

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 | Erwinia amylovora | |
| Short description | Detection of E. amylovora by Loop mediated isothermal amplification in shoots and leaves | |
| Laboratory contact details | Bacteriology. Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Agrarias CV-315, km. 10.7, 46113 Moncada, Spain | |
| Date and reference of the validation report | 2012-03 - Not specified | |
| Validation process according to EPPO Standard PM 7/98: | Yes | |
| Reference of the test description | 0 Temple T. and Johnson K. (2011). Evaluation of loop mediated isothermal amplification for rapid detection of E. amylovora on pear and apple fruit flowers. Plant Disease 95:423-430. | |
| Is the test the same as described in the EPPO DP? | Yes | |
| Is the lab accredited for this test? | No | |
| Plant species tested (if relevant) | Several plant species from the Rosaceae family | |
| Matrices tested (if relevant) | Shoots, leaves | |
| | | |
| List of methods used | | |
| Method for extraction / isolation / baiting of target organism from matrix | | |
| Molecular methods, e.g. hybridization, PCR and real time PCR | X | Loop mediated isothermal amplification |
| 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? | 105-10 ⁶ CFU/mL plant extract after DNA extraction following Taylor et al (2001) (in the ring test 2010) | |
| <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 | Proportion of true positives/total number of samples: 0.45 (in samples from 1 to 10 ⁶ CFU/mL and healthy samples in ring test 2010). | |
| Specify the standard test | | |
| <u>Analytical specificity</u> | | |
| Specificity value | | |
| Number of strains/populations of target organisms tested | 10 strains: all positive | |
| Number of non-target organisms tested | 30 strains: all negative | |
| Cross reacts with (specify the species) | None | |
| <u>Diagnostic Specificity</u> | | |
| Proportion of uninfected/uninfested samples (true negatives) testing negative compared to results from a standard test | Proportion of true negatives/total number of samples: 0.83 (in samples from 1 to 10 ⁶ CFU/mL and healthy samples in ring test 2010). | |
| Specify the standard test | | |
| <u>Reproducibility</u> | | |
| Provide the calculated % of agreement for a given level of the pest (see PM 7/98) | 90% (when tested with different operators in IVIA) | |
| <u>Repeatability</u> | | |
| Provide the calculated % of agreement for a given level of the pest (see PM 7/98) | 96% in IVIA assays | |
| <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 | Recommended for analysis of symptomatic plants, for the low sensitivity and high specificity. Do not detect pEA29 free strains. | |
| <u>Other information</u> | | |
| Any other information considered | Recommended for analysis of symptomatic plants, for the low | |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| useful e.g. robustness, ease of performing the test, etc. | sensitivity and high specificity. Do not detect pEA29 free strains. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|