, 1996; Mock *et al.*, 2008). Southern populations of *P. tremuloides*, particularly those in Mexico, have been hypothesized to represent relict lineages, remnants of ancient genetic diversity that have persisted in isolation following glacial retreats. These populations may harbor unique allelic combinations shaped by long-term climatic and geographic constraints, making them valuable for studying local adaptation and evolutionary history (Goessen *et al.*, 2022; Hernández-Velasco *et al.*, 2024).

Understanding its genetic composition requires high-quality DNA for applications such as PCR amplification, sequencing, and genomic analyses (Saiki *et al.*, 1988; Zhu *et al.*, 2020) as well as differentiation and hybridization studies in tree species (Sánchez-Hernández *et al.*, 2022; Wehenkel *et al.*, 2020). However, DNA extraction from plants is challenging due to the presence of secondary metabolites, polysaccharides, and phenolic compounds that can compromise DNA purity and integrity (Mitchell, *et al.*, 2023; Porebski *et al.*, 1997; Schenk *et al.*, 2023). In the case of *P. tremuloides*, it has been reported that modifications to commercial DNA extraction protocols are necessary (Goessen *et al.*, 2022).

To overcome these challenges, various DNA extraction protocols have been developed for *Populus*, with the cetyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB) method being one of the most commonly used, originally proposed by (Doyle & Doyle, 1990) and later modified (Qiu *et al.*, 2019; Zhou *et al.*, 2023). Additionally, commercial kits have been used for microsatellite analysis (Blonder *et al.*, 2020), and some studies have developed custom protocols based on phenol-chloroform extraction (Bagley *et al.*, 2020). The CTAB method is a cost-effective and widely used alternative, although its efficiency depends on the type of tissue and sample conditions (Schenk *et al.*, 2023). In contrast, commercial kits such as the Macherey-NagelTM Nucleo SpinTM Plant II offer standardized protocols with reagents designed to minimize contaminants. However, these kits may not always provide the highest DNA quality for all research applications (Méndez-Cea *et al.*, 2019; Shields *et al.*, 2013). In some cases, developing a custom protocol or adapting commercial procedures may be preferable (Jiao *et al.*, 2015).

This study compares two variations of the NucleoSpin™ Plant II kit protocol for DNA extraction from *P. tremuloides*, which differ in homogenization techniques and lysis buffers. The kit manual recommends homogenizing samples with liquid nitrogen or laboratory ball mills, resources that are not always available. In addition, it offers two alternative buffers for cell lysis (PL1 based on CTAB-based and Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate, SDS-based PL2), which have each different degrees of effectiveness depending on the properties of the plant tissue. Testing these options was therefore important in order to establish an optimized and accessible protocol for extracting DNA from buds of *P. tremuloides*.

The objective is to assess how these modifications impact DNA yield, purity (260/280 ratios), and fragment integrity, which are critical aspects for applications requiring high-quality DNA. Unlike previous studies that have compared multiple extraction methods (Verbylaite *et al.*, 2010), this study focuses on evaluating adjustments within a widely used commercial kit to determine whether these modifications can improve the quality of extracted DNA.

By analyzing DNA concentration, purity, and PCR amplification success, this study seeks to determine the suitability of these variations for genomic applications in *P. tremuloides*, thus contributing to the optimization of DNA extraction strategies for genetic and evolutionary studies of the species.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Samples studied and their genomic DNA extraction

In April 2022, vegetative buds were collected from three *P. tremuloides* trees in Santiago Papasquiaro, Durango, Mexico located at 25°1'40.5" Lat. N and 105°42'8.5" Long. W, at an elevation of 2568 m. The collected population is referred to as SAA, the number that follows indicates the sampled tree, and the orientation (north, south, east, west) indicates the position of the collected buds. The samples were transported in airtight bags for approximately eight hours and then stored at -18°C in a Daewoo refrigerator-freezer, model DFR-N141D, for eight months before being processed in the laboratory (due to restrictions on access to instruments and the laboratory). DNA was isolated using two adaptations of the Macherey-Nagel™ Nucleo Spin™ Plant II Mini kit protocol for plant DNA. By focusing on buds, we were therefore able to ensure both a high DNA yield and biological relevance for future epigenetic applications.

DNA isolation protocol

1. Homogenization of the sample and cell lysis

Variation Method 1

The Nucleo Spin™ Plant II manual recommends using up to 100 mg wet weight or 20 mg dry weight of plant tissue for DNA extraction. In this study, the lignified hull of the buds was removed, leaving the central part, which was weighed to an optimal 30-40 mg. Initial tests showed that sample weights below 20-30 mg or more than 40-50 mg resulted in lower DNA concentration and purity. The buds were ground in a mortar and placed in 1.5 mL microtubes.

An aliquot of 400 µL of lysis buffer PL1, containing CTAB (which was included as part of the prepared buffer in the NucleoSpin™ Plant II kit, Macherey-Nagel, Germany), was added to each sample. CTAB releases nucleic acids and forms an insoluble complex when NaCl concentration is reduced to ~0.5 M. Phenolic compounds, polysaccharides, and other contaminants are removed with the supernatant as they do not precipitate under these conditions (Ausubel *et al.*, 2003).

