

Article

Impact of the design of walls made of compressed earth blocks on the thermal comfort of housing in hot climate

Césaire Hema ^{1,2,*}, Adamah Messan ¹, Abdou Lawane ¹, Geoffrey van Moeseke ²

¹ Laboratoire Eco-Matériaux et Habitats Durables (LEMHaD), Institut International d'Ingénierie de l'Eau et de l'Environnement (Institut 2iE), Burkina Faso

² Architecture et Climat, Université Catholique de Louvain (UCLouvain), Belgium

* Correspondence: cesaire.hema@2ie-edu.org, cesaire.hema@gmail.com

Abstract: This study investigated the impact of the design of wall systems, mainly made of compressed earth blocks (CEB), on the indoor thermal comfort of naturally ventilated housing in hot climates of Burkina Faso. Conventional housing was modelled and calibrated using the WUFI® Plus dynamic simulation tool based on typical field surveys and literature. This allowed testing the ability of different wall designs to impact the thermal comfort. Thermal discomfort was assessed through adaptive approach and was based on the annual weighted exceedance hours of overheating. Six designs of walls made of CEB and other locally available materials were simulated and compared to those made of classical hollow concrete blocks. The results of the simulation reveal that the profiles of thermal discomfort vary depending on the wall designs and building spaces. Thus, the wall made, from the outside toward the inside surface, of a plywood of 2 cm, an insulation layer of 5 cm and a CEB layer of 29 cm of thickness is the most suitable for annual reduction of overheating for the living room. Regarding the bedroom, the most adapted wall is made of 14 cm of CEB layer, 5cm of insulating layer and 2 cm of a wood layer from the outside toward the inside surface.

Keywords: compressed earth block, building thermal simulation, earthen material, thermal comfort, wall design in hot climate, weighted exceedance hour.

Nomenclature

T	temperature	[°C]
t_i	time step	[h]
WEH	weighted exceedance hour	[°C·h]
w_i	weighted factor	[-]
<i>Subscripts</i>		
air	related to air	
int	related to interior surface of wall	
inf	related to the lower limit of acceptability	
sup	related to the upper limit of acceptability	
op	related to operative temperature	
out	related to mean outdoor temperature	

1. Introduction

The energy performance of buildings is at the heart of policies in developed countries. Guidelines and standards are developed for this purpose to help designers and building practitioner to reduce energy consumption at all stages of construction [1]. Indeed buildings consume 30 to 40% of the primary energy on the global scale for maintaining comfortable indoor climate [2]. These percentages can be much higher in some southern countries. Throughout a case study in Burkina Faso, Coulibaly [3] showed that nearly 76% of the energy consumption in building is used to maintain acceptable comfort environment. This reveals the inadequacy between the building design and the climate. The directives put in place for the energy efficiency and saving are generally based on the reduction of the heat transfer coefficient of the envelope which are suitable for air conditioned buildings.

In regard to buildings without air conditioning and mechanical ventilation system i.e. naturally ventilated building – which is the case of most dwelling in Burkina – the bioclimatic approach presents the thermal mass as a suitable method to reduce thermal discomfort due to excessive temperatures in a hot climate [4]. Therefore, the building materials such as clay bricks, mud bricks, concrete blocks or compressed earth blocks (CEB), which have a high heat capacity, are recommended. These materials absorb heat from solar radiation at a slower rate and are very effective in countering rapid heat transfer [5].

However, providing the walls with a thermal resistance layer can allow to reduce the energy demand for cooling and therefore have an impact on the thermal comfort of the occupants [6]. Eben Saleh [7] investigated the effect of insulation material on the thermal performance of building in hot-dry climate and showed that better performance was achieved by locating the insulation layer on the outer side of the building envelope. Al-Sanea *et al.* [8] and Meral Ozel [9] reached the same conclusions. However, depending on parameters such as energy consumption the reverse construction system, i.e. placing the thermal mass layer outside and insulation layer inside can be more effective. Bojic and Loveday [10] studied the impact of the relative location of the wall layers. Through thermal simulation on a box with fixed wall thickness and U-value of $0.142 \text{ W.m}^{-2}.\text{K}^{-1}$, the authors showed that a wall with thermal insulation at the inner side can reduce energy consumption by up to 40% in case of intermittent heating. The presence of the insulating layer would not only reduce the variation of indoor temperatures but also restrain the heat transfer with respect to the outside climate. Therefore, a special attention should be given to the walls provided with a thermal resistance in order to take advantage of the cool climate at night in naturally ventilated buildings.

