



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_5635
Title of the Manuscript:	CURRENT RHIZOBIUM TAXONOMY
Type of the Article	Review

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This article is a REVIEW article, and was going to review the current taxonomy of Rhizobium. But it is not an up-to-date article at all. Some examples of the mistakes: There are already more than fifty five species that are called Rhizobium, among which only less than half are mentioned in this manuscript (table 1). In total Table 1 is full of mistakes and old information. Figure 2 is in French. The manuscript really does not give any information about the current methods of taxonomy. For instance, in line 64: the 16S rDNA based phylogeny is mentioned as the main tool in the study of phylogeny. The authors did not write about using protein-coding genes in systematics study. There are also some vague sentences and paragraphs in the text, and they are all based on old data. For example, what do lines 147-153 imply? How about the other species of Rhizobium, in which sub-branch they are positioned?	We tried to do our best to correct, update and complete this paper, whishing it will be suitable for publication. Figure 2 have been modified Thank you for these remarks which have been considered.