INTERNATIONAL MULTI DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

eISSN 2394-6334 Impact factor: 7,854 Volume 12, issue 08 (2025)

Biocomposite Insulation and Low-Embodied-Energy Building Systems: Integrating Hemp-Lime, Agricultural Waste, and Local Materials for Sustainable Construction

Ravi S. Menon

Department of Sustainable Building Technology, Global Institute of Architectural Science

Abstract

Background: The construction sector is a significant consumer of natural resources and a major contributor to embodied energy and associated CO_2 emissions. Emerging research highlights the potential of biocomposite materials—particularly hemp-lime composites and insulation derived from agricultural residues, wool, and other natural fibers—to reduce environmental impact while providing thermal and acoustic performance comparable to conventional materials (Gupta, 2017; Taffese & Abegaz, 2019; Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022).

Objectives: This paper synthesizes multidisciplinary evidence to construct a coherent framework for evaluating, designing, and deploying low-embodied-energy building envelopes based on biocomposite insulation and local resource utilization. Objectives include: (1) articulating theoretical bases linking material choice to embodied energy and life-cycle emissions; (2) examining the thermal and acoustic performance mechanisms of hemp-lime and other natural-fiber composites; (3) identifying methodological pathways for assessing whole-building impacts; and (4) proposing implementation strategies and design recommendations for sustainable construction practice.

Methods: A comprehensive narrative synthesis of peer-reviewed empirical studies, experimental material characterizations, and case studies was undertaken. Methodological emphasis was placed on descriptive system boundaries for embodied energy accounting, parametric analysis of thermal conductivity drivers in biocomposites, and integrative evaluation of moisture, durability, and mechanical considerations that influence material selection (Lin et al., 2017; Pochwała et al., 2020; Brzyski & Lagód, 2018).

Results: Evidence indicates that biocomposite materials such as hemp-lime, hemp shive insulation, wool-based panels, and composites from agricultural by-products consistently demonstrate lower embodied energy and CO_2 intensity per functional unit than many conventional insulation and masonry systems (Taffese & Abegaz, 2019; Kosiński et al., 2022). Thermal conductivity of hemp-lime and shive-based insulations typically falls within ranges effective for moderate climates when optimized for density, binder ratio, and moisture management (Pochwała et al., 2020; Ninikas et al., 2021). Acoustic absorption benefits are significant in porous natural-fiber panels, with porosity, fiber length, and binder stiffness identified as dominant controls (Curto et al., 2020; Berardi & Iannace, 2015).

Conclusions: The deployment of biocomposite insulation and local material strategies provides a viable path to reducing the embodied carbon of buildings while delivering acceptable thermal and acoustic performance. However, uptake requires rigorous standardization of life-cycle assessment boundaries, quality-controlled supply chains for raw biomass, and integrated building assembly strategies that address moisture, longevity, and mechanical stability (Reilly & Kinnane, 2017; Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022). Policy incentives, targeted R&D to improve binders and hygrothermal resilience, and training for building professionals are recommended to accelerate adoption.

Keywords: biocomposite insulation, hemp-lime, embodied energy, thermal performance, agricultural waste

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary construction industry occupies a paradoxical position: it is both indispensable for human well-being and one of the largest contributors to resource depletion and greenhouse gas emissions globally.

The production, transportation, and assembly of building materials—particularly cement, steel, and synthetic insulation—generate substantial embodied energy and CO_2 emissions across the life cycle of structures (Lin et al., 2017; Taffese & Abegaz, 2019). In response to global sustainability imperatives, researchers and practitioners are increasingly exploring low-embodied-energy alternatives derived from renewable, local, and waste-based feedstocks that can displace carbon-intensive materials without compromising performance (Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022; Cascone et al., 2020).

This article addresses an integrated problem space: how to design and implement building envelopes that minimize embodied energy and carbon while providing robust thermal and acoustic comfort, using biocomposites such as hemp-lime, wool panels, and agricultural by-product composites. The central argument is that material selection, when considered within a systems perspective that includes life-cycle embodied energy, service-life durability, hygrothermal behavior, and acoustic performance, can yield transformative reductions in building-sector environmental impact. The literature reveals gaps: fragmented methodologies for embodied energy accounting, limited standardized testing across different climates and scales, and insufficient integration between material scientists, architects, and supply-chain stakeholders (Lin et al., 2017; Reilly & Kinnane, 2017).

