

Short paper (4 pages in ACM-format) Research project and academic publishing, DMD 15 ECTS - referee's comments

Course description:

https://mit.itu.dk/ucs/cb/course.sml?course_id=1232604&mode=search&goto=1351772138.000

Author(s) of article: Jesper Dalsten, Jacob E. Halland, Kasper Nielsen, Mathias V. Stuhau

Title of article: **Imagined Home of the Future**

Referee's name: Lea Schick

	<i>Strong Yes</i>	<i>Weak Yes</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Weak No</i>	<i>Strong No</i>
Is the paper interesting, timely and thought provoking?	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Is the subject matter relevant to the DMD area?	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Is the intellectual level appropriate?	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Is the paper written and structured clearly?	<u>5</u>	4	3	2	1
Are there adequate references to related work?	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Are there sufficient graphics? NOT NEEDED	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1

Recommendation (select one only)

- Accept with no changes
- Accept with minor changes
- Request a major revision
- Reject

Comments for the editors only:

All comments are available for authors

Comments which may be shown anonymously to the author(s):

I find the paper very well written. It gives a clear overview of what it wants to do and also does it. Gives a nice introduction to an interesting area and a good comparison. The subject is highly relevant and important.

Where I think the paper is maybe a bit weak is in its lack of being thought provoking and a lack of controversy, a problem, something to discuss. Why is it important for me to know this? Why is it relevant, and what can I take with me for further research? I think the paper stays to

much on ‘safe grounds’, not really daring to take up a discussion. As it is now, the discussion part is only containing discussion on the method used. I would personally find it more interesting to discuss some of the findings, such as: Why do you think that it is exactly the 6 analyzed ‘themes’ that are continuing being in the center of imaginaries? Why is it interesting that the imaginaries of the future house has not changed much over the last 50 years, when the technologies has? What does it say about innovation, about us humans, about dreams and technology, that it does not change? What are the political implications of such houses? What does the houses tell us about the relation between humans and technology?

Furthermore I would consider focusing more on some of the differences, because there are significant differences – maybe not so much over time, but from home to home: ex. Corning is all about being with friends and family, whereas the HP man is all alone in the world and end up choosing tech over girl friend. Another interesting issue is the one that the Ford movie asks: “How much they got right, and how much they got wrong?” All the homes are about saving time and labor, but why are people more stressed than ever then? And finally I find it a bit odd that you have not chosen any smart houses including energy-management systems? I visited IPA this year where it was all about that.

So, all together my recommendation is to find out something really important (for you important and interesting) question you wanna ask yourself and discuss – something which you might not find direct answers to in your cases, but which you need to develop arguments to discuss. If you do that, I believe this will be a really interesting and intriguing contribution to the academic field of smart houses.

It might sound like ‘major revisions’, but I think the main part of the paper works as it is, it is simply to find a good discussion to engage with.

Suggestion to reference: *Energy impacts of the smart home – conflicting visions*
Sophie Nyborg & Inge Røpke

Referees are asked to complete this form electronically and return it to:
malmborg@itu.dk, jensp@itu.dk, annevejsel@itu.dk, nmpe@itu.dk