

Interactive
Comment

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

M. Ahmed

mahmed@harper-adams.ac.uk

Received and published: 22 December 2015

Dear Reviewer, Thank you very much for your comments on our manuscript. Please find below my personal responses to your comments.

Proposed statement of purpose: "This paper reviews some of the past and present approaches to nematode identification and classification". This will follow the last sentence of the introduction.

Regarding the sentence on page 1181 line 25, the complete form should read: To properly deal with the issue of taxonomic deficit, De Ley (2000) suggested that reassessment of priorities is the best way to progress.

On page 1183 line 13, "too" will be replaced with "also"

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

Line 19 of the same page has the definition of phasmids. I agree with your suggestion. They are sensory and secretory structures. I add secretory now because in some taxa like *Scutellonema*, it is believed to be involved in the passing of some secretions.

Page 1188 line 7-8. The statement is based on observations of some of articles being published in the nematological journals. Therefore, one can say it is hypothetical and not based on a study I/we conducted. Perhaps, this can be rephrased as: "An observation of nematological publications from the past two decades will show a steady increase in the use of molecular data for nematode diagnostics".

With regards to the disproportionately large paragraphs and discussion of the various methods, we look at how to address that shortly. Also all the scientific names will also be checked and formatted accordingly.

Many thanks, Mohammed Ahmed

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