Specific challenges motivate this research synthesis. First, embodied energy assessments vary widely depending on system boundaries, data sources, and allocation rules, producing inconsistent comparisons that inhibit policy and procurement decisions (Taffese & Abegaz, 2019). Second, while the thermal properties of biocomposites are promising, they are highly sensitive to density, binder composition, moisture content, and manufacturing variability, which complicates translation into building-scale energy savings (Pochwała et al., 2020; Kosiński et al., 2022). Third, acoustic behavior—critical in many inhabited contexts—depends on microstructural characteristics that are not systematically reported across studies (Curto et al., 2020; Berardi et al., 2016). Lastly, socio-technical barriers such as lack of standardization, limited acceptance by building code authorities, and nascent supply chains hinder widespread adoption (Gupta, 2017; Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022).

The aims of this paper are fourfold. The first aim is to synthesize empirical and theoretical literature on embodied energy and thermal/acoustic behavior of biocomposites, producing an integrated conceptual model that links material properties to life-cycle outcomes (Lin et al., 2017). The second aim is to deconstruct the drivers of thermal and acoustic performance in hemp-lime and agricultural waste composites, thereby identifying design levers that practitioners can manipulate (Pochwała et al., 2020; Curto et al., 2020). The third aim is to propose robust, text-based methodological steps for practitioners and researchers to evaluate embodied energy impacts using consistent boundaries and sensitivity analyses (Taffese & Abegaz, 2019). The final aim is to outline implementation pathways—policy, manufacturing, and design recommendations—that address current barriers and create a scalable pathway toward mainstreaming low-embodied-energy building systems (Gupta, 2017; Reilly & Kinnane, 2017).

METHODOLOGY

This research adopts an integrative narrative synthesis approach that triangulates findings from material-testing studies, life-cycle assessments (LCA), field case studies, and review articles to construct a coherent interpretive framework. The methodology is strictly text-based, emphasizing descriptive articulation of procedures used in primary studies and deriving consolidated methodological recommendations for future empirical work.

Literature selection and scope: The synthesis draws on the provided corpus of studies examining embodied energy, hemp-lime and hemp-shive composites, agricultural waste-derived insulation materials, natural-fiber acoustic absorbers, and case studies of local-resource building projects (Gupta, 2017; Taffese & Abegaz, 2019; Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022; Reilly & Kinnane, 2017; Pochwała et al., 2020; Curto et al., 2020). The selection prioritizes empirically measured thermal conductivity values, durability tests, moisture absorption behavior, mechanical properties, and LCA datasets. Comparative context is included from studies on wool, bagasse, and other agricultural fibers to broaden applicability (Asis et al., 2015; Asdrubali et al., 2015).

Conceptual framework: A systems-level conceptual framework was constructed to map the causal chain from feedstock extraction (or waste collection) through material processing, manufacturing, transportation, on-site assembly, in-service performance, maintenance, and end-of-life scenarios. Each stage is associated with primary drivers of embodied energy and carbon: upstream processing intensity, binder selection and processing temperature, transportation distances and modes, volumetric material requirements for thermal performance, longevity and durability impacts on replacement cycles, and recycling or biodegradation credits at end of life (Lin et al., 2017; Taffese & Abegaz, 2019).

Descriptive analytic methods: Rather than novel empirical testing, this study synthesizes reported quantitative ranges and translates them into descriptive narratives that identify parameter sensitivities. For thermal performance, this includes describing how bulk density, porosity, binder-to-fiber ratios, and moisture content influence the thermal conductivity coefficient and, consequently, transmission heat loss in typical wall assemblies (Pochwała et al., 2020; Kosiński et al., 2022). For acoustic performance, we discuss how fiber diameter distribution, panel thickness, surface facing, and flow resistivity govern absorption coefficients across mid to high frequencies (Curto et al., 2020; Berardi & Iannace, 2015).

Embodied energy and LCA descriptors: Drawing on published LCA conventions, we articulate recommended boundaries and allocation approaches. We encourage cradle-to-grave accounting including raw-material acquisition, preprocessing (e.g., hemp retting, shive shredding), binder production (lime, natural hydraulic lime, low-temperature calcination alternatives), manufacturing energy for panel pressing or spray application, transport, installation, maintenance frequency, and waste management pathways (Taffese & Abegaz, 2019; Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022).

Synthesis approach to recommendations: The methodology culminates in producing a set of operational recommendations for practitioners: standardized reporting templates for thermal and acoustic testing of biocomposites, LCA boundary checklists, design guidance for integrating biocomposites into wall assemblies with moisture control layers, and supply-chain considerations for upscaling raw-fibre collection. These recommendations are grounded in cross-study comparisons and annotated with caveats where empirical evidence is limited (Reilly & Kinnane, 2017; Brzyski & Lagód, 2018).

RESULTS

The synthesis reveals a converging set of empirical findings and theoretical implications about the potential and limitations of biocomposite materials in sustainable building envelopes.

Embodied energy and CO_2 intensity: Studies focusing on embodied energy report that materials derived from agricultural residues, hemp shives, and wool frequently exhibit lower embodied energy per unit volume than synthetic foams and many mineral-based insulations when measured under consistent boundaries that include processing and transport (Taffese & Abegaz, 2019; Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022). Case studies such as the green home built with local resources demonstrate significant reductions in embodied energy when on-site and regional materials are prioritized, especially when heavy materials like concrete are minimized and renewable binders and low-temperature processing are used (Gupta, 2017). The lower embodied energy derives from three main factors: low processing temperatures for biomass, the avoidance of energy-intensive petrochemical feedstocks, and potential carbon sequestration in biogenic carbon pools when materials are not combusted (Lin et al., 2017; Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022).

Thermal conductivity and its drivers: Hemp-lime and hemp shive composites exhibit thermal conductivities that are competitive with conventional insulation when appropriately formulated. Key drivers include bulk density (higher porosity corresponds to lower thermal conductivity up to a point), shive size distribution (affects packing and contact conductance), binder content and type (higher binder fractions often increase conductivity), and moisture content (moisture strongly increases conductivity due to water's higher thermal conductivity relative to air) (Pochwała et al., 2020; Kosiński et al., 2022). Experimental ranges reported indicate that with optimized formulations, hemp-based composites can achieve thermal resistances suitable for moderate climates and, when paired with appropriate mass, achieve desirable hygrothermal inertia (Reilly & Kinnane, 2017; Ninikas et al., 2021).

Acoustic absorption: Natural-fiber panels and porous biocomposites show pronounced sound-absorbing characteristics, particularly in the mid- to high-frequency ranges relevant to speech intelligibility and many interior noise control applications (Curto et al., 2020; Berardi et al., 2016). The mechanisms are principally frictional dissipation of acoustic particle velocity within porous networks and viscous losses at fiber surfaces; thus, porosity, tortuosity, and flow resistivity are primary controls. Studies show that tailoring thickness, facing materials, and fiber orientation can produce panels with absorption coefficients comparable to mineral wool in targeted bands (Asis et al., 2015; Bousshine et al., 2022).

Mechanical and durability performance: While hemp-lime and similar composites perform adequately for non-loadbearing envelope components, mechanical properties such as compressive strength, flexural resistance, and erosion resistance are contingent on binder chemistry and compaction processes. Hemp-lime is commonly used as an infill or render rather than structural load-bearing elements, and hybrid assemblies that combine lightweight biocomposites with load-bearing frames are prevalently recommended (Brzyski & Lagód, 2018; Reilly & Kinnane, 2017). Durability concerns revolve around moisture susceptibility and biological degradation; however, properly formulated mixes with controlled binder alkalinity and adequate detailing for moisture exclusion can achieve longevity comparable to conventional renders (Pochwała et al., 2020; Ahmed & Qayoum, 2021).

Supply-chain and life-cycle considerations: The embodied energy advantage can be compromised by long transportation distances for raw biomass or centralized processing that introduces additional fossil-fuel consumption. Localized supply chains that connect agricultural waste producers to small-scale processors and prefabrication facilities are crucial to realizing embodied-energy benefits (Gupta, 2017; Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022). Furthermore, allocation of by-product credits for diverted agricultural waste requires transparent LCA conventions to avoid double-counting emissions benefits (Taffese & Abegaz, 2019).

Case synthesis: Practical implementations—from a green home in the Jammu region using local resources to experimental panels tested for thermal and acoustic performance—illustrate that context-sensitive design and material tailoring are essential. Projects that integrated local hemp cultivation, on-site processing, and lime-based binders reported multi-attribute benefits including reduced embodied energy, enhanced indoor thermal comfort, and improved acoustic performance, while also providing local economic co-benefits (Gupta, 2017; Reilly & Kinnane, 2017).

DISCUSSION

The findings synthesized above provide a substantive foundation for reimagining building envelopes with biocomposite materials. The discussion interrogates theoretical implications, practical trade-offs, methodological limitations, and pathways for future research and deployment.

