



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_16700
Title of the Manuscript:	SIMULATION-BASED ASSESSMENT OF THE THERMAL PERFORMANCE OF HIGH-RISE OFFICE BUILDINGS IN GHANA
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		-
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some typos all along the text e.g. line 28 the citation year is 2012 but in reference is 2014 or in line 305 the unit is (1) but has to be (-1)	Thanks. In line 28, the reference is actually 2014. Have corrected it in the text. In line 305, have corrected the unit.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There no new science at all. All the presented issue are well-known and do present in literature. The paper is very well presented and robust and with a lot of (no new) scientific work within. In the policy of the present journal, the paper, in my opinion, could be suitable for publication.	I think the study present empirical evidence for a specific situation in the context of Ghanaian office buildings and that is not in literature. Again simulation studies always make use of a weather file. And once the weather file used is not the same as in literature, it does present something new.