

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

**Abstract Number: 013**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Historic Preservation: Sustainability**

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			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			7
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			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		6
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	x			7
<b>Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 7-</b>				

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

The abstract is explicit in summarizing the conditions ‘framing’ the study.

However, the potentially truly interesting content in the context of the DCA is the consideration of the collection of case-based study projects, about which relatively little is said.

What were the results and findings, what are the perspectives and suggestions for follow-ups?

Promising, needs work.

**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: 013**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Historic preservation as a vehicle ...**

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			10
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	X			10
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.	X			10
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.	X			10
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.	X			10
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	X			10
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.	X			10
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		5
<b>Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 90</b>				

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

A well composed abstract and an interesting project. High accept. Recommend the author more fully and more directly explore how design communication media is used and how the project is related to the conference theme "virtual + actual". Also describe clearly how modes of instruction were delivered if this focus is to be pedagogical in nature. In the paper and presentation, illustrate more specific instruction prompts given to students, and focus on any that should be elaborated upon. Address innovations that resulted from the study more clearly in the 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)

3. **Not Recommended**

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

**Abstract Number: 013**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Historic preservation as a vehicle for integrated design practice and sustainability**

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	v			10
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.	v			6
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.		v		7
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.		v		7
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.	v			9
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.	v			9
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	v			8
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.	v			9
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		v		6
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	v			8
<b>Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 79</b>				

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

- A lack of connections among IPD, historic preservation, and sustainability in the abstract
- What are the findings/results of this study?
- The purpose of the study is not clear
- Missing conclusion
- In-text citations

**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**