

## List of Figures

Figure B-1: Two detection devices used to measure stickiness in this CFC / ICAC.....	32
Figure B-2: Procedure SCT.....	33
Figure B-3: Procedure SCT (continued).....	34
Figure B-4: H2SD 's work stations.....	34
Figure B-5: Processing steps and tools used in the H2SD.....	35
Figure B-6: Other tools used in H2SD.....	36
Figure B-7: Information displayed on the screen.....	37
Figure B-8: Distribution of SCT-measured stickiness for different Variety / Factory / Type of ginning combinations.....	52
Figure B-9: SCT results on lots from one Variety / Factory / Type of ginning combination.....	52
Figure B-10: SCT results on lots from one Variety / Factory / Type of ginning combination.....	52
Figure B-11: SCT results on lots from one Variety / Factory / Type of ginning combination.....	53
Figure B-12: SCT results on lots from one Variety / Factory / Type of ginning combination.....	53
Figure B-13: SCT results on lots from one Variety / Factory / Type of ginning combination.....	53
Figure B-14: SCT results on lots from one Variety / Factory / Type of ginning combination.....	54
Figure B-15: SCT results on lots from one Variety / Factory / Type of ginning combination.....	54
Figure B-16: SCT results for different bales in the lot.....	54
Figure B-17: Comparison of stickiness distributions in 2 crops.....	55
Figure B-18: Relationship between within bale variance and bale mean on SCT measurements on 1000 bales sampled from 1996 production of 100 blocks of the Sudan Gezira board. The solid line shows the theoretical variance x mean relationship for negative binomial distributions with a common k estimated on all the bales. .	60
Figure B-19: Same relation as previous figure with a classification according to the ginning method (roller / saw).....	61
Figure B-20: Relationship between within-bale variance and bale mean on over-dispersed SCT measurements. Over-dispersed bales are selected from the 1000 bales, after a chi-square over-dispersion test with alpha = 0.01. The solid line shows the theoretical variance x mean relationship for negative binomial distributions with a common k of 10.81, estimated on the over-dispersed bales. ....	62
Figure B-21: Relationship between within-bale variance and bale mean on SCT measurements in a randomized experiment carried out at Cirad on 29 bales of Sudanese cotton. The bisecting line shows the theoretical variance x mean relationship for Poisson distributions. The solid line shows the theoretical variance x mean relationship for negative binomial distributions with a common k estimated on the 29 bales.....	63
Figure B-22: Relationship between within-bale variance and bale mean on SCT measurements in a non-randomized experiment carried out at Cirad on 30 bales of Sudanese cotton. The bisecting line (dashed) shows the theoretical variance x mean relationship for Poisson distributions. The solid line shows the theoretical variance x mean relationship for negative binomial distributions with a common k estimated on the 30 bales. .	64
Figure B-23 : Relation Variance vs Mean of the number of sticky points as measured by H2SD.....	70
Figure B-24: Negative binomial probability distribution of sticky point numbers, mean = 12 and k = 9.43.....	70
Figure B-25: Litigation risk when classification threshold = evaluation threshold = 10 sticky points. Negative binomial distribution, k = 9.43, R=1 measurement per bale. ....	71
Figure B-26: Evaluation threshold lv as a function of the classification threshold ts in the case of a negative binomial distribution with k = 9,43 and two H2SD measurements per bale (r=1).....	72
Figure B-27: Evaluation threshold lv as a function of the classification threshold ts in the case of a negative binomial distribution with k = 9,43 and two H2SD measurements per bale (r=2).....	73
Figure B-28: Results on 'reference cottons'.....	76
Figure B-29: Stickiness results: gin 1.....	77
