

Original Research Article

Effect of Shea Nut Shell Biochar on Root Knot Nematodes (*Meloidogyne* spp.) of Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.)

ABSTRACT

Effect of shea nut shell biochar on root knot nematodes and performance of tomato was investigated under nematode infested and inoculated soils. Two methods of nematode study were employed, using naturally infested root knot nematode soils and inoculated soils. In the first experiment, naturally infested soil (second stage juveniles (J_2) per ml) was admixed with biochar in different proportions. In the inoculated soil experiment, steam sterilized soil was admixed with biochar, which was later inoculated with 1000 second stage juveniles (J_2) two weeks after transplanting. Tomato variety (Petomech-GH) was planted in potting medium of soil to biochar ratio of one part of biochar (250 g) is to one part of soil (1B1S), one part of biochar is to two parts of soil (1B2S), two parts of biochar is to one part of soil (2B1S), and no biochar application (control). Nematode infested soil was amended with biochar as well as steam sterilized soil amended with biochar inoculated with 1000 second stage juveniles (J_2). The result indicated that, biochar increased the pH of the soil, lessened the adverse effects of *Meloidogyne* spp., resulting in decline in galling and improvement in growth and yield of tomato. Increased biochar concentration resulted in decreased nematode gall formation on the roots of the tomato plant. Biochar amended soils resulted in lower egg masses. Increased biochar concentration resulted in decreased performance of tomato plant. Tomato plants treated with low biochar concentrations (1B2S and 1B1S) produced higher fruit numbers and weights, and plant biomass.

Keywords: Biochar; shea nut shell; root knot nematode; tomato.

1. INTRODUCTION

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) is one of the most popular vegetable consumed in almost every Ghanaian household [1]. It is an important component of balanced diet of most Ghanaians that provide vitamin A and C, lycopene which serves as antioxidant and can help reduce the risk of cardiac diseases and some types of cancer [2]. Tomato production in Ghana has been significantly affected by the incidence of pests and diseases [3] especially the root knot nematodes (RKN) [4, 5]. Crop damages more than 27% in tomato [6] and in excess of \$100 billion loss globally [7]. At the Bontanga irrigation zone in the northern region of Ghana, total crop loss of tomato occurs and

23 currently, most farmers do not cultivate tomato in this area [1]. Soil fumigants and chemical
24 nematicides are used in controlling nematodes. These are, however, expensive and pose threats to
25 environment and human health resulting in its withdrawal. Several reports indicated the use of
26 botanicals, aqueous and crude plant extracts for **nematodes management**, which contain minimum
27 bioactive concentration against RKN [8, 9, 10]. Biochar, most agro **byproducts** has now been directed
28 to manage nematodes. **It was found that the admixing of biochar into the soil increases the soil pH to**
29 **become alkaline** [11]. **Decomposition of organic matter releases toxic wastes like NH_3^+ that can be**
30 **nematicidal to plant parasitic nematodes** [12]. There is one published report that biochar soil
31 amendment at the concentration of 1.2% delays the development of root knot nematode [13].

32 **Therefore, the present investigation aimed to evaluate the impact of biochar on the root knot**
33 **nematodes development and the growth performance of tomato plants.**

34

35 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

36 **2.1 Experimental Site**

37 The study was carried out at the plant house of the University for Development Studies (UDS),
38 Nyankpala campus which lies within latitude $9^\circ 25' 41''$ and longitude $0^\circ 58' 42''$ W. The soil is an
39 Alfisol under USDA classification, and Savanna Ochrosol under the Ghanaian system of
40 classification [14]. The entire experiment was conducted from September to December, 2017.

41 **2.2 Source of Study Materials**

42 Tomato (Petomech GH) **seeds** were obtained from the local farmers in Nyankpala. The shea nut shell
43 used to make the biochar was sourced from Cheyohi, a superb of UDS Nyankpala campus.
44 Nematode infested soil sample was collected from Bontanga irrigation farm in the Kumbungu district
45 of the northern region of Ghana.

