# EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

#### Paper: "Factors Influencing Bursting Strength of Single Jersey Knitted Fabrics"

Submitted: 27 July 2022 Accepted: 10 November 2022 Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: Md. Ariful Islam

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n36p68

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Mohsin Ul Hoque

Reviewer 2: Kazi Sowrov

# **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!* 

Date Manuscript Received: 3 <sup>rd</sup> August, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted:	
Manuscript Title: Influences of Factors in Bursting Strength of Single Jersey Knitted Fabrics		
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0815/22 You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No		
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is av You approve, this review report is available in the "revie"		

#### **Evaluation Criteria:**

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

Questions	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
Rephrasing the title is necessary.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
The abstract does not fully describe the methods. There isn't a single statement in the abstract that explains the n	

research, and it's unclear what the scientific conclusions will be.

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
It would be helpful to reword the sentences so that they are eas	ier to grasp.
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<ol> <li>There is a lack of precise yarn characteristics.</li> <li>GSM (Gram per Square Meter) of Fabric         <ul> <li>a. It is not stated whether the Finished GSM or the Grinto account.</li> <li>b. Table 2 does not specify if the GSM value is actual the stitch length.</li> </ul> </li> <li>It was written under Tools and technique "to find ou parameters of the single jersey derivatives (Plain, Pique the bursting strength. And, following regression model experiments." However, there is not enough information and table 2 does not indicate which data relates to whic structure (plain, pique, or fleece).</li> <li>Knitting machine specifications and process control parameters, brand and specification)</li> <li>How does knitting tightness affect bursting strength if i formation of crease marks on knitted fabric?This qu to be explain</li> </ol>	or estimated based on at the influences of e, Fleece) fabrics on is to fit the n available on this, h sorts of fabric rameters are not achine (technical t is related to the
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
The dependent and independent variables that are discussed in not have their interrelationships properly justified or realized in necessary to accomplish the purpose of the research.	this manuscript do n the way that is
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
A conclusion appears to be a descriptive message, and one must not it should be correct and supported by the findings of the inv	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3

# **Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Please devote a greater amount of attention to study and research in order for the research to achieve its intended purpose. There is insufficient attention paid to the management of the efforts that are provided. Please take the time to concentrate on the objective of your research and do your best to close any gaps in the mapping of your research. Thank you for your attention to our requests.

#### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# **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!* 

Date Manuscript Received: 3 <sup>rd</sup> August, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted:		
Manuscript Title: Influences of Factors in Bursting Strength of Single Jersey Knitted Fabrics			
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0815/22 You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No			
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is av	vailable 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.

Questions	Rating Result
Questions	[Poor] <b>1-5</b>

	[Excellent]	
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2	
Rephrasing the title is necessary.	-	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2	
The abstract does not fully describe the methods. There isn't a single statement in the abstract that explains the r research, and it's unclear what the scientific conclusions will b Rewriting sentences is necessary to avoid syntactic and gramm	e.	
<b>3.</b> There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2	
It would be helpful to reword the sentences so that they are easily	sier to grasp.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1	
<ol> <li>8. GSM (Gram per Square Meter) of Fabric         <ul> <li>c. It is not stated whether the Finished GSM or the Greigh GSM were taker into account.</li> <li>d. Table 2 does not specify if the GSM value is actual or estimated based or the stitch length.</li> </ul> </li> <li>9. It was written under Tools and technique "to find out the influences of parameters of the single jersey derivatives (Plain, Pique, Fleece) fabrics on the bursting strength. And, following regression model is to fit the experiments." However, there is not enough information available on this, and table 2 does not indicate which data relates to which sorts of fabric structure (plain, pique, or fleece).</li> <li>10. Knitting machine specifications and process control parameters are not mentioned (such as machine gauge, yarn tension)</li> <li>11. There is no information about the Bursting Strength machine (technical features, brand and specification)</li> <li>12. How does knitting tightness affect bursting strength if it is related to the formation of crease marks on knitted fabric?This question answer need to be explain</li> </ol>		
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1	
The dependent and independent variables that are discussed in this manuscript do not have their interrelationships properly justified or realized in the way that is necessary to accomplish the purpose of the research.		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1	
A conclusion appears to be a descriptive message, and one must consider whether or not it should be correct and supported by the findings of the investigation.		
	vestigation.	

Ok. However, there are more references on this research topic available.

#### **Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

## **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Please devote a greater amount of attention to study and research in order for the research to achieve its intended purpose. There is insufficient attention paid to the management of the efforts that are provided. Please take the time to concentrate on the objective of your research and do your best to close any gaps in the mapping of your research. Thank you for your attention to our requests.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**