

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

**Abstract Number: 139**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Boosting Realism and Spatial Experience with Everyday People in the Virtual Environment: Animated Avatars for High-Fidelity Virtual Reality Design Representation**

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	✓			7
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.		✓		7
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.	✓			8
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.		✓		5
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.			✓	5
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.			✓	5
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.		✓		6
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.			✓	0
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.			✓	0
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees		✓		6
<b>Please Add Total Points from All Rows:</b>				<b>49</b>

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**

*"This paper presents viable options for designers to convert 3D designed environments. . ."*

Define what work has been done by the author and explain the viable options. What specific methods were employed and what projects/evidence are used to support the idea/thesis/claim? - Citations that support the work, properly formatted - A clear explanation of the main results - Conclusions of the work and the recommendations of the author

**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: 139**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Boosting Realism**

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				7
2. The content contains some original ideas and contributes to research, or teaching, or practice.				8
3. The purpose of the paper is stated clearly.				8
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.				7
5. The content shows evidence of sufficient background reading and state-of-the-art research and topic.				5
6. The research study methods are sound and appropriate.				2
7. The writing is clear, concise and interesting.				8
8. The references and quotations are clear. The bibliography is updated and relevant.				0
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.				8
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees				5
<b>Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 58</b>				

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback):**

The topic needs further investigations to be presented at this conference. There is no counterpoint to the topic and that's not scholarly. Support your paper with similar research to endow it with credibility.

Good luck.

**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: 139**

**Abstract/Paper Title: Boosting Realism and Spatial Experience with Everyday People in the Virtual Environment: Animated Avatars for High-Fidelity Virtual Reality Design Representation**

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,
1. Proposed abstract/pap	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			10
4. The paper is well organized and contains all the relevant sections.	x			10
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.	x			7
9. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	x			9
10. Proposed paper will likely be of interest to conference participants and attendees	x			10
<b>Please Add Total Points from All Rows: 94</b>				

**Reviewer General Comments and Suggestions (mandatory written feedback)**

Very interesting topic—an area that one does not typically think of regarding VR environments. Overall, the organization of the proposed paper makes sense. It appears that the author will be providing a recommended workflow for the creation of these avatars. Will the paper also talk about the appropriateness of using one kind of avatar over another? Sometimes there can be a disconnect between the users shown and the real-life users of a design. Similarly, we can significantly alter the character of a place through the types and number of people we include in our design. This might be getting into the ethics of design communication a bit, but that could be a good branch of discussion for the paper. Overall, it would be an interesting presentation

**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**