

ACM SIGGRAPH

SIS Conference Reporting

30 - Submission Reviews - By Person

Generated: April 18, 2017 05:08:12 EDT

Question	Response
Id:	artpapers_0030
Title:	Awkward Consequence_a Virtual Reality massive performance
Reviewer #58:	
1) Contribution to the Field:	The authors create a series of environments that are distorted because of the presence of the different people in the experience. Because the concepts of altered spaces and collaborative environment art pieces in VR have been explored extensively, perhaps the claim that can be made is the access to such spaces is improved by smartphones with VR viewer cardboard holders.
2) Clarity of Exposition:	yes
3) Clarity of Exposition:	yes
4) Clarity of Exposition:	no
5) Quality of References:	yes
6) Quality of Support Media:	yes
7) Content:	yes
8) Supplemental Video:	na
9) Review Rating: (Please base your rating on the paper as it was submitted. 0 indicates no formal score provided.)	3.0
10) Explanation of Rating: (This statement will be shared with the authors)	The paper has some interesting insights and useful references, however, the claims made in the abstract are not necessarily addressed, namely "venues of exploration", the defining of "rich traditions of musical performances", or paths to investigate "the future role of VR". Maybe it is just that the claims are too general and need to be significantly refined. It is not convincing to state that live music and computer graphics account for "stereo reality" specially since stereoscopy is a technical term that entails information that may not fit the metaphor intended. What is political dimension? What is traditional graphic language? Why mention them if they are not defined? The aesthetic relationships addressed with the project also need to be defined better, with a more solid connection to the diegesis and mimesis idea, which is intriguing. Talking about meta narrative and anything meta seems like a digress. At this point the paper improves. In the end, saying that the actual sound of the performance drives the behaviors in the virtual world... does it refer to the behaviors of people or the behaviors of the assets in the scene? This needs to be explained better as it will make the difference between a screen saver and an actual interactive experience. There are VR works from the 90s that may help the authors frame their contribution better. Look up for example Petra Geimenboek's work, and also telepresence in VR.
11) Reviewer Expertise:	3.0
Reviewer #9:	
1) Contribution to the Field:	This art paper introduces a Virtual Reality (VR) experience that is worn during a live music performance. It's called 'Awkward Consequence (AC)'. The paper positions the work within various frameworks of inspiration, and in doing so aims to explore aesthetic parameters and the role of VR within society. The paper also aims to contribute to discourse on the characteristics of public performances. The reviewer is positive about the set-up of the artwork for as far as the material shown can be judged, but feels the paper needs work.
2) Clarity of Exposition:	yes
3) Clarity of Exposition:	no
4) Clarity of Exposition:	no
5) Quality of References:	yes
6) Quality of Support Media:	yes
7) Content:	yes
8) Supplemental Video:	na
9) Review Rating: (Please base your rating on the paper as it was submitted. 0 indicates no formal score provided.)	4.0

Question	Response
	This art paper introduces a virtual reality experience that is worn during a live music performance. It's called 'Awkward Consequence (AC)'. The paper positions the work within various frameworks of inspiration, and in doing so aims to explore new aesthetic parameters and a deeper understanding of the social and political role of virtual reality within society. The paper also aims to contribute to discourse on the characteristics of public performances. The paper provides good descriptions of the work, and has attached images that show some nice visuals, however without video documentation of the performance, audio material or video registration of the VR material (and how they work together), it is hard to judge the overall artistic quality. In spite of this, the AC is an intriguing art project with talented use of new technologies. With regards to the ark work, the reviewer is positive, in spite of the lack of moving images. With regards to the paper, this reviewer is of the opinion that the paper is a work in progress, with the potential to grow and make an important contribution to understanding new aesthetic experiences that (affordable) VR brings. This reviewer advises to take a closer look at the arguments and elaborate on them so that it is more clear to the reader what is meant. The reviewer believes that there might be a language barrier, that gets in the way of the clarity of the argumentations. This thought arises from the use of words such as 'massive' in relation to the performance- when the images shows a small group (if 'massive' is meant to refer to its potential, this should be mentioned in the text), but also from the flow of the English in some sentences. Text correction is needed if to be considered for publication. Examples: 1) "artists are not verbally narrating, nor they are (only) deploying characters." change to: "artists are not verbally narrating, nor are they (only) deploying characters." 2) "For example, although every artwork can be thought of as interactive [2], only with the creation of explicit interactive works, the art of interaction could begin to be explored." change to: "For example, although every artwork can be thought of as interactive [2], only with the creation of explicit interactive works, could the art of interaction begin to be explored." Review sentences for clarity. For instance, the following sentence is long and becomes unclear because it lacks the word 'than'(***) - "If to..., than new media art must also...: "If to see something as art requires something the eye cannot descry –an atmosphere of artistic theory, a knowledge of the history of art: an artworld" [11], '***' new media art also requires a techno-world, where the consumption of the technological object is complemented with an understanding (by both audience and creator) of its environment and social roles" The arguments built in the subject 'Image as stage, place as narrative' could use some more clarity in the jump from gesamtkunstwerk to Rococo and how it relates the the AC experience. For instance it is unclear what is meant with: "The audience is presented with a 'real object' during the performance". It seems to be referring to the music? The paper would improve with a more detailed description of the music used, and more detailed description of the explored aesthetics and its political and social implications, which might be clear to the author, but not to the reader.
10) Explanation of Rating: (This statement will be shared with the authors)	
11) Reviewer Expertise:	3.0
Reviewer #59:	
1) Contribution to the Field:	This paper opens with an well-referenced and rich discussion of VR as a semi-cinematic medium, but fails to connect the artwork "Awkward Consequence" to this discussion, and fails to contextualize the artwork in other contemporary work in VR. It's difficult to identify the novel and meaningful contributions of this paper, especially without supplemental video that better documents the artwork at the subject of the paper.
2) Clarity of Exposition:	no
3) Clarity of Exposition:	no
4) Clarity of Exposition:	no
5) Quality of References:	yes
6) Quality of Support Media:	no
7) Content:	yes
8) Supplemental Video:	na
9) Review Rating: (Please base your rating on the paper as it was submitted. 0 indicates no formal score provided.)	2.0
10) Explanation of Rating: (This statement will be shared with the authors)	This paper opens with an well-referenced and rich discussion of VR as a semi-cinematic medium, but fails to connect the artwork "Awkward Consequence" to this discussion, and fails to contextualize the artwork in other contemporary work in VR. To begin improving this paper, the author(s) should describe the artwork earlier in the paper, and include more images and video to describe it in depth. Next, the author(s) should connect the artwork the hypotheses or critical themes surfaced in the discussion of VR as an emerging medium. Statements like "an unapologetic abstract hyperrealism that celebrates the possibilities of the medium, while reminding us of its inherent strangeness" are too vague, and the conclusion that the artwork provokes and supports "an urgent need for artistic exploration of this new medium" is too obvious and insufficiently novel to be a contribution from this paper. Finally, the paper could benefit from a discussion of audience response.
11) Reviewer Expertise:	3.0
Submission Information:	

