

Final Review Report ISVSej_12.02.13_Akash
Compiled from Two Reviews

Please use this number to identify the revision.

Title of paper: **Creating Resilient Infrastructure And Responding To The Emerging Climatic Calamities: Scope Of Amphibious Architecture To Deal With Below Sea Level Settings In Kuttanads, India”**

General

This paper examines an issue related to the making of buildings related to water: being called amphibious vernacular architecture. The paper is reasonably well written. However, it has some issues that need to be resolved.

Title: The title needs revision. Following title is suggested: **Creating Resilient Vernacular Responses to Emerging Climatic Calamities: Possibilities of Amphibious Architecture to Deal with Floods In Kuttanads, India.**

Language: Language is reasonably good. However, write short and meaningful sentences, using appropriate connectors to construct an argument. Pay attention to definite and indefinite articles, which are often not well placed.

Formatting: This paper has major issues of formatting. Sub titles should be always 12 points. There should be a space between a paragraph and a figure below as well as the source and the paragraph below it always. However, there should be no spaces between paragraphs. First line of every paragraph must be indented from the left. Line spaces must be always single. Use the same font throughout. Moreover, bulleted or numbered text must be left-justified.

References are not formatted properly. Font size must be 11. They should have the second and third lines indented from the left. References should be listed according to alphabetical order. Do not use all capitals. Some references are incomplete.

Please use the ISVS e-journal template to the last dot.

Abstract

Abstract is reasonably well-written. However, the contents have some issues. First paragraph must introduce the issue of the floods. It does this well but the discussion is too long. It must then say what is examined at the end. Second paragraph must be about the research methods and the third paragraph must be about the conclusions.

Current second paragraph does not explain the research methods well. This research employs a case study method within which literature study, interviews and a survey have been carried out. Please explain how data was gathered and not what was the data. There are no conclusions mentioned in the abstract. What is written currently in the paper are also only concluding remarks. Please list the specific conclusions related to this issue briefly. It uses 'will' as if this is a proposal. Do not use 'will'. This is not a proposal. Abstract is written at the end of doing a research and even after writing the full paper. Write short sentences and be brief. An abstract must be succinct and there is no need to write at length. Complete within one page including the keywords.

Paper

- 1. The introduction:** Introduction is written reasonably well, in terms of introducing the issue, but it has issues. Its line of argument is abruptly broken. It should introduce the broader issue of the emerging floods in India. Second paragraph is repeated twice. Delete one. An introduction must say what it investigates and then the aims and objectives. In this paper, there are no aims and objectives.
Please note that aims are noble, unmeasurable, long term, almost-impossible-to-fully-achieve expectations while objectives are practical, measurable, short term, achievable intentions. Objectives must be always listed starting with 'To'. The introduction must end with them.