The samples and buffer were mixed in a vortex mixer (Vortex-Genie 2, Scientific Industries, Inc.) for one minute at maximum speed and shaking at approximately 3200 rpm. The mixture was then homogenized for 10 sec (D-160 DLAB® tissue homogenizer) and centrifuged (Legend Micro 21R, Centrifuge, Thermo Fisher Scientific, 2011, Germany) at 11000 rpm for two minutes. The aqueous phase was transferred to a new tube, and 10 µL of RNase (which was included as part of NucleoSpin™ Plant II kit, Macherey-Nagel, Germany) was then added to each sample. The RNase contained in the kit was prepared by addition of 600 µL of nuclease-free water and

incubation (Incubator H₂O Bath series, Sheldon Manufacturing, Inc., Shel Lab, USA) at 65 °C for 30 minutes.

Variation Method 2

For the second DNA extraction process, 6 to 8 sample buds, with a total weight of 30–40 mg, were used. The samples were ground in a mortar and placed in 1.5 mL microtubes. Five mg of 0.1 mm glass beads and 400 µL of PL2 lysis buffer (SDS-based, provided in the NucleoSpin™ Plant II kit, Macherey-Nagel, Germany) were added to each sample. SDS is an anionic detergent that solubilizes cell membranes and denatures proteins, facilitating the release of nucleic acids. The sample was mixed with the buffer and the glass beads in a vortex mixer (Vortex-Genie 2, Scientific Industries Inc.) for five minutes at maximum speed and shaking at approximately 3200 rpm. After centrifugation for two minutes, the aqueous phase was placed in a new 1.5 mL tube, avoiding the concentrated mass at the end of the tube, and 10 µL of RNase (previously prepared) was added to each sample.

The samples were incubated at 65 °C for 45 minutes (Incubator H₂O Bath series, Sheldon Manufacturing, Inc., Shel Lab, USA) and then allowed to cool for five minutes at room temperature, before 75 µL of PL3 buffer (protein precipitation buffer, potassium acetate-based, provided in the kit) was added. The mixtures were processed in the vortex mixer and incubated (Incubator H₂O Bath series, Sheldon Manufacturing, Inc., Shel Lab, USA) at -80 °C for five minutes. The samples were then left at room temperature to thaw.

2. Filtration, adjustment of DNA binding conditions, DNA binding to silica membrane

After incubation, the samples underwent a filtration and lysate clarification process using the violet column (supplied with the kit), followed by the addition of buffer PC under different conditions depending on the method:

Variation Method 1

The lysate was applied to the violet column and centrifuged at 13,000 rpm for two minutes. The column was discarded, and 450 µL of buffer PC (guanidine hydrochloride-based) was added directly to the clarified lysate in the collection tube. The mixture was gently vortexed for 5 seconds before proceeding to DNA binding on the silica column.

Variation Method 2

Thawed samples were also clarified using the violet column and centrifuged at 13,000 rpm for two minutes. In this case, the aqueous phase was transferred to a new tube, and 450 µL of buffer PC was added to the recovered supernatant. The mixture was vortexed briefly before being loaded onto the silica column for DNA binding.

Application of PC Buffer and Green Column:

In both methods, an aliquot of 450 µL of buffer PC (which was included as part of the buffers in the NucleoSpin™ Plant II kit, Macherey-Nagel, Germany) was then added to the tubes containing the samples. Buffer PC contains guanidine hydrochloride, which completely removes RNA, metabolites and other PCR inhibitors. The mixture was done by gently vortexing for 5 sec. The provided green column (NucleoSpin™ filter) was placed inside a 2 mL collection tube. Then, 700 µL of the sample mixed with PC buffer was added to this assembly. The tube was centrifuged at 13000 rpm for one minute. After centrifugation, the liquid was discarded, while the column, which includes the filter, was retained.

3. Washing and drying of the silica membrane

In both methods, the green column was washed three times:

1. Add 400 µL of PW1 buffer, centrifuge at 13000 rpm for one minute, discard the liquid.
2. Add 700 µL of PW2 buffer, centrifuge at 13000 rpm for one minute, discard the liquid. PW2 was prepared by adding 100 µL of 96-100 % ethanol. Keep the vial tightly closed to prevent evaporation.
3. Add 200 µL of PW2 buffer, centrifuge at 13000 rpm for two minutes, discard the fluid.

4. Eluting the DNA

The filter was placed in a new 1.5 mL microtube, and 30 µL of PE buffer with 13 µL of 1 mM EDTA (CTR scientific, México) was added to moisten the filter membrane. After incubating at

65 °C for five minutes, the tube was centrifuged at 13000 rpm for one minute. The filter was discarded, and the eluted DNA was stored at -20 °C. EDTA was added to the PE buffer to prevent DNA degradation by chelating Mg^{2+} ions needed by DNAases, as previous tests showed low DNA concentrations and 260/280 ratios below 1.8.

DNA quantification

The DNA was analyzed by spectrophotometry (in a NanoDrop 2000 spectrophotometer) to determine both the concentration ($ng\ \mu L^{-1}$) and the ratio of absorbance at 260 nm and 280 nm (260/280 ratio), an indicator of purity.

The electrophoresis system included an agarose gel prepared with 30 mL of 1X TAE, 0.3 g of standard electrophoresis agarose and 1 μL of ethidium bromide (EtBr). Aliquots of 3 μL of the samples were loaded using 3 μL of loading buffer, and a Promega brand of 10000 bp molecular size marker was added. Gels were visualized on a photodocumenter (ChemiDoc XRS+ from Bio-Rad) including Image Lab software (Bio-Rad Laboratories, 2017).

