

Review of: "Thermal Comfort Temperature Evaluation in Hospital Wards for Patient Safety and Climate Change Sustainability"

Luca Borghero

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article looks really interesting but is very confusing and imposes an extra effort from part of the reader! Language is not fluent, and sentences are not connected logically. Sometimes some important issues for this kind of study pop up with no relation to the previous paragraph and then just disappear.

The article still needs further work before being fully understandable and useful for the scientific community.

A few comments among all the ones that came up to me are:

In the introduction, when you talk about the Construction Green Building Certification, maybe you should mention what it is and add a reference about it. And what do you mean that the significance should not be exaggerated?

Ref number is really talking about CGCC?

"This multidisciplinary approach results in a plethora of interpretations of CGCC from multiple perspectives, thereby enriching the understanding of this concept. Consequently, the existing comprehension of CGCC remains inadequate." I think that the conjunction "consequently" does not make any sense between these two statements.

Also, right before you mention reference number 16, you use "As a result", but it is not really linked to the previous sentence.

The introduction looks kinda split between two parts, a first one about the importance of CGCC (not really mentioned anywhere else or in the title) and a second one which is more in line with the title and the rest of the text.

In the methodology, do you have any reference for the climate data and information you are providing? After Figure 1, there are some sentences which might be rewritten in English as they miss a verb. In this section: "Daily monthly average air temperature was monitored by means of shielded copper-constantan thermocouples. Total solar radiation. The ratio of daily total reflected, and incoming shortwave radiation was calculated for surface albedo, actual sunshine hour's ratio n/N, wind speed, relative humidity." You might need to revise a bit what you say. Why do you say you calculate wind speed if later you say you have an anemometer? Also, consider adding the name of the sensors you used and technical specifications.

It remains to me a bit unclear what you exactly did in this study, and I would not have the tools to replicate it. Did you use a

simulation software? Which one? What was the objective of this sensitivity analysis?

In the Results and Discussion section, you start repeating many of the information you mentioned earlier. The explanation of Figure 2 is not exhaustive enough to explain why are some temperatures calculated and some “protected”?

Because it is not very well explained in Methodology, it is a bit difficult to understand the results of Figure 3.

Why then are you suddenly talking about dust storms and pollutions? Was it in your simulation?

Figure 5-6 do not talk about renewable energy!!!!

In criteria of Adaptation section, you mention that patients appreciate the cozy atmosphere, but how do you know it?

Conclusion section is not related to the rest of the work for most of the information provided. Where do you get the “5 percent” from? (Among others).