

EUROPEAN AND MEDITERRANEAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION EUROPEENNE ET MEDITERRANEENNE POUR LA PROTECTION DES PLANTES
Summary sheet of validation data for a diagnostic test

The EPPO Standard PM 7/98 *Specific requirements for laboratories preparing accreditation for a plant pest diagnostic activity* describes how validation should be conducted. It also includes definitions of performance criteria.

Laboratory contact details	Council for Agricultural Research and Economics- Research Centre for Plant Protection and Certification Via Carlo Giuseppe Bertero, 22, 00156 Rome, Italy
Short description of the test	Detection of <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> subsp. <i>pauca</i> ceppo CoDiRo in plant olive extracts by real time PCR
Date, reference of the validation report	2015-10-28 - Loreti S., Pucci N., Loconsole G., Modesti V, Lucchesi S.,Potere O., Saponari M 2017. Protocollo Diagnostico per XYLELLA FASTIDIOSA subsp. PAUCA ceppo CoDiRO. In Protocolli Diagnostici - ASPROPI- ISBN 9788899595722.pp. 241-278
Validation process according to EPPO Standard PM7/98?	yes
Is the lab accredited for this test?	yes
Was the validated data generated in the framework of a project?	
If yes, please specify	
Description of the test	
Organism(s)	<i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> subsp. <i>pauca</i> (XYLEFP)
Detection / identification	detection
Matrix(ces) tested	Leaves leaves extracts
Plant species tested	<i>Olea europaea</i>
Method(s)	Molecular Extraction DNA RNA Molecular Extraction DNA RNA (2) Molecular real time PCR Molecular real time PCR (2) Molecular real time PCR (3)
Method: Molecular Extraction DNA RNA	
Reference of the test description	
As or adapted from an EPPO diagnostic protocol	no
New test being considered for inclusion in the next version of the EPPO diagnostic protocol?	
As or adapted from an IPPC diagnostic protocol	no

Reference of the test	DNA extraction of plant extracts by LoConsole et al 2015) (procedure B)
Is the test modified compared to the reference test	
Kit	
Is a kit used	
Other information	
Other details on the test	DNA extraction of plant extracts by LoConsole et al 2015) (procedure B)
Method: Molecular Extraction DNA RNA (2)	
Reference of the test description	
As or adapted from an EPPO diagnostic protocol	
New test being considered for inclusion in the next version of the EPPO diagnostic protocol?	
As or adapted from an IPPC diagnostic protocol	
Is the test modified compared to the reference test	
Kit	
Is a kit used	
Other information	
Other details on the test	DNA extraction from bacterial bacterial suspension
Method: Molecular real time PCR	
Reference of the test description	
As or adapted from an EPPO diagnostic protocol	no
New test being considered for inclusion in the next version of the EPPO diagnostic protocol?	
As or adapted from an IPPC diagnostic protocol	
Is the test modified compared to the reference test	
Kit	
Is a kit used	
Other information	
Reaction type	
Other details on the test	Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010 and Li et al. 2006
Method: Molecular real time PCR (2)	
Reference of the test description	

As or adapted from an EPPO diagnostic protocol	yes
New test being considered for inclusion in the next version of the EPPO diagnostic protocol?	
EPPO Diagnostic Protocol name	(version)
Name of the test	
As or adapted from an IPPC diagnostic protocol	
Is the test modified compared to the reference test	
Kit	
Is a kit used	
Other information	
Reaction type	
Other details on the test	Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010
Method: Molecular real time PCR (3)	
Reference of the test description	
As or adapted from an EPPO diagnostic protocol	yes
New test being considered for inclusion in the next version of the EPPO diagnostic protocol?	
EPPO Diagnostic Protocol name	(version)
Name of the test	
As or adapted from an IPPC diagnostic protocol	
Is the test modified compared to the reference test	
Kit	
Is a kit used	
Other information	
Reaction type	
Other details on the test	Real-time PCR following Francis et al., 2006
Are the performance characteristics included in the EPPO diagnostic protocol?	yes
Performance Criteria :	
Organism 1.:	Xylella fastidiosa subsp. pauca(XYLEFP)
Analytical sensitivity	
What is smallest amount of target that can be detected reliably?	Real-time PCR (Francis et al., 2006): 10^1 CFU/ml Real-time PCR (Harper et al., 2010): 10^2 CFU/ml
Diagnostic sensitivity	

Proportion of infected/infested samples tested positive compared to results from the standard test, see appendix 2 of PM 7/98	Real-time PCR (Francis et al., 2006): 90% Real-time PCR (Harper et al., 2010): 100% Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010 and Li et al. 2006: 100%
Standard test(s)	Real-time PCR following Francis et al., 2006 Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010 Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010 and Li et al. 2006
Analytical specificity - inclusivity	
Number of strains/populations of target organisms tested	Agrobacterium tumefaciens bv1 L.C.58 Agrobacterium tumefaciens bv2 AT 20 N5 Agrobacterium tumefaciens bv1 B6 Xanthomonas campestris pv. vesicatoria CREA-DC 1009 Xanthomonas arboricola pv. juglandis NCPPB 411 Xanthomonas arboricola pv. corylina NCPPB 935 Xanthomonas arboricola pv. pelargonii CREA-DC 1033 Xanthomonas arboricola pv. pelargonii CREA-DC 1040 Clavibacter michiganensis pv. michiganensis CREA-DC 1046 Pseudomonas savastanoi CREA-DC 1180 Pseudomonas syringae pv. syringae CREA-DC 1204 Pseudomonas syringae pv. syringae CREA-DC 1205 Pseudomonas marginalis pv. marginalis CREA-DC 1229 Pseudomonas marginalis pv. marginalis CREA-DC 1230 Pantoea agglomerans ISF 438 Xanthomonas campestris pv. citri CREA-DC 1264 Xanthomonas arboricola pv. juglandis CREA-DC 1300 Brenneria rubrifaciens NCPPB 2020 ^T Brenneria quercina NCPPB 1852 ^T Brenneria populi NCPPB 4249 ^T Ralstonia solanacearum NCPPB 325 ^T Xanthomonas arboricola pv. pruni IVIA-3287.1 Erwinia amylovora CREA-DC 208 Xanthomonas arboricola pv. celebensis NCPPB 1832 Xanthomonas campestris pv. populi NCPPB 2987 Xanthomonas arboricola Uni-Mo 279 Pantoea stewartii subsp. stewartii 2766 Pantoea stewartii subsp. stewartii 1788 Agrobacterium vitis CREA-DC 1822 Agrobacterium vitis CREA-DC 1824
Specificity value	
Analytical specificity - exclusivity	
Number of non-target organisms tested	35 non target organism tested belonging to the following species: Xanthomonas arboricola pv juglandis, Xanthomonas arboricola pv. pruni, Xanthomonas arboricola pv. corylina, Xanthomonas arboricola pv. fragariae, Xanthomonas arboricola pv. celebensis, X. campestris pv. campestris, X. campestris pv. populi, X. axonopodis pv. citri, X. hortorum pv. pelargonii, Pseudomonas savastanoi pv. savastanoi, P. marginalis, P. syringae pv. syringae, Brenneria rubrifaciens, B. quercina, B. salicis, B. populi, Pantoea stewartii, P. agglomerans, Erwinia amylovora, Agrobacterium tumefaciens, Rhizobium vitis
Specificity value	Real-time (Francis et al., 2006): X. arboricola pv. celebensis (NCPPB 1832) and Brenneria populi (NCPPB 4299 ^T) gave an amplification curve

