

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

E. N. Obika¹

¹ Nnamdi Azikiwe University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors,

Your paper presented some interesting findings on the mechanical properties of a reinforced composite with a hybrid of sisal and sugar palm fibre. However, I have the following comments to make:

1. The Abstract is quite a long and unnecessary introduction.
2. Mentioning the names of the equipment used for testing is also unnecessary.
3. The abstract should be restructured: a short introduction, actual work done, method, results, and a short conclusion in that order. The author seems to mix these parts together, especially in the results section.
4. The general language structure of the paper should be revisited to reflect the correct tenses and improve the use of scientific terms.
5. The introduction section can be better written to systematically guide readers to the aim of the research that comes at the end of the introduction. The aim of the research is missing in the introduction.
6. The materials and methods section of the paper should begin with an overview of the section. What the authors have presented at the beginning of the materials and methods section is not different from what is stated in the introduction of the paper. The authors should rewrite them to give an overview of the section.
7. Proper material selection is one of the vital aspects of material science. This paper lacks a proper material selection approach. What informed your choices of fibre, binder, etc.? Proper material selection provides answers to such research questions.
8. The description of the fibre extraction process is also lacking. It is important to make a clear description of how these fibres were extracted.
9. I don't see any citation in the whole of the materials and methods section. Does it mean that the authors invented all adopted procedures? The authors should validate the adopted procedures by providing their sources.
10. The sample ratio is insufficient to give a conclusive result on the impact of these fibres on the composite. At least the authors should have samples with only one of the fibres at a time to help monitor the effect of the introduction of the second fibre.
11. The mechanical properties section should be part of the materials and methods section.
12. The results and discussion section is inconsistent with presenting and discussing the obtained. Presenting test procedures in this section makes it clumsy.

13. A proper discussion of the obtained results is also lacking in this section.
14. Most importantly, the presented result in this paper lacks validity. The authors should at least present a comparison of the results with what is obtainable in the literature.
15. The conclusion should be reconstructed. At this point, the authors should focus on making emphatic scientific conclusions, hence the use of “sample1 ...” should be replaced with the actual composition of the materials.