

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

Azrin Hani Abdul Rashid¹

¹ Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

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

The paper explores the mechanical properties of sisal and sugar palm fiber-reinforced hybrid composites, offering an interesting topic for investigation. However, the technical explanations regarding the crucial reasons for using these fibers and their advantages lack depth, relying on basic properties and a fundamental review of their potential.

Regrettably, the paper appears unprepared for publication due to significant mistakes. The discrepancies between the results presented in the abstract and conclusion versus the "Results and Discussion" section raise concerns. It seems the author lacks a solid grasp of basic mechanical testing principles, evident in the properties analyzed, and insufficient references to the field.

The introduction section requires a more critical review of sisal and sugar palm fibers compared to other alternatives. The paragraph's end should emphatically state the research aim.

The Materials and Methods section is marred by excessive literature review instead of focusing on essential details such as the basic chemical, physical, and mechanical properties of sisal and sugar palm fibers. Specifics about testing specifications, sample fabrication methodology, and analysis formulas are lacking.

Furthermore, the poor quality of images and the manuscript's structural disorganization hinder comprehension. Figures display messy work, with incorrect axis titles and captions.

The Results and Discussion section demonstrates a mix of literature review and methodology statements, indicating weak writing skills. The discussions lack conviction, lacking support citations and comparisons with prior research results.

Misleading conclusions further raise concerns about the thoroughness of the author's review. It is advisable to send the manuscript for English proofreading.

In summary, this paper is inadequately prepared, rife with major mistakes, and is not recommended for publication.