

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 inoculated soils. 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). 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 currently, most farmers do not cultivate tomato in this area [1]. Soil fumigants and chemical nematicides are used in controlling nematodes. These are, however, expensive and pose threats to environment and human health resulting in its withdrawal. Several reports indicated the use of 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 components like NH_3^+ that can
30 be 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 Steam sterilized soil was admixed with biochar, which was later inoculated with 1000 second stage
53 juveniles (J_2) two weeks after transplanting. Soil was sterilized using the steam barrel sterilization
54 method. Gravels were removed from sandy loam soil by sieving, which was then packed into a jute
55 sack. Three stones were laid in a triangular form above the ground level to provide space for fire
56 wood. Water was poured into a tank about one quarter. Tripod wooden slaps were placed little above
57 the water surface to provide room for vapor to form. The soil was then placed on this wooding slaps

58 and the tank covered with polythene. Fire was set under the tank and the heat produced was used to
59 generate steam below the soil in the tank which was then allowed to stand for 6 hours.

60 **2.5 Soil Sampling, extraction and identification of nematodes**

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

65 **2.6 Nursing of Seeds and Transplanting**

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

69 **2.7 Application of *Meloidogyne* spp. Inoculum Level to Potted Tomato Seedlings**

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

73 **2.8 Experimental Design and Treatments**

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

83 **2.9 Data Collection and Statistical Analysis**

84 The pH of the various treatments were determined using a pH meter. The Plant growth parameters
 85 such as plant height, number of leaves and root weight were taken at two weeks interval after (2WAP)
 86 transplanting. Similarly, yield characteristics such as shoot weight and plant biomass were taken at
 87 two weeks interval after planting. At 4 and 6WAP after planting, the sampled plants were then dried
 88 separately at 80 °C in an oven for 48 h to constant weights and the root and shoot dry weights were
 89 recorded. The various organs were thoroughly dried to obtain the biomass comprising of the fruits,
 90 roots, stems, and the leaves. Number of fruits and fruit weight were taken at ten weeks after planting
 91 (10WAP). The weight measurements were done using an electronic digital balance. Nematode
 92 induced parameter such as root galling was scored using the Bridge and Page [17] rating chart. Root
 93 systems were also rated for number of egg masses produced [18]. The egg mass index consisted of a
 94 0-to-5 scale, with 0 = no egg masses, 1 = 1 to 2 egg masses, 2 = 3 to 10 egg masses, 3 = 11 to 30
 95 egg masses, 4 = 31 to 100 egg masses, and 5 = >100 egg masses. Final nematode population were
 96 also taken at ten weeks after planting (10WAP). Reproductive factor (Rf) was also calculated.

97 Data collected were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using GenStat (18th Edition) statistical
 98 package. Treatment means was separated using least significant difference (LSD) at 5% level of
 99 significance.

100 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

101 3.1 The Power of Hydrogen (pH) of the treatments at the end of the experiment

102 The pH of the various treatments is shown in Table 1. There were significant differences in pH among
 103 the treatments. 2B1S recorded the highest pH followed by 1B:1S and 1B2S recording the lowest
 104 alkaline pH. The control however had a pH that is acidic.

105 **Table 1. The pH of the treatments at the end of experiment**

Treatment	pH	Interpretation
1B1S	7.46 ^c	Alkaline
1B2S	7.12 ^b	Alkaline
2B1S	8.62 ^d	Alkaline
Control	6.20 ^a	Acidic
LSD($\alpha= 0.05$)	0.10	
P value	<0.001	

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

107 3.2 Growth Characteristics

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 2). 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 experiment.** 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 2). 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 2). 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 2. 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	1.27 ^a	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	0.92 ^a	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
<i>P</i> 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

139 3.3 Yield and Yield Parameters

140 There was significant effect of biochar on the number of fruits, fruit weight and plant biomass of
 141 tomato (Table 3). This varied according to the biochar treated with 1B2S recording the highest
 142 average mean value followed by 1B1S and control, respectively. 2B1S treatment produced no fruits
 143 and at the same time recorded the lowest dry plant biomass which may be due to the higher biochar
 144 concentration. This agree with the findings of Grabber et al. [20] whose reports indicated that, biochar
 145 contains chemicals most of which are phytotoxic or biocidal at high concentration and therefore may
 146 affect plant growth. 1B2S recorded the highest increment in plant biomass and fruit weight followed by
 147 1B1S with control recording the least. Grabber et al. [20] reported significant improvement in plant
 148 growth at low biochar concentration. Hossain et al. [22] also reported improved growth and
 149 productivity of cherry tomato at 10t/ha biochar application. The observed low biomass of control was
 150 due to *Meloidogyne* spp. infection. Sharma and Sharma [21] reported reduced growth as a result of
 151 root knot nematode infection in tomato. Similarly, Maleita et al. [23] reported stunted growth and
 152 reduction in yield on root knot nematode heavily infested fields. Moreover, application of 1000 J₂ per
 153 plant significantly reduced growth and yield in a trial by Haider et al. [24] using French bean and pea.

