ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE

Abstract Number: 142

Abstract/Paper Title: Cardinal Divide: Inverting the Stigma of Borders as Dividers

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	√			8
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.	√			10
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	√			10
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.		√		7
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.		√		7
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		√		6
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	√			10
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.			√	3
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		√		5
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	√			10
Please Add Total Points from All Rows:			76	

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

Sounds great, Do you have specific study/design methods? Define what work has been done by the author and expain the viable options. What projects/evidence are used to support the idea/thesis/claim? - Citations that support the work, properly formatted - A clear explanation of the main results - Conclusions of the work and the recommendations of the author

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: 142

Abstract/Paper Title: Cardinal Divide

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			■	0
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.			■	2
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.	■			8
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.			■	0
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees			■	0
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 26				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The topic is more suited for the "ACSA" conferences. It does not conform or address the DCA conf. theme.

Too much background information and very little propositions. The problem I note is that the proposed paper does not exhibit any subjective research. Critical research is so important to support your argument or else it will read as an opinion.

Good luck.

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: 142

Abstract/Paper Title: Cardinal Divide: Inverting the Stigma of Borders as Dividers

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,
1. Proposed abstract/pap			x	3
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.	x			6
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	x			8
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.	x			7
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			7
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	3
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 59				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback)

While this is an interesting topic and proposal, it does not appear to address the theme of the conference or the general topic of Design Communication. Other than the first line of the abstract, which refers to "…when we draw lines on a map?" there is no reference or connection to the role that drawing, modeling, or other design communication media might play in this proposal or design. I kept waiting for something to bring that initial line back into the discussion or approach but it was not evident. This paper would likely be a better fit at an ACSA conference or at another organization. Well written and an interesting proposal but it appears to be outside of the scope of this concept.

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**