The problem, however, lies in the assessment of acceptable indoor climate and thermal discomfort. Theories on the thermal comfort have for a long time been based on a heat-balance model, predicted mean vote (PMV) and percentage of people dissatisfied (PPD) index model [11]. The adaptive theory of thermal comfort, defined in EN 15251 [12] and ASHRAE 55 standard [13], is developed to take into consideration the psychological and physiological adaptation of the occupants as well as the gap found between the expressions of thermal comfort and the PMV model, particularly in non-air-conditioned buildings [14]. Thus, the present study assesses the performance of the indoor climate of the different types of walls based on the adaptive theory of thermal comfort, especially on the weighted exceedance hours (WEH) as recommended by Silva *et al.* [15].

Significant improvement of the thermal comfort can be achieved through the design of the wall. Emmanuel *et al.* [16] performed a thermal modelling of a building under the climate of Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso) and showed that the parameters of the thermal inertia such as time shift and wave damping can be improved using wall made of double layers and provides with a CEB layer and an air gap. Coulibaly *et al.* [17] defined design of walls according to climatic zones of Burkina Faso based on the bioclimatic diagram. The authors prescribed high thermal inertia of the walls associated with natural ventilation in dry and in semi-desert zone. Rincón *et al.* [18] showed that the high-inertia earthbag technique leads to a reduction of thermal discomfort throughout the year.

In the previous studies, the design of walls was based on a static model of comfort, did not take into account the occupancy patterns and did not highlight the advantage of using an alternative sustainable material instead of the conventional hollow concrete blocks (HCB) walls. The present

study proposes to compare the thermal performance of different types of walls based on an adaptive index of discomfort and taking into account the occupancy profiles of building's occupant. For this purpose, a building was monitored in order to set up a calibrated thermal model. Then, based on the thermal model, the study investigated the impact of the wall design on the indoor climate. The study attempts to identify the wall systems that would improve the thermal comfort compared to conventional walls in urban architecture made of HCB.


2. Methodology

2.1. Case study building

The architecture of the modelled building is based on local and widespread building practices and architecture found in the urban areas of Burkina Faso. It is a one storey housing, F2 type, implemented by local real estate developers and shown in Fig.1. The roof of the building consist, from the top towards the interior spaces, of a steel sheet, a ventilated attic and a suspended ceiling made of plywood. Door and windows are made of metal louvers and are modelled as glazing fully shaded in the simulated software. From the outside to the inside, the walls of the building are made of 2 cm of cement coating, 15 cm of hollow concrete blocks and 2 cm of cement coating. The main façade of the building is oriented toward the geographic north.



(a)



(b)

Figure 1. Modest and classical urban housing in Ouagadougou (a) picture of the main façade, (b) plan and section view

The experimental measurements of the building were performed from March 20, 2014 to June 10, 2014 by Kabore as a part of his thesis [19]. The building was monitored using temperature sensors type TH from “Waranet Solutions” with accuracies of 0.12°C. The air temperature was recorded each hour in the living room and in the bedroom. At the time of monitoring, the building was at the end of the construction phase. Therefore, it was not occupied during the data collection and there was no internal heat source. The building was not naturally ventilated (doors and windows were kept closed) during the measurement periods. External measurements were also taken during the monitoring period, including: air temperature; relative humidity; wind speed and direction; global, direct and diffuse radiation.

In order to avoid the influence of the initial conditions of the model on the predicted results, the period from March 20 to 31 was not included in the calibration. It is believed that this 12-day period

was sufficient for the thermal model to converge with the actual measurement parameters. Thus, the calibration used monitoring data from April 01, 2014 to June 10, 2014.

2.2. Thermal model calibration criteria

The climatic parameters measured during monitoring of the building (Fig. 1) are temperature and relative humidity. The thermal performance of the model, i.e. its ability to predict the real thermal behavior of the building is assessed through the normal mean bias error (NMBE), the coefficient of variation of the root mean squared error (CVRMSE) and the correlation coefficient R^2 as recommended by ASHRAE [20, 21] (equation 1-3).

$$NMBE = \frac{\sum_1^n (x_s^i - x_m^i)}{(n-1)\bar{x}_m} \quad (1)$$

$$CVRMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_1^n (x_s^i - x_m^i)^2}{(n-1)} \frac{1}{\bar{x}_m}} \quad (2)$$

$$R^2 = \frac{\sum_1^n x_m^i x_s^i - n\bar{x}_m \bar{x}_s}{\sqrt{(\sum_1^n (x_m^i)^2 - n\bar{x}_m)(\sum_1^n (x_s^i)^2 - n\bar{x}_s)}} \quad (3)$$

With x_m : measured value; x_s : simulated value; $\bar{x}_m$: average measured value; $\bar{x}_s$: average simulated value.

2.3. Setting of the thermal model

In order to assess the impact of the wall design on the indoor climate, a modelling and simulation tool, namely WUFI® Plus v2.5.1.0, was used. The WUFI software allowed to model the heat and moisture transfer and storage in building components. In addition, it simulates the indoor thermal environment and is therefore suitable for addressing issues of thermal comfort and energy consumption in buildings. The mathematical modelling is based on the heat and moisture balance equations described by Künzle [22].

Based on the literature, the thermal properties that have been adopted with regard to the building envelope for the calibration of the model are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Thermal properties of building materials adopted for the modelling [19]

System	Material	d [cm]	λ [W·m ⁻¹ ·K ⁻¹]	ρ [kg·m ⁻³]	c [J·kg ⁻¹ ·K ⁻¹]	α ; ε [-]	U-value [W·m ⁻² ·K ⁻¹]
Walls	Exterior cement coating	2.00	1.10	1700	1000	0.40;0.95	2.54
	Hollow concrete blocks	15.00	0.80	1000	1000	-	
	Interior cement coating	2.00	1.10	1700	1000	-	
Roof	Paint metal sheet (color between red and orange)	0.15	50	7800	450	0.39;0.95	7.14
Doors, windows	Modelled as single glazing completely shaded	-	-	-	-	0,85 1	5.00 2

The initial thermal parameters of the monitored building have been extended to take into account the interaction between the occupants and the building. The modelled building is assumed to be occupied by two adults whose activity type is assumed "Seated, quiet" according to ASHRAE 55 [13], i.e. a metabolic rate of 1 met. The thermal insulation of occupants' clothes is fixed at 0.7 corresponding to an "underwear, shirt, pants, socks, shoes". The house is divided into several living spaces but this study focused on the living room and the bedroom. The occupancy profile adopted of both rooms during the weekdays are shown in Fig. 2(a) while the occupancy profile during the weekends are shown in Fig. 2(b) and Fig. 2(c).




Figure 2. Occupancy schedule of the living room and bedroom of the simulated building (a) during weekdays, (b) on Saturdays and (c) on Sundays

In order to assess the indoor thermal environment of the building over an entire year (instead of the 2 months during the calibration process), the weather data used are the typical meteorological year (TMY2) for the city of Ouagadougou.

In reality, the rates of ventilation and infiltration are governed by wind and temperature gradient between the exterior and interior air. For the purpose of the study, it is assumed that the adopted rates of ventilation and infiltration are fixed and remain constant for all designs of walls. The rate of air change is set at 0.2 vol.h⁻¹ between 8 AM and 5 PM and 4 vol.h⁻¹ between 5 PM and 8 AM in the living room and bedroom [18]. It is assumed that during the day (8 AM to 5 PM) the windows are closed to avoid exterior hot air. During the night times (5 PM and 8 AM) the strategy of cooling down the indoor air is based on nocturnal ventilation and therefore the windows are considered to be completely opened. The rate of air change in the ventilated attic of the roof is set by default at 1 vol.h⁻¹. No mechanical ventilation or cooling system is proposed.

2.4. Assessment of overheating discomfort

The assessment of the thermal discomfort is based on a linear regression of the adaptive theory of thermal comfort of the ASHRAE 55 standard [13] as indicated in equations 4-6. The adaptive comfort model is the most suitable theory for the assessment of the indoor climate given that the simulated building is naturally ventilated [23, 24].

$$T_{op,sup} = 0.31 T_{out} + 21.3 \quad (4)$$

$$T_{op,inf} = 0.31 T_{out} + 14.3 \quad (5)$$

$$T_{out} = (1 - 0.7)[T_{e(d-1)} + 0.7 \cdot T_{e(d-2)} + \dots + 0.7^6 \cdot T_{e(d-7)}] \quad (6)$$

With, $T_{e(d-i)}$: the main daily outdoor temperature for the previous day.

The operative temperatures outside the upper limit of 80% of acceptability of the model, i.e. high temperatures out of the comfort zone, are counted for one year. This is the thermal discomfort due to overheating. It is crucial to assess the thermal discomfort only during the occupancy periods of the building spaces. Therefore, the occupancy profiles are important because they are the main difference between different building spaces, i.e. living room and bedroom in the current case. So the time during which a room is unoccupied and the operating temperature outside the limits indicated by the adaptive model are not considered in the evaluation of the discomfort. In order to consider the intensity of the discomfort, i.e. how high the operative temperature is from the upper limit of comfort acceptability, an index named degree-hour or weighted exceedance hours (WEH) of overheating is defined [13]. The number of hours during which the operative temperature is out of the comfort zone (equations 4 – 6), namely t_i , is counted and weighted by a factor proportional to the gap between the acceptable limit and the actual operative temperature, $T_{op,sup} - T_{op}$. The WEH index of overheating is calculated using equations 7 – 8. Although episodes of discomfort associated with low temperatures exist, they are minimal and less problematic in hot and dry weather of Ouagadougou and are not considered in this study. The assessment of WEH is directly related to the occupancy profiles of the building spaces (Fig. 2). Indeed, the periods during which a room is unoccupied were not considered in the assessment of WEH.

$$WEH = \sum wf = \sum (T_{op,sup} - T_{op}) \cdot t_i \quad (7)$$

$$T_{op} = 0.5 \cdot T_{air} + 0.5 \cdot T_{int} \quad (8)$$

2.5. Walls design

In regard to the context of Burkina Faso, walls are generally massive and made of adobes, hollow concrete blocks (HCB), lateritic building stones (LBS) or CEB [25]. Firstly, the wall made of HCB and cement coating is considered as reference case because it represents 42.6% of buildings walls in urban zones [26]. Then, six other wall types based on CEB are considered in order to assess their ability to impact on thermal comfort. Fig. 3 illustrates different walls considered in the simulation.

The masse effect of the walls is assessed through the heat capacity and the insulating effect through the thermal transmittance values (U-value). Figure 4 presents the values of these two parameters in comparison to the reference case: the positive and negative values respectively indicate the values which are greater and lesser than those of the reference case. The mass effect on the thermal comfort is assessed through the wall made of CEB29 (CEB layer with 29 cm of thickness). The effect of the improvement of the thermal transmittance is assessed through the wall made of CEB14 +Ins (CEB14+Insulation) and Ins+CEB14. The coupled mass and thermal transmittance effects are assessed through the wall CEB29+Ins and Ins+ CEB29.




Figure 3. Constructive systems of the walls




Figure 4. Heat capacity and thermal transmittance of the walls

The properties of the classical materials (HCB, cement coating, roof, windows, etc.) were considered from the software database, while the review of the literature allowed to determine the thermal properties of CEB [27-30]. The values of the thermal properties of the building components remain the same from one design of wall to another. Only the position and the thickness of constituent layers varies from one simulation to another.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Calibration of the model

Fig. 5 shows the measured and predicted temperatures of the living room and bedroom on representative days during the experiment (from April-09 to April 16). The measured temperatures

of the living room in Fig. 5(a) and the bedroom in Fig. 5(b) range from 30.9 °C to 41.5 °C and from 31.5 °C to 41.1 °C respectively while the simulated temperatures range from 30.7 °C to 41.7 °C and from 31.3 °C to 41.1 °C. For the both rooms, the predicted temperatures are slightly higher than those measured. However, the shape of the two curves is similar and predicted temperature fit to that measured. Table 2 gives the criteria for validating the thermal model as well as the values obtained of NMBE, CVRMSE and R^2 . The values of statistical indices fulfil the validation criteria except for R^2 of the living room. The uncertainties of the thermal properties and of the measurements can explained the values of statistical indices. Nevertheless, since 0.87 is close to 0.90 and the other statistical indices have reached the required values, it is believed that the thermal model can be used to compare the thermal performance of wall system.





Figure 5. Evolution of measured and predicted temperatures in the (a) living room and (b) bedroom

Table 2. Statistical values of calibration indices			
	Required values for validation	Temperature of the living room	Temperature of the bedroom
NMBE	< 0.10	0.036	0.025
CVRMSE	< 0.30	0.048	0.035
R^2	≥ 0.90	0.87	0.92


3.2. Impact of wall design

Fig. 6 shows the weighted exceedance hours (WEH) over the year as a function of the walls design compared to the reference case made of HCB: positive and negative values in Fig. 6 depends on whether the WEH is higher or lower than that of the reference case respectively.

216



(a)



(b)

Figure 6. Profiles of thermal discomfort of 6 constructive systems compared to the building made of HCB for (a) the living room and (b) the bedroom

217 When considering the building space occupied during the day time i.e. the living room, the
 218 increase in wall thermal mass leads to the global reduction of the WEH compared to building made
 219 of HCB walls as illustrated by the graph CEB29 in Fig. 4 (a). Indeed, the U-value of wall made of
 220 CEB29 and those made of HCB is almost identical ($2.17 \text{ W/m}^2\cdot\text{K}$ and $2.21 \text{ W/m}^2\cdot\text{K}$ respectively) while
 221 the thermal mass (estimated by multiplying the density, the specific heat and the wall thickness) are
 222 $558 \text{ kJ/m}^2\cdot\text{K}$ and $310 \text{ kJ/m}^2\cdot\text{K}$ respectively. Therefore, the improvement in thermal comfort is only due
 223 to the thermal mass effect. When considering the wall made of CEB having a thickness of 14 cm, the
 224 indoor climate is more uncomfortable compared to that of HCB. The addition of an insulating layer
 225 to the CEB layer, i.e. the increase of the thermal resistance of the walls, has a beneficial effect on the
 226 level of overheating. However, the best opportunities to reduce the WEH are obtained when the CEB
 227 layer is placed at the interior side of the wall. Thus, the wall made, from the outside toward the inside
 228 surface, of a plywood of 2 cm, an insulation layer of 5 cm and a CEB layer of 29 cm of thickness is the

most suitable for annual reduction of overheating for the living room. The results on the room occupied during day time are similar to those prescribed by bioclimatic approach [17].

When considering the building space occupied during the night i.e. the bedroom, all constructive systems performed better than HCB wall in terms of reduction of WEH. The least efficient design of wall is CEB29 and the most efficient are CEB14+Ins and CEB29+Ins. Indeed, the only increase in thermal mass (CEB29) is insufficient when the room is occupied during the night but the addition of a thermal resistance layer in contact with the indoor environment allows improving the indoor climate. Thus, the most adapted wall is made of 14 cm or 29 cm of CEB layer, 5cm of insulating layer and 2 cm of a wood layer from the outside toward the inside surface.

These results show that the constructive systems implemented for the building envelope have an impact on the indoor climate and on the risk of overheating in the hot dry climate of Ouagadougou. Although the buildings made of HCB have many advantages such as easy implementation, constructive process well-known by local population, durability and low cost, in terms of indoor climate performance there are some alternatives based on earth materials. The design of the exterior walls of the building rooms must consider the occupancy periods and hence should not be unique for the entire envelope of the building. On the one hand, the thermal capacity of wall especially when it allows to store the heat from indoor ambiance is suitable for the rooms mainly used during the day. Indeed, the thermal mass is an opportunity to store the overheating during the day especially when it has been efficiently cooled during the night (nocturnal ventilation). This explains why the constructive systems CEB29, Ins+CEB14 and Ins+CEB29 performed better than the HCB walls. On the other hand, when the thermal resistance prevents the heat stored in the thermal capacity layer to reach indoor environment; this gives opportunities to increase the thermal comfort of the rooms occupied during the night especially since the cold air brought by the nocturnal ventilation is not used to cool the thermal mass but it is directly available to lower the temperature of indoor air.

These findings also highlight the complementarity of thermal resistance and thermal mass of exterior walls in houses without air conditioning systems. Provided with proper ventilation, double layer walls give more opportunities to improve the indoor climate than the conventional HCB walls.

Researches on earthen material for construction must therefore be directed toward these two properties, i.e. finding materials with high thermal resistance or high thermal mass, instead of materials with the both properties. This study also raise the question of the suitable thermal mass layer to be provided in double walls since the improvement of indoor climate between Ins+CEB14 and Ins+CEB29 or between CEB14+Ins and CEB29+Ins is weak.

