

Title: Identification of microbial exopolymer producers in sandy and muddy intertidal sediments by compound-specific isotope analysis

Author: Cédric Hubas, Julie Gaubert-Boussarie, An-Sofie D'Hondt, Bruno Jesus, Dominique Lamy, Vona Meleder, Antoine Prins, Philippe Rosa, Willem Stock, and Koen Sabbe

General Comments:

The work is well done, and although a good deal of literature is available on the EPS in intertidal, investigation of precise composition is limited and much needed. That said, the work is of good quality, and the paper is well-presented, so I only have minor comments.

Specific comment

Line 36: What are the "improvement of the engineering effects."

Line 38: What are the classifications, and why are they important?

Line 41: Remove "As a general rule".

Line 41-45: This information is unnecessary I would have thought.

Line 137: Please add appropriate references used in this section.

Line 139: How many reps were used?

Fig: 1: What does "s" in Ss and Ms stand for?

Line 232: Please add appropriate references used in this section.

Line 285: Ms 1 indicates the sampling site of time/date of sampling. Perhaps you could add a letter "e or r" to show ebbing or rising.

Line 296: Any reference to support this statement?

Line 330-339: In Ms1 and 2, as there were differences in the sampling time, would this matter for all sampling dates to be grouped together?

Line 420: Could light availability (sampling time) influence the EPS contribution?