

Review of: "From Earth to Art: Repurposing Clay Residues into Ephemeral Clay Sculptures of Organic Art and Styles"

Mitsuhiro Shigeishi¹

¹ Kumamoto University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author's purpose in writing this document is as follows:

"Regarding the transformation of clay residues into nature art, MET elucidates how artists perceive and engage with these materials."

However, the content is merely a report of what was done, what was seen, and what was felt, not a scientific paper on the field, just a report of implementation.

From the "Introduction" to the "Framework: Theoretical perspective," the contents seem to be adequate as a description.

Perhaps a researcher in the field of fine arts would be able to evaluate the contents clearly.

However, if we assume that the expressionist and the clay residue are protagonists, either cooperative or antagonistic, we need to describe their respective characteristics precisely and accurately to clarify the premise.

The author should provide a deeper insight into the novelty of reusing clay residues for art by showing:

There are already many examples of similar materials or different junk being used in art, but what sets it apart from them?

The purpose and specific procedures of the experimental method and the justification for its contribution to solving the problem should be explained.

Requirements for scientific papers include the following:

Novelty: the content of the paper must be novel to the author

Validity: the content of the paper must be useful for academic or industrial development

Reliability: the content of the paper must be reliable from the reader's point of view

Comprehensibility: The development of the thesis should be comprehensible and clearly stated in an orderly fashion.

The basic structure of a scientific paper includes a title, abstract, introduction, experimental methods, results and discussion, and references.

Although a certain model case is supposed to be discussed here that is subject to MET-based considerations, there will be no consensus because none of the various claims scattered throughout will have any clarification.

Therefore, the objectives originally set forth have not been achieved and are incomplete.

