

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

**Abstract Number: 026**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Out of Control: An Examination of the Role of Tools in Architectural Authorship**

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			9
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.	X			9
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	X			9
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		6
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		X		6
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	X			8
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.		X		5
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		X		5
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	X			9
<b>Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 72</b>				

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**

The work is very pertinent to the conference objectives and original in the critical perspective offered by the author/s. I suggest to provide bibliographic references and eventually add some visual schemes and diagrams in order to communicate the change of the relationship authorship/tools over time from Alberti to today.

**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: 26**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Out of Control**

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		4
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.		X		5
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.		X		4
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			7
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		X		4
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	X			6
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	3
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	X			6
<b>Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 51</b>				

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**

Design authorship is certainly an interesting topic, and using Alberti as the place to begin the discussion makes sense. But what about contemporary assessments of authorship – in other words, what does the AIA and/or existing case law have to say about the definition of design authorship today? Also, there appears to be an assumption that the “unexpected and unpredictable” influence of technology on the design process is necessarily superior to sole human authorship. It would help clarify the intention of the study if the writer could establish how/why “novel new methods of form finding” are assumed to be the primary if not exclusive goal of design – because it appears from the abstract to be at the root of the challenge to design authorship.

**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: 26**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Out of Control: An Examination of the Role of Tools in Architectural Authorship**

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.				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.				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
<b>Please Add Total Points from All Rows:</b>				<b>100</b>

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**

- **Would like to see more process drawings**
- **Very original paper**

**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**