

◀ [Go back to manuscript \(/journals/archidoct/manuscripts/1943040-artistic-processes-for-the-foundation-of-a-new-architecture-1950-70\)](#)

🖨 [Print decision](#)

Publication Decision from *archiDOCT*

"Artistic processes for the foundation of a “new architecture”, 1950-70"

Decision made on March 11th, 2023

Editorial board's determination

Accepted

If you have any questions, you may contact the journal directly at maria.vogiatzaki@aru.ac.uk
(<mailto:maria.vogiatzaki@aru.ac.uk>)

Comments from the editor

Dear bianca felicori,

Having received the reports from the reviewers assigned to your manuscript “Artistic processes for the foundation of a “new architecture”, 1950-70”, the Editorial Committee of ArchiDOCT (<https://archidoct.scholasticahq.com/>) (<https://archidoct.scholasticahq.com/>) has accepted your manuscript that you can find below. Despite this acceptance we are kindly asking you to pay attention to any improvements suggested.

Meanwhile, you can also proceed to register to the Conference through the dedicated online portal: <https://store.anglia.ac.uk/conferences-and-events/conferences-events/fse-conferences-courses-and-events/fse-conference-courses-events/relevance-of-doctoral-research-in-architecture> (<https://store.anglia.ac.uk/conferences-and-events/conferences-events/fse-conferences-courses-and-events/fse-conference-courses-events/relevance-of-doctoral-research-in-architecture>) so that early bird registration is granted.

Thank you very much for your commitment and congratulations on having your abstract accepted.

Looking forward to meeting you in person in July, and discuss your research experience.

Kind regards,
Dr Valerio Perna
On Behalf of the Editorial Board

Reviewer 1

Rating scale questions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Effectiveness in explaining the specific issues addressed in the paper					✓
2. The paper is organised adequately			✓		
3. The paper is original and represents a significant advance in theory or knowledge				✓	
4. The literature review is adequate					✓
5. The research method is described effectively/clearly/accurately				✓	
6. The research method is appropriate and effective				✓	
7. The evidence is good and related to the paper				✓	
8. The evidence is presented effectively/clearly/accurately				✓	
9. The questions addressed in this study are handled creatively					✓
10. Rigorous, academic writing					✓
11. The title of the paper is precise					✓

12. Are the pictures/diagrams/tables presented in the paper necessary



Open response questions

1. Comments for the Author suggesting how, if necessary, the paper should be revised. Please write a text of max 500 words guiding the author to best revise her/his paper addressing the following points:

Very good and promising work with a suggestive topic an approach. It is important that the final full paper includes all references as in-text citations as well.

4. Additional Feedback Please read the comments below regarding the content of each section, by specifying the lines (number) where your comments apply: - Title - Abstract - Examples - Conclusions - References

No additional feedback has been considered.

Reviewer 2

Rating scale questions

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Effectiveness in explaining the specific issues addressed in the paper					✓
2. The paper is organised adequately					✓

3. The paper is original and represents a significant advance in theory or knowledge					✓
4. The literature review is adequate					✓
5. The research method is described effectively/clearly/accurately				✓	
6. The research method is appropriate and effective					✓
7. The evidence is good and related to the paper					✓
8. The evidence is presented effectively/clearly/accurately					✓
9. The questions addressed in this study are handled creatively				✓	
10. Rigorous, academic writing					✓
11. The title of the paper is precise				✓	
12. Are the pictures/diagrams/tables presented in the paper necessary			✓		

Open response questions

1. Comments for the Author suggesting how, if necessary, the paper should be revised. Please write a text of max 500 words guiding the author to best revise her/his paper addressing the following points:

no revisions necessary

4. Additional Feedback Please read the comments below regarding the content of each section, by specifying the lines (number) where your comments apply: - Title - Abstract - Examples - Conclusions - References

nope

Jump to section

- [Board's determination](#)
- [Editor's comments](#)
- [Reviewer 1](#)
- [Reviewer 2](#)