

EUROPEAN AND MEDITERRANEAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION EUROPEENNE ET MEDITERRANEENNE POUR LA PROTECTION DES PLANTES
(11-17239)

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.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Target Organism | Candidatus Phytoplasma prunorum - European stone fruit yellows (ESFY) phytoplasma | |
| Short description | Detection of 'Candidatus Phytoplasma prunorum' by real time PCR | |
| Laboratory contact details | Council for Agricultural Research and Economics– Research Centre for Plant Protection and Certification Via Carlo Giuseppe Bertero, 22, 00156 Rome, Italy | |
| Date and reference of the validation report | 2013 - 1) www.strateco.it 2)Pasquini et al., 2013. Petria 23(3),491-516 | |
| Validation process according to EPPO Standard PM 7/98: | Yes | |
| Reference of the test description | N/R -Baric S., J. Dalla-Via, 2004. A new approach to apple proliferation detection: a highly sensitive real-time PCR assay. Journal of Microbiological Methods, 57, 135-145. - Pignatta D., C. Poggi Pollini, L. Giunchedi, M. Gobber, P. Morelli, F. Forno, L. Martedì, E. Ropelato, 2008. A Real-time PCR assay for the detection of European stone fruit yellows phytoplasma (ESFYP) in plant propagation material. Acta Horticulturae, 781, 499-503 - Minguzzi i S., C. Ratti, C. Lanzoni, C. Rubies Autonell, N. Reggiani, C. Poggi Pollini, 2010. Detection and relative quantification of ‘Candidatus Phytoplasma prunorum’ by spot real-time RT-PCR TaqMan assay. Petria, 20 (2), 219-220; -Osman F., C. Leutenegger, D. Golino, A. Rowhani, 2007. Real-time RT-PCR (Taq-Man) assays for the detection of Grapevine leafroll associated virus 1-5 and 9. Journal of Virological Methods, 141, 22-29. - Pasquini G., Bertaccini A., Bianco P.A., Casati P., Costantini E., Martini M., Marzachì C., Palmano S., Paltrinieri S., 2013. Protocollo diagnostico per 'Candidatus Phytoplasma prunorum'. Petria 23 (3), 491-516 | |
| Is the test the same as described in the EPPO DP? | | |
| Is the lab accredited for this test? | No | |
| Plant species tested (if relevant) | apricot, plum, peach, apple and pear species | |
| Matrices tested (if relevant) | leaf midribs and bark | |
| | | |
| List of methods used | | |
| Method for extraction / isolation / baiting of target organism from matrix | X | Commercial kit (DNeasy Plant Mini kit Qiagen) from leaf midribs or phloem tissue, previously powdered with liquid nitrogen. An alternative protocol has |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | been used in the case of not availability of liquid nitrogen for the initial powdering of plant material. (Pasquini et al., 2013) |
| Molecular methods, e.g. hybridization, PCR and real time PCR | X | TaqMan real time PCR specific for the detection and identification of 'Ca. P. prunorum' and an internal control (18S gene) |
| Serological methods: IF, ELISA, Direct Tissue Blot Immuno Assay | | |
| Plating methods: selective isolation | | |
| Bioassay methods: selective enrichment in host plants, baiting, plant test and grafting. | | |
| Pathogenicity test | | |
| Fingerprint methods: protein profiling, fatty acid profiling & DNA profiling | | |
| Morphological and morphometrical methods intended for identification | | |
| Biochemical methods: e.g. enzyme electrophoresis, protein profiling | | |
| Other | | |
| <u>Analytical sensitivity (= limit of detection)</u> | | |
| What is smallest amount of target that can be detected reliably? | The analytical sensitivity was calculated analyzing three samples at seven dilution levels (1/1-1/1.000.000). The dilutions were in DNA from an healthy peach sample. Last dilution level with 100% positive results for all three samples: 1/1000 for bark samples collected in collected in early spring and 1/100 leaf midribs samples collected in late summer | |
| <u>Diagnostic sensitivity</u> | | |
| Proportion of infected/infested samples tested positive compared to results from the standard test , see appendix 2 of PM 7/98 | | |
| Specify the standard test | | |
| <u>Analytical specificity</u> | | |
| Specificity value | | |
| Number of strains/populations of target organisms tested | | |
| Number of non-target organisms tested | | |
| Cross reacts with (specify the species) | | |
| <u>Diagnostic Specificity</u> | | |
| Proportion of uninfected/uninfested samples (true negatives) testing negative compared to results from a | | |

| | |
|---|------|
| standard test | |
| Specify the standard test | |
| <u>Reproducibility</u> | |
| Provide the calculated % of agreement for a given level of the pest (see PM 7/98) | |
| <u>Repeatability</u> | |
| Provide the calculated % of agreement for a given level of the pest (see PM 7/98) | |
| <u>Test performance study</u> | |
| Test performance study? | Yes |
| Include brief details of the test performance study and its output. If available, provide a link to published article/report | ffff |
| <u>Other information</u> | |
| Any other information considered useful e.g. robustness, ease of performing the test, etc. | |