

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 April 10th through April 23rd 2018

<i>Allium</i> sp./spp.	Allium; Onions; leeks; garlic	White rot (<i>Stromatinia cepivora</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Buxus</i> sp./spp.	Boxwood	Crown rot; Root rot; Stem rot (<i>Phytophthora</i> sp./spp.)	0	1	0	0
<i>Buxus</i> sp./spp.	Boxwood	High soil moisture (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Impatiens walleriana</i>	Double Impatiens	Acarid mites (Family Acaridae)	0	1	0	0
<i>Impatiens walleriana</i>	Double Impatiens	Cucumber mosaic (CMV) (Cucumovirus Cucumber Mosaic Virus)	0	1	0	0
<i>Impatiens walleriana</i>	Double Impatiens	Growth regulator effect (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Impatiens walleriana</i>	Double Impatiens	Impatiens necrotic spot (INSV) (Tospovirus Impatiens Necrotic Spot Virus)	0	1	0	0
<i>Impatiens walleriana</i>	Double Impatiens	Potyvirus Group (<i>Potyvirus</i> sp./spp.)	0	1	0	0
<i>Impatiens walleriana</i>	Double Impatiens	Tobacco mosaic (TMV) (Tobamovirus Tobacco Mosaic Virus)	0	1	0	0
<i>Impatiens walleriana</i>	Double Impatiens	Tomato spotted wilt (TSWV) (Tospovirus Tomato Spotted Wilt Virus)	0	1	0	0
<i>Lactuca sativa</i>	Lettuce	Unidentified bacteria (Unidentified Bacteria)	1	0	0	0
<i>Matthiola</i> sp./spp.	Stocks	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Matthiola</i> sp./spp.	Stocks	Nutritional pathology (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.

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>Origanum vulgare</i>	Oregano	Stem rot (<i>Botrytis</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Oryza sativa</i>	Rice	Fusarium root rot (<i>Fusarium fujikuroi</i>)	0	0	1	0
<i>Oryza sativa</i>	Rice	Unspecified pathology (<i>Fusarium</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Pelargonium</i> sp./spp.	Geranium (cultivated)	Arabis mosaic (ARMV) (Nepovirus Arabis Mosaic Virus)	0	2	0	0
<i>Pelargonium</i> sp./spp.	Geranium (cultivated)	Cucumber mosaic (CMV) (Cucumovirus Cucumber Mosaic Virus)	0	1	0	0
<i>Pelargonium</i> sp./spp.	Geranium (cultivated)	Pelargonium flower break (PFBV) (Alphacarmovirus Pelargonium Flower Break Virus)	1	1	0	0
<i>Pelargonium</i> sp./spp.	Geranium (cultivated)	Tobacco ringspot (TRSV) (Nepovirus Tobacco Ringspot Virus)	0	2	0	0
<i>Pelargonium</i> sp./spp.	Geranium (cultivated)	Tomato ringspot (ToRSV) (Nepovirus Tomato Ringspot Virus)	0	2	0	0
<i>Pelargonium</i> sp./spp.	Geranium (cultivated)	Tomato spotted wilt (TSWV) (Tospovirus Tomato Spotted Wilt Virus)	0	1	0	0
<i>Pelargonium</i> sp./spp.	Geranium (cultivated)	Botrytis blight (<i>Botrytis</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Pelargonium</i> sp./spp.	Geranium (cultivated)	Geranium bacterial wilt; Bacteria blight (<i>Xanthomonas hortorum (campestris) pv. pelargonii</i>)	0	1	0	0
<i>Pelargonium</i> sp./spp.	Geranium (cultivated)	Nutritional deficiency (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Picea pungens</i>	Blue Spruce	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	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.

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>Picea pungens</i>	Blue Spruce	Wound canker (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Pinus strobus</i>	Eastern White pine	High temperature damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Pinus strobus</i>	Eastern White pine	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	Pin Oak	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	Pin Oak	Transplant shock; Stress (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Quercus palustris</i>	Pin Oak	Wood boring insect damage (Unidentified Wood Boring Insect)	0	0	1	0
<i>Ranunculus</i> sp./spp.	Crowfoot; Buttercup	Impatiens necrotic spot (INSV) (Tospovirus Impatiens Necrotic Spot Virus)	0	1	0	0
<i>Ranunculus</i> sp./spp.	Crowfoot; Buttercup	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Ranunculus</i> sp./spp.	Crowfoot; Buttercup	Nutritional pathology (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Ranunculus</i> sp./spp.	Crowfoot; Buttercup	Tomato spotted wilt (TSWV) (Tospovirus Tomato Spotted Wilt Virus)	0	1	0	0
<i>Raphanus sativus</i>	Radish	Rhizoctonia root and stem rot (<i>Rhizoctonia solani</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Rosmarinus officinalis</i>	Rosemary	Stem rot (Botrytis sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Thuja</i> sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Thuja</i> sp./spp.	Arborvitae	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.

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>Thuja sp./spp.</i>	Arborvitae	Tip desiccation (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Trichilia emetica</i>	Natal Mahogany	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
<i>Trichilia emetica</i>	Natal Mahogany	Physiological responses (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Trichilia emetica</i>	Natal Mahogany	Unknown abiotic disorder (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.