

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_102613
Title of the Manuscript:	Formulation and thermomechanical characterization of earth-based biosourced composites: cases of clay-Hibiscus cannabinus L. fiber, clay-sawdust and clay-Oryza sativa husk.
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.journalajopacs.com/index.php/AJOPACS/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. This Paper reveals the thermal and mechanical characterization of a composite material based on clay and plant fibers, in order to meet the need for bioclimatic and sustainable environment.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Update in Recent Literature.</p> <p>1. The author has not differentiated methylene blue and plasticity index range value. The ambiguity between the value and reference has to be rectified to avoid confusion for the readers.</p> <p>2. In table 3 compressive strength value has been increased with the increase of fiber ratio and the author has mentioned that the fiber value 3% as the optimum. But there is no clarity or justification for the optimum value to mention as 3%. The author has to check the optimum value for at least two concentrations beyond 3 %.</p> <p>3. In table 5, 6 and 7 the abbreviation of samples MSB- K, MSB- BR and MSB- SB has not been abbreviated in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>---</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arulraj M
Department, University & Country	Sri Krishna Polytechnic College, India