

| 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 February 5th through February 18th 2018

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Begonia</i> sp./spp. | Begonia | Bacterial blight (<i>Xanthomonas</i> sp./spp.) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Begonia</i> sp./spp. | Begonia | High soluble salt (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Beta vulgaris</i> | Garden Beet | Damping off; Root rot (<i>Phoma betae</i>) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| <i>Beta vulgaris</i> | Garden Beet | Rhizoctonia root; Crown rot (<i>Rhizoctonia</i> sp./spp.) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mixed species | Vegetables | Botrytis blight (<i>Botrytis</i> sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mixed species | Vegetables | Damping off; Root rot (<i>Phoma betae</i>) | 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) | Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Pelargonium</i> sp./spp. | Geranium (cultivated) | Oedema; Edema (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Petunia</i> sp./spp. hybrids | Petunias | Fungal pathogens (General) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Petunia</i> sp./spp. hybrids | Petunias | Impatiens necrotic spot (INSV) (Tospovirus Impatiens Necrotic Spot Virus) | 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>Petunia</i> sp./spp. hybrids | Petunias | Tomato spotted wilt (TSWV) (Tospovirus Tomato Spotted Wilt Virus) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Petunia</i> sp./spp. hybrids | Petunias | Unknown abiotic disorder (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Picea glauca</i> | White Spruce | Environmental stress; Problem (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Picea glauca</i> | White Spruce | Lichenicolous fungus (Various Fungi) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Picea glauca</i> | White Spruce | Unspecified pathology (<i>Rhizosphaera</i> sp./spp.) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Rhododendron</i> sp./spp. | Azalea; Rhododendron | Herbicide injury; Exposure (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Rhododendron</i> sp./spp. | Azalea; Rhododendron | No pathogen found (Identification Analysis) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Solanum tuberosum</i> | Potato | Black leg (<i>Pectobacterium parmentieri</i>) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Thuja</i> sp./spp. | Arborvitae | Armillaria root rot (<i>Armillaria</i> sp./spp.) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Thuja</i> sp./spp. | Arborvitae | Crown and root rot (<i>Phytophthora</i> sp./spp.) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>Thuja</i> sp./spp. | Arborvitae | High soil moisture (Abiotic disorder) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| <i>Thuja</i> sp./spp. | Arborvitae | Unspecified pathology (<i>Pestalotiopsis</i> sp./spp.) | 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.