

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

Abstract Number: 152

Abstract/Paper Title: Urban Metabolism

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 | | 5 |
| 2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice. | X | | | 7 |
| 3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly. | X | | | 7 |
| 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 | | | 8 |
| 6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate. | | X | | 6 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | X | | | 7 |
| 8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant. | | X | | 6 |
| 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 | | | 8 |
| Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 65 | | | | |

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The topic sounds interesting, but the author was not clear about what the method of investigation would be or what the conclusion or outcomes, if any, were. There was limited bibliography.

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: 152

Abstract/Paper Urban Metabolism

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 | | 6 |
| 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 | | | 7 |
| 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 | | 5 |
| 6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate. | | x | | 5 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | x | | | 7 |
| 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 | | 5 |
| Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 56 | | | | |

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

Questions are there, answers and methods not.

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: 152

Abstract/Paper Title: Urban metabolism

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 | | 5 |
| 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 | 2 |
| 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 | 2 |
| 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 | 2 |
| Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 26 | | | | |

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

A possible contribution to the discourse around urban metabolism, and a good note on considering temporality as a first-principle of design. However, this abstract does not follow basic organizational structure/formatting, and makes no clear connection between the vague argument and any sort of evidence to support it.

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**