

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 June 22nd through July 5th, 2021

<i>Acer saccharum</i>	Sugar Maple	Discula anthracnose (<i>Discula</i> sp./spp.)	2	0	0	0
<i>Acer saccharum</i>	Sugar Maple	Leaf blister (<i>Taphrina</i> sp./spp.)	0	0	2	0
<i>Buxus</i> sp./spp.	Boxwood	Boxwood blight; Leaf and stem blight (<i>Calonectria pseudonaviculata</i>)	0	3	0	0
<i>Buxus</i> sp./spp.	Boxwood	Fusarium dieback (<i>Fusarium</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Buxus</i> sp./spp.	Boxwood	High soil moisture (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Buxus</i> sp./spp.	Boxwood	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Buxus</i> sp./spp.	Boxwood	Nutrient imbalance (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Buxus</i> sp./spp.	Boxwood	Unknown abiotic disorder (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	3	0
<i>Buxus</i> sp./spp.	Boxwood	Unspecified pathology (<i>Phomopsis</i> sp./spp.)	2	0	0	0
<i>Buxus</i> sp./spp.	Boxwood	Volutella leaf blight; Dieback (<i>Volutella</i> sp./spp.)	3	0	0	0
<i>Capsicum annuum</i>	Pepper	Fusarium wilt; Fusarium wilt complex (<i>Fusarium</i> sp./spp.)	0	0	1	0
<i>Capsicum annuum</i>	Pepper	Unspecified pathology (<i>Phoma</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	European Hornbeam	Crown and root rot (<i>Phytophthora</i> sp./spp.)	0	1	0	0
<i>Carpinus betulus</i>	European Hornbeam	Wood decay fungus (Unidentified Fungus)	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				
Conifers: Softwoods	Conifers: Softwoods	Non-pathogenic; Saprophyte (Secondary Agents; Saprophytes; Unspecif.)	1	0	0	0
Conifers: Softwoods	Conifers: Softwoods	Root damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
Cucurbita sp./spp.	Pumpkin	Cucumber bacterial soft rot (<i>Xanthomonas campestris</i> pv. <i>cucurbitae</i>)	0	0	1	0
<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>	American Beech	Leaf gall nematode (<i>Litylenchus crenatae</i>)	6	0	0	0
<i>Fagus</i> sp./spp.	Beech	Leaf gall nematode (<i>Litylenchus crenatae</i>)	6	3	0	0
<i>Glycine max</i>	Soybean	Rhizoctonia stem and root rot (<i>Rhizoctonia</i> sp./spp.)	0	0	1	0
<i>Glycine max</i>	Soybean	Unknown abiotic disorder (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Humulus lupulus</i>	Hops	Hop downy mildew (<i>Pseudoperonospora humuli</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	Sweetgum	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	Sweetgum	Root damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Magnolia acuminata</i>	Cucumber Tree	Phomopsis blight (<i>Phomopsis</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Picea abies</i>	Norway Spruce	Eastern spruce gall adelgid (<i>Adelges abietis</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Picea abies</i>	Norway Spruce	Eriophyid mites (Family Eriophyidae)	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 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	Confidence (to genus)			
Scientific Name	Common Name		Confirmed	Not Detected	Suspected	Inconclusive
<i>Picea abies</i>	Norway Spruce	Norway spruce shoot gall midge (<i>Piceacecis abietiperda</i>)	2	0	0	0
<i>Picea abies</i>	Norway Spruce	Spruce spider mite (<i>Oligonychus ununguis</i>)	1	0	1	0
<i>Picea abies</i>	Norway Spruce	Stigmina needle blight (<i>Stigmina lautii</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Picea glauca</i>	White Spruce	Eriophyid mites (Family Eriophyidae)	1	0	0	0
<i>Picea glauca</i>	White Spruce	Spruce spider mite (<i>Oligonychus ununguis</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Picea glauca</i>	White Spruce	Stigmina needle blight (<i>Stigmina lautii</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Picea pungens</i>	Blue Spruce	Eriophyid mites (Family Eriophyidae)	1	0	0	0
<i>Picea pungens</i>	Blue Spruce	Stigmina needle blight (<i>Stigmina lautii</i>)	1	0	0	0
<i>Pinus</i> sp./spp.	Pine	Branch canker (<i>Curreya pithyophila</i>)	0	0	1	0
<i>Pinus</i> sp./spp.	Pine	Scale insects (Order Homoptera)	0	0	1	0
<i>Pinus strobus</i>	Eastern White pine	No pathogen found (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
<i>Pinus strobus</i>	Eastern White pine	Root damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Pyrus</i> sp./spp.	Pear (ornamental)	Fungal hyperparasite (<i>Ampelomyces quisqualis</i>)	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
<i>Pyrus</i> sp./spp.	Pear (ornamental)	Pear rust mite (<i>Epitrimerus pyri</i>)	0	0	1	0
<i>Pyrus</i> sp./spp.	Pear (ornamental)	Powdery mildew (<i>Oidium</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Pyrus</i> sp./spp.	Pear (ornamental)	Rust (<i>Gymnosporangium</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Quercus</i> sp./spp.	Oak	Leaf blister (<i>Taphrina</i> sp./spp.)	0	1	0	0
<i>Quercus</i> sp./spp.	Oak	Oak shothole leafminer (<i>Agromyza viridula</i>)	0	0	1	0
<i>Raphanus</i> sp./spp.	Radish	Physarum slime mold (<i>Physarum</i> sp./spp.)	0	0	1	0
<i>Raphanus</i> sp./spp.	Radish	Slime mold (Class Myxogastria; Mycetozoa)	1	0	0	0
<i>Syringa</i> sp./spp.	Lilac	Cladosporium leaf spot (<i>Cladosporium</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Thuja</i> sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Additional sample requested (Identification Analysis)	1	0	0	0
<i>Thuja</i> sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Leaf spot (<i>Phyllosticta</i> sp./spp.)	0	0	1	0
<i>Thuja</i> sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Root damage (Abiotic disorder)	0	0	1	0
<i>Thuja</i> sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Spider mites (Family Tetranychidae)	0	0	1	0
<i>Thuja</i> sp./spp.	Arborvitae	Unspecified pathology (<i>Phomopsis</i> sp./spp.)	1	0	0	0
<i>Triticum</i> sp./spp.	Wheat	Eye spot; Foot rot (<i>Oculimacula yallundae</i>)	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>Ulmus americana</i>	American Elm	Dutch elm disease (<i>Ophiostoma</i> sp./spp.)	4	1	0	0
<i>Ulmus procera</i>	English Elm	Dutch elm disease (<i>Ophiostoma</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.