

Review Form2

Book Name:	Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2552
Title of the Manuscript:	Static foam and its properties
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript covers the comprehensive investigation of static foam stabilization under different surfactants, pH values, and volatile components. Detailed experimental results were reported. However, more experimental pics can be included for each effect to highlight the results obtained.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Study on Static Foam Stabilization and its Properties	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Some key results can be included in the abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, and the “Role of NPs:” section before Fig. 2 can be deleted as this is unnecessary.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Provide the reason for getting the best formability/ foaming power in case of different parameters (pH, VOCs, and surfactants) and include experimental pictures taken after noting the results. The results are listed here, “The initial foam height in basic condition found to be more as compared to acidic condition but static foam is more stable in acidic condition” “It was observed that 0.2 g of xylene and toluene show the best result to increase the life of foam.” “It was found that SLS surfactant foam shows the highest percentage foamability, while mixed surfactants show less percentage foamability (See table 3)”	

Review Form2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	No additional references required. Before starting the methodology section, provide key research gaps by listing some of the work done in the past literature(from references reported in this manuscript). Very few are noted in the introduction section.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, please check for punctuation errors. In section 3.3, space was not given in this line “0.2 g,0.4 g, 1 g, and 2 g “. Similarly, in Fig. 4, no space was provide “(a) ethanol (b) xylene (c)toluene (d) benzene”.	
Optional/Generalcomments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Merugu Rakesh
Department, University & Country	IIT Bombay, India