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| Comment | Response |
| Reviewer 1 |  |
| more explanation is necessary linking the cases to the concept of co-creation. The author begins the paper by telling us how he or she will discuss co-creation as a space of overlap between BOP practices and HCDA practices. Discussion of co-creation, however, feels very very abstract compared to the specific and grounding details of the DakNet project and the Voices project. … These examples are used to exemplify the differences between those 2 theories. Then the authors bring up a number of issues around participation of co-creation–unequal power relations, distributions of capital, and ranges of local embeddedness. While I am sure that these issues came up in both cases of projects, we aren't given any examples from the case projects of how these kinds relations played out and how development practitioners dealt with them as they happened.  Using the cases to illustrate the problematics of co-creation, first, would serve an explanatory purpose of making the ending discussion of co-creation as grounded as the discussion of BOP and capabilities approaches. | We have linked the idea of co-creation more to the examples/cases.  We have highlighted co-creation as a lens to evaluate the two examples. To make the point that the two approaches contribute significantly to understanding development theories. |
| The authors discuss the Finding A Voice project as an exemplar of the capabilities approach–developing people's voices as a way of preparing them for citizenship. As someone someone familiar with Anthropology's of India, I find it hard to take on face value that Fing A Voice Simply made people better advocates for themselves with state actors. The authors cite Appadurai as their source for citizenship practices in India. Capacity to Aspire is a particularly optimistic piece. Other sources, such as Corbridge, S. (2005). Seeing the state: Governance and governmentality in India (Cambridge UP) or any documentary on dalits in India cast doubt on the sufficiency of voice as a means of development.  Voice from a low caste person in some parts of India can get one's house burned down. Anthropologist Anand Vaidya shows how voices also accomplished through the creating of solidarities they can exert political pressure, rather than enhancing individuals capabilities. His recent n+1 piece offers a grounded example of what the capabilities approach misassesses in Indian slums (<http://nplusonemag.com/a-subtle-alignment>).  Even if the Finding A Voice project did not succeed fully, hearing how a project to develop voice did have emergent effects (of the sort Mazzarella 2010 “Beautiful Balloon” describes of other Indian ICT projects) would make a contribution to how we understand the contours and possibilities of voice-based approaches in action. | Agreed, this adds subtlety – we were not suggesting FaV was an exemplar, and have made additions that will help clarify this. We have clarified what the paper is trying to address, which is outside of the scope of this comment. |
| Editor request |  |
| Editor also wants us to make somewhat more relevant to Community Informatics, and development informatics | We have consolidated the relevance to community informatics by incorporating the case studies within that framework. |
| Reviewer 2 |  |
| 1. A more significant emphasis upon geography in the introduction such that the spectre of "India" is not reduced to an imaginary, rather that the "poor" are placed within specific locale and geographic range to -- goods, communications, transport. This would make the justification for the creation of such worthy, inexpensive and flexibile infrastructure more apparent. | We consider this to be outside the scope of the paper and the argument that the paper is making. We feel that the above changes make this comment irrelevant. |
| 2. I would include, particularly regarding the Finding Voice project, but also with Daknet, greater analysis of poverty and its conditions than simply an adherence to a fairly traditional consumer/market model. Do these people value their lives significantly in any other systems beyond capitalism and marketplaces, for instance; anarchy, socialism, communitarian values - as those studied by the late Elinor Olson in her work on governance, "the commons" and small African fishing communities. One reason I raise this question is that it is a bit unclear how local poor have a stake in the development of networks beyond their roles as users and consumers. For instance, can they collectively own or invest in the ongoing sustainability of the network? Do they know how to set one up? Do they understand how their data is used? | As above |
| 3. "Sustainability" is generally a bit vague across the argument, which, focus largely on a debate about personal value through choice and notions of "freedom" fails to substantially address how once the BOP has been recognized as an appropriate consumer market for the TOP, can the BOP sustain itself? This has been an ongoing problem in much development. The same markets which start "doing good" end up displacing their initial consumer base and "its" economies. | We think this is covered, and doesn’t require a response. |
|  |  |