The authors of the article are proposing a design for the de-channelisation concrete river channel in Jurong, Singapore. The authors offer a speculative investigation into the plausibility of softening the embankment and hybridising the embankment to include *recreational activity in a designed cool micro-climate, agriculture and water harvesting.*

The data being described in this graphic is a pivotal – it depicts how much water is captured in the entire Jurong water catchment – specifically the upstream catchment the channel being redesigned captures. I,e. This graphic tells us how much water the Jurong Channel captures from rainwater in the area.

**DATA:**

**Opening Critique:**The article uses Rhino 3D software as a platform to simulate, draft and problem-solve the problem at hand. It is therefore no surprise that the information is so 3D orientated.

I really enjoy the paring of the information in this data-set It depicts the geographic location, monthly rainfalls and water storage capacities being discussed in a single are. How informative!   
However, the informative nature may be its obstacle as it verges in being too congested.

The data captures quantitative data at varies scales. The left is nominal, the right is mostly interval with some ordinal. This means, the challenge is finding ways to correspond nominal information with values attributed to their arithmetic order.

**Improvement:**

1. **Complexity of information.** The information being given is dense and complex. Perhaps information that relates to each-other should be collapsed or relate in some form.
2. **Information overload subtleties.** There is subtle extra information that is certainly unnecessary. For example, although the contours speak to water flow, there is no way that is coming across in this image, but rather contributes to densifying the visual.
3. **Rain-fall and Stroage on a 3D Graph:** The graph on the right shows how much of the water captures on the left is stored in the months it falls in. The 3D nature of the article explains its use, but the already complex information is further complicated with use of this technique. It therefore takes away from any effort possible to link the related concepts to each-other.

**IDIOMS:**

**Opening Critique:**The pairing of the geographic map and the graph to indicate rainfall location and rainfall quantity is a great touch to help audiences grasp the context in which the rainfall qualities are being captured.

However, in separating the information and so densely populating it, it reads incongruently. Although, it could be argued that the simplest solution would be to separate the two graphs – the richness of it is found when the information is overlapped. This is why I ideate over its improvement.

**Improvement:**

1. **Text Readability could be improved**. The red text on each area indicates how much people live in the sub-regions. This level of information takes too long to realise because the text is small and the information feel disconnected from what the rest of the graphic speaks of.
2. **Colour is too muted:** The style of the article is muted to match the default style of Rhino 3D (so it is defensible) but for the purpose of presenting information colour would assist mentally mapping the information being presented.
3. **Graph Labels:** As mentioned, that the graph 3D – so it is already a bit confusing to have an x, y and z axis but the labels are not clearly indicated. Year is actually not indicated at all.
4. **Information Hierarchy**: The graph is making special attention to the point where ‘121mm’/’1 230m3’ of rainfall fell – a dotteed line to trace the axis would help guide what date that corresponds to. That line could also correspond to the ‘3 966m3’ of water stored.

Similarly, the number of people being catered form in the different regions of the upstream catchment area is information being highlighted, this needs to be brough out and made clearer.