



Paper: “Prediction of Hernia Formation or Cracking of Boiler Water Tubes due to Corrosion”

Submitted: 08 October 2024

Accepted: 25 February 2025

Published: 31 March 2025

Corresponding Author: Sibiri Traore

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n9p36

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kojo Boakye
University of Mines and Technology, Ghana

Reviewer 2: Salloom Al-Juboori
University of Mu'tah, Jordan

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes. *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: 7/12/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/12/ 2024
Manuscript Title: PREDICTION OF HERNIA FORMATION OR CRACKING OF BOILER WATER TUBES DUE TO CORROSION	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1052/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No.	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available 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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

PREDICTION OF HERNIA FORMATION OR CRACKING OF BOILER WATER TUBES DUE TO CORROSION”	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
The abstract outlines the problem and the proposed solution but lacks details about the methodology employed and does not present the results achieved.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
A couple of sentences need to be rephrased to ensure they convey clear information. A few words are written in French; those words need to be translated into their appropriate English equivalents.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Mathematical modelling is the methodology employed; please rephrase the points to present them more clearly.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
A separate section should be dedicated to the results obtained. Additionally, the analysis should be conducted thoroughly, ensuring that the graph has properly labelled axes and includes a clear legend to explain the data represented.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion is good, as it incorporates supportive statements derived from the results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
There are no in-text citations that correspond to the Bibliography list, making it difficult to link the cited sources to the relevant parts of the text. The bibliography should be properly organized to fully adhere to the APA referencing style, ensuring all required components are included.	

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):

Thank you for allowing me to review your work “PREDICTION OF HERNIA FORMATION OR CRACKING OF BOILER WATER TUBES DUE TO CORROSION”. Preventive maintenance is vital for ensuring equipment performs optimally, minimizing downtime, and preventing costly failures. Predicting issues such as hernia formation and cracking in boiler water tubes facilitates proactive maintenance, reduces the risk of catastrophic failures, ensures plant safety and operational efficiency, and extends the lifespan of the equipment.

While the work is commendable, there are a few corrections needed in grammar, the arrangement of some mathematical expressions, and the organization of certain sections of the write-up.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes. ***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!***

Reviewer Name: Prof. Dr. Salloom Al-Juboori	
University/Country: Mutah/Jordan	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/12/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 23/12/204
Manuscript Title: PREDICTION OF HERNIA FORMATION OR CRACKING OF BOILER WATER TUBES DUE TO CORROSION	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 52	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
------------------	----------------------

	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2
Please see comments for the authors	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Please see comments for the authors	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
Please see comments for the authors	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
Please see comments for the authors	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. The main goals of this study (highlighted) must be achieved and final main results summarized in abstract and in conclusions. Such as: -
 - i. The maximum limit time not to exceed to replace the tubes
 - ii. The corrosion rate and stresses in the tubes due to water/steam pressure
1. Articles ended with references not Bibliography and the references should contain recent application about the topic of the interest, because contains up to 2022