



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_20496
Title of the Manuscript:	A testing procedure to analyse the effect of window coverings
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The effect of window coverings on the heat flux received by a chamber modeling a building or a house is investigated. The idea, the calibration and the experimental results are interesting but thermal properties and instrument characteristics are lacking, which could help the authors to interpret the results. Authors are requested to improve the text with more physical aspects. 1) The radiative properties of the surfaces (emissivity, absorptivity, reflectivity and transmittance) should be considered in the study for the glass and the window coverings. An analysis based on these properties could be conducive. An example of study is attached (Logerais-2015.pdf, see pages 5 and 6) 2) The radiative source is a halogen lamp. Its spectral characteristics have to be provided namely the emission domain. 3) The heat flux sensor characteristics are not given. This is an important point. 4) Line 131: the type of IR camera has to be mentioned with eventually its main properties. Please indicate that the apparent temperature is depicted. 5) Table 1: Indicate the calculation of the heat transferred. 6) Please give more details about the air-conditioned system. 7) Please correct: - Line 40: the solar irradiance (and not the solar radiation) is plotted.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Line 42: "certainly" should be removed, this fact is sure. - The references are not quoted in the right order.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The paper is well written. Please improve the text with the following points. The corrections to be made are given in American English. Line 6: to empirically assess Line 7: The ability of the window coverings to minimize the heat gain Line 13: It was found that the thermal conductivity of window covering materials (and R-value indirectly) seemed to be less significant. Line 15: color (modify whenever this word appears in the text) Line 21: optimization (modify whenever this word appears in the text) Line 32: behavior (modify whenever this word appears in the text) Line 32: wall and window systems. Line 35: In summer Line 36: a high solar altitude? (please check) Line 37: wall is limited. This is presented in Figure 1. Line 38: mid-height (use hyphen) Line 41: for external surfaces of modules Line 42: through the walls and the windows Line 44: 200W/m² despite the peak incident Line 46: 900 W/m². However, it was	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 54: (see Figure 2) Line 58 : Both windows had the same standard 3 mm glass panes (“identical” is correct, not to repeat) Line 61: 25% of the ratio of the floor relative to the window size (please check) Line 64: sensor arrays. Line 72 : for each chamber Line 80 : to search thermal bridges on Line 97: was achieved after continuous tests Line 98: control chambers are overlayed as presented in Figure 5 Line 107: It should be noted that the conductivity of aluminium is relatively high Line 112: window coverings Line 117: resisted to 80% of 1111 W/m² (please check values) Line 117: when compared to the controlled chamber Line 118: Even though the test was continued for over 9.5 hours (as per the testing 119 procedures), more than 60% of less heat was transferred to the testing chamber. Line 119: The higher R-value of 120 of the insulation panel might provide slightly better thermal “blockage,” resisting more to heat (remove “note”). Line 122: the best difference, of 39.7%, between both the chambers. The satin white panel enabled a 15% better difference than the satin black panel (Table 1).	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 136: a much higher one for the satin black panel (Table 1). Line 139: transferred by conduction Line 142 There is a dramatic difference ("It can be seen that" is useless so please remove). Line 151: can be absorbed and released Line 155: environnement than darker counterparts Line 156: the internal side of the chamber. Line 160: The facilities and testing procedures were positively assessed Line 162: The thermal conductivity of window covering materials (remove "It seems").	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Logerais Pierre-Olivier
Department, University & Country	Université Paris-Est Créteil, France