Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Physical Science International Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_PSIJ_87100**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evolution of the average temperature of the interior atmosphere of a habitable cell made of foamed concrete in Burkina Faso**
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.journalpsij.com/index.php/PSIJ/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	The topic is relevant to current context but needs to incorporate all the modifications suggested in the aforementioned form- ● Abstract underscores the content of work as the flow of description doesn't seems will attract any reader. Existing gaps have to be highlighted like why this work is necessary? ● Plagiarism shows 11% which is acceptable for journal repute but still preferred to have less than 10%. ● References should be mentioned as per the journal guidelines Authors have to cross verify the quoted references for self-citation. (as it's not a good practice) ● There are hardly any references from 2020 to 2022. Introduction part looks to have no latest references, which is quite unrealistic. There need to be understanding of existing work with details. There is still lot of scope for improvising the introduction section as it talks limited in terms of the current trends on simulation aspects. Especially focusing on alternative tool data collection in comparison to COMSOL. ANSYS based simulation there are some important articles covering the various kinds of simulation aspects for comparison in related work section for the author. You are free to select other relevant articles as well- ● doi.org/10.3390/ma14144039 ● doi.org/10.1007/s11665-021-05843-9 ● doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2021.03.074 ● 10.1007/s00894-020-04560-9 ● doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121750 ● doi.org/10.1007/s13369-019-03951-2 ● doi.org/10.2478/scjme-2018-0031 ● doi:10.1088/1757-899X/376/1/012072 ● doi:10.1166/mat.2017.1466 ● doi.org/10.1177/1740349915599182 There are no details about process map or road map for the entire simulation? How the validation of simulation is done? No information about convergence study? The above articles can be considered to understand the process of convergence and same can be adopted to arrive at the justification. The introduction section looks to be limited in terms of genetic algorithm content. There is no discussion of ANSYS simulation study ... ● Detailed material property has to be mentioned with source for (Such as what is the source for these properties?) reference need to be mentioned for each if extracted from different sources ● Information about the material procured company address and location is a must in material and method section for others to read and imitate ● No information about type of contact generation? No information about tetrahedral element type? ● What is the rule to select the element size? Any thumb rule used discuss the same ● Number of nodes and elements have to be mentioned in the discussion ● For any kind of simulation all quality parameters need to be checked. What about other quality parameters such as warpage, Jacobian, skewness, minimum edge length etc. ● Table 2 talks about thermal properties of local materials but it does miss information about CEB, ADOBE and CLB that from where these materials are procured? Section talks about thermal analysis but no information about how it is executed in simulation. Need to focus on conduction, convection how it is solved?	

	● Results and discussions are acceptable only with any correlation between the current used material and existing models in public domain ● There is no comparative study with analytical/experimental/simulation for validation of the extracted results ● Validation analysis is missing the comparative study not even a single citation is considered inside this? ● Results are accepted only when a loads and boundary condition related information is shared for each of the case. ● The discussion section lags in explanation with respect to the work carried out. there are no citations in discussion section to compare the work with existing materials ● Conclusion looks to be generic need to compile the outcomes and state based on the tests conducted and convey how best this can fit in the current context for any application. ● In conclusion section, values have to be displayed with explanation. It's better to mention the salient features of the entire work in terms of bullet points with current context	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* Currently 11% can be reduced to less than 10%	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Arun Y Patil**
Department, University & Country	**KLE Technological University, India**