

Review of: "Investigation of Mechanical Properties of Sisal Fiber and Sugar Palm Fiber Reinforced Hybrid Composites"

Sibel Tuna¹

¹ Bursa Technical University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- First of all, I would like to thank the authors for their work on this important and popular topic. However, I would like to list the general points I would like to point out and add below.
- In abstract section, it would be meaningful to especially highlight the results. There is no need for knowledge of the device and experiments on which the experiments are performed. Those parts should be explained in the experimental section. Sections such as abstract-introduction-materials-method are not clearly separated in the article. Article design should be clearly reconsidered.
- In general, the author should be more careful about units throughout the article. There should be no data without units, and these units should always be written in the same way. If any abbreviation is to be used, this should be explained beforehand. Figure numbers should be reviewed and should be in consecutive order. For example, Figure 1.2 is included in the text, but there is no such figure.
- There is a main heading called mechanical tests, and under this there are mechanical test details such as Tensile and Izod. However, Water Adsorption is also below these tests. Is Water Adsorption a mechanical test?
- It would be more meaningful to present mechanical test results as a table and include standard deviations in both the table and bar graphs.
- In addition, performing SEM analyzes examining the interfacial behavior of fibers and matrix would have been beneficial, especially in terms of interpreting mechanical analyses. I have to consider it as an important deficiency that the harmony between the two components that make up the composite structure is not interpreted structurally and morphologically.