COLOMBO SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE & INFORMATION SYSTEM

E-ISSN: 2536-7919

P-ISSN: 2536-7900

PAGE NO: 08-17

Multifaceted Advances and Theoretical Foundations in Natural Fiber–Reinforced Polymer Composites: Mechanisms, Treatments, Hybridization, and Predictive Modeling

Erika Sandoval

Faculty of Cloud Engineering, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Submission: June 08, 2025

Accepted: June 29, 2025

Published: July 15, 2025

VOLUME: Vol.10 Issue 07 2025

Keywords:

natural fiber composites, cellulose fibers, hybrid composites, interfacial modification, moisture absorption, mechanical properties, machine learning.

ABSTRACT

Background: Natural fiber–reinforced polymer composites (NFPCs) have emerged as compelling sustainable alternatives to conventional synthetic-fiber composites because of their renewable origins, low density, and favorable specific mechanical properties (Bledzki et al., 1998; Chawla, 1987). Over the last three decades, research has progressed from basic characterization and processing of wood-flour and plant-fiber filled thermoplastics to sophisticated chemical surface treatments, hybridization strategies combining multiple natural and synthetic reinforcements, and the integration of data-driven predictive methods to anticipate mechanical performance (Hull & Clyne, 1996; Bledzki & Gassan, 1999; Kumar et al., 2025).

Objectives: This work synthesizes the theoretical foundations, mechanistic understanding, empirical trends, and predictive modeling approaches relevant to NFPCs, with explicit attention to cellulose-based fibers, wood-flour fillers, and hybrid fiber systems. The goal is to provide a rigorous, publication-ready synthesis that links microscale interfacial chemistry, mesoscale morphology, and macroscale mechanical response—while mapping how chemical modification, processing variables, moisture, and hybrid architectures combine to determine static and dynamic properties.

Methods: The article integrates classical composite micromechanics, interfacial adhesion theory, extensive literature-derived empirical observations, and contemporary machine learning–enabled predictive approaches to create a coherent narrative. Methods are presented descriptively—detailing experimental designs commonly used in the literature (tensile, flexural, impact, dynamic mechanical analysis, moisture absorption tests), chemical and physical fiber treatments, hybrid stacking strategies, and data-driven model development pipelines (feature selection, supervised learning, cross-validation). Each methodological element is linked to its mechanistic rationale and to reported results across the cited literature (Chawla, 1987; Bledzki & Gassan, 1999; Wang et al., 2006; Karamov et al., 2022).

Results: Collated findings indicate consistent patterns: (1) chemical treatments (alkali, silane, acetylation, fatty acid plasticization) systematically improve fiber–matrix adhesion and tensile strength when optimized, though excessive treatment degrades fiber integrity (Suardana et al., 2010; Marion et al., 2003); (2) hybridization employing wood flour, short natural fibers (jute, hemp, kenaf, sisal, banana), and controlled synthetic phases can be tuned to balance stiffness, toughness, and moisture sensitivity (Mwaikambo & Ansell, 2003; Thiagamani et al., 2022; Balaji et al., 2019); (3) moisture absorption remains a critical degradation mechanism that compromises interface and mechanical properties unless mitigated via coupling agents, matrix selection, or encapsulation strategies (Wang et al., 2006); (4) machine learning models trained on curated material descriptors and processing parameters show promising predictive accuracy for tensile strength and other mechanical endpoints, but their reliability depends on dataset quality, descriptor selection, and interpretability strategies (Karamov et al., 2022; Kumar et al., 2025).

Conclusions: The literature collectively supports a paradigm in which successful NFPC design arises from multipronged control of fiber chemistry, interface engineering, microstructural architecture, and moisture management—augmented increasingly by data-centric predictive frameworks. Future work should target standardized datasets, mechanistically informed descriptors, and systematic studies of long-term environmental durability.

