SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**Annual Research & Review in Biology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARRB_45187**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of Shea Nut Shell Biochar on Root Knot Nematodes (Meloidogyne spp.) of Tomato (Solanum lycopersicum L.)**
Type of Article:	**Original Research Article**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
Comments on the revised document We see that the author has tried to improve the document but there are some serious mistakes that I noted and some of them can invalidate the document if they are maintained. Page 2, lines 52-54. With 32 juveniles / hole from an infested soil that contains several other nematode species seems weird to me. With 32 J2 / hole you would not have any effect of *Meloidogyne* and even if it was possible, the effect you obtained would not only come from the Meloidogyne J2 but from all the nematodes in the soil. Page 3 (lines 70 to 72), we cannot identify the juveniles from the perineal patterns because they do not have any. Only females of *Meloidogyne* have the perineal patterns around the vulva of females or no one has ever seen vulva in J2 of *Meloidogyne*. Line 80. There is no evidence that the juveniles extracted from the soil after 48 hours of decantation are 48 hours old. That is why I said that the juveniles intended for inoculation must come from a pre-established breeding or J2 obtained from egg masses put in a hatchery. This is not your case. I maintain that the juveniles with which you must inoculate must be at most 48 hours old, but in this work, this information is missing. the author has not yet answered my question Page 4. lines 99-100. The scale of Bridge and Page of which the author speaks does not speak of eggs, but only of galls. Page 4. Lines 100-1002. To calculate the multiplication rate or the reproductive factor (Rf) of *Meloidogyne* the author said to have used the J2 and the eggs. But the extraction method he used does not allow to recover the eggs. So all he says is feasible with the extraction method of nematodes he used. **Conclusion** In view of the above, I sincerely believe that the document suffers from a real problem of methodology. So, to validate this document, I think it is necessary to eliminate from Material and Methods, the part on the infested soils because the author does not refer to it in results and discussions. Such an action will give more homogeneity.	To avoid controversy on *Meloidogyne* species identification, I have decided to delete identification to species level. *Meloidogyne* species is used in the texts instead of specific species to avoid ambiguity. P4,L92-95. Root systems were also rated for number of egg masses produced [18]. The egg mass index consisted of a 0–to-5 scale, with 0 = no egg masses, 1 = 1 to 2 egg masses, 2 = 3 to10 egg masses, 3 = 11 to 30 egg masses, 4 = 31 to 100 egg masses, and 5 = >100 egg masses. P4,L95-96. Final nematode population were also taken at ten weeks after planting (10WAP). Reproductive factor (Rf) was also calculated. I have eliminated from Material and Methods, the part on the infested soils as suggested to give more homogeneity.