Statistical analysis

We analyzed $n = 8$ paired samples, each processed using Method 1 and Method 2, respectively. In this design, both methods were applied to the same biological unit, so each sample serves as its own control. This approach accounts for variability among trees and sampling positions, which would otherwise inflate error terms if methods were compared across independent groups. Since we did not generate technical replicates, the data structure consists of pairs rather than repeated measurements or factorial combinations; therefore, a paired comparison is the most appropriate statistical framework (McDonald, 2014). For each variable (DNA concentration and 260/280 ratio), we first tested the normality of the paired differences using the Shapiro–Wilk test. If the differences followed a normal distribution, we applied a paired t -test; otherwise, we used the Wilcoxon signed-rank test. For all tests, we reported two-sided p -values, 95% confidence intervals of the mean or median difference, and paired effect size (dz). Statistical analyses were performed in R Core Team, 2021.

Amplification of the protein tyrosine and serine/threonine kinase gene by PCR

After verifying the quality of the extracted DNA, the *AT3G09010* gene (encoding a protein tyrosine and serine/threonine kinase, PTK/PSK) was amplified, and a polymorphism was detected in Mexican *P. tremuloides*, identified as *Potrs00121211g02063* homologous to the *AT3G09010* gene (see more <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gene/820053>) (Goessen *et al.*, 2022). The following 5' to 3' primers were used to perform PCR for the amplification of 1,613 base pairs of the *PTK/PSK* gene: forward primer (Fwd-Potrs): GAACTGGTACCACATATCGTGCATAGAGAC, and reverse primer (Rev-Potrs): CCTGGAGCAGTGAGTAACTTGTCATTTAGCC. The Promega kit was used with a total reaction volume of 25 μL consisting of 5X buffer (5 μL), $MgCl_2$ (2 μL), dNTPs (0.25 μL), forward primer (0.25 μL), reverse primer (0.25 μL), Taq DNA polymerase (0.2 μL), DNA sample (1 μL), and nuclease-free water (16.05 μL).

The positive and negative controls, consisting of a previously analyzed DNA sample and nuclease-free water, were analyzed together with the prepared samples. PCR amplification was performed in a thermocycler under the following conditions: initial denaturation at 95°C for 1 minute, followed by 30 cycles at 95°C for 45 seconds, hybridization at 65°C for 45 seconds, and 72°C for 1 minute. A final extension was performed at 72°C for 5 minutes, and the reaction was kept at 4°C. During this process, the primers specifically bound to their complementary DNA sequences: the sense primer to the positive (+) strand and the antisense primer to the negative (–) strand.

Subsequently, the amplified fragments were visualized on agarose gel by using the same methodology described above. Gels were prepared with only three samples (SAA-9 South, SAA-9 West and SAA-5 South) for each method used (Method 1; Method 2), plus one positive and one negative marker.

RESULTS

DNA quantification

The DNA concentration and absorbance values for each sample are listed in Table 1. Normality was evaluated on the paired differences using the Shapiro–Wilk test. DNA concentration differences were normally distributed ($W = 0.92$, $p = 0.124$), whereas absorbance differences (260/280 ratio) were not ($W = 0.55$, $p < 0.001$). For DNA concentration, Method 1 yielded significantly higher values than Method 2 (mean paired difference = 71.98 ng/μL; 95% CI 17.3–126.7; $t(7) = 3.11$, $p = 0.017$; $d_z = 1.10$) (Figure 1). This pattern was consistent across all samples and is clearly illustrated in the paired difference plot (Figure 2).

Tabla 1. Concentración y absorbancia (relación 260/280) del ADN de cada muestra extraída con el método 1 y el método 2, según análisis espectrofotométrico (Nanodrop 2000).

Table 1. DNA concentration and absorbance (260/280 ratio) of each sample extracted with Method 1 and Method 2, according to spectrophotometric analysis (Nanodrop 2000).

Sample	Conc. (ng/μL) M1	Conc. (ng/μL) M2	260/280 M1	260/280 M2
SAA-10-east	124	74.8	1.83	1.86
SAA-10-north	56.4	13.5	1.91	1.89
SAA-5-west	122.3	91	1.86	1.84
SAA-5-south	160.6	48.4	1.91	1.89
SAA-9-east	106.5	90.7	1.91	1.92
SAA-9-north	66.6	56.2	1.88	1.28
SAA-9-west	199	86.4	1.79	1.8
SAA-9-south	268	66.6	1.93	1.72

Note: “Conc.” indicates DNA concentration (ng/μL). “260/280” indicates absorbance ratio (optimal values 1.8–1.9). Statistical comparisons were conducted with paired tests (paired t-test or Wilcoxon signed-rank test, depending on normality of paired differences).




Figure 1. DNA concentration (ng/μL) for each sample processed with Method 1 and Method 2. Lines connect paired observations from the same sample ($n = 8$). Colors denote individual samples.

Figura 1. Concentración de ADN (ng/μL) para cada muestra procesada con el método 1 y el método 2. Las líneas conectan observaciones apareadas de la misma muestra ($n = 8$). Los colores indican las muestras individuales.




Figure 2. Paired differences in DNA concentration (Method 1 – Method 2). Gray dots represent individual differences, colors indicate sample identity, and the blue marker with error bars represents the mean difference $\pm$ 95% CI. A dashed line marks zero difference.

