



Journal of Visualization and Interaction

Reviews for 2024-cretaio-greetings-round2

Review #1

Completed: 15-08-2025 20:11

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Conflict Declaration

I declare that I have no known conflicts of interest with the authors.

Review

The work advances the field of Information Visualisation and HCI by exploring participatory, situated, and tangible approaches to data collection and communication. By employing postcards as a low-barrier, tactile medium, the workshop encourages both personal narrative and structured visual analysis. The format is situated within the Systemic Innovation Design Methodology, with emphasis on the early “research” phase, and is illustrated through the Greetings from Naples case study. The authors reflect on methodological design, process outcomes, and potential for replication.

I have reviewed this work previously, and the authors have made refinements addressing all the major issues I pointed out earlier. The manuscript is now clear, well-structured, and methodologically sound. I recommend acceptance, limited to the editorial and consistency adjustments listed in the Requested Changes section.

Openness

I appreciate that the authors have considerably improved the supplementary materials since the last review cycle.

Classification

Systems or design research

Classification

Art

Recommendation

Accept

Revisions Requested

I only have minor suggestions that would improve readability and consistency: 1. Remove the period at the end of the title to match conventional titling practices. 2. Section 2.2 – visually indent the block quote starting with “the ability to ask and answer...” to distinguish it clearly from the body text. 3. Figures 1 and 2 – consider merging these into a single figure. Rather than fading the other stages in grey (as in Figure 2), highlight the “study” or research part in blue within Figure 1 to maintain visual coherence. 4. Typographical error – correct “FFrom that moment...” to “From that moment...”. 5. Terminology consistency – in the description of the postcards’ impacts, ensure that “ingenuity” in the text matches the label “intellect” shown in Figure 9.

Reviewer Name

Luiz Augusto Morais

ORCID

N/A

Review #2

Completed: 25-08-2025 23:08

Recommendation: See Comments

Conflict Declaration

I declare that I have no known conflicts of interest with the authors.

Review

I will revisit each of the points that I made in my review of the earlier submission. The submission continues to be relevant and interesting to those in the visualization and HCI communities, as well as the visualization pedagogy sub-community.

Several of the revisions address a concern to ensure that the workshop approach is replicable. The revisions to Section 3.1 are useful, referring to two concrete use cases for a databook. The cover letter refers to Figures 7 and 8. However, this connection is not obvious in the paper. It seems as though the revised text in 3.1 is best supported by the two sides of Figure 3. This figure is perhaps too high-level / synoptic; a more detailed figure that corresponds more closely with the new revised text, perhaps with annotations pointing out aspects of the databooks, would be more appropriate. Currently, Figure 3 operates more as a teaser

image. See my “Openness/Transparency” comments below about barriers to accessing the databook analyzed as supplemental material.

I will reiterate my hesitation with respect to the novelty and value of the workshop approach, stemming from the need for workshop participant voices and an analysis of a completed databook (and its value). In the revised manuscript, the authors mention both of these aspects, but they have chosen to relegate much of the detail to supplemental material.

First, the authors have extended their discussion section with a couple of paragraphs that reflect on participants’ experiences at a high level. Only a couple of unattributed participant quotes now appear within these revisions, and these quotes are unspecific with respect to the procedure of the workshop or parts of the completed databook. While including supplemental video of participant interviews is laudable in terms of transparency, it is not a replacement for a detailed thematic analysis that distills participants’ experiences, which should appear in the main body of the paper. For example, each of the claimed benefits listed in the final sentence of 6.2 (“It amplifies the...”) should be supported with evidence.

Second, the authors now describe two completed databooks and their purposes in Section 3.1. However, it would seem as though neither of these databooks were produced as a result of the proposed workshop method, but rather by the authors and their external collaborators prior to the workshop that produced the “Greetings from Naples” databook (however this is never stated explicitly). It would therefore seem as though the purpose of the workshop approach is to generate databooks of similar comprehensiveness and quality as the “Design & Territorio” and “Follow App” databooks. The authors have added a high-level analysis of the “Greetings from Naples” databook in Section 5.2, which includes three speculations that could lead to the stated goals of identifying “impactful, sustainable, or innovative outcomes” that stakeholders might consider. The extended descriptions of the “Design & Territorio” and “Follow App” databooks earlier in the paper refer to stakeholders who commissioned them (Vodafone Italia and a hospital, respectively); the value of the “Greetings from Naples” databook should therefore be similarly determined in consultation with external stakeholders, such as residents or policy makers representing the Quartieri Spagnoli or the city of Naples. Would such stakeholders find aspects of the databook to be “unexpected”? ... and does it elicit in them impactful design strategies in line with the three observations made by the authors at the end of Section 5.2? In other words, the authors need evidence to support their revised claims (*(): that the databook “transforms information into awareness and guidelines for actions that have a significant impact on the chosen territory, how the databook is” a tool to comprehend a specific territory and guide project actions** for its improvement,” and how “the databook provides the designer with the *most objective* tools and knowledge to act and communicate through data.”

