

Peer-Review form

Please comment on the paper with regard to the following general criteria. If more than one response is pertinent, check all relevant boxes.

Paper Title:

Combating Urban Stratification: Building Fresh Strategies for Integrative Symbiotic Urban Interventions

Content and Relevance

Is the paper appropriate to the conference theme(s)?

Very Appropriate Appropriate Somewhat appropriate Not appropriate

If it has specific in focus (for example a case study) does it also raise relevant issues of general concern in its field(s)?

Very relevant Relevant Somewhat relevant Not relevant

If it is a general overview, does it back up arguments with sufficient specific examples?

Ample Sufficient Lacking

Significance

Does the paper deal with issues of importance or interest to some / all of the following discipline areas:

Architecture Media Politics Sociology Other (please explain)

Does it deal with significant questions in the fields of:

Practice Education Theory

Is the paper likely to stimulate debate?

Very likely Likely Somewhat Likely Not likely

Originality and Quality

To what extent does the paper represent original primary research?

Very original Original Somewhat original Not original Not applicable

To what extent does the paper represent original theoretical insights?

Very original Original Somewhat original Not original Not applicable

Does the paper introduce new findings of interest to the conference?

Very novel **Novel X** Somewhat novel Not novel

Does the paper meet expectations in terms of depth and range of analysis?

Exceed **Meet X** Does not meet

Citation / Formatting

Does it follow the AMPS formatting template?

Yes **Somewhat X** No

Is it within the word limit?

Yes **Approximately X** No

Clarity of Expression

Are the principal ideas / arguments clearly and convincingly explained?

Very Clear X Clear Somewhat Clear Not clear

Is the standard of written English appropriate / sufficient for publication?

Ready for publication X In need of minor copyedit Not sufficient

Type of copyedit recommended:

None X Minor proofreading (grammar) Minor proofreading (clarify) Major copyedit (English expression)

Other comments to the author or reviewers:

Comments for the reviewers: this will fit clearly in the housing strand of the conference. It discusses policy rather than designed so if there is a particular strand on this obviously that is the place for it. If not it could it potentially in a strand on the economics and politics of the city and developments therein.

Comments for the author: this reads as a very sound and logically argued paper. The use of case studies in New York allows the opening speculative theory to be grounded. More specifics on the case study would be a logical next step for the presentation.

Status: Accept