The essay reviews the relationship between buildings. A deeper analysis of each text is necessary. The analyses of the buildings are detailed, but less onarchitectural. The comparison of building styles is not complete, but a good start. The text is comprehensive, but is not very deep. The essay does not fulfill the requirement of 7500 characters. It is full with total irrelevant information and copy & paste text without any source signs. Plus it is unfinished.

The essay reviews the hotel deeply, but concentrates on to architectural totally irrelevant points, like person ... topics, which were mentioned on the lecture. Plus there are some parts which are copied with out any source signs.

There are a lot of problems with this essay. The first one, it is too short, does not accomplish the requirement of minimum 2000 characters. Minor, the text was written without any connection or promotion in this minor area. A lot of text is not architectural, the structure is not very well, there is no very good introduction or conclusion in this essay.

The essay is full with irrelevant information and copy + paste text without any source signs, especially the review of the Sheraton Hotel. The analysis of the Clark Hotel is totally missing.

Although the essay reviews the hotel deeply, it is short, not comprehensive, and has no architectural background. The final made photos made the concept of the essay very necessary.

Very interesting and analytical essay. It is a huge plus to visit the building personally, made the photos. In this case the comparison, the building of the architects, the connection between the urban and the architectural parts are full with total irrelevant points. Next time You should either concentrate on this as part of the topic. Nowadays, good design is not enough, there should be a lot more to think about, also the essay is not written very well.