



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_62282
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of the Huichol vernacular dwelling through a thermal analysis of the characteristics construction elements of the pre-Hispanic era.
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Carefully check English. English requires significant improvement throughout the entire paper. 2) Graphs from 7 to 10 are not clear and easily understandable. There are too many lines and it is hard to distinguish them. In my opinion, the lines should be presented not only with different colors, but also by different line-types. The Authors must significantly improve visibility of those graphs. 3) It is not clear (at least to me), what is a scientific novelty of this paper. This element should be much better explained in the paper text and better highlighted. 4) In my opinion, this paper has a potential to be published – but as Review paper, not as Original Research Article. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Please, carefully check the whole paper and remove many obvious typos and errors which occurs throughout the paper text. For example: in the abstract – after word Jalisco should be putted comma and the rest of the sentence is a continuation of previous one (not independent sentence as presented). In Figure 1 title – in word Keuruwit+a remove +. Correct such mistakes throughout the paper text. 2) Figure 1 – highlight (bold) markings a, b, c, d, etc. in this Figure to ensure better visibility. 3) Inside the paper text is completely missing calls on the Figures and Graphs. It should be added. 4) In the paper text should be highlighted that data in Graphs from 7 to 10 are performed by using data available in the literature. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper is interesting and after proper and complete corrections it should be published as Review paper. the paper classification should be changed before potential publication as recommended in my comments above</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vedran Mrzljak
Department, University & Country	University of Rijeka, Croatia