Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic

Charcoal Rot (*Macrophomina phaseolina*)

Dieback; Canker (Diplodia sp./spp.)

Root Damage (Abiotic disorder)

Root Damage (Abiotic disorder)

Unspecified Pathology (Colletotrichum sp./spp.)

Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder)

Unspecified Pathology (Phytophthora sp./spp.)

False Spider Mite (*Tenuipalpus* sp./spp.)

Dieback; Canker; Twig Blight (*Botryosphaeria* sp./spp.)

Tomato Spotted Wilt (Tomato Spotted Wilt Virus (TSWV))

Glycine max

Glycine max

Solanum

Solanum

melongena

melongena

Syringa sp./spp.

Syringa sp./spp.

Taxus sp./spp.

Taxus sp./spp.

Juniperus sp./spp.

Juniperus sp./spp.

Soybean

Soybean

Juniper

Juniper

Eggplant

Eggplant

Lilac

Lilac

Yew

Yew

Diagnostic Review Report

1 0

0 0

0

0

0

0

0

0 0

0

1

0

1

0

0

0

1

1

0

1

0

1

1

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

		•	•				
Host		Diagnosis		Confidence (to genus)			
Scientific Name	Common Name		Confirmed		Suspected	Inconclusive	
		Time Period Report for October 13th through Octobe	er 19 th , 2015				
Chrysanthemum sp./spp. hybrids	Chrysanthemum	Septoria Leaf Spot (<i>Septoria</i> sp./spp.)		0	0	1	0
Cryptomeria japonica	Japanese Cedar	Root Damage (Abiotic disorder)		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.

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		Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive	
Taxus sp./spp.	Yew	Unknown Abiotic Disorder (Abiotic disorder)		0	2	0	
Thuja sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Pestalotiopsis Needle Blight; Tip Blight (<i>Pestalotiopsis</i> sp./spp.)		0	0	0	
Thuja sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Root Damage (Abiotic disorder)		0	1	0	
Weigela sp./spp.	Weigela	Not Pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)		0	0	0	
Weigela sp./spp.	Weigela	Root Damage (Abiotic disorder)		0	1	0	
Weigela sp./spp.	Weigela	Unidentified Insect (Unidentified Insect)		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.