	corresponding to melt peak values of respectively 87.5°C and 87°C (differently from <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> that have a melt peak at 84-85°C). <i>Pantoea agglomerans</i> (ISF 438), <i>B. quercina</i> (NCP PB 1852 ^T), <i>Pseudomonas marginalis</i> (CREA-PAV 1229), <i>X. hortorum</i> pv. <i>pelargonii</i> gave amplification curves with inconsistent melting peak. No amplification were obtained with the tested non-target organisms by real-time PCR of Harper et al., 2010
Cross reacts with	
Diagnostic Specificity	
Proportion of uninfected/uninfested samples (true negatives) testing negative compared to results from a standard test	Real-time PCR following Francis et al., 2006: 100% Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010: 97% Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010 and Li et al. 2006:100%
Specify the test(s)	Real-time PCR following Francis et al., 2006 Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010 Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010 and Li et al. 2006
Reproducibility	
Provide the calculated % of agreement for a given level of the pest (see PM 7/98)	(Concordance) Real-time PCR following Francis et al., 2006: 85 % Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010: 99% Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010 and Li et al. 2006: 100%
Repeatability	
Provide the calculated % of agreement for a given level of the pest (see PM 7/98)	(Accordance) Real-time PCR following Francis et al., 2006: 91% Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010: 99% Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010 and Li et al. 2006: 100%
Test performance study	
Test performance study?	yes
Brief details of the test performance study and its output. It available, link to published article/report	1. Two series of olive extracts spiked with ten fold dilution of <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> CODiRo strain suspensions from 10 ⁷ to 10 ³ cfu/ml plus two healthy samples (16 samples in total) were tested in three different laboratories (CREA-PAV; CNR-IPSP; Plant Protection Service Lombardy) (NTC, healthy and infected olive extracts as control) for analytical sensitivity. 2. To check the diagnostic sensitivity and specificity, the accuracy, the repeatability and reproducibility, olive extract samples spiked with <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i> CODiRo strain suspensions at 10 ⁶ cfu/ml (three repetitions), 10 ⁴ cfu/ml (three repetitions), 10 ³ cfu/ml (three repetitions), healthy olive extracts (three repetitions) for a total of 12 samples, were tested by the following TPS participants: 1. CREA-DC (N. Pucci; S. Loreti) 2. SELGE/CNR-IPSP/ DiSSPA-Uniba (M. Saponari, G. Loconsole; O. Potere) 3. PPS Piemonte (C. Morone, G. Mason) 4. PPS Friuli Venezia Giulia (G. Bianchi) 5. PPS Lombardia (F. Gaffuri) 6. PPS Emilia Romagna (A. Alessandrini; R. Gozzi) 7. PPS Trentino Alto Adige (V. Gualandri; L.

	<p>Tessari) 8. PPS Marche (S. Nardi; S. Talevi) 9. PPS Liguria (M. Guelfi) 10. CIHEAM-IAMB (A.M. D'Onghia; M. Digiario) 11. CRSFA (F. Palmisano) 12. Centro di Sperimentazione Agraria e Forestale, Laimburg (A. Gallmetzer;A. Kraus) 13. Uni-MI (P. Casati) 14. Uni-CT (V. Catara) 15. PPS Toscana (D. Rizzo) 16. PPS Veneto (A. Saccardi; D. Pasqua di Bisceglie) Olive extract samples spiked with Xylella fastidiosa CODiRo strain suspensions at 10⁶ cfu /ml (three repetitions), 10⁴ cfu /ml (three repetitions), 10³ cfu /ml (three repetitions), healthy olive extracts (three repetitions) for a total of 12 samples, were tested by the following TPS participants: 1. CREA-DC (N. Pucci; S. Loreti) 2. SELGE/CNR-IPSP/ DiSSPA-Uniba (M. Saponari, G. Loconsole; O. Potere) 3. PPS Piemonte (C. Morone, G. Mason) 4. PPS Friuli Venezia Giulia (G. Bianchi) 5. PPS Lombardia (F. Gaffuri) 6. PPS Emilia Romagna (A. Alessandrini; R. Gozzi) 7. PPS Trentino Alto Adige (V. Gualandri; L. Tessari) 8. PPS Marche (S. Nardi; S. Talevi) 9. PPS Liguria (M. Guelfi) 10. CIHEAM-IAMB (A.M. D'Onghia; M. Digiario) 11. CRSFA (F. Palmisano) 12. Centro di Sperimentazione Agraria e Forestale, Laimburg (A. Gallmetzer;A. Kraus) 13. Uni-MI (P. Casati) 14. Uni-CT (V. Catara) 15. PPS Toscana (D. Rizzo) 16. PPS Veneto (A. Saccardi; D. Pasqua di Bisceglie)</p>
<p>Other information</p>	
<p>Any other information considered useful</p>	<p>Accuracy Real-time PCR following Francis et al., 2006: 92% Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010: 100% Real-time PCR following Harper et al., 2010 and Li et al. 2006: 100% Validation was carried out by the Laboratories listed below, under the supervision of the reference laboratory CREA-PAV with the collaboration of CNR-IPSP: • CREA-PAV: Centro di Ricerca per la Patologia Vegetale CREA, Rome (Italy) • CNR-IPSP: Istituto per la Protezione Sostenibile delle Piante CNR, UOS Bari (Italy) • UNIBA: Dipartimento di Scienze del Suolo, della Pianta e degli Alimenti, Università degli Studi Aldo Moro, Bari (Italy); • Servizio Fitosanitario Regione Lombardia, Laboratorio Fitopatologico c/o Fondazione Minoprio 22070 Vertemate con Minoprio (CO) Italy</p>

Creation date: 2015-10-28 00:00:00 - Last update: 2021-05-04 22:35:54