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

María Napal[1]

1 Universidad Pública de Navarra

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this manuscript, the author argues how knowledge co-creation can lead to improved productivity and research outcomes, and proposes a framework for analyzing projects.

The introduction and theoretical foundations are well writen, with minor grammatical or writing errors. However, it goes a bit too deep into some definitions that are not central to the content of the manuscript (e.g. the definition and examples of tacit and codified knowledge); those digresions may hinder understanding of the main ideas.

Objectives or research questions should be clearly stated at the end of the introduction. Likewise, the rationale for considering the selected 6 case studies (appart from the fact that the author leaded or took part in them) is far from evident, and so is the analytic procedure.

This lack of definition in the selection criteria leads to undesired effects on the results: it the 6 cases are selected as examples of co-creation of knowledge, it is kind of evident that the common outcome will be knowledge co-creation, and tables 1 and 2 would fit better in the methodology.

In the same vein, there is no evaluation of the "quality" of these outcomes or on the benefits for the participants, which would allow for making statments such as "collective/interactive approaches involving diverse participants acknowledge is critical for quality co-production as it allows for distributed cognition", or that tacit knowlegde has been modified. Processess (democratic participation, skilled facilitation and dialogue) are included in the discussion of relevant factors, but there is no description of how were, actually, all these processes enacted. In this sense, most of the conclusions are self-contained and largely unsupported.

As such, my reccomendation is the authors state clearly their objectives, the rationale for including these 6 projects, and describe in detail the features of these projects that support the discussion and conclusions.