Astilbe japonica

Astilbe japonica

Astilbe

Astilbe

Diagnostic Review Report

1 0

0 0

0

1

0

0

| | Corneil | University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic | Diagnostic Review Report | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Host | | Diagnosis | | Confidence (to genus) | | | |
| Scientific Name | Common Name | 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 | | Confirmed | Not Detected | Suspected | Inconclusive |
| | | Time Period Report for July 29 th through August | 4 th , 2014 | | | | |
| Abies fraseri | Fraser Fir | Insect Damage (Unidentified Insect) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Abies fraseri | Fraser Fir | Insufficient Sample (Identification Analysis) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Abies fraseri | Fraser Fir | Not Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Abies fraseri | Fraser Fir | Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Allium cepa | Onion | Bacterial Blight (Xanthomonas axonopodis) | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Allium cepa | Onion | Stemphylium Leaf Spot (<i>Stemphylium</i> sp./spp.) | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Allium cepa | Onion | Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder) | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Amelanchier x grandiflora | Apple Serviceberry | Cytospora Canker; Dieback (Cytospora sp./spp.) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Astilbe japonica | Astilbe | Foliar Nematodes (Family Aphelenchoididae) | | 0 | 1 | 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 Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)

Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder)

- 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.

Diagnostic Review Report

| Host | | Diagnosis | | Confidence (to genus) | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|--|--|
| Scientific Name | Common Name | 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 | | |
| Capsicum sp./spp. | Pepper | Cucumber Mosaic (Cucumber Mosaic Virus (CMV)) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Capsicum sp./spp. | Pepper | Nutrient Imbalance (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Capsicum sp./spp. | Pepper | Tobacco Mosaic (Tobacco Mosaic Virus (TMV)) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Capsicum sp./spp. | Pepper | Bacterial Soft Rot (Unidentified Bacterium) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Capsicum sp./spp. | Pepper | No Pathogen Found (Identification Analysis) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Capsicum sp./spp. | Pepper | Sour Rot (Geotrichum sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Cornus kousa | Japanese Dogwood (kousa) | High Soil Moisture (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Cryptomeria sp./spp. | Cryptomeria | Pestalotiopsis Canker/ Dieback (<i>Pestalotiopsis</i> sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| <i>Cryptomeria</i> sp./spp. | Cryptomeria | Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Glycine max | Soybean | Additional Sample Requested (Identification Analysis) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Glycine max | Soybean | Soybean Brown Stem Rot (Cadophora (Phialophora) gregata) | 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.

Diagnostic Review Report

| Host | | Diagnosis | | Confidence (to genus) | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---|--------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--|
| Scientific Name | Common Name | 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 | | Confirmed | Not Detected | Suspected | Inconclusive | |
| Glycine max Soybean High Soil Moisture (Abiotic disorder) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | |
| Glycine max | Soybean | Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Glycine max | Soybean | Unspecified Pathology (<i>Phytophthora</i> sp./spp.) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Ilex x meserveae | Blue Holly | High Soil Moisture (Abiotic disorder) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Lactuca sativa | Lettuce | Aster Yellows Phytoplasma (Candidatus Phytoplasma asteris) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Lactuca sativa | Lettuce | Insect Damage (Unidentified Insect) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Lactuca sativa | Lettuce | Marginal Leaf Burn (Abiotic disorder) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Lactuca sativa | Lettuce | Bacterial Soft Rot (Unidentified Bacterium) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Lactuca sativa | Lettuce | Cucumber Mosaic (Cucumber Mosaic Virus (CMV)) | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| Lactuca sativa | Lettuce | Pythium Root and/or Crown Rot (<i>Pythium</i> sp./spp.) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Lactuca sativa | Lettuce | Tobacco Mosaic (Tobacco Mosaic Virus (TMV)) | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| Lycopersicon esculentum | Tomato | Alternaria Stem Canker (Alternaria alternata) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Lycopersicon esculentum | Tomato | Cladosporium Mold (Cladosporium 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.

Diagnostic Review Report

| Host | | Diagnosis Diagnostic Cliffe Diagnostic New Neport | | Confidence (to genus) | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|--|--|
| Scientific Name | Common Name | 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 | | |
| Picea sp./spp. | Spruce | Cytospora Canker; Dieback (<i>Cytospora</i> sp./spp.) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Picea sp./spp. | Spruce | Dieback; Canker (<i>Diplodia</i> sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Quercus sp./spp. | Red Oaks | Discula Anthracnose (<i>Discula</i> sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Picea sp./spp. | Spruce | Root Damage (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Picea sp./spp. | Spruce | Unspecified Pathology (<i>Rhizosphaera</i> sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Prunus sp./spp. | Plum | Stonefruit Bacterial Spot (Xanthomonas campestris pv. pruni) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Quercus sp./spp. | Red Oaks | Spider Mites (Family Tetranychidae) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Quercus sp./spp. | Red Oaks | Wood Decay Fungus (Unidentified Fungus) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Raphanus sativus | Radish | Downy Mildew (<i>Peronospora</i> sp./spp.) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Rhododendron sp./spp. | Rhododendron | Tomato Spotted Wilt (Tomato Spotted Wilt Virus (TSWV)) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Rhododendron sp./spp. | Rhododendron | Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 3 | 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.

Diagnostic Review Report

| Host | | Diagnosis | | Confidence (to genus) | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|--|--------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Scientific Name | Common Name | 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 | | Confirmed | Not Detected | Suspected | Inconclusive |
| Rubus sp./spp. | Raspberry | Additional Sample Requested (Identification Analysis) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rubus sp./spp. | Raspberry | Cultural/Environmental Problem (Abiotic disorder) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Rubus sp./spp. | Raspberry | Nutrient Imbalance (Abiotic disorder) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Taxus sp./spp. | Yew | Insect Damage (Unidentified Insect) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Taxus sp./spp. | Yew | Not Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif. | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Taxus sp./spp. | Yew | Wound Canker (Abiotic disorder) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Taxus sp./spp. | Yew | Crown Rot; Root Rot; Stem Rot (<i>Phytophthora</i> sp./spp.) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turfgrass mixed species | Turfgrass | Pythium Root and/or Crown Rot (<i>Pythium</i> sp./spp.) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turfgrass mixed species | Turfgrass | Anthracnose Basal Rot; Crown Rot (Colletotrichum sp./spp.) | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Vitis sp./spp. | Grape | Potassium Deficiency (Abiotic disorder) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Vitis sp./spp. | Grape | Spider Mites (Family Tetranychidae) | | 0 | 1 | 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.