

Supplementary data

Supplementary Table 1: Physiochemical measures of DNA extracted from the fixed and non-fixed *E. coli* cells based on averages of three replicates.

	Yield (ng)		pairwise t-test FDR adj. p-value	Integrity (DIN)		pairwise t-test FDR adj. p-value	Purity (260/280 ratio)		pairwise t-test FDR adj. p-value
	fixed	non-fixed		fixed	non-fixed		fixed	non-fixed	
Kit1	7120	6740	0.85	6.20	6.20	1	1.93	1.93	0.996
Kit2	7306.7	8113.3	0.72	5.63	5.67	0.91	1.90	1.93	0.996
Kit3	331.3	151.5	0.93	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Kit4	2060	3393.3	0.53	5.90	6.00	0.75	2.09	2.01	0.923
Kit5	4593.3	2813.3	0.39	7.17	7.07	0.75	1.97	2.01	0.996
Kit6	9766.7	10420	0.77	7.63	7.67	0.91	1.91	1.90	0.996
Kit7	2713.3	3953.3	0.56	6.47	6.80	0.27	2.00	2.00	0.996
Kit8	12373.3	11773.3	0.78	5.97	5.87	0.75	1.92	1.91	0.996

Supplementary Table 2: Physiochemical measures of DNA extracted from the NIBSC WC-Gut-RR before (average of three replicates) and after lyophilisation (average of five replicates)

	Yield (ng)		pairwise t-test FDR adj. p-value	Integrity (DIN)		pairwise t-test FDR adj. p-value	Purity (260/280 ratio)		pairwise t-test FDR adj. p-value
	Pre-lyo	Post-lyo		Pre-lyo	Post-lyo		Pre-lyo	Post-lyo	
Kit1	653	840	0.63	4.67	4.12	0.23	1.87	1.98	0.91
Kit2	655	799	0.73	4.93	4.28	0.17	1.89	1.69	0.65
Kit3	84	125	0.92	1.20	1.45	n/a	1.33	2	0.03
Kit4	883	1240	0.39	4.53	4.24	0.55	2.32	1.81	0.11
Kit5	499	628	0.79	4.53	3.35	0.01	2.04	1.96	0.91
Kit6	2187	2462	0.16	5.47	5.32	0.77	1.99	1.98	0.98
Kit7	382	555	0.66	5.55	4.84	0.18	1.58	1.81	0.60
Kit8	1677	1555	0.77	4.03	4.34	0.54	1.89	1.95	0.93

Supplementary Table 3: Technical specifications of the DNA extraction kits used. Steps included in the manufacturer's manual for each kit are indicated using the symbol "+" and steps not included are indicated with "-".

	Kit	Company	Specific for faeces	Beating Beads	Heat incubation	Cold incubation	Spin column purification	Filter after elution
Kit1	QIAamp PowerFecal DNA kit	Qiagen	+	+	+	+	+	-
Kit2	DNAeasyPowerSoil DNA Isolation Kit	Qiagen	-	+	-	+	+	-
Kit3	QIAamp Fast DNA stool Mini Kit	Qiagen	+	-	+	-	+	-
Kit4	ZymoBIOMICS DNA miniprep kit	Zymo Research	-	+	-	-	+	+
Kit5	GenElute™ Stool DNA Isolation Kit	Sigma-Aldrich	+	+	-	-	+	-
Kit6	FastDNA™ SPIN Kit for Soil	MP Biomedicals	-	+	-	-	+	-
Kit7	PureLink™ Microbiome DNA Purification Kit	Thermo Fisher Scientific	+	+	+	-	+	-
Kit8	DNeasy® PowerSoil® Pro Kit	Qiagen	-	+	-	-	+	-

Supplementary Table 4: Physiochemical measures of DNA extracted from the NIBSC WC-Gut-RR after lyophilisation; average based on five replicates and the Coefficient of Variation (CV%) of DNA Yield, DNA Integrity, DNA Purity.