INTRODUCTION

The drive toward sustainable materials has placed natural fiber–reinforced polymer composites at the forefront of research and industrial interest. Early foundational texts established the mechanical framework and processing considerations for composite materials broadly (Hull & Clyne, 1996; Chawla, 1987). Building on that foundation, research into thermoplastics reinforced with wood fillers and cellulose-based fibers consolidated the practical promise of incorporating renewable plant-derived reinforcements into polymer matrices (Bledzki et al., 1998; Bledzki & Gassan, 1999). The appeal of natural fibers springs from multiple properties: low density producing favorable specific stiffness and strength per unit mass, biodegradability in certain life-cycle stages, widespread availability, and cost-effectiveness in many geographic contexts (Bledzki & Gassan, 1999; Mwaikambo & Ansell, 2003).

Despite these advantages, NFPCs pose intrinsic challenges. Plant fibers are hydrophilic because of cellulose and associated hemicellulose and lignin constituents, whereas common polymer matrices—polypropylene, polyethylene, epoxy—are hydrophobic; this inherent polarity mismatch generates weak interfacial bonding and consequent mechanical underperformance and moisture sensitivity (Wang et al., 2006; Bledzki et al., 1998). Additionally, natural fibers exhibit high variability in geometry, aspect ratio, and microstructure across species, harvest conditions, and processing histories, complicating reproducibility and predictive modeling (Shalwan & Yousif, 2013; Rohit & Dixit, 2016). These challenges underline the need for systematic interfacial engineering, controlled hybrid architectures, and rigorous evaluation protocols capable of linking microstructural features to mechanical performance.

The literature has evolved along several complementary avenues. One avenue focuses on chemical modification and surface treatments to reduce polarity mismatch and strengthen fiber–matrix adhesion; techniques such as alkali (mercerization), silane coupling, acetylation, and fatty acid plasticization have been extensively investigated, demonstrating clear performance improvements when treatment parameters are optimized (Suardana et al., 2010; Marion et al., 2003; Bledzki & Gassan, 1999). A second avenue explores hybrid composites—combining different natural fibers, blending wood flour with fibers, or mixing natural with synthetic reinforcements—to harness synergies where one reinforcement compensates for another's weaknesses in stiffness, toughness, or moisture resistance (Mwaikambo & Ansell, 2003; Thiagamani et al., 2022; Balaji et al., 2019). A third, more recent avenue brings data-driven modeling and machine learning to bear on property prediction—where features that describe fiber chemistry, processing, filler content, and morphological metrics are fed to supervised models to predict tensile strength, fracture toughness, or transition behaviors (Karamov et al., 2022; Kumar et al., 2025).

This article offers an integrative synthesis grounded strictly in the provided references. It proceeds to present methodical descriptions of the experimental and analytical methods common in the field, collated results and patterns across studies, and an in-depth discussion that examines mechanistic explanations, limitations in current knowledge, and directions for future research. Throughout, emphasis is placed on linking specific processing choices to observable mechanical and environmental performance outcomes, and on clarifying how predictive modeling can be used ethically and effectively to accelerate material discovery.

METHODOLOGY

This section describes the conceptual and practical methodologies employed across the literature for investigating natural fiber composites, framed so that a reader can both understand the mechanisms by which properties emerge and replicate typical experiments in a rigorous fashion. The methods encompass material selection and preprocessing, composite fabrication, mechanical and environmental testing, microstructural characterization, and predictive model development.

Material selection and preprocessing

Material selection in NFPC studies balances fiber type (jute, hemp, kenaf, sisal, banana, coir, flax, wood flour), matrix polymer (thermoplastics such as polypropylene or polyethylene; thermosets such as epoxy), and additives (coupling agents, plasticizers, flame retardants). Natural fiber selection is governed by desired mechanical goals (stiffness vs. toughness), availability, and cost considerations (Bledzki & Gassan, 1999; Shalwan & Yousif, 2013). Preprocessing typically involves fiber sizing, drying to reduce moisture content, mechanical size reduction (for wood flour), and chemical surface treatments intended to alter surface energy and increase interfacial adhesion.

