

ERRATUM

Page 50 The line "SEM-images showed that the collapsed methyl nanocellulose and EHEC-methyl nanocellulose foams (Figures 7.12(a) and 7.12(c)) closed the surface of the substrates more compared to the coatings with the non-foamed solutions (Figures 7.12(b) and 7.12(d))." The phrase "foams (Figures 7.12(a) and 7.12(c))" and "non-foamed solutions (Figures 7.12(b) and 7.12(d))" should be read as "foams (Figures 7.12(b) and 7.12(d))" and "non-foamed solutions (Figures 7.12(a) and 7.12(c))".

Page 52 The line "The roughness of the EHEC-MFC film dried at an elevated temperature (Figure 7.14(a)) was higher than that of the EHEC-methyl nanocellulose (Figure 7.14(c)) or EHEC-MFC film dried at a lower temperature (Figure 7.14(d)), and this can explain the minor differences between the samples." The phrase "The roughness of the EHEC-MFC film dried at an elevated temperature (Figure 7.14(a))" and "EHEC-MFC film dried at a lower temperature (Figure 7.14(d))" should be read as "The roughness of the EHEC-MFC film dried at a lower temperature (Figure 7.14(d))" and "EHEC-MFC film dried at an elevated temperature (Figure 7.14(a))".

The line "The surface energy was not found to correlate with the oil behaviour on the hydrophobically modified EHEC-containing films, although the methyl nanocellulose had the lowest surface energy and the highest contact angle with oil." The phrase "methyl nanocellulose" should be read as "methyl nanocellulose-MFC".