Abstracts: Specific Comments

Specific comments on the various abstracts are set out below, for reference and consideration.

For the avoidance of doubt, these should be read in conjunction with the “Abstracts: General Comments” summary. All papers, when drafted, should follow the specific guidance provided on structure and emphasis.

From Rio with concern: Benefits for whom and what now?
Daniel Radai

This abstract is well structured and the index is clear. So too are the objectives of the research. There are, consequently, no specific comments. We look forward to the results of the interviews.

Beyond the Iron Triangle & Olympic Period: A Legacy of the London Olympics
Oscar Wong, Aigerim Rakhmetulina

This abstract is well structured and the index is clear. So too are the objectives of the research.

The paper should make clear the extent to which lessons from London can be applied to other cities. The governance structure in London is clear and well-resourced. A large and complex city is therefore able to plan very strategically to understand and address shortcomings. It would be interesting to understand how replicable London’s approach could be.

The 1968 Olympic Games: A Preview of Forthcoming Urban Policies in Grenoble
Maële Giard, Gauthier Avenas

The language used in the abstract is unclear. The suggestion appears to be that the paper will explore the short and long-term impacts of the Olympic Games. We expect that it will be analysed, but is this the case?

It seems that the case being made is that Grenoble constitutes an important city (a centre for tourism and regional activities at the entrance to the Alps) but that it lacks the appropriate infrastructure (such as urban quality, seen through districts in decline). Is this correct? How does this link to the Olympic Games?

The abstract appears to suggest that Grenoble needs to update its approach to urbanism. Is the premise that this means it needs another mega-event, or that mega-events aren’t successful in the longer-term?

Please clarify the methodology and hypothesis. Please also clarify the language to ensure that it provides a clear basis from which to understand the proposed paper.
Learning From Mega Events
Luke Martin, Padraig Collins, Danielle Nevin, Kayleigh Sexton, and Ciara Cosgrave

Our understanding is that your hypothesis is that the success of the legacy of cities which host these events depends on the planning which takes place for and after event. This does not appear to be clearly reflected in the abstract. Nor does the abstract show clearly what your focus will be on. The title is very general and yet the paper will need to be focused. You must therefore use the following stages to make the paper more specific. It would be helpful if you could clarify exactly how you intended to do this beforehand. Focusing on three events might assist you here.

Could you also clarify in the introduction of your future paper exactly what methodology and hypothesis you have adopted.

To be a Culture Capital City
Marta Ducci, Giulia Maroni

It is an interesting contribution. The idea of exploring capitals of culture seems very relevant and to complement the other papers nicely. The impression we have is that these mega-events have a different starting point. It will be important to draw out the similarities and differences to other events to get the most from this paper. Is it, for example, that they have fewer risks because they do not require specific equipment or investments?

A question to be explored is whether Olympics or Expos can be used as examples to learn from in the planning of European capitals of culture, or whether they constitute totally different events with different problems and challenges.

Mega Events Planning Process As Synergy Of Urban Regeneration:
Tourism And Heritage Promotion, Possibilities And Problems
Milica Igić, Mihailo Mitković, Magdalena Vasilevska, Jelena Đekić & Milena Dinić Branković

This abstract is well structured and the index is clear. So too are the objectives of the research. There are, consequently, no specific comments.

The Mega-event(s) that formed Paris! World Expositions and the Impact on the City
Hans Smolenaers, Timo Cents

This abstract is well structured and the index is clear. So too are the objectives of the research. The abstract suggests a positive assessment of the urban legacy from the Expos in Paris. It might be interesting to understand the case that exists for another such event in Paris today. Likewise, if such an event were to proceed, it would be interesting to understand how this might be done most effectively. A question is the extent to which Paris’ size is important. Would it make sense to have an event such as this in intermediate cities such as Marseille, Lyon, Hannover, Milan, Seville ... etc?
A World Exposition as a Catalyst for Urban Development in Flanders, Belgium
Filine Declerck.

The abstract suggests that the hypothesis of this paper is (1) that the concept of a world exposition needs to be re-examined taking an account Urban challenges in Europe, flexible ways of living, etc, and (2) that there are questions over the influence that a World Exposition in Flanders would have in Eurometropolis. Is this correct?

It also appears that your abstract references integration in the Vision 2050 which has disappeared from your index. If this is to remain part of the focus, please don’t forget to include it in the introduction of your paper.

Please clarify the objectives and hypothesis of your work. Please also clarify your methodology.

London 2012 Olympics: An Inclusive Planning Revolution?
Harry Burchill

This abstract is well structured and the index is clear. So too are the objectives of the research. There are, consequently, no specific comments.

The 2008 International Exposition in Zaragoza
Beatriz Santos

This abstract is well structured and the index is clear. So too are the objectives of the research. There are, consequently, no specific comments.