Alkali treatment (mercerization) is described in numerous studies: fibers are immersed in sodium hydroxide solutions at controlled concentrations and durations to remove surface impurities, waxes, and portions of hemicellulose, increasing surface roughness and exposing microfibrils. This treatment enhances mechanical interlocking and can increase cellulose crystallinity to varying degrees, affecting stiffness (Suardana et al., 2010). Silane coupling agents form covalent bonds between fiber hydroxyl groups and polymer matrices, thereby increasing chemical bonding at the interface (Bledzki & Gassan, 1999). Acetylation substitutes hydroxyl groups with acetyl moieties to reduce hydrophilicity and moisture uptake (Marion et al., 2003). Fatty acid plasticization of proteinaceous biopolymers (a different but relevant approach) demonstrates how matrix chemistry itself can be tuned when the polymer is bio-derived (Marion et al., 2003).

Careful control of treatment parameters is critical: overly aggressive alkali etching reduces fiber cross-section and tensile capacity; insufficient treatment fails to produce adequate interfacial improvement. Therefore, studies emphasize parameter sweeps with systematic measurement of fiber tensile strength, diameter, and surface chemistry before composite manufacture (Suardana et al., 2010).

Composite fabrication

Common fabrication routes include melt compounding followed by molding for thermoplastics (extrusion + injection or compression molding) and hand lay-up or resin transfer molding for thermosets. For wood flour and short fibers, melt compounding in a twin-screw extruder ensures dispersion, followed by pelletizing and final molding to produce standardized specimens for mechanical testing (Bledzki et al., 1998). Hybrid composites are fabricated by arranging layers of fabrics or aligned short fibers in desired stacking sequences or by blending multiple fiber types during compounding to yield a homogeneous mixture; the choice depends on whether one aims to exploit anisotropy (layered stacks) or achieve isotropic-like reinforcement (random short-fiber mixes) (Mwaikambo & Ansell, 2003; Thiagamani et al., 2022).

Processing parameters—screw speed, barrel temperature, residence time, mold temperature, and pressure—substantially influence fiber length retention, fiber wetting, and void content. High shear can fragment fibers and reduce effective aspect ratio, decreasing reinforcing efficiency; conversely, insufficient shear can cause poor wetting and agglomeration. As such, studies document compounding conditions and measure fiber length distributions post-processing to correlate with mechanical performance (Bledzki et al., 1998; Shalwan & Yousif, 2013).

Mechanical and environmental testing

Standard mechanical tests include tensile tests (to obtain modulus, ultimate tensile strength, and elongation at break), flexural tests (modulus and strength under bending), impact tests (Charpy or Izod) to assess toughness, and dynamic mechanical analysis (DMA) to probe viscoelastic behavior and damping across temperature ranges (Mehdi Tajvidi; Shlykov et al., 2022). The dynamic behavior of natural viscoelastic composites is particularly important when composites are used in applications subject to cyclic loading (Shlykov et al., 2022).

Moisture absorption tests follow established protocols: specimens conditioned to known dry weight are immersed or exposed to controlled humidity, and mass gain is recorded as a function of time to produce sorption curves (Wang et al., 2006). Subsequent mechanical testing after conditioning quantifies degradation. Often, water uptake data are analyzed using Fickian diffusion models or empirical curve fitting to quantify diffusivity and equilibrium uptake. Such environmental-aging tests are essential for assessing long-term viability in humid climates (Wang et al., 2006).

Morphological and chemical characterization tools—scanning electron microscopy (SEM) to examine fracture surfaces and fiber–matrix interfaces, Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) to confirm chemical modifications, and thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) to evaluate thermal stability—are employed systematically. SEM can reveal debonding, fiber pull-out, and matrix cracking modes, providing mechanistic insight into failure processes (Bledzki & Gassan, 1999).

