

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

These interesting and engaging works of art presented by the author are not fully supported by this essay in its current form. The premise and essay question need to be reconsidered to strengthen the narrative. This essay needs a structural edit in order to allow the ideas to transition more meaningfully from one paragraph to the next. Some of the ideas and quotes are awkwardly introduced, and concepts need to be fleshed out a bit more for clarity.

Commented [M1]: Agree and MS totally revised.

The overall premise of the essay as described in the abstract (1-5) is that, 'Sculptural objects and their holographic counterparts, when placed together in a constructed mixed-reality environment, exhibit a sense of ambiguity as neither the material nor the virtual objects maintain a clear integrity of form and identity.' I am not satisfied that this essay addresses nor answers this premise in any meaningful way.

Instead, I think this essay needs to be re-written to plainly focus on the author's own practice, so as to enable them to contextualise their work and their use of holography. I like the author's personal journey to consider the use of holography, and the political underpinning of the work. However, it requires further critical visual analysis of each works to enable the reader to understand how the works of art were resolved with the use of holography.

Commented [M2]: I added two new images of previous works (with analysis) and noted influences of Post-minimalism and Process Art Movement.

This essay also requires a more in-depth examination of artists who use holography so the author can position their work in this field. The mention of Paula Dawson is far too brief and does not give a visual analysis of her work, and assumes that the readers have prior knowledge. There is not an accurate reference to Louise Bourgeois hologram work is that the author is referring to (133-145) and does not even describe what the subject matter is in the work. A missed opportunity to analyse and compare Dawson and Bourgeois's use of domestic symbolism and psychological imagery. How does the author/artist's work resonate with or build upon these examples?

Commented [M3]: This required more research time as my knowledge in this area is limited. Because of your positive comments on my use of the "personal" I focused on that in this section

The artist/author should avoid justifying themselves with the use of self-reflective criticism as it comes across as a negative, rejected voice of an outsider. E.g., (205-207) "Because I work as an independent artist, I have found it necessary to be my own critic, and after years of making art I can usually recognise deficiencies in my technique or acknowledge when an attempt is derivative, or content forced, two of the criteria I use for evaluating any work as art." Instead the author needs to use persuasive and positive language to engage the reader and support the reason why their work should be considered interesting.

Commented [M4]: This would be an excellent theme in itself but far too vast a diversion from the new revised essay. I had to make some serious cuts to keep the flow of the narrative.

I don't agree with the author's statement (196-197) that art-holography is not accepted or lacks content, and in any case this statement has not been substantiated by the author with direct research. This statement further undermines the very premise of the essay.

Commented [M5]: Thank you for that excellent critical observation - I had not realized that this had become a habit of mine. I removed any comments of this nature and yes, the narrative worked better.

I hope that the author will re-structure and re-write this essay so that their work can be better understood as important contributions to this interesting field.

Commented [M6]: Agree. Deleted the reference.

Commented [M7]: With thanks!