

**Round Test 2021-1 on
Stickiness Characterization Methods**

- FINAL REPORT –

date: June 30, 2020

**Stickiness Task Force of the 'International Committee
on Cotton Testing Methods' (ICCTM) of the
'International Textile Manufacturers Federation'
(ITMF)**

**Gourlot Jean-Paul ⁽¹⁾
Drieling Axel ⁽²⁾
Froese Karsten ⁽³⁾
Lassus Serge ⁽¹⁾**

⁽¹⁾ CIRAD, France, ⁽²⁾ FIBRE, Germany, and ⁽³⁾ ICA Bremen, Germany

Contents

Introduction	4
Confidentiality and use of information from this report	4
Preparation of cottons and samples	4
Organization of this report	5
Conversion of 'laboratories raw records' into numeric data for use in this report	6
All individual results per Method and LabID for each cotton	8
Table for Cotton A	9
Table for Cotton B	10
Table for Cotton C	11
Table for Cotton D	12
Table for Cotton E	13
Statistics per Method, LabID for each cottons	14
Table for Cotton A	15
Table for Cotton B	16
Table for Cotton C	17
Table for Cotton D	18
Table for Cotton E	19
Data presented by boxplots per Method, LabID for each cotton	20
Charts of individual readings per Method and LabID for each cotton	21
Correlation charts and correlation values between LabID using a same Method for all cottons	28
Charts Variance = f(Mean) for each Cotton and Method, taking care of LabIDs	32
Cotton A : Variance between individual measurements = f(Mean) for all concerned labs	32
Cotton B : Variance between individual measurements = f(Mean) for all concerned labs	39
Cotton C : Variance between individual measurements = f(Mean) for all concerned labs	46
Cotton D : Variance between individual measurements = f(Mean) for all concerned labs	53
Cotton E : Variance between individual measurements = f(Mean) for all concerned labs	60
CSITC type charts: distance Delta of Lab readings to the Grand Mean by Method and by LabID	67
CSITC type chart for Method Caramelization	67
CSITC type chart for Method Contest-S	71
CSITC type chart for Method H2SD	79
CSITC type chart for Method KOTITI	87
CSITC type chart for Method Minicard	88
CSITC type chart for Method Quantitative method	89
CSITC type chart for Method SCT	90
CommonScale	99
Principle	99
Limitations of the CommonScale approach	100
CommonScale charts	101
Overall statistics per Cotton and Method	106
Mean, standard deviation and CV between instruments by method, Cotton A	107
Mean, standard deviation and CV between instruments by method, Cotton B	108
Mean, standard deviation and CV between instruments by method, Cotton C	109
Mean, standard deviation and CV between instruments by method, Cotton D	110

Mean, standard deviation and CV between instruments by method, Cotton E	111
Frequently asked questions (Q) and answers (A)	112
Software components to realize this report	113
General conclusions about the results of this round-test	115

Round Test on stickiness characterization 2021-1

- FINAL REPORT -

data: June 30, 2021

Stickiness Task Force of the 'International Committee
on Cotton Testing Methods' (ICCTM) of the
'International Textile Manufacturers Federation'
(ITMF)

Gourlot Jean-Paul (1)

Drieling Axel (2)

Froese Karsten (3)

Lassus Serge (1)

(1) CIRAD, France, (2) FIBRE, Germany, and (3) ICA Bremen, Germany

Introduction

Confidentiality and use of information from this report

This report is both public and confidential:

- It is public as it will be released on the internet website of the ITMF (www.itmf.org) without providing any private information.
- It also is confidential as we provide Participating Laboratories with their own confidential laboratory LabID code that gives access to understanding each piece of information of the report; indeed with this LabID code number, more information can be extracted from the report. Please note that this LabID is changed for each test.

The Authors will not be held responsible to any degree for dissemination of the LabID code after the confidential distribution of their LabID code to the participating laboratories.

Gourlot Jean-Paul, Drieling Axel, Froese Karsten, Lassus Serge. 2021. Round Test 2021-1 on stickiness characterization methods - Final report. Montpellier : CIRAD-ITMF, 116 p.

Preparation of cottons and samples

A range of five cottons was selected for their stickiness potential range. Basically, the stickiness level of these cottons is not known a priori and their level is being better known after the test, expecting that these cottons cover a range of stickiness.

All cottons in this test got a similar level of homogenization using an homogenizing machine developed during CFC/ICAC/33 project ‘CSITC’ project (so called CSITC homogenizing machine). The main goal of this preparation is to ensure that any drawn sample from the original mass would carry the “same” stickiness potential as any other sample for evaluating the laboratory performance, but without affecting too much the size of individual sticky points that could affect some measurement methods.

The degree of this preparation affects the distribution of sticky points within the mass of the fibers. When an homogenization is ‘perfectly performed’, then the sticky point distribution follows Poisson’s distribution within the fibers; in other cases, sticky point distribution follows over-dispersed distributions, such as negative binomial distributions, meaning that sticky points may be ‘grouped’ in some parts of the material while the rest of the material remains free of stickiness. In these conditions, many repetitions of measurements are required to statistically compare laboratory performances or method performances.

From the beginning, we knew that homogenizing the cottons would induce some ‘preparation’, and this was several times reported to us with the results. However, this has been the only way to ensure that all samples

would be ‘alike’ for any given cotton in order to compare method performances or laboratory performances within methods.

Once the cottons were homogenized, samples were drawn from their original cotton mass, and sets of cottons were constituted for each participating laboratory, whatever the method used. Envelopes were sent out to laboratories in mid April 2021.

All laboratories were supposed to send their results back by June 25, 2021. This FINAL REPORT is prepared after this date when most Laboratories who received the material lately sent back their results.

Organizing this round-test, at present running for free, takes time and uses precious materials; therefore we really appreciate when all registered Laboratories who received RT samples provide us with results.

Organization of this report

As stated in the Contents,

- Individual results provided by Participating Laboratories are reported, cotton by cotton, sorted by method and then by LabID. A mail is sent out in a confidential manner to each participating laboratory for reading this public report, and therefore getting more out of it.
- Statistics are then presented in summary tables or in charts, cotton by cotton, sorted by method and then by LabID. This section allows the comparison of results by LabID within each method. Both the mean results and the variation of individual results are then highlighted.
- Correlation matrix are given for comparing LabID Mean results cotton by cotton, and sorted by method.
- Charts linking the within-laboratory variances of LabIDs for each method to the calculated mean results per LabID are displayed. Precision and accuracy of individual LabID performance can be deduced from these charts.
- Finally, distances between LabID mean result to the Grand Mean are displayed by method, sorted by method and by LabID.

