

Manuscript: “**Compact Spinning in Cotton-based Core-spun Yarn: A Review**”

Submitted: 18 June 2020

Accepted: 12 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Md. Ehsanur Rashid

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p287](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p287)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Zahidul Islam

Reviewer 3: Dr. Engr. Ayub Nabi Khan, BGMEA University of Fashion & Technology (BUFT)

Reviewer 4: Md Mahbubul Haque, Daffodil International University

Reviewer 5: Toufiqua Siddiqua

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
<i>The title does not match to the described text.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No grammatical errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Comprehensive.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X minor revision is needed.
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):The title would be **Comfortability of the fabrics produced from compact spun yarn.**

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Prof. Dr. Engr. Ayub Nabi Khan	Email:
University/Country: BGMEA University of Fashion & Technology (BUFT)	
Date Manuscript Received: June 07, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: July 19, 2021
Manuscript Title: Compact Spinning in Cotton-based Core-spun Yarn: A New Idea	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0706/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
<i>(Please insert your comments) The Title is not appropriate</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) few corrections are made in the body of the article</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>(Please insert your comments) There is no methods explained in the article</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments) there are no experimental results</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) Yes conclusions are supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments) References are written as per international standard.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Experiment should be carried out and Methods, Results and discussion should be explained scientifically and logically.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: The article is actually a review of previous works of researchers.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Md Mahbul Haque	
University/Country: Daffodil International University	
Date Manuscript Received: July 26, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: July 31, 2021
Manuscript Title: Compact Spinning in Cotton-based Core-spun Yarn: A New Idea	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0706/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
The title can be rewritten as “Compact Spinning in Cotton-based Core-spun Yarn: A Review”	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>The last two sentences of the abstract does not follow the previous discussion</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Compact spinning has several major advantages and each advantage can be denoted by a separate section and the authors should discuss literature under those sections.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Clear but insufficient and should do more works considering my suggestions mentioned above in section 4</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>Abstract and conclusion has some relationship which is missing here, should be revised and linked</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4.5
<i>Okay</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Improve the paper and resubmit

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: They need to improve the paper and resubmit. I am ready to help them if necessary

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 25 th Sep 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 8 th October 2021
Manuscript Title: Compact Spinning in Cotton-based Core-spun Yarn: A New Idea	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>The title is not clearly related with the abstract</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Should be more precise and align with the title and methods</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	N/A
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	Applicable
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I have marked the changes in the main article in red colour. The paper will be much better after this correction.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Please take initiatives for correction.