1 # Abstract

2 Nematodes represent a species-rich and morphologically diverse group of metazoans known
3 to inhabit both aquatic and terrestrial environments. Their role as biological indicators and as
4 key players in nutrient cycling has been well documented. Some plant-parasitic species are
5 also known to cause significant losses to crop production. In spite of these, there still exists a
6 huge gap in our knowledge of their diversity due to the enormity of time and expertise often
7 involved in characterising their species using phenotypic features. Molecular methodology
8 provides a useful means of complementing the limited number of reliable diagnostic
9 characters available for morphology-based identification. We discuss herein some of the
10 limitations of traditional taxonomy and how molecular methodologies, especially the use of
11 high throughput sequencing, have assisted in carrying out large scale nematode community
12 studies and characterisation of phytonematodes through rapid identification of multiple taxa.
13 We also provide brief descriptions of some the current and almost-outdated high throughput
14 sequencing platforms and their applications in both plant nematology and soil ecology.
15

16 # 1. Introduction

17 The phylum Nematoda is a species-rich taxonomic group that has been reported in abundant
18 numbers across a wide range of habitats (Cobb, 1915; Holterman et al., 2009), from aquatic
19 marine and freshwater to terrestrial environments (van Megen, 2009). They represent one of
20 the most dominant metazoans on the surface of the earth in terms of abundance and diversity
21 (Groombridge, 1992; Wilson, 2000), with densities of up to 10^8 individuals per square meter
22 and species richness of up to 60 morphospecies (species delineated based on morphology)
23 per 75 cm^3 of sediment (Lambshead, 2004) reported in marine environments. Approximately
24 four out of every five metazoans are estimated to be nematodes (Bongers and Bongers,
25 1998). And in addition to these high abundances, nematodes have been shown to exhibit a
26 remarkable range of feeding behaviour (Yeates et al., 1993) and life history strategies
27 (Bongers, 1990). In terms of feeding groups, there are bacterial, fungal and plant feeders, and
28 then omnivores and carnivores. Life strategies span from the small-bodied highly fecund r-
29 strategists, such as the bacterivorous rhabditidae to the large-bodied less fecund k-
30 strategists, such as the omnivorous dorylaimida.

31 Previous studies have shown that prevailing physical conditions such as soil texture, climate,
32 biogeography, as well as enrichment and disturbance events can be reflected through species
33 composition of the local nematode community (Cobb, 1915; Tietjen, 1989; Yeates, 1984;
34 Neher, 2001). In other words, depending on the state of the environment- for example
35 whether soil is stable or has undergone some recent perturbation, the soil nematode
36 community is likely to differ from one place to another. The contribution of nematodes to
37 nutrient cycling (Bardgett et al., 1999; Bongers and Ferris, 1999; Wardle et al., 2006) is a very
38 well documented aspect of the role they play in maintaining a balance in the functioning of
39 the ecosystem. And as permanent community members (being unable to escape habitat
40 disturbance), they serve as important biological indicators of sediment quality (Bongers and
41 Ferris, 1999; Sochova et al., 2006; Wilson and Kakouli-Duarte, 2009; Höss et al., 2011).

42 Nematode indices used to assess soil quality are based mostly on categorisation of nematodes
43 into feeding groups, reproductive strategies and general responses to physical and organic
44 disturbances (Bongers, 1990; Bongers and Ferris, 1999). Classifications into such functional
45 groups are often means of simply lumping together individuals considered to have similar
46 influence on ecosystem functioning; and the validity of such grouping depends mainly on the
47 underlying research objectives (Bongers and Bongers, 1998). Therefore, individuals within a
48 group may not necessarily have any close phylogenetic connections. The family or genus level
49 identification is often sufficiently informative enough for understanding nematodes' role in
50 soil functioning, although species level identification will certainly unravel more information
51 pertaining to several key ecological concepts (Bongers and Bongers, 1998; Yeates, 2003). The
52 drawback, however, is that their high abundance, minute size and conserved morphology
53 (Decraemer and Hunt, 2006) preclude rapid and accurate identification of species.
54 Consequently, this has severely limited the fraction of environmental samples analysed in
55 nematode community studies, thus limiting the scale and resolution of many important
56 ecological studies (Porazinska et al., 2010).

57 In terms of the need for accurate identification of nematodes to species level, research has
58 largely focused on plant parasitic taxa, due mainly to the magnitude of direct economic losses
59 they inflict on agriculture – an estimated USD118 billion in a single year (McCarter, 2009).
60 Their management in field crops has for a long time been dependent on the use of
61 nematicides (Hague and Gowen, 1987) which are being gradually phased out following the
62 realisation of the impact that these nematicides pose to the environment (Akhtar and Malik,
63 2000). The EU some years ago made some very important modifications to its policy on the
64 use of pesticides to make it more sustainable and to reduce the risk this poses to human
65 health and the environment. This has led to the re-evaluation (Regulation 2009/1107/EC OL
66 and Directive 2009/128/EC) of various synthetic pesticides leaving only a few nematicides
67 available for use by growers (Ntalli and Menkissoglu-Spiroudi, 2011). Alternative non-
68 chemical options have for sometime now been sought to replace the loss of synthetic
69 products (Kerry, 2000). Examples include crop rotation and host plant resistance. Effective
70 implementation of such strategies often requires a good understanding of the taxonomy and
71 biology of plant parasitic nematodes species being targeted. This is because most plant
72 resistance genes are effective only against a narrow range of parasitic species or populations.
73 Therefore, knowing the targeted parasitic species or population makes easier the choice of
74 which plant genotype introduce into the field.

75 The existence of character variation and physiological races within species are some of the
76 problems associated with, but not limited to the taxonomy of plant parasitic nematodes
77 (Allen and Sher, 1967). Such complications among other factors became the main catalysts
78 for the search for alternative approaches devoid of the constraints associated with
79 morphological identifications. Particularly within the genus *Meloidogyne*, a taxon that has
80 received by far more attention than any other group of plant parasitic nematodes (Sasser and
81 Carter, 1982), techniques such as the differential host test (Sasser, 1954), scanning electron

microscopy (Eisenback and Hirschmann, 1981; Charchar and Eisenback, 2000; Eisenback and Hunt, 2009), biochemical approaches such as isozyme electrophoresis (Berge and Dalmasso, 1975; Esbenshade and Triantaphyllou, 1985; 1990; Tastet et al., 2001; Carneiro et al., 2000) as well as molecular techniques (Hyman, 1990; Harris et al., 1990; Petersen and Vrain, 1996; Powers et al., 2005) have been used to complement light microscopic approach for identification. Each of the above mentioned techniques have certain constraints that limit their use as quick, accurate and simple tool for nematode identification across the phylum. However, the use of molecular methods has continued to gain recognition for being fast, reliable and an easy diagnostic approach across many taxa within the phylum Nematoda (Floyd et al., 2002; De Ley et al., 2005).

It is important to mention that most of the pioneering works on molecular-based nematode detection were developed on plant parasitic nematodes. As evidence of the importance of molecular data in taxonomy, it has become a common practice in recent times that most taxonomic descriptions comprise both morphology and morphometric studies as well as molecular analysis of the taxon's relatedness to other species (Handoo et al., 2004; Vovlas et al., 2011; Cantalapiedra-Navarrete et al., 2013). Over the past two decades there have been a number of published reviews on molecular methods of plant parasitic nematode identification discussing in depth the different markers and DNA target regions used for discriminating species, their future prospects and limitations (Powers, 2004; Blok, 2004, 2005). More recently, high throughput species identification using next generation sequencing (NGS) technology has also been applied for large scale nematode community studies to enhance better understanding of their diversity. This technique, known as metabarcoding has also been applied in the area of plant nematology as a means of analysing very large samples of important plant parasitic nematode groups for improved understanding of their distribution and diversities (Eves-Van Den Akker et al., 2016). This current review discusses some of the past and most current approaches to nematode identification and classification with some emphasis on the future use of high throughput species identification for large-scale nematode pest detection and on the possibility of increased use of nematode communities for evaluation of management strategies and assessments of ecosystem health.

Classical taxonomy

The need for diagnosticians with the skills for routine identification of taxa based on morphological differences is a problem well acknowledged across many areas of plant pathology, of which nematology is no exception (Blok, 2005). According to Coomans (2002), morphology can still provide useful diagnostic characters, especially if we are able to overcome the limited resolution light microscopy provides. And despite all its limitations, morphology-based study when carried out diligently can be as good as any biochemical or molecular method used in identifying taxa (Mayr and Ashlock, 1991; De Ley, 2006; Agatha and Strüder-Kypke, 2007). What is lacking, however, is the technical and taxonomic expertise required to correctly utilize phenotypic characters and use this to effectively make a decision about the identity of an organism (Abebe et al., 2013). The continuous decline in the number

of taxonomists has serious repercussions to our understanding of life's diversity. According to Coomans (2002) this waning number of specialists is also detrimental even to the quality of taxonomic researches that get published, since less qualified referees have to review such manuscripts.

