**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** | Phyllosticta citricarpa | |
| **Short description** | Detection of Phyllosticta citricarpa by PCR (Bonants et al. 2003) | |
| **Laboratory contact details** | Council for Agricultural Research and Economics– Research Centre for Plant Protection and Certification<br>Via Carlo Giuseppe Bertero, 22, 00156 Rome, Italy | |
| **Date and reference of the validation report** | 2014-09-15 - | |
| **Validation process according to EPPO Standard PM 7/98:** | Yes | |
| **Reference of the test description** | 0<br>Bonants P.J.M., Caroll G.C., de Weerdt M., van Brouwershaven I.R.,Baayen R.P., 2003. Development and validation of a fast PCR-based method for pathogenic isolates of the citrus black spot fungus Guignardia citricarpa. European Journal of Plant Pathology, 109, 503–513. van Gent-Pelzer M.P.E,. van Brouwershaven I.R., Kox L.F.F., Bonants P.J.M., 2007. A Taqman PCR method for routine diagnosis of the quarantine fungus Guignardia citricarpa. Journal of Phytopathology, 155, 357–363. EPPO PM 7/17(2), 2009. Guignardia citricarpa. EPPO Bulletin, 39, 318–327. | |
| **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)** | Citrus lemon | |
| **Matrices tested (if relevant)** | Fungal mycelium, fruits | |
| | | |
| ***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 | PCR method |
| **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?** | 20 pg of DNA | |
| **<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** | 4 target strains for PCR | |
| **Number of non-target organisms tested** | 3 non-target strains (see validation report) | |
| **Cross reacts with (specify the species)** | No cross reaction | |
| **<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)** | 100% | |
| **<u>Repeatability</u>** | | |
| **Provide the calculated % of agreement for a given level of the pest (see PM 7/98)** | 100% | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Test performance study** | |
| **Test performance study?** | Yes |
| **Include brief details of the test performance study and its output.It available, provide a link to published article/report** | The robustness of the method was verified through a Test Performance Study among 7 laboratories. For each lab 6 positive samples (3 containing the target DNA slightly above the relative limit of detection and 3 containing the target DNA ten times the relative limit of detection) and 6 negative samples (3 containing no DNA and 3 containing DNA of non-target strains) were tested. The results showed:<br>-100% relative sensitivity<br>-100% relative specificity<br>-100% repeatability<br>-100% reproducibility |
| **Other information** | |
| **Any other information considered useful**<br>**e.g. robustness, ease of performing the test, etc.** | The verification of performance criteria did not give the same value as the limit of detection defined in the EPPO bulletin PM 7/17 (20 pg instead of 1pg), so a new validation was performed<br>See full report for details or contact lab1 |
| | |
| The following complementary files are available online: | • Validation process of the conventional PCR for the identification of Phyllosticta citricarpa (Bonants et al., 2003) |