Completed
Review

Manuscript Type:	Technical article
Keywords:	tourism , experience , design , place-making
Date Submitted:	*blinded*
Manuscript Title:	Beyond Destinations: Exploring Tourist Technology Design Spaces Through Local-Tourist Interactions
Date Assigned:	09-Sep-2011
Date Review Returned:	01-Oct-2011
M-Score for this manuscript:	1.35

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

I would be willing to re-read a final version if minor revisions are required before publishing. However I don't think it should be necessary. In my view, all that remains to be done could be done with slightly more careful writing, nothing substantial. This could take the form of a recommendation from the editors rather than a requirement.

⌐req⌐ Comments to the Author

My comments on the original version of this paper were generally supportive with some reservations about:
1. The structure of the paper producing unhelpful repetition
2. Position the empirical work as case study methodology and making claims from it that would be difficult to justify on the basis of the use of the methodology
3. The provenance of design sensibilities and design ideas.
I also made some suggestions for minor revisions in the writing, mainly with reference to slightly idiosyncratic sentences and clauses.

This revised version of the paper retains the energy and novelty of the original, bringing a relatively novel performative (and networked and locative) frame to designing for the tourist experience. This key contribution and remains strong. The conceptual framing and design implications are carefully teased out.

The reservations I had with the first version of the paper have been addressed quite successfully. The paper is sharper, less repetitive; the case study methodology is more carefully and accurately positioned as a 'staged encounter' to inspire design; and the development of design ideas is carefully traced.

I have two minor suggestions to make at this stage to make the paper as strong as it can be:

1. It comes across in various parts of the paper that performance and networking have been established as being of worth in designing for tourist experience. Sometimes it reads as if the case study results warranted this claim. However the evidence provided cannot sustain the claim. I don't that that is a major problem and I don't think it is necessarily the authors' intentions to even make the claim as an empirically established one. It is enough to establish the distinctiveness of the performative approach conceptually as the authors do in the first few sections and to then frame the rest of the paper as exploring the value of that distinctive performative approach to design. The question then for the final section is whether taking a performative perspective has been fruitful in design terms (not whether it was right or wrong). This slight (but important I think) change of emphasis could be achieved by more careful, less evangelical, writing about the performative approach to tourist experience, especially in the second half of the paper where it is likely to be read as an outcome of the analysis rather than the starting perspective that it is.

2. Some of my minor writing suggestions on version 1 have not been taken and I stumbled over a few more sentences and phrases this time. Nothing major, and very simply addressed by having a native English speaker proof read the final version.

Well done on the good work, and good luck with finalising the paper.

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