46 **2.3 Biochar Preparation**

47 Shea nut shells were placed in a barrel with holes under and a chimney on top which **served** as a
48 pyrolizer. Dried leaves were lighted on top of the shea nut shell for a few minutes and covered with a
49 chimney to allow charring or incomplete burning of the shells which will eventually form biochar. It is a
50 slow process which **took about 3-6 hours** but very efficient when done in small quantities [15].

51 **2.4 Experimental Approach**

52 **Two methods of nematode study were employed, using naturally infested root knot nematode soils**
53 **and inoculated soils. In the first experiment, naturally infested soil [32 second stage juveniles (J_2) per**
54 **ml] was admixed with biochar in different proportions. In the inoculated soil experiment, steam**

55 sterilized soil was admixed with biochar, which was later inoculated with 1000 second stage juveniles
56 (J_2) two weeks after transplanting.

57 **2.5 Soil Sterilization**

58 Soil for inoculated experiment was sterilized using the steam barrel sterilization method. Gravels were
59 removed from sandy loam soil by sieving, which was then packed into a jute sack. Three stones were
60 laid in a triangular form above the ground level to provide space for fire wood. Water was poured into
61 a tank about one quarter. Tripod wooden slaps were placed little above the water surface to provide
62 room for vapor to form. The soil was then placed on this wooding slaps and the tank covered with
63 polythene. Fire was set under the tank and the heat produced was used to generate steam below the
64 soil in the tank which was then allowed to stand for 6 hours.

65 **2.6 Soil Sampling, extraction and identification of nematodes**

66 Twenty core soil samples were taken from each plot and thoroughly mixed to form a composite
67 sample. The root knot nematode juveniles (J_2) were extracted from 200 cm³ of soil samples using a
68 series of sieves (850, 250, 75 and 38 μ m) and a 48 h decanting period using the modified Baermann
69 tray [16] method. Counting of J_2 was carried out with stereoscopic microscope.

70 Root knot nematodes juveniles (J_2) were identified to species level based on perineal pattern
71 characteristics for identification. The patterns were compared with micrographs of perineal patterns of
72 *Meloidogyne incognita*, *M. arenaria* and *M. javanica* provided by the International *Meloidogyne* Project
73 [17]

74 **2.7 Nursing of Seeds and Transplanting**

75 Tomato seeds were sown in steam sterilized soil placed in a wooden box measuring 1.0 m by 0.6 m.
76 Cultural practices such as watering and shading was done to ensure proper germination. The most
77 uniform seedlings were transplanted three weeks after emergence.

78 **2.8 Application of *Meloidogyne* spp. Inoculum Level to Potted Tomato Seedlings**

79 In the inoculated soil experiment, the potted seedlings were inoculated with 3 ml of the *Meloidogyne*
80 spp. solution per pot two weeks after transplanting [approximately 1000 second stage juveniles (J_2)].
81 Three holes were made in a triangular form 2 cm equidistant from the base of each plant. The

82 *Meloidogyne* spp. solution was homogenized by gentle shaking the test tubes containing the
83 nematode solution and then introduced into the holes.

84 2.9 Experimental Design and Treatments

85 The two experiments were laid out in completely randomized design with five replications. Soil-biochar
86 treatment was prepared into a 2 L size pot. In the naturally infested soil experiment, the 20 pots were
87 filled with 1.6 L of the naturally infested soil-biochar combination, whilst in the inoculated soil
88 experiment, the 20 pots were filled with 1.6 L of steam sterilized soil-biochar combination in different
89 proportions (v/v). The control was without biochar. Watering was done early mornings or evenings.
90 Too much watering was avoided to prevent water logging. Detailed treatment descriptions (v/v) were
91 as follows: one part of biochar (250 g) is to one part of soil (1B1S); one part of biochar (150 g) is to
92 two parts of soil (1B2S); two parts of biochar (350 g) is to one part of soil (2B1S); no biochar
93 application (control).

94 2.10 Data Collection and Statistical Analysis

95 In the naturally infested soil experiment, plant growth parameters such as plant height, number of
96 leaves and root weight were taken at two weeks interval after (2WAP) transplanting. Similarly, yield
97 characteristics such as shoot weight and plant biomass were taken at two weeks interval after
98 planting except number of fruits and fruit weight which were taken at ten weeks after planting
99 (10WAP) in the first experiment. In both experiments, nematode induced parameters such as root
100 galling and egg mass indices were scored using the Bridge and Page [18] rating chart. Final
101 nematode population were also taken at ten weeks after planting (10WAP). The total number of eggs
102 and nematodes in the soil constituted the total population and the reproductive factor (Rf) was
103 calculated by dividing the final population (Pf) by the initial one (Pi).

104 Data collected were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using Genstat (18th Edition) statistical
105 package. Treatment means was separated using least significant difference (LSD) at 5% level of
106 significance.

107 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

108 No significant difference on the plant height of tomato was observed among the biochar treatments
109 which were significantly different from the control (Table 1). However, it was observed that, as
110 concentration of the biochar increased, the height of tomato plant decreased. Lower mean height was

111 observed in the highest biochar concentration (2B1S). It might be attributed to increase in alkalinity as
 112 2B1S recorded the highest alkaline pH of 8.62, followed by 1B1S with a pH of 7.46 and 1B2S with a
 113 pH of 7.12 at the end of the experiments. Similar observation was made by Howard [19] in corn and
 114 soybean, where he reported reduced growth in higher biochar weights investigated and suggested
 115 that, increment in alkalinity of the soil, the holding of too many nutrients, potential toxic ions and
 116 microbes upon too much biochar addition may have negative effect on plant growth. Grabber et al.
 117 [20] similarly reported enhanced plant height of tomato following biochar application.

118 The reduction of plant height under control condition was due to root knot nematode infection.
 119 Sharma and Sharma [21] reported significant reduction in plant height of tomato due to root knot
 120 nematode (RKN) infection (1000 J₂).

121 The effect of biochar on the number of leaves was only significant at two weeks after planting (2WAP)
 122 and four weeks after planting (4WAP) (Table 1). At two weeks after planting (2WAP), 1B2S treatment
 123 recorded the highest average leaf number while 2B1S treatment recorded the lowest. This might be
 124 attributed to the fact that, at 2WAP, root knot nematode may have penetrated the roots of tomato but
 125 may have not caused significant infection. At 4WAP, similar observation was made but in this case,
 126 the average leave number for 1B1S treatment was higher than the control whereas 2B1S treatment
 127 recorded the lowest. It was observed that, as the concentration of the biochar increased, leave
 128 number decreased.

129 Root weight generally differed based on the concentration of biochar with 1B2S treatment recording
 130 higher significant mean values followed by 1B1S, 2B1S and the control, respectively (Table 1). The
 131 root weight of the control plant was significantly low because of the lack of formation of lateral roots
 132 due to root knot nematode infection. This agree with the findings of Sharma and Sharma [21], whose
 133 report indicated significant reduction in root weight and root length of tomato as a result of root knot
 134 nematode infection.

135

136 **Table 1. Effect of biochar concentrations on growth characteristics of tomato**

Treatment	Plant height			Number of leaves			Root weight		
	2WAP	4WAP	6WAP	2WAP	4WAP	6WAP	2WAP	4WAP	6WAP
1B1S	23.80 ^a	33.52 ^a	48.30 ^a	5.20 ^b	8.20 ^{bc}	13.80 ^a	0.96 ^a	1.18 ^a	1.98 ^{ab}
1B2S	25.12 ^a	36.10 ^a	52.34 ^a	6.00 ^{bc}	10.00 ^{bc}	17.80 ^a	1.27a	1.88 ^a	2.47 ^a
2B1S	22.94 ^a	26.58 ^a	39.50 ^a	4.40 ^a	4.80 ^a	7.50 ^a	0.92a	1.26 ^a	1.60 ^{ab}
Control	25.54 ^a	31.54 ^a	39.25 ^a	5.60 ^{bc}	7.60 ^b	8.00 ^a	1.26a	1.18 ^a	1.03 ^b
LSD $\alpha=0.05$	7.11	10.05	18.86	0.43	2.11	11.69	0.85	0.86	1.32

