

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_97718
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF COCONUT FIBRE REINFORCED LOW DENSITY POLYETHELENE COMPOSITES
Type of the 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:

<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript does not bring current data such as the volume discarded of portable water sachets and coconut fibers in the environment that would allow associating it with a reduction in environmental degradation generated by improper disposal of the same, with citations from 2003 to 2016. use recent searches (from 2019 to 2023). 2. The title of the article is adequate to the research carried out. 3. I missed the summary of a brief presentation of the theme to only then present the general objective, methodology and results obtained. So they must improve. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. The methodological procedures are in accordance with the scientific method. Arguments are lacking to justify the conclusion given in the summary that it contributes to reducing environmental degradation. Well, it does not bring the volume of waste generated or data that demonstrate that this use by the industries mentioned is economically viable. I suggest adding data that fills this gap and using information from surveys from 2019 to 2023. 6. The references are not recent and are not sufficient to meet the given suggestions to improve the work. 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is adequate.	
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:	Sâmea Valensca Alves Barros
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Rural de Semi-Árido, Brazil