Prior to the introduction of molecular data, studies on phylogenetic relationships within nematology have been based on morphological characters. A notable challenge to the use of morphological characters for achieving a more natural classification is recognizing characters that are homologous from those that are not. A similar problem has been reported with the use of molecular data where identifying positional homology has been a major hindrance to their use in reconstructing phylogeny among taxa (Abebe et al., 2013). Although it is evidently much easier to identify and quantify sequence evolution than morphological evolution (De Ley, 2000), DNA data when used alone may be subject to some amount of noise and artefact (Dorris et al., 1999). In view of this, Dayrat (2005) proposed a more holistic approach to describing biodiversity which involves the integration of as much data about the organism as possible. According to Dayrat (2005), it is better that morphological and molecular approaches are not seen as competing with each other but rather, used to complement one another. For example, Sites and Marshall (2003), in their review of twelve delimitation methods, cautioned against adherence to the use of one method to singly delimit species, since all of the approaches can possibly fail at some point when used in isolation. This integrative approach has been successfully applied in some studies for examining species diversity (Boisselier-Dubayle and Gofas, 1999; Shaw and Allen, 2000; Williams, 2000; Drotz and Saura, 2001; Marcussen, 2003, De Ley et al., 2005; Ferri et al., 2009).

Integrative taxonomy is without a doubt an excellent approach to species delimitation, especially with the existence of several species concepts, and the fact that each of the species delineation approaches when used singly only constitutes one of the multiple aspects of life's diversity (Dayrat, 2005). However, a key constraint to the widespread adoption of this method is the time and expertise involved. One of the major goals of modern taxonomy is to find identification methods which are fast, accurate, reliable, affordable and perhaps even capable of characterizing undescribed specimens (Powers, 2004). In the identification of regulated pest species, for example, speed and accuracy are very important (Holterman et al., 2012; Kiewnick et al., 2014). Therefore, although reliable and probably more accurate than any of the individual approaches, integrative taxonomy may lack the speed and simplicity which are equally important in certain situations. The best option therefore, remains to improve and optimize the process of collecting and analysing molecular data to make them singly powerful for species delineation.

Biochemical methods for nematode identification

Several biochemical and molecular approaches have been used for identification of nematodes. Genomic information at all levels have been utilized for identifying nematodes,

from DNA sequence, the structure of molecules, genetic mutations to the presence versus absence of genes (Subbotin and Moens, 2007). At the protein level, isozyme analysis (Esbenshade and Triantaphyllou, 1990; Payan and Dickson, 1990), two-dimensional sodium dodecyl sulphate polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (2-D SDS-PAGE) (Ferris et al., 1994), monoclonal or polyclonal antibodies-base serological techniques (Jones et al., 1988; Schots et al., 1990) and matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOFMS) (Perera et al., 2009) are the methods that have been utilized for distinguishing nematodes at species or subspecific levels (Table 1).

The use of molecular data for identification of taxa has also been widely accepted, largely because of its inherent ability to overcome most limitations associated with traditional morphology-based nematode identification. Most molecular diagnostic methods are PCR based and rely on DNA sequence variations. The DNA regions often specifically targeted include the nuclear ribosomal DNA, satellite DNAs and various protein coding genes within the mitochondrial genome (Blok, 2005).

Other approaches are based on random amplification of DNA sequences. Examples include the randomly amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) (Cenis, 1993 Castagnone-sereno et al., 1994), amplified fragment length polymorphism (AFLP) (Semblat et al., 1998; Marche et al., 2001), restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) (Curran et al., 1986; Carpenter et al., 1992) and sequence characterized amplified DNA regions (SCAR) (Zijlstra, 2000; Zijlstra et al., 2000; Carrasco-Ballesteros et al., 2007) (Table 2). These random DNA target based markers have the advantage of having a higher multiplex ratio, a feature which is particularly useful when there is insufficient sequence divergence in the targeted DNA regions (Blok, 2005).

DNA barcoding

Molecular diagnostics of nematodes has over the years seen enormous progress. Technological advancements, particularly in the areas of DNA amplification and sequencing, have been the main driving forces towards achieving this. They have made it possible to accumulate substantial amounts of genetic data with sufficient information on sequence divergence that can aid in reliable and easy identification of nematodes (Blok, 2005). Data provided by molecular diagnostics have also enhanced our understanding of nematode systematics and biology in general, by demonstrating whether or not a targeted DNA region will be suitable for species identification (Holterman et al., 2009). Molecular approaches have enabled the validation of most of the classically delineated nematode taxa (Powers and Fleming, 1998) while providing clarification in areas where the classical approach has failed. For example, molecular approaches may provide the only practical means of discriminating between cryptic species (Powers, 2004). They are also fast, relatively simple, applicable to all nematode life stages, provide highly specific means of identifying taxa, (Powers, 2004) and most of all provide substantial amount of differential characteristics in the form of sequence divergence (Blok, 2005).

200 Most molecular diagnostics have targeted two main genomic regions for sequence
201 divergence: the nuclear ribosomal RNA genes with their transcribed and untranscribed spaces
202 and the mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase I (COI) gene. The nuclear ribosomal RNA genes
203 constitute a highly conserved but sufficiently divergent region of the genome that has proven
204 very useful for species discrimination among many groups of nematodes. These genes occur
205 in multiple copies in the genome, thus making them easily amplifiable by Polymerase Chain
206 Reaction (PCR). These tandemly repeating units may also occur in variable number of copies
207 between different taxa and even between closely related individuals in nematodes. Basically,
208 rRNA genes consist of 18S, 5.8S and the 28S genes separated by the non-coding internal
209 transcribed spacers 1 and 2 (ITS 1 and 2) positioned between 18S and 5.8S and between 5.8S
210 and 28S respectively.

211 Like all DNA based identification methods, DNA barcoding was designed for situations where
212 the morphology-based approach proved problematic. It is defined as the use of standardized
213 DNA regions as markers for rapid and accurate species identification (Hebert et al., 2005;
214 Blaxter, 2005). The key distinguishing feature between DNA barcoding and other molecular
215 diagnostic methods is the use of standardized markers in the former. Therefore, one of the
216 aims of the barcoding consortium is to build taxonomic reference libraries with sequences of
217 standardized markers from different organisms (Taberlet et al., 2012). Thus, by comparing
218 the sequences of such markers from unidentified organisms with these reference sequences,
219 their identities can be determined.

220 DNA barcoding has proven useful in our understanding of the degree of variation there is
221 between certain species and how these variations can obscure identification. For example,
222 the concept of cryptic species shows how morphology alone cannot be relied on for
223 discriminating phenotypically identical but valid species. Studies have shown that there are
224 several examples of cryptic species (e.g. *Tobrilus gracilis* (Ristau et al., 2013)) within the
225 phylum Nematoda that were previously considered to be the same species (Chilton et al.,
226 1995; Derycke et al., 2005; Fonseca et al., 2008). Barcoding also provides a means of
227 identifying rare species or specimens with limited availability.

228 DNA barcoding may also be the only option available for identifying an organism when the
229 required life stage or specific sex for morphological identification is lacking or the morphology
230 of the specimen being studied is badly distorted. And finally on the control of pest movement
231 within trade where speed and accuracy of species identification is critical, barcoding offers a
232 quick and reliable means of detecting quarantine nematode species (Powers, 2004).

233 Hebert et al. (2003), in their heavily cited study on biological identifications through DNA
234 barcoding, proposed the use of COI of the mitochondrial DNA as a molecular marker for DNA
235 barcoding. As a result, COI has been widely used as standard barcode marker for metazoans
236 (Ferri et al., 2009). Different markers have been proposed for other groups of cellular
237 organisms. Markmann and Tautz, (2005) used the nuclear rRNA gene to study the diversity of
238 meiobenthos (small meiofauna that live in marine and freshwater sediments). Applying the
239 environmental metabarcoding approach, Fonseca et al. (2010) used the nuclear SSU gene of

240 the rRNA to study marine metazoan biodiversity. In plants, on the other hand, the preferred
241 barcode markers are ones found within the chloroplast genome, and identification often
242 entails the use of combination of two or more regions of this genome (Lahaye et al., 2008;
243 Hollingsworth et al., 2009) or with other nuclear genes (Tripathi et al., 2013). The nuclear
244 small subunit ribosomal RNA gene has also been successfully used as marker for studies
245 involving nematodes (Floyd et al., 2002; Porazinska et al., 2010).

246 The rRNA genes (SSU and LSU) are preferred over the mitochondrial COI gene in most
247 nematological studies due to the availability of more conserved regions for universal primer
248 design. Moreover, the abundance of sequences of these two genes from described taxa in
249 public databases make matching sequences for identification an easier job than when using
250 COI. In terms of resolution, however, COI is capable of discriminating between species more
251 than either of the rRNA genes. But a combination of the SSU and LSU genes has been shown
252 to be able to significantly improve the resolution, thereby achieving better detection levels
253 (Porazinska et al., 2009). With current advancements in sequencing technology resulting in
254 increasingly wide usage of next generation sequencing, a form of barcoding which has
255 recently gained much popularity is DNA metabarcoding. Taberlet et al. (2012) defined
256 metabarcoding as the automated identification of several species from a single bulk sample
257 containing multiples of different taxa. Using this approach, it is possible to carry out high
258 throughput identification of several species in a parallel fashion. DNA metabarcoding
259 classically involves the analysis bulk DNA derived from environmental samples (Taberlet et
260 al., 2012).

261 A typical metabarcoding approach proceeds as follows (i) extracting bulk DNA from the
262 organisms or directly from the environment (ii) amplifying a selected DNA barcode marker
263 region using universal primers (iii) sequencing all the amplified regions in parallel via a next
264 generation sequencing platform (iv) clustering of sequences into molecular operational
265 taxonomic units (MOTU) and (v) matching each MOTU against sequences of identified
266 organisms in a reference database (Valentini et al., 2009). Metabarcoding like standard
267 barcoding is based on the assumption that with appropriate barcode marker(s), each
268 molecular operational taxonomic unit can be assigned to a described species through its DNA
269 sequence (Orgiazzi et al., 2015) or identified as unknown if not yet described to assist with
270 the discovery of unknown biodiversity.

271 Almost all DNA metabarcoding applications in nematology have mainly been based on the
272 analysis of bulk samples of entire organisms already isolated from the containing substrates
273 such as soil, water, plant material etc. (Porazinska et al., 2009; Porazinska et al., 2010; Creer
274 et al., 2010; Bik et al., 2012). Beyond multispecies identification from bulk samples of entire
275 extracted organisms, metabarcoding also may comprise the use of total and typically
276 degraded DNA extracted directly from environmental samples without prior isolation of
277 organisms (Taberlet et al., 2012). This approach, if successfully applied in nematology, can
278 help overcome the inconsistencies and poor recovery rates associated with various nematode
279 extraction methods (see, den Nijs and van den Berg, 2013). This method was applied for

community profiling of nematodes from European soils using the 18S rDNA (Waite et al., 2003). Sapkota et al. (2015) also tested and developed new amplification approach to enable high throughput analysing of soil samples by directly extracting the DNA without a nematode extraction step. The authors reported very good coverage of the nematode diversity within the tested soils. However, detailed assessment of the efficiency of DNA recovery from the soil is generally lacking. Also, such a method will usually only allow for analysis of soil samples much smaller in volume than would otherwise be used if there would be an extraction step. Moreover, since most meiofaunal organisms are often found in substrates with volumes profoundly larger than the total biomass of the organisms themselves, it becomes eminent that they are separated first before DNA can successfully be extracted (Creer et al., 2010). Nonetheless, with sufficient testing and validation, this approach can be immensely beneficial in the long run.

Limitations of high throughput DNA barcoding

There are a number of challenges associated with DNA metabarcoding analysis of environmental DNA. The most notable of these is the identification of a suitable marker to provide the required taxonomic coverage and species resolution. This problem is not unique to only metabarcoding but is shared by the single species standard barcoding as well. As mentioned in earlier paragraphs, the SSU rRNA gene has been the most commonly used marker in nematode barcoding due to the availability of extensive database resources and the possibility of using conserved regions for designing versatile primers. The latter are continuously improved to allow coverage of newly discovered taxa (Sapkota 2015). In contrast, it has been shown to have limited taxonomic resolution among certain taxa within the phylum Nematoda. Nonetheless SSU rRNA region is still the marker of choice for DNA metabarcoding of environmental samples where wider coverage remains essential and species level identification not strictly important.

The COI gene on the other hand, is the designated marker for animals as a result of the degree of sequence divergence associated with it, thus permitting species-level delimitation (Deagle et al., 2014). In the case of nematodes, there appears to be a challenge finding suitable primer sets that can amplify this marker across distant taxa due to the extreme sequence divergence within the mitochondrial genome within this phylum (Taberlet et al., 2012). Hence, the challenge still remains as to where the most suitable barcode marker(s) might be found within the nuclear and mitochondrial genome.

Another issue with DNA metabarcoding is its reliance on PCR (Taberlet et al., 2012). Significant amount of errors has been shown to accrue during amplification (Haas et al., 2011; Porazinska et al., 2012). These errors often lead to misinterpretation of diversity within samples, mainly due to the formation of chimeras (Huber et al., 2004; Edgar et al., 2011). While most of these errors have been attributed to technical factors such as PCR and sequencing errors, inappropriate protocols such as incorrect annealing temperatures and cycle numbers as well as human errors can contribute to the formation sequence artefacts. Fonseca et al. (2012)

defined chimeras as artefacts of PCR consisting of sequence fragments from two or more phylogenetically distinct sequence origins. They are produced when an incompletely extended DNA fragment from one cycle anneals to a template of an unrelated taxon and gets copied to completion in the subsequent cycles. Their formation has been shown to be higher in samples that are species-rich and genetically diverse (Fonseca et al., 2012).

According to Porazinska et al. (2012), up to 14% of raw sequence data can be made up of chimeras and in clustered OTU datasets, they can constitute up to 40% of dataset. Considering how rampant they may be in sequence dataset, there is always the risk such hybrid sequences being classified as new taxa or unknown to science as is often the case in many metabarcoding studies. Stringent approaches to removing them from sequence data are, thus, warranted. Several bioinformatic tools designed to identify and discard such hybrid sequences from the reads generated from high throughput sequencing platforms are available (Beccuti et al., 2013). For biodiversity studies, the most commonly used ones are CHIMERA_CHECK, Pintail, Mallard, Bellerophon, ChimeraChecker, ChimeraSlayer, Perseus and UCHIME. Persues and UCHIME, operate on the assumption that chimeric sequences should be less frequent than the parental sequences (Edgar et al., 2011; Bik et al., 2012). In other words, the assumption is that chimeras are less abundant than their parents because they have undergone fewer cycles of amplification compared to their parents. Another method of chimera picking which is incorporated within the QIIME analysis pipeline, is the blast fragment method which is based on the BLAST taxonomic-assignment (Altschul et al. 1990).

One other constraint to DNA barcoding is the need for a huge repository of sequences of characterized species. This data generation process is arguably the most important step, as the success of any future identification will depend on the accuracy of sequence information in the database. Without any sequence from described taxa to match the obtained sequences with, they may convey limited biological or taxonomic meaning to the investigator. This need for existing sequence information for specific applications has been the main hindrance to many efforts to widen the choices of potential barcode markers, since that would mean channelling a substantial amount of effort into building databases with sequence information from as many characterized species as possible. It also explains why almost all metabarcoding studies involving nematodes tend to use only the SSU rDNA as barcode (Porazinska et al., 2009, Creer et al., 2010, Bik et al., 2012).

Next generation sequencing technology

In spite of the immense improvements made to the capillary electrophoresis sequencing method, cost of sequencing, time and labour needed were still too high for the growing demands for DNA sequence information (Metzker, 2005) – it was so until the introduction of the various next generation sequencing (NGS) platforms. These platforms have reduced the cost and run time for sequencing significantly (Zhou et al., 2013). The run time for these sequencers can range from just minutes to weeks (Glenn, 2011). There are currently a number

359 of platforms available, all based on some common basic principles, such as their streamlined
360 library preparation steps, and the simultaneity of sequencing and detection processes. They
361 each employ complex interactions of enzymology, chemistry, high-resolution optics,
362 hardware, and software engineering (Mardis, 2008).

363 The following are some of the next generation sequencing platforms that surfaced into the
364 market some years ago: The Roche 454 genome sequencer, the Illumina Solexa technology,
365 the SMRT sequencing technology by Pacific Biosciences, the Ion Torrent and the ABI SOLiD
366 platform. Other platforms included the Polonator and the HeliScope single molecule
367 sequencer technology. Both the Polonator and the HeliScope are single molecule (shotgun)
368 sequencing platforms; hence no amplification step is needed. These have the advantage of
369 eliminating biodiversity inflation or artifacts often associated with PCR-based sequencing
370 methods. The absence of PCR in their sequencing pipelines also means abundant information
371 of taxa in samples, which are often obscured by amplification, can be revealed (Zhou et al.,
372 2013). There have been several review articles that have covered in detail how each of these
373 platforms operate including the chemistry and the instrumentations involved (Mardis, 2008;
374 Metzker, 2005). This review will, therefore, only touch on a few basic and key features of
375 these platforms.

376 The Roche 454 pyrosequencer was the first next generation sequencing platform to become
377 commercially available. It was introduced into the market in 2004 (Mardis, 2008). This
378 method is based on the pyrosequencing approach which was first described by Hyman (1988).
379 The main advantage to using this platform is the relatively long read lengths of the sequences,
380 thus making assembly of contigs easier even in the absence of reference genomes. On the
381 other hand, it has shallow sequencing coverage due to the few reads it generates per run (1
382 million sequences). It also has higher errors rates, especially when it encounters
383 homopolymer repeats within the sequence (Ekblom and Galindo, 2011). These characteristics
384 are some of the reasons why the technology has since been superseded by other approaches
385 described below. Recent reports indicate that Roche will soon withdraw support for this
386 instrument marking an end to the 454 technology.

