

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_95622</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Modelling and simulation of the earth-to-air heat exchanger in laminar air flow regime for the passive cooling of buildings</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Yes. The study is relevant to detain heat of clean way.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Ok.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? It would be more didactic if a chart was used in the methodology to explain the simulation and the equations were located in a table.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes, but it is important to insert the discretized equations in the annex.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Ok.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Please, consider the comments below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Amplify the figures.</li> <li>2) All the graphics must be colour.</li> <li>3) Detail the physical phenomena in figure 8...why in (b) the temperature for <math>x=4.85</math> is lower than (d)?</li> <li>4) One figure (probably 9) was not cited in the text.</li> <li>5) The heat transfer in the system was considered by forced convection but the author has used Ra number. Explain in the methodology if the natural convection was considered.</li> <li>6) In equation 13 it is missing one boundary condition for vorticity.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Yes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There are some formatting mistakes that were specified along of the text.</li> <li>2) I suggest to improve the organization of the boundaries.</li> <li>3) Consider the questions were done along the text.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I believe that it more didatic if a summary organization chart was placed at the methodology to explain the input and output parameters and the steps of the simulation.</li> </ol>	

**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:	<b>Elisa Pinto da Rocha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>UFRJ, Brazil</b>