

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_117581
Title of the Manuscript:	Mechanical Characterization and Comparative Analysis of Fiber-Reinforced Polymer Composites: Implications for Medical and Physiological Applications
Type of the Article	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:

(<https://www.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>FRP for medical applications is more needed. The findings talked about the mechanical properties but not in greater detail.</p> <p>The title is good but the finding doesn't match much with the findings.</p> <p>Abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>Average</p> <p>The findings are ok but the explanation has to be more stick with the findings</p> <p>The references are inappropriate. The references are not in order</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Quality of English is average. Found grammatical error.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Comment 1: The references are not in order and the first author should be mentioned in the citations. Additionally, some cited references are missing from the reference list. Authors kindly ensure all citations are correctly referenced and ordered.</p> <p>Comment 2: The introduction section is missing citations related to natural fibers. Including studies on natural fibers would enhance the context and background of your research.</p> <p>Comment 3: There is a lack of discussion on advanced measurement techniques. Please ensure the literature review covers recent advancements relevant to your study</p> <p>Comment 4: The manuscript contains several grammatical errors. A thorough proofreading is recommended to improve clarity and readability.</p> <p>Comment 5: The author didn't include all abbreviations are defined at their first occurrence in the text.</p> <p>Comment 6: The dimensions of the samples subjected to testing are not mentioned. Including this information would be beneficial for reproducibility (for example, The ASTM standards for testing are not mentioned. Including the specific standards used would strengthen the validity of your methods).</p> <p>Comment 7: The authors must provide a detailed explanation of the fiber bonding and the fabrication process of the composites. Also, the discussion should focus on interpreting your results rather than reiterating the literature review. Compare your findings with existing studies where relevant.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Comment 8: The authors should clearly state the potential applications of FRP in the medical field. The current discussion lacks specific examples and practical implications. If there are claims about the use of FRP in orthopedic implants or other medical applications, ensure these are supported by citations from relevant studies.</p> <p>Comment 9: Figures and tables are not properly cited in the text. Ensure all figures and tables are appropriately referenced within the manuscript (For example Fig 1a represents....).</p> <p>Comment 10: If using natural fibers like banana, discuss their moisture absorption properties and how this impacts the material's performance is appreciable.</p> <p>Comment 11: The conclusion should clearly state which concentration or composition is most suitable based on your research findings. The authors should note that on what basis you have claimed the results for medical applications.</p> <p>The overall review of the manuscript reveals that the authors did not perform thorough proofreading. The scope of the research is not clearly defined, and the manuscript lacks a novel approach that distinguishes it from existing studies on natural fibers. The discussion of results needs to provide a clearer understanding of the outcomes, including which concentration yields the best results. This clarity is essential to enhance the manuscript's contribution to the field.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	J R Jessy Michla
Department, University & Country	Kalasalingam Academy of Research and Education, India