

International Plant Protection Convention Diagnostic Protocol Notification Period : 01 July – 15 August 2016

## Diagnostic Protocol Notification Period : 01 July – 15 August 2016 Formal Objections

Formal objection submitted by: The European Union and its 28 Member States and supported by Turkey

Date: 29 July 2016 (Turkey supported on 14 August 2016)

**Draft DP:** Tomato spotted wilt virus (TSWV), Impatiens necrotic spot virus (INSV) and Watermelon silver mottle virus (WSMoV) (2004-019)

**General comment:** The draft diagnostic protocol is not ready for adoption, to which we therefore express hereby our formal objection. The main reason is that it would already be outdated before publication. As mentioned in the comments sent during member consultation, it was noted that the tests were quite old and that specificity data was lacking. We believe that at least a warning should have been added for users of the protocol as in some parts the tests are claimed to be specific for different species.

## **Specific comments:**

Some examples for raising our formal objection are given below (more can be provided if needed)

Danagement 26 Commont	C man an an			
Paragraph 50 Comment	SC response			
With regard to serological tests with specific	The primers of Mumford et al. 1994 and 1996a			
antibodies it should be noted that in the case of	are described as specific for TSWV and INSV,			
tospoviruses specific (polyclonal) antisera may	respectively. The primers by Chu et al. 2001 are			
cross react with other species. So a serological	described as specific for WSMoV. This is			
test might not be sufficient for identification of	supported by the DIAGPRO test performance			
the species.	validation study. Paragraph 109 indicates that			
Also for the molecular tests described, no data are	sequence of amplicons may be carried out if an			
available on the specificity of the tests. Moreover,	NPPO requires additional confidence.			
it is not known which species will be detected by				
the generic RT-PCR. Since the RT-PCR amplifies				
part of the N gene, which sequence is an				
important criterion for species demarcation, this				
might allow identification in cases an amplicon is				
obtained.				

Since primers for TSWV have only been tested with INSV and CMV and primers for INSV only with TSWV and GRSV, the conclusion that the test is specific for TSWV and INSV is not substantiated.

Paragraph 52 Comment	SC response		
Regarding the last sentence, the question is 'is this	If a citable reference states otherwise this		
still the case?'. Since the test performance study	reference should be provided		
additional tospovirus species have been described.			
Consider adding more data.			

At least it should clarify which virus species had been tested.

Paragraph 53

Regarding the interpretation of results, (paragraph 53) a similar comment was made by the EU in the Protocol for *Citrus Tristeza virus* and changes were implemented in the later protocol.

*We do not understand why a similar change was not made in the protocol for Tospoviruses.* Other information

Finally, please find below data from the paper Hassani-Mehraban et al (2016) on cross reactions of antisera.

Species <sup>1</sup>	Serogroup/type	Target	Type of	Test method	Cross reacting species <sup>3</sup>	Reference
		(protein)	antiserum			
BeNMV	-	Ν	Pab	Dot-blot	GRSV, TSWV	De Oliveira et al., 2012
CSNV	-	Ν	Pab	DAS-ELISA	TCSV, TSWV	Ciuffo et al., 2008
GRSV	II / II	Ν	Pab	DAS-ELISA	TCSV, TSWV	Boben et al., 2007;
						Hassani-Mehraban et al., 2005;
						Williams et al., 2001
INSV	III / -	NSs	Pab	Indirect ELISA, Western blot	GRSV, INSV, TCSV, TSWV	Heinze et al., 2000
MeSMV	-	Ν	Pab	Western blot	TSWV	Ciuffo et al., 2009
MYSV	IV / -	Ν	Pab	Indirect ELISA, Western blot	CaCV, CCSV, GBNV, WBNV	Chen et al., 2010
PCFV	PYSV <sup>4</sup> / -	Ν	Pab	Indirect ELISA	PYSV <sup>4</sup>	Kang et al., 2014
$PYSV^4$	$PYSV^4 / -$	Ν	Pab	Western blot	PCFV	Kang et al., 2014
PolRSV	IYSV / -	Ν	Pab	DAS-ELISA.	IYSV. TYRV	Ciuffo et al., 2008
				Western blot		
TCSV	II / I	Ν	Pab	DAS-ELISA	CSNV. TSWV	Boben et al., 2007:
						Ciuffo et al 2009:
						Hassani-Mehraban et
						al 2010.
						Williams et al. 2001
TSWV	I/-	N	Pah	DAS-FLISA	ANSV GRSV TCSV	Hassani-Mehraban et
15.77	17		1 40	Western blot		al 2005:
				western blot		Hassani Mahrahan et
						al 2010:
						Williams et al. $2001$
		N	Mah	DASELISA	CSNV	Matsuura at al. 2007
WCMOV	TV /	IN N	Dah	Indirect ELISA	CONV COSV CDNV	Char at al. 2010
W SIVIO V	IV / -	IN	Pab	mullect ELISA,	CaCV, CCSV, ODINV,	Cheff et al., 2010
		N	N 1	western blot	MYSV, WBNV	61 ( 1 2010
		IN	Mad	indirect ELISA,	CaCV, GBINV, WBINV	Chen et al., 2010
		NG		western blot	C CH CCCH HICH	C1 1 2011
		NSs	Mab	Indirect ELISA,	CaCV, CCSV, IYSV,	Chen et al., 2011
				Western blot	MYSV, TYRV,	
					WSMoV	

Supplemental data S1. Cross reactions of antisera raised against tospoviruses

<sup>1</sup>Species to which antibody was raised, indicated by acronyms as in Figure 1; <sup>2</sup>Pab: polyclonal antibody, Mab: monoclonal antibody; <sup>3</sup>Species cross reacting with the antiserum, acronyms representing positive test results; test results for other tospovirus species are not reported or unknown; <sup>4</sup>Peanut yellow spot virus is synonym for Groundnut yellow spot virus.