



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_60212
Title of the Manuscript:	A Preliminary Study on Tensile Properties of Gellan Gum/KCF Biocomposite Films
Type of the Article	Short communication

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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Introduction Paragraph 2 ,line 1: The word "created" could be changed to a better choice of word. Paragraph 2,line 3 : Please clarify "The previous study" which study is indicated. 2. Please provide the methodology followed in the Preparation of Biocomposite in section 2.2. 3. Consider changing the sentence " Figure 1 shows the film samples that have been cut for tensile test" Results and discussions 4. p. 1, line 1 : Please clarify "The tensile extension and tensile energy at break of the gellan gum/KCF biocomposite films without and containing KCF are displayed in Figure 2 and 3, respectively". It appears that the "The tensile extension and tensile energy at break of the gellan gum/KCF biocomposite films without KCF are depicted figure 2 and The tensile extension and tensile energy at break of the gellan gum/KCF biocomposite films containing KCF are depicted in figure 3. Title for the Figure 2 and 3 provided in the manuscript is confusing. 5. p.2 ,line 1: Please clarify "The tensile stress and tensile modulus at maximum load of the gellan gum/KCF biocomposite films without and containing KCF are shown in Figure 4 and 5, respectively" Title for the Figure 4 and 5 provided in the manuscript is confusing. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adding an explanation how incorporation of KCF decreases the tensile stress and tensile modulus properties of the biocomposite films. 2. A statement in the result and discussion section justifying the use of gellan gum/KCF biocomposite films. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>Adding an explanation on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What could be the reason of increase in tensile extension and tensile energy with the increase of KCF content in gellan gum/KCF biocomposite films 2. How the ductility of the film has been calculated? 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Soumiya Sukumar
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Technology Calicut, India