Hybrid design strategies

Hybrid composites are engineered by combining fibers with complementary properties. Layered hybrids (laminates) place high-stiffness fibers in load-bearing orientations and tougher, higher elongation fibers in off-axis layers to improve energy absorption. Particulate hybrids, such as wood flour-filled fiber-reinforced polymers, use the particulate phase to increase stiffness or reduce cost while continuous or long fibers maintain load-bearing capacity (Mwaikambo & Ansell, 2003; Balaji et al., 2019). Stacking sequence, volume fraction, and interface quality are treated as design variables requiring optimization through experimental matrices or computational surrogate modeling (Thiagamani et al., 2022).

Predictive modeling and machine learning pipelines

Recent studies incorporate supervised machine learning to predict mechanical properties from descriptors encoding material chemistry, fiber morphology, processing conditions, and test parameters (Karamov et al., 2022; Kumar et al., 2025). Typical pipelines involve dataset assembly (compiling experimental records), feature engineering (e.g., fiber volume fraction, average fiber length, treatment type encoded as categorical variables, matrix glass transition temperature), model selection (regression algorithms such as random forests, support vector regression, or neural networks), hyperparameter tuning, and performance evaluation using cross-validation. Interpretability techniques (feature importance, SHAP values) illuminate which descriptors drive predictions and connect back to mechanistic understanding (Karamov et al., 2022).

Crucially, predictive models require standardized and sufficiently large datasets; heterogeneity in test protocols, specimen geometry, and reporting conventions can impede model generalization. Thus, the literature stresses the importance of curated datasets, metadata completeness, and mechanistically informed descriptor selection to improve model robustness (Karamov et al., 2022; Kumar et al., 2025).

RESULTS

This section synthesizes consistent empirical patterns and mechanistic observations derived from the cited literature. Results are presented thematically: interfacial treatments and their mechanical consequences, effects of moisture and mitigation strategies, hybridization outcomes, dynamic mechanical and failure behavior, and performance of predictive models.

Effects of chemical and physical fiber treatments

The consensus across multiple studies is that chemical surface modification improves interfacial bonding and consequently elevates tensile and flexural properties—up to an optimal treatment level (Bledzki & Gassan, 1999; Suardana et al., 2010). Alkali treatment increases surface roughness and creates mechanical interlocking, often increasing tensile strength and modulus relative to untreated composites (Suardana et al., 2010). Silane treatments further enhance bond strength by reacting with surface hydroxyls and coupling to polymer chains, leading to notable gains particularly in thermoset matrices where covalent bonding is feasible (Bledzki & Gassan, 1999).

Acetylation and fatty acid plasticization reduce hygroscopicity by capping hydroxyl groups; studies on protein-based matrices demonstrate that fatty acid addition can dramatically alter matrix ductility and interfacial stress transfer when the polymer contains reactive sites for interaction (Marion et al., 2003). However, empirical results consistently caution that excessive chemical modification can embrittle fibers or remove structural constituents (hemicellulose/lignin) necessary for load transfer—leading to net reductions in strength. This nonlinear response underscores the need for optimization of reagent concentration, treatment time, and post-treatment neutralization (Suardana et al., 2010).

Microscale observations via SEM corroborate mechanical test outcomes: well-treated fibers exhibit reduced interfacial gaps, reduced fiber pull-out length, and more cohesive fracture surfaces indicative of improved load sharing between fiber and matrix (Bledzki & Gassan, 1999). FTIR measurements confirm the presence of new chemical moieties after treatments, linking chemical modification to altered surface energy and hydrophobicity (Marion et al., 2003).

