Mechanical Engineering for Society and Industry

Supplementary File S1

Original Letter to the Editor by Dr. Saber CHEMKHI

Associated with:
Corrigendum to "The new modification of a solar still chamber with hollow glass: An experimental comparison between perpendicular and inline hollow glass configurations" [MESI Vol. 5, No. 2 (2025) pp 331-341]

Original Article DOI : 10.31603/mesi.13238
Corrigendum DOI : 10.31603/mesi.17044

Editorial Note

This file contains the original Letter to the Editor submitted by **Dr. Saber CHEMKHI (LPT Laboratory, CRTEn, Tunisia)** regarding the reporting of productivity and thermal efficiency data from Reference [35] in the above article.

The correspondence was received and reviewed by the Editorial Office. Following verification of the issues raised and consultation with the authors, corrections were made to Table 3 and the associated discussion section, resulting in the publication of the corresponding corrigendum.

The content of the letter is reproduced as originally submitted, except for minor formatting adjustments made for publication purposes.

Received by the Editorial Office : 15 May 2026
Permission for publication granted : 14 June 2026

Letter to the Editor

Subject: Comment on " *The new modification of a solar still chamber with hollow glass: An experimental comparison between perpendicular and inline hollow glass configurations* " Published in: **Mechanical Engineering for Society and Industry, Vol. 5 No. 2 (2025).** https://doi.org/10.31603/mesi.13238

Dear Prof. Muji Setiyo, Editor of MESI Journal

I am writing to comment on the recently published article by **Eko Prasetya Budiana et al. (2025)**. While the study provides interesting insights into the enhancement of a single slope solar still designed and tested in Indonesia with hollow glass. However, we would like to raise several concerns regarding the discussion and comparison used in their analysis that may affect the validity of the results.

First, the literature review in Table 1 presented eight published papers between 2019 and 2021, with various configurations of solar stills. However, the data provided does not support their work and their choices with the single slope solar still, to make a more appropriate choice. More recent references might be added in the table 1.

Second, in the Discussion section, the authors conducted a comparison study with findings from previous studies in Table 3. They concluded that: “these results indicate that PHGSS and IHGSS are competitive with the conventional CS4 chamber, as noted in previous studies”. These conclusions were based on two parameters, the daily productivity (yield) and the thermal efficiency. The problem that the values in Table 3 from reference [35] are false. In fact, the productivity varying from 0.73 to 0.83 L/m².day is not the published values in the paper, but they corresponded to the overnight system production. The published results of the total production were 3.95 to 4.7 L/m².day for the two configurations. Moreover, the thermal efficiency of 15% is also a false value. If we examine the work of Ouled Saad et al. (mentioned in the reference 35)**,** we find that the thermal efficiency vary from 24.5% and 29.8%.

I think that the authors of the above paper make some mistakes in the comparison study that must be explained or revised to give true data and to support their conclusions. To compare the daily productivity, the yield must be given in Litre per unit surface of the distiller (1m²) to

compare properly all the results. I believe these points are vital for an accurate interpretation of the study's findings. We look forward to the authors' clarifications.

I am ready for any extra details and for the discussion of the paper results with the authors. Sincerely,

Dr. Saber CHEMKHI

LPT Laboratory, CRTEn, Tunisia.

Email: saber.chemkhi@crten.rnrt.tn

Reference

F. Ouled Saad, J. Madiouli, S. Chemkhi, S. Mankai, and I. Shigidi, "Increasing the productivity and the thermal efficiency of conventional solar stills using a new rotating discs mechanism," *International Journal of Environmental Science and Technology*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 923–932, 2025. doi: 10.1007/s13762-024-05711-8