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

## **Diagnostic Review Report**

Time Period Report for April9 <sup>th</sup> through April 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2013					Confidence (to genus)			
Host		Diagnosis		cted	pə	sive		
Scientific Name	Common Name	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		Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive		
Abies balsamea	Balsam Fir	Not Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0 0 0				
Abies balsamea	Balsam Fir	er Mites (Family <i>Tetranychidae</i> )		0	1	0		
Abies fraseri	Fraser fir	Additional Sample Requested (Identification Analysis)  Cooley Spruce Gall Adelgid ( <i>Adelges cooleyi</i> )		0	0	0		
Picea pungens	Blue Spruce			0	0	0		
Picea pungens	Blue Spruce	Lichens (Lichenes)	1	0	0	0		
Picea pungens	Blue Spruce	Scale Insects (Order homoptera)		0	0	0		
Picea pungens	Blue Spruce	Spruce Needleminers (Endothenia; Epinotia sp./spp.)		0	0	0		
Picea pungens	Blue Spruce	Spruce Spider Mite (Oligonychus ununguis)		0	1	0		
Picea pungens	Blue Spruce	Stigmina Needle Blight ( <i>Stigmina lautii</i> )		0	0	0		
Pinus taeda	Loblolly Pine	Not Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)		0	0	0		
Pinus taeda	Loblolly Pine	Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	0 1 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.

Corrien on	versity i lant bisease biagnostic enine	Biagnostic Neview Neport		

Diagnostic Review Report

Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic

- 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.