Moisture absorption and environmental degradation

Wang et al. (2006) and others demonstrate that moisture absorption is a dominant durability concern for NFPCs. Water molecules ingress through the matrix or along fiber–matrix interfaces, plasticize the matrix locally, and weaken hydrogen-bonding networks critical for cellulose structural integrity. The net effect is reduced stiffness, decreased tensile strength, and accelerated fatigue under cyclic loading. Studies report that water uptake follows complex kinetics often approximated by Fickian diffusion in early times but diverges at longer exposures due to swelling, microcracking, and interface debonding (Wang et al., 2006).

Mitigation strategies include the use of coupling agents (promoting tighter interfaces), hydrophobic surface treatments (acetylation, silanization), matrix modification (using less permeable polymers or adding barrier coatings), and hybrid architectures that encapsulate hydrophilic components. Empirical results show that coupling agents reduce equilibrium moisture uptake and attenuate strength losses after conditioning—though they do not eliminate moisture-induced damage entirely (Wang et al., 2006).

Hybridization outcomes

Hybrid composites that combine multiple natural fibers or natural with synthetic reinforcements reveal capacity for property tailoring. Layered stacking sequences produce bending-dominated improvements in flexural strength, while particulate wood flour additions can increase stiffness but may reduce impact toughness unless balanced with long fibers or tougher matrices (Mwaikambo & Ansell, 2003; Balaji et al., 2019). Experimental studies of jute/kenaf/banana and sisal/banana/coir systems report that appropriate combinations yield synergistic improvements in tensile and impact performance relative to single-fiber composites, often attributable to improved stress distribution and arrest of crack propagation by fibers of differing aspect ratios and failure strains (Thiagamani et al., 2022; Balaji et al., 2019).

However, the literature also records trade-offs: some hybrid combinations increase moisture sensitivity (if one constituent is especially hygroscopic), and incompatibility issues can arise if the fiber surface chemistries differ substantially, necessitating selective surface treatments for each constituent (Thiagamani et al., 2022). Thus, hybrid design is not merely additive; it requires strategic pairing and sometimes differential treatments to harmonize interfacial behavior across constituents.

Dynamic mechanical response and failure mechanisms

Dynamic mechanical analysis and impact testing demonstrate that NFPCs often show marked viscoelastic damping attributable to fiber–matrix frictional mechanisms and internal friction within lignocellulosic microstructures (Shlykov et al., 2022). The presence of multiple relaxation processes—fiber glass transition-like phenomena, matrix alpha and beta relaxations, and interfacial debonding—produces temperature- and frequency-dependent moduli and damping factors that must be characterized for applications subject to cyclic or impact loading.

Fracture modes in NFPCs are heterogeneous: brittle matrix cracking, fiber fracture, interface debonding, and fiber pull-out all contribute in varying proportions depending on interfacial quality, fiber aspect ratio, and loading mode. High-quality interfaces reduce pull-out and shift energy dissipation to fiber fracture, which generally corresponds to higher composite strength but potentially lower toughness unless fibers possess intrinsic ductility or are used in hybrid form to promote energy absorption (Mehdi Tajvidi; Shlykov et al., 2022).

Predictive modeling: efficacy and limitations

Supervised machine learning models show promising capability to predict mechanical endpoints from curated descriptors (Karamov et al., 2022; Kumar et al., 2025). When datasets contain robust features—fiber volume fraction, average fiber length, treatment type, matrix identity, and processing parameters—models such as ensemble trees or regression neural networks can capture nonlinear relationships and interactions that are cumbersome to express analytically. Studies report meaningful predictive accuracy for tensile strength and even fracture toughness when sufficient data are available (Karamov et al., 2022).

Nonetheless, limitations are prominent: small or heterogeneous datasets impair generalization; the black-box nature of some models complicates mechanistic interpretation; and models trained on data with inconsistent testing protocols can reflect procedural artifacts rather than true material physics. To mitigate these issues, studies advocate for mechanistically guided feature selection, use of interpretable model architectures, and community efforts to consolidate standardized datasets (Karamov et al., 2022; Kumar et al., 2025).

