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According to Rules and Principles of the Bacteriological Code (1990 Revision), *Micromonospora aurantiaca* (Sveshnikova et al., 1969) is not correct because the specific epithet is illegitimate. The authors request the replacement of the specific epithet *aurantiaca* and they suggest *sandarakina*. They also request that the specific epithet *aurantiaca* in *M. aurantiaca* be rejected.

The names *Micromonospora aurantiaca* (Sveshnikova et al., 1969) and *Micromonospora carbonacea* subsp. *aurantiaca* (Luedemann & Brodsky, 1964) were included in the Approved Lists of Bacterial Names (Skerman et al., 1980, 1989).

According to Rule 12b of the Bacteriological Code (1990 Revision) (Lapage et al., 1992) no specific or subspecific epithets within the same genus may be the same if based on different types.


*M. aurantiaca* Sveshnikova et al. 1969 (Approved Lists 1980) is illegitimate (Rule 12b) and consequently can not be correct (Principle 6). Rule 51a states that an illegitimate name may not be used and Principle 9 states that the name of a taxon should be changed if the name is contrary to the Rules of the Bacteriological Code (1990 Revision) (Lapage et al., 1992).

According to Rule 23a, the Judicial Commission may correct the Approved Lists and we request that the name *M. aurantiaca* be changed.

The neo-Latin adjective *aurantiaca* means orange-coloured. It seems useful to propose a specific epithet with the same meaning, so we suggest using the Greek adjective *sandarakinos* -é- on, of orange colour. According to the rules of transliteration, the neo-Latin adjective should be *sandaracinus* -a -um. However, Recommendation 6(7) (De Vos & Trüper, 2000) states that the Greek κ should be maintained to avoid confusion. The genus *Micromonospora* is in the feminine gender and we propose the name *Micromonospora sandarakina* [san.da.ra’ki.na. N.L. fem. adj. sandarakina (from Gr. fem. adj. sandarakinê) of orange colour].

If the Judicial Commission agrees with our proposal, the date of publication and the authorship will not be changed and *M. sandarakina* should be cited as *M. sandarakina* Sveshnikova et al. 1969 (Approved Lists 1980), type strain ATCC 27029T (= DSM 43813T = JCM 10878T = NBRC 16155T = NRRL B-16091T = VKM Ac-1936T).

According to Rule 51a ‘a name of a taxon which is illegitimate when the taxon is in one taxonomic position is not necessarily illegitimate when the taxon is in another taxonomic position’, and according to Rule 41a the specific epithet must be retained when a species is transferred to another genus without any change of rank.

The name *M. aurantiaca* should never have been created and, if an author proposes to transfer this taxon to another genus, the new epithet (for example, *sandarakina* if the Judicial Commission agrees with our proposal) should be retained, even if the epithet *aurantiaca* is not illegitimate in the new taxonomic position. However, to avoid problems we also request that the specific epithet *aurantiaca* in the
name *M. aurantiaca* be rejected (i.e. be placed on the list of ‘Epitheta specifica et subspecifica rejicienda’) as a perplexing name [Rule 56a(4)].
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