Manuscript biomolecules-1691308

In this manuscript, the exopolysaccharide from *Bacillus haynesii* CamB6 was exhaustively characterized. Unfortunately, its structure was not fully determined.

The manuscript is very long: it contains a lot of information and many references not always pertinent to EPS characterization. Optimization of production constitutes an important part not mentioned in the title. Acceptability for food applications was not discussed.

English language should be revised thoroughly. There are inconsistencies in singular-plural concordance between subject and verb as well as noun and pronoun. Verb tenses should be checked. Articles (mostly definite, but also indefinite) are often missing and sometimes superfluous.

General comments:

EPS vs. EPSs in plural form should be consistent throughout.

Use a consistent abbreviation (l or L) for liter (including milliliter and microliter) throughout.

Specific comments and corrections:

ll. 50-51
"improvement of rheological"

l. 57
"stabilizing"

l. 133
"in nutrient"

l. 143
"min" instead of "mins"

l. 145
"volume of chilled acetone was added"

l. 160
There is no coded value in Table 1.

l. 165
Table 2 where Table 1 expected

l. 169-170
"thirty" instead of "thirteen"?

l. 177
"β_i" instead of "β_0" in second term?

l. 228
GPC defined on l. 231

l. 230
PEG undefined

l. 247
Volume of 0.2 mM ethanolic DPPH solution?

ll. 255, 286, and 441
“et al.”

l. 284
No section 2.6.3

Figure 1
What is the significance of the tick mark labels on the maps? Are these maps really necessary?

l. 340
“source”

Figure 2
No x-axis label
Units not specified

l. 400
“affected”?

Figure 3
Units are not specified on the axes labels or in the legend.

l. 414
Delete “(” before “C. pH”.

ll. 416 and 432
Add “C. ” before “pH=”.

ll. 417 and 432
“30.0” instead of “3.0”?

Figure 4
This figure is redundant as it gives the same information as Figure 3. Tick label values for glucose and yeast extract are different. Units are not specified on the axes labels or in the legend.

ll. 433, 434, 454, 458, and 507
First section 3.6 (and its subsections) should be section 3.5.

l. 442

“C), whereas the”

l. 471, 600, 678, and 718
Reference format is different; corresponding references could be missing in the list.

l. 480
Why was linkage analysis not performed?

ll. 481-482
“spectrum”

Figure 6
Bacterial EPSs are normally composed of repeating units. Based on the ^{1}H NMR spectrum, the purity and/or heterogeneity of the EPS is questioned. How can the authors ascertain that mannose does not come from mannans in yeast extract?
A 2D COSY spectrum would be necessary to confirm the assignments made on the 1D: e.g., H2-αMan is not normally found in the range 3.2-3.5 ppm (the statement ll. 495-496 is wrong).
The abbreviation for glucose is Glc.

l. 500
The chemical shift range is more than from 1 to 5.

ll. 528 and 531
“radical”

l. 535 and 536
“activity”

l. 537
No section 3.6.2

l. 581
“Table S1A”

l. 603
“Figure S1”

l. 636
“Glc and Gal”

l. 683-684
Food-grade oils are not aliphatic and aromatic hydrocarbons.

l. 711
“to be significantly”

l. 725
“possibility of future”