

**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 mali' - Apple proliferation<br>Phytoplasma  |  |
| Short description  | Detection of 'Candidatus Phytoplasma mali' by direct and nested PCR   |  |
| 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                                | 2013 - 1) www. strateco.it 2)Pasquini et al., Petria 23(3), 461-490   |  |
| Validation process according to EPPO Standard PM 7/98:                     | Yes   |  |
| Reference of the test description  | N/R<br>- Deng S., C. Hiruki, 1991. Amplification of 16S rRNA genes from culturable and nonculturable mollicutes. J. Microbiol. Methods, 14, 53-61. - Lee I.M., M. Martini, C. Marcone, S.F. Zhu, 2004. Classification of phytoplasma strains in the elm yellows group (16SrV) and proposal of ‘Candidatus Phytoplasma ulmi’ for the phytoplasma associated with elm yellows. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol, 54, 337-347. - Lorenz K.H., B. Schneider, U. Ahrens, E. Seemuller, 1995. Detection of the apple proliferation and pear decline phytoplasmas by PCR amplification of ribosomal and nonribosomal DNA. Phytopathology, 85, 771-776. - Pasquini G., Ferretti L., Bertaccini A., Bianco P.A., Casati P., Costantini E., Martini M., Marzachì C., Palmano S., Paltrinieri S., 2013. Protocollo diagnostico per 'Candidatus Phytoplasma mali' (AP). Petria, 23 (3), 461-490. |  |
| Is the test the same as described in the EPPO DP?                          |   |  |
| Is the lab accredited for this test?                                       | No  |  |
| Plant species tested (if relevant)   | Apple, pear and plum species  |  |
| Matrices tested (if relevant)  | leaf midribs and phloem tissue  |  |
|  |   |  |
| 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.<br>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)   |
| <b>Molecular methods, e.g. hybridization, PCR and real time PCR</b>   | X   | Direct universal PCR with primers P1(Deng and Hiruki, 1991)/16S-Sr (Lee et al., 2004), followed by a nested 16SrX group specific with primers fO1/rO1 (Lorenz et al., 1995) |
| <b>Serological methods: IF, ELISA, Direct Tissue Blot Immuno Assay</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Plating methods: selective isolation</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Bioassay methods: selective enrichment in host plants, baiting, plant test and grafting.</b>                                       |   |   |
| <b>Pathogenicity test</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Fingerprint methods: protein profiling, fatty acid profiling &amp; DNA profiling</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Morphological and morphometrical methods intended for identification</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Biochemical methods: e.g. enzyme electrophoresis, protein profiling</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Other</b>  |   |   |
| <b>Analytical sensitivity (= limit of detection)</b>  |   |   |
| <b>What is smallest amount of target that can be detected reliably?</b>   | 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 apple sample. Last dilution level with 100% positive results for all three samples: 1/1000  |   |
| <b>Diagnostic sensitivity</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Proportion of infected/infested samples tested positive compared to results from the standard test , see appendix 2 of PM 7/98</b> | 23 'target' samples: 20 apple samples infected by 'Ca. P. mali' coming from different Italian areas, 2 plum samples infected by 'Candidatus Phytoplasma prunorum' (ESFY phytoplasma) and one sample of pear infected by 'Candidatus Phytoplasma pyri' (PD phytoplasma)<br>Diagnostic sensitivity: 83% |   |
| <b>Specify the standard test</b>  | Other methodologies included in the ringtest:<br>- Direct universal PCR with primers fAT/rAS (Smart et al., 1996)<br>- SYBR Green real time PCR (Galetto et al., 2005)  |   |
| <b>Analytical specificity</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Specificity value</b>  | Analytical specificity: 100%  |   |
| <b>Number of strains/populations of target organisms tested</b>   | 23 'target' samples: 20 apple samples infected by 'Ca. P. mali' coming from different Italian areas, 2 plum samples infected by 'Candidatus Phytoplasma prunorum' (ESFY phytoplasma) and one sample of pear infected by 'Candidatus Phytoplasma pyri' (PD phytoplasma)                                |   |
| <b>Number of non-target organisms tested</b>  | Two 'non target' samples were included: phyto bacteria commonly spread on pome fruits:<br>- Extracted DNA from a pear infected by Pseudomonas syringae pv. syringae<br>- Extracted DNA from an apple infected by Erwinia amilovora  |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   |   |
| <b>Cross reacts with (specify the species)</b>  | Not occurred  |
| <b><u>Diagnostic Specificity</u></b>  |   |
| <b>Proportion of uninfected/uninfested samples (true negatives) testing negative compared to results from a standard test</b>       | Five samples of apple tree uninfected (certified material)<br>Diagnostic specificity: 100%  |
| <b>Specify the standard test</b>  | Other methodologies included in the ringtest:<br>- Direct universal PCR with primers fAT/rAS (Smart et al., 1996)<br>- SYBR Green real time PCR (Galetto et al., 2005)  |
| <b><u>Reproducibility</u></b>   |   |
| <b>Provide the calculated % of agreement for a given level of the pest (see PM 7/98)</b>  | The reproducibility was calculated analyzing in six laboratories all samples included in diagnostic specificity and sensitivity tests.<br>Reproducibility: 89.1%  |
| <b><u>Repeatability</u></b>   |   |
| <b>Provide the calculated % of agreement for a given level of the pest (see PM 7/98)</b>  | The repeatability was calculated in three laboratories analyzing three samples at seven dilution levels (1/1-1/1.000.000). The dilutions were in DNA from an healthy apple sample.<br>Repeatability: 100%     |
| <b><u>Test performance study</u></b>  |   |
| <b>Test performance study?</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>Include brief details of the test performance study and its output. If available, provide a link to published article/report</b> | A ringtest was organized with the official phytosanitary Italian laboratories within a Project financed by the Italian Ministry of Agriculture (ARNADIA) for the definition of 'Italian reference protocols'. |
| <b><u>Other information</u></b>   |   |
| <b>Any other information considered useful<br/>e.g. robustness, ease of performing the test, etc.</b>                               |   |