

Article "When Design Fiction meets Geospatial Sciences for a 3 more inclusive Smart City"	
Smartcities 952227	
Reviewers' questions and suggestions	Authors' answers and comments
<b>Reviewer 1</b>	
The abstract should emphasize the originality and the focus of the research.	<i>The abstract has been updated according to reviewer 1 and 2's suggestions.</i>
The introduction should be better structured, framing the paper in more detail. In relation to the concept of smart cities, I strongly suggest to authors to talk about the evolution from the era "smart cities 1.0" (based on technology) to "smart cities 2.0" one (following an human-centered approach).	<i>Some extra explanations have been added in the introduction in order to make it more in line with the evolving concept of smart city.</i>
For these reasons, I strongly suggest to read and quote the following articles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Kamolov, S., &amp; Kandalintseva, Y. (2020, January). The Study on the Readiness of Russian Municipalities for Implementation of the "Smart City" Concept. In Ecological-Socio-Economic Systems: Models of Competition and Cooperation (ESES 2019) (pp. 256- 260). Atlantis Press.</li> <li>- Garau, C., Desogus, G., &amp; Zamperlin, P. (2020). Governing technology-based urbanism. The Routledge Companion to Smart Cities. (particularly the paragraph: From smart cities 1.0 to smart cities 2.0: what about the governance? pp. 159-162).</li> </ul>	<i>Thanks to reviewer 1, the suggested references (Kamolov and Kandalintseva; Garau et al.) have been read, mentioned in the paper (in the intro and section 2 in particular), and finally added to the bibliography. Cohen (2015), probably the first to have proposed the Smart City 1.0 / 2.0 / 3.0 idea has also been introduced and quoted. Therefore, the numbering of the bibliography has been updated.</i>
Authors must better organise the section "Discussions and Conclusions", by separating it, in order to facilitate the reading of the paper and also to concentrate the results of the research in the conclusions.	<i>Ok the conclusion has been separated from the discussion and it has been improved.</i>
<b>Reviewer 2</b>	
The first issue relates to the concept of 'the smart city' [not 'smart city' as used throughout]. The authors circle around what they are trying to say, but it takes a while to land on their goal which emerges on Line 51: to improve "the characteristics of the environment rather than as the limits of the person". That could be stated immediately to give the paper clarity.	<i>See the adds in the abstracts and introduction. This unique posture is assumed from the very beginning in order to make the main paper aim clear.</i>

<p>A crucial second issue relates to deafness. At one or two points, deafness is conflated explicitly with cochlear implants. This is highly problematic due to the small numbers of the devices in use and the political issues that surround their use. More needs to be said on this and these issues confronted. I am also concerned a phrase such as “that Deaf people use” [141] is defining when the goal of the paper is inclusionary.</p>	<p><i>p. 5, lines 220 to 237 already address this issues. According to the reviewer 2’s suggestion, one more paragraph has been added, p. 5, lines 233-236 as well as two references [53] and [54].</i></p> <p><i>p. 5, lines 164, 165, “that Deaf people use” has been changed, indeed the Deaf community does not only include deaf people.</i></p>
<p>The paper also needs to tie its themes together. The front end is all about cities, but this is not mentioned again after the workshops. This needs to be resolved, especially given the journal in question.</p>	<p><i>Section 3 has been enriched in order to bridge the gap between smart city and deafspace in a more explicit manner. Several points are now embedded in the text, for instance: lines 359-360; 482-484.</i></p>
<p>The presentation is a little idiosyncratic and needs work. Some examples include:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As mentioned, the paper needs to use the term “The smart city”, or “a smart city”, not ‘smart city’</li> </ul>	<p><i>We have tried to use the right expression at the right place.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avoid ending a sentence by running out of ideas [.....] on several occasions.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Yes, ... have been erased.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- While we still have apostrophes, please use them: ‘Cities’ engineering’, ‘Citizens’ engagement’.....;</li> </ul>	<p><i>Done.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some phrases are slightly un-colloquial: As regards as, As a matter of facts, ethics smart city platforms, Concrete experimentations.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Changes done.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Instead of writing ‘According to [53]’ the author should provide the name of the researcher being cited, in several places.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Done.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avoid gendered language by using plurals: e.g. 233-240</li> </ul>	<p><i>Done.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avoid the word ‘Properly’ in the context of behavior which seems directive or normative; use instead ‘appropriately’ or ‘effectively’</li> </ul>	<p><i>Done.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 273 Despite [insert ‘this’], our position here; 395 ‘dole jewel’ [?];</li> </ul>	<p><i>Russian doll piece of jewelry (sorry my mistake) ;-)</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “What if the sound had a flat” is ambiguous given the use of[sharps/flats] in music. English-English uses ‘puncture’ which might be better</li> </ul>	<p><i>Ok flat has been replaced by puncture.</i></p>
<p><b>Reviewer 3</b></p>	
<p>The methodology used should be able to be reproduced by other researchers or other research projects. This idea ends up rendering the article very fragile.</p>	

Many aspects remain to be described both at the technological level - after all the Vibrapod is about?	
- How it works? How it applies to the body?	<i>In Section 3.1.2 we provide further technical details and information. Nevertheless, some cannot be published due to partners' IP issues. We have also added two figures for a better explanation of the components and working principals of the Vibropod.</i>
- What is its energy source?	
- What is its autonomy?	
- What limitations does it have?	
Or at the level of detail of the workshops	
- One lasts one year and the other two hours?	<i>Not really, the works done to design and build the first Vibropod prototype including some tests with partners of "The Chambre Blanche" took almost a year. The final workshop 2 hours, like the one of the "Pointes-aux-lièvres". We try to better explain this in section 3.1.1., 3.1.3. and 3.2.</i>
- How many participants?	<i>A table is now provided to answer those questions.</i>
- How were they chosen?	
- How did the workshop work?	
Section 3.1.1 is missing.	<i>Oups, my mistake. Correction is done.</i>