154

155 **Table 3. 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	4WAP	6WAP		
1B1S	1.71 ^a	4.07 ^{ab}	6.63 ^a	0.86 ^{ab}	2.96 ^a	3.00 ^a	37.60 ^b
1B2S	2.27 ^a	4.50 ^{ab}	9.20 ^a	1.19 ^{ab}	5.28 ^b	7.00 ^b	170.00 ^c
2B1S	1.88 ^a	2.79 ^a	4.43 ^a	0.81 ^a	1.91 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.00 ^a
Control	1.60 ^a	3.10 ^{ab}	3.76 ^a	1.46 ^{ab}	1.92 ^a	2.00 ^a	25.00 ^b
LSD $\alpha=0.05$	1.39	1.71	7.95	0.65	2.70	4.07	17.78
<i>P</i> values	0.44	0.02	0.20	0.02	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01

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

157 3.4 Root knot Nematode Population and Reproductive Factor

158 Final nematodes population and reproductive factor is an indication of nematode multiplication.
 159 Biochar treatment resulted in significant reduction in final nematode population over the control at
 160 (Table 4). 2B1S recorded the highest reduction in final nematode population which is significantly
 161 different from 1B1S and 1B2S. The control, however, showed a significant increase in final nematode
 162 population ($P < .05$).

163 Nematode reproductive factor, as indicated in Table 4, also showed significant differences among the
 164 treatments with 2B1S recording the lowest reproduction factor less than 1, followed by 1B1S and
 165 1B2S, respectively. The control recorded the highest reproductive factor which was greater than 1.
 166 This suggested that, root knot nematode may not multiply in biochar amended soils. It is generally
 167 observed that, nematode population and reproduction factor decreased as the concentration of
 168 biochar in the medium increased showing the nematicidal potential of biochar against RKN. Biochar
 169 soil amendments was targeted to highly weathered and acidic soil because biochar has been reported
 170 to increase soil pH and moisture content [25, 11]. Aduke [12] reported a sharp decrease in *M.*
 171 *incognita* population when the pH of the soil became alkaline. 2B1S recorded the highest alkaline pH
 172 of 8.62, followed by 1B1S with a pH of 7.46 and 1B2S with a pH of 7.12 at the end of the experiment.
 173 The control soil was, however, acidic with a pH of 6.20. Since biochar amended soil becomes alkaline
 174 at the end of experiment, the reduction in final nematode population and decreased reproduction
 175 factor in biochar amended soil may be attributed to increased pH of the medium.

176 **Table 4. Effect of biochar concentration on final *M. incognita* population and reproductive**
 177 **factor at ten weeks after planting**

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

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

179 3.5 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 5. 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. At 4WAP, significant galling occurred on the roots which increased at
 190 6WAP. The absence of galls during the first 2WAP may be due to the fact that, most **of the** RKN has a
 191 life cycle of at least three (3) weeks [27]. The root knot nematodes may have penetrated the roots but
 192 may have not reproduced to establish permanent feeding sites in the roots which lead to the formation
 193 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 5). 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 5. Effect of biochar concentration on root gall formation and egg masses**

Treatment	Root gall index		Egg mass index	
	4WAP	6WAP	Infested soil	Inoculated soil
1B1S	2.10 ^a	2.60 ^b	1.10 ^a	1.60 ^a
1B2S	3.00 ^a	3.10 ^b	1.62 ^a	1.81 ^a
2B1S	1.20 ^a	1.30 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.60 ^a
Control	6.40 ^b	8.10 ^c	3.67 ^b	3.50 ^b
LSD $\alpha=0.05$	2.17	1.57	1.65	1.29
P Value	<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 **Ethical approval and consent are not applicable.**

215

216 **REFERENCES**

217

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

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

222 3. Clotley VA, Karbo N, Gyasi KO. The tomato industry in northern Ghana; production
223 constraints and strategies to improve competitiveness. *Afr J Food Agric Nutr Dev.* 2009;
224 9(6):1436–1451.

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

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

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

232 7. Bird DM, Opperman CH, Williamson VM. Plant infection by root knot nematode. In: Berg, R.
233 H. and Taylor, C. G. eds. *Cell biology of plant nematode parasitism.* Berlin, Springer Verlag.
234 2008;1–13.

235 8. Mashela WP, Dirk De Waele D, Pofu KM. Use of Indigenous Cucumis technologies as
236 alternative to chemical nematicides in management of root knot nematodes in low input
237 agricultural farming systems: A review. *Scientific Research and Essays.* 2011;6(33):6762–
238 6768.

239 9. Kankam F, Sowley ENK, Dankwa IN. Management of root knot nematode (*Meloidogyne*
240 *incognita*) on cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp.) with oil cakes. *Int J Biosci.*
241 2014;5(12):413–419.

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

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

247 12. Aduke VDO. *Nematode response to soil organic amendments in a semi-arid region under*
248 *soybean (Glycine max), Naivasha, Kenya. MSc thesis, University of Nairobi, Kenya, 2016;1–*
249 *82.*

250 13. Wen-kun H, Hong-li J, Godelieve G, Jane D, Tina K. Biochar amended potting medium

- 251 reduces the susceptibility of rice to root knot nematodes infections. BMC Plant Biol.
252 2015;15:267.
- 253 14. Nyankpala Agricultural Experimental Station (NAES). Annual report 1984. Tamale, Ghana.
254 1984;41.
- 255 15. Zhang M, Gao B, Varnoosfaderani S, Hebard A, Yao Y, Inyang M. "Preparation and
256 characterization of a novel magnetic biochar for arsenic removal," Bioresource Technology.
257 2013;130:457–462.
- 258 16. Whitehead AG, Hemming Jr. A comparison of some quantitative methods of extracting small
259 vermiform nematodes from soil. Ann Appl Biol. 1965;55:25–38.
- 260 17. Bridge J, Page SLJ. Estimation of root knot nematode infestation levels on roots using a
261 rating chart. Tropical Pest Management. 1980;26:296–298.
- 262 18. Taylor AL, Sasser, JN. Biology, identification, and control of root knot nematode (*Meloidogyne*
263 species). Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University Graphics. 1978
- 264 19. Howard T. The effect of biochar on the root development of corn and soybeans in Minnesota
265 soil and sand. International Biochar Initiative. 2011;1–23.
- 266 20. Grabber ER, Yigal E, Eddie C, Yael MH, Beni L. The biochar effect: plant resistance to biotic
267 stresses. A review. Phytopathol Mediterr. 2011;50:335–349.
- 268 21. Sharma IP, Sharma AK. Effect of initial inoculum levels of *Meloidogyne incognita* J2 on
269 development and growth of tomato cv. PT-3 under control conditions. Afr J microbiol Res.
270 2015;9(20):1376–1380.
- 271 22. Hossain MK, Strezov V, Yin-Chan, K, Nelson PF. Agronomic properties of wastewater sludge
272 biochar and bioavailability of metals in production of cherry tomato (*Lycopersicon*
273 *esculentum*). Chemosphere. 2010;78(9):1167–1171.
- 274 23. Maleita CMN, Curtis RHC, Powers SJ, Abrantes IMO. Inoculum levels of *Meloidogyne*
275 *hispanica* and *M. javanica* affect nematode reproduction, and growth of tomato genotypes.
276 Phytopathol Mediterr. 2012;51(3):566–576.
- 277 24. Haider MG, Dev LK, Nath RP. Comparative pathogenicity of root knot nematode, *Meloidogyne*
278 *incognita*, on different pulse crops. Ind J Nematol. 2003;33:152–153.
- 279 25. Lehmann J, Gaunt J, Rondon M. Biochar sequestration in terrestrial ecosystems. A review.
280 Mit Adapt Strat Global Chang. 2006;11:403–427.
- 281 26. Babu AM, Vineet K, Tomy P. Root knot nematode: A hard to kill parasite study. Indian Silk
282 1999;38:11–12.
- 283 27. Moens T, Yeates GW, Ley P. Use of carbon and energy sources by nematodes. In:
284 Proceeding of the Fourth International Congress of Nematology. 2004;2:529–545.
- 285 28. Mitkowski NA, Abawi GS. Reproductive fitness on lettuce of populations of *Meloidogyne hapla*
286 from New York State vegetable fields. Nematology. 2003;5(1):77–83.