Figure B-30: Stickiness results: gin 2.....	77
Figure B-31: Stickiness results: gin 3.....	78
Figure B-32: Stickiness results: gin 4.....	78
Figure B-33: Stickiness results: gin 5.....	79
Figure B-34: Stickiness results: gin 6.....	79
Figure B-35: Stickiness results: gin 7.....	80
Figure B-36: Stickiness results: gin 8.....	80
Figure B-37: Stickiness results: all gins.....	81
Figure B-38: Log(variance) = f(Log (mean)); all gins.....	81
Figure B-39: Log(variance) = f(Log (mean)) per production zone.....	82

Figure B-40: Factory location effect on the H2SD stickiness level. ....	82
Figure B-41: Comparison of SCT and H2SD results where all measurements are available ( $r=0.70$ ). ....	89
Figure C-1: Check of the bale breaker. ....	113
Figure C-2: Check of the magnetic zigzag. ....	113
Figure C-3: Check of the RN opener cleaner. ....	113
Figure C-4: Check of the LVS condenser. ....	113
Figure C-5: Check of the RSK opener mixing machine. ....	114
Figure C-6: Check of the card. ....	114
Figure C-7: Check of the drawing frame. ....	114
Figure C-8: Check of the flyer. ....	114
Figure C-9: Check of the drafting zone on the flyer. ....	115
Figure C-10: Check of the ring spinning frame. ....	115
Figure C-11: Check of the ring spinning position. ....	115
Figure C-12: Check of the open-end spinning position. ....	115
Figure C-13: Relationship between SCT and H2SD counts in raw cottons. ....	141
Figure C-14: Trehalulose content (W) plotted against the number of sticky points as measured by H2SD and SCT. ....	141
Figure C-15: Melezitose content (M) plotted against the number of sticky points as measured by H2SD and SCT. ....	142
Figure C-16: Saccharose content (S) plotted against the number of sticky points as measured by H2SD and SCT. ....	142
Figure C-17: Total sugars content (Stotal) plotted against the number of sticky points as measured by SCT and H2SD. ....	143
Figure C-18: Total sugar (%w/w) distribution for all cottons. ....	143
Figure C-19: Distribution of sugar types (%w/sample weight). ....	143
Figure C-20: Sugar content as a proportion of total sugars, without Central Asia cottons. ....	144
Figure C-21: Sugar content as a proportion of total sugars, with Central Asia cottons. ....	144
Figure C-22: Card efficiency vs H2SD. ....	144
Figure C-23: Total number of breakages per 100 km at the card level vs H2SD. ....	144
Figure C-24: Total number of breakages per 100 km at the 1st drafting pass vs H2SD. ....	144
Figure C-25: Drawing frame efficiency (2nd draft) vs H2SD. ....	144
Figure C-26: Total number of breakage per 100 km of roving material at the flyer level vs H2SD. ....	145
Figure C-27: Flyer efficiency vs H2SD. ....	145
Figure C-28: Ring spinning frame breakage ratio per 1000 spindles/hour vs H2SD. ....	145
Figure C-29: Open-end efficiency vs H2SD. ....	145
Figure C-30: Number of OE yarn-piecing per 240 rotors/hour vs H2SD. ....	145
Figure C-31: Mean mass CV% of the flyer fleece vs H2SD. ....	145
Figure C-32: Mean mass CV% of ring spun yarn vs H2SD. ....	146
Figure C-33: Number of thin places (-50%) per km of RS yarn vs H2SD. ....	146
Figure C-34: Number of thick places (+50%) per km of RS yarn vs H2SD. ....	146
Figure C-35: Number of neps per km of RS yarn vs H2SD. ....	146
Figure C-36: Distribution in the different nep classes. ....	147
Figure C-37: Number of sticky neps per 1000 m of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	147
Figure C-38: Number of fiber neps per 1000 m of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	147
Figure C-39: Number of SCF per 1000 m of RS yarn vs H2SD. ....	148
Figure C-40: Number of entanglements per 1000 m of RS yarn vs H2SD. ....	148
Figure C-41: Number of neps of diverse origins per 1000 m of RS yarn vs H2SD. ....	148
Figure C-42: Hairiness of the RS yarn vs H2SD. ....	148
Figure C-43: RS Yarn strength (cN/tex) vs H2SD. ....	148
Figure C-44: RS work to break (cN.m) vs H2SD. ....	148
