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

**Diagnostic Review Report** 

Host		Diagnosis		Confidence (to genus)			!
Scientific Name Con	mmon 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		onfirme	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive

Time Period Report for September 16 <sup>th</sup> through September 22 <sup>nd</sup> ,2014							
Brassica sp./spp.	ca sp./spp. Cole Crops Black Rot (Xanthomonas campestris)		1	0	0	0	
Buxus sp./spp.	Boxwood	Boxwood Blight; Leaf and Stem Blight (Calonectria (ana. Cylindrocladium) pseudonaviculata (pseudonaviculatum))	0	2	0	0	
Buxus sp./spp.	Boxwood	Boxwood Leafminer (Monarthropalpus flavus (buxi))	0	0	2	0	
Buxus sp./spp.	Boxwood	Boxwood Mite (Eurytetranychus buxi)	0	0	2	0	
Buxus sp./spp.	Boxwood	Boxwood Psyllid ( <i>Psylla buxi</i> )	0	0	2	0	
Buxus sp./spp.	Boxwood	High Soil Moisture (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0	
Chrysanthemum sp./spp. hybrids	Chrysanthemum	Chrysanthemum White Rust ( <i>Puccinia horiana</i> )	1	0	0	0	
Coriandrum sativum	Cilantro	Leaf Spot and Seed Decay ( <i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> pv. <i>coriandricola</i> )	1	0	0	0	
Fragaria x. ananassa	Strawberry	Leaf Scorch ( <i>Diplocarpon (ana. Marssonina) earlianum (fragariae</i> ))	0	0	1	0	
Fragaria x. ananassa	Strawberry	Powdery Mildew ( <i>Oidium</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0	
Fragaria x. ananassa	Strawberry	Strawberry Angular Leaf Spot; (Xanthomonas fragariae)	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.

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

**Diagnostic Review Report** 

Host		Diagnosis 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		Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive
Lycopersicon Tomato Cucumber Mosaic (Cucumber Mosaic Virus (CMV)) esculentum		0		0	0		
Lycopersicon esculentum	Tomato	Genetic Disorders (Abiotic disorder)		0	0	1	0
Lycopersicon esculentum	Tomato	Tomato Chlorosis (Tomato Chlorosis Virus (TOCV))		0	1	0	0
Lycopersicon esculentum	Tomato	Tomato Infectious Chlorosis (Tomato Infectious Chlorosis Virus)		0	1	0	0
Pinus densiflora umbraculifera	Tanyosho Pine	Beetles (Order coleoptera)		1	0	0	0
Pinus densiflora umbraculifera	Tanyosho Pine	Not Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)		1	0	0	0
Pinus densiflora umbraculifera	Tanyosho Pine	Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder)		0	0	1	0
Quercus sp./spp. red	Red Oaks	Phytophthora Canker ( <i>Phytophthora</i> sp./spp.)		0	1	0	0
Rhododendron sp./spp.	Azalea; Rhododendron	Aerial Stem Blight (Phytophthora sp./spp.)		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.

## Cornell 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
Rhododendron sp./spp.	Azalea; Rhododendron	Dieback; Canker; Twig Blight ( <i>Botryosphaeria</i> sp./spp.)		0	0	1	0
Rhododendron sp./spp.	Azalea; Rhododendron	Verticillium Wilt ( <i>Verticillium</i> sp./spp.)		0	1	0	0
Thuja sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Dieback; Canker (Seiridium sp./spp.)		1	0	0	0
<i>Thuja</i> sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Needle Dieback ( <i>Phyllosticta</i> sp./spp.)		1	0	0	0
<i>Thuja</i> sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Pestalotiopsis Dieback (Pestalotiopsis funerea)		1	0	0	0
Thuja sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder)		0	0	1	0
Ulmus sp./spp.	Elm	Anthracnose; Black Spot (Stegophora (Gnomonia) ulmea)		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.