



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_65566
Title of the Manuscript:	MODELING INJECTION MOULDING PARAMETERS FOR FLEXURAL RESPONSES OF BIO-FIBRE FILLED POLYMER 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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The general subject of this study entitled " Modeling injection moulding parameters for flexural responses of bio-fibre filled polymer composites" (Ms_JMSRR_65566) is interesting and has valuable information. The aim of the study is on modelling injection moulding parameters for a bio-fiber filled polymer composite.</p> <p>In general, the writing is well tailored, and the explanations are often reasonable. However, sometimes, at some points, the submitted research leaves something to be desired. Nevertheless, the presented manuscript could be accepted after a minor revision and amendments following these next comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The keywords should be arranged alphabetically. 2. In the abstract should indicate the independent parameters as well as their range. Also some results. 3. In introduction "the size of paragraph one" is a little long with only one reference. So, at least one more reference should be added. 4. At the end of "introduction section" the main objectives of the study should be presents. What is the benefit of this work over previous works. 5. References should be made for all equations used in this study. 6. More literatures for discussion are essential. 7. Conclusion is weak and need to rewritten and solidify. only present the importance conclusion with few results. 8. There is no information about the sample preparation "fibre fillers". Please explain? 9. In the paragraph 2.3 the authors used two compatibilizers or coupling agents. Please give more details about it. 10. Results and Discussions section is weak. The results of the study are good and a lot, so, must be explained clearly in relation to previous studies or literature. 	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Omar Sulyman
Department, University & Country	Gdansk University of Technology, Poland