Response to Reviewers

We wish to thank the Editor and the reviewers for the evaluation of the manuscript and the suggestions which will improve our paper. List of changes are given bellow.

Reviewer A

Introduction

**„When a clothing comfort is discussed, liquid moisture is recommended to be**

**used: lines 72, 76, 98, 100, 104.“**

According to the Reviewer's B „liquid moisture is a pleonasm“, so we decided not to use „liquid moisture“.

Line 74: a typing mistake was corrected.

Line 76: the sentence was corrected to become clear.

Line 80: “complex yarn” was changed to “composite yarn”. However, the authors of the ref. 14 did not specify how they combined the yarns during knitting.

Line 83: fibres in the mixture were added to become clear.

Line 98: we gave an additional explanation (good comfort performance such as softness) of our decision to use acrylic fibres, in lines 98-100.

Lines 118-124: this part of the manuscript were re-written in the form of hypothesis of the research (lines 118-124)

Experimental

**„A presentation of the experiment should be presented in the first paragraph of Experimental, followed by descibing materials and methods. Now the methods are mixed with description of a process investigation.“**

The presentation of the experiment was presented at the beginning of the „Experimental“ part.

**Describe yarn construction.**

Construction of the yarns was described by the parameters: diameter, bulk density, packing density and hairiness, which were given in Table 1.

Lines 127 and 128: producers of the yarns were added (lines 137 and 138).

**Add equations for planar/volume stitch modulus.**

We decided not to add equations for planar and volume stitch moduli because of the number of pages limitation (24 pages without figures nad tables). After the revision, the manuscript has 27 pages excluding figures and tables, and adding three equations with the explanations would occupy one more page.

Line 166: dimensions of the specimens were added (line 183).

Line 167: temperature of distilled water was added (line 185).

Line 171: drying duration was added (line 188).

Line 176: the measurement error caused by the manipulation time was added (line 206)

Line 182: filter paper type was added (line 127).

Line 201: equation has not given due to already given reason.

Line 205: the used detergent was described (line 221).

Line 206: temperature of ironing was given (line 222).

Line 207: one cycle was described (line 223-224).

Line 216: corrected

**Ten persons were included in the wearing test. How many shirts were made for**

**the wearing test for each person? Where was cut specimens from the shirt for**

**Malden Mill's water dist. test?**

These questions were answered on lines 219 and 227.

Lines 243-245: the sentence was changed to avoid a dilemma.

Line 262: additional explanation and the micrographs were given in the manuscript (lines 285-293).

Results and Discussion

Subtitles were added in this section.

Statistical values were added where applicable.

Figures were re-designed to become clearer. Some results were presented separately (for each fabric type).

**Term "we believe" (p. 11, 17, 20) is not acceptable for scientific paper.**

These sentences were changed to avoid term “we believe”.

**Wearing and washing procesess result in loss of fibers from fabrics. How did**

**you account for these changes?**

The explanations for these changes were given on lines 288-297.

Line 231: changes in properties of the knitted fabric after the wear trial test were listed before an explanation of them.

Reviewer B

**However, some of the results of statistical analyses are not convincing and should be carefully checked again. Also, figures with bar graphs would be probably clearer in the scatter form with error bars. Data presented in tables should be accompanied with standard deviations and statistically different values should be marked. English language is satisfactory and some corrections and specific comments are given directly in the pdf document.**

Statistical analyses were carefully checked again, and some corrections were made in the manuscript. The corrections together with some added sentences were marked yellow. Type of the Figures was changed and error bars were added. Standard deviations were added in the Tables and statistically different values were marked.

The manuscript was corrected according to suggestions given in the pdf-file of the manuscript.