

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_95772
Title of the Manuscript:	Contribution of the Provençal well for the improvement of the thermal comfort in the building in turbulent regime
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajopacs.com/index.php/AJOPACS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Quite important. But the author must be highlighting the important of the research in the INTRODUCTION. The INTRODUCTION part is too short. Must be elaborate more.</p> <p>2. YES.</p> <p>3. YES</p> <p>4. The subsections is too cramp. Must be write in the proper way or must include a little bit explanations/information on every subsection.</p> <p>5. YES</p> <p>6. NEED TO BE IMPROVE</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comment</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	NEED TO BE IMPROVE. THERE ARE SOME GRAMMATICAL ERRORS.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>- The title is in accord with article</p> <p>- The manuscript adheres to the journal's standards after revision</p> <p>- This article contains new aspects, but the authors must underline the major findings of their work and explain how this study represents a progress to other similar published papers. Please provide comparison with other articles</p> <p>- The Abstract section refers to the study findings, methodologies, discussion as well as conclusion. The Abstract section must be improved. The Abstract should refer to the study findings, methodologies, discussion as well as conclusion. In this form the abstract is too generally</p> <p>- The keywords permit found article in the current registers or indexes</p> <p>- In the introduction it is not clearly described the state of the art of the investigated problem. More references are necessary. The references from last years are necessary for demonstrated that this study is actual</p> <p>- The text can be understood by specialists from other domains</p> <p>- The paper was written in standard, grammatically correct English, more corrections are necessary</p> <p>- More discussions are necessary. COMPULSORY.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wan Mastura Binti Wan Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Malaysia