Conversion of ‘laboratories raw records’ into numeric data for use in this report

Answers to this round-test were provided **freely** by laboratories in a table having five columns (one per cotton) and six lines (for potentially recording six results for each cotton) for a total of 30 table cells.

For comparing results between laboratories, results were expected to be reported in a coordinated and harmonized manner within each method. However, for this test also, laboratories reported results the way they probably are used to do in their every day practice: the observation is that the report was not always harmonized within methods.

Under necessity and for allowing a comparison, we may be obliged to convert some laboratory records into harmonized numeric values by applying the following rules when needed (most acronyms are explained in the ‘Frequently asked questions’ section):

- For Caramelization : one measurement = one cell. No transformation of the data.
- For Clinitest: >1: was converted into 1.5.
- For Contest and Fibermap: Since RT2018-1 included: these devices are using the same technology for characterizing stickiness and their results are grouped together into one single ‘Contest-Fibermap’ category. Since March 2020, Contest-S was recognized by ITMF-ICCTM, and therefore Contest-S becomes the nam of this category. No transformation of the data.
- For GB/T13785-1992: one measurement = one cell. No transformation of the data.
- For H2SD: one measurement = one cell. No transformation of the data.
- For HSI-NIR: one measurement = one cell. No transformation of the data that has been calibrated to H2SD count at the beginning.
- For KOTITI: grades were converted into numeric values as follows:
 - A: 0
 - A+ = B-: 1
 - B: 2
 - B+ = C-: 3
 - C: 4
 - C+ = D-: 5
 - D: 6
 - D+ = E-: 7
 - E: 8
 - E+: 9.
- For minicard: ITMF grades 0 to 3 were used for reporting, one measurement = one cell. No transformation of the data.

- For Qualitative:
 - NIL: 0
 - Trace: 1
 - Light: 2
 - Moderate : 3.
- For SCT: one measurement = one record = sum of reading of top foil + reading of bottom foil.
- For TDM-A: one measurement = one record. No transformation of the data.

All individual results per Method and LabID for each cotton ¹

¹Footnote

* Results sorted by Method and then by LabID.

* NA or NaN : no results provided.

Table for Cotton A

Meth	LabID	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	Un
Carameliza	15	2.3	2.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	115	3.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	150	1.9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	165	1.4	1.9	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Contest-S	25	183.0	142.0	140.0	186.0	142.0	179.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	35	173.0	104.0	126.0	144.0	162.0	100.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	45	186.0	161.0	173.0	175.0	166.0	169.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	65	172.0	354.0	198.0	220.0	345.0	287.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	70	232.0	192.0	227.0	225.0	194.0	192.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	80	173.0	271.0	312.0	128.0	198.0	209.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	95	218.0	187.0	151.0	126.0	123.0	184.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	155	108.0	118.0	121.0	105.0	111.0	128.0	C/F Grade
H2SD	75	2.0	3.0	1.0	5.0	11.0	2.0	Sticky point
H2SD	90	12.0	10.0	12.0	14.0	13.0	NA	Sticky point
H2SD	105	11.0	16.0	10.0	10.0	9.0	14.0	Sticky point
H2SD	110	13.0	10.0	28.0	14.0	15.0	11.0	Sticky point
H2SD	125	33.0	34.0	29.0	13.0	11.0	12.0	Sticky point
H2SD	130	15.0	4.0	17.0	19.0	8.0	23.0	Sticky point
H2SD	135	14.0	10.0	7.0	17.0	15.0	14.0	Sticky point
H2SD	145	20.0	19.0	17.0	24.0	15.0	16.0	Sticky point
KOTITI	60	7.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	5	0.5	0.5	3.0	NA	NA	NA	ITMF grade
Quantitati	120	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	Percent
SCT	10	22.0	21.0	17.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	20	22.0	17.0	23.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	30	24.0	23.0	17.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	40	21.0	24.0	12.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	50	20.0	17.0	24.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	55	17.0	7.0	7.0	15.0	10.0	8.0	Sticky point
SCT	85	21.0	24.0	22.0	25.0	23.0	21.0	Sticky point
SCT	100	20.0	20.0	17.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	140	12.0	13.0	11.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point

Table for Cotton B

Meth	LabID	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	Un
Carameliza	15	3.2	3.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	115	3.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	150	2.2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	165	2.2	1.9	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Contest-S	25	415.0	339.0	437.0	430.0	334.0	327.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	35	290.0	381.0	420.0	584.0	469.0	439.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	45	549.0	495.0	465.0	490.0	490.0	565.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	65	551.0	643.0	531.0	423.0	568.0	556.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	70	550.0	598.0	548.0	619.0	626.0	526.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	80	373.0	558.0	634.0	477.0	716.0	667.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	95	671.0	533.0	609.0	631.0	607.0	365.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	155	419.0	402.0	530.0	306.0	458.0	489.0	C/F Grade
H2SD	75	66.0	40.0	32.0	24.0	49.0	18.0	Sticky point
H2SD	90	49.0	46.0	56.0	38.0	36.0	NA	Sticky point
H2SD	105	31.0	46.0	33.0	40.0	52.0	38.0	Sticky point
H2SD	110	30.0	58.0	68.0	59.0	31.0	31.0	Sticky point
H2SD	125	22.0	61.0	45.0	48.0	57.0	65.0	Sticky point
H2SD	130	52.0	39.0	38.0	50.0	44.0	51.0	Sticky point
H2SD	135	65.0	79.0	44.0	45.0	55.0	52.0	Sticky point
H2SD	145	39.0	41.0	36.0	51.0	41.0	35.0	Sticky point
KOTITI	60	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	5	3.0	2.5	2.0	NA	NA	NA	ITMF grade
Quantitati	120	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	Percent
SCT	10	50.0	64.0	66.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	20	73.0	57.0	99.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	30	79.0	72.0	67.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	40	88.0	85.0	89.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	50	74.0	83.0	107.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	55	48.0	48.0	62.0	59.0	65.0	48.0	Sticky point
SCT	85	73.0	75.0	78.0	77.0	75.0	79.0	Sticky point
SCT	100	49.0	66.0	38.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	140	135.0	114.0	144.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point

