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

Paolo Lenzuni[1]

1 INAIL Istituto Nazionale per l'Assicurazione contro gli Infortuni sul Lavoro

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper is unsuitable for publication. It appears to have been written by loosely assembling sentences and figures which are often unrelated to one another, which makes the paper very hard to read. The absence of any connection between text and figures is particularly puzzling. It is very difficult to determine what the original results of this study are.

The abstract is too vague, while it should summarize the essential results of the paper.

The introduction is extremely long and hard to make sense of. Most of this section focuses on CGCC, a concept that never appears anywhere else in the paper.

As other reviewers have already mentioned, nowhere in the paper do the authors provide a clear outline of the model that they claim to have developed. It is therefore impossible to understand how air temperature values were calculated and to what extent such predictions are reliable.

In Table 1, it is unclear what the authors mean by "Reference". It is also unclear what the authors mean by "Maximum Solar Radiation."

In Figure 2, it is unclear why only data from Wards 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 are shown. It is also unclear what the difference is between calculated and predicted.

Figure 2 claims to show the minimum, average, and maximum air temperatures. However, the text immediately following Figure 2 indicates that it displays the minimum, median (not average), and typical (not maximum) temperatures. Which one is correct?

The data shown in Figure 3 display a large value of the correlation coefficient R2. However, the slope of the best-fitting line is below 0.9, while it should be 1. The authors should discuss why their model underpredicts the air temperature.

In Table 3, Entry #4 is the same as entry #2, with different values for (a), (b), and r2. All in all, Table 3 is hard to make sense of.

It is unclear what distinguishes the two panels of Figure 4. Also, the authors do not indicate the source for these data that clearly suggest some kind of adaptive comfort.

It is unclear what kind of use the authors make of the information shown in Figure 5, if any.

Figure 6 shows huge day-to-day oscillations for the relative humidity. The authors do not provide any comment on such oscillations, which may be an artefact of the measuring equipment.