# Review of: ""Hospital's Thermo-neutral Zone for Patient Safety and Climate Change Sustainability"

Aldona Skotnicka-Siepsiak[1]

1 University of Wamia and Masuria in Olsztyn

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript "Thermal Comfort Temperature Evaluation in Hospital Wards for Patient Safety and Climate Change Sustainability," sent to Qeios, presents a standardized methodology for evaluating thermal comfort in the field, using the example of Kadhimiya Teaching Hospital.

I found the idea interesting and worthwhile to review. However, significant changes must be addressed before it is published.

1. The article needs thorough linguistic correction, from stylistic errors to rewriting incomprehensible and incomplete sentences or phrases.

2. Please characterize the accuracy of the devices mentioned on page 4.

3. How do you understand "a sensitive anemometer"? Please characterize the device.

4. How do you understand "poisoned storm" on page 9?

5. How do you understand "toxic weather" on page 9?

6. How do you understand "Cpretected,P" in the description of Fig. 2?

7. Please change the resolution of Fig. 4. It is unreadable.

8. On what basis was it formulated:

"When it comes to commercial and institutional buildings in modern Iraq, "6 percent yearly occupied above 30 °C" is deemed acceptable, while "the appropriate temperature is 37 °C in warm weather."?

9. Unlikely seems to me the claim:

"No one in Baghdad, Iraq, or the Gulf region seems to connect the dots between deadly air temperatures and health problems." This problem has been extensively researched and discussed in the United States, Europe, and India and recognized by international organizations (such as the WHO). It needs to be clarified.

10. The paper states:

"The model was built using data collected in the field from January 2021 to March 2022. Field measurements taken between March and August of 2022 were utilized to check the accuracy of the models." It is unclear which of the results presented are measurements and which are results derived from the model.

11. The measurement period was 15 months. Why do the results in Fig. 5 and 6 cover a period of one year?

11. The main issue that needs thorough improvement in the presented work is the lack of an accurate description of the created model. What are its assumptions and mathematical interpretation?

12. There is no explicit comparison of measured and calculated results for the model.

13. Should the results in Fig. 2 be point and not linear?

14. There is no discussion of the results in the paper.