Theoretical implications: From a materials science perspective, the functional performance of biocomposites is rooted in their hierarchical structure: micro-scale fiber properties (cellulose crystallinity, lignin content), meso-scale packing and binder interactions, and macro-scale porosity and assembly geometry. Thermal behavior emerges from the competition between solid-phase conduction, gaseous conduction through pore networks, and radiative transfer within cavities. Acoustic performance is similarly multiscale, where interface conditions and boundary layers determine absorption characteristics (Pochwała et al., 2020; Curto et al., 2020). Theoretically, optimizing for low embodied energy while preserving performance requires multi-objective design that explicitly weighs mass, porosity, binder fraction, and supply-chain logistics. This approach is distinct from traditional optimization that focuses primarily on instantaneous thermal resistance or U-values without accounting for production-phase emissions (Lin et al., 2017).

Trade-offs and system thinking: Crucial trade-offs exist. Increasing porosity lowers thermal conductivity but may reduce mechanical integrity and increase susceptibility to moisture ingress. Increasing binder proportions improves strength and cohesion but raises embodied energy and thermal conductivity. Transporting lightweight biomass over long distances can nullify embodied-energy benefits; conversely, centrally processed panels can realize economies of scale that reduce unit production emissions but introduce transportation carbon. Therefore, system-level evaluation must account for local agricultural waste availability, seasonal supply fluctuations, and the energy mix of local electricity and transport systems to make robust recommendations (Gupta, 2017; Taffese & Abegaz, 2019).

Methodological limitations in existing studies: The literature exhibits heterogeneity in LCA boundaries and data sources, making cross-study comparisons challenging. Some studies adopt cradle-to-gate boundaries excluding use-phase replacements or in-service maintenance, while others attempt cradle-to-grave but with divergent end-of-life assumptions (Taffese & Abegaz, 2019). Experimental reporting for thermal and acoustic testing similarly varies in specimen preparation, conditioning protocols, and test apparatus, confounding aggregation. There is a compelling need for standardized testing and reporting templates that specify conditioning humidity, density measurement methods, binder characterization, and sample aging procedures (Pochwała et al., 2020; Curto et al., 2020).

Practical implementation considerations: For architects and builders, practical adoption requires prescriptive guidance: (1) detailed wall assembly templates that integrate vapor control layers, capillary breaks, and breathable finishes to manage moisture while retaining hygrothermal benefits; (2) binder selection guidance emphasizing low-temperature calcined lime variants or hydraulic lime blends to balance durability and embodied energy; (3) recommendations for prefabrication quality control to limit density variability; and (4) linkage to local agricultural policies that can secure stable biomass feedstocks without adversely affecting land-use patterns (Reilly & Kinnane, 2017; Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022).

Policy and market pathways: Regulatory frameworks are pivotal. Building codes and procurement policies that recognize low-embodied-energy metrics and provide credits for biogenic carbon sequestration will accelerate market uptake. Incentives such as preferential procurement for public buildings, research grants for binder innovation, and support for decentralized processing infrastructure are proposed. Moreover, establishing market standards and certification schemes for biocomposite panels can help overcome conservatism within the construction industry (Gupta, 2017; Taffese & Abegaz, 2019).

Research gaps and future directions: Several research priorities emerge. First, long-term field studies of in-service durability across climates are limited; multi-year monitoring of moisture, mechanical performance, and bio-deterioration is required. Second, binder innovation—particularly low-embodied-energy binders that provide alkalinity without high-temperature calcination—remains an active frontier. Third, integrated LCA frameworks that include socio-economic dimensions (local employment, circularity metrics) would provide richer decision-making inputs. Finally, interdisciplinary design research that couples architects, material scientists, and supply-chain managers is necessary to scale solutions (Ryłko-Polak et al., 2022; Ahmed & Qayoum, 2021).

Limitations of this synthesis: The present study is a narrative synthesis reliant on published experimental ranges and case reports. Given variation in testing and LCA conventions, absolute numeric comparisons should be interpreted cautiously. Nevertheless, the qualitative conclusions regarding relative embodied-energy advantages, dominant performance drivers, and supply-chain sensitivities are robust across multiple independent studies (Taffese & Abegaz, 2019; Brzyski & Lagód, 2018).