With respect to situating the work in prior work, I am content with the authors’ addition of Section 2.3, tying it to the work of Walny et al and to the FdS methodology.

The writing and presentation is generally improved, though it is not obvious when comparing the revised submission with the original one because only additions have been highlighted, not deletions. One presentation aspect that I overlooked in my original review was the figure captions. These need to be more detailed throughout the paper - they should include a key

takeaway in addition to a description of the image - currently, the onus is on the reader to infer the purpose of the figure. Meanwhile, the authors have added a new Figure 2, which is a highlighted version of Figure 1. In the original submission, this was a consolidated figure. I would argue that the original Figure 1 is better than two figures, but the caption needs to be more thorough to clearly indicate the scope of the workshop relative to the full methodology.

Finally, the cover letter could be improved with attribution and / or quotes from the various reviewers, with the authors' direct responses appearing next to reviewers' requests.

Openness

My review of openness / transparency for the original submission included requests for completed databooks, guidance for educators, and additional reflection on both.

In the revised manuscript, the revisions and cover letter refer to new supplementary material that serve to support the transparency and reproducibility of the workshop approach. The supplementary material includes an analysis of a completed databook, a short video interview with workshop participants, and a "guide on how to structure the workshop". However, these materials are not attached in this reviewing platform - all I have access to is the manuscript, a version with tracked changes, and a cover letter. The authors also include a research material statement that points to an OSF repository URL that contains "Additional material regarding the databook, the workshop structure, agenda, tools, environment and outcomes". However, following this link does not allow me to browse these materials without requesting access via my ORCID login, which compromises reviewer anonymity. I therefore request that the associate editor verify the existence and completeness of this supplemental content on my behalf. Alternatively, the authors could provide material as an attachment to the review manuscript or provide materials in a repository that allows for anonymous access.

Classification

Empirical Research - Qualitative

Classification

Systems or design research

Recommendation

Minor Revisions

Revisions Requested

Transcribe quotes from the interviews as evidence to support claims made in the revised Section 6.2.

Comment on the stakeholder / reader impressions of the "Greetings from Naples" databook.

Include a more detailed view of the completed databooks depicted in Figure 3 and include key takeaways in figure captions.

The supplemental material should be attached to the review record or posted online in such a way that does not require explicit access requests.

Reviewer Name

anonymous

ORCID

N/A

Review #3

Completed: 20-11-2025 10:13

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Conflict Declaration

I declare that I have no known conflicts of interest with the authors.

Review

The authors have made meaningful revisions that address most points raised in my initial review. As noted previously, the paper advances our understanding of how individual territorial explorations can be synthesized into a collective databook and contributes to design research within InfoVis/HCI. The core argument remains credible, and the added clarifications strengthen the transparency of the process.

Since the first round, the work has been more clearly situated in prior visualization research in section 2.3 and the databook examples mentioned in 3.1 have been further elaborated. The workshop structure (4.2) has also been substantially improved; the visual timeline is a nice addition and the reordering of activities makes the sequence of events clearer. The additional reflections in 5.2 provide a useful synthesis of findings into future design directions.

One remaining structural point concerns section 6.2: participant quotes and descriptive details read more like findings and would fit better in section 5. Moving them there would allow the Discussion to focus on reflection rather than introducing new observations.

In terms of transparency, the authors frequently reference supplementary materials in their response letter. As a reviewer, I cannot currently access these, so I'm just flagging this for the editor to verify. That said, the manuscript is sufficiently detailed as a standalone piece.

Openness

No additional concerns beyond the placement of the details of workshop two. These have been moved but now appear somewhat abruptly at the end of the Conclusion. I would integrate them earlier in the manuscript to improve flow.

Classification

Empirical Research - Qualitative

Classification

Systems or design research

Recommendation

Minor Revisions

Revisions Requested