

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

Jari Lyytimäki<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Finnish Environment Institute

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I read the manuscript with interest, and I feel that it presents a promising analysis but there are some major issues that should be considered.

In my view the introduction should be more focused. Now it nicely introduces some key aspects or categories of knowledge but leaves the relationships between those unclear. Especially the relationship between innovations and different categories of knowledge should be clarified. One way to do this could be to start the introduction from the most general level categories and continue towards more specific issues, leading to the research question that also should be formulated more clearly. Now it is a bit unclear if the paper aims to tackle questions related “appropriate conditions”, “diverse participants”, “knowledge exchange” or “co-creation”. Addressing all of these seems a bit too much for one paper.

First paragraph of the “Theoretical Framework” section erroneously mentions “SDC” framework.

Sections “Theoretical Framework” and “Conceptual Framework” are a bit overlapping and could be merged. These sections, or already the introduction, should define what kind of knowledge creation process is in focus here. In particular, it is curious that the concept of sustainability is not addressed in the first parts of the manuscript even though it is highlighted in the title. Likewise, “future” that is emphasized in the title is not addressed in the manuscript.

Figure 1. is unnecessarily hard to read, please simplify the visualisation, especially the background textures. The term “Scaler fit” needs to be corrected. Color codes of the texts in the figure seem logical but they are not opened up.

Presentation of the six cases could be strengthened with a table utilising the key components of Fig 1. This would also connect the theoretical background with the data used and analytical choices.

The presentation of the results should open up how specific methods of knowledge generation or co-production led to specific outcomes. What worked and what did not work? What was specific for certain type of cases and what may be generally applicable? How was the longitudinal setting of cases actually employed in the analysis?

The section on sustainability approach to knowledge co-production needs rewriting in order to be better connected with the results from the case studies. Actually, in my view, considerations of sustainability are too much for this article. I think that the article would be stronger if it leaves the notion of sustainability out and focuses on the knowledge co-creation processes. Another option would be to build the article around the concept of sustainability transition (or sustainability knowledge co-creation?) starting already from the introduction.