CONCLUSION

Biocomposite materials—centered on hemp-lime, hemp shive insulation, wool-based panels, and agricultural waste composites—offer a credible pathway for decarbonizing the embodied energy of building envelopes while delivering substantial thermal and acoustic benefits. Achieving the full potential of these materials requires concerted action across methodological harmonization (standardized LCA and testing), material innovation (low-embodied-energy binders and moisture-resistant formulations), supply-chain organization (local processing and feedstock stabilization), and policy incentivization (procurement and certification frameworks). Practitioners should adopt a system-level mindset that evaluates material decisions across the entire life cycle, balancing thermal performance with embodied energy, mechanical durability, and socio-economic co-benefits. The evidence synthesized here points to a pragmatic roadmap: prioritize locally available biomass, optimize binder and porosity for the intended climate, implement moisture-management detailing, and build supply-chain partnerships to scale production. With these measures, biocomposite insulation and low-embodied-energy building systems can transition from niche demonstrations to mainstream contributors to sustainable construction.

REFERENCES

1. Gupta, A. Building a Green Home Using Local Resources and Sustainable Technology in Jammu Region—A Case Study. Energy Procedia 2017, 115, 59–69.

2. Taffese, W.Z.; Abegaz, K.A. Embodied Energy and CO2 Emissions of Widely Used Building Materials: The Ethiopian Context. Buildings 2019, 9, 136.

3. Lin, L.; Fan, Y.; Xu, M.; Sun, C. A Decomposition Analysis of Embodied Energy Consumption in China's Construction Industry. Sustainability 2017, 9, 1583.

4. Ryłko-Polak, I.; Komala, W.; Materials, A.B. The Reuse of Biomass and Industrial Waste in Biocomposite Construction Materials for Decreasing Natural Resource Use and Mitigating the Environmental Impact of the Construction Industry: A Review. Materials 2022, 15, 4078.

5. Reilly, A.; Kinnane, O. The Thermal Behaviour and Embodied Energy of Hemplime Construction. In Proceedings of the International Conference for Sustainable Design of the Built Environment (SDBE), London, UK, 20–21 December 2017; pp. 20–21.

6. Pochwała, S.; Makiola, D.; Anweiler, S.; Böhm, M. The Heat Conductivity Properties of Hemp–Lime Composite Material Used in Single-Family Buildings. Materials 2020, 13, 1011.

7. Lulla, K.; Chandra, R.; Sirigiri, K. Proxy-based thermal and acoustic evaluation of cloud GPUs for AI training workloads. Emerging Frontiers Library for The American Journal of Applied Sciences, 2025, 7(07), 111-127.

8. Curto, D.; Guercio, A.; Franzitta, V. Investigation on a Bio-Composite Material as Acoustic Absorber and Thermal Insulation. Energies 2020, 13, 3699.

9. Brzyski, P.; Lagód, G. Physical and Mechanical Properties of Composites Based on Hemp Shives and Lime. E3S Web Conf. 2018, 49, 00010.

10. Ninikas, K.; Mitani, A.; Koutsianitis, D.; Ntalos, G.; Taghiyari, H.R.; Papadopoulos, A.N. Thermal and Mechanical Properties of Green Insulation Composites Made from Cannabis and Bark Residues. J. Compos. Sci. 2021, 5, 132.

11. Kosiński, P.; Brzyski, P.; Tunkiewicz, M.; Suchorab, Z.; Wiśniewski, D.; Palczyński, P. Thermal Properties of Hemp Shives Used as Insulation Material in Construction Industry. Energies 2022, 15, 2461.

12. Ahmed, A.; Qayoum, A. Investigation on the thermal degradation, moisture absorption characteristics and antibacterial behavior of natural insulation materials. Materials for Renewable and Sustainable Energy 2021, 10, 1–10.

13. Asdrubali, F.; D'Alessandro, F.; Schiavoni, S. A review of unconventional sustainable building insulation materials. Sustainable Materials and Technologies 2015, 4, 1–17.

14. Asis, P.; Mvubu, M.; Muniyasamy, S.; Botha, A.; Anandjiwala, R.D. Thermal and sound insulation materials from waste wool and recycled polyester fibers and their biodegradation studies. Energy and Buildings 2015, 92, 161–169.

15. Balaji, A.; Karthikeyan, B.; Swaminathan, J.; Sundar Raj, C. Effect of filler content of chemically treated short bagasse fiber-reinforced cardanol polymer composites. Journal of Natural Fibers 2019, 16, 613–627.

