

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

Rabinder Kumar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mehran University of Engineering & Technology

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The title is too long and does not clearly state the main objective or findings of the study. A possible alternative title is: "Mechanical Properties of Hybrid Composites Reinforced with Sisal and Sugar Palm Fibers".

The abstract is poorly written and does not follow the standard structure of an abstract. It should include the following sections: background, objective, methods, results, and conclusion. The abstract should also avoid using abbreviations, citations, and equations, and should provide specific and quantitative information about the study.

The introduction is not well-organized and does not provide a clear overview of the research gap, motivation, and objectives of the study. The introduction should start with a broad context of the topic, then narrow down to the specific problem and research questions, and finally state the main aim and scope of the study. The introduction should also provide a brief literature review of the relevant previous studies and highlight the novelty and significance of the current work.

The materials and methods section is not detailed enough and does not follow the standard format of a materials and methods section. It should include the following subsections: materials, fiber treatment, composite preparation, and mechanical testing. Each subsection should provide sufficient information about the materials, equipment, procedures, and parameters used in the study, as well as the rationale and justification for the choices made. The materials and methods section should also include references to the ASTM standards used for the tests and provide the sample size, statistical analysis, and error estimation methods used for the data analysis.

The figures are poorly drawn. Figure 7's aspect ratio is distorted, and Figures 8, 9, and 10 use different fonts and sizes in the axis titles.

The results and discussion section is not well-presented and does not provide a clear and comprehensive analysis of the data. The results and discussion section should include the following subsections: tensile properties, flexural properties, impact properties, and water absorption properties. Each subsection should present the data in tables and figures, as well as provide a descriptive and interpretive analysis of the data. The results and discussion section should also compare the data with that of previous studies, explain the possible mechanisms and factors affecting the data, and discuss the implications and limitations of the data.

The conclusion section is too brief and does not summarize the main findings and contributions of the study. The

conclusion section should restate the main objective and scope of the study, highlight the key results and outcomes, and suggest future directions and recommendations for further research. The conclusion section should also avoid introducing new information or repeating the abstract.

After a thorough review of the manuscript, I recommend rejecting it in its current form. The article lacks clarity, organization, and proper scientific rigor. The issues with the title, abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusion sections need significant revision.