DISCUSSION

This section synthesizes the mechanistic implications of the compiled results, explores counterarguments and unresolved questions, and outlines specific directions for future research. The discussion emphasizes the interplay of chemistry, microstructure, processing, and environmental exposure in determining NFPC performance and argues for an integrated approach that couples experiment with predictive methods.

Mechanistic synthesis: interfacial chemistry as the fulcrum of performance

Across the literature, interfacial quality emerges as the central determinant of composite behavior. The fiber–matrix interface is where load transfers from the matrix to discrete reinforcing elements; thus, the chemical affinity, mechanical interlocking, and geometric contact area at this boundary directly influence stiffness, strength, and toughness (Chawla, 1987; Bledzki & Gassan, 1999). Chemical treatments operate by modulating this boundary: alkali treatment increases roughness and exposes reactive hydroxyls; silane coupling creates chemical bridges; acetylation reduces hydrophilicity to limit moisture ingress. The mechanistic consequence is predictable: improved adhesion reduces interfacial sliding and fiber pull-out, elevating stiffness and strength but potentially reducing energy-dissipative pull-out mechanisms that underpin toughness. This trade-off demonstrates why hybridization and controlled microarchitectures are necessary to balance competing performance metrics.

Trade-offs and design tensions

The literature repeatedly documents inherent trade-offs. Increasing fiber loading raises stiffness but can reduce processability and increase void content, which in turn can degrade impact properties and environmental durability (Bledzki et al., 1998). Aggressive chemical treatment can both improve interface and damage fiber integrity. Hybridization can produce synergistic mechanical benefits but complicate processing and might introduce differential moisture responses between constituents.

Addressing these trade-offs requires a design viewpoint that articulates constraints and objectives: for applications prioritizing specific stiffness, high fiber volume fractions with robust coupling are appropriate; for applications demanding impact resistance, hybrid stacks with energy-absorbing layers may be favored. Crucially, moisture-sensitive applications require encapsulation, better matrices, or alternative fiber selection (Wang et al., 2006; Thiagamani et al., 2022).

Data-driven design: promise and caution

Machine learning provides a toolset to navigate the many-dimensional design space more efficiently than exhaustive experimentation. However, the power of predictive modeling is contingent on dataset quality. The literature suggests that only when data are curated with consistent test standards, adequate representation across parameter ranges, and mechanistically informative descriptors do models achieve reliable predictive power (Karamov et al., 2022; Kumar et al., 2025). Moreover, interpretability is essential to translate model outputs into actionable mechanistic insight; black-box predictions without feature-level explanations risk producing spurious correlations that mislead materials design.

Therefore, the integration of physics-based descriptors—parameters derived from micromechanics, surface energy estimates, and fiber morphology measurements—into data-driven models is recommended to ground predictions in physical reality and to improve transferability (Karamov et al., 2022).

Limitations in the current literature

Several critical limitations persist. First, cross-study comparability is hindered by inconsistent reporting of processing conditions, specimen geometries, and treatment protocols. Lack of standardized metadata diminishes the value of compiled datasets for machine learning (Karamov et al., 2022). Second, long-term durability under realistic environmental cycles (temperature variations, UV exposure, combined hygrothermal aging) is underexplored relative to short-term mechanical testing; yet these factors are decisive for real-world adoption (Wang et al., 2006). Third, most studies focus on monotonic mechanical endpoints; fewer studies address fatigue life, creep, and fracture mechanics across scales in a systematic way (Shlykov et al., 2022).

Future research directions and recommendations

To advance NFPCs toward broader adoption, the literature suggests several concrete priorities:

- **Standardization and data curation.** Develop and adopt community standards for reporting processing parameters, specimen geometries, and conditioning protocols so that datasets are interoperable for modeling and meta-analysis (Karamov et al., 2022).

Mechanistically informed descriptors. In predictive modeling, pair statistical descriptors with physics-based features (e.g., interfacial energy proxies, fiber aspect ratio distributions, degree of crystallinity) to improve interpretability and generalization (Karamov et al., 2022).

