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

Omkumar Meenakshisundaram[1]

1 Anna University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Upon reviewing the work, the following suggestions are placed before the authors to incorporate in their paper for improvement.

1. The paper requires thorough linguistic correction in order to improve the quality of the work. Keywords may be revised based on importance.
2. The literature survey needs to be well structured. Furthering the literature review with more recent publications is needed, and comparison with benchmarking work will strengthen the work.
3. Citations are to be made in the introduction part. The authors should present the detailed process of the extraction of the fibers from sisal and palm for the better understanding of the readers.
4. An image of the compression molding set-up must be added.
5. The composite material's shape and size are not clearly specified in the manuscript. No images of the fabricated composites are shown.
6. The number of samples tested and the repetition of the testing are not clearly indicated. All tests should have been carried out, at least, for 5 samples of each condition, as suggested by the ASTM standards. The testing samples data is also missing.
7. The resolution of the images must be enhanced. The figures require proper citations.
8. What is the uniqueness of the fibers used and how is it different from other natural fibers?
9. Explain the novelty of the current research article?
10. Provide the images for the chemical treatment processes.
11. The structure and the composition of the fibers need to be specified, and it should be proved, for example, using XRD, FT-IR, NMR, SEM, etc.
12. The chemical treatment process needs to be explained elaborately. It is mentioned that the fibers are treated with alkali 5 %, whilst they mentioned previously that they used a 20 % alkali solution.
13. Pictures of setups for various tests conducted must be added.
14. No micrographs, such as SEM figures of the fractured specimens, are included in the paper, which can provide deeper insight into the proposed research.
15. Recommendations for future research may be added.

The conclusion part of the paper has to be improved further.