Table for Cotton C

Meth	LabID	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	Un
Carameliza	15	3.0	3.2	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	115	4.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	150	1.9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	165	2.4	2.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Contest-S	25	389.0	401.0	560.0	404.0	460.0	429.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	35	341.0	391.0	348.0	475.0	359.0	492.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	45	538.0	616.0	515.0	565.0	512.0	164.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	65	517.0	459.0	459.0	477.0	400.0	419.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	70	506.0	548.0	518.0	548.0	617.0	567.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	80	827.0	762.0	469.0	509.0	717.0	568.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	95	595.0	484.0	438.0	592.0	274.0	401.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	155	574.0	472.0	567.0	617.0	554.0	487.0	C/F Grade
H2SD	75	45.0	23.0	33.0	29.0	45.0	22.0	Sticky point
H2SD	90	38.0	52.0	32.0	41.0	54.0	NA	Sticky point
H2SD	105	67.0	54.0	61.0	49.0	57.0	26.0	Sticky point
H2SD	110	23.0	39.0	51.0	33.0	27.0	37.0	Sticky point
H2SD	125	32.0	38.0	71.0	55.0	29.0	31.0	Sticky point
H2SD	130	40.0	67.0	49.0	41.0	40.0	44.0	Sticky point
H2SD	135	41.0	35.0	74.0	45.0	38.0	19.0	Sticky point
H2SD	145	62.0	34.0	40.0	60.0	35.0	43.0	Sticky point
KOTITI	60	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	5	1.2	1.2	3.0	NA	NA	NA	ITMF grade
Quantitati	120	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	Percent
SCT	10	68.0	71.0	64.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	20	131.0	101.0	85.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	30	100.0	100.0	103.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	40	98.0	115.0	122.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	50	158.0	144.0	139.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	55	45.0	68.0	50.0	60.0	45.0	49.0	Sticky point
SCT	85	84.0	83.0	90.0	84.0	86.0	87.0	Sticky point
SCT	100	46.0	52.0	72.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	140	152.0	101.0	134.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point

Table for Cotton D

Meth	LabID	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	Un
Carameliza	15	2.8	2.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	115	3.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	150	2.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	165	2.0	2.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Contest-S	25	509.0	505.0	506.0	493.0	299.0	466.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	35	295.0	351.0	358.0	336.0	437.0	467.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	45	422.0	457.0	434.0	551.0	512.0	460.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	65	307.0	352.0	376.0	461.0	504.0	507.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	70	346.0	303.0	481.0	246.0	477.0	545.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	80	549.0	470.0	474.0	377.0	453.0	546.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	95	369.0	161.0	356.0	466.0	353.0	342.0	C/F Grade
Contest-S	155	586.0	397.0	451.0	526.0	258.0	308.0	C/F Grade
H2SD	75	14.0	19.0	11.0	20.0	11.0	13.0	Sticky point
H2SD	90	34.0	30.0	32.0	10.0	15.0	NA	Sticky point
H2SD	105	44.0	54.0	56.0	42.0	41.0	68.0	Sticky point
H2SD	110	12.0	20.0	45.0	20.0	42.0	21.0	Sticky point
H2SD	125	25.0	22.0	21.0	26.0	17.0	20.0	Sticky point
H2SD	130	25.0	34.0	37.0	35.0	36.0	24.0	Sticky point
H2SD	135	32.0	31.0	46.0	33.0	35.0	24.0	Sticky point
H2SD	145	13.0	21.0	19.0	13.0	14.0	20.0	Sticky point
KOTITI	60	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	5	2.0	1.5	2.5	NA	NA	NA	ITMF grade
Quantitati	120	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	Percent
SCT	10	47.0	46.0	46.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	20	37.0	57.0	54.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	30	42.0	43.0	46.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	40	63.0	40.0	50.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	50	51.0	87.0	51.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	55	37.0	27.0	28.0	17.0	29.0	27.0	Sticky point
SCT	85	60.0	70.0	61.0	63.0	63.0	70.0	Sticky point
SCT	100	41.0	44.0	55.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	140	41.0	58.0	53.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point

Table for Cotton E

Meth	LabID	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	Un
Carameliza	15	3.0	3.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	115	3.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	150	2.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Carameliza	165	1.9	2.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	Color degree
Contest-S	25	74.0	80.0	102.0	56	113	93	C/F Grade
Contest-S	35	78.0	106.0	79.0	88	46	71	C/F Grade
Contest-S	45	97.0	186.0	82.0	102	160	122	C/F Grade
Contest-S	65	284.0	154.0	97.0	110	76	123	C/F Grade
Contest-S	70	240.0	143.0	149.0	182	179	202	C/F Grade
Contest-S	80	262.0	218.0	211.0	187	185	123	C/F Grade
Contest-S	95	108.0	65.0	87.0	106	146	173	C/F Grade
Contest-S	155	171.0	54.0	108.0	48	86	85	C/F Grade
H2SD	75	9.0	4.0	12.0	4	5	3	Sticky point
H2SD	90	6.0	13.0	10.0	12	18	NA	Sticky point
H2SD	105	14.0	10.0	4.0	18	25	8	Sticky point
H2SD	110	4.0	22.0	10.0	14	15	NA	Sticky point
H2SD	125	10.0	6.0	7.0	9	18	11	Sticky point
H2SD	130	8.0	19.0	13.0	8	11	8	Sticky point
H2SD	135	7.0	11.0	11.0	11	15	18	Sticky point
H2SD	145	9.0	8.0	7.0	6	4	6	Sticky point
KOTITI	60	6.0	7.0	7.0	7	7	6	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	5	1.5	1.0	0.8	NA	NA	NA	ITMF grade
Quantitati	120	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	Percent
SCT	10	15.0	18.0	18.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	20	20.0	8.0	22.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	30	16.0	8.0	11.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	40	25.0	20.0	21.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	50	27.0	30.0	17.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	55	10.0	5.0	16.0	7	12	12	Sticky point
SCT	85	28.0	21.0	23.0	26	15	23	Sticky point
SCT	100	18.0	12.0	10.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point
SCT	140	6.0	14.0	15.0	NA	NA	NA	Sticky point

Statistics per Method, LabID for each cottons ²

²Footnote

- * Mean of all readings per LabID (NA excluded, expressed in Unit).
- * Var = variance taking care of all available readings per LabID (NA excluded).
- * CV = CV between reading per LabID expressed in percent.
- * GMean = Grand Mean of all laboratory means, calculated by Method.
- * Delta = LabID Mean - GMean.
- * NA or NaN : no result provided.

Table for Cotton A

Meth	LabID	MeanIntraLab	Un	VarIntraLab	CVIntraLab	MeanInterLab	Delta
Carameliza	15	2.4	Color degree	0.0	5.9	2.4	0.0
Carameliza	115	3.6	Color degree	NA	NA	2.4	1.2
Carameliza	150	1.9	Color degree	NA	NA	2.4	-0.5
Carameliza	165	1.6	Color degree	0.1	21.4	2.4	-0.7
Contest-S	25	162.0	C/F Grade	518.0	14.0	179.6	-17.6
Contest-S	35	134.8	C/F Grade	904.2	22.3	179.6	-44.8
Contest-S	45	171.7	C/F Grade	74.3	5.0	179.6	-7.9
Contest-S	65	262.7	C/F Grade	5987.1	29.5	179.6	83.1
Contest-S	70	210.3	C/F Grade	380.3	9.3	179.6	30.8
Contest-S	80	215.2	C/F Grade	4440.6	31.0	179.6	35.6
Contest-S	95	164.8	C/F Grade	1427.0	22.9	179.6	-14.8
Contest-S	155	115.2	C/F Grade	75.8	7.6	179.6	-64.4
H2SD	75	4.0	Sticky point	13.6	92.2	13.8	-9.8
H2SD	90	12.2	Sticky point	2.2	12.2	13.8	-1.6
H2SD	105	11.7	Sticky point	7.5	23.4	13.8	-2.2
H2SD	110	15.2	Sticky point	43.0	43.2	13.8	1.3
H2SD	125	22.0	Sticky point	123.2	50.5	13.8	8.2
H2SD	130	14.3	Sticky point	50.3	49.5	13.8	0.5
H2SD	135	12.8	Sticky point	13.4	28.5	13.8	-1.0
H2SD	145	18.5	Sticky point	10.7	17.7	13.8	4.7
KOTITI	60	6.7	KOTITI Grade	0.3	7.7	6.7	0.0
Minicard	5	1.3	ITMF grade	2.1	108.3	1.3	0.0
Quantitati	120	0.2	Percent	0.0	29.5	0.2	0.0
SCT	10	20.0	Sticky point	7.0	13.2	18.4	1.6
SCT	20	20.7	Sticky point	10.3	15.6	18.4	2.3
SCT	30	21.3	Sticky point	14.3	17.7	18.4	2.9
SCT	40	19.0	Sticky point	39.0	32.9	18.4	0.6
SCT	50	20.3	Sticky point	12.3	17.3	18.4	1.9
SCT	55	10.7	Sticky point	18.7	40.5	18.4	-7.7
SCT	85	22.7	Sticky point	2.7	7.2	18.4	4.3
SCT	100	19.0	Sticky point	3.0	9.1	18.4	0.6
SCT	140	12.0	Sticky point	1.0	8.3	18.4	-6.4

Table for Cotton B

Meth	LabID	MeanIntraLab	Un	VarIntraLab	CVIntraLab	MeanInterLab	Delta
Carameliza	15	3.2	Color degree	0.0	2.2	2.7	0.5
Carameliza	115	3.4	Color degree	NA	NA	2.7	0.7
Carameliza	150	2.2	Color degree	NA	NA	2.7	-0.5
Carameliza	165	2.0	Color degree	0.0	10.3	2.7	-0.7
Contest-S	25	380.3	C/F Grade	2715.9	13.7	502.1	-121.8
Contest-S	35	430.5	C/F Grade	9483.5	22.6	502.1	-71.6
Contest-S	45	509.0	C/F Grade	1518.0	7.7	502.1	6.9
Contest-S	65	545.3	C/F Grade	5073.9	13.1	502.1	43.2
Contest-S	70	577.8	C/F Grade	1754.6	7.2	502.1	75.7
Contest-S	80	570.8	C/F Grade	16483.8	22.5	502.1	68.7
Contest-S	95	569.3	C/F Grade	12040.7	19.3	502.1	67.2
Contest-S	155	434.0	C/F Grade	6090.0	18.0	502.1	-68.1
H2SD	75	38.2	Sticky point	308.2	46.0	45.2	-7.1
H2SD	90	45.0	Sticky point	67.0	18.2	45.2	-0.2
H2SD	105	40.0	Sticky point	62.8	19.8	45.2	-5.2
H2SD	110	46.2	Sticky point	300.6	37.6	45.2	0.9
H2SD	125	49.7	Sticky point	241.5	31.3	45.2	4.4
H2SD	130	45.7	Sticky point	38.7	13.6	45.2	0.4
H2SD	135	56.7	Sticky point	177.9	23.5	45.2	11.4
H2SD	145	40.5	Sticky point	32.7	14.1	45.2	-4.7
KOTITI	60	8.0	KOTITI Grade	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0
Minicard	5	2.5	ITMF grade	0.2	20.0	2.5	0.0
Quantitati	120	0.4	Percent	0.0	14.8	0.4	0.0
SCT	10	60.0	Sticky point	76.0	14.5	77.5	-17.5
SCT	20	76.3	Sticky point	449.3	27.8	77.5	-1.2
SCT	30	72.7	Sticky point	36.3	8.3	77.5	-4.8
SCT	40	87.3	Sticky point	4.3	2.4	77.5	9.8
SCT	50	88.0	Sticky point	291.0	19.4	77.5	10.5
SCT	55	55.0	Sticky point	62.4	14.4	77.5	-22.5
SCT	85	76.2	Sticky point	5.0	2.9	77.5	-1.3
SCT	100	51.0	Sticky point	199.0	27.7	77.5	-26.5
SCT	140	131.0	Sticky point	237.0	11.8	77.5	53.5

Table for Cotton C

Meth	LabID	MeanIntraLab	Un	VarIntraLab	CVIntraLab	MeanInterLab	Delta
Carameliza	15	3.1	Color degree	0.0	4.6	2.9	0.2
Carameliza	115	4.3	Color degree	NA	NA	2.9	1.4
Carameliza	150	1.9	Color degree	NA	NA	2.9	-1.0
Carameliza	165	2.5	Color degree	0.0	2.9	2.9	-0.5
Contest-S	25	440.5	C/F Grade	4067.5	14.5	497.9	-57.4
Contest-S	35	401.0	C/F Grade	4406.0	16.6	497.9	-96.9
Contest-S	45	485.0	C/F Grade	26208.0	33.4	497.9	-12.9
Contest-S	65	455.2	C/F Grade	1736.2	9.2	497.9	-42.8
Contest-S	70	550.7	C/F Grade	1548.7	7.1	497.9	52.7
Contest-S	80	642.0	C/F Grade	21468.8	22.8	497.9	144.1
Contest-S	95	464.0	C/F Grade	14938.0	26.3	497.9	-33.9
Contest-S	155	545.2	C/F Grade	3056.6	10.1	497.9	47.2
H2SD	75	32.8	Sticky point	105.0	31.2	42.6	-9.8
H2SD	90	43.4	Sticky point	87.8	21.6	42.6	0.8
H2SD	105	52.3	Sticky point	203.9	27.3	42.6	9.7
H2SD	110	35.0	Sticky point	97.6	28.2	42.6	-7.6
H2SD	125	42.7	Sticky point	282.7	39.4	42.6	0.1
H2SD	130	46.8	Sticky point	109.4	22.3	42.6	4.2
H2SD	135	42.0	Sticky point	325.6	43.0	42.6	-0.6
H2SD	145	45.7	Sticky point	152.3	27.0	42.6	3.1
KOTITI	60	8.0	KOTITI Grade	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0
Minicard	5	1.8	ITMF grade	1.0	55.1	1.8	0.0
Quantitati	120	0.1	Percent	0.0	32.7	0.1	0.0
SCT	10	67.7	Sticky point	12.3	5.2	95.2	-27.6
SCT	20	105.7	Sticky point	545.3	22.1	95.2	10.4
SCT	30	101.0	Sticky point	3.0	1.7	95.2	5.8
SCT	40	111.7	Sticky point	152.3	11.1	95.2	16.4
SCT	50	147.0	Sticky point	97.0	6.7	95.2	51.8
SCT	55	52.8	Sticky point	85.4	17.5	95.2	-42.4
SCT	85	85.7	Sticky point	6.7	3.0	95.2	-9.6
SCT	100	56.7	Sticky point	185.3	24.0	95.2	-38.6
SCT	140	129.0	Sticky point	669.0	20.1	95.2	33.8

