The article is trying to distinguish between diverse mapping strategies. These are divided in two categories: on the one hand out of the field of data sonification and design of new musical interfaces, and on the other those born of purely creative pursuits, such as algorithmic composition. At the same time it strives to provide an inventory of such strategies, as a model for new composers to use as springboard to devise their own. It tackles these objectives by posing a series of 10 questions to 6 different composers and analyzing the ground the answers share, as well as their divergences. The questions are very general in nature, but are all related to mapping strategies in composition. The apparent goal is to generalize idiosyncratic practices into a set of general principles: complexity in data requires a simple (linear) mapping, and vice versa; and musical coherence trumps intelligibility of underlying data.

I found interesting the way the article is laid out, like 6 different interviews intermingling at the same time. This allowed easy comparison between points of view and permitted singling out very personal opinions that diverged from the rest. The comparisons with purely utilitarian approaches to mapping was really interesting, as is something I tried to explore in an early paper.

It could be argued that too much emphasis was placed in the author’s points of view and how they intersected with everyone else’s. Another approach would have been possible by taking into account divergences in opinions an exploring ways to associate the apparent disparities