

## ***Interactive comment on “Nematode taxonomy: from morphology to metabarcoding” by M. Ahmed et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 11 December 2015

General comments: Overall this paper provides a decent review of the broad history of nematode taxonomy and the methods available for nematode classification. This paper is fitting for the SOIL journal and (with modifications) would provide a valuable contribution to the journal. I loved the idea of making nematode classification more accessible to a broader research audience. However, as it is written, the information is useful for a specific group of people, and needs clarification to apply to a broader audience. Currently, the paper reads as a list of facts/methods and barely hints at an overall aim and message. My specific comments follow.

Specific comments: -A statement of purpose/aims at the end of the introduction would be helpful - as it ends currently, it states that a number of reviews have been published, which left me wondering why should I be interested to read this one? -With a clear

C640

statement of purpose, the article can be reworked to support this -much time is spent discussing the particulars of some methods, but not others, perhaps a table of methods and pros/cons or uses would be helpful to clarify for the reader the different method options

Technical comments: Please double check the formatting of scientific names (families, species) and be consistent throughout the paper. -Consider shortening or dividing up paragraphs, many paragraphs quite lengthy and could be logically divided -Please check the use of commas throughout p.1181, line 25 - to properly deal with the issue of what? p.1183, line 13 - incorrect use of "too" p.1183, line 19 - phasmids are sensory, not secretory p. 1188, line 7-8 - did you do this study? is this hypothetical?

---

Interactive comment on SOIL Discuss., 2, 1175, 2015.

C641