

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: Christian Degn Andreasen, Kristian Fløjman Pedersen, Yannick Poirel, Andreas M. Poulsen, Kristian Brouer Seedorff

Title of article: Creating awareness on energy consumption through design

Referee's name: Mads Tofte

	<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?	<u>5</u>	4	3	2	1
Is the subject matter relevant to the DMD area?	<u>5</u>	4	3	2	1
Is the intellectual level appropriate?	5	4	3	2	<u>1</u>
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?	<u>5</u>	4	3	2	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):

It is unclear what question the paper tries to answer, partly because the sentence that defines the question is not meaningful (my question marks): “The goal is to methodology [?] find answers to the question of: How do people react when made aware of their energy consumption and can we encourage reflection through [?]” Guessing that the second question mark should be “design”,

the question is a rather weak one, in the sense that the answer is trivially “yes”, *some* people can certainly be encouraged to reflect on their energy consumption, see for example Richard Ling’s work on energy bills in Norway. In fact, it is already well known in the literature that not only can feedback cause users to reflect, it can also cause them to reduce their energy consumption considerably. Papers concluding this exist and should have been referenced.

In the discussion and conclusion, the authors, not surprisingly, do conclude that some users were caused to think of energy consumptions, others not. The only thing one can conclude from this part of the conclusion is that the sign in front of the elevator did make at least one person think about his or her taking the stairs, but not one single instance of the experiment changing the behavior of the interviewees is reported (nor is it clear that no so change in behavior took place). One may interpret the last half of the conclusion as saying that the authors found changing the behavior of users at ITU harder than they anticipated. If so, the explanation that users are not as careful about not wasting energy when at the university as they are when at home is plausible and backed by some respondents.

The authors deserve credit for conducting experiments in a real-life situation involving real users and a real design. Because of the problems stated earlier, the paper should not be accepted as is, but it is quite possible that a careful reformulation of the research question can be answered using the already collected data, leading to a good paper. Even a negative conclusion, e.g., “The sign and the Arduino device did not make any of the 50 people we interviewed change from the elevator to the stairs.” would be interesting (and a strengthening of the current conclusion).

The paper needs careful proof reading (many occurrences of “was” should be “were”, for example).

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