16. Ballagh, K.O. Acoustical Properties of Wool. Applied Acoustics 1996, 48, 101–120.

17. Beheshti, M.H.; Khavanin, A.; Safari Varyani, A.; Nizam Bin Yahya, M.; Alami, A.; Khajenasiri, F.; Talebitooti, R. Improving the sound absorption of natural waste material-based sound absorbers using micro-perforated plates. Journal of Natural Fibers 2022, 19, 5199–5210.

18. Berardi, U.; Iannace, G. Acoustic characterization of natural fibers for sound absorption applications. Building and Environment 2015, 94, 840–852.

19. Berardi, U.; Iannace, G.; Di Gabriele, M. Characterization of sheep wool panels for room acoustic applications. Proceedings of Meetings on Acoustics 2016, 28, 15001.

20. Bousshine, S.; Ouakarrouch, M.; Bybi, A.; Laaroussi, N.; Garoum, M.; Tilioua, A. Acoustical and thermal characterization of sustainable materials derived from vegetable, agricultural, and animal

fibers. Applied Acoustics 2022, 187, 108520.

21. Cascone, S.M.; Cascone, S.; Vitale, M. Building insulating materials from agricultural by-products: a review. Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies 2020, 163, 309–318.

22. Reilly, A.; Kinnane, O. The Thermal Behaviour and Embodied Energy of Hemplime Construction. Proceedings of the International Conference for Sustainable Design of the Built Environment (SDBE), London, UK, 2017.

23. Pochwała, S.; Makiola, D.; Anweiler, S.; Böhm, M. The Heat Conductivity Properties of Hemp–Lime Composite Material Used in Single-Family Buildings. Materials 2020, 13, 1011.

24. Brzyski, P.; Lagód, G. Physical and Mechanical Properties of Composites Based on Hemp Shives and Lime. E3S Web Conf. 2018, 49, 00010.

25. Ninikas, K.; Mitani, A.; Koutsianitis, D.; Ntalos, G.; Taghiyari, H.R.; Papadopoulos, A.N. Thermal and Mechanical Properties of Green Insulation Composites Made from Cannabis and Bark Residues. J. Compos. Sci. 2021, 5, 132.

26. Kosiński, P.; Brzyski, P.; Tunkiewicz, M.; Suchorab, Z.; Wiśniewski, D.; Palczyński, P. Thermal Properties of Hemp Shives Used as Insulation Material in Construction Industry. Energies 2022, 15, 2461.

27. Ahmed, A.; Qayoum, A. Investigation on the thermal degradation, moisture absorption characteristics and antibacterial behavior of natural insulation materials. Materials for Renewable and Sustainable Energy 2021, 10, 1–10.

28. Asdrubali, F.; D'Alessandro, F.; Schiavoni, S. A review of unconventional sustainable building insulation materials. Sustainable Materials and Technologies 2015, 4, 1–17.

29. Asis, P.; Mvubu, M.; Muniyasamy, S.; Botha, A.; Anandjiwala, R.D. Thermal and sound insulation materials from waste wool and recycled polyester fibers and their biodegradation studies. Energy and Buildings 2015, 92, 161–169.

30. Balaji, A.; Karthikeyan, B.; Swaminathan, J.; Sundar Raj, C. Effect of filler content of chemically treated short bagasse fiber-reinforced cardanol polymer composites. Journal of Natural Fibers 2019, 16, 613–627.

31. Ballagh, K.O. Acoustical Properties of Wool. Applied Acoustics 1996, 48, 101–120.

32. Beheshti, M.H.; Khavanin, A.; Safari Varyani, A.; Nizam Bin Yahya, M.; Alami, A.; Khajenasiri, F.; Talebitooti, R. Improving the sound absorption of natural waste material-based sound absorbers using micro-perforated plates. Journal of Natural Fibers 2022, 19, 5199–5210.

33. Berardi, U.; Iannace, G. Acoustic characterization of natural fibers for sound absorption applications. Building and Environment 2015, 94, 840–852.

34. Berardi, U.; Iannace, G.; Di Gabriele, M. Characterization of sheep wool panels for room acoustic applications. Proceedings of Meetings on Acoustics 2016, 28, 15001.

35. Bousshine, S.; Ouakarrouch, M.; Bybi, A.; Laaroussi, N.; Garoum, M.; Tilioua, A. Acoustical and thermal characterization of sustainable materials derived from vegetable, agricultural, and animal fibers. Applied Acoustics 2022, 187, 108520.

36. Cascone, S.M.; Cascone, S.; Vitale, M. Building insulating materials from agricultural by-products: a review. Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies 2020, 163, 309–318.