Reviewer 1

1. The introduction is not well written. There is no flow. Each paragraph stands alone. It does not become clear why each part was included. The authors need to explain the connection between the information provided and their work. Why did the authors include polypropylene and microtomography into the introduction? Polypropylene does not play any role in this publication. Microtomography was only one of several methods used in this work.

   I worked over the introduction and added a few sentences to explain more in detail why several points are important for this publikation. Polypropylene was described to have a poor bonding tot he fiber. The Interaction was investigated in former publication.

2. Was the pultrusion tool selfmade? If so, please, provide more details. If it was purchased, please, provide the supplier. A reference with the patent number should be given.

   The tool oft he pultrusion process is a patent which is [19] in the references. The tool is designed for a short exposion time of the RCF to the high process temperatures. I added the reference in the text to give a link for more details.

3. Line 197-198: Were these the glass fibres or the cellulose fibres?

   This sentence was deleted as it confuses the reader concerning the fiberlength

4. This paper does not contain any discussion section. With the exception of the impact, results are barely explained. The authors need to provide a synthesis of the results from different methods to explain the outcome.

   The chapter Results is renamed in results and discussion and I added more discussion tot he text there. The main results are listed in the conclusions then.

5. Line 235: Table 4 should be Table 5.

   I changed the number of the table to 6, because there is another table inbetween

6. Line 270-271 ("Only in the hybrid...is close to the RoHM."): This behaviour should be explained by the authors.

   I corrected the sentence and compared the results with a different reference. Line 292

7. 3.3 RoHM: This part is quite difficult to understand, because the authors use the same terms for tensile and flexural properties. The authors should be very careful not to cause confusion.

   In reference 20 the RoHM was also used in flexual properties. They write about a positive effect in flexural tests on sandwich coupons with a high glass mat to carbon fiber content ratio. In this study the prediction line ist o show the positive or negative hybrid effect

8. Line 301: Table 4 should be Table 6.

   I numbered the tables from 1 to 6

9. 3.5 Dynamic image analysis: The observed distribution density should be compared with the theoretical one calculated from the GF and the RCF samples.

The explaination oft he initial fiberlength before injection molding is explained in an added sentence and talks about the comparison tot he shown curves

10. More explanation should be provided for the DIA analysis data. Why is the number of long fibres in the GF=RCF and GF<RCF sample so much higher than in the RCF sample?

    I added the explaination oft he RCF interaction with the GF in injection molding

11. x-ray microtomography: The results from the microtomography should be compared with those from the dynamic image analysis. Do both methods show the same result for GF? Since the microtomography only shows GF, it should be possible to calculate the size distribution of RCF? More discussion about the changes in the size distribution is required, i.e. what is the reason for changes in the fibre length.

    The results of the DIA and the CT were compared to eachother. The results of the CT lead to a conclusion, that the high distribution of the hybrid reinforced results consist of a high number GF. The text was added in line 392.