

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

John Bartzis¹

1 University of Western Macedonia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The subject is interesting. However the article needs major restructuring before it becomes readable and a proper review can take place.

More specifically:

- 1. First of all, English needs to be improved.
- 2. The text layout needs to be redesigned. There should be a coherence along introduction, objectives, methodology results and conclusions. All Chapters need to serve clearly stated scientific objectives. What is new in the present study compared to the state of the art needs also to be explicitly stated.
- 3. In the methodology Chapter is better to start with the methodology strategy and how this strategy serves the present objectives.
- 4. General statements that do not serve above mentioned principles is better to be avoided since although they can be true, can create confusion to the reader with respect to the present scientific objectives.
- 5. At present, it is not easy to understand the scientific objectives. For example in the abstract it is stated "" This paper presents a standardized methodology for evaluating thermal comfort in the field... "", In the Introduction it seems to be something different: "The objective of this research is to provide insight into the interconnectedness across many disciplines within the subject of CGCC...". Please make things more precise, more scientifically clear.
- 6. In the methodology chapter, it is better to start with the methodology strategy having in mind how this strategy serves the present objectives. In addition it should be noted that almost nothing is presented on the modeling methods and tools.
- 7. The parameters appearing in the Figures need to be clearly defined and quantified.
- 8. The Conclusions include several statements that they do not seem to correlate with the results presentation and discussion. It is better to be removed and replaced by conclusions originated from the present scientific results.