387 The 454 technology was soon followed by the Solexa/Illumina technology as the second NGS
388 platform to be available commercially. Solexa sequencing has a far more superior sequencing
389 output and depth of coverage than the 454 pyrosequencer. It records fewer incidences of
390 errors in homopolymer regions compared to its 454 predecessor. One of its platforms, the
391 Miseq series currently can produce read lengths of up to 2x300 bp
392 (www.illumina.com/systems/miseq.html) which is an improvement over the 35 bp read
393 lengths of the early Solexa platforms. Nonetheless, Illumina has its own unique base calling
394 errors. For instance, it has been observed that accumulation of errors tends to be higher
395 towards the 3' end than at the 5' end (Schroder et al., 2010). There has also been an observed
396 association between increase single-base errors and GGC sequence motifs (Nakamura et al.,
397 2011).

398 The SOLiD platform from Applied Biosystems employs a similar library preparation as the

399 previously mentioned NGS platforms. But unlike the other platforms, it uses ligation to
400 determine sequences. Because each base pair is essentially sequenced twice, the error rates
401 encountered tends to be less in this platform (Ekblom and Galindo, 2011).

402 The HeliScope was the first NGS platform to introduce the single-molecule sequencing
403 approach. Although this platform has the advantage of being less prone to errors especially
404 those related to amplification artefacts, it produced read lengths that are short compared to
405 any of the previous technologies. For this reason and the high cost of the instrument, the
406 HeliScope is no longer being sold (Glenn, 2011).

407 The Ion Torrent platform operates in a similar fashion as the 454 technology in that they both
408 involve similar library preparation steps and sequential introduction of each of the four bases.
409 However, instead of registering base incorporation by fluorescent emission, H^+ are released
410 and a signal in proportion to the number of incorporated bases is detected (Rothberg et al.,
411 2011). The PGM (Personal Genome Machine) of Ion Torrent was evaluated together with
412 other platforms such as Illumina and Pacific Biosystem by Quail et al. (2012). The results
413 indicated that the PGM gave an excellent coverage for those sequences with high GC content
414 to moderate AT richness. However, sequencing of AT-rich genomes resulted in substantial
415 amount of bias with coverage for only about 70% of the genome. On its ability to detect
416 variants, it slightly outperformed the MiSeq, but in doing so recorded significant amount of
417 false positives as well.

418 The SMRT sequencing technology by Pacific Biosciences is based on the natural process of
419 DNA replication by DNA polymerase for real time sequencing of individual DNA molecules (Eid
420 et al., 2009). Each dNTP has a specific fluorescence label attached to its terminal phosphate,
421 which upon incorporation of a nucleotide gets detected immediately before it is cleaved off
422 (www.pacificbiosciences.com/products/smrt-technology/). Features such as high speed, long
423 read lengths, high fidelity and low cost per experiment have made this technology a desirable
424 investment (Glenn, 2011; https://genohub.com/ngs-instrument-guide/). However, in
425 comparison with the Ion Torrent and MiSeq sequencers, higher depth of coverage is required
426 for calling of variants (Quail et al., 2012).

427 Most NGS-based nematode community studies have used the pyrosequencing method of the
428 Roche 454 platform (Porazinska et al., 2009, 2010; Creer et al., 2010; Bik et al., 2012; Lallias,
429 2015). The relatively longer read lengths generated with this platform made it more suitable
430 for metabarcoding analysis. Porazinska et al. (2009) carried out one of the early studies to
431 evaluate the suitability of NGS for nematode metabarcoding analysis while comparing two
432 potential barcode regions from the SSU and LSU genomic regions. Using a combination of the
433 two, up to 97% of the species in the tested community were detected in this study. Using
434 either of these markers alone could only not provide this high coverage of the diversity in the
435 sample. The authors also found no correlation between the number of reads generated for
436 each of the sampled taxa and their abundances. In fact, some of the low abundant taxa
437 produced the highest number of reads. Later, Creer et al. (2010) reported a case study of
438 meiofaunal diversity in marine littoral benthos and tropical rainforest habitats. Out of eleven

439 classified taxonomic groups recovered from each of the case studies, nematodes emerged as
440 the most dominant taxonomic group in both environments through the proportion of the
441 total number of molecular operational taxonomic units (MOTUs) that matched sequences of
442 nematodes.

443 Using metabarcoding, Lallias et al. (2015) examined the variation in diversities of protists and
444 microbial metazoans including nematodes across two distinct estuaries in UK. They utilized
445 the same small subunit nuclear rRNA gene marker as the one used by Fonseca et al. (2010) in
446 a similar study on marine microbial eukaryotes. One of the key aspect of the outcome of this
447 study was that patterns of the marine meiofauna diversity followed specific factors such as
448 hydrodynamics, salinity range and granulometry depending on their life-history
449 characteristics. In phytonematology, metabarcoding approach targeting a region within the
450 mitochondrial genome was used in a recent study to characterise populations of potato cyst
451 nematodes from several Scottish soils (Eves-Van Den Akker et al., 2015). Besides this study
452 describing the distribution of *Globodera pallida* mitotypes across Scotland, it also outlined
453 how to carry out an accurate, high throughput and quantitative means of characterizing up
454 to a thousand fields at the same time.

455 High throughput Next Generation Sequencing (NGS) methods have also been applied in
456 sequencing of complete mitochondrial genomes (Jex et al., 2008a, 2010). The process
457 involved an initial amplification step referred to as Long PCR which is important to provide
458 enough copies of the mitochondrial genome for sequencing. This step basically amplifies the
459 entire mitochondrial genome as two overlapping fragments of approximately 5 and 10 kb
460 sizes (Hu et al., 2002) which then were subsequently bulked and sequenced using the Roche
461 454 platform. Prior to the use of NGS for whole mitochondrial genome sequencing, the
462 sequencing step was carried out by “primer walking” on capillary sequencers (Jex et al.,
463 2008b). This exercise, if carried out for as many nematode species as possible, may enhance
464 the utility of the complete mitochondrial genome for inferring phylogeny between related
465 taxa. At the moment, this area remains to be properly exploited. Although most widely
466 adopted phylogenetic relationships derived from molecular data are based on the small
467 subunit ribosomal RNA gene (Blaxter et al., 1998; Holterman et al., 2006; van Megen et al.,
468 2009), information relating to phylogeny from the mitochondrial genome may increase
469 greatly our understanding of relationships between nematodes.
470

471 Concluding remarks

472 The major determining factor for the success or otherwise of any marker-based molecular
473 identification method, whether it is standard DNA barcoding or metabarcoding, is finding the
474 most suitable marker or a combination of markers. Several markers have been tested on
475 different nematode groups and these have exhibited varying degrees of performances.
476 However, there still seem to be no known marker that can demonstrate all the key qualities
477 required of an ideal marker- to contain a region of very low substitution rate for ease of
478 amplification with a universal primer, to have regions of sufficient mutations to allow for

479 inter-species delimitation while still maintaining sufficient within species similarity across the
480 entire phylum. The choice of DNA region to target largely relies on the objectives of the study.
481 One may target any of the mitochondrial DNA- based markers such the COI, Nad5, 16S, COI
482 and Nad2 if the study demands species level resolution or to the level of populations covering
483 a narrow diversity such as a family or genus. In plant nematology, a number closely related
484 species within groups such as the cyst and root-knot nematodes have been successfully
485 identified using DNA markers within the mitochondrial genome (Eves-Van Den Akker et al.,
486 2015; Janssen et al., 2016). If, on the other hand, the study demands a wider coverage without
487 strict requirement for species level identification, as in community level analysis where
488 computation of diversity indices usually only require family or genus level identification
489 (Bongers, 1990), any of the markers within rRNA genes can be suitable.

490 DNA barcoding is a tool with numerous potentials in the field of taxonomy. It can serve as a
491 rapid identifying feature of organisms written simply as sequence of four distinct bases, thus
492 providing an unambiguous reference for rapid identification (Bucklin et al., 2011). The
493 application of this tool will allow non-experts to carry out some of the routine tasks of
494 identifying species, thus equipping scientists with tools for identifying known organisms and
495 recognition of new species. It can facilitate the recognition and discrimination of cryptic
496 species. This is especially useful when distinguishing invasive species from closely resembling
497 but harmless species. Moreover, unlike classical taxonomy, DNA barcoding makes it possible
498 to determine the identity of a species from any life stage available. And this becomes
499 particularly useful when analysing samples intercepted in trade, where diagnosticians are
500 often confronted with the problem of having very limited material to work with.

501 Although the ultimate goal in DNA barcoding is the development of molecular tool(s) capable
502 of profiling as wide diversity of the phylum as possible, for now, at least in nematology, both
503 the classical and molecular fields are needed for a better understanding of the biology and
504 diversity of nematodes. With the speed and higher output that the molecular approaches
505 introduce, nematode community analysis will be less laborious and this may eventually
506 facilitate the use of nematodes as bioindicators.

507

508 Acknowledgements

509 The authors wish to thank EUPHRESCO for the funding. We would like to thank Bex Lawson
510 of Fera for providing some nematological articles used in preparing this manuscript. We also
511 appreciate the inputs from Ian Adams and Giles Budge in the form of suggestions and
512 comments.

513

514 References

515 Abebe, E., Mekete, T., and Thomas,W. K.: A critique of current methods in nematode
516 taxonomy, Afr. J. Biotechnol., 10, 312–323, 2013.

517 Agatha, S. and Strüder-Kypke, M. C.: Phylogeny of the order Choreotrichida (Ciliophora,

518 Spirotricha, Oligotrichea) as inferred from morphology, ultrastructure, ontogenesis, and
519 SSr- RNA gene sequences, Eur. J. Protistol., 43, 37–63, 2007.

520 Akhtar, M. and Malik, A.: Roles of organic soil amendments and soil organisms in the biological
521 control of plant-parasitic nematodes: a review, Bioresource Technol., 74, 35–47, 2000.

522 Allen, M. and Sher, S.: Taxonomic problems concerning the phytoparasitic nematodes, Annu.
523 Rev. Phytopathol., 5, 247–262, 1967.

524 Altschul, S. F., Gish, W., Miller, W., Myers, E. W. and Lipman, D. J.: Basic local alignment search
525 tool., J. Mol. Biol., 215(3), 403–10, doi:10.1016/S0022-2836(05)80360-2, 1990.

526 Bardgett, R. D. and Chan, K. F.: Experimental evidence that soil fauna enhance nutrient
527 mineralization and plant nutrient uptake in montane grassland ecosystems, Soil Biol.
528 Biochem., 31(7), 1007–1014, doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(99)00014-0, 1999.

529 Beccuti, M., Carrara, M., Cordero, F., Donatelli, S., and Calogero, R. A.: The structure of state-
530 of-art gene fusion-finder algorithms, Genome Bioinformatics, 1, 1–6, 2013.

531 Bergé, J.-B. and Dalmasso, A.: Caractéristiques biochimiques de quelques populations de
532 Meloidogyne hapla et Melodogyne spp, Cah ORSTOM. Série Biologie: Nématologie, 10,
533 263–271, 1975

534 Bik, H. M., Porazinska, D. L., Creer, S., Caporaso, J. G., Knight, R., and Thomas, W. K.:
535 Sequencing our way towards understanding global eukaryotic biodiversity, Trends Ecol.
536 Evol., 27, 233–243, 2012.

537 Blaxter, M. L., De Ley, P., Garey, J. R., Liu, L. X., Scheldeman, P., Vierstraete, A., Vanfleteren, J.
538 R., Mackey, L. Y., Dorris, M., and Frisse, L. M.: A molecular evolutionary framework for the
539 phylum Nematoda, Nature, 392, 71–75, 1998.

540 Blaxter, M., Mann, J., Chapman, T., Thomas, F., Whitton, C., Floyd, R., and Abebe, E.: Defining
541 operational taxonomic units using DNA barcode data, Philos. T. R. Soc. B, 360, 1935–1943,
542 2005.

543 Blok, V. C. and Powers, T. O.: Biochemical and molecular identification, in: Root-knot
544 nematodes, edited by: Perry, R. N., Moens, M., and Starr, J. L., CABI Wallingford, UK, 98–
545 118, 2009.

546 Blok, V. C.: Molecular diagnostics for plant-parasitic nematodes, Proceedings of the Fourth
547 International Congress of Nematology, June 2002, Tenerife, Spain, Tenerife, Spain, 2004,
548 195–206, 2004.

549 Blok, V.: Achievements in and future prospects for molecular diagnostics of plant-parasitic
550 nematodes, Can. J. Plant. Pathol., 27, 176–185, 2005.

551 Boisselier-Dubayle, M. and Gofas, S.: Genetic relationships between marine and
552 marginalmarine populations of Cerithium species from the Mediterranean Sea, Mar. Biol.,
553 135, 671– 682, 1999.

554 Bongers, T. and Ferris, H.: Nematode community structure as a bioindicator in environmental
555 monitoring, Trends Ecol. Evol., 14, 224–228, 1999.

556 Bongers, T., and Bongers, M.: Functional diversity of nematodes. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 10(3),
557 pp.239–251, 1998.

558 Bongers, T.: The maturity index: an ecological measure of environmental disturbance based
559 on nematode species composition, Oecologia, 83, 14–19, 1990.

560 Bucklin, A., Steinke, D. and Blanco-Bercial, L.: DNA barcoding of marine metazoa, Ann. Rev.
561 Mar. Sci., 3, 471–508, 2011.

562 Bongers, T.: The maturity index: an ecological measure of environmental disturbance based
563 on nematode species composition, Oecologia, 83, 14–19, 1990.

564 Cantalapiedra-Navarrete, C., Navas-Cortés, J. A., Liébanas, G., Vovlas, N., Subbotin, S. A.,
565 Palomares-Rius, J. E., and Castillo, P.: Comparative molecular and morphological
566 characterisations in the nematode genus Rotylenchus: Rotylenchus paravitis n. sp., an
567 example of cryptic speciation, Zool. Anz.-A Journal of Comparative Zoology, 252, 246–268,
568 2013.

569 Carneiro, R. M., Almeida, M. R. A., and Quénéhervé, P.: Enzyme phenotypes of Meloidogyne
570 spp. populations, Nematology, 2, 645–654, 2000

571 Carpenter, A., Hiatt, E., Lewis, S., and Abbott, A.: Genomic RFLP analysis of Meloidogyne
572 arenaria race 2 populations, J. Nematol., 24, 23–28, 1992

573 Carrasco-Ballesteros, S., Castillo, P., Adams, B., and Pérez-Artés, E.: Identification of
574 Pratylenchus thornei, the cereal and legume root-lesion nematode, based on SCAR-PCR
575 and satellite DNA, Eur. J. Plant. Pathol., 118, 115–125, 2007.

576 Castagnone-Sereno, P., Vanlerberghe-Masutti, F., and Leroy, F.: Genetic polymorphism
577 between and within Meloidogyne species detected with RAPD markers, Genome, 37, 904–
578 909, 1994.

579 Cenis, J.: Identification of Four Major Meloidogyne ssp. by Random Amplified Polymorphic
580 DNA (RAPD-PCR), Phytopathology, 83, 76–76, 1993.

581 Charchar, J. and Eisenback, J.: An improved technique to prepare perineal patterns of root-
582 knot nematodes for SEM, Nematol. Bras., 24, 245–247, 2000.

583 Chilton, N. B., Gasser, R. B., and Beveridge, I.: Di_ erences in a ribosomal DNA sequence of
584 morphologically indistinguishable species within the Hypodontus macropi complex
585 (Nematoda: Strongyloidea), Int. J. Parasitol., 25, 647–651, 1995.

586 Cobb, N. A.: Nematodes and their relationships, in: Yearbook of the United States Department
587 of Agriculture, 1914, US Government Printing Office, Washington DC, 457–490, 1915.

588 Coomans, A.: Present status and future of nematode systematics, Nematology, 4, 573–582,
589 2002.

590 Creer, S., Fonseca, V., Porazinska, D., Giblin-Davis, R., Sung, W., Power, D., Packer, M.,
591 Carvalho, G., Blaxter, M., and Lambshead, P.: Ultrasequencing of the meiofaunal
592 biosphere: practice, pitfalls and promises, Mol. Ecol., 19, 4–20, 2010.

593 Curran, J., McClure, M., and Webster, J.: Genotypic di_ erentiation of Meloidogyne
594 populations by detection of restriction fragment length di_ erence in total DNA, J.
595 Nematol., 18, 83–86, 1986.

596 Dayrat, B.: Towards integrative taxonomy, Biol. J. Linn. Soc., 85, 407–415, 2005

597 De Ley, P. and Blaxter, M.: Systematic position and phylogeny, in: The biology of nematodes,
598 edited by: Lee, D., Harwood Academic Publishers, Reading, 1–30, 2002.

599 De Ley, P., De Ley, I. T., Morris, K., Abebe, E., Mundo-Ocampo, M., Yoder, M., Heras, J.,
600 Waumann, D., Rocha-Olivares, A., and Burr, A. J.: An integrated approach to fast and
601 informative morphological vouchering of nematodes for applications in molecular
602 barcoding, Philos. T. R. Soc. B, 360, 1945–1958, 2005

603 De Ley, P.: A quick tour of nematode diversity and the backbone of nematode phylogeny, in:
604 WormBook, edited by: The Caenorhabditis elegans Research Community,
605 doi/10.1895/wormbook.1.7.1, available at: www.wormbook.org (last access: 10 August
606 2015), 2006.

607 De Ley, P.: Lost in worm space: phylogeny and morphology as road maps to nematode
608 diversity, Nematology, 2, 9–16, 2000.

609 Deagle, B. E., Jarman, 5 S. N., Coissac, E., Pompanon, F., and Taberlet, P.: DNA metabarcoding
610 and the cytochrome c oxidase subunit I marker: not a perfect match, Biology Lett., 10,
611 doi:10.1098/rsbl.2014.0562, 2014.

612 Decraemer, W. and Hunt, D.: Taxonomy and principal genera, in: Plant Nematology, edited
613 by: Perry, R. and Moens, M., CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK, 3–32, 2006.

614 den Nijs, L. and van den Berg, W.: The added value of proficiency tests: choosing the proper
615 method for extracting Meloidogyne second-stage juveniles from soil, Nematology, 15,
616 143– 151, 2013.

617 Derycke, S., Remerie, T., Vierstraete, A., Backeljau, T., Vanfleteren, J., Vincx, M., and Moens,
618 T.: Mitochondrial DNA variation and cryptic speciation within the free-living marine
619 nematode Pellioditis marina, Mar. Ecol.-Prog. Ser., 300, 91–103, 2005.

620 Dorris, M., De Ley, P., and Blaxter, M.: Molecular analysis of nematode diversity and the
621 evolution of parasitism, Parasitol Today, 15, 188–193, 1999.

622 Drotz, M. K., Saura, A., and Nilsson, A. N.: The species delimitation problem applied to the
623 Agabus bipustulatus complex (Coleoptera, Dytiscidae) in north Scandinavia, Biol. J. Linn.
624 Soc., 73, 11–22, 2001.

625 Edgar, R. C., Haas, B. J., Clemente, J. C., Quince, C. and Knight, R.: UCHIME improves sensitivity
626 and speed of chimera detection, Bioinformatics, 27(16), 2194–2200, 2011.

627 Eid, J., Fehr, A., Gray, J., Luong, K., Lyle, J., Otto, G., Peluso, P., Rank, D., Baybayan, P. and
628 Bettman, B.: Real-time DNA sequencing from single polymerase molecules, Science (80-.
629)., 323(5910), 133–138, 2009.

630 Eisenback, J. and Hirschmann, H.: Identification of Meloidogyne Species on the Basis of Head
631 Shape and, Stylet Morphology of the Male, J. Nematol., 13, 513–521, 1981.

632 Eisenback, J. D. and Hunt, D. J.: General Morphology, in: Root-knot Nematodes, edited by:
633 Perry R. N., Moens, M., and Starr J. L., CABI Wallingford, UK, 18–54, 2009.

634 Ekblom, R. and Galindo, J.: Applications of next generation sequencing in molecular ecology
635 of non-model organisms, Heredity, 107, 1–15, 2011.

636 Esbenshade, P. and Triantaphyllou, A.: Isozyme phenotypes for the identification of
637 Meloidogyne species, J. Nematol., 22, 10–15, 1990.

638 Esbenshade, P. and Triantaphyllou, A.: Use of enzyme phenotypes for identification of
639 Meloidogyne species, J. Nematol., 17, 6–20, 1985.

640 Eves-Van Den Akker, S., Lilley, C. J., Reid, A., Pickup, J., Anderson, E., Cock, P. J. A., Blaxter, M.,
641 Urwin, P. E., Jones, J. T. and Blok, V. C.: A metagenetic approach to determine the diversity
642 and distribution of cyst nematodes at the level of the country, the field and the individual,
643 Mol. Ecol., 24(23), 5842–5851, doi:10.1111/mec.13434, 2015.

644 Ferri, E., Barbuto, M., Bain, O., Galimberti, A., Uni, S., Guerrero, R., Ferté, H., Bandi, C., Martin,
645 C., and Casiraghi, M.: Integrated taxonomy: traditional approach and DNA barcoding for
646 the identification of filarioid worms and related parasites (Nematoda), Front Zool., 6,
647 doi:10.1186/1742-9994-6-1, 2009.

648 Ferris, V., Ferris, J., Faghihi, J., and Ireholm, A.: Comparisons of isolates of Heterodera avenae
649 using 2-D PAGE protein patterns and ribosomal DNA, J. Nematol., 26, 144–151, 1994.

650 Floyd, R., Abebe, E., Papert, A., and Blaxter, M.: Molecular barcodes for soil nematode
651 identification, Mol. Ecol., 11, 839–850, 2002

652 Fonseca, G., Derycke, S., and Moens, T.: Integrative taxonomy in two free-living nematode
653 species complexes, Biol. J. Linn. Soc., 94, 737–753, 2008.

654 Fonseca, V. G., Carvalho, G. R., Sung, W., Johnson, H. F., Power, D. M., Neill, S. P., Packer, M.,
655 Blaxter, M. L., Lambshead, P. J. D. and Thomas, W. K.: Second-generation environmental
656 sequencing unmasks marine metazoan biodiversity, Nat. Commun., 1, 98, 2010.

657 Fonseca, V. G., Nichols, B., Lallias, D., Quince, C., Carvalho, G. R., Power, D. M. and Creer, S.:
658 Sample richness and genetic diversity as drivers of chimera formation in nSSU metagenetic
659 analyses, Nucleic Acids Res., 40(9), e66–e66, 2012.

660 Fourie, H., Zijlstra, C. and McDonald, A.: Identification of root-knot nematode species
661 occurring in South Africa using the SCAR-PCR technique, Nematology, 3(7), 675–680,
662 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/156854101753536046, 2001.

663 Glenn, T. C.: Field guide to next generation DNA sequencers, Mol. Ecol. Resour., 11, 759–769,
664 2011.

665 Groombridge, B.: Global biodiversity: status of the Earth's living resources, Chapman & Hall,
666 London, UK, 1992.

667 Haas, B. J., Gevers, D., Earl, A. M., Feldgarden, M., Ward, D. V., Giannoukos, G., Ciulla, D.,
668 Tabbaa, D., Highlander, S. K., and Sodergren, E.: Chimeric 16S rRNA sequence formation
669 and detection in Sanger and 454-pyrosequenced PCR amplicons, Genome Res., 21, 494–
670 504, 2011.

671 Hague, N. and Gowen, S.: Chemical control of nematodes, Principles and practice of
672 nematode control in crops, 131–178, 1987.

673 Handoo, Z., Nyczepir, A., Esmenjaud, D., Van der Beek, J., Castagnone-Sereno, P., Carta, L.,
674 Skantar, A., and Higgins, J.: Morphological, molecular, and differential-host
675 characterization of Meloidogyne floridensis n. sp. (Nematoda: Meloidogynidae), a root-
676 knot nematode parasitizing peach in Florida, J. Nematol., 36, 20–35, 2004

677 Harris, T., Sandall, L., and Powers, T. O.: Identification of single Meloidogyne juveniles by
678 polymerase chain reaction amplification of mitochondrial DNA, J. Nematol., 22, 518–524,
679 1990

680 Hebert, P. D. and Gregory, T. R.: The promise of DNA barcoding for taxonomy, Syst. Biol., 54,
681 852–859, 2005.

682 Hebert, P. D., Cywinska, A., and Ball, S. L.: Biological identifications through DNA barcodes, P.
683 Roy. Soc. Lond. B Bio., 270, 313–321, 2003.

684 Hollingsworth, P. M., Forrest, L. L., Spouge, J. L., Hajibabaei, M., Ratnasingham, S., van der
685 Bank, M., Chase, M. W., Cowan, R. S., Erickson, D. L., and Fazekas, A. J.: A DNA barcode for
686 land plants, Proc. Natl. Aca. Sci., 106, 12794–12797, 2009.

687 Holterman, M. H., Oggenfuss, M., Frey, J. E., and Kiewnick, S.: Evaluation of High resolution
688 Melting Curve Analysis as a New Tool for Root-knot Nematode Diagnostics, J. Phytopathol.,
689 160, 59–66, 2012.

690 Holterman, M., Karssen, G., Van Den Elsen, S., Van Megen, H., Bakker, J., and Helder, J.: Small
691 subunit rDNA-based phylogeny of the Tylenchida sheds light on relationships among some
692 high impact plant-parasitic nematodes and the evolution of plant feeding, Phytopathology,
693 99, 227–235, 2009.

694 Holterman, M., van der Wur_ , A., van den Elsen, S., van Megen, H., Bongers, T., Holovachov,
695 O., Bakker, J., and Helder, J.: Phylum-wide analysis of SSU rDNA reveals deep phylogenetic
696 relationships among nematodes and accelerated evolution toward crown clades, Mol. Biol.
697 Evol., 23, 1792–1800, 2006.

698 Höss, S., Claus, E., Von der Ohe, P. C., Brinke, M., Güde, H., Heininger, P., and Traunspurger,
699 Sochová, I., Hofman, J., and Holoubek, I.: Using nematodes in soil ecotoxicology, Environ.

700 Int., 32, 374–383, 2006

701 Hu, M., Jex, A. R., Campbell, B. E., and Gasser, R. B.: Long PCR amplification of the entire
702 mitochondrial genome from individual helminths for direct sequencing, Nat. Protoc., 2,
703 2339– 2344, 2007.

704 Huber, T., Faulkner, G., and Hugenholtz, P.: Bellerophon: a program to detect chimeric
705 sequences in multiple sequence alignments, Bioinformatics, 20, 2317–2319, 2004.

706 Hyman, E. D.: A new method of sequencing DNA, Anal. Biochem., 174, 423–436, 1988.

707 Ibrahim, S., Davies, K., and Perry, R.: Identification of the root-knot nematode, Meloidogyne
708 incognita, using monoclonal antibodies raised to non-specific esterases, Physiol. Mol.
709 Plant. P., 49, 79–88, 1996.

710 Janssen, T., Karssen, G., Verhaeven, M., Coyne, D. and Bert, W.: Mitochondrial coding genome
711 analysis of tropical root-knot nematodes (Meloidogyne) supports haplotype based
712 diagnostics and reveals evidence of recent reticulate evolution, Sci. Rep., 6, 2016.

713 Jex, A. R., Hu, M., Littlewood, D. T. J., Waeschenbach, A., and Gasser, R. B.: Using 454
714 technology for long-PCR based sequencing of the complete mitochondrial genome from
715 single Haemonchus contortus (Nematoda), BMC genomics, 9, 2008a.

716 Jex, A. R., Littlewood, D. T. J., and Gasser, R. B.: Toward next-generation sequencing of
717 mitochondrial genomes – focus on parasitic worms of animals and biotechnological
718 implications, Biotechnol. Adv., 28, 151–159, 2010.

719 Jex, A. R., Waeschenbach, A., Littlewood, D. T. J., Hu, M., and Gasser, R. B.: The Mitochondrial
720 Genome of Toxocara canis, Plos Neglect. Trop. D., 2, e273,
721 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0000273, 2008b.

722 Jones, P., Ambler, D., and Robinson, M.: The application of monoclonal antibodies to the
723 diagnosis of plant pathogens and pests, Proc. Brighton Crop., 1988, 767–776, 1988.

724 Karssen, G., Van Hoenselaar, T., Verkerk-Bakker, B., and Janssen, R.: Species identification of
725 cyst and root-knot nematodes from potato by electrophoresis of individual females,
726 Electrophoresis, 16, 105–109, 1995.

727 Kerry, B. R.: Rhizosphere interactions and the exploitation of microbial agents for the
728 biological control of plant-parasitic nematodes, Annu. Rev. Phytopathol., 38, 423–441,
729 2000.

730 Kiewnick, S., Holterman, M., van den Elsen, S., van Megen, H., Frey, J. E., and Helder, J.:
731 Comparison of two short DNA barcoding loci (COI and COII) and two longer ribosomal DNA
732 genes (SSU & LSU rRNA) for specimen identification among quarantine root-knot
733 nematodes (Meloidogyne spp.) and their close relatives, Eur. J. Plant. Pathol., 140, 97–110,
734 2014.

735 Lahaye, R., Van der Bank, M., Bogarin, D.,Warner, J., Pupulin, F., Gigot, G., Maurin, O., Duthoit,
736 S., Barraclough, T. G., and Savolainen, V.: DNA barcoding the floras of biodiversity hotspots,

Proc. Natl. Aca. Sci., 105, 2923–2928, 2008.

Lallias, D., Hiddink, J. G., Fonseca, V. G., Gaspar, J. M., Sung, W., Neill, S. P., Barnes, N., Ferrero, T., Hall, N. and Lambshead, P. J. D.: Environmental metabarcoding reveals heterogeneous drivers of microbial eukaryote diversity in contrasting estuarine ecosystems, ISME J., 9(5), 1208–1221, 2015.

Lambshead, P.: Marine nematode diversity, in: Advances and Perspectives: Nematode Morphology, Physiology and Ecology, edited by: Chen, W. Y., Chen, S. Y., and Dickson, S. W., CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK, 438–468, 2004.

Marché, L., Valette, S., Grenier, E., and Mugniéry, D.: Intra-species DNA polymorphism in the tobacco cyst nematode complex (Globodera tabacum) using AFLP, Genome, 44, 941–946, 2001.

Marcussen, T.: Evolution, phylogeography, and taxonomy within the Viola alba complex (Violaceae), Plant. Syst. Evo., 237, 51–74, 2003

Mardis, E. R.: Next-generation DNA sequencing methods, Annu. Rev. Genomics Hum. Genet., 9, 387–402, 2008.

Markmann, M. and Tautz, D.: Reverse taxonomy: an approach towards determining the diversity of meiobenthic organisms based on ribosomal RNA signature sequences, Philos. T. R. Soc. B., 360, 1917–1924, 2005.

Mayr, E. and Ashlock, P. D.: The Science of Taxonomy, in Principles of Systematic Zoology, pp. 1–14., 1991.

McCarter, J. P.: Cell Biology of Plant Nematode Parasitism, edited by R. H. Berg and C. G. Taylor, pp. 239 267, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg., 2009.

Metzker, M. L.: Emerging technologies in DNA sequencing, Genome Res., 15, 1767–1776, 2005.

Nakamura, K., Oshima, T., Morimoto, T., Ikeda, S., Yoshikawa, H., Shiwa, Y., Ishikawa, S., Linak, M. C., Hirai, A., and Takahashi, H.: Sequence-specific error profile of Illumina sequencers, Nucleic Acids Res., 39, e90, doi:10.1093/nar/gkr344, 2011.

Neher, D. A.: Role of nematodes in soil health and their use as indicators, J. Nematol, 33, 161–168, 2001

Ntalli, N. G. and Menkissoglu-Spiroudi, U.: Pesticides of botanical origin: a promising tool in plant protection, in: Pesticides – Formulations, Effects, Fate, edited by: Stoytcheva, M., In-Tech Europe, 3–24, 2011.

Orgiazzi, A., Dunbar, M. B., Panagos, P., de Groot, G. A., and Lemanceau, P.: Soil biodiversity and DNA barcodes: opportunities and challenges, Soil. Biol. Biochem., 80, 244–250, 2015.

Payan, L., and Dickson, D.: Comparison of populations of Pratylenchus brachyurus based on isozyme phenotypes, J. Nematol., 22, 538–545, 1990.

773 Perera, M. R., Taylor, S. P., Vanstone, V. A., and Jones, M. G.: Protein biomarkers to distinguish
774 oat and lucerne races of the stem nematode, Ditylenchus dipsaci, with quarantine
775 significance for Western Australia, Nematology, 11, 555–563, 2009.

776 Petersen, D. and Vrain, T.: Rapid identification of Meloidogyne chitwoodi, M. hapla, and M.
777 fallax using PCR primers to amplify their ribosomal intergenic spacer, Fund. Appl. Nematol.,
778 19, 601–605, 1996.

779 Porazinska, D. L., GIBLIN-DAVIS, R. M., Faller, L., Farmerie, W., Kanzaki, N., Morris, K., Powers,
780 T. O., Tucker, A. E., Sung, W., and Thomas, W. K.: Evaluating high-throughput sequencing
781 as a method for metagenomic analysis of nematode diversity, Mol. Ecol. Resour., 9, 1439–
782 1450, 2009.

783 Porazinska, D. L., Giblin-Davis, R. M., Sung, W., and Thomas, W. K.: Linking operational
784 clustered taxonomic units (OCTUs) from parallel ultra sequencing (PUS) to nematode
785 species, Zootaxa, 2427, 55–63, 2010.

786 Porazinska, D. L., Giblin-Davis, R. M., Sung, W., and Thomas, W. K.: The nature and frequency
787 of chimeras in eukaryotic metagenetic samples, J. Nematol., 44, 18–25, 2012.

788 Powers, T. O. and Fleming, C. C.: Biochemical and molecular characterization, in: The
789 physiology and biochemistry of free-living and plant-parasitic nematodes, edited by: Perry,
790 R. and Wright, D., CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK, 355–380, 1998

791 Powers, T. O., Mullin, P., Harris, T., Sutton, L., and Higgins, R.: Incorporating molecular
792 identification of Meloidogyne spp. into a large-scale regional nematode survey, J.
793 Nematol., 37, 226–235, 2005.

794 Powers, T.: Nematode molecular diagnostics: from bands to barcodes, Annu. Rev.
795 Phytopathol., 42, 367–383, 2004.

796 Quail, M. A., Smith, M., Coupland, P., Otto, T. D., Harris, S. R., Connor, T. R., Bertoni, A.,
797 Swerdlow, H. P. and Gu, Y.: A tale of three next generation sequencing platforms:
798 comparison of Ion Torrent, Pacific Biosciences and Illumina MiSeq sequencers, BMC
799 Genomics, 13(1), 1, 2012.

800 Ristau, K., Steinfartz, S., and Traunspurger, W.: First evidence of cryptic species diversity and
801 significant population structure in a widespread freshwater nematode morphospecies
802 (Tobrilus gracilis) , Mol. Ecol., 22, 4562–4575, 2013

803 Rothberg, J. M., Hinz, W., Rearick, T. M., Schultz, J., Mileski, W., Davey, M., Leamon, J. H.,
804 Johnson, K., Milgrew, M. J., and Edwards, M.: An integrated semiconductor device enabling
805 non-optical genome sequencing, Nature, 475, 348–352, 2011.

806 Sapkota, R. and Nicolaisen, M.: High-throughput sequencing of nematode communities from
807 total soil DNA extractions, BMC Ecol., 15(1), 1–8, doi:10.1186/s12898-014-0034-4, 2015.

808 Sasser, J. and Carter, C. C.: Root-knot nematodes (Meloidogyne spp.): Identification,
809 morphological and physiological variation, host range, ecology, and control, Nematology

810 in the southern region of the United States, Southern Cooperative Series Bulletin, 276, 21–
811 32, 1982.

812 Sasser, J. N.: Identification and host-parasite relationships of certain root-knot nematodes
813 (Meloidogyne spp.), Technical Bulletin, Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station, A-77, 31
814 pp., 1954.

815 Schots, A., Gommers, F. J., Bakker, J., and Egberts, E.: Serological di_ erentiation of
816 plantparasitic nematode species with polyclonal and monoclonal antibodies, J. Nematol.,
817 22, 16– 23, 1990.

818 Schroder, J., Bailey, J., Conway, T., and Zobel, J.: Reference-free validation of short read data,
819 PLoS One, 5, e12681, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0012681, 2010.

820 Semblat, J., Wajnberg, E., Dalmasso, A., Abad, P., and Castagnone-Sereno, P.: High-resolution
821 DNA fingerprinting of parthenogenetic root-knot nematodes using AFLP analysis, Mol.
822 Ecol., 7, 119–125, 1998.

823 Shaw, A. J. and Allen, B.: Phylogenetic relationships, morphological incongruence, and
824 geographic speciation in the Fontinalaceae (Bryophyta), Mol. Phylogenet. Evol., 16, 225–
825 237, 2000.

826 Subbotin, S. and Moens, M.: Molecular diagnostics of plant-parasitic nematodes, in: Plant
827 Nematology, edited by: Perry, R. and Moens, M., CABI Wallingford, UK, 33–58, 2007.

828 Taberlet, P., Coissac, E., Pompanon, F., Brochmann, C., and Willerslev, E.: Towards next
829 generation biodiversity assessment using DNA metabarcoding, Mol. Ecol., 21, 2045–2050,
830 2012.

831 Tastet, C., Val, F., Lesage, M., Renault, L., Marché, L., Bossis, M., and Mugniéry, D.: Application
832 of a putative fatty-acid binding protein to discriminate serologically the two European
833 quarantine root-knot nematodes, Meloidogyne chitwoodi and M. fallax, from other
834 Meloidogyne species, Eur. J. Plant Pathol., 107, 821–832, 2001

835 Tietjen, J. H.: Ecology of deep-sea nematodes from the Puerto Rico Trench area and Hatteras
836 Abyssal Plain, Deep Sea Res. Pt. A, 36, 1579–1594, 1989.

837 Tripathi, A. M., Tyagi, A., Kumar, A., Singh, A., Singh, S., Chaudhary, L. B., and Roy,S.: The
838 internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region and trnhH-psbA are suitable candidateloci for DNA
839 barcoding of tropical tree species of India, PloS one, 8,
840 e57934,doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0057934, 2013.

841 Valentini, A., Pompanon, F., and Taberlet, P.: DNA barcoding for ecologists, Trends Ecol. Evol.,
842 24, 110–117, 2009.

843 van Megen, H., van den Elsen, S., Holterman, M., Karssen, G., Mooyman, P., Bongers, T.,
844 Holovachov, O., Bakker, J., and Helder, J.: A phylogenetic tree of nematodes based on
845 about 1200 full-length small subunit ribosomal DNA sequences, Nematology, 11, 927–950,
846 2009.

847 van Megen, H., van den Elsen, S., Holterman, M., Karssen, G., Mooyman, P., Bongers, T.,
848 Holovachov, O., Bakker, J., and Helder, J.: A phylogenetic tree of nematodes based on
849 about 1200 full-length small subunit ribosomal DNA sequences, Nematology, 11, 927–950,
850 2009.

851 Vovlas, N., Troccoli, A., Palomares-Rius, J. E., De Luca, F., Liébanas, G., Landa, B. B., Subbotin,
852 S. A., and Castillo, P.: Ditylenchus gigas n. sp. parasitizing broad bean: a new stem
853 nematode singled out from the Ditylenchus dipsaci species complex using a polyphasic
854 approach with molecular phylogeny, Plant Pathol., 60, 762–775, 2011

855 W.: Nematode species at risk – a metric to assess pollution in soft sediments of freshwaters,
856 Environ. Int., 37, 940–949, 2011

857 Waite, I. S., O'Donnell, A. G., Harrison, A., Davies, J. T., Colvan, S. R., Ekschmitt, K., Dogan, H.,
858 Wolters, V., Bongers, T., and Bongers, M.: Design and evaluation of nematode 18S rDNA
859 primers for PCR and denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis (DGGE) of soil community
860 DNA, Soil Biol. Biochem., 35, 1165–1173, 2003.

861 Wardle, D., Yeates, G., Barker, G. and Bonner, K.: The influence of plant litter diversity on
862 decomposer abundance and diversity, Soil Biol. Biochem., 38(5), 1052–1062,
863 doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2005.09.003, 2006.

864 Williams, S.: Species boundaries in the starfish genus Linckia, Mar. Biol., 136, 137–148, 2000.

865 Wilson, E. O.: A global biodiversity map, Science, 289, 2279–2279, 2000.

866 Wilson, M. J. and Khakouli-Duarte, T.: Nematodes as environmental indicators, CABI
867 Publishing, Wallingford, UK, 326 pp., 2009.

868 Yeates, G. W.: Nematodes as soil indicators: functional and biodiversity aspects, Biol. Fert.
869 Soils, 37, 199–210, 2003.

870 Yeates, G., Bongers, T., De Goede, R., Freckman, D., and Georgieva, S.: Feeding habits in soil
871 nematode families and genera – an outline for soil ecologists, J. Nematol., 25, 315–331,
872 1993.

873 Yeates, G.: Variation in soil nematode diversity under pasture with soil and year, Soil Biol.
874 Biochem., 16, 95–102, 1984.

875 Zhou, X., Li, Y., Liu, S., Yang, Q., Su, X., Zhou, L., Tang, M., Fu, R., Li, J., and Huang, Q.: Ultradeep
876 sequencing enables high-fidelity recovery of biodiversity for bulk arthropod samples
877 without PCR amplification, GigaScience, 2, 1–12, 2013.

878 Zijlstra, C., Donkers-Venne, D. T., and Fargette, M.: Identification of Meloidogyne incognita,
879 M. javanica and M. arenaria using sequence characterised amplified region (SCAR) based
880 PCR assays, Nematology, 2, 847–853, 2000.

881 Zijlstra, C.: Identification of Meloidogyne chitwoodi, M. fallax and M. hapla based on SCAR
882 PCR: a powerful way of enabling reliable identification of populations or individuals that
883 share common traits, Eur. J. Plant. Pathol., 106, 283–290, 2000.

884 Table 1 Summary of some of the protein-based techniques for distinguishing between
885 species/population of nematodes, their advantages, disadvantages and applications.

Approach	**Principle**	**Advantages**	**Disadvantages**	**Applications**
Isozyme analysis	Patterns of gel-separated isoenzyme bands used to identify species	1. Robust and easy to carry out. 2. To date, offers an excellent means of identifying tropical root-knot nematode species. 3. Extracts from a single sedentary female sufficient for reliable identification	1. Dependent on a particular life-stage of the nematode (young female). 2. Being protein-based subjects this method to influence of environmental conditions (e.g. type of host)	Widely used to separate species of cyst and root-knot nematodes (Esbenshade and Triantaphyllou, 1990: Karssen et al., 1995)
Two-dimensional polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis	Soluble proteins separated on the basis of their charges and masses on a gel	This method allows the separation of proteins with an even better resolution.	1. Subject to environmental variations.	Used to compare *Heterodera avenae* isolates (Ferris et al., 1994)
Antibody-based serological techniques	Antibodies are raised against species of nematodes and used to detect them	1. Can provide good specificity and sensitivity. 2. Can reliably distinguish between the two species of potato cyst nematodes.	Occasional cross-reactivity can affect specificity.	Monoclonal antibody used to test major *Meloidogyne* species (Ibrahim et al., 1996).

886

887 Table 2 Summary of some of the DNA-based techniques for distinguishing between species/population of
888 nematodes, their advantages, disadvantages and applications.

Markers	Principle	Advantages	Disadvantages	Applications
Restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP/PCR-RFLP)	Sequence polymorphism between species results in distinct cleaving sites for restriction enzymes, thus resulting in variable number of fragments with diverse sizes	1. The technique is fairly reproducible 2. Simple and inexpensive	Requires prior knowledge of the sequence of DNA region for design of primers or probes.	Using this technique, Carpenter et al. (1992) distinguished between three populations of a *Meloidogyne arenaria* race called race 2
Random amplification of polymorphic DNA (RAPD)	A short primer set is used which anneal to several sites on the DNA. If two of the annealed short primer happen to be close and opposite to each other, they will produce an amplicon. Difference in the gel	1. Sequence information of DNA region not a prerequisite. 2. Simple and inexpensive	Technique may lack reproducibility.	Used to distinguish between species and populations of *Meloidogyne* from different origins. Castagnone-sereno et al. (1994)

	fingerprints of amplicons separates species or populations.			
Amplified fragment length polymorphism (AFLP)	This involves a series of PCR steps in which separate sets of primers are used to selectively amplify some subsets of products of each preceding PCR step. All selected fragments are run on a gel to product unique fingerprints.	1. Requires no prior knowledge of the sequence of the DNA region. 2. Highly reproducible.	1. Complex technique to carry out. 2. Expensive	Used to typify the genetic variability within the tobacco cyst nematode (TCN) complex Marche et al. (2001)
Sequence Characterised Amplified Region (SCAR)	A specific distinguishing marker from the fingerprint of a specific taxon or life stage of a species is isolated and amplified. This becomes a SCAR by which that taxon or life stage is identified.	1. Provides a rapid means of screening individuals. 2. Can be highly specific	May be labour-intensive.	Successfully used for identifying species of root-knot nematodes (Zijlstra et al., 2000; Fourie et al., 2001)

889
890