SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJAST_10383**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effects of /HMDA dual Compatibilizer and Filler loading on Physico-Mechanical and Water Sorption Properties of Natural Rubber/Poly (ethylene terephthalate) (PET)/Dikanut Shell Powder Bio-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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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	In the present work, the authors discuss about the: Effects of /HMDA dual Compatibilizer and Filler loading on Physico-Mechanical and Water Sorption Properties of NR/PET/Dikanut Shell Powder Bio-Composites: a narrative approach. I think it is very interesting to investigate the some thought of a dual Compatibilizers were incorporated with NR/PET for the fabrication of regenerated bio-composite to enhance its mechanical properties. The result indicates the good tendency and also assimilates the knowledge of the combination of two compatibilizer systems. I hope that it likely to be significance to other researchers which probably in the applied material field. However, the authors do not explain the very purpose of their work and mentions the result in the viewpoint of commercial application. The paper contains some interesting results but the following comments should be followed to make the manuscript better: At the introduction you have shown what the other authors made in the field of the paper but you did not indicate what the difference between their work and yours is. In addition you did not indicate what is novel in your work exactly. Also the way of writing is like showing the others work from the abstract of their research papers without showing your opinion about it or comparing with your new ideas.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Some grammatical mistakes need to be corrected. I think, with minor revision, the article can be published in British Journal of applied Science & Technology	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer