ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE

Abstract Number: 117

Abstract/Paper Title: Documentation of architectural design and it process

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		5
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.		X		6
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.				Na
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		6
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		X		5
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.				Na
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
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 47				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

Number agreement problem in title and subsequent mechanical issues with language suggests a significant need for better proofreading before submission.

What is the connection between the design communication artifacts and the design process implied in the research?

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 Number: 117

Abstract/Paper Title: Documentation of architectural design and it process

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	3
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.			x	3
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.			x	3
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	3
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	3
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees		x		5
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 40				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):
In the abstract, it is not clear the differences between contemporary architectural photography and conservation documentation. It did explain terminologies that the abstract wished to problematize. A short outline of the method for analysis would be a helpful addition. Further, the issues, questions and the aims of the paper are not clearly articulated

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)

(X) 3. **Not Recommended**

ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE

Abstract Number: 117

Abstract/Paper Title: Documentation of architectural design and it process: Lessons from documentation of conservation of British Residency, Hyderabad, India

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		7
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.		v		7
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.			v	5
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.		v		6
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.		v		6
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		v		7
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		v		6
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.			v	5
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.			v	3
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees		v		7
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 59				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The abstract introduces two technologies of documentation but does not state what the purpose, or critical point of the comparison is. There is also no (not even a promise) of a strong conclusion. Description of the technologies, or even methodologies is not enough for a successful paper.

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**