# ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
# 2018 DCA CONFERENCE

**Abstract Number: 129**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Parametric Intention**

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 | | 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 | | ■ | | 5 |
| 2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice. | | | ■ | 0 |
| 3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly. | ■ | | | 8 |
| 4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections. | ■ | | | 8 |
| 5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic. | | | ■ | 2 |
| 6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate. | | | ■ | 0 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | ■ | | | 8 |
| 8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant. | | | ■ | 0 |
| 9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | | | ■ | 2 |
| 10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees | | | ■ | 2 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 35** | | | | |

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

There is nothing polemic about this, it's just a report

How is this study unique, different, etc. Almost all schools of architecture do this, so why is yours different? If you answer this, you'll have a good 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)

**( x )** 3. **Not Recommended**

**Abstract Number: 129**

**Abstract/Paper Title:**  Parametric Intention: Embodying a Thorough Design Ideology

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 | | | 10 |
| 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 | | | 10 |
| 4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections. | X | | | 8 |
| 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 | | | 8 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | X | | | 10 |
| 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 | | | 10 |
| 10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees | X | | | 10 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 90** | | | | |

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

**Important topic to cover. It is not clear if the proposal is specifically innovative as others have worked to introduce grasshopper into studios, but there may be some aspects of the details in the teaching methodology that add new insight into this issue. A question that I would have is what happens after the three to four week introduction of grasshopper?  How is this new way of thinking further integrated into the studio?  What is the follow-up in subsequent studios?  This paper has a lot of potential and is a session that I would want to attend.**

**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: 129**

**Abstract/Paper Title:** Parametric Intention: Embodying a Thorough Design Ideology

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. | √ | | | 8 |
| 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. | √ | | | 8 |
| 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. | √ | | | 8 |
| 20. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees | √ | | | 8 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows:** | | | | **89** |

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

This abstract should be interesting for those with an interest in having computers define architecture.

**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**