

Paper: “Determination of Optimum Speed of a Knitting Machine by Analyzing the Different Parameters”

Submitted: 12 April 2022

Accepted: 01 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Mohammad Hosain Reza

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p22](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n21p22)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mahbubul Haque
Daffodil International University, Bangladesh

Reviewer 2: Sanjida Sultana
Primeasia University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Title is Okay

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract is Okay

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No grammatical errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methods are Okay

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Okay

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Okay

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Title is clear. Keyword of the paper should be more clear. The keyword present in the paper shows more long like a sentence.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Materials and methods of the experiment are not explained properly.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Check the grammatical error and spelling mistake.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Method of the study is not explained properly. Only mentioning the yarn count in the study. Type of yarn, construction of yarn, composition of yarn, lycra attachment or not, machine model number with brand name, no. of cam truck is not clear in the study.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Background of the study should be clear more. Problem statement and objective of this study is not clear in the introduction part. Result and discussion part of the study is not clear. The study shows yarn breakage occurs more in 44 rpm but less in yarn joining. Efficiency of the machine is more for 44 rpm than 42 rpm although the yarn breakage is more in 44 rpm. There is no relationship is shown in the fly contamination with machine speed. Broken needle is shown more for 42 and 44 rpm where is no needle broken for 40 rpm. The quality and cycle time of the needle is same or not is not clearly mentioned. The paper shows needle broken is nil for 40 rpm and 8 for 44 rpm but the efficiency of the machine is almost same.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Conclusion should be more clear.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Number of reference in the paper is inadequate. Suggested to read more article regrading this.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The Abstract very clearly presents objects, methods and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study Methods are explained clearly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
