

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

Abstract Number: 69

Abstract/Paper Title: Rethinking circulation pattern in urban market at Dhaka

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			10
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		7
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.	X			9
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			9
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		X		7
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.		X		7
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			10
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 86				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

Applying mass motion to a case study with behavior in an urban space. Graphics are unclear on how they relate to the solution of integration. They are too small to read.

References are needed.

Would the optimized layout for the redevelopment proposal vary with different users during different times of the day and different days of the week.

On the fourth line, is it form of invention or form of intervention?

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: 69

Abstract/Paper Title: Rethinking circulation pattern in urban market at Dhaka

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		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		5
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		5
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: 54				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback): This paper, which discusses the use of agent-based simulation, should be of interest to the conference audience. However, there are three key areas the paper needs to improve:

- Discuss at least briefly other aspects that are related to urban development – land use, built character, transportation modes etc. and how they influence and are influenced by pedestrians
- Provide more specifics about the simulation itself, how the pedestrian agents were implemented, what characteristics of the agent were able to be manipulated in the simulation
- what advantages and limitations do you see with your approach to crowd simulation

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: 069

Abstract/Paper Title: Rethinking circulation pattern in urban market at Dhaka

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	X			8
12. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.		X		6
13. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.		X		6
14. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.		X		6
15. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.		X		7
16. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		X		6
17. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		X		6
18. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.		X		NA
19. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		X		6
20. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees		X		7
Please Add Total Points from All Rows:				6- 7

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The subject matter is compatible with the theme of the conference.

- The fragmentary structure of the paper should be developed.
- The conclusion doesn't reinforce the main objective of 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**