

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

Tomás Jesús Madera-Santana<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Center for Food and Development A.C.

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

## Reviewer's Report

I have observed several writing issues in this manuscript. Some of these were highlighted in your manuscript. The most common writing issues were passive voice misuse, word choice, unclear sentences, punctuation in compound/complex sentences, wordy sentences, etc.

The manuscript has abbreviations that have not been defined by the authors; these were pointed out in the revised document.

This indicates that in the introduction, there are sentences that should be carefully reviewed by the authors. For example, the treatment with sodium hydroxide, which elements of the natural fibers are removed. I suggest checking very carefully for mistakes in their sentences.

The last sentence of the introduction section does not describe or state the purpose of the research or what the research question is that this paper wishes to answer. I suggest editing and correcting the spelling and grammatical errors observed in the manuscript.

The quality of Figure 7 should be improved by the authors.

Can the authors explain the difference between impact resistance and impact strength?

The legend in Figure 8 does not have the correct order. It should be sample 1, sample 2, and sample 3.

The authors do not conduct any statistical analysis of the results presented. As is the case in Figure 9, where the average values are shown, but no statistical analysis is made to show how different these results are from each other.

In my opinion, it is not appropriate to write any formulas in the Results and Discussion section. These formulas should be kept away from the results and discussion section, since they should be presented in the materials and methods section.

In this section, it is possible to read that some sentences are supported by the results. However, I can see that its description of the actions performed looks like an abstract. These sentences are not a conclusion of the research performed. I recommend improving this section.

The conclusion usually encloses all the important findings to suggest or express a future application.



## The Reviewer