ABSTRACT/PAPER REVIEW FORM
2018 DCA CONFERENCE

Abstract Number: 118

Abstract/Paper Title: Logical_Illogical

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			8
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	X			10
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			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.				Na
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			9
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 77				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

Some terms could use more definition and context (i.e., thickness.)

In the research methodology a case study?

Reviewer Recommendation:
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.
(x) 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: 118

Abstract/Paper Title: Logical Illogical

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			9
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	x			8
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.	x			8
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.	x			8
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.		x		6
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	x			8
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.	x			8
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			8
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 73				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):
The abstract depicted a thoughtful methodology of comparing the real and the virtual. It is also a welcome venture into the studies of canonical work in architecture. It would be clearer if the abstract outlined the methodology in assessing the comparisons between the physical and the virtual models.

Reviewer Recommendation:
Please indicate which of the following actions you recommend.
(X) 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: 118

Abstract/Paper Title: Logical + Illogical: The Counterintuitive Construction of Interior Effects

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	v			8
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			8
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.	v			8
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.		v		8
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.	v			8
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.	v			8
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.	v			8
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		v		7
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	v			9
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 78				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

It would be interesting to see a stronger and much more elaborate conclusion to this paper. Beyond the particular studio projects described by the author, if we reject the haptic vs retinal = physical vs digital - how do we rethink that relationship in more general, but in-depth, terms?

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

( ) 2. **Recommended with Reservation** (suggest changes to the manuscript as specified in this review)

( ) 3. **Not Recommended**