

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

Abstract Number: 028

Abstract/Paper Title: A meeting on the corner of Physical and Technological

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			8
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.			X	3
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.		X		5
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.			X	2
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.			X	0
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.			X	2
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		X		5
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	2
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees		X		6
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 33				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The proposed content is pertinent to the conference topics and offers a critical point of view, even if not very original in the present form. In any case it is not clear what the author/s will present in the full paper: a teaching experience? The abstract does not provide clear insights about how case-study applications and literature review will be addressed: is it going to be a critical position paper or an excursus on design experiences by students? For instance, on the proposed topics there is a rich state-of-art, both on case-study applications in teaching experience and in design thinking theory.

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: 28

Abstract/Paper Title: Physical and Technological

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	2
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.		X		5
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.			X	2
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.			X	2
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.			X	2
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	X			7
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.			X	2
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.			X	2
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	X			9
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 42				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The topic is quite relevant, but unfortunately the abstract gives no indication of how the topic has been studied and how the results of the study might be evaluated. If the abstract had given any indication of *what* are the “practical methods” mentioned in the final line, it would be much more clear what’s actually being done in terms of research, or pedagogy, or assessment of approaches. Without this level of explanation, it’s impossible to know what the paper is really about and whether it shows promise for the conference.

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: 28

Abstract/Paper Title: A meeting on the corner of Physical and Technological: Strategies for teaching the digital design student

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.				9
13. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.				9
14. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.				2
15. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.				2
16. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.				2
17. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.				10
18. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.				3
19. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.				3
20. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees				10
Please Add Total Points from All Rows:				60

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

- Reads more like an opinion/position paper rather than research
- Good questions listed but need to back it up with data
- Too generic in its tone right now

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**