Completed
Review

Manuscript Type:	Technical article
Keywords:	co-creation* , collaborative design* , design process* , participatory design* , user-centred design*
Date Submitted:	*blinded*
Manuscript Title:	Design process excludes users: the co-creation activities between user and designer
Date Assigned:	21-Oct-2011
Date Review Returned:	25-Oct-2011
M-Score for this manuscript:	2.17

Rating Table

Rating	Strong Yes	Weak Yes	Average	Weak No	Strong No	N/A
req Is the paper interesting, timely and thought provoking?		✓				
req Is the subject matter relevant to this journal?		✓				
req Is the intellectual level appropriate?			✓			
req Is the paper written and structured clearly?				✓		
req Are there adequate references to related work?	✓					
req Are there sufficient graphics?	✓					

req Recommendation

    Publish with no changes

✓ Publish with minor changes

    Request a major revision

    Reject

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

✓   Yes

     No

Comments

Confidential Comments to the Editors

The author has clearly taken into account my recommendations. 'Design process' has been defined in a comprehensive way: as design activities and design techniques. The paper now contextualizes theoretical viewpoints that link the discussion to the origins of design methodologies, and the way these were influenced by first-order cybernetics (and to the second wave of the design methodologies inspired by second-order cybernetics). References of historical examples of participatory design and of the way these early attempts have failed to enhance creativity were amended, and the presentation of contemporary examples that succeeded in facilitating the communication between stakeholders strengthens the argument of the author. The introduction of a 'user-evolving' instead of 'user-centred' view of the design process is very successful as it fits well with the hypothesis of the author. Also, the contextualization of the theoretical scope of the paper by contemporary discussions of open-source architectures, wherein the designer is a participant and not the person who exercises top-down control, highlights the purpose and applicability of the research presented.
The concluding remark about the significance of the proposed understanding of the designer as facilitator and its implications on the role of professional designers in our contemporary societies justifies the author's proposition of a design method that operates through 'co-creation activities'. However, there are several grammatical mistakes, especially in the amended text, i.e., in pages 2, 3, 14-18, that make difficult to follow the argument. I recommend the proofreading of the text.

req Comments to the Author

The author has clearly taken into account my recommendations. 'Design process' has been defined in a comprehensive way: as design activities and design techniques. The paper now contextualizes theoretical viewpoints that link the discussion to the origins of design methodologies, and the way these were influenced by first-order cybernetics (and to the second wave of the design methodologies inspired by second-order cybernetics). References of historical examples of participatory design and of the way these early attempts have failed to enhance creativity were amended, and the presentation of contemporary examples that succeeded in facilitating the communication between stakeholders strengthens the argument of the author. The introduction of a 'user-evolving' instead of 'user-centred' view of the design process is very successful as it fits well with the hypothesis of the author. Also, the contextualization of the theoretical scope of the paper by contemporary discussions of open-source architectures, wherein the designer is a participant and not the person who exercises top-down control, highlights the purpose and applicability of the research presented.
A concluding remark about the significance of the proposed understanding of the designer as facilitator and its implications on the role of professional designers in our contemporary societies justifies the author's proposition of a design method that operates through 'co-creation activities'.
However, there are several grammatical mistakes, especially in the amended text, i.e., in pages 2, 3, 14-18, that make difficult to follow the argument. I recommend the proofreading of the text.

Use the below rating options to rate the reviewer on this submitted review. The rating options have corresponding numerical values which are averaged to determine an "R-Score" for reviewers. The "R-Score" for a reviewer displays as part of the reviewer search results to give you an indication of past performance.

Timeliness

    3 - Review was on time (Rating 3.0)

    2 - Review was slightly delayed (Rating 2.0)

    1 - Review was severely delayed (Rating 1.0)

Quality Assessment

    3 - Review was highly relevant (Rating 3.0)

    2 - Review was sufficient (Rating 2.0)

    1 - Review was below average (Rating 1.0)

Save Print Edit Close Window