

**ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE**

Abstract Number: 021

Abstract/Paper Title: Promiscuous Promise

Please mark the appropriate column and add mandatory written feedback below. The right hand column is for ranking by numeric number (1 being lowest and 10 being highest) for each row. Please add total.

	YES	Needs Work	NO	Please rank by a numeric number below for each row, 10 being highest 1 being lowest
1. Proposed abstract/paper addresses the conference theme or sub-themes		X		6
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.	X			7
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	X			8
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.		X		5
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.	X			8
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		X		6
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		X		6
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.		X		6
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		X		6
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	X			8
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 66				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The work is very original and pertinent to the conference objectives. I suggest the author/s to better address and critically discuss the overall topic of the conference, namely the relationships between virtual and actual in the process and product of design execution. The topic of translation is already a very promising ground.

Please, reinforce the literature review of similar case studies as well.

Reviewer Recommendation:

Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.

1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

2. **Recommended with Reservation** (suggest changes to the manuscript as specified in this review)

3. **Not Recommended**

**ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE**

Abstract Number: 21

Abstract/Paper Title: Promiscuous Promise

Please mark the appropriate column and add mandatory written feedback below. The right hand column is for ranking by numeric number (1 being lowest and 10 being highest) for each row. Please add total.

	YES	Needs Work	NO	Please rank by a numeric number below for each row, 10 being highest 1 being lowest
1. Proposed abstract/paper addresses the conference theme or sub-themes		X		6
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.		X		7
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	X			8
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.		X		6
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.	X			8
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		X		6
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	X			9
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.	X			8
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		X		6
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	X			8
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 72				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The abstract showed initial promise as a catalog of sorts, documenting selected examples of the cross-pollination that's occurred throughout the design/arts disciplines. In the end, it's apparently more focused on a specific approach by the author involving photographic and drawn abstraction and subsequent reinterpretation. At least as it's described in the abstract, it's not clear what is truly novel about this approach to form/concept generation – exercises like these are common in academic design studios and frequently described in conference papers. The most interesting phrase is at the end: "transforming the banal and mundane into the magical and marvelous." But the abstract doesn't describe how this is done, or, more importantly, how it is assessed. Who's to say what is "banal and mundane"? Can it be objectively determined? Likewise, how does one claim with objective assurance that something has become "magical and marvelous"? Answers to questions like these might lead to a more clear and compelling case for the specific approach to cross-pollination advocated by the author.

Reviewer Recommendation:

Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.

1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

2. **Recommended with Reservation** (suggest changes to the manuscript as specified in this review)

3. **Not Recommended**

**ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE**

Abstract Number: 21

Abstract/Paper Title:Peomiscuous Promise

(please copy and paste or type in title)

Please mark the appropriate column and add mandatory written feedback below. The right hand column is for ranking by numeric number (1 being lowest and 10 being highest) for each row. Please add total.

	YES	Needs Work	NO	Please rank by a numeric number below for each row, 10 being highest 1 being lowest
11. Proposed abstract/paper addresses the conference theme or sub-themes				10
12. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.				10
13. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.				10
14. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.				10
15. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.				7
16. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.				7
17. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.				10
18. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.				10
19. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.				10
20. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees				10
Please Add Total Points from All Rows:				94

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

- Need to articulate and address the physical-virtual dimensions of the work in more tangible ways. Currently is sounds a bit vague.
- Could some potential connections be made to deconstructive architectural communication?
- Very original

Reviewer Recommendation:

Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.

1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

2. **Recommended with Reservation** (suggest changes to the manuscript as specified in this review)

3. **Not Recommended**