Cornell University Plant Disease Diagnostic Clinic

Wound canker (Abiotic disorder)

Picea sp./spp.

Spruce

Diagnostic Review Report

0

1 0

0

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 April 16 th through April .	29 th 2019				
Buxus sp./spp.	Boxwood	Boxwood blight; Leaf and stem blight (Calonectria pseudonaviculata)		2	0	0	0
Calibrachoa sp./spp.	Million Bells	Black root rot (Thielaviopsis basicola)		0	1	0	0
Calibrachoa sp./spp.	Million Bells	Powdery mildew (<i>Oidium</i> sp./spp.)		1	0	0	0
Elettaria cardamomum	Malabar Cardamon	Unidentified virus (Unidentified Virus)		0	0	1	0
Ipomoea batatas	Sweetpotato	Oedema; Edema (Abiotic disorder)		0	0	1	0
Juniperus chinensis glauca	Blue Pfitzer juniper	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)		1	0	0	0
Juniperus chinensis glauca	Blue Pfitzer juniper	Root damage (Abiotic disorder)		0	0	1	0
Pachysandra sp./spp.	Pachysandra	Leaf and stem blight (Volutella pachysandrae)		1	0	0	0
Pachysandra sp./spp.	Pachysandra	Vinter injury (Abiotic disorder)		0	0	1	0
Picea sp./spp.	Spruce	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspe	cif.)	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		Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive	
Pinus monticola	Western White pine	Red band needle blight (Dothistroma septosporum)	1	0	0	0	
Pinus sp./spp.	Pine	Cenangium twig blight; Canker (Cenangium ferruginosum)	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.