# 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 |
| ***Time Period Report for September 27th through October 3rd, 2016*** | | | | | | |
| *Allium sativum* | Garlic | Skin blotch (*Alternaria (Embellisia) embellisia (alli*)) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Allium sativum* | Garlic | Eriophyid mites (Family Eriophyidae) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Allium sativum* | Garlic | Bulb mite (*Rhizoglyphus* sp./spp.) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Allium sativum* | Garlic | Stem and bulb nematode (*Ditylenchus dipsaci*) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| *Allium cepa* | Onion | Referred to specialist (Identification Analysis) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Allium cepa* | Onion | Unspecified pathology (*Botryti*s sp./spp.) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| *Buxus* sp./spp. | Boxwood | Fusarium canker (*Fusarium* sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Buxus* sp./spp. | Boxwood | Macrophoma blight; Dieback (*Macrophoma* sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Buxus* sp./spp. | Boxwood | Volutella leaf blight; Dieback *(Volutella* sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Hydrangea petiolans* | Hydrangea | Cultural/environmental problem (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Malus* sp./spp. | Crabapple | Unknown abiotic disorder (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Malus* sp./spp. | Crabapple | Fire blight (*Erwinia amylovora*) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Osmanthus fragrans* | Sweet Olive; tea olive | Not pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.) | 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

| 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 |
| *Osmanthus fragrans* | Sweet Olive; tea olive | Root damage (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Pinus strobus* | Eastern White pine | Not pathogen; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Pinus strobus* | Eastern White pine | Root damage (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Pinus strobus* | Eastern White pine | Woolly aphids (Family Aphididae; Adelgidae) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Prunus* sp./spp. | Flowering Cherry | Wood decay fungus (Unidentified Fungus) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Quercus alba* | White Oak | Gall wasps (Family Cynipidae) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Quercus alba* | White Oak | Oak twig canker and dieback (*Botryosphaeria quercuum*) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Rhus aromatica* | Fragrant Sumac | Dieback; Canker; Twig blight (*Botryosphaeria* sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Rhus aromatica* | Fragrant Sumac | Unknown abiotic disorder (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Rosa* sp./spp. | Rose | Growth regulator effect (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Rosa* sp./spp. | Rose | Referred to specialist (Identification Analysis) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Rubus* sp./spp. | Raspberry | Cultural/environmental problem (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Rubus* sp./spp. | Raspberry | 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 | Confirmed | Not Detected | Suspected | Inconclusive |
| *Solanum tuberosum* | Potato | Early blight; Leaf spot (*Alternaria solani*) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Solanum tuberosum* | Potato | Leaf scorch (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Syringa* sp./spp. | Lilac | High soluble salt (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Syringa* sp./spp. | Lilac | Powdery mildew (*Oidium* sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Tilia* sp./spp. | Basswood; Linden | Herbicide injury; Exposure (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Tilia* sp./spp. | Basswood; Linden | Moisture stress (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| *Tilia* sp./spp. | Basswood; Linden | Spider mite injury (Unidentified Spider Mite) | 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.