

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: Tim Løye Skafte, Martin Hansen, Bjørn Toft Madsen, Lau Nielsen, Lars Westergaard Thomsen

Title of article: Communicating Future Energy Challenges through Games

Referee's name: Peter Sestoft

	<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	4X	3	2	1
Is the subject matter relevant to the DMD area?	5X	4	3	2	1
Is the intellectual level appropriate?	5	4	3X	2	1
Is the paper written and structured clearly?	5	4	3X	2	1
Are there adequate references to related work?	5	4	3	2X	1
Are there sufficient graphics?	5	4	3	2X	1

Recommendation (select one only)

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

Comments for the editors only:

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

The paper studies an important question (the effects of the not-in-my-backyard or NIMBY phenomenon in relation to renewable generation of energy) and does it in an interesting way (by letting people play a board game).

The main conclusion is that a majority of players focus more on winning the gameplay than on the expected subject proper (the NIMBY phenomenon, the required scale of construction for

renewables-based energy production, etc). The paper suggests that a digital game might work better and offers some reasons for this.

The paper does not discuss the (possible threats to the) validity of the observations. For instance, what is the influence of the test subjects' age, and the environment from which you recruit them? Young people seem less concerned about environmental noise than older people, and (young) people who do not own real estate are less likely to be concerned about spoiled views, noise, and reduced property values than those who do.

Is the classification into "gamers and non-gamers" (section 5) solely based on their behavior in the game, or based on some other evidence?

It is difficult to see that the paper presents evidence for the abstract's statement "indicated a very low level of reflection on energy changes in relation to the Danish 2050 energy plan.

The paper does not mention that most large-scale windfarms being planned are put off-shore, where they are mostly not visible or audible from the coast. Did any players mention this, or weren't they at all aware of it?

It would be interesting to introduce into the game mechanics the conflict between (relatively cheap-to-build, noisy, ugly) on-shore wind farms and (relatively expensive-to-build and maintain, unintrusive) off-shore wind farms.

No part of the game itself is presented in the paper (eg board layout, central rules, game objective).

It would be good to refer to academic work on the NIMBY effect, and how to overcome or mitigate it (especially in the related area of siting nuclear power plants and long-term storage facilities for nuclear waste).

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