4. Conclusions

The aim of this study was to improve the thermal comfort of houses in hot dry climate by using compressed earth blocks instead of hollow concrete blocks in the design of exterior walls. A computer simulation investigation was carried out in order to assess the weighted exceedance hours of discomfort of six designs of walls and compared to the wall made of hollow concrete blocks. The following conclusions were drawn from this study:

- The thermal comfort of buildings can be improved by the use of alternative sustainable materials such as compressed earth blocks instead of the conventional material used for walls, i.e. the hollow concrete blocks.
- Double layer walls in terms of thermal properties (i.e. thermal mass and a thermal resistance layer) must be consider in naturally ventilated buildings. They give more opportunity to improve the indoor climate than the hollow concrete blocks walls.
- The appropriate location of the compressed earth blocks layer (i.e. the thermal mass) in double layer walls depends on the occupancy periods of the rooms. The CEB layer must be place at the interior side of the wall when the room is mainly occupied during the day and at the exterior side when the room is mainly occupied at night.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express gratitude to the “Académie de la Recherche et de l’Enseignement Supérieur” of the “Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles (Belgium)-Commission de la Coopération au Développement” (ARES-CCD) for funding this study as part of an international research and development project “Amélioration de la qualité de l’habitat en terre crue au Burkina Faso-Improving the quality of earth-based housing in Burkina Faso”.

References

- [1] J. Laustsen, Energy efficiency requirements in building codes, energy efficiency policies for new buildings, International Energy Agency (IEA), 2 (8) (2008) 477-488.
- [2] J. José Vinagre Díaz, M. Richard Wilby, A. Belén Rodríguez González, Setting up GHG-based energy efficiency targets in buildings: The Ecolabel, Energy Policy, 59 (2013) 633-642.
- [3] O. Coulibaly, Contribution à l’élaboration d’une réglementation thermique et énergétique des bâtiments au Burkina Faso: Données de base multiparamétriques et modélisation thermo-aéraulique sous CoDyBa et TRNSYS, Université de Ouagadougou Burkina Faso, 2011.
- [4] B. Givoni, Comfort, climate analysis and building design guidelines, Energy and Buildings, 18 (1) (1992) 11-23.
- [5] S. Mirrahimi, M.F. Mohamed, L.C. Haw, N.L.N. Ibrahim, W.F.M. Yusoff, A. Aflaki, The effect of building envelope on the thermal comfort and energy saving for high-rise buildings in hot-humid climate, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 53 (2016) 1508-1519.
- [6] L. Long, H. Ye, The roles of thermal insulation and heat storage in the energy performance of the wall materials: a simulation study, Scientific Reports, 6 (2016) 24181.
- [7] M. Eben Saleh, Thermal insulation of buildings in a newly built environment of a hot dry climate: the Saudi Arabian experience, International Journal of Ambient Energy, 11 (3) (1990) 157-168.
- [8] S.A. Al-Sanea, M.F. Zedan, S.N. Al-Hussain, Effect of thermal mass on performance of insulated building walls and the concept of energy savings potential, Applied Energy, 89 (1) (2012) 430-442.
- [9] M. Ozel, Effect of insulation location on dynamic heat-transfer characteristics of building external walls and optimization of insulation thickness, Energy and Buildings, 72 (2014) 288-295.
- [10] M.L. Bojić, D. Loveday, The influence on building thermal behavior of the insulation/masonry distribution in a three-layered construction, Energy and buildings, 26 (2) (1997) 153-157.
- [11] P. Fanger, Thermal Comfort. 1970, New York: Mac Graw Hill, (1973).
- [12] B. EN, 15251: 2007, Indoor environmental input parameters for design and assessment of energy performance of buildings addressing indoor air quality, thermal environment, lighting and acoustics, (2007).
- [13] A.S. ASHRAE, Standard 55-2013, Thermal environmental conditions for human occupancy, (2013) 12.
- [14] F. Jazizadeh, F.M. Marin, B. Becerik-Gerber, A thermal preference scale for personalized comfort profile identification via participatory sensing, Building and Environment, 68 (2013) 140-149.
- [15] A.S. Silva, E. Ghisi, R. Lamberts, Performance evaluation of long-term thermal comfort indices in building simulation according to ASHRAE Standard 55, Building and Environment, 102 (2016) 95-115.
- [16] O. Emmanuel, Détermination des données climatiques de bases et caractérisation des blocs de terre comprimée pour l’étude du confort thermique dans le bâtiment en climat tropical sec, thesis Laboratoire d’Energies Thermiques et Renouvelables, Université de Ouagadougou, 2015
- [17] Y. COULIBALY, G. TIOMBIANO, Climat et confort thermique, (1998).
- [18] L. Rincón, A. Carrobé, I. Martorell, M. Medrano, Improving thermal comfort of earthen dwellings in sub-Saharan Africa with passive design, Journal of Building Engineering, (2019) 100732.

322

323



© 2020 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

324