Author Review Overview paper1013

Overview

[All] [|All|]	**ReviewId**	20504	20353	20438	21049	20867	20878
[-][|+|]	**Summary**						

20504: This paper digital worfklow for the design and fabrication of 3D heritage puzzles. The workflow was applied to real-world CH assets. The contribution is the generation and fabrication of a physical puzzle. The input is a 3D model of a CH asset. The workflow is deployed with a late Iron Age burial urn from the area of Sussex.

20353: This paper describes a digital workflow for the design and fabrication of 3D heritage puzzles for museums gallery. The main challenge is to produce the watertight 3D mesh suitable for the puzzle generation.

20438: The authors describe the creation of 3D puzzles to enable user experience of pot sherds in similar way that archaeologists do. The requirments for the production of the puzzles as well as the steps from 3d data acquisition towards the full 3d model are described in a very clear and understandable way.

21049: All my comments have been addressed.

20867: This paper describes a digital workflow for the design and fabrication of 3D heritage puzzles for museums gallery. The main challenge is to produce the watertight 3D mesh suitable for the puzzle generation.

20878:

[-][|+|]	**Clarity of Exposition**						

20504: The exposition is clear. The the description is well explained.

20353: The exposition is clear and the process effectively described

20438: The paper describes a framwork for the generation of 3d puzzles for museum galeries. Target audience for using the printed puzzles are children in the age of 6 to 12years. The paper is very valuable for the clarity of its presentation, rather then innovative aspects of the technologies applied.

21049: Yes it is

20867: The exposition is clear

20878:

[-][|+|]	**Technical Soundness**						

20504: The work is technically sound.

20353: The process form the technical piont of view is well described and demonstrated by a 3D puzzle of a real artefact .

20438: All steps like from acquisition, 3d modelling, generation of individual puzzle pieces until 3d printing described and explained in a sound matter.

21049: Yes it is

20867: The process from the technical point of view is well described and demonstrated by a 3D puzzle of a real artifact .

20878:

[-][|+|]	**Quality of References**						

20504: Some references on 4D and 5D CH modelling can be included.
Rodríguez-Gonzálvez, P., Muñoz-Nieto, A. L., del Pozo, S., Sanchez-Aparicio, L. J., Gonzalez-Aguilera, D., Micoli, L., ... & Haynes, I. (2017). 4D Reconstruction and visualization of Cultural Heritage: Analyzing our legacy through time. The International Archives of Photogrammetry,

Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, 42, 609.
Logothetis, S., A. Delinasiou, and E. Stylianidis. "Building information modelling for cultural heritage: a review." ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences 2, no. 5 (2015): 177.
Kyriakaki, Georgia, Anastasios Doulamis, Nikolaos Doulamis, Marinos Ioannides, Konstantinos Makantasis, Eftichios Protopapadakis, Andreas Hadjiprocopis et al. "4D reconstruction of tangible cultural heritage objects from web-retrieved images." International Journal of Heritage in the Digital Era 3, no. 2 (2014): 431-451.

20353: the references are adequate

20438: good list of references

21049: Yes they are.

20867: References are adequate

20878:

[-][|+|]	**Reproducibility**						

20504: The work is reproducible. The explained work is well explained.

20353: the process seems to be competently described

20438: Based on the clear presention reproducibility is clearly given.

21049: Yes it can

20867: the process seems to be competently described

20878:

	Overall Recommendation	7	6	8	8	6	0
	Evaluation Confidence	5	3	5	5	3	0

[-][|+|]	**Explanation of Recommendation**						

20504: The paper presents a workflow for 3D puzzle fabrication for CH assets. The paper is technically sound and somehow original.

20353: the workflow for creating 3D puzzle is clear. It takes into account only the shape of the object with no particular reference to the history of the object itself. A comparison with other methods regarding the costs is lacking

20438:

21049: My comments have been addressed.

20867: A comparison with other methods have been added

20878: