The properties given at the time of publication for the designated type strain of *Leifsonia rubra* Reddy *et al.* 2003, CMS 76r, do not correspond with those of MTCC 4210, DSM 15304, CIP 107783 and JCM 12471 that are deposited as representing the type strain: Opinion 96.
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The Judicial Commission affirms that, according to information presented to it, the type strain of *Leifsonia rubra* Reddy *et al.* 2003 designated in the original publication as strain CMS 76r and deposited as MTCC 4210, DSM 15304, CIP 107783 and JCM 12471 does not have properties corresponding with those of the strains held in those collections under those accession numbers.

The species *Leifsonia rubra* Reddy *et al.* 2003 was not represented by an authentic deposit of a type strain at the time of effective publication in the pages of the *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology*.

An & Yokota (2007) presented evidence to suggest that strains obtained as MTCC 4210, DSM 15304, CIP 107783 and JCM 12471 and designated to represent the type strain do not have properties corresponding with those of the type strain listed in the original publication (Reddy *et al.*, 2003) as strain CMS 76r. In particular, examination of the 16S rRNA gene sequences of MTCC 4210 and JCM 12471 indicated that they were members of the class *Gamma-proteobacteria*, whereas strains CMS 76r [provided by the authors of the report by Reddy *et al.* (2003)], CIP 107783 and DSM 15304 were shown to have 99.9% 16S rRNA gene sequence similarity with *Arthrobacter roseus*.

At its meetings in 2008 at the IUMS Bacteriology and Applied Microbiology Congress in Istanbul, the Judicial Commission of the International Committee on Systematics of Prokaryotes ruled that, based on information presented by An & Yokota (2007), an authentic extant type strain of the species *Leifsonia rubra* had not been deposited in any of the collections at the time the name was effectively published in the *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* (Reddy *et al.*, 2003).

Consideration was given to the altered wording of Rule 30, i.e. Rule 30 (3b) (Labeleda, 2000; Garrity *et al.*, 2011):

‘As of 1st January 2001 the description (of a new species, or new combinations previously represented by viable cultures) must include the designation of a type strain, and a viable culture of that strain must be deposited in at least two publicly accessible service collections in different countries from which subcultures must be available. The designations allotted to the strain by the culture collections should be quoted in the published description. Evidence must be presented that the cultures are present, viable, and available at the time of publication’.

However, it was considered, despite the fact that evidence was available to indicate that no strains that had the same 16S rRNA gene sequence attributed to the type strain CMS 76r (AJ438585) had been deposited in culture collections at the time the effective publication appeared in the *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology* (Reddy *et al.*, 2003), that the name is to be considered to be validly published and that a search is to be made for derivatives of strain CMS 76r that are to be deposited in (at least) two different collections in two different countries. The deposit of authentic strains is to be documented in accordance with Rule 30 (3b) and is to be
documented in the International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology. Alternatively, a search is to be made for an appropriate neotype that is to be proposed in accordance with Rule 18c of the International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria (Lapage et al., 1992) and documented changes made to it (De Vos & Trüper 2000; De Vos et al. 2005; Frederiksen, 1995; Garrity et al., 2011; Goodfellow 1995; Labeda 1997a, 1997b, 2000; Labeda & Oren 2008, 2011; Saddler 2005; Tindall et al. 2008).
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