# ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
## 2018 DCA CONFERENCE

**Abstract Number: 037**

**Abstract/Paper Title: From 2D Klimts Art Work to 3D Architectural Façade with Fluidic Forms**

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 | | | 7 |
| 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 | | 6 |
| 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 | | | 7 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | | X | | 5 |
| 8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant. | | X | | 4 |
| 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: 64** | | | | |

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**
The work is original and pertinent to the conference main 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 presentation of the content is not always very clear and in the absence of visuals it was difficult to evaluate the abstract. Nevertheless, the topic is very interesting and touches design thinking issues related to the translation from 2D to 3D or viceversa.

Please, try to reinforce the literature review on this topic, which was not addressed in the abstract: are there similar case-study applications or teaching experiences that are worth to mention?

**Reviewer Recommendation:**
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.
**(X)** 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: 37**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Klimt**

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 | | | 7 |
| 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 | | 4 |
| 4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections. | | X | | 4 |
| 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 | 3 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | | | X | 3 |
| 8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant. | | X | | 4 |
| 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 | | 6 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 40** | | | | |

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**
The abstract describes a process of form generation based on using images from Gustav Klimt, though it's not clear why Klimt is the specific artist chosen for the exercise. Some general attributes of his work are mentioned, but not mentioned is how Klimt was selected in lieu of myriad other artists – why is Klimt a better choice than Picasso, or any number of others? At least as it's described in the abstract, it's not clear what is truly novel about this approach of 2D-to-3D, image-to-mass, form/concept generation – exercises like these are common in academic design studios and frequently described in conference papers. What makes this particular study different? How is the effectiveness of the exercise being evaluated? How does this exercise fit into the larger curriculum or class? Also, the writing is unnecessarily floral – invented words like "formativeness" don't help to clarify the writer's intentions. Keep it as simple and clear as possible.

**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: 37**

**Abstract/Paper Title: From 2D Klimt's Art Work to 3D Architectural Façade with Fluidic Forms**

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 | ■ | | | 8 |
| 12. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice. | ■ | | | 8 |
| 13. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly. | | ■ | | 6 |
| 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. | | ■ | | 6 |
| 16. The research study methods are sound and appropriate. | | ■ | | 6 |
| 17. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | ■ | | | 10 |
| 18. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant. | | ■ | | 6 |
| 19. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | | ■ | | 6 |
| 20. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees | ■ | | | 8 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows:** | | | | **74** |

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**
- Illustrations missing
- Methodology of analysis is not clear
-  Might be useful to add a section on "lessons learned."
- Why focus on Klimt art? Is fluidic architecture related to other art genres (e.g. surrealism, suprematism?) need to make the case for selection?

**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**