

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: Atusa Zamani, Birgitte Krag, Chris Christensen, Michala Mathiesen, Peter Ellerhammer

Title of article: **Facts and fictions of the smart home**

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	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Is the subject matter relevant to the DMD area?	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Is the intellectual level appropriate?	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Is the paper written and structured clearly?	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	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
- X Request a major revision
- Reject

Comments for the editors only:



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

I really like the idea of comparing SF with imaginaries of smart houses. It is a good and relevant subject and I am sure it can lead to some interesting discussions and compose an important contribution to the field of smart homes.

However, I believe that the paper fails to really construct a debatable question, an argument and a discussion. As it is now, your discussion is only including a discussion of your method. I think it would be more interesting with a discussion on the relation between smart house and SF. Consider what you want to discuss with the 'result' that smart houses are very often inspired by SF. This argument is not new (that technological development is inspired by movies), so you need to discuss something with it. It seems like you are choosing 2 movies, which are both kind of 'technological determinists' and rather gloomy and dystopian, I think that you have to take that into account somehow and maybe discuss why houses seems to be imagined based on such stories. Somehow, you cannot avoid the surveillance discussion when you choose HAL. The vision of home information centers has survived a journey through five decades. The question remains, why is this vision so persistent? This seems like a really interesting question to discuss.

There seem to be some contradictions in the way it is written:

Ex: Therefore, in this paper, the smart home is defined as being fiction as well, as it is a way of consuming technology that has not yet been implemented in common households. How can one consume technologies not yet implemented? And already existing houses with technological systems not smart houses?

Ex. You use Harper's text from 2003 and say that not enough studies inside the home has been made. I don't think that is true anymore. There has been made loads of studies of domesticated home technologies and how they affect people's lives. You continue: He believes the home as an institution, develops itself throughout time, and adapt to the contemporary culture it is part of. There was a time where our needs in the home were different than they are today. Mere? If that's the case, why are the imaginaries of smart houses today then similar (your argument) to that of SF from the 1970?

Furthermore the paper does not seem to well written. Lots of mistakes, not tightly structured, and there are whole long text pieces copied in twice. The introduction is far too long and imprecise. Make it completely clear in the beginning what you want to do and what the reader can expect. I think it would be of benefit to the paper to consider how much space there is to re-tell movies? If an argument has been found, I believe it will be easier to only pick the most important things from movies. You say that you have picked 2 movies, but suddenly a third one (Moon) is re-told, that is confusing. The same happens with the smart house (House of tomorrow).

So, all in all, I believe this can become an interesting paper, but it needs a rethinking of the argument and the discussion, and then it needs to be rewritten and structured around this argument.

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