Figure C-45: Hairiness of the OE yarn vs H2SD. ....	149
Figure C-46: OE yarn strength (cN/tex) vs H2SD. ....	149
Figure C-47: Number of defects class A4 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	149
Figure C-48: Number of defects class B3 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	149
Figure C-49: Number of defects class B4 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	149
Figure C-50: Number of defects C2 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	149
Figure C-51: Number of defects class C3 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	150
Figure C-52: Number of defects C4 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	150
Figure C-53: Number of defects class D1 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	150
Figure C-54: Number of defects class D2 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	150

Figure C-55: Number of defects class D3 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	150
Figure C-56: Number of defects class D4 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	150
Figure C-57: Number of defects class H1 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	151
Figure C-58: Number of defects class I1 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	151
Figure C-59: Number of defects class H2 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	151
Figure C-60: Number of defects class I2 per km of RS yarn vs H2SD count. ....	151
Figure C-61: Operational steps in the combed spinning tests. ....	158
Figure C-62: Plot of control cottons: H2SD results vs time. ....	167
Figure C-63: Linear relation between the proportion of sticky cotton and H2SD results: measured stickiness is questionable when stickiness exceeds 50 sticky points. ....	168
Figure C-64: Spinning procedure in a micro-spinning test. ....	190
Figure C-65: Organization of the test from raw cotton to yarn testing. ....	191
Figure C-66: Effect of stickiness on rolling-up at the card level. ....	192
Figure C-67: Time to onset of rolling-up at different RH% values. ....	192
Figure C-68: Number of rollings-up at the drawing frame level vs stickiness. ....	193
Figure C-69: Number of interventions on the drawing frame vs stickiness. ....	193
Figure C-70: Number of cleanings required on a drawing frame vs stickiness. ....	194
Figure C-71: Breakages vs stickiness on the OE machine. ....	194
Figure C-72: Number of cleanings on the OE machine vs stickiness. ....	195
Figure C-73: Number of cleanings on the RS machine vs stickiness. ....	195
Figure C-74: Number of thin places vs stickiness under different RH% conditions. ....	196
Figure C-75: Number of thick places under different RH% conditions and stickiness levels. ....	196
Figure C-76: Number of neps under different RH conditions and stickiness levels. ....	197
Figure C-77: Number of sticky neps, detailed analysis. ....	197
Figure C-78: Number of fiber neps, detailed analysis. ....	198
Figure C-79: Effect of RH% and stickiness on yarn strength. ....	198
Figure C-80: Number of seed coat fragments in the card fleeces as counted by Cirad's Trashcam device. ....	199
Figure C-81: Detailed analysis on RS yarns: seed coat fragments content. ....	199
Figure C-82: Effect of stickiness and RH% on the number of thin places. ....	200
Figure C-83: Number of thick places for different RH% and stickiness values. ....	200
Figure C-84: Number of neps 280% at different RH and stickiness values. ....	201
Figure C-85: Number of sticky neps, detailed analysis. ....	201
Figure C-86: Number of fiber neps, detailed analysis. ....	202
Figure C-87: Detailed analysis of OE yarns: seed coat fragments content. ....	202
Figure C-88: Yarn strength at different RH and stickiness values. ....	203
Figure C-89: Results for RS yarn neps: detailed analysis at different RH%. ....	203
Figure C-90: Results for OE yarn neps: detailed analysis at different RH%. ....	204
Figure C-91: Expected relation between stickiness and disruptions. ....	205

## List of Tables

<i>Table B-1: Cross tabulation by variety and geographic zone.</i>	74
<i>Table B-2: Repartition if the gins within the cotton area.</i>	74
<i>Table B-3: Number of samples per gin and stickiness grade.</i>	84
<i>Table B-4: Variance estimations of SCT and H2SD results (square root transformation) depending on the gin.</i>	84
<i>Table C-1: Distribution of the sticky bales by variety and ginning equipment.</i>	107
<i>Table C-2: Fiber quality characteristics for selected bales in the spinning tests.</i>	108
<i>Table C-3: Stickiness data for the raw cottons.</i>	109
<i>Table C-4: Frequency and list of machine check points.</i>	110
<i>Table C-5: Main sampling and quality evaluations.</i>	116
<i>Table C-6: HPLC results.</i>	119
<i>Table C-7: Correlation coefficients between H2SD (RSK samples), SCT et HPLC results.</i>	120
<i>Table C-8: Over-dispersion index of the SCT and H2SD number of sticky points at different operating levels.</i>	121
<i>Table C-9: Correlation coefficients <math>r</math> between stickiness measurements and productivity criteria.</i>	122
<i>Table C-10: Correlation coefficients <math>r</math> between stickiness determinations and quality criteria.</i>	123
<i>Table C-11: Sugar content (%) of insect honeydew by HPLC (Hendrix et al, 1992).</i>	124
<i>Table C-12: Correlation coefficients between H2SD counts and nep classes in RS yarns.</i>	133
<i>Table C-13: Correlation coefficients between CLASSIMAT<sup>®</sup> defects and H2SD count.</i>	135
<i>Table C-14: Spinning results at 2 relative humidities.</i>	138
<i>Table C-15: Results of spinning at 2 relative humidities, drawing frame 1<sup>st</sup> draft.</i>	139
<i>Table C-16: Results of spinning at 2 relative humidities: drawing frame 2<sup>nd</sup> draft.</i>	139
<i>Table C-17: Results of spinning at 2 relative humidities: flyer.</i>	140
<i>Table C-18: Results of spinning at 2 relative humidities: ring spinning frame.</i>	140
<i>Table C-19: Quality results for Barakat cottons.</i>	157
<i>Table C-20: Changes in stickiness in the course of the process (mean of 10 H2SD replicates).</i>	159
<i>Table C-21: Breaks, efficiency and mass variation of the card sliver.</i>	160
<i>Table C-22: Breaks, efficiency mass variation of the 1st draft drawing frame.</i>	160
<i>Table C-23: Breaks, efficiency on the sliver lap machine.</i>	161
<i>Table C-24: breaks and efficiency at the combing machine level.</i>	161
<i>Table C-25: breaks and efficiency at the 2<sup>o</sup> draft.</i>	162
<i>Table C-26: breaks and efficiency at the flyer level.</i>	162
<i>Table C-27: breaks, imperfections, and efficiency at the ring spinning frame level.</i>	163
<i>Table C-28: Non-proportionality test between the measurement of stickiness by H2SD and the proportion of sticky cotton.</i>	166
<i>Table C-29: Analysis of variance of the data collected in the RH experiment on RS yarns.</i>	181
<i>Table C-30: Analysis of variance of the data collected in the RH experiment on OE yarns.</i>	184
<i>Table D-1: Statistics for Sudanese production in 1996/1997.</i>	213
<i>Table D-2: Estimated cost of H2SD grading, 2 counts/bale (500,000 bales).</i>	215
<i>Table D-3: The gain (millions of US\$) resulting from grading <b>Acala</b> bales into two categories, sticky and non sticky, for different proportions of non sticky bales <math>X</math> and discounting of the sticky bales <math>D'</math>. Discounting in the absence of grading <math>D = 7\%</math> and grading cost <math>CC_{Bale} = \\$1.51/bale</math>.</i>	218
<i>Table D-4: The gain (millions of US\$) resulting from grading <b>Barakat</b> bales into two categories, sticky and non sticky, for different proportions of non sticky bales <math>X</math> and discounting of the sticky bales <math>D'</math>. Discounting in the absence of grading <math>D = 7\%</math> and grading cost <math>CC_{Bale} = \\$1.51/bale</math>.</i>	218