## **Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic**

**Diagnostic Review Report** 

			<u> </u>				
Hos	t	Diagnosis			Confid (to ge		
Scientific Name	Common Name	This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have hence this section does not represent the total number of samples	e one or more diagnosis or identification;	Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive

Time Period Report for October 29 <sup>th</sup> through November 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2013							
Allium schoenoprasum	Chives	Stem and Bulb Nematode ( <i>Ditylenchus dipsaci</i> )	0	1	0	0	
Ilex opaca	American Holly	Black Root Rot (Thielaviopsis (Chalara) basicola (elegans))	1	0	0	0	
Ilex opaca	American Holly	Jelly Fungus ( <i>Tremella</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0	
Pinus thunbergiana	Japanese Black pine	Additional Sample Requested (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0	
Pinus thunbergiana	Japanese Black pine	Not Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0	
Quercus sp./spp. white	White Oaks	Insect Damage (Unidentified Insect)	0	0	2	0	
Quercus sp./spp. white	White Oaks	Jumping Bullet Gall Wasp (Neuroterus saltatorius)	0	0	2	0	
Quercus sp./spp. white	White Oaks	Leaf Spot ( <i>Tubakia dryina</i> )	2	0	0	0	
Quercus sp./spp. white	White Oaks	Powdery Mildew ( <i>Oidium</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0	

- Confirmed The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.
- Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.
- Suspected Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.
- Inconclusive Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.

## Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic

## **Diagnostic Review Report**

Hos	st	Diagnosis  This section reports samples from all statuses. Each sample may have one or more diagnosis or identification; hence this section does not represent the total number of samples		Confidence (to genus)				
Scientific Name	Common Name			Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive	
					1 -			
Quercus sp./spp. white	White Oaks	Root Damage (Abiotic disorder)		0	0	1	0	
Ulmus parvifolia	Chinese Elm	Bacterial Leaf Scorch (BLS) (Xylella fastidiosa (BLS))		1	0	0	0	
Viburnum sp./spp.	Viburnum	Environmental Stress; Problem (Abiotic disorder)		0	0	1	0	
Viburnum sp./spp.	Viburnum	No Pathogen Found (Identification Analysis)		1	0	0	0	

Confirmed - The diagnosis was derived using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations which allowed for the confirmation of the organism to Genus, species and/or race or pathovar level.

Not Detected -The sample was submitted as a suspect sample or as part of survey project. The pathogen was not detected on this sample at this time using approved molecular technologies, serological testing and/or morphological observations.

Suspected - Diagnostic symptoms of the pathogen were present but evidence of the pathogen could not be confirmed at this time. This term may also be used at the species level if confirmations cannot be made. This term may also be used with abiotic entries.

Inconclusive - Although a suitable sample was received, a reliable result could not be achieved. For example, the test kit may have not worked correctly and there was no sample material remaining to perform the test again. Or, no DNA was detected in a PCR analysis. Inhibitors may have been present in the sample. A second attempt may have been made with the same results. The only conclusion is to label the sample as inconclusive.