

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_114949
Title of the Manuscript:	Numerical study of the thermal behavior of a wall containing phase change material (PCM) in a hot and dry climate
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The manuscript is very necessary to study the evolution of the heat flux and the temperature in a wall containing PCM when it is subjected to external and internal convective stresses. 2- The alternative title : Numerical investigation of the phase change material (PCM) thermal performance in a composite wall placed in a hot and dry climate 3- The abstract should start with a clear statement of the problem and then progress logically through the purpose of the study, the methods used, and the results obtained. 4- yes 5- yes 6- The references are not sufficient and so old 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>To ensure the highest quality of the paper and to improve its readability, it is recommended that the author seek a professional language editing service for polishing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract should start with a clear statement of the problem and then progress logically through the purpose of the study, the methods used, and the results obtained. 2. More details about the methods used in the study would be useful. 3. It would be helpful to have a more detailed and cohesive summary of the main findings. 4. The abstract would benefit from a clear statement of the conclusions drawn from the study and the implications of these results. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure of introduction could be more organized, grouping studies by their key findings or methodologies to provide a more coherent flow of information. 2. The motivation for the study could be more clearly stated. 3. When discussing previous studies, it would be helpful to include more specifics about the results and methods used, rather than simply stating the conclusions. <p>Material and Numerical Setup</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The aforementioned energy conservation equation (1) needs to be modified for the special case of using phase change materials 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>2. The authors should ensure that all figures and diagrams mentioned in the text are included in the paper and appropriately labelled.</p> <p>3. The authors should consider discussing any limitations or assumptions made during the simulations and procedure.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>1. The authors have presented an in-depth analysis of the data collected. However, the authors should consider providing more interpretation of the data.</p> <p>2. The authors have done a good job of interpreting the results. However, some parts, like the explanation of the impact of adding PCM on the heat transfer rate and heat transfer coefficient and the role of PCM, could use further clarification.</p> <p>3. The authors should aim to clearly summarize the key findings from the results, and how these findings contribute to the field of study and the specific research question.</p> <p>4. All existing shapes need to be more precise, as they are not clear.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>1. The authors have done a good job of summarizing the main findings. However, it would be beneficial to further illustrate how these findings will contribute to the existing body of knowledge, and how they can be used to improve or innovate the current technology or practices in the field.</p> <p>2. The authors could consider including suggestions for future research based on their findings.</p> <p>Language Evaluation To ensure the highest quality of the paper and to improve its readability, it is recommended that the author seek a professional language editing service for polishing.</p> <p>Decision on the Paper Based on the content you've provided, my decision would be: Major Revisions.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bassim Mohammed Majel
Department, University & Country	Al-Rafidain University College, Iraq