

Completed
Review



Manuscript Type: Tutorial article

Keywords: creative entrepreneurship*, design innovation*, co-creation*, serious game design*

Date Submitted: *blinded*

Manuscript Title: Social Innovation through employing Design Entrepreneurship in serious game design; How to use design entrepreneurship as the innovator in social contexts?

Date Assigned: 09-Sep-2011

Date Review Returned: 11-Sep-2011

M-Score for this manuscript: 2.00

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

req Comments to the Author

The research problem in this article is very important for the field of design; and I found the author's discussion on "Social Innovation through employing Design" is very important. However the author has to improve following parts before publication:

Although the author uses the term of "serious game design" in the title, this issue is clearly discussed nowhere in the article. The Author should revise the title.

The aim of the article is not specified clearly. The following statement in the abstract "...article the transformative potential of design on social innovation, and what is needed to enable these..." and following statement in the introduction "...It will then unpack creative and social entrepreneurship through understanding the definition, what is needed to make it happen and how it can be applied....

are not the same to explain the aim. The reader may confused about it. In this way, the introduction should be detailed more to explain the aim, scope, methodology and expected results. In the same way, the aim and concrete results of the research should be summarized in the abstract.

In the clause 2.1, the statement "...Little research has been carried out on how design can be inclusive to society and its citizens, or what role creative entrepreneurship plays in enabling collective change ..." needs to be explained more. It should show more specific clues what is the lack in previous research in this area.

The structure of "2.0 Background: Innovation and Design" is also weak. Although the author describes the big picture of the problem in design, there is no enough connection between sub clauses. The author cites his/her references a lot. I suggest, the author should cite the other important references for his/her arguments. In this way, this part should be re-written.

Before the clause 4.0, the author needs to explicitly describe his/her own model in a separate section. In this respect, the author own model cannot be seen clearly in clause 3.2. Additionally, the author claims that s/he applied Light's Model in his/her model, but we can see nowhere in the article how to applied it.

The author should also explain clearly in 4.0, why s/he uses these examples as case studies to test his/her model. They needs a good connection in the research method.

Finally, Because the aim and expected result are not written well, we cannot understand ".. what is needed to make it happen and how it can be applied....". The author should explain concrete results from his/her study.

There are a lot of valuable outputs in the articles. I enjoyed to read it. However, the reader may not follows it easily because of above weaknesses. Therefore I encourage the author to revise the manuscript according to above commend for the publication.

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