P values 0.56 0.05 0.14 < 0.01 < 0.01 0.05 0.51 0.05 0.06

137 Means followed by the same letter(s) in a column are not significantly different ($P > .05$).

138 3.2 Yield and Yield Parameters

139 There was significant effect of biochar on the number of fruits, fruit weight and plant biomass of
 140 tomato (Table 2). This varied according to the biochar treated with 1B2S recording the highest
 141 average mean value followed by 1B1S and control, respectively. 2B1S treatment produced no fruits
 142 and at the same time recorded the lowest dry plant biomass which may be due to the higher biochar
 143 concentration. This agree with the findings of Grabber et al. [20] whose reports indicated that, biochar
 144 contains chemicals most of which are phytotoxic or biocidal at high concentration and therefore may
 145 affect plant growth. 1B2S recorded the highest increment in plant biomass and fruit weight followed by
 146 1B1S with control recording the least. Grabber et al. [20] reported significant improvement in plant
 147 growth at low biochar concentration. Hossain et al. [22] also reported improved growth and
 148 productivity of cherry tomato at 10t/ha biochar application. The observed low biomass of control was
 149 due to *Meloidogyne* spp. infection. Sharma and Sharma [21] reported reduced growth as a result of
 150 root knot nematode infection in tomato. Similarly, Maleita et al. [23] reported stunted growth and
 151 reduction in yield on root knot nematode heavily infested fields. Moreover, application of 1000 J₂ per
 152 plant significantly reduced growth and yield in a trial by Haider et al. [24] using French bean and pea.

153
154

Table 2. Effect of biochar concentrations on yield and yield parameters of tomato

Treatment	Shoot weight (g)			Mean plant biomass (g)			Fruit number	Fruit weight (g)
	2WAP	4WAP	6WAP	2WAP	4WAP	6WAP		
1B1S	1.71 ^a	4.07 ^{ab}	6.63 ^a	0.34 ^a	0.86 ^{ab}	2.96 ^a	3.00 ^a	37.60 ^b
1B2S	2.27 ^a	4.50 ^{ab}	9.20 ^a	0.42 ^a	1.19 ^{ab}	5.28 ^b	7.00 ^b	170.00 ^c
2B1S	1.88 ^a	2.79 ^a	4.43 ^a	0.34 ^a	0.81 ^a	1.91 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.00 ^a
Control	1.60 ^a	3.10 ^{ab}	3.76 ^a	0.37 ^a	1.46 ^{ab}	1.92 ^a	2.00 ^a	25.00 ^b
LSD $\alpha=0.05$	1.39	1.71	7.95	0.20	0.65	2.70	4.07	17.78
<i>P</i> values	0.44	0.02	0.20	0.55	0.02	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01

155 Means followed by the same letter(s) in a column are not significantly different ($P > .05$).

156 3.3 Root knot Nematode Population and Reproductive Factor

157 Final nematodes population and reproductive factor is an indication of nematode multiplication.
 158 Biochar treatment resulted in significant reduction in final nematode population over the control at
 159 termination of both experiments (Table 3). 2B1S recorded the highest reduction in final nematode

160 population which is significantly different from 1B1S and 1B2S. The control, however, showed a
161 significant increase in final nematode population at the end of both experiment ($P < .05$).

162 Nematode reproductive factor, as indicated in Table 2, also showed significant differences among the
163 treatments with 2B1S recording the lowest reproduction factor less than 1 for both **experiments**,
164 followed by 1B1S and **1B2S**, respectively. The control recorded the highest reproductive factor which
165 was greater than 1 for both **experiments**. This suggested that, root knot nematode may not multiply in
166 biochar amended soils. It is generally observed that, nematode population and reproduction factor
167 decreased as the concentration of biochar in the medium increased showing the nematicidal potential
168 of biochar against RKN. Biochar soil amendments was targeted to highly weathered and acidic soil
169 because biochar has been reported to increase soil pH and moisture content [25, 11]. Aduke [12]
170 reported a sharp decrease in *M. incognita* population when the pH of the soil became alkaline. 2B1S
171 recorded the highest alkaline pH of 8.62, followed by 1B1S with a pH of 7.46 and 1B2S with a pH of
172 7.12 at the end of the **experiments**. The control soil was, **however**, acidic with a pH of 6.20. Since
173 biochar amended soil becomes alkaline at the end of both experiments, the reduction in final
174 nematode population and decreased reproduction factor in biochar amended soil may be attributed to
175 increased pH of the medium.

176 **Table 3. Effect of biochar concentration on final *M. incognita* population at harvest and**
177 **reproduction factor**

Treatment	Final <i>M. incognita</i> population per ml		Reproductive factor (Pf/Pi)	
	Infested soil	Inoculated soil	Infested soil	Inoculated soil
1B:1S	21.00 ^b	23.00 ^b	0.66 ^b	0.72 ^{ab}
1B:2S	27.00 ^c	32.00 ^c	0.84 ^b	1.00 ^b
2B:1S	0.00 ^a	13.00 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.41 ^a
Control	47.00 ^d	61.00 ^d	1.47 ^c	1.91 ^c
LSD $\alpha=0.05$	2.14	2.33	0.18	0.56
<i>P</i> values	<0.001	<0.001	<0.01	<0.01

178 *Means followed by the same letter(s) in a column are not significantly different ($P > .05$).*

179 3.4 Root Galling

180 Root knot nematode infection is manifested by the development of galls or giant cells on the root
181 accompanied by stunted growth, chlorosis and loss of energy by the plant [26]. Biochar lessened the
182 adverse effects of nematodes, resulting in decline in galling and an improvement in the growth and
183 yield of the tomato, but the effect **differed** based on the treatment applied and parameters measured.
184 Application of biochar treatment significantly reduced the formation of galls on the **roots** of tomato as
185 shown in Table 4. The number of galls or knots varied with the concentration of the biochar treatment.
186 Results revealed that, extent of gall formation on the roots **was** significantly lower in higher biochar
187 treated medium with 2B1S recording the lowest root galling followed by 1B1S and 1B2S, **respectively**.

188 It may be observed that, as the biochar concentration increased, the extent of gall formation on the
 189 roots of tomato decreased. Root galling was not observed during the first 2WAP, at 4WAP, significant
 190 galling occurred on the roots which increased at 6WAP. The absence of galls during the first 2WAP
 191 may be due to the fact that, most of the RKN has a life cycle of at least three (3) weeks [27]. The root
 192 knot nematodes may have penetrated the roots but may have not reproduced to establish permanent
 193 feeding sites in the roots which lead to the formation of galls.

194 Moreover, the control recorded higher number of root galls, where most of the plants showed
 195 symptoms of wilting during the day and most died before maturity. This agrees with the findings of
 196 Mitkowski and Abawi [28] who reported wilting and stunted growth in lettuce as a result of root knot
 197 nematode infection. It is observed that, the extent of gall formation on the roots positively correlated
 198 with egg mass indices analyzed. Treatments that recorded higher root gall indices had higher egg
 199 masses (Table 4). Biochar amended soils had lower egg masses in which no significant differences
 200 occur among the three biochar concentrations, but all were significantly different from the control.
 201 Hence, biochar may have the potential to manage gall formation on the roots of tomato.
 202

203 **Table 4. Effect of biochar concentration on root gall formation and egg masses**

