History for Manuscript Number: RINENG-D-21-00519

Close

Correspondence History

Correspondence Date	Letter	Recipient	Revision
Feb 27, 2022	Editor Decision - Accept	Jauhar Fajrin	1
Feb 22, 2022	Author Submits Revision Confirmation	Jauhar Fajrin	1
Feb 22, 2022	PDF Built and Requires Approval	Jauhar Fajrin	1
Feb 22, 2022	PDF Built and Requires Approval	Jauhar Fajrin	1
Feb 22, 2022	Author Revision Reminder - Before Due Date	Jauhar Fajrin	0
Feb 18, 2022	Author Revision Reminder - Before Due Date	Jauhar Fajrin	0
Jan 28, 2022	Editor Decision - Revise	Jauhar Fajrin	0
Dec 31, 2021	Author Notice of Manuscript Number	Jauhar Fajrin	0
Dec 29, 2021	Author Submits New Manuscript Confirmation	Jauhar Fajrin	0
Dec 29, 2021	PDF Built and Requires Approval	Jauhar Fajrin	0

Close

Date:	Dec 29, 2021
To:	"Jauhar Fajrin" jauhar.fajrin@unram.ac.id
From:	"Results in Engineering" support@elsevier.com
Subject:	Your PDF Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites has been built and requires approval

Dear Dr Fajrin,

The PDF for your submission, "Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites" is ready for viewing.

This is an automatic email sent when your PDF is built. You may have already viewed and approved your PDF while on-line, in which case you do not need to return to view and approve the submission

Please go to https://www.editorialmanager.com/rineng/ to approve your submission.

Username: ********
If you do not know your confidential password, you may reset it by clicking this link: ********

Your submission must be approved in order to complete the submission process and send the manuscript to the Results in Engineering editorial office.

Please view the submission before approving it to be certain that your submission remains free of any errors.

Thank you for your time and patience.

Editorial Office Staff
Results in Engineering
https://www.editorialmanager.com/rineng/

#AU_RINENG#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

Date: Dec 29, 2021
To: "Jauhar Fajrin" jauhar.fajrin@unram.ac.id
From: "Results in Engineering" support@elsevier.com
Subject: Submission Confirmation for Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites

Dear Dr Fajrin,

Your submission entitled "Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites" has been received by journal Results in Engineering

You will be able to check on the progress of your paper by logging on to Editorial Manager as an author. The URL is https://www.editorialmanager.com/rineng/.

Your manuscript will be given a reference number once an Editor has been assigned.

Thank you for submitting your work to this journal.

Kind regards,

Results in Engineering

#AU_RINENG#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

Date:	Dec 31, 2021
To:	"Jauhar Fajrin" jauhar.fajrin@unram.ac.id
cc:	"Femiana Gapsari" memi_kencrut@ub.ac.id, "Akmaluddin Akmaluddin" akmaluddin@unram.ac.id
From:	"Results in Engineering" support@elsevier.com
Subject:	A manuscript number has been assigned to Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites

Dear Dr Fajrin,

Your submission entitled "Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites" has been been assigned the following manuscript number: RINENG-D-21-00519.

You will be able to check on the progress of your paper by logging on to Editorial Manager as an author.
The URL is https://www.editorialmanager.com/rineng/.

Thank you for submitting your work to this journal.

Kind regards,

Norman Toy, Ph.D
Managing Editor
Results in Engineering

#AU_RINENG#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

Date: Jan 28, 2022
To: "Jauhar Fajrin" jauhar.fajrin@unram.ac.id
From: "Results in Engineering" support@elsevier.com
Subject: Your Submission
Attachment(s): JRE Comments.docx
RINENG-D-21-00519_Kenaf_Fibers_Reviewer_1_Editor.pdf
RINENG-D-21-00519_Kenaf_Fibers_Reviewer_1_Author.pdf

Ref.: Ms. No. RINENG-D-21-00519
Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites
Results in Engineering

Dear Dr Fajrin,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript.

Please resubmit your revised manuscript by Feb 25, 2022.

To submit a revision, go to https://www.editorialmanager.com/rineng/ and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.

Yours sincerely

Daniel M Mulvihill, D.Phil.
Associate Editor
Results in Engineering

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Your article would appear to be of interest to a wide engineering research community and in order to promote its visibility even more, may we recommend that you view the past published articles in Results in Engineering and if you find any relevant publications, CITE the article from this Journal.

We recommend a revision of the paper in line with the reviewer comments. Please revise the manuscript addressing the comments of each of the reviewers in turn.

Reviewer 1: Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites

The presented article "Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites" looks to assess the mechanical properties of Kenaf Fiber reinforced composites. A low cost composite is produced from textile waste material (Kenaf Fibers) and a polyester matrix. The paper assesses the impact of fiber orientation on the flexural and tensile strength of the composite in order to assess the potential use in civil engineering applications. The results show good strength in a unidirectional layup but drops in strength when using random or woven layups.
The work is well structured, novel and of value but this reviewer believes the work needs some additional clarity on some of the technical details and some errata removed from the manuscript.

Section 1 Introduction
1. This gives a good overview of the previous literature and the motivations for carrying out the study.
Section 2.1 Kenaf Fiber (KF) Preparation
2. "The catalyst, which is methyl ethyl ketone peroxide (MEKP) was added to the polyester, and the mixture was mixed before being poured into a mold. The mold was 300 mm by 210 mm in size. The fiber loading was fixed at 20 wt% for all samples. The composite laminate was made using a combination of manual lay-up and vacuum bagging. Fig. 2 depicts the sample preparation method as well as the finished product of polyester-KF waste composites."
You first mention pouring the matrix material into a 300 mm by 210 mm mold before using manual layup and vacuum bagging to prepare the laminate. The specific method is unclear and some clarification is needed around the following issues
* What was the curing time and temperature for the unsaturated polyester resin?
* How was the matrix and fiber material mixed?
* Was the vacuum applied on the mold in order to produce sheets of that size?
It is later mentioned (in section 3.3) that there is issues with matrix-fiber bonding in the random layout so clarifying the layup process would strengthen the paper.
3. In Fig. 2, Giving an idea of scale would be useful. Are these the cut 120 x 12 x 3 mm sheets?

Section 2.2 Testing Method

4. "The flexural test was carried out following ASTM D-790."
Stating the specimen dimensions, span and fixture dimensions, and speed of testing for the flexural test would be useful for the reader.
5. "The specimens were cut to the size of 120 mm length, 12 mm width, and the thickness of 3 mm."
Is this for both the tensile test and the flexural test? How were the specimens cut?
6. "The testing speed used was 2 mm/min"
This sentence is repeated in the middle and the end of the paragraph. If the sentences are referring to the flexural and tensile tests separately then it is unclear. Overall this section is ambiguous as to which test is referred to and could be clarified for the benefit of the reader.

Section 3. Results and Discussions

7. Including the equations used to calculate the Tensile Modulus, Tensile Strength, Flexural Modulus and Flexural Strength would be useful.
8. The labels on the top of the Flexural Strength bars in Fig. 3(b) all show 153.1 which disagrees with the bar height shown.
9. It would be useful to add information on standard deviation to get an idea of the spread of the results.
10. There is some inconsistency in the accuracy and formatting of the percentages used in this section. It would be good to select a consistent method. Ie,
"Meanwhile, the flexural modulus of composites reinforced with random fibers is just 2.38 percent greater…"
"According to the findings, the composite reinforced with random and woven fiber only has 34.98% and 28%..."

Section 3.3 Morphology

11. "Fig. 3c also shows some voids. There is rougher surface seen in Fig. 3c indicating the pull out from woven fiber."
Should this refer to Figure 4 c?
12. If available, images of the flexural fracture would be interesting.

Section 3.4 Discussion

13. "Tensile strength in line with tensile modulus that incite to stiffness of composites."
I don't understand this sentence, could you clarify it?
14. "Figure 3 also reveal that the resultant composites behave as brittle materials, as indicated by stresses of less than 5% [20] "
Should this refer to Strains of less than 5%?
15. "It was discovered that when the KFs are arranged randomly, they tend to clump together and pull out of the bundle, lowering the mechanical characteristics."
Is this during the layup phase or when under stress in the solid matrix? It's unclear what is being referred to.
16. Fig 5. Are the other Kenaf Fibre composites referenced also unidirectional, ie are these valid comparisons?

Section 4. Conclusions

17. "KF is varied in various fiber orientations"
There is a missing full stop after this sentence
18. The drop off in strength between unidirectional and woven/random seems like a significant conclusion that should be mentioned in the conclusion.
19. "It was also found that the fibers lay flat."
Do you have any evidence to support this being unique to the unidirectional layups? SEM imaging of the woven fibers (Fig. 4 (c)) seems to show parallel layers of fibers.

Reviewer 2: 1) Data mentioned in each graphs are not correct as mentioned in supportive data table.
2) Presentation of whole article is to be improve with supportive citations and justifyable reasons.
3) Comparative studies on mechanical characterization between uni, random and woven fibers reinforced composites are not satisfactory. 4) Reasons for obtained results on tensile and flexure is need to be technically justify.
5) Indetail report on stress strain graphs are to be provide and further its importace to analyze the mechanical characterization is needed.
6) Effective utilization of references to make the article more informative is lacking.
7) SEM analysis to study the marphological changes of fibers is acceptable.

Reviewer 3: This is the review for the manuscript titled "Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites"
The manuscript is good and well organized, also, the plan of work incorporated with this manuscript is very interesting and highly appreciated. however, the questions and comments below should be considered before publication.
1. The abstract does not reflect the main points of the work, I suggest to rewrite it with focus on the novelty and main results.
2. The introduction section is short, also I couldn't find a firm justification for the novelty of this work, it is better to clarify the novelty for the readers.
3. "The fiber loading was fixed at 20 wt% "why this percentage used? Why didn't go for 30%? As its known that the optimal natural fiber ratio is about 35%.
4. What the reason that made the KF used considered as waste? What is the difference with regular KF in terms of strength?
5. Some typos need to be corrected through the manuscript.
6. A few recent reference was found, I think more recent and related references should be added.
7. Please added the following related references:
Sharba, M. J., Leman, Z., Sultan, M. T., Ishak, M. R., & Hanim, M. A. A. (2016). Effects of kenaf fiber orientation on mechanical properties and fatigue life of glass/kenaf hybrid composites. BioResources, 11(1), 1448-1465.

Sharba, M. J., Leman, Z., & Sultan, M. T. H. (2019). Fatigue life prediction of textile/woven hybrid composites. In Durability and life prediction in biocomposites, fibre-reinforced composites and hybrid composites (pp. 63-82). Woodhead Publishing.
Kirmasha, Y. K., Sharba, M. J., Leman, Z., & Sultan, M. T. H. (2020). Mechanical Performance of Unstitched and Silk Fiber-Stitched Woven Kenaf Fiber-Reinforced Epoxy Composites. Materials, 13(21), 4801.

Reviewer 4: NO

Reviewer 5: This manuscript can be accepted with addition in discussion and conclusion

#AU_RINENG#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

Date: Feb 18, 2022
To: "Jauhar Fajrin" jauhar.fajrin@unram.ac.id
From: "Daniel M Mulvihill" daniel.mulvihill@glasgow.ac.uk
Subject: Revision of "Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites" is due soon

This is an automated message.

Manuscript Number: RINENG-D-21-00519
Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites

Dear Dr Fajrin,

We would like to remind you that on Jan 28, 2022 we asked you to revise your above referenced manuscript and your revision is due by Feb 25, 2022.

Results in Engineering values your contribution and we look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

To submit your revision, please log in as an author at https://www.editorialmanager.com/RINENG/, and navigate to the "Submissions Needing Revision" folder under the Author Main Menu. You will also find the decision letter and comments available there.

If you do not plan to revise your manuscript, please click "Decline to Revise" in the "Submissions Needing Revision" folder.

If you require more time, please contact the journal office by replying to this email.

Kind regards,
Results in Engineering

More information and support:

%CUSTOM_AUTHORSUPPORT%

%CUSTOM_GENERALSUPPORT%

#AU_RINENG#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

Date: Feb 22, 2022
To: "Jauhar Fajrin" jauhar.fajrin@unram.ac.id
From: "Daniel M Mulvihill" daniel.mulvihill@glasgow.ac.uk
Subject: Revision of "Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites" is due soon

This is an automated message.

Manuscript Number: RINENG-D-21-00519
Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites

Dear Dr Fajrin,

We would like to remind you that on Jan 28, 2022 we asked you to revise your above referenced manuscript and your revision is due by Feb 25, 2022.

Results in Engineering values your contribution and we look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

To submit your revision, please log in as an author at https://www.editorialmanager.com/RINENG/, and navigate to the "Submissions Needing Revision" folder under the Author Main Menu. You will also find the decision letter and comments available there.

If you do not plan to revise your manuscript, please click "Decline to Revise" in the "Submissions Needing Revision" folder.

If you require more time, please contact the journal office by replying to this email.

Kind regards,
Results in Engineering

More information and support:

%CUSTOM_AUTHORSUPPORT%

%CUSTOM_GENERALSUPPORT%

#AU_RINENG#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

Date:	Feb 22, 2022
To:	"Jauhar Fajrin" jauhar.fajrin@unram.ac.id
From:	"Results in Engineering" support@elsevier.com
Subject:	Your PDF Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites has been built and requires approval

Dear Dr Fajrin,

The PDF for your submission, "Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites" is ready for viewing.

This is an automatic email sent when your PDF is built. You may have already viewed and approved your PDF while on-line, in which case you do not need to return to view and approve the submission

Please go to https://www.editorialmanager.com/rineng/ to approve your submission.

Username: ********
If you do not know your confidential password, you may reset it by clicking this link: ********

Your submission must be approved in order to complete the submission process and send the manuscript to the Results in Engineering editorial office.

Please view the submission before approving it to be certain that your submission remains free of any errors.

Thank you for your time and patience.

Editorial Office Staff
Results in Engineering
https://www.editorialmanager.com/rineng/

#AU_RINENG#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

Author's Response To Reviewer Comments

Close

Associate Editor
Result in Engineering Journal

Object: Revision Manuscript ID: RINENG-D-21-00519

Dear Prof. Daniel M Mulvihill

On behalf of the Authors, I would like to thank you again for allowing us to further improve our manuscript. We have tried our best to respond to the latest comments as detailed below. Changes in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow.

Reviewer #1
The presented article "Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites" looks to assess the mechanical properties of Kenaf Fiber reinforced composites. A low-cost composite is produced from textile waste material (Kenaf Fibers) and a polyester matrix. The paper assesses the impact of fiber orientation on the flexural and tensile strength of the composite in order to assess the potential use in civil engineering applications. The results show good strength in a unidirectional layup but drops in strength when using random or woven layups. The work is well structured, novel and of value but this reviewer believes the work needs some additional clarity on some of the technical details and some errata removed from the manuscript.

Section 1 Introduction

1. This gives a good overview of the previous literature and the motivations for carrying out the study.
Section 2.1 Kenaf Fiber (KF) Preparation
Response:
Thank you for highlighting this important point. We have added the KF preparation section.

2. "The catalyst, which is methyl ethyl ketone peroxide (MEKP) was added to the polyester, and the mixture was mixed before being poured into a mold. The mold was 300 mm by 210 mm in size. The fiber loading was fixed at 20 wt% for all samples. The composite laminate was made using a combination of manual lay-up and vacuum bagging. Fig. 2 depicts the sample preparation method as well as the finished product of polyester-KF waste composites."
You first mention pouring the matrix material into a 300 mm by 210 mm mold before using manual layup and vacuum bagging to prepare the laminate. The specific method is unclear and some clarification is needed around the following issues

* What was the curing time and temperature for the unsaturated polyester resin?
Response: Thank you for your sharp observation. We cured the composite for 24 hours at 25 oC (as an ambient temperature in our place). According to an article published in https://fiberglasswarehouse.com, the ideal temperature to work in is 70 oF (± 21 oC). It is unlikely the product will cure in temps under 60 oF. The product could cure too fast if the temperature is above 80 oF. Typically catalyst is used between 1.25% to 1.75%. We have included this information in the manuscript.

* How was the matrix and fiber material mixed?
Response: Thank you for highlighting this important comment. KFW composite laminates were prepared using a vacuum bagging method. Vacuum bagging employs atmospheric pressure as a clamp to keep the fiber and matrix together within an airtight enclosure. Vacuum bag molding may be defined as a technique that combines a manual approach of hand-layup or spray-up on an open mold to generate a laminated component with a vacuum process after covering the laminated with a polymeric sheet. The composite was prepared using an open mold with dimensions of 300 mm x 210 mm x 3 mm. Three distinct composite sheets were created using three different fiber configurations: longitudinal, woven, and randomly oriented. The matrix material was made by mixing unsaturated polyester resin and catalyst in a 100:2 weight ratio. The catalyst, methyl ethyl ketone peroxide (MEKP), was added to the polyester and stirred before being put into a mold. The produced matrix was mixed with fibers based on fiber orientation to make three distinct composite sheets. We have included this information in section 2.3 Composites Fabrication.

* Was the vacuum applied on the mold in order to produce sheets of that size?
It is later mentioned (in section 3.3) that there is issues with matrix-fiber bonding in the random layout so clarifying the layup process would strengthen the paper.
Response: Thank you for highlighting this important point. The composite was prepared using an open mold with dimensions of 300 mm x 210 mm x 3 mm. Three distinct composite sheets were created using three different fiber configurations: longitudinal, woven, and randomly oriented. We have added this point in section 2.3 Composites Fabrication.

3. In Fig. 2, Giving an idea of scale would be useful. Are these the cut 120 x 12 x 3 mm sheets?

Response: Thank you for your observation. We have added the scale in Fig. 2 as requested. The composite was prepared using an open mold with dimensions of 300 mm x 210 mm x 3 mm.

Section 2.2 Testing Method

4. "The flexural test was carried out following ASTM D-790."
Stating the specimen dimensions, span and fixture dimensions, and speed of testing for the flexural test would be useful for the reader.
Response: We are grateful for the pertinent comment. The bending test was performed by referring to the ASTM D790 standard. The bending test was carried out using the same tool for the tensile test with a three-point bending load and a test strain limit of 5.0%. The span length ratio to thickness was 16:1 and the crosshead speed was 5 mm/min.

5. "The specimens were cut to the size of 120 mm length, 12 mm width, and the thickness of 3 mm."
Is this for both the tensile test and the flexural test? How were the specimens cut?
Response: Thank you for your observation. The cutting process was conducted on tensile and bending specimens according to the standard of each test (ASTM D3039 for tensile testing and ASTM D790 for flexural testing). The cutting process was performed manually using a cutting grinder and followed by smoothing/finishing using sand paper (100-1500 grid).

6. "The testing speed used was 2 mm/min"
This sentence is repeated in the middle and the end of the paragraph. If the sentences are referring to the flexural and tensile tests separately then it is unclear.
Response: Thank you for your pertinent comment. We have separated into 2 sections.

Overall this section is ambiguous as to which test is referred to and could be clarified for the benefit of the reader.
Response: Thank you for your sharp observation. We have revised the reference we used.

Section 3. Results and Discussions

7. Including the equations used to calculate the Tensile Modulus, Tensile Strength, Flexural Modulus and Flexural Strength would be useful.
Response: Thank you for highlighting this important point. We have added the equation as requested.

8. The labels on the top of the Flexural Strength bars in Fig. 3(b) all show 153.1 which disagrees with the bar height shown.
Response: Thank you for mentioning this point. We have corrected the bar height.

9. It would be useful to add information on standard deviation to get an idea of the spread of the results.
Response: Thank you for highlighting this important point. We have added the standard deviation as requested.

10. There is some inconsistency in the accuracy and formatting of the percentages used in this section. It would be good to select a consistent method. Ie,
"Meanwhile, the flexural modulus of composites reinforced with random fibers is just 2.38 percent greater…"
"According to the findings, the composite reinforced with random and woven fiber only has 34.98% and 28%..."
Response: Thank you for your pertinent critics. We have revised and presented the data consistently.

Section 3.3 Morphology

11. "Fig. 3c also shows some voids. There is a rougher surface seen in Fig. 3c indicating the pull out from woven fiber."
Response: Thank you for pointing out this anomaly. We have revised the referred of the figure.

Should this refer to Figure 4 c?
12. If available, images of the flexural fracture would be interesting.
Response:Thank you for highlighting this important point. We have retested the SEM on tensile fractures and added flexural fractures to show the tensile strength difference on each fiber orientation.

Section 3.4 Discussion

13. "Tensile strength in line with tensile modulus that incite to stiffness of composites."
I don't understand this sentence, could you clarify it?
Response: Thank you for mentioning this point. We have corrected the sentence accordingly.

14. "Figure 3 also reveal that the resultant composites behave as brittle materials, as indicated by stresses of less than 5% [20] "
Should this refer to Strains of less than 5%?
Response: Thank you for mentioning this important point. We strongly agree with your statement regarding brittle materials. The ductility of materials is greatly affected by their strain. We have corrected the reference used.

15. "It was discovered that when the KFs are arranged randomly, they tend to clump together and pull out of the

bundle, lowering the mechanical characteristics."
Is this during the layup phase or when under stress in the solid matrix? It's unclear what is being referred to.
Response:
Thank you for mentioning this important point. During the lay-up process, the kenaf fibers had been optimally arranged for homogeneous distribution. After observing with SEM photos, we got agglomeration when under pressure in a dense matrix which was maybe caused by a shift in the position of the fibers when pressing for curing is performed.

16. Fig 5. Are the other Kenaf Fibre composites referenced also unidirectional, ie are these valid comparisons?
Response: Thank you for your sharp observation. We have added the fiber orientation in Fig. 6 as requested.

17. "KF is varied in various fiber orientations"
There is a missing full stop after this sentence
Response: Thank you for the correction. We have changed the sentence.

18. The drop off in strength between unidirectional and woven/random seems like a significant conclusion that should be mentioned in the conclusion.
Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added and rewritten the conclusion.

19. "It was also found that the fibers lay flat."
Do you have any evidence to support this being unique to the unidirectional layups? SEM imaging of the woven fibers (Fig. 4 (c)) seems to show parallel layers of fibers
Response: Thank you for pointing out your observation. We have retested the SEM on tensile fractures and added flexural fractures to show the tensile strength difference on each fiber orientation.

Reviewer #2:
1) Data mentioned in each graphs are not correct as mentioned in supportive data table.
Response : Thank you for your sharp observation. We have corrected each graph.

2) Presentation of whole article is to be improve with supportive citations and justifyable reasons.
Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added the supportive reference.

3) Comparative studies on mechanical characterization between uni, random and woven fibers reinforced composites are not satisfactory.
Response: Thank you for pointing out this anomaly. We have added the discussion about fiber orientation.

4) Reasons for obtained results on tensile and flexure is need to be technically justify.
Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added the testing method section as requested.

5) Indetail report on stress strain graphs are to be provide and further its importace to analyze the mechanical characterization is needed.
Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added the discussion about mechanical characterization as requested.

6) Effective utilization of references to make the article more informative is lacking.
Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added the references.

7) SEM analysis to study the marphological changes of fibers is acceptable.
Response: Thank you for reviewing this point.

Reviewer #3
This is the review for the manuscript titled "Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites"
The manuscript is good and well organized, also, the plan of work incorporated with this manuscript is very interesting and highly appreciated. however, the questions and comments below should be considered before publication.

1. The abstract does not reflect the main points of the work, I suggest to rewrite it with focus on the novelty and main results.
Response: Thank you for pointing out your observation. We have rewritten the abstract accordingly.

2. The introduction section is short, also I couldn't find a firm justification for the novelty of this work, it is better to clarify the novelty for the readers.
Response: Thank you for mentioning this important point. We have rewritten the introduction accordingly.

3. "The fiber loading was fixed at 20 wt% "why this percentage used? Why didn't go for 30%? As its known that the optimal natural fiber ratio is about 35%.
Response: Thank you for highlighting this important point. The optimal fiber loading for natural fiber composites is around 30-35 percent wt., while some study has indicated less or even more than that figure. The allegation in those reported publications, on the other hand, was originally predicated on the fact that they employed ordinary fibers. Because we employed waste fiber, a byproduct of the textile industry, in this study, we sought to use slightly fewer fibers than the optimal reported proportion, 20 percent wt. In numerous prior investigations, the value of 20% wt. was also stated as the optimal fiber loading, as follows:

[1] V.P. Kommula, K.O. Reddy, M. Shukla, T. Marwala, A.V. Rajulu, Mechanical Properties, Water Absorption, and Chemical Resistance of Napier Grass Fiber Strand–Reinforced Epoxy Resin Composites, Int. J. Polym. Anal. Charact. 19 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1080/1023666X.2014.954186.
[2] W.Z.W. Mohamed, A. Baharum, I. Ahmad, I. Abdullah, N.E. Zakaria, Effects of fiber size and fiber content on mechanical and physical properties of mengkuang reinforced thermoplastic natural rubber composites, BioResources. 13 (2018). https://doi.org/10.15376/biores.13.2.2945-2959.

4. What the reason that made the KF used considered as waste? What is the difference with regular KF in terms of strength?
Response: Thank you for your interesting comment. We use KF waste because it is the waste from a factory that is not used anymore. Previously, it had been treated with the preparation process as a fiber. If we use New KF Fiber, then we have to prepare it from the kenaf plant. Therefore, we recommend using KF waste because it has the same properties as the new KF.

5. Some typos need to be corrected through the manuscript.
Response: Thank you for reading thoroughly. We corrected the typos in the manuscript.

6. A few recent reference was found, I think more recent and related references should be added.
Response: Thank you for mentioning this point. We have added more references as requested.

7. Please added the following related references:
Sharba, M. J., Leman, Z., Sultan, M. T., Ishak, M. R., & Hanim, M. A. A. (2016). Effects of kenaf fiber orientation on mechanical properties and fatigue life of glass/kenaf hybrid composites. BioResources, 11(1), 1448-1465.
Sharba, M. J., Leman, Z., & Sultan, M. T. H. (2019). Fatigue life prediction of textile/woven hybrid composites. In Durability and life prediction in biocomposites, fiber-reinforced composites and hybrid composites (pp. 63-82). Woodhead Publishing.
Kirmasha, Y. K., Sharba, M. J., Leman, Z., & Sultan, M. T. H. (2020). Mechanical Performance of Unstitched and Silk Fiber-Stitched Woven Kenaf Fiber-Reinforced Epoxy Composites. Materials, 13(21), 4801.
Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added the references as requested.

We hope that the above responses can satisfy the editor and the reviewers' comments. Thank you again for the opportunity and the pertinent comments.

Best regards,

Jauhar Fajrin

Close

Date: Feb 22, 2022
To: "Jauhar Fajrin" jauhar.fajrin@unram.ac.id
From: "Results in Engineering" support@elsevier.com
Subject: Submission Confirmation for RINENG-D-21-00519R1

Ref.: Ms. No. RINENG-D-21-00519R1
Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites

Dear Dr Fajrin,

Results in Engineering has received your revised submission.

You may check the status of your manuscript by logging onto Editorial Manager at (https://www.editorialmanager.com/rineng/).

Kind regards,

#AU_RINENG#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code

Date: Feb 27, 2022
To: "Jauhar Fajrin" jauhar.fajrin@unram.ac.id
From: "Daniel M Mulvihill" daniel.mulvihill@glasgow.ac.uk
Subject: Your Submission

Ref.: Ms. No. RINENG-D-21-00519R1
Utilization of Kenaf Fiber Waste as Reinforced Polymer Composites
Results in Engineering

Dear Dr Fajrin,

I am pleased to tell you that your work has now been accepted for publication in Results in Engineering.

It was accepted on Feb 27, 2022

Comments from the Editor and Reviewers can be found below.

Thank you for submitting your work to this journal.

With kind regards

Daniel M Mulvihill, D.Phil.
Associate Editor
Results in Engineering

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

The authors have made a good job of addressing the reviewer remarks

Eligible for a waiver?

If your manuscript was transferred from an Elsevier subscription journal and submitted in this open access journal before 30 June 2022, you do not have to pay the article publishing charge (APC). We will waive the APC.

How to get your APC waived?
Please use this webform to contact our support team: https://service.elsevier.com/app/contact/supporthub/publishing/

You can then expect the following:
1. You will receive a voucher code upon successful validation.
2. You will receive an email with a link to the Rights and Access form.
3. Enter the voucher code in the Rights and Access form, in the Publishing options step and complete the form.

Important note:
Please complete the Rights and Access Form within 14 days of receipt of the link to the form. An open access invoice will be sent to you if you don't complete the Rights and Access form.

#AU_RINENG#

To ensure this email reaches the intended recipient, please do not delete the above code