



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_35841
Title of the Manuscript:	Mechanical Behavior of Agricultural Waste Fibers Reinforced Vinyl ester Bio-composites
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Please consider the compositions in Table 1 in order to allow for the sums to make 100, possibly adding "other components" or similar. Please note that for bagasse your sum even exceeds 100!</p> <p>Also, we accept that the values in Table 1 and Table 2 are average ones. However, for natural materials it would be interesting to know the standard deviation of these, since it can be high and significant. Please consider adding some indications of this sort.</p> <p>Line 158: cross-head speed of 10 mm/minute appears really quite fast (with such a short gauge length) which would affect the accuracy of results. Please justify, possibly with literature.</p> <p>About data in Figure 2 and 3, it is clear that passing from 10 to 15 wt.% of any agrowaste the effect is decreasing tensile strength and modulus. Why progressing up to 20 wt.% then? Please clarify. Also in this case having some standard deviation of data obtained (I do hope you did not test one sample per series) would be needed. (This applies also to Figure 4 and Figure 5 obviously).</p> <p>About SEM, since you said in the text that fibres tend to touch to each other for 15 and 20 wt.% of these introduced, one would expect you show also some images at these filler contents other than only at 10 wt.%. In the absence of this, the SEM doesn't tell much, apart from obvious voids, which can be reduced by the manufacturing process anyway.</p> <p>You add agrowaste to vinylester, but do not provide any information on why you did select this matrix. Please add some information somewhere, may be in the discussion of results.</p> <p>Conclusions are quite poor and would need some more expansion, in particular on whether there is some agrowaste more adapted than other to use. Please also note that at Line 267 the meaning of "the doing well manufacture" is not clear. Please check and correct.</p>	Noted.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 38: please replace "reinforced" with "reinforcement for"</p> <p>Line 129: please replace the indication in "psi" with the one in International units (e.g., MPa)</p> <p>Line 167: please replace "was indented" with "were indented"</p>	
Optional/General comments	A quite interesting and up-to-date paper with important points needing attention.	