Treatment	Root gall index				Egg mass index	
	Infested soil		Inoculated soil		Infested soil	Inoculated soil
	4WAP	6WAP	4WAP	6WAP		
1B1S	1.80 ^b	2.00 ^a	2.10 ^a	2.60 ^b	1.10 ^a	1.60 ^a
1B2S	2.80 ^c	2.80 ^a	3.00 ^a	3.10 ^b	1.62 ^a	1.81 ^a
2B1S	1.00 ^a	1.00 ^a	1.20 ^a	1.30 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.60 ^a
Control	6.80 ^d	8.00 ^b	6.40 ^b	8.10 ^c	3.67 ^b	3.50 ^b
LSD $\alpha=0.05$	0.77	2.68	2.17	1.57	1.65	1.29
P Value	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01

204 *Means followed by the same letter(s) in a column are not significantly different ($P > .05$).*
 205

206 4. CONCLUSION

207 The effectiveness of biochar against root knot nematodes may be confirmed by an increment in shoot
 208 growth, plant biomass, fruit numbers and weight which are due to decline in nematode attack as
 209 indicated by decreased final nematode populations in biochar treated soils. The study demonstrated
 210 that, root knot nematode densities decreased, whilst plant growth parameters were enhanced
 211 significantly due to biochar application. Biochar increased the pH of the soil to become alkaline at the
 212 end of the experiments. Soil pH control should be carried out after biochar application to a range that
 213 is suitable for the growth of tomato.

214

215 **REFERENCES**

216

217 1. Asare-Bediako E, Showemimo FA, Buah JN, Ushawu Y. Tomato production constraint at
218 Bolgatanga. *J Appl Sci.* 2007;7(3):459–461.

219 2. Campbell JK, Canene-Adams K, Lindshield BL, Boileau TWM, Clinton SK, Erdman J. Tomato
220 phytochemicals and prostate cancer risk. *J Nutr.* 2004;134(12):3486S–3492S.

221 3. Clottey VA, Karbo N, Gyasi KO. The tomato industry in northern Ghana; production
222 constraints and strategies to improve competitiveness. *Afr J Food Agric Nutr Dev.* 2009;
223 9(6):1436–1451.

224 4. Sikora RA, Fernandez E. Nematodes parasites of vegetables. In: Luc, M., Sikora. A. and
225 Bridge, J. eds. *Plant parasitic nematodes in subtropical and tropical agriculture.* Wallingford,
226 C.A.B. International. 2005;319–392.

227 5. Kankam F, Adomako J. Influence of inoculum levels of root knot nematodes (*Meloidogyne*
228 spp.) on tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.). *Asian J Agric Food Sci.* 2014;2(2):171–177.

229 6. Kaur DN, Sharma SK, Sultan MS. Effect of different chemicals on root knot nematode in seed
230 beds of tomato. *Plant Dis Res.* 2011;26:170–170.

231 7. Bird DM, Opperman CH, Williamson VM. Plant infection by root knot nematode. In: Berg, R.
232 H. and Taylor, C. G. eds. *Cell biology of plant nematode parasitism.* Berlin, Springer Verlag.
233 2008;1–13.

234 8. Mashela WP, Dirk De Waele D, Pofu KM. Use of Indigenous Cucumis technologies as
235 alternative to chemical nematicides in management of root knot nematodes in low input
236 agricultural farming systems: A review. *Scientific Research and Essays.* 2011;6(33):6762–
237 6768.

238 9. Kankam F, Sowley ENK, Dankwa IN. Management of root knot nematode (*Meloidogyne*
239 *incognita*) on cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp.) with oil cakes. *Int J Biosci.*
240 2014;5(12):413–419.

241 10. Kankam F, Sowley ENK, Mohammed A. Management of root knot nematode (*Meloidogyne*
242 spp.) on okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus* (L.) Moench) with aqueous sesame seed extract. *Int*
243 *J Agron Agric Res.* 2015;6(4):24–31.

244 11. Novak JM, Busscher WJ, Laird DL, Ahmedna M, Watts DW, Niandou MAS. Impact of biochar
245 amendment on fertility of a southeastern coastal plain soil. *Soil Sci.* 2009;174:105–112.

