Background document and summary of comments for TPDP e-decision 2022

(2022-eTPDP\_APR\_01)

Genus Ceratitis (2016-001)

Background

1. The draft diagnostic protocol (DP) for [Genus Ceratitis (2016-001)](https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/genus-ceratitis-2016-001/)is in the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) work programme with priority 2[[1]](#footnote-1).
2. In November 2020, the TPDP agreed to recommend a scope change of the draft DP to the Standards Committee (SC). In May 2021, the SC agreed to reduce the scope of this DP to the diagnosis of the genus and six species.
3. In September 2021, the draft DP was submitted to [Expert Consultation](https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/expert-consultation-draft-diagnostic-protocols/2021/09/2021-09_draft-dp-for-genus-ceratitis-2016-001/).
4. The drafting group list can be found on the [IPPC website](https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2020/08/IPPC_DP_DraftingGroups_AuthorsEmails_DPStatus_2020-08-31.pdf).

Summary of major comments

The major comments received are presented in the Table 1.

Documents

The following documents are presented:

* Draft DP for Genus Ceratitis *(*2016-001) with major comments from the expert consultation
* Figures DP for Genus Ceratitis (2016-001) – sets 1 and 2

**Recommendations to the TPDP:**

1. The TPDP is invited to:
2. *review* the major comments document from the 2021 expert consultation and *revise* the draft DP for Genus Ceratitis (2016-001).
3. *approve* to recommend the draft DP to the Standards Committee for consultation period.

Table 1: Expert comments submitted for draft DP Genus Ceratitis (2016-001).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comment 1** | **Nader Elbadry** |
| **Institution** | Central Administration of Plant Quarantine |
| **Expertise** | Phytosanitary Specialist and SC member |
| **Comments** | Comments were provided directly into the draft.  |
| **Last update** | 19 Nov 2021, 19:17 |
| **Comment 2** | **Angel Ramirez-Suarez** |
| **Institution** | SENASICA - Mexico |
| **Expertise** | Technical Head of Phytosanitary Diagnosis Department.My expertise is focused on diagnosis of plant pests and diseases of economical and quarantine importance using classical and molecular methods (such as PCR end-point, qPCR, dPCR, and Next Generation Sequencing). |
| **Comments** | Paragraph 79. It is not mentioned the concentration or quality of the nucleic acids. It is important to include the recommended DNA concentration and the 260/280 ratio that indicates good quality. Although in Table 4 indicate that the amount (volume) must be 1ul, it is not mentioned the parameters for a good DNA to have success in the PCR amplification. |
| **Last update** | 8 Nov 2021, 06:21 |
| **Comment 3** | **Stephen Gaimari** |
| **Institution** | Plant Pest Diagnostics Center, California Department of Food & Agriculture (CDFA) |
| **Expertise** | Supervisor of the Entomology Lab of the CDFA Plant Pest Diagnostics Branch; a fly-specialist responsible for identification of fruit flies and other Diptera for the State of California; a fruit fly worker |
| **Comments** | There are some words that use both the British spelling and American, e.g., colour (many instances) vs color (paragraph 19, Table 2, Figure 14 and 15 legends), so one way or another should be consistent: Several instances of spelling Marc De Meyer’s name as “DeMeyer” without a space (heading status box, paragraph 8, paragraph 135) Paragraph 39: no authors on C. divaricata, C. flexuosa, C. munroanum, C. taitaensis, C. whartoni. Should check to be sure all other taxa have author at first occurrence. Section 4.2.1: I would question whether killing in boiling water is really necessary for molecular analysis. Collecting directly into 95% ethanol should be sufficient, and would make it more likely that users will properly preserve larval samples (e.g., knowing to boil this sample but not that one will be confusing). Section 4.2.1.2, paragraph 50: aren’t there non-destructive DNA digests that would leave a larva suitable for mounting after DNA extraction, but without using hydroxide solutions? These instructions do not indicate slide-mounting after DNA extraction. Section 4.2.1.3, paragraph 52: should give times for the ethanol step series (70%, 80%, 95%) – these are typically in hours, not the 15 minutes you have indicated for the absolute ethanol washes Paragraph 58: 1) “Dacines” should either be “dacines” or “Dacinae” – I would suggest the latter. 2) Spelling Carpomyini. 3) As counter to Dacinae, the “Carpomyini (Rhagoletis, Carpomya)” should be “Trypetinae, Carpomyini (Rhagoletis, Carpomya)” Paragraph 69: spelling Wiegmann 4.3.5 heading: spelling capitata Paragraph 117, line 4: spelling cosyra Paragraph 122, line 4: spelling capitata Section 9 (Figures) – 1) many taxonomic names are not italicized, 2) several figures do not specify the taxon, but instead only state the character (e.g., Figs. 1-2, 4-7, 18-24, 27-34, 37-44, 48-49), 3) on the figures themselves, many of the characters specified as important in the text do not have labeled arrows. |
| **Last update**  | 12 Nov 2021, 23:18 |  |

1. List of topics for IPPC standards: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/list> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)