

I have assessed the review process of 2013_BMRJ_5635 Taxonomy of the Rhizobia: current perspectives and I do not find the final version suitable for publication. The final version I have read is attached.

Just to list a FEW justifications for my opinion:

1. Several remarks made by the last reviewer were not taken in consideration and the authors do not explain why. (review is attached)

Dear Sir, All the corrections asked by the reviewer have been taken in our consideration, and the comments have been made for every one of his 11 remarks points (please find our complete answers in attached file).

2. A review article on taxonomy should include the most updated references, including a discussion on different approaches for classification, as well as a description of techniques currently used. These topics are poorly addressed in the manuscript.

We have already included all updated references we could afford. If you have other suggestions, you're welcome, especially if you suggest any updated paper in this expertise field. We tried to add more details about the different classification approaches and the most important techniques currently used.

3. Corroborating this lack of content, I find that reviewers had to explain the authors critical points on taxonomy and Rhizobia, making it clear that the authors do not have enough expertise on the proposed subject.

The previous reviewers have already showed several critical points about the subject, and were so kind to help us to improve the quality of our review, and we've already expressed our thanks to them and to the editorial staff in a previous mail.

4. Figure 1 is unacceptable: it does not explain parameters used for the creation of the phylogenetic tree, nor an explanation on distances and conclusions. Figure 1 is also not adequate to illustrate the text where it is inserted.

5. Figure 2 is unacceptable: it is in French and the caption does not explain any of the acronyms present in the Figure.

6. Same observation for Figure 3.

The figures have already been eliminated, except the one which is published in an interesting journal from which we get the copyright permission to reproduce it.