Post-Lyophilisation							
Kit		Yield (ng)		Integrity (DIN)		Purity (260/280 ratio)	
		Average	CV%	Average	CV%	Average	CV%
QIAamp PowerFecal DNA kit	Kit1	840	11	4.12	1	1.98	7
Dneasy PowerSoil DNA Isolation Kit	Kit2	799	8	4.28	4	1.69	11
QIAamp Fast DNA stool Mini Kit	Kit3	125	13	1.45	15	2	31
ZymoBIOMICS DNA miniprep kit	Kit4	1240	9	4.24	4	1.81	3
GenElute™ Stool DNA Isolation Kit	Kit5	628	8	3.35	45	1.96	5
FastDNA™ SPIN Kit for Soil	Kit6	2462	10	5.32	1	1.98	2
PureLink Microbiome DNA Purification Kit	Kit7	555	17	4.84	15	1.81	14
DNeasy PowerSoil Pro Kit	Kit8	1555	3	4.34	2	1.95	2

Supplementary Table 5: FDR adjusted p-value calculated using the Kruskal-Wallis test, comparing the relative abundance of each strain in DNA-RR with those found in the WC-RR and of which DNA

Supplementary Table 7: FDR adjusted p-value calculated using Tukey HSD following ANOVA, comparing the relative abundance of Gram-negative bacteria, using DNA extracted from the different DNA extraction kits, analysed using Shotgun Sequencing and the MetaPIAn3 bioinformatics tool.

Tukey HSD following ANOVA, FDR adjusted p-value								
	DNA-Gut-Mix-RR	Kit1	Kit2	Kit3	Kit4	Kit5	Kit6	Kit7
Kit1	7.09E-10							
Kit2	5.91E-11	0.96						
Kit3	0	0	0					
Kit4	1.64E-13	0	0	0				
Kit5	0	0	0	0.13	0			
Kit6	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Kit7	2.79E-05	0	0	0	3.07E-08	0	0	
Kit8	1.38E-10	0	0	0	0.056	0	0	0.00038

Supplementary Table 8: FDR adjusted p-value calculated using the Kruskal-Wallis test, comparing the relative abundance of each strain in NIBSC DNA-Gut-Mix-RR with those found in the WC-RR and of which DNA extracted from each kit, FDR adjusted p-value > 0.05 is shown in bold. The data was analysed using 16S Amplicon Sequencing and the QIIME2 (Deblur) pipeline.

16S Amplicon Sequencing / QIIME2 – Deblur								
Taxonomy	Kit1	Kit2	Kit3	Kit4	Kit5	Kit6	Kit7	Kit8
<i>Akkermansia</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.456	0.029	0.029	0.205	0.486
<i>Alistipes</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.034	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.031
<i>Anaerostipes</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.034	0.297	0.192	0.031	0.031
<i>Bacteroides</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.034	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.031
<i>Bifidobacterium</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.456	0.029	0.029	0.486	0.655
<i>Blautia</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.034	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.031
<i>Clostridium</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.034	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.031
<i>Collinsella</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.034	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.031
<i>Escherichia</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.034	0.029	0.029	0.881	0.031
<i>Eubacterium</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.034	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.031
<i>Faecalibacterium</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.205	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.031
<i>Lactobacillus</i>	0.316	0.029	0.027	0.124	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.339
<i>Parabacteroides</i>	0.031	0.029	0.027	0.034	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.031
<i>Prevotella</i>	0.031	0.029	0.053	0.034	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.031
<i>Roseburia</i>	0.881	0.655	0.027	0.034	0.029	0.029	0.031	0.031
<i>Ruminococcus</i>	0.316	0.316	0.027	0.034	0.192	0.655	0.031	0.031

Supplementary Table 9: P-value calculated via PERMANOVA, comparing the b-diversity (Bray-Curtis matrix) of the samples. The data was generated using 16S Amplicon Sequencing and the QIIME2 (Deblur) pipeline.

PERMANOVA, p-value								
	DNA-Gut-Mix-RR	Kit1	Kit2	Kit3	Kit4	Kit5	Kit6	Kit7
Kit1	0.025							
Kit2	0.031	0.105						
Kit3	0.034	0.022	0.025					
Kit4	0.031	0.022	0.022	0.022				
Kit5	0.030	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022			
Kit6	0.025	0.022	0.024	0.022	0.022	0.022		
Kit7	0.03	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	
Kit8	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.545	0.022	0.022	0.022

Supplementary Table 10: FDR adjusted p-value calculated using Tukey HSD following ANOVA, comparing the relative abundance of Gram-negative bacteria, using DNA extracted from the different DNA extraction kits, analysed using Shotgun Sequencing and the MetaPIAn3 bioinformatics tool.

Tukey HSD following ANOVA, FDR adjusted p-value								
	DNA-Gut-Mix-RR	Kit1	Kit2	Kit3	Kit4	Kit5	Kit6	Kit7
Kit1	0.041							
Kit2	0.015	0.9999						
Kit3	0	0	0					
Kit4	8.15E-05	1.4E-10	4.45E-11	0				
Kit5	0	0	0	0.023	0			
Kit6	0	2.67E-13	8.02E-13	0.017	0	5.2E-07		
Kit7	1	0.0053	0.0014	0	1.38E-05	0	0	
Kit8	0.00074	1.32E-09	3.96E-10	0	0.993	0	0	0.00018

Supplementary Table 11: FDR adjusted p-value calculated using Tukey HSD following ANOVA, comparing the relative abundance of Gram-positive bacteria, using DNA extracted from the different DNA extraction kits, using five different mock communities; NIBSC WC-RR, ZYMO, ATCC-MSA 2002,

ATCC-MSA 2003, ATCC-MSA 2006. The data was generated using Shotgun Sequencing and the MetaPIAn3 bioinformatics tool.

NIBSC WC-RR				ZYMO		
	Kit2	Kit6	Kit7		Kit6	Kit7
DNA-Gut-Mix-RR	1	8.03E-05	0.000226	Kit2	0.073592	4.9E-13
Kit2		9.41E-05	0.000193	Kit6		1.01E-13
Kit6			3.6E-11			

ATCC-MSA 2002			ATCC-MSA 2003			ATCC-MSA 2006		
	Kit6	Kit7		Kit6	Kit7		Kit6	Kit7
Kit2	0.38887	3.01E-13	Kit2	0.977396	1.19E-06	Kit2	4.63E-05	1.04E-13
Kit6		1.02E-13	Kit6		7.19E-05	Kit6		1.35E-09

Supplementary Table 12: Composition of commercial reagents used in this study.

ATCC-MSA 2002		
Species	Composition (%)	Gram status
<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	5	-
<i>Actinomyces odontolyticus</i>	5	+
<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	5	+
<i>Bacteroides vulgatus</i>	5	-
<i>Bifidobacterium adolescentis</i>	5	+
<i>Clostridium beijerinckii</i>	5	+
<i>Cutibacterium acnes</i>	5	+
<i>Deinococcus radiodurans</i>	5	+
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	5	+
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	5	-
<i>Helicobacter pylori</i>	5	-
<i>Lactobacillus gasseri</i>	5	+
<i>Neisseria meningitidis</i>	5	-
<i>Porphyromonas gingivalis</i>	5	-
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	5	-
<i>Rhodobacter sphaeroides</i>	5	-
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	5	+
<i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i>	5	+
<i>Streptococcus agalactiae</i>	5	+
<i>Streptococcus mutans</i>	5	+
ATCC-MSA 2003		
Species	Composition (%)	Gram status
<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	10	+
<i>Bifidobacterium adolescentis</i>	10	+
<i>Clostridium beijerinckii</i>	10	+
<i>Deinococcus radiodurans</i>	10	+
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	10	+
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	10	-
<i>Lactobacillus gasseri</i>	10	+
<i>Rhodobacter sphaeroides</i>	10	-
<i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i>	10	+
<i>Streptococcus mutans</i>	10	+
ATCC-MSA 2006		
Species	Composition (%)	Gram status
<i>Bacteroides fragilis</i>	8.3	-
<i>Bacteroides vulgatus</i>	8.3	-
<i>Bifidobacterium adolescentis</i>	8.3	+
<i>Clostridioides difficile</i>	8.3	+
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	8.3	+
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	8.3	-
<i>Fusobacterium nucleatum</i>	8.3	-
<i>Helicobacter pylori</i>	8.3	-
<i>Lactobacillus plantarum</i>	8.3	+
<i>Salmonella enterica</i>	8.3	-
<i>Yersinia enterocolitica</i>	8.3	-
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>	8.3	-
ZYMO		
Species	Composition (%)	Gram status
<i>Bacillus intestinalis</i>	12	+
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	12	+
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	12	-
<i>Lactobacillus fermentum</i>	12	+
<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i>	12	+
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	12	-
<i>Salmonella enterica</i>	12	-
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	12	+