# ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
## 2018 DCA CONFERENCE

**Abstract Number: 023**

**Abstract/Paper Title:** A Study of Mixed Reality Simulation For Architectural Space Design

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 | | | 8 |
| 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 | | | 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 | | 5 |
| 6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate. | | X | | 4 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | | X | | 6 |
| 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 | | 4 |
| 10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees | X | | | 8 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 59** | | | | |

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**
The work on the subject of teaching design and representation using MR is pertinent to the conference objectives. I suggest the author/s to better explore similar case studies and recent experiences of using MR in teaching. A more recent state-of-the-art compared to the one reported in the references can be found. At the moment it is not clear how the paper will develop and which structure it will have at the end: In the final paper I expect to see a critical discussion of the design outcomes, rather than simply a presentation of those design outcomes.

**Reviewer Recommendation:**
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.
**( )** 1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

**(X)** 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: 23**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Mixed Reality Simulation**

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 |  |  | 7 |
| 3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly. |  | X |  | 5 |
| 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 |  | 6 |
| 6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate. |  | X |  | 4 |
| 7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. |  | X |  | 5 |
| 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 |  |  | 7 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 56** | | | | |

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**
Appears to be a potentially interesting subject, though the abstract should be far more clear about exactly what is going to be studied, and how. Pedagogical comparisons are suggested between mixed reality and the "conventional learning environment," but it isn't clear how any differences and/or similarities will be evaluated.

**Reviewer Recommendation:**
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.
( ) 1. **Recommended** (no significant changes suggested)

(x) 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: 23**

**Abstract/Paper Title: A Study of Mixed Reality Simulation For Architectural Space Design**

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. | ■ | | | 10 |
| 13. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly. | | ■ | | 7 |
| 14. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections. | ■ | | | 8 |
| 15. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic. | ■ | | | 9 |
| 16. The research study methods are sound and appropriate. | ■ | | | 8 |
| 17. The writing is clear, concise and interesting. | | ■ | | 7 |
| 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. | ■ | | | 9 |
| 20. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees | ■ | | | 10 |
| **Please Add Total Points from All Rows:** | | | | **85** |

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

- **Good original project**
- **Needs workflow details**
- **Perhaps needs to limit the scope to 'aesthetics of light'**

**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**