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

Christian Barrantes[1]

1 Universidade de São Paulo

Congratulations on the article. Here's my review:

1. In the abstract you don't show a correct sequence of reading, try to follow the next steps to made up an abstract. Context of the article or topic that will be developed; Problem/Gap you will try to solve; Purpose of your work; Methodology used in your work; Some results you obtained (or the main ones); Conclusions or implications for future works. Remember all this had to be done in 250 words generally.

2. In the introduction, when you said "Recently, innovation policies have been strategically moved from the periphery (being part of economic or education) to the centre (standalone innovation policy) of national/regional policy frameworks." Where is the reference? Who said that? Where I can find the support of that argument? We need to show where or who said those important sentences, and must be a relevant source.

3. Third paragraph of the introduction you open a parenthesis to show an example and didn't close that parenthesis, take care with those tiny mistakes.

4. Just two major categories for knowledge? What about Explicit Knowledge? Is kind of similar to Codified Knowledge but without taking into account the scientific recognition.

5. Congratulations on introduction, is well explained, but just see comments made to correct those mistakes.

6. In the third line of the Theorical Framework, again you open a parenthesis and didn't close it, please see all article to correct those typing mistakes.

7. Theorical Framework is well explained, very good.

8. I suggest to redraw Figure 1 in a black and white and/or minimalist figure, think in researches who may will reply your figure, maybe they will use in black and white and so on maybe some information will be lose, or maybe just try to redraw in a minimalist way but colored form, just to be easier to see. Also add the source of each figure, if is yours, just put "Sources: Author" so other researchers will reference you appropriately when reply your figure.

9. The way you explained the inputs and outputs in Figure 1 was so clear and easy, however, when explaining the Processes, it was more difficult, maybe you can try to make an easier explain of each process item, so readers can get easily your Figure.

10. You explained so well the methodology and detailed well the six cases, congratulations. Even though, I didn't see in the work why and where you took those six cases, maybe you need to explain that in the methodology stage, like why just six cases, why not more, why specifically those cases, where did you take from, a literature review? Personal experience? A previous research and methodology applied? Just clarify that as far as rest of that stage (methodology

and cases) is so well explained.

11. Findings and discussion are not clear neither explained. Table 1 and Table 2 even been clear don't give enough information, please give a good, well-detailed explanation of this stage and the tables. Think that you article must include replicable information, for example, if I or any other researcher or viewer want to apply the model you shown in Figure 1, no one can't do it, as far as there is not a clear apply process showed, how you made the Table 1 and Table 2? How many discipline scopes exist? Because in table 1, case 2 and 4 said "all" like all scope disciplines? But all from where? Is a scope discipline list? How outputs form table 2 were made up? Which information you used to created or affirm that information from table 2?

12. You said that knowledge co-production is the unifying outcome, but how you get that conclusion? Based on which information? Because your article doesn't show how to get to that conclusion, neither table 1 or 2 or explanation in the figure 1 show me how I can get the same conclusion. I suggest you to detailed the process to reach such kind of conclusion within the article. The knowledge co-production section doesn't explain how you get to that conclusion but detailed the main characteristic of knowledge co-production.

13. You said the inputs proposed seems to be applicable in the six cases, but if they weren't, what you will do? Maybe that's is important to write in the implications/conclusion section.

14. Define what is Sustainability for this article, as far as it is strongly linked to environment and sustainable development, but for this article is not the case. So, define to give a complete understanding to the reader.

15. Figure 2 is not clear, where in the article you explained the Figure 2? Why learning is showed as pointed-line through all the figure? Figure 2 is the steps to follow? Need to detailed that please.