

Review of: "Corralling a Chimera: A Critical Review of the Term Social Infrastructure"

Rachel Demma

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This meta-analysis seeks to refine the definition of social infrastructure by term usage. The analysis identified five categories of usage. It would helpful to the reader to see some kind of frequency analysis of how many times the various five categories appeared in the analysis of the articles. Ultimately, the researchers state that the clarification of the term social infrastructure may be realizing by narrowing its definition to only refer to networking spaces.

This reviewer suggests two means of strengthening the research presented here. First, the Results section indicates that the researchers primarily reject the other 4 types of infrastructure based on their direct contribution to social capital versus human capital and because each infrastructure area already has its own self-defined singular infrastructure context or constructed meaning. The second line of reasoning does not fully demonstrate why such subcategories should be disqualified as portions of the definition of the broader social infrastructure term. The researchers should expand on why this facet of the subcategories eliminates them from usage under the broader term of social infrastructure.

Second, the Discussion should recognize that the term networking spaces could easily be parsed in its most recent and widely used context as digital or virtual spaces or platforms. To only recognize that the use of this term in the literature refers to physical locations analysis would seem to limit the common usage of this verbage. The researchers may want to suggest that the term social infrastructure in fact be broadened to include virtual and physical social networking. Or the researchers might suggest this as future research needed to fully examine social infrastructure terminology.