

Paper: “Comparison of Physical Properties between Grey and Dyed Knitted Fabric”

Submitted: 24 November 2021

Accepted: 09 February 2022

Published: 31 May 2022

Corresponding Author: Nusrath Jahan Khanam

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n17p235](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n17p235)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Md Mahbubul Haque
Daffodil International University, Bangladesh

Reviewer 2: Mohammad Hosain Reza.
Sonargaon University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Mohammad Hosain Reza.	
University/Country: Sonargaon University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.	
Date Manuscript Received: 31 – 03 - 2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Analysis Of Fabric Physical Properties (GSM, Bursting Strength, Pilling, Extension And Residual Extension) In Grey And Dyed Stage.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0414/22	
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
<i>As per title it is expected to show the comparison between the properties of grey and dyed fabric. G.S.M. was one of the properties. But in the paper, it is mentioned</i>	

<i>in Introduction “Target of this paper is to portrait the influence of GSM in both grey and dyed stage in different physical properties.” It is confusing whether the authors showed the effect of G.S.M. on properties or compared the grey and dyed fabric properties.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>It is confusing whether the authors showed the effect of G.S.M. on properties or compared the grey and dyed fabric properties.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>No grammatical or spelling mistakes detected.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The authors prepared 10 grams of sample. Normally it is dyed in lab dyeing machine. But it is mentioned the 10-gram sample is dyed in sample dyeing machine. For dyeing 4.5% shade on fabric in textile factories, Glauber salt is required 80 gram/ liter and soda ash 20 gram / liter. But in the paper, it is mentioned only 17 gram / liter and 7 gram / liter respectively. Again, during dyeing the liquor ratio is incorrectly mentioned. (It may be 1:10 or 1: 8 etc. Not a full number 60) (In lab dyeing machine the chemicals are taken from solution as ml/ liter)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The paper has confusion between the property (G.S.M.) and stage (Grey and dyed fabric)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>[In the whole paper there is confusion between the property (G.S.M.) and stage (Grey and dyed fabric)]</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
1. <i>The quoted part not found in reference: 12. Taslima Ahmed Tamanna, M.A.H.S. (2017). Investigation of stretch and recovery property of wetf knitted regular rib fabric. European Scientific Journal, 13(27),400-412.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): 1. As per title the paper has to compare properties of grey and dyed fabric. Here, G.S.M. is also a basic property. It changed after dyeing
2. It will be easier to understand, if the changes of properties are compared with graphs.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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. Md Mahbul Haque	
University/Country: Daffodil International University	
Date Manuscript Received: 26/4/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/4/2022
Manuscript Title: Analysis Of Fabric Physical Properties (GSM, Bursting Strength, Pilling, Extension And Residual Extension) In Grey And Dyed Stage	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0414/22	
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.	1.5																																									
<i>The title can be written as (1) "Comparison of physical properties between grey and dyed knitted fabric" Or (2) "The effect of dyeing on the physical properties of grey knitted fabric"</i>																																										
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3																																									
<i>At the end of abstract, it is better to mention the changes specifically.</i>																																										
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4																																									
<i>(Very few)</i>																																										
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2.5																																									
<i>The study was very interested but not very easy to understand I suggest the following format of table 2</i>																																										
<table border="1"> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Serial No</th> <th colspan="2">GSM</th> <th colspan="2">L. Extension</th> <th colspan="4">Pilling</th> <th rowspan="2"></th> </tr> <tr> <th>Grey</th> <th>Dyed</th> <th>Grey</th> <th>Dyed</th> <th>500 Rev</th> <th>1000 Rev etc</th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> </tr> </table>		Serial No	GSM		L. Extension		Pilling											Grey	Dyed	Grey	Dyed	500 Rev	1000 Rev etc																			
Serial No	GSM		L. Extension		Pilling																																					
	Grey	Dyed	Grey	Dyed	500 Rev	1000 Rev etc																																				
<i>Do all the figures like figure 1, 3 and 4 and use different colors for grey and dyed samples. Use sample No 1, 2,3 etc rather than GSM</i>																																										
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3.5																																									
<i>After doing the change the results will be clearer. There are some important changes e.g. length wise extension and corresponding residual extensions. You must try for this variation. Reporting only the result will not give too much credits. If you can explain the unusual changes then it will be the authors tallents.</i>																																										
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5																																									
<i>Can be improved by mentioning the exact reasons for changes before and after dyeing.</i>																																										
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4																																									
<i>References seems okay if they were done as per ESJ guidance.</i>																																										

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please do the changes as per my suggestion

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I am interested to see the paper after changes has been made.