

Host		Diagnosis	Confidence (to genus)			
Scientific Name	Common Name		Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive
		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				

Time Period Report for November 29th through December 12th 2016

<i>Allium cepa</i>	Onion	Damping off (<i>Fusarium oxysporum</i>)	0	0	1	0
<i>Allium cepa</i>	Onion	Unknown abiotic disorder (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Fagus sp./spp.</i>	Beech	Additional sample requested (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
<i>Fagus sp./spp.</i>	Beech	Wood decay fungus (Unidentified Fungus)	1	0	0	0
<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	Common Honeylocust	Mechanical damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	Common Honeylocust	Wood decay fungus (Unidentified Fungus)	1	0	0	0
<i>Helleborus sp./spp.</i>	Hellebore	Foliar nematodes (<i>Aphelenchoides sp./spp.</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Helleborus sp./spp.</i>	Hellebore	Hellebore black death (Carlavirus (HeNV))	0	0	1	0
<i>Helleborus sp./spp.</i>	Hellebore	Spring crimp (Foliar) nematode (<i>Aphelenchoides fragariae</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Picea omorika</i>	Serbian Spruce	Low pH; Nutrient imbalance (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Picea omorika</i>	Serbian Spruce	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
<i>Quercus phellos</i>	Willow Oak	Wood rot fungus; Dryadeus root rot (<i>Inonotus dryadeus</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	Northern Red oak	Oak wilt (<i>Ceratocystis fagacearum</i>)	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.

Host		Diagnosis	Confidence (to genus)			
Scientific Name	Common Name		Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive
		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				
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	Northern Red oak	Phytophthora canker (<i>Phytophthora</i> sp./spp.)	0	0	1	0
<i>Vitis</i> sp./spp.	Grape	Dieback; Canker; Twig blight (<i>Botryosphaeria</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Vitis</i> sp./spp.	Grape	Insect damage (Unidentified Insect)	1	0	0	0
<i>Vitis</i> sp./spp.	Grape	Sour rot (Multiple Pathogens)	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.