

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

Abstract Number: 120

Abstract/Paper Title: Typologies in Architecture Form understanding form complexity

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			9
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			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		8
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		7
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	X			9
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 73				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

Some work on the leap toward applicability to design may be helpful.

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: 120

Abstract/Paper Title: Typologies in Architecture Form - understanding form complexity

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		4
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.		x		4
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	1
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.			x	2
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.			x	2
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.			x	2
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		4
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 28				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

The literature overview of the concept of “typology” and other architectural terminologies, including “essence,” “form,” and “archetype” are rather thin and superficial. Certainly, the Italian manuscript of Aldo Rossi predated that of Rafael Moneo. The way the abstract discussed typology and other concepts was very reductive. Further, beside this very reductive literature overview, the abstract did not discuss the aspects of design representation as well as the methodology of assessing practical examples.

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: 120

Abstract/Paper Title: Typologies in Architecture Form | understanding form complexity

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		6
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.	v			8
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.		v		7
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.		v		7
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.	v			7
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		6
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.		v		6
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	v			8
Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 68				

Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):

This could be an interesting take on communication (DCA) and on virtual / real (conference theme), but author's position on both is not quite clear. To make the paper strong the author needs to elaborate on the relationship of the proposed typology, and / or methods of critical analysis and the issues of design communications / virtual / real

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**