ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE

Abstract Number: 025

Abstract/Paper Title: A SUBURBAN HORROR STORY

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	2
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.	X			8
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	X			7
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	3
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	0
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.			X	4
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees			X	3
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 44				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):
The work is very original and the investigation proposed is intriguing. Nevertheless, it has very little connection to the main conference objectives. Thus, presenting the paper to the audience in the actual form would not bring a great feedback to the author/s.

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.

Please, reinforce the literature review of similar case studies in the teaching practice.

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)

(X) 3. **Not Recommended**

ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE

Abstract Number: 25

Abstract/Paper Title: Suburban Horror Story

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	2
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	3
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		5
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		X		5
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		X		4
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.	X			7
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		X		4
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	X			6
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 48				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

Interesting design studio project, though it's not clear how it relates to design communication, the broader aims of design pedagogy, or the conference topics. It's not clear whether residential typology is actually the focus of the paper (as stated in the first line), or if the opposite of typology (i.e., unique, one-off, custom design) is really the focus. It seems apparent that the author is questioning the validity of residential typology, and is thus having her or his students go *against* type in a situation that ordinarily calls for it. The abstract gets a bit lost in jargon and the repetition of certain terminology, and doesn't always communicate clearly the intentions of the study. Again, the studio project sounds interesting, but the abstract doesn't explain how the pedagogical aims are being evaluated, and therefore, finally, why the project might be useful to others.

Reviewer Recommendation:
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.

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

(x) 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: 25

Abstract/Paper Title: A SUBURBAN HORROR STORY

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			■	2
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.	■			10
16. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.	■			10
17. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	■			10
18. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.		■		7
19. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		■		7
20. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees			■	2
Please Add Total Points from All Rows:				**78**

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):
- **Not related to virtual-physical theme**
- **Very interesting methods used**
- **Would like to see more process drawings**

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**