Figura 2. Diferencias apareadas en la concentración de ADN (método 1 – método 2). Los puntos grises representan diferencias individuales, los colores indican la identidad de la muestra y el marcador azul con barras de error muestra la diferencia media $\pm$ IC95%. La línea discontinua indica diferencia cero.

In contrast, for the 260/280 ratio, no significant differences were observed between methods. A paired t-test suggested no difference (mean difference = 0.10; 95% CI -0.08 – 0.28 ; $p = 0.219$; Figure 3), and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test confirmed this result ($W = 9.0$, $p = 0.25$). The Hodges–Lehmann median difference was $+0.02$ with a 95% CI of -0.01 – 0.295 (Figure 5). Both analyses converge on the conclusion that DNA purity was equivalent between the two methods.




Figure 3. DNA purity (260/280 ratio) for each sample processed with Method 1 and Method 2. Lines connect paired observations from the same sample ($n = 8$). Colors denote individual samples.

Figura 3. Pureza del ADN (relación 260/280) para cada muestra procesada con el método 1 y el método 2. Las líneas conectan observaciones apareadas de la misma muestra ($n = 8$). Los colores indican las muestras individuales.




Figure 4. Paired differences in DNA purity (260/280 ratio, Method 1 – Method 2). Colored dots represent individual differences, and blue markers with error bars indicate central tendency estimates $\pm$ 95% CI. A) Mean difference (paired t-test). B) Hodges–Lehmann median difference (Wilcoxon signed-rank test). A dashed line marks zero difference.

Figura 4. Diferencias apareadas en la pureza del ADN (relación 260/280, método 1 – método 2). Los puntos coloreados representan diferencias individuales, y los marcadores azules con barras de error muestran las estimaciones de tendencia central $\pm$ IC95%. A) Diferencia media (prueba t apareada). B) Diferencia mediana de Hodges–Lehmann (prueba de rangos con signo de Wilcoxon). La línea discontinua indica diferencia cero.

The comparison between methods showed that method 1 yielded a statistically significant higher concentration of DNA than method 2. The 260/280 ratio was higher for Method 1 than for Method 2, but the difference was not statistically significant.

In addition, the products were visualized on agarose gels to corroborate the integrity of the DNA. For method 1, intense smearing is observed at the lower part of the gel (<500 bp), indicating that most of the extracted DNA is fragmented into very small sizes, while for method 2 bands are observed in the 500–3000 bp range, indicating the presence of slightly larger DNA fragments with less fragmentation compared to the first gel. (Figure 5 and 6).




Figure 5. Electrophoresis of DNA samples obtained using Method 1, with PL1 buffer, a tissue homogenizer and a 30 minutes incubation with RNase. In lane M the 10000 bp marker is observed, while lanes 1 to 8 show eight DNA samples with the absence of any bands.

Figura 5. Electroforesis de muestras de ADN obtenidas mediante el método 1, con tampón PL1, un homogeneizador de tejidos y una incubación de 30 minutos con ARNasa. En el carril M se observa el marcador de 10 000 pb, mientras que los carriles 1 a 8 muestran ocho muestras de ADN sin bandas.




Figure 6. Electrophoresis of DNA samples obtained using Method 2, with PL2 and PL3 buffer, glass beads and incubation for 45 min with RNase. In lane M the 10000 bp marker is observed, while lanes 1 to 8 show eight DNA samples with a well-defined band.

Figura 6. Electroforesis de muestras de ADN obtenidas mediante el método 2, con tampón PL2 y PL3, microesferas de vidrio e incubación durante 45 min con ARNasa. En la línea M se observa el marcador de 10 000 pb, mientras que las líneas 1 a 8 muestran ocho muestras de ADN con una banda bien definida.

Amplification of the protein tyrosine and serine/threonine kinase gene by PCR

The PCR results are shown in Figure 7. In lane C+, the positive control was observed with a band of the expected size of 1600 bp, and in lane C- no amplification band was observed, as expected. In lanes 1 to 4, amplification at 1600 bp of three samples obtained using method 1 was observed. In the subsequent lanes 5 to 8, three samples obtained using method 2 were visualized (all amplified at 1600 bp).




Figure 7. PCR amplification of three DNA samples obtained by each method. Lane M include the 10000 bp marker, C+, the positive control and C- the negative control. Lanes 1 to 4, include samples obtained using Method 1; lane 5 to 8 include samples obtained using Method 2. The DNA obtained by both methods was successfully amplified at 1600 bp.

Figura 7. Amplificación por PCR de tres muestras de ADN obtenidas con cada método. El carril M incluye el marcador de 10 000 pb, C+ el control positivo y C- el control negativo. Los carriles 1 a 4 incluyen muestras obtenidas con el método 1; los carriles 5 a 8 incluyen muestras obtenidas con el método 2. El ADN obtenido con ambos métodos se amplificó correctamente a 1600 pb.

DISCUSSION

Vegetative bud samples were selected for this study because they contain constantly dividing meristematic cells in which DNA synthesis is active and which yield larger amounts of genomic DNA compared to mature tissues. In *Populus*, different tissues were used for molecular studies depending on the research objective, including leaves for assessing fungi in litter and for speciation and evolutionary analyses (Li *et al.*, 2021; Yang & Vinatzer, 2021), as well as wood for studying secondary metabolites and nutrients (Birkemoe *et al.*, 2022).

According to the results of this study, in Method 1, the PL1 lysis buffer contained cetyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB), which is widely used in plant DNA extraction due to its ability to remove polysaccharides and yield high-purity DNA (Aboul-Maaty & Oraby, 2019; Rogers & Bendich, 1994). This method generated higher DNA concentrations, while 260/280 ratio values did not differ significantly between methods. However, agarose gel electrophoresis revealed the lack of a defined band for Method 1, despite NanoDrop 2000 results indicating high DNA concentration. The absence of a band may indicate DNA degradation, as degradation results in fluorescent smears instead of the defined bands observed in high-quality DNA samples (Crespo *et al.*, 1999) (Figures 5).

There are homogenization methods, such as the use of pestles, which break down the sample by friction against the tube wall, as well as abrasive materials like powdered glass or resins. In these cases, it is recommended to add a small amount of lysis buffer before starting the process to denature proteins and stabilize DNA (Alejos *et al.*, 2014). Mechanical disruption in Method 1 was performed using a manual homogenizer, however, excessive DNA fragmentation was observed, suggesting that cell lysis may have been too aggressive (Demkina *et al.*, 2023).

On the other hand, Method 2 used PL2 buffer (SDS-based), glass beads, and vortex homogenization. Although the DNA concentration obtained with this method was lower, agarose gel electrophoresis revealed relatively higher quality compared to Method 1, with bands that were more clearly defined and indicative of larger fragments. Nevertheless, some degree of degradation was still evident, suggesting that while Method 2 improved DNA integrity, it did not completely eliminate fragmentation (García-Godos & Cueva-Castillo, 2021) (Figures 1 and 6).

In this method, the use of SDS, which contains sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS), a detergent that facilitates membrane dissolution and the removal of proteins and polysaccharides (Dairawan & Shetty, 2020), while subsequent treatment with PL3 (a potassium acetate-based protein precipitation buffer) helped remove proteins and other contaminants. Protein precipitation with potassium acetate has been reported as an effective step to improve DNA purity by eliminating denatured proteins and residual polysaccharides (Chiong *et al.*, 2017). However, SDS-based extractions have also been reported to yield lower DNA quantities, so its use is recommended only in lysis buffer when an excess of secondary metabolites is present (Carey *et al.*, 2023). To mitigate these risks, its use in controlled concentrations, such as the 1% concentration suggested by (Kotchoni *et al.*, 2011), is recommended.

During the DNA extraction process, cell walls and membranes must be broken down in order to release cellular constituents and genetic material. This is usually done using detergents such as SDS, which solubilizes membranes and denatures proteins, and CTAB, which precipitates polysaccharides and removes secondary metabolites (Ausubel *et al.*, 2003). In fact, some protocols have reported that the combined use of SDS and CTAB can be particularly efficient for DNA extraction from difficult plant tissues, especially when liquid nitrogen or specialized homogenization equipment is not available (Ambawat *et al.*, 2020).

We assume that the original protocol of the NucleoSpin™ Plant II kit provides good results, as it has been successfully used in other genomic studies of *Populus* (Verbylaite *et al.*, 2010) (Scobeyeva *et al.*, 2018). Additionally, comparative studies in other plant systems, such as oilseed rape, have shown that DNA isolated with this kit is of comparable quality to that obtained with the classical Doyle and Doyle CTAB protocol (Dobrzycka *et al.*, 2014). This supports the reliability of the original kit protocol as a valid baseline for DNA extraction.

Comparing the results of this study with the CTAB protocol, some commercial kits have been observed to significantly reduce DNA extraction time by streamlining or simplifying steps such as nucleic acid precipitation and purification, thereby improving process efficiency (Scobeyeva *et al.*, 2018). In the NucleoSpin™ Plant II kit, for example, the addition of buffer PL3 (potassium acetate-based) promotes protein precipitation, while nucleic acids are efficiently bound to the silica membrane, replacing the traditional ethanol precipitation step used in CTAB protocols. Furthermore, modifications to the lysis and precipitation steps have overcome contamination problems, such as the formation of insoluble complexes between DNA and polysaccharides, which were reported in earlier studies (Rache-Cardenal *et al.*, 2022). Moreover, the use of CTAB- or SDS-based buffers, either separately or in combination, as described in some protocols, allows for sample processing without the need of specialized equipment or liquid nitrogen, which are costly and pose handling risks, as well as in processes such as lyophilization (Kotchoni & Gachomo, 2009; Sharma *et al.*, 2010). However, recent advances have led to the development of toxin-free methods that leverage the physicochemical properties of nucleic acids (El-Ashram *et al.*, 2016; Ueno *et al.*, 2024).

Using PCR, the DNA samples obtained with both methods were successfully amplified, producing a 1,600 bp fragment. Although Method 1 showed good spectrophotometric yields, gel electrophoresis results revealed lower DNA quality. This finding aligns with the report by (Abubakar *et al.*, 2021), who observed that DNA extracted with the NucleoSpin™ Plant II kit showed some degradation detected in electrophoresis, but without affecting PCR amplification. Additionally (Särkinen *et al.*, 2012), analyzed degraded plant DNA and concluded that DNA purity is a more critical factor than yield in predicting amplification success, emphasizing the need for extraction techniques that maximize DNA purity rather than just yield.

Interestingly, the amplified fragment corresponds to the *AT3G09010* gene, which encodes a protein tyrosine and serine/threonine kinase (PTK/PSK) and has previously been associated with a polymorphism specific to Mexican populations of *Populus tremuloides* (Goessen *et al.*, 2022). The successful amplification of this gene, even from partially degraded DNA, highlights its potential as a marker for understanding local adaptations in these populations. In this sense, the presence of this polymorphism underscores the biological importance of Mexican populations of *P. tremuloides*, which harbor unique genetic signatures that reflect their historical persistence under past climatic conditions.

