

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_120448
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF COMFORT PROPERTIES OF MULBERRY SILK AND VISCOSE BLENDED KNITTED FABRICS FOR SUITABILITY IN CLOTHING IN TEMPERATE REGIONS
Type of the Article	

#### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study offers intriguing findings from both an experimental and statistical perspective. However, the paper is lacking in originality and rigor. The study of water permeability is not warranted; instead, it was imperative to investigate water vapor permeability. While it may be accepted, there is room for improvement to enhance its overall quality.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>New Objective Method for Analyzing the Comfort Properties of Mulberry Silk and Viscose Blended Knitted Fabrics</b>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Areas for improvement in the summary include demonstrating the originality of the work and conducting a thorough spelling revision.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is suitable. The manuscript is well-organized, with sections including an abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results and discussions, and conclusions.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper introduces an experimental study that utilizes statistical analysis to objectively evaluate the comfort level. The study's content requires enhancement. For instance, incorporating the water vapor permeability factor is crucial for a more comprehensive analysis. In addition, the presentation of the statistical method has been omitted, and a revision of spelling is necessary. To enhance the scientific rigor of the analysis, it is recommended to include additional arguments such as the analysis of the F-value and p-value. These statistical measures provide valuable insights into the significance of the results and can help strengthen the overall validity of the study. By incorporating these metrics, the research findings will be more robust and credible, ultimately contributing to a more comprehensive and insightful analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	It is better to include more recent references in your work. The most recent reference available is from 2018. There are also more recent studies that address this subject matter.	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please check your manuscript.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Imed Ben Marzoug</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Monastir, Tunisia</b>