

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

Abstract Number: 024

Abstract/Paper Title: Integrating Revit in the Beginning Design Studio

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		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		6
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		X		6
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		X		6
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.			X	4
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: 60				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The work is pertinent to the main conference objectives. Nevertheless, the content proposed is very broad, addressing design thinking in education (and partly in the professional domain) over a long time of teaching experience. I suggest the author to focus on a specific topic (maybe on the survey part?), otherwise given the short extension of a full conference paper, the content risks to be presented in a superficial way.

I suggest the author/s to better address and critically discuss the overall topic of the conference, namely the relationships between virtual and actual in the process and product of design execution.

Please, reinforce the literature review of similar case studies as well.

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: 24

Abstract/Paper Title: Integrating Revit

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		6
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		4
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.	X			8
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		X		6
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.		X		4
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):

The subject is potentially interesting, but the research seems to be headed in many directions – it's difficult to know what will be the real focus of the study. Most of the scores above reflect this lack of clarity or focus – for example, regarding question #2, it's not clear what, specifically, is novel about the author's approach to integrating Revit into beginning design studios. Some terminology is used but not clarified (e.g., "selective taxonomy" or "containment thinking"), though the brief length of the abstract allowed further explanation.

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: 24

Abstract/Paper Title: Integrating Revit in the Beginning Design Studio

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.				9
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.				9
16. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.				9
17. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.				10
18. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.				8
19. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.				10
20. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees				10
Please Add Total Points from All Rows:				95

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

- **Might be worth making some connections to existing research literature from CAD types of conferences**
- **Interesting paper and useful**

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**