246 12. Aduke VDO. **Nematode response to soil organic amendments in a semi-arid region under**
247 **soybean (*Glycine max*), Naivasha, Kenya. MSc thesis, University of Nairobi, Kenya, 2016;1–**
248 **82.**

249 13. Wen-kun H, Hong-li J, Godelieve G, Jane D, Tina K. Biochar amended potting medium
250 reduces the susceptibility of rice to root knot nematodes infections. *BMC Plant Biol.*

- 2015;15:267.
- 252 14. Nyankpala Agricultural Experimental Station (NAES). Annual report 1984. Tamale, Ghana.
253 1984;41.
- 254 15. Zhang M, Gao B, Varnoosfaderani S, Hebard A, Yao Y, Inyang M. "Preparation and
255 characterization of a novel magnetic biochar for arsenic removal," *Bioresource Technology*.
256 2013;130:457–462.
- 257 16. Whitehead AG, Hemming Jr. A comparison of some quantitative methods of extracting small
258 vermiform nematodes from soil. *Ann Appl Biol*. 1965;55:25–38.
- 259 17. Sasser JN, Carter CC. Root knot nematodes (*Meloidogyne* spp.): Identification, morphological
260 and physiological variation, host range, ecology and control, pp 21-32. In; *Nematology in the*
261 *Southern region of the United States* (ed). R.D. Riggs. South Coop. Serv. Bull. 276, Arkansas
262 Agricultural Experimental Station, Fayetteville, Arkansas, 1982;206.
- 263 18. Bridge J, Page SLJ. Estimation of root knot nematode infestation levels on roots using a
264 rating chart. *Tropical Pest Management*. 1980;26:296–298.
- 265 19. Howard T. The effect of biochar on the root development of corn and soybeans in Minnesota
266 soil and sand. *International Biochar Initiative*. 2011;1–23.
- 267 20. Grabber ER, Yigal E, Eddie C, Yael MH, Beni L. The biochar effect: plant resistance to biotic
268 stresses. A review. *Phytopathol Mediterr*. 2011;50:335–349.
- 269 21. Sharma IP, Sharma AK. Effect of initial inoculum levels of *Meloidogyne incognita* J2 on
270 development and growth of tomato cv. PT-3 under control conditions. *Afr J microbiol Res*.
271 2015;9(20):1376–1380.
- 272 22. Hossain MK, Strezov V, Yin-Chan, K, Nelson PF. Agronomic properties of wastewater sludge
273 biochar and bioavailability of metals in production of cherry tomato (*Lycopersicon*
274 *esculentum*). *Chemosphere*. 2010;78(9):1167–1171.
- 275 23. Maleita CMN, Curtis RHC, Powers SJ, Abrantes IMO. Inoculum levels of *Meloidogyne*
276 *hispanica* and *M. javanica* affect nematode reproduction, and growth of tomato genotypes.
277 *Phytopathol Mediterr*. 2012;51(3):566–576.
- 278 24. Haider MG, Dev LK, Nath RP. Comparative pathogenicity of root knot nematode, *Meloidogyne*
279 *incognita*, on different pulse crops. *Ind J Nematol*. 2003;33:152–153.
- 280 25. Lehmann J, Gaunt J, Rondon M. Biochar sequestration in terrestrial ecosystems. A review.
281 *Mit Adapt Strat Global Chang*. 2006;11:403–427.
- 282 26. Babu AM, Vineet K, Tomy P. Root knot nematode- A hard to kill parasite study. *Indian Silk*
283 1999;38:11–12.
- 284 27. Moens T, Yeates GW, Ley P. Use of carbon and energy sources by nematodes. In:
285 *Proceeding of the Fourth International Congress of Nematology*. 2004;2:529–545.
- 286 28. Mitkowski NA, Abawi GS. Reproductive fitness on lettuce of populations of *Meloidogyne hapla*
287 from New York State vegetable fields. *Nematology*. 2003;5(1):77–83.