

Review of: "Sustainable futures: a quality-focused model for inclusive knowledge co-production"

Zora Kovacic¹

¹ Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper reviews six case studies of knowledge co-production from different fields including higher education and public health management. The author proposes the use of a model which characterizes the inputs, process and outcomes of knowledge co-production. I find the focus on quality interesting and worthy of investigation, and I particularly appreciate the treatment of both codified and tacit knowledge - but I think the paper needs some revisions to better communicate its aims and results. My suggestions are:

- The aims of the paper and research question are not clearly stated, and from reading the introduction, I was unclear on what the paper tries to do. I suggest adding aims and/or research question in the introduction.
- The structure of the paper is explained only in the methods section, leaving the reader a bit lost in the first few pages. I suggest explaining how the paper is organized right after stating its aims, as a roadmap explaining how the aims will be met.
- The methods need improvement as well: How were the cases analyzed? From the description of the case studies, it is unclear what makes these cases relevant to the paper and how they were selected. I suggest specifying: How were the cases studied, how many people participated in each case, what was analyzed and how
- I would warn against the use of 'innovation' and 'knowledge co-production' as interchangeable terms. As the author notes, policies tend to refer to innovation and I would be careful to assume that there is a direct link between knowledge co-production and the type of business and economic growth-oriented innovation that many policies promote. Rather than mentioning innovation superficially and possibly generating some misunderstandings, I would suggest that the reference to innovation and innovation policies can be dropped and the case for knowledge co-production can be made on its own.
- The author mixes different concepts of knowledge co-production, co-creation and co-generation, often in the same figure (e.g. figure 1) and knowledge co-production is only defined towards the end of the paper on pg. 10. There are different academic traditions behind these different terms, so to avoid confusion, I suggest clarifying which definition of knowledge co-production is used right at the beginning and being consistent in the use of jargon throughout the paper.
- The author speaks of "enabling success" (pg. 4) and I get the impression that inclusiveness is assumed to lead to better results - I suggest adding a note of caution. Inclusive and democratic processes with a diversity of actors are often conflictive, and power dynamics have to be taken into account. You may have a look at: Strumińska-Kutra, Marta, and Christian Scholl. "Taking power seriously: Towards a power-sensitive approach for transdisciplinary action research." *Futures* 135 (2022): 102881.

- Tacit knowledge is difficult to codify – see Meisch, Simon P., et al. "Extended Peer Communities: Appraising the contributions of tacit knowledges in climate change decision-making." *Futures* 135 (2022): 102868, for a critical discussion. Can you give an example of tacit knowledge? This is just mentioned in the text, but it is not clear what the author refers to.
- The author argues that the outcome of the case studies is knowledge co-production – knowledge about what? How can you tell that knowledge was created? I also wonder if learning may be considered an outcome