

# Review of: "Investigation of the properties of the composition obtained based on mixtures of polyvinyl chloride"

Soma El Mogy<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Institute of Standards

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

**Dear Peer Review Team, Qeios,**

Title: "Investigation of the properties of the composition obtained based on mixtures of polyvinyl chloride".

Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. The manuscript is very poorly written. The overall flow of the manuscript and writing style should be corrected before publication. I have comments and questions for the authors to improve their manuscript. So, based on these findings; my recommendation is to publish only if major improvements are made.

\*\*\*\* This manuscript tries to "Investigation of the properties of the composition obtained based on mixtures of polyvinyl chloride". The following are my comments and critique:

1. The English of the paper needs a thorough revision for grammar and syntax.
2. Throughout the manuscript, the target of the study was not mentioned.

## **Abstract**

In the abstract:

concentrations are not mentioned. The composites were prepared via ....

Mention, characterization was performed using FTIR, SEM, ...

## **Introduction**

Introduction: an introduction is very brief. more details about the behavior of the characteristics of the polymers used. Previous work should be mentioned. The aim of the work must be clear and detailed, conc, characterization, tests,

## **Methodology**

The material part must include details about the materials used only. Other ingredients used??? Name, symbol, purity, role, and manufacturer.

The methodology must be divided into three titles:

- preparation: grinding, sieving, apparatus used,
- treatment: two types of treatment; conc, time, sequence ...,
- and preparation (in detail): method and apparatus used. The method section: the authors should clarify the name of the test, apparatus used, manufacturer, no of samples used, and sample shape, ....

## Results and discussion

1. The figures are not clear.

Here are some related papers highlighting these points to help in the revised version:

<https://doi.org/10.1002/vnl.21745>

<https://doi.org/10.1002/pi.6207>

<https://doi.org/10.1177/08927057221126927>

<https://doi.org/10.1002/pi.6207>

2. Table 1 is not clear. It must be divided into figures to illustrate the main of the manuscript.
1. it's appropriate that this part is re-written
  2. References: authors should support the manuscript with recent literature.