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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**I cannot accept this paper for publication. The manuscript is not scientifically robust . According to me the Authors are not very familiar with rhizobium taxonomy. They wrote in abstract "……in the taxonomy of the Rhizobiaceae" but we know that rhizobia belong to different family e.g.Phylobacteriaceae, Bradyrhizobiaceae…** **They wrote (many times) classification of Rhizobia is presented in this paper. They should write "rhizobia" "lowercase".** **Figure 2 is in French language .** **In paper many inappropriate expressions e.g. rods of this genus are …** **Authors wrote "subclass of alfa-Proteobacteria it should be written alfa -subclass of Proteobacteria** **Generally, this paper requiresmajor language correction** **In the descriptions of rhizobium branches there is information which does not differentiate them**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer