



Paper: “Modification of Drafting Zone of Jute Flyer Spinning Frame to Improve the Jute Yarn Quality”

Corresponding Author: Khalil Khan

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n27p354

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: DR. Salloum A. Al-Jibury" Muta'h University/ Jordan

Reviewer 2: Dr. Fatma KOÇ, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University

Published: 30.09.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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. Salloom Al-Juboori	Email:
University/Country: Muta'h University/ Jordan	
Date Manuscript Received: 8/9/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 9/9/2020
Manuscript Title: Modification of Drafting Zone of Jute Flyer Spinning Frame to Improve the Jute Yarn Quality	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 96.09.2020	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
Needs to define the units system of hardness (Brunel or Rockwell system)	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>I suggest to write the main conclusions as numbering system i.e 1,2,3,....</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The most recent reference is 2003 , i.e very old. So, needs to put recent references, i.e 2017, 2018,2019,2020</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):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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. Fatma KOÇ	Email:
University/Country: Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University- Turkey	
Date Manuscript Received: 8.09.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15.09.2020
Manuscript Title: Modification of Drafting Zone of Jute Flyer Spinning Frame to Improve the Jute Yarn Quality	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 96.09.2020	
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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>The abstract should include the purpose, method and results of this study. In the summary of the study, there is only information about the results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The study should be reviewed by the authors. There are problems with some small details. eg. It is stated in the following sentence that this study is a thesis. This work is taken from the thesis, but here is the article. or this study can be called.</i>	
<i>“However, considering the above mentioned significant aspects of jute spinning it is desired in this thesis work to perform a modification on the apron draft spinning frame so that the quality of jute yarn can be improved.”</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>There are many photographs, figures and tables between 4-9 pages in the methodology section of this study. However, what they are and their functions require explanation along with the reasons.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>Findings section of the study should be separated with a title. The author wrote the result after the methodology in this study. Should be rearranged.</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.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):