Table for Cotton D

Meth	LabID	MeanIntraLab	Un	VarIntraLab	CVIntraLab	MeanInterLab	Delta
Carameliza	15	2.8	Color degree	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.2
Carameliza	115	3.4	Color degree	NA	NA	2.5	0.9
Carameliza	150	2.0	Color degree	NA	NA	2.5	-0.5
Carameliza	165	2.0	Color degree	0.0	0.0	2.5	-0.5
Contest-S	25	463.0	C/F Grade	6706.8	17.7	420.9	42.1
Contest-S	35	374.0	C/F Grade	4217.6	17.4	420.9	-46.9
Contest-S	45	472.7	C/F Grade	2430.3	10.4	420.9	51.7
Contest-S	65	417.8	C/F Grade	7121.4	20.2	420.9	-3.1
Contest-S	70	399.7	C/F Grade	13911.1	29.5	420.9	-21.3
Contest-S	80	478.2	C/F Grade	4114.2	13.4	420.9	57.2
Contest-S	95	341.2	C/F Grade	9835.8	29.1	420.9	-79.8
Contest-S	155	421.0	C/F Grade	15812.8	29.9	420.9	0.1
H2SD	75	14.7	Sticky point	15.5	26.8	27.5	-12.9
H2SD	90	24.2	Sticky point	119.2	45.1	27.5	-3.3
H2SD	105	50.8	Sticky point	110.6	20.7	27.5	23.3
H2SD	110	26.7	Sticky point	181.5	50.5	27.5	-0.9
H2SD	125	21.8	Sticky point	11.0	15.2	27.5	-5.7
H2SD	130	31.8	Sticky point	33.4	18.1	27.5	4.3
H2SD	135	33.5	Sticky point	51.5	21.4	27.5	6.0
H2SD	145	16.7	Sticky point	13.9	22.3	27.5	-10.9
KOTITI	60	8.0	KOTITI Grade	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0
Minicard	5	2.0	ITMF grade	0.2	25.0	2.0	0.0
Quantitati	120	0.1	Percent	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
SCT	10	46.3	Sticky point	0.3	1.2	49.2	-2.9
SCT	20	49.3	Sticky point	116.3	21.9	49.2	0.1
SCT	30	43.7	Sticky point	4.3	4.8	49.2	-5.5
SCT	40	51.0	Sticky point	133.0	22.6	49.2	1.8
SCT	50	63.0	Sticky point	432.0	33.0	49.2	13.8
SCT	55	27.5	Sticky point	40.7	23.2	49.2	-21.7
SCT	85	64.5	Sticky point	19.5	6.8	49.2	15.3
SCT	100	46.7	Sticky point	54.3	15.8	49.2	-2.5
SCT	140	50.7	Sticky point	76.3	17.2	49.2	1.5

Table for Cotton E

Meth	LabID	MeanIntraLab	Un	VarIntraLab	CVIntraLab	MeanInterLab	Delta
Carameliza	15	3.1	Color degree	0.0	6.7	2.7	0.4
Carameliza	115	3.8	Color degree	NA	NA	2.7	1.1
Carameliza	150	2.0	Color degree	NA	NA	2.7	-0.7
Carameliza	165	2.0	Color degree	0.0	7.1	2.7	-0.7
Contest-S	25	86.3	C/F Grade	422.7	23.8	127.0	-40.7
Contest-S	35	78.0	C/F Grade	391.6	25.4	127.0	-49.0
Contest-S	45	124.8	C/F Grade	1623.4	32.3	127.0	-2.2
Contest-S	65	140.7	C/F Grade	5612.7	53.3	127.0	13.6
Contest-S	70	182.5	C/F Grade	1276.3	19.6	127.0	55.5
Contest-S	80	197.7	C/F Grade	2115.9	23.3	127.0	70.6
Contest-S	95	114.2	C/F Grade	1547.0	34.5	127.0	-12.9
Contest-S	155	92.0	C/F Grade	1992.4	48.5	127.0	-35.0
H2SD	75	6.2	Sticky point	12.6	57.5	10.5	-4.4
H2SD	90	11.8	Sticky point	19.2	37.1	10.5	1.3
H2SD	105	13.2	Sticky point	57.0	57.3	10.5	2.6
H2SD	110	13.0	Sticky point	44.0	51.0	10.5	2.5
H2SD	125	10.2	Sticky point	18.2	41.9	10.5	-0.4
H2SD	130	11.2	Sticky point	19.0	39.0	10.5	0.6
H2SD	135	12.2	Sticky point	14.6	31.4	10.5	1.6
H2SD	145	6.7	Sticky point	3.1	26.3	10.5	-3.9
KOTITI	60	6.7	KOTITI Grade	0.3	7.7	6.7	0.0
Minicard	5	1.1	ITMF grade	0.1	35.3	1.1	0.0
Quantitati	120	0.0	Percent	0.0	NaN	0.0	0.0
SCT	10	17.0	Sticky point	3.0	10.2	16.7	0.3
SCT	20	16.7	Sticky point	57.3	45.4	16.7	0.0
SCT	30	11.7	Sticky point	16.3	34.6	16.7	-5.0
SCT	40	22.0	Sticky point	7.0	12.0	16.7	5.3
SCT	50	24.7	Sticky point	46.3	27.6	16.7	8.0
SCT	55	10.3	Sticky point	15.5	38.1	16.7	-6.3
SCT	85	22.7	Sticky point	20.3	19.9	16.7	6.0
SCT	100	13.3	Sticky point	17.3	31.2	16.7	-3.3
SCT	140	11.7	Sticky point	24.3	42.3	16.7	-5.0

Data presented by boxplots per Method, LabID for each cotton ³

This section was appearing for the last time in RT2019-1 as the same information is given in the next section in a much more concise way; therefore next section only will remain in future reports from RT2019-2 on.

³Footnote

* NA excluded.

* In each box, the bolded line represents the median of all individual results for the considered LabID.


* The square represents the upper 75% (Q75) and lower 25% (Q25) percentiles of the individual results.

* The whiskers represent the quantiles that included in $\pm 1.5 * (Q75 - Q25)$.

* Extreme points may additionally be displayed by a point further out from the whiskers.

Charts of individual readings per Method and LabID for each cotton

4




RStudioGD 2


⁴Footnote

- * NA excluded
- * LabID are given in the abscissa axis at the bottom of the chart in the following charts.
- * Black dashed line = Method GrandMean per cotton.
- * Red + = Laboratory mean for the given method and for the given cotton.
- * Black x = Laboratory individual reading for the given method and for the given cotton.


Individual readings per LabID with Method = Contest-S




Individual readings per LabID with Method = H2SD




Individual readings per LabID with Method = KOTITI




Individual readings per LabID with Method = Minicard






Individual readings per LabID with Method = SCT



Correlation charts and correlation values between LabID using a same Method for all cottons ⁵

A correlation matrix of charts is provided only when two or more instruments were used for a given method.



⁵Footnote


* Based on Means of available results (NA excluded)

* LabIDs are given in the diagonal of the matrix.


* Squares in red for Cotton A, rounds in green for Cotton B, triangles in blue for Cotton C, + in black for cotton D, and x in purple for cotton E.

* The lower left corner of the matrix provides the correlation charts, while the upper right corner of the matrix provides the corresponding raw correlation coefficients. Higher the correlation coefficient, larger the font size of the corresponding text.


Correlations between instruments for Method = Contest-S



Correlations between instruments for Method = H2SD




Correlations between instruments for Method = SCT




Charts Variance = f(Mean) for each Cotton and Method, taking care of LabIDs


This type of chart is devoted to displaying the ability of laboratories to reproduce themselves for each cotton, based on the n readings (up to six) they provided for each cotton sample. Stickiness has the reputation to be heterogeneously distributed within samples (whatever the efforts we made for homogenizing cotton masses before dispatching representative samples); therefore, if methods are sensitive enough, then a certain level of variance (displayed on the vertical axis in the following charts) is to be seen when the number of measurements exceeds 1 in this test.


Cotton A : Variance between individual measurements = f(Mean) for all concerned labs





[1] “For Cotton = A and for method = Caramelization , 2 LabID (LabID being , 115, 150) cannot be shown on this chart as only one measurement was performed and, therefore, a variance cannot be calculated in this case.”














Cotton = A
Method = SCT (Sticky points)





Cotton B : Variance between individual measurements = $f(\text{Mean})$ for all concerned labs





[1] “For Cotton = B and for method = Caramelization , 2 LabID (LabID being , 115, 150) cannot be shown on this chart as only one measurement was performed and, therefore, a variance cannot be calculated in this case.”














Cotton = B
Method = SCT (Sticky points)




Cotton C : Variance between individual measurements = f(Mean) for all concerned labs





[1] “For Cotton = C and for method = Caramelization , 2 LabID (LabID being , 115, 150) cannot be shown on this chart as only one measurement was performed and, therefore, a variance cannot be calculated in this case.”




Cotton = C
Method = H2SD (Sticky points)












Cotton = C
Method = SCT (Sticky points)




Cotton D : Variance between individual measurements = $f(\text{Mean})$ for all concerned labs





[1] “For Cotton = D and for method = Caramelization , 2 LabID (LabID being , 115, 150) cannot be shown on this chart as only one measurement was performed and, therefore, a variance cannot be calculated in this case.”





Cotton = D
Method = H2SD (Sticky points)














Cotton E : Variance between individual measurements = f(Mean) for all concerned labs




[1] “For Cotton = E and for method = Caramelization , 2 LabID (LabID being , 115, 150) cannot be shown on this chart as only one measurement was performed and, therefore, a variance cannot be calculated in this case.”





Cotton = E
Method = H2SD (Sticky points)




Cotton = E
Method = KOTITI (KOTITI Grade)










CSITC type charts: distance Delta of Lab readings to the Grand Mean by Method and by LabID ⁶

This type of chart is devoted to displaying the ability of any Method and any LabID to not deviate from the observed GrandMean of any given characteristic whatever the measured levels of the participating cottons, and then covering the range of stickiness of the participating cottons in this case. If only one LabID is using a given Method, then all Delta points (one point per participating cotton) will be positionned at Delta = 0 (Y axis) and at the GrandMean values of the cottons (X axis). If two labs are using a given Method, then their respective Delta points will be positionned in symetry of the X axis at the respective Delta values (Y axis) and at the GrandMean values of the cottons (on the X axis).

CSITC type chart for Method Caramelization




⁶Footnote


* GMean = Grand Mean of all laboratory means, calculated by Method.

* Chart abscissa axis is given in the original individual readings scale.


LabID = 115 Method = Caramelization (Color degree)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean



LabID = 150 Method = Caramelization (Color degree)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




LabID = 165 Method = Caramelization (Color degree)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




CSITC type chart for Method Contest-S

LabID = 25 Method = Contest-S (C/F Grade)


Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




LabID = 35 Method = Contest-S (C/F Grade)
Delta = Lab Mean - Method Mean




LabID = 45 Method = Contest-S (C/F Grade)
Delta = Lab Mean - Method Mean




LabID = 65 Method = Contest-S (C/F Grade)
Delta = Lab Mean - Method Mean




LabID = 70 Method = Contest-S (C/F Grade)
Delta = Lab Mean - Method Mean




LabID = 80 Method = Contest-S (C/F Grade)
Delta = Lab Mean - Method Mean




LabID = 95 Method = Contest-S (C/F Grade)
Delta = Lab Mean - Method Mean




LabID = 155 Method = Contest-S (C/F Grade)
Delta = Lab Mean - Method Mean




CSITC type chart for Method H2SD




LabID = 90 Method = H2SD (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




LabID = 105 Method = H2SD (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




LabID = 110 Method = H2SD (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




LabID = 125 Method = H2SD (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




LabID = 130 Method = H2SD (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




LabID = 135 Method = H2SD (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




LabID = 145 Method = H2SD (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean



CSITC type chart for Method KOTITI




CSITC type chart for Method Minicard




CSITC type chart for Method Quantitative method


LabID = 120 Method = Quantitative method (Percent)

Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




CSITC type chart for Method SCT







LabID = 30 Method = SCT (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




LabID = 40 Method = SCT (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean







LabID = 55 Method = SCT (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean




LabID = 85 Method = SCT (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean - Method Mean



LabID = 100 Method = SCT (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean



LabID = 140 Method = SCT (Sticky points)
Delta = Lab Mean – Method Mean



CommonScale ⁷

Principle

In ITMF-ICCTM meeting organized in March 2018 in Bremen, it was envisaged to compare results from various stickiness methods to check how close are the gained results. A proposal using a pro-rata approach was made as one way to achieve this comparison. The following table gives the numeric values to which each and all results from this round-test were calculated with the following formula: $CommonScale = \frac{LabID \text{ reading} * 100}{MaxEver \text{ for this method}}$, with MaxEver being the maximum value that any given method could read for the most sticky cotton ever. This will continue as long as necessary.

During this ITMF-ICCTM meeting in March 2018, it was also mentioned that MaxEver may not be the best way to base the provided calculations for COMmonScale. We then expect Participating Laboratories to propose an other calculation method(s), which then would be added to this report in the future.

Method	MaxEver	Unit
Caramelization	7.0	Color degree
Contest-S	750.0	C/F Grade
H2SD	70.0	Sticky points
KOTITI	9.0	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	3.0	ITMF grade
Quantitative method	1.2	Percent
SCT	150.0	Sticky points

For instance,

- a reading of 2 at the minicard, with a MaxEver set at 3, will convert into a CommonScale reading of:
 $67 = \frac{2 * 100}{3}$.
- a reading of 63 at the SCT, with a MaxEver set at 150, will convert into a CommonScale reading of:
 $42 = \frac{63 * 100}{150}$.
- *etc.*

⁷Footnote

* In the following charts, ML stands for the code Method x LabID.

* In the following charts, LM stands for the code LabID x Method.

* NA excluded

* Black dashed line = Method MeanInterLab per cotton and per Method.

* Red + = Laboratory mean for the given method and for the given cotton.

* Black x = Laboratory or CommonScale reading or individual reading for the given method and for the given cotton.

Limitations of the CommonScale approach


This approach has potential limitations:

- The resolution of CommonScale results is not equivalent for methods having a discrete scale, especially when the number of levels is low (for instance, levels for minicard stickiness grading is limited to 4 [0, 1, 2 and 3]) letting the corresponding CommonScale only limited to 0, 33, 67 and 100 results. In the same time, other methods having counts expressed in sticky points on extended scales for instance have lot more possibilities, as well as method being able to measure according to a continuous scale.
- **It only is safe to compare methods that are measuring the same single phenomenon, stickiness, or phenomena that are related to stickiness.** At this point in time, it is not given that all present methods are measuring ‘stickiness’ or criterion that are related to stickiness.
- This CommonScale approach provides results that still are cotton dependent.
- This CommonScale approach may squeeze the scale for lower or highly stickiness contaminated cottons.
- This CommonScale approach may therefore have incidence on precision and accuracy of gained results.


As a conclusion, as said earlier, CommonScale will be experimented at least for some round-tests in order to see if it could help Manufacturers and Users ***to get closer and closer results for each method for the same cottons over time.*** On the long run, the ability of each method to characterize stickiness ***in its strict sense*** will have to be evaluated to go further in the harmonization process; this could be by restricting some method(s) to be present in this round-test if they do not predict well enough stickiness troubles: a procedure has to be developed accordingly.

CommonScale charts


Individual CommonScale readings per Method and LabID




Individual CommonScale readings per LabID and Method



Individual readings in their original scale per Method and LabID



Individual readings in their original scale per LabID and Method



Overall statistics per Cotton and Method ⁸

The following tables provide information about observed variations between results of various instruments within each method, for each of all used methods and for each and all cottons used in this round-test.

- Comparing the CVs between the lines of these tables - meaning comparing methods for each cotton - is not helpfull at all, as units used are very different between methods (so different that it has been necessary to create the CommonScale approach just displayed above to get a way of comparing results).
- However seing the evolution of these CV values over time, Method by Method, will inform about the degree of harmonization achieved for stickiness measurement. A decrease of the CV values between instruments for each Method - which is expected over time - will give indications about the degree of care taken by Laboratories and Manufacturers to harmonize results over time for their respective methods.

⁸Footnote

* NA or NaN excluded from the orginal raw data * NA appears in the following tables when less that two laboratories provided data for the given cotton and method

* Mean and Standard Deviation expressed in Unit, CV expressed in %

Mean, standard deviation and CV between instruments by method, Cotton A

Method	MeanInterLab	SdInterLab	CVInterLab	Unit
Caramelization	2.4	0.9	36.3	Color degree
Contest-S	179.6	47.6	26.5	C/F Grade
H2SD	13.8	5.3	38.2	Sticky points
KOTITI	6.7	NA	NA	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	1.3	NA	NA	ITMF grade
Quantitative method	0.2	NA	NA	Percent
SCT	18.4	4.2	22.7	Sticky points

Mean, standard deviation and CV between instruments by method, Cotton B

Method	MeanInterLab	SdInterLab	CVInterLab	Unit
Caramelization	2.7	0.7	25.0	Color degree
Contest-S	502.1	77.0	15.3	C/F Grade
H2SD	45.2	6.0	13.2	Sticky points
KOTITI	8.0	NA	NA	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	2.5	NA	NA	ITMF grade
Quantitative method	0.4	NA	NA	Percent
SCT	77.5	24.0	31.0	Sticky points

Mean, standard deviation and CV between instruments by method, Cotton C

Method	MeanInterLab	SdInterLab	CVInterLab	Unit
Caramelization	2.9	1.0	35.1	Color degree
Contest-S	497.9	77.1	15.5	C/F Grade
H2SD	42.6	6.3	14.7	Sticky points
KOTITI	8.0	NA	NA	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	1.8	NA	NA	ITMF grade
Quantitative method	0.1	NA	NA	Percent
SCT	95.2	32.3	34.0	Sticky points

Mean, standard deviation and CV between instruments by method, Cotton D

Method	MeanInterLab	SdInterLab	CVInterLab	Unit
Caramelization	2.5	0.7	26.7	Color degree
Contest-S	420.9	48.9	11.6	C/F Grade
H2SD	27.5	11.5	41.8	Sticky points
KOTITI	8.0	NA	NA	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	2.0	NA	NA	ITMF grade
Quantitative method	0.1	NA	NA	Percent
SCT	49.2	10.9	22.1	Sticky points

Mean, standard deviation and CV between instruments by method, Cotton E

Method	MeanInterLab	SdInterLab	CVInterLab	Unit
Caramelization	2.7	0.9	32.6	Color degree
Contest-S	127.0	44.3	34.8	C/F Grade
H2SD	10.5	2.7	25.8	Sticky points
KOTITI	6.7	NA	NA	KOTITI Grade
Minicard	1.1	NA	NA	ITMF grade
Quantitative method	0.0	NA	NA	Percent
SCT	16.7	5.4	32.2	Sticky points

Frequently asked questions (Q) and answers (A) ⁹

Q: Correlation matrix are sometimes difficult to read due to formatting; is there any improvement possible?

A: We search for a solution, probably for next RT. Sorry for the inconvenience in the meantime.

Q: For SCT, do we have to report the number of sticky points adhering to the top and the one adhering to the bottom aluminum foils in each cell of the provided Excel sheet, or do we have to report their sum?

A: _ For SCT, please only report the sum of the counts observed on the top and bottom foils _ in each cell of the Excel sheet; thanks.

Q: Why are the cells of the Excel form locked?

A: The cells are locked to avoid modifications in the template to enable our importing system 'to know' where to get each piece of information for placing and pasting it into a devoted cell in the data base system. This saves time and secures the data in its original state (avoiding typing mistakes). So please _ make sure to use the proper Excel template: use the latest form that was sent together with the announcement of samples dispatch for sending back you results. _

Q: What 'GB/T13785-1992' stands for?

A: GB/T13785-1992 stands for a Chinese standards called 'Test method for degree of sugar contains in cotton fibers – Colorimetry'.

Q: What 'H2SD' stands for?

A: H2SD stands for High Speed Stickiness Detector.

Q: What 'HSI-NIR' stands for?

A: HSI-NIR stands for Hyper Spectral Imaging based on Near Infra-red spectra.

Q: What 'SCT' stands for?

A: SCT stands for Sticky Cotton Thermodetector.

Q: What 'TDM-A' stands for?

A: TDM-A stands for Thermo Detection Method, and A stands for a specific scale for designing the stickiness level.

To be complemented on demand.

⁹Footnote

* Based on all round-tests carried out already.

Software components to realize this report ¹⁰

Software code version: June 30, 2021 by Jean-Paul Gurlot

R version 4.0.2 (2020-06-22) Platform: x86_64-w64-mingw32/x64 (64-bit) Running under: Windows 10 x64 (build 19042)

Matrix products: default

locale: [1] LC_COLLATE=French_France.1252 LC_CTYPE=French_France.1252 LC_MONETARY=French_France.1252 LC_NUMERIC=C

[5] LC_TIME=French_France.1252

attached base packages: [1] grid stats graphics grDevices utils datasets methods base

other attached packages: [1] rmarkdown_2.3 markdown_1.1 ggplot2_3.3.2 reshape2_1.4.4 xlsx_0.6.3
xlsxjars_0.6.1 rJava_0.9-13 knitr_1.29

[9] readxl_1.3.1

loaded via a namespace (and not attached): [1] Rcpp_1.0.5 highr_0.8 cellranger_1.1.0 compiler_4.0.2
pillar_1.4.6 plyr_1.8.6 tools_4.0.2

[8] digest_0.6.25 evaluate_0.14 lifecycle_0.2.0 tibble_3.0.3 gtable_0.3.0 pkgconfig_2.0.3 rlang_0.4.7

[15] cli_2.0.2 rstudioapi_0.11 yaml_2.2.1 xfun_0.16 withr_2.2.0 stringr_1.4.0 vctrs_0.3.2

[22] glue_1.4.1 R6_2.4.1 rematch_1.0.1 fansi_0.4.1 farver_2.0.3 magrittr_1.5 scales_1.1.1

[29] htmltools_0.5.0 ellipsis_0.3.1 assertthat_0.2.1 colorspace_1.4-1 labeling_0.3 stringi_1.4.6 munsell_0.5.0

[36] crayon_1.3.4

¹⁰Footnote

* List of all R components for processing the data

[1] “ICCTM-ITMF-RTStick 2021-1_Long_2021-06-30_Raw”

General conclusions about the results of this round-test

At this point, some general conclusions can be drawn from the results of this round-test:

- Seven methods (in past RTS, up to 11 methods were participating) for measuring stickiness were used. Maybe the current pandemic is the reason for this low participation. It could also be that our conclusions in Bremen Conferences already reached them (see below), and that they are trying to make according decision for their future testing instrumentations and procedures.
- Thirty two instruments participated to this test. On our side, we were not able to deliver samples to some laboratories due to restrictions by carriers, and some labs are still waiting samples for sending back results. We will issue special and confidential reports to them when possible. This report is the only official one for ever.
- Levels of reading as well as units to express stickiness are quite different, confirming that maybe all methods are not exactly measuring the same property that all methods however name 'stickiness' by all methods. This could be a problem for the comparability of the measurements and the application of the results in processing;
- Variations in results are still quite high between laboratories using the same method, inducing somewhat low levels of reproducibility in the measurements;
- This variation seems not evolving since RT2017-1; please see last comment below;
- If one would compare methods, it would require calculating a representative result for each of the used methods; however taking care of the observed large variability levels in the results - both within laboratory and between laboratories - a mean result or a median result per method would not be meaningful at this stage. When these levels of variability will decrease, such a comparison will be published for each round-test occurrence.
- As discussed in Bremen (March 2018), since RT 2018-1, a new chapter appeared in the full report about the CommonScale approach as a first attempt of harmonization within and between methods (the later, at the condition that all methods do measure stickiness which will have to be proven according to a procedure to be developed).
- As discussed in Bremen (March 2021), since RT 2020-2, harmonization steps will concentrate on thermo-mechanic methods and keeping the minicard as ITMF-ICCTM reference. More information will be disseminated on the harmonization steps in the future.
- To see the presentation that was made about this round-test in Bremen in March 2021, please visit: https://baumwollboerse.de/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/CCB_2021-T5-Gourlot-Drieling.pdf
- As we assume that by showing their relative position of each laboratory on comparison with others will induce corrective actions to favor more harmonized results along time, we will run other occurrences of this stickiness round-test in the coming times.

We recommend laboratories to observe their position and deduce the potential corrective actions that will lead to more grouped results in the coming round-test occurrences.

We stay available to all laboratories participating to this RT as long as possible during the

pandemic. However, preparing and dispatching samples has a cost and we urge laboratories receiving samples to submit their results in due time.

In the same time, if you would have several kilograms of homogeneous material having a typical sticky behavior, and that you would like this cotton to participate in one or several future round-test occurrence(s), please contact Jean-Paul GOURLOT. Every thing will remain confidential at any time.

Finally, next round-test samples will be sent in a close future. Messages will be sent to the mailbox of participating laboratories contacts. If you know other laboratories who wish to participate, please ask them to contact us... Thanks for the cotton community.

We stay at disposal for any additional discussion; we do hope to see you again during the coming next RT later within the coming months.

Thank you again for your participation and support.