The essay does not accomplish the requirements (minimum 8,000 characters). Plus the main goal of the project is social intervention, than sustainable building. The comparison is not really relevant.

The essay is more or less review the project, but it is based on too much on sources. Plus it is full with unremarkable texts. The sign of written sources are missing. The writing is too short.

No submission.

The essay is more or less review the building, but a deeper analysis is missing. The written sources are not signed. The comparison is absolutely not fitted.

No submission.

No submission.

The essay does not accomplish the requirements. This writing is not an essay, it is a list of information.

The review is more or less the Ozd project and there are only a few word of about it. The comparison is also interesting, but the three examples are too much.

No submission.

Well structured writing with deep balanced informations. Deeper architectural analysis and some own opinion are very missing to be perfect. Plus it would be better to keep a distance from the written sources.

No submission.

The essay is a good analysis and summary of the project. The own opinions and viewpoint is also good, as well as the structure of the writing. Only problem is number of the characters, which is under the requirement.

The analysis is sensitive and detailed. The theoretical background is interesting, but there are some difference between the Wright's and Makovecz's architecture. The comparison does not fit exactly. The sources of the information is missing.

The essay is a good review, but task was to write an analysis with own opinion. These are missing.

No submission.

Well structured writing with well balanced informations. Deeper architectural analysis and some own opinion are very missing to be perfect. Plus it would be better to keep a distance from the written sources.

No submission.

The essay is summarized the story of the rehabilitation quite well. The analysis and the own opinions are good, but a little bit too short.

Relevant and interesting comparison. But both projects were just reviewed, not analysed.

Really good analysis with clear criticism and critical opinion. Nice explanatory sketches. It would be better to name the source of the student photos.

We have already discussed it.

Deep analysis of the building with relevant and interesting comparison. Some photo's sources are not signed.

The essay is a good analysis and summary of the project. The own opinions and viewpoint is also good, as well as the structure of the writing. Only problem is number of the characters, which is under the requirement.

The analysis is sensitive and detailed. The theoretical background is interesting, but there are some difference between the Wright's and Makovecz's architecture. The comparison does not fit exactly. The sources of the information is missing.

The essay is understood the main goal of the project and reflects to it a very personal and theoretical way. It was thoughtful to read. Just go on this way!

The review is more or less ok, but it misunderstood the point of the exhibition. Some of the text are irrelevant. The sources of the information is missing.

Good structure and essay equipments. The writing is rather a review, than a critic. A deeper analysis is missing.

Well structured essay with perfectly fitted comparison. But missing a deeper analysis about architecture and relations between the two projects, and more own opinion.

The essay is more or less review the building, but a deeper analysis is missing. The written sources are not signed. The comparison is absolutely not fitted.

The essay is more or less review the building, but a deeper analysis is missing. The written sources are not signed. The comparison is absolutely not fitted.

The essay collected the facts of the project and the project's history, but missed to outline the form is architectural point of view.

The essay does not accomplish the requirements. This writing is not an essay, it is a list of information.

The essay is more or less review the building, but a deeper analysis is missing. The written sources are not signed. The comparison is absolutely not fitted.

The essay is summarized the story of the rehabilitation quite well. The analysis and the own opinions are good, but a little bit too short.

Relevant and interesting comparison. But both projects were just reviewed, not analysed.

Really good analysis with clear criticism and critical opinion. Nice explanatory sketches. It would be better to name the source of the student photos.

We have already discussed it.

Deep analysis of the building with relevant and interesting comparison. Some photo's sources are not signed.