2. **Theoretical Framework:** This paper presents a theoretical discussion about 'Terp Dwellings', 'Static Dwellings', 'Pile Dwellings', 'Houseboats' and finally 'Amphibious Dwellings'. It should also discuss other theoretical notions explored in this paper. However, a theoretical framework must be produced employing the voice of the authors with statements such as 'according to Godman (1999), or Lawarence (2000) argues, instead of the author making statements and putting references within brackets. This theoretical framework does not have a single reference and that is not acceptable. The author of this paper cannot theorize because she/he is not a theoretician. Currently, what is written under this sub title is just the personal opinions of the author. It is a discussion about the ideas as the author understands them, which is inadequate. Please produce a proper theoretical framework by referring to theoreticians. Define the terms first.
3. **Review of Literature:** A review of literature should discuss the major research that have examined the issue previously, to show the status of current knowledge. The issue here is the 'possibilities of amphibious architecture to deal floods'. However, no research is being critically reviewed. Some of what is written is theory.
A review of literature must be produced employing the voice of the authors with statements such as 'according to Oliver (1999), or Rapoport (2000) points out, instead of the authors making statements and putting references within brackets. It should be a 'critical review'. Please see 'how to write a review of literature' in the ISVS e-journal web site and follow suit. Write in the present tense because it discusses current knowledge. Sum up at the end and show what is the status of current knowledge and where the gaps of that knowledge exist. 12-15 references are needed. Currently, none exists. Instead, under this sub title, an introduction to amphibious architecture, amphibious housing in the Netherlands, the Massbommel Amphibious Project, construction and functionality, and testing and results are explained. This is an introduction to amphibious architecture and not a critical review of previous research that have examined this issue. Some of what is written should be part of the 'theoretical framework'. Some must be presented sub titled as 'Introduction to amphibious architecture', placed after the review of literature before the research methods.
4. **Research Methodology:** This is poorly done. The research employs a case study method and this must be mentioned first, after which, all the data gathering techniques employed must be mentioned in the text immediately. The current discussion does not do so. Instead, it says that the research adopts integrated qualitative-quantitative methods. The term is 'mixed methods'. This research employs interviews of residents, a quantitative survey, a living case study of a house, an interview with an architect, and a survey of literature (do not call it a review of literature). It also uses 'will' which is wrong. However, they must be listed and each must be explained in detail. Say what was employed (Case studies) (Use present tense nevertheless) then the data gathering techniques. List them first and explain how each was carried out, with full details. They must be explained in such a way that another independent researcher can repeat them and see if they will get the same results. That is the test of science.
5. **Case studies:** Before the findings, introduce the case study region-Kuttanad, and the living house: where the observations were conducted. Show the locations where research was conducted. Provide location plans and a general descriptions to the case study. Satellite images are not needed. In any case, they are not clear. Moreover, do not discuss about the surveys and their findings here. This should be an introduction to the place. Introductions to the case studies 1 and 2 are not done properly. Instead, it discusses the findings. Although at the end of the Case Study 1: VSK Model House, it says 'this case study will be discussed further,' it is not done.
6. **Findings:** Findings are not well presented. Most of the data do not have sources acknowledged. For example, it says 'The 2018 Kerala floods were the worst ever recorded in the history of the region. The calamity came with severe impacts on human life and infrastructure. Between August 7th and 20th, the floods killed 504 people and directly affected 23 million others.' How do the authors know these? No sources acknowledged.
Produce the data for each data gathering technique first and analysis of data afterwards. Explain what the observations and the interview outcomes are, before explaining. More critically, cite the sources of information. Currently, it is written as an essay describing as if the author knows everything. There is no data from many of the techniques of gathering data. For example, where are the data from the literature? survey? interview data with the residents? Interview data with the architect? No data. No sources acknowledged. This is written like an essay. Not acceptable.
First section of the Findings relate only to costs. Tables 2,3 and 4 are all about costs.
Case study findings are descriptive of technologies but do not explain them well. Instead, they refer to irrelevant details such as costs. There is no data from any of the techniques: survey, interviews and literature.

ISVS e-journal

Journal of the International Society for the Study of Vernacular Settlements

2025

Discussion: There is no section sub titled Discussion. Please discuss the findings of this research with other research that have examined the same issue if any and show if they are similar or different. If different, explain why. Discuss what the findings mean and what their implications are.

7. **Conclusions:** Poor. It begins with a statement that is not acceptable: It says 'This research paper has reflected upon the impact of climate change'. This paper did not examine such an issue and cannot make such statements in the conclusion. 'Amphibious structures have seen success in the Netherlands, New Orleans, Sausalito, and Bangladesh thus far' cannot be a conclusion. This research did not examine them. Please remember that this paper studied only 3 case studies and the conclusions must be related only to these 3. Case study findings cannot also be generalized.

List the conclusions separately. Currently, it claims many things which are not conclusions derived from data in this research. For example, it says Amphibious architecture is 'stable, sustainable, and feasible.' This paper did not examine sustainability, or even stability. If these have not been studied, such 'conclusions' cannot be made. If it identified any specific conclusions related to the 3 case studies, they must be listed here. Say what this research 'concludes'. Please note that 'concluding remarks for an essay' is not acceptable in research as conclusions.

Please discuss the strengths and weaknesses after the conclusions.

8. **References:** References are poorly done. The second and third lines should be indented. Some of the page numbers are missing. Books do not require page numbers. Pay attention to details and be consistent. Use Harvard system as per the template. Follow the template to the last dot. Left justify the list.

Final Decision: **Accept after the Revisions**

Summary of the overall observations of the paper:

This is a very valuable paper that could make a potentially significant contribution to knowledge about the possibility of employing amphibious architecture in response to emerging floods in India. However, it needs major revisions to bring the argument to be cohesive supported by clear findings. The abstract needs to be succinct but must have sufficient details of research methods and the specific conclusions. Introduction needs to be presented in the proper order ending with proper aims and objectives. Introduce a proper theoretical framework, and write a proper review of literature. The research methodology requires to be organized well with a list of techniques employed to gather data and explanations of how each was carried out. Re-organise the findings to be meaningful and to show the main finding of how amphibious architecture exists in Kuttanad and how new technologies are emerging (the titles implies so). Detailed floor plans are needed for the 3 case studies and interview, survey and literature data must be presented if they were carried out. Demonstrate the possibilities of amphibious architecture. That is what this research is about.

Write the conclusion with only the specific conclusions arising from the findings related to the 3 case studies. Do not make general statements about things that were not investigated. This should not be 'concluding remarks' but 'conclusions derived and substantiated by data'.

At the end, discuss the strengths, weaknesses and limitations of this research. Re-examine and reproduce the references to be compatible with the ISVS e-journal template.