CONCLUSION

This study compared two DNA extraction methods in *Populus tremuloides*, revealing significant differences in DNA concentration and integrity. Method 1, which used PL1 buffer (CTAB), a mechanical homogenizer, and a 30-minute RNase incubation, resulted in higher DNA concentrations but severe DNA fragmentation, with no significant differences in the 260/280 ratio compared to Method 2. In contrast, Method 2, which used the PL2 buffer (SDS), glass beads, an extended incubation time (45 minutes), and subsequent protein precipitation with PL3 (potassium acetate buffer), preserved DNA integrity better, as evidenced by more clearly defined fragments in electrophoresis.

Importantly, these findings demonstrate that modifications to commercial extraction protocols can lead to different outcomes in terms of DNA quantity and quality, highlighting the need to tailor protocols to both the available equipment and the downstream applications. Both methods enabled successful amplification of a 1600-bp fragment via PCR, confirming the suitability of the extracted DNA for molecular analyses. However, since DNA integrity is a key factor for sequencing applications and genetic and epigenetic studies in plants, Method 2 is considered the most suitable option for studies requiring high-quality DNA with minimal fragmentation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

When selecting a DNA extraction method, it is important to consider the available equipment and the sample homogenization process. The use of a mechanical homogenizer may be too aggressive for *P. tremuloides* bud tissues and may compromise DNA integrity. For studies requiring intact DNA, less invasive homogenization methods, such as with glass beads, may be preferable. In addition, the intended use of the extracted DNA should be taken into account when choosing a protocol. While higher DNA concentrations may be beneficial for some studies, DNA integrity is crucial for analyses involving sequencing or epigenetic studies. Our findings show that even small modifications to commercial protocols can substantially influence both DNA yield and quality, underscoring the importance of tailoring the protocol to specific research needs. The use of vegetative buds as study material also highlights the relevance of meristematic cells, which can provide valuable insights for genetic and epigenetic studies in trees. Finally, although this study focused on the 260/280 ratio as a standard indicator of DNA purity, it is also important to consider the 260/230 index in future studies as a complementary measure. Due to a lack of complete records, this parameter could not be systematically assessed here; however, we recommend its inclusion in future studies to enable a more comprehensive evaluation of DNA quality.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This material is based on work supported by Secretaría de Ciencia, Humanidades, Tecnología e Innovación – SECTIHTI (before CONAHCYT). Moreover, SECTIHTI provided financial support to Cecilia Nataly Gutiérrez-Contreras for her PhD studies.

REFERENCES

- Aboul-Maaty, N. A. F., & Oraby, H. A. S. (2019). Extraction of high-quality genomic DNA from different plant orders applying a modified CTAB-based method. *Bulletin of the National Research Centre*, 43, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42269-019-0066-1>
- Abubakar, B. M., Salleh, F. M., Wagiran, A., & Abba, M. (2021). Comparative evaluation of different DNA extraction methods from *E. longifolia* herbal medicinal product. *eFood*, 2(1), 21-26. <https://doi.org/10.2991/efood.k.210202.001>
- Alejos, V. L., Aragón, M. D. C., & Cornejo, R. A. (2014). *Extracción y purificación de ADN: herramientas moleculares aplicadas en ecología: Aspectos teóricos y prácticos*. SEMARNAT-INECC. [https://www2.congreso.gob.pe/sicr/cendocbib/con4_uibd.nsf/770DBBBD5ADF759505257D4900580FE6/\\$FILE/HerramientasMolecularesAplicadasEcolog%C3%ADa.pdf](https://www2.congreso.gob.pe/sicr/cendocbib/con4_uibd.nsf/770DBBBD5ADF759505257D4900580FE6/$FILE/HerramientasMolecularesAplicadasEcolog%C3%ADa.pdf)
- Ambawat, S., Singh, S., Satyavathi, C. T., Meena, R., Meena, R. C., & Khandelwal, V. (2020). Development of a high quality, rapid, efficient and economical DNA extraction protocol from climate resilient pearl millet crop without liquid nitrogen. *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change*, 10(12), 85-94. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijec/2020/v10i1230287>
- Ausubel, F. M., Brent, R., Kingston, R. E., Moore, D. D., Seidman, J. G., Smith, J. A., & Struhl, K. (2003). *Current protocols in molecular biology*. John Wiley & Sons Inc. <https://hoclai.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/current-protocols-in-molecular-biology.pdf>
- Bagley, J. C., Heming, N. M., Gutiérrez, E. E., Devisetty, U. K., Mock, K. E., Eckert, A. J., & Strauss, S. H. (2020). Genotyping-by-sequencing and ecological niche modeling illuminate phylogeography, admixture, and Pleistocene range dynamics in quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*). *Ecology and Evolution*, 10(11), 4609-4629.

- <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.6214>
- Birkemoe, T., Nybakken, L., Andelic, M., Tangnæs, M. J., Sverdrup-Thygeson, A., Kausrud, H., & Jacobsen, R. M. (2022). Secondary metabolites and nutrients explain fungal community composition in aspen wood. *Fungal Ecology*, 59, 101115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funeco.2022.101115>
- Blonder, B., Graae, B. J., Greer, B., Haagsma, M., Helsen, K., Kapás, R. E., & Strimbeck, R. (2020). Remote sensing of ploidy level in quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.). *Journal of Ecology*, 108(1), 175-188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13296>
- Carey, S. J., Becklund, L. E., Fabre, P. P., & Schenk, J. J. (2023). Optimizing the lysis step in CTAB DNA extractions of silica-dried and herbarium leaf tissues. *Applications in Plant Sciences*, 11(3), e11522. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aps3.11522>
- Chiong, K. T., Damaj, M. B., Padilla, C. S., Avila, C. A., Pant, S. R., Mandadi, K. K., Ramos, N. R., Carvalho, D. V., & Mirkov, T. E. (2017). *Reproducible genomic DNA preparation from diverse crop species for molecular genetic applications*. 13(106). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13007-017-0255-6>
- Crespo, A., Blanco, O., Cubero, O. F., Molina, M. C., & Cubas, P. (1999). Técnicas y métodos para la iniciación en el estudio de la evolución molecular con aplicaciones especiales para el análisis de los hongos liquenizados. *Bot Complut*, 23, 13-51. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/38807236.pdf>
- Dairawan, M., & Shetty, P. J. (2020). The evolution of DNA extraction methods. *American Journal of Biomedical Science and Research*, 8, 39-45. <https://doi.org/10.34297/ajbsr.2020.08.001234>
- Demkina, A., Slonova, D., Mamontov, V., Konovalova, O., Yurikova, D., Rogozhin, V., Belova, V., Korostin, D., Sutormin, D., & Severinov, K. (2023). Benchmarking DNA isolation methods for marine metagenomics. *Scientific Reports*, 13, 22138. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-48804-z>
- Dobrzycka, A., Olejnik, A., & Wolko, J. (2014). *A simple and rapid method of DNA isolation from oilseed rape plants*. 35, 59-70. <https://doi.org/10.5604/12338273.1137532>
- Doyle, J. J., & Doyle, J. L. (1990). Isolation of plant DNA from fresh tissue. *Focus*, 12, 13-15. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Adhityo_Wicaksono/post/Quick_Extraction_of_plant_DNA_does_anyone_have_protocol/attachment/59d642dcc49f478072eaba57/AS:273804717166592@1442291539148/download/Doyle%26Doyle_Focus_1990_CTAB.pdf
- El-Ashram, S., Al Nasr, I., & Suo, X. (2016). Nucleic acid protocols: Extraction and optimization. *Biotechnology Reports*, 12, 33-39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.btre.2016.10.001>
- García-Godos, P., & Cueva-Castillo, J. M. (2021). Variabilidad genética de 29 accesiones de quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd) peruana mediante marcadores AFLP y análisis multivariante. *Scientia Agropecuaria*, 12(1), 57-64. <https://doi.org/10.17268/sci.agropecu.2021.01.06>
- Goessen, R., Isabel, N., Wehenkel, C., Pavy, N., Tischenko, L., Touchette, L., Giguère, I., Gros-Louis, M. C., Laroche, J., & Boyle, B. (2022). Coping with environmental constraints: Geographically divergent adaptive evolution and germination plasticity in the transcontinental *Populus tremuloides*. *Plants People Planet*, 4(6), 638-654. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ppp3.10297>
- Jiao, L., Liu, X., Jiang, X., & Yin, Y. (2015). Extraction and amplification of DNA from aged and archaeological *Populus euphratica* wood for species identification. *Holzforschung*, 69(8), 925-931. <https://doi.org/10.1515/hf-2014-0128>
- Kotchoni, S. O., & Gachomo, E. W. (2009). A rapid and hazardous reagent-free protocol for genomic DNA extraction suitable for genetic studies in plants. *Molecular Biology Reports*, 36, 1633-1636. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11033-008-9362-9>
- Kotchoni, S. O., Gachomo, E. W., & Jimenez-Lopez, J. C. (2011). A plant cocktail amenable for PCR-based genetic analysis in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Molecular Biology Reports*, 38, 5281-5284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11033-011-0677-6>

- Li, J. L., Zhong, L. L., Wang, J., Ma, T., Mao, K. S., & Zhang, L. (2021). Genomic insights into speciation history and local adaptation of an alpine aspen in the Qinghai–Tibet Plateau and adjacent highlands. *Journal of Systematics and Evolution*, 59(6), 1220-1231. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jse.12864>
- McDonald J. H. (2014). *Handbook of Biological Statistics* (3.^a ed.). Sparky House Publishing. <https://www.biostathandbook.com/HandbookBioStatThird.pdf>
- Méndez-Cea, B., Cobo, I., Pérez, A., García, I., Linares, J., & Gallego, F. (2019). DNA extraction and amplification from Pinaceae dry wood. *Silvae Genetica*, 68(1), 55-57. <https://doi.org/10.2478/sg-2019-0010>
- Mitchell, N., McAssey, E. V., & Hodel, R. G. J. (2023). *Emerging methods in botanical DNA/RNA extraction*. 11(3), e11530. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aps3.11530>
- Mitton, J. B., & Grant, M. C. (1996). Genetic variation and the natural history of quaking aspen. *BioScience*, 46(1), 25-31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1312652>
- Mock, K. E., Rowe, C. A., Hooten, M. B., Dewoody, J., & Hipkins, V. D. (2008). Clonal dynamics in western North American aspen (*Populus tremuloides*). *Molecular Ecology*, 17(22), 4827-4844. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.03963.x>
- Porebski, S., Bailey, L. G., & Baum, B. R. (1997). Modification of a CTAB DNA extraction protocol for plants containing high polysaccharide and polyphenol components. *Plant Molecular Biology Reporter*, 15, 8-15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02772108>
- Qiu, D., Bai, S., Ma, J., Zhang, L., Shao, F., Zhang, K., Yang, Y., Sun, T., Huang, J., Zouh, Y., Galbraith, D., Wang, Z., & Sun, G. (2019). The genome of *Populus alba* x *Populus tremula* var. *Glandulosa* clone 84K. *DNA Research*, 26(5), 423-431. <https://doi.org/10.1093/dnares/dsz020>
- R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing* [Software]. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org>
- Rache-Cardenal, L. Y., Albesiano-Hoyos, A. S., & Tall, H. (2022). Optimización de un método de extracción de ADN utilizando Subepidermis de *Austrocylandropuntia* y *Opuntia-Opuntioideae*. *Revista de Investigación, Desarrollo e Innovación*, 12(2), 305-314. <https://doi.org/10.19053/20278306.v12.n2.2022.15273>
- Rogers, S. O., & Bendich, A. J. (1994). Extraction of total cellular DNA from plants, algae and fungi. En *Plant Molecular Biology Manual* (pp. 183-190). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0511-8_12
- Saiki, R. K., Gelfand, D. H., Stoffel, S., Scharf, S. J., Higuchi, R., Horn, G. T., Mullis, K. B., & Erlich, H. A. (1988). Primer-directed enzymatic amplification of DNA with a thermostable DNA polymerase. *Science*, 239(4839), 487-491. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.2448875>
- Sánchez-Hernández, R. S., Quiñones-Pérez, C. Z., Hernández-Díaz, J. C., Prieto-Ruiz, J. Á., & Wehenkel, C. (2022). Field trials to assess the growth, survival, and stomatal densities of five Mexican pine species and their hybrids under common plantation conditions. *Forests*, 13(11), 1791. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f13111791>
- Särkinen, T., Staats, M., Richardson, J. E., Cowan, R. S., & Bakker, F. T. (2012). How to open the treasure chest? Optimising DNA extraction from herbarium specimens. *PLoS ONE*, 7(8), e43808. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043808>
- Schenk, J. J., Becklund, L. E., Carey, S. J., & Fabre, P. P. (2023). What is the “modified” CTAB protocol? Characterizing modifications to the CTAB DNA extraction protocol. *Applications in Plant Sciences*, 11(3), e11517. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aps3.11517>
- Scobeyeva, V., Omelchenko, D., Dyakov, L., Konovalov, A., Speranskaya, A., & Krinitsina, A. (2018). Comparison of some plant DNA extraction methods. *Russian Journal of Genetics*, 54, 576-586. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1022795418050095>
- Sharma, P., Joshi, N., & Sharma, A. (2010). Isolation of genomic DNA from medicinal plants without liquid nitrogen. *Indian Journal of Experimental Biology*, 48, 610-614. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/47154477_Isolation_of_genomic_DNA_from_medicinal_plants_without_liquid_nitrogen

Recibido:
13/mayo/2025

Aceptado:
28/noviembre/2025

- Shields, J., Joo, J., Kim, R., & Murphy, H. (2013). Assessment of three commercial DNA extraction kits and a laboratory-developed method for detecting *Cryptosporidium* and *Cyclospora* in raspberry wash, basil wash and pesto. *Journal of Microbiological Methods*, 92(1), 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2012.11.001>
- Ueno, S., Ito, Y., Hasegawa, Y., & Moriguchi, Y. (2024). Developing simple DNA extraction and PCR-RFLP for MALE STERILITY 4 (MS4) gene in *Cryptomeria japonica* D. Don: Toward an environmentally friendly protocol. *Tree Genetics & Genomes*, 20(6), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11295-024-01682-6>
- Verbylaite, R., Beisys, P., Rimas, V., & Kuusiene, S. (2010). Comparison of ten DNA extraction protocols from wood of European aspen (*Populus tremula* L.). *Baltic Forestry*, 16(1), 35-42. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287677920_Comparison_of_Ten_DNA_Extraction_Protocols_from_Wood_of_European_Aspen_Populus_tremula_L
- Wehenkel, C., Mariscal-Lucero, S. R., González-Elizondo, M. S., Aguirre-Galindo, V. A., Fladung, M., & López-Sánchez, C. A. (2020). Tall *Pinus luzmariae* trees with genes from *P. herrerae*. *PeerJ*, 8, e8648. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.8648>
- Yang, S., & Vinatzer, B. A. (2021). Draft genome sequence of *Mortierella alpina* strain LL118, isolated from an Aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) leaf litter sample. *Microbiology Resource Announcements*, 10(47), e00864-21. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MRA.00864-21>
- Zhou, R., Jenkins, J. W., Zeng, Y., Shu, S., Jang, H., Harding, S. A., & Tsai, C. J. (2023). Haplotype-resolved genome assembly of *Populus tremula* × *P. alba* reveals aspen-specific megabase satellite DNA. *The Plant Journal*, 116(4), 1003-1017. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tpj.16454>
- Zhu, H., Zhang, H., Xu, Y., Laššáková, S., Korabečná, M., & Neužil, P. (2020). PCR past, present and future. *Biotechniques*, 69(4), 317-325. <https://doi.org/10.2144/btn-2020-0057>