Long-term environmental studies. Expand durability testing to include cyclic hygrothermal loading, UV exposure, and biological degradation where relevant; couple mechanical testing with microstructural evolution studies to map damage progression (Wang et al., 2006).

Optimized hybrid architectures. Conduct parametric studies that vary stacking sequences, fiber mixtures, and localized treatments to develop design rules for balancing stiffness, strength, toughness, and moisture resistance (Thiagamani et al., 2022; Balaji et al., 2019).

Lifecycle and sustainability analysis. Complement mechanical and durability research with full life-cycle assessments to quantify environmental trade-offs in production, use, and end-of-life stages—a necessary step for industrial acceptance and policy alignment.

Bridging scales with multiscale modeling. Integrate micromechanical models with mesoscale finite-element representations and data-driven surrogates to predict behavior across length scales, especially for complex hybrid architectures (Chawla, 1987).

Conclusion

Natural fiber–reinforced polymer composites stand at the intersection of sustainability goals and material-performance demands. The reviewed literature presents a unified picture: performance emerges from the confluence of fiber chemistry, interfacial engineering, processing-induced microstructure, hybrid design, and environmental exposure. Chemical treatments and coupling strategies consistently improve interfacial bonding and mechanical properties up to optimal thresholds; hybridization strategies enable designers to negotiate trade-offs among stiffness, strength, and toughness; moisture remains the principal durability challenge; and machine learning offers a promising but data-hungry route to accelerate materials discovery and design.

For the field to mature into robust, industrially viable solutions, coordinated efforts are required to standardize experimental reporting, generate large standardized datasets, pursue mechanistically informed predictive models, and expand research into long-term hygrothermal and cyclic durability. Doing so will bridge the existing gap between promising laboratory results and reliable, scalable components deployed in real-world applications—realizing the potential of renewable-fiber composites to contribute meaningfully to sustainable material ecosystems.

References

1. Hull, D. and Clyne, T.W. 1996. An introduction to composite materials. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
2. Bledzki, A. K., Reinhmane, S. and Gassan, J. 1998. Thermoplastics reinforced with wood fillers. Polym Plast. Technol. Eng. 37:451-468.
3. Chawla, K.K. 1987. Composite Materials. Science and Engineering. Springer-Verlag, New York.

4. Schneider, J. P.; Myers, G. E.; Clemons, C. M.; English, B. W. Eng Plast 1995, 8 (3), 207.
5. Reinforced Plastics 1997, 41(11), 22.
6. Colberg, M.; Sauerbier, M. Kunstst-Plast Europe 1997, 87(12), 9.
7. Schloesser, Th.; Knothe, J. Kunstst-Plast Europe 1997, 87 (9).
8. Bledzki, A.K. and Gassan, J. 1999. Composites reinforced with cellulose based fibers. Prog. Polym. Sci. 24:221-274.
9. Marion, P., Andréas, R. and Marie, H.M. 2003. Study of wheat gluten plasticization with fatty acids. Polym. 44:115-122.
10. Mwaikambo, L.Y. and Ansell, M.P. 2003. Hemp fiber reinforced cashew nut shell liquid composites.
11. Maya Jacob John, Rajesh D. Anandjiwala. A recent developments in chemical modifications and characterization of natural fibre reinforced composites.
12. Mehdi Tajvidi. Static and Dynamic Mechanical Properties of a Kenaf Fiber–Wood Flour/Polypropylene Hybrid Composite. DOI 10.1002/app.22093.
    A. Shahzad, D.H. Isaac and S.M. Alston. Mechanical Properties of Natural Composites.
13. Suardana, Yingjun Piao, Jae Kyoo Lim. Mechanical properties of Hemp fibres and Hemp/PP Composites: Effects of chemical surface treatment. December 2010.
14. Wang, W., Sain, M. & Cooper, P. A. Study of moisture absorption in natural fiber plastic composites. Comp. Sci. Tech. 66, 379–386 (2006).
15. Habibi, M., Laperrière, L. & Hassanabadi, H. M. Replacing stitching and weaving in natural fiber reinforcement manufacturing, part 1: Mechanical behavior of unidirectional flax fiber composites. J. Nat. Fibers. 16, 1064–1076 (2019).
16. Shalwan, A. & Yousif, B. F. State of art: Mechanical and tribological behaviour of polymeric composites based on natural fibers. Mater. Des. 48, 14–24 (2013).
17. Rohit, K. & Dixit, S. A review—Future aspect of natural fiber reinforced composite. Poly. Renew. Res. 7, 43–59 (2016).
18. Bharath, K. N. & Basavarajappa, S. Applications of biocomposite materials based on natural fibers from renewable resources: A review. Sci. Eng. Comp. Mater. 23, 123–133 (2016).
19. Kumar, S. S. Effect of natural fiber loading on mechanical properties and thermal characteristics of hybrid polyester composites for industrial and construction fields. Fibers Polym. 21, 1508–1514 (2020).
20. Subramanian, S. & Kumar, S. S. Investigation of mechanical attributes and dynamic mechanical analysis of hybrid polyester composites. Fibers Polym. 23, 2736–2745 (2022).
21. Al Mahmud, M. Z., Islam, M. D. & Rabbi, S. M. F. Analysis of epoxy composites reinforced with jute, banana, and coconut coirs and enhanced with Rubik's layer: Tensile, bending, and impact performance evaluation. J. Mech. Behav. Biomed. Mater. 147, 106151 (2023).
22. Balaji, A. et al. Study on mechanical and morphological properties of sisal/banana/coir fiber–reinforced hybrid polymer composites. J. Braz. Soc. Mech. Sci. Eng. 41, 386 (2019).
23. Sumesh, K. R., Kavimani, V., Rajeshkumar, G., Indran, S. & Saikrishnan, G. Effect of banana, pineapple and coir fly ash filled with hybrid fiber epoxy–based composites for mechanical and morphological study. J. Mater. Cyc. Was. Manag. 23, 1277–1288 (2021).

24. Thiagamani, S. M. K. et al. Mechanical, absorption, and swelling properties of jute/kenaf/banana reinforced epoxy hybrid composites: Influence of various stacking sequences. Polym. Comp. 43, 8297–8307 (2022).

25. Saleem, M. M., Kumar, M. & Malhi, G. S. Predictive analysis of fused deposition modeling of PLA material through machine learning. AIP Conf. Proc. 2986, 020003 (2024).

26. Pan, G. et al. Advances in machine learning– and artificial intelligence–assisted material design of steels. Int. J. Miner. Metall. Mater. 30, 1003–1024 (2023).

27. Shlykov, S., Rogulin, R., & Kondrashev, S. (2022). Determination of the dynamic performance of natural viscoelastic composites with different proportions of reinforcing fibers. Curved and Layered Structures, 9(1), 116-123.

28. Karamov, R., Akhatov, I. & Sergeichev, I. V. 2022. Prediction of fracture toughness of pultruded composites based on supervised machine learning. Polym. 14, 3619.

29. Zhu, D. et al. 2023. Identifying intrinsic factors for ductile–to–brittle transition temperatures in Fe–Al intermetallics via machine learning. J. Mater. Res. Technol. 26, 8836–8845.

30. Chen, Y. et al. 2023. Identifying facile material descriptors for Charpy impact toughness in low–alloy steel via machine learning. J. Mater. Sci. Technol. 132, 213–222.

31. Kotsiantis, S. B. 2007. Supervised machine learning: A review of classification techniques. Informatica 31, 249–268.

32. Kumar, S. S., Shyamala, P. & Pati, P. R. 2025. Machine learning algorithms to predict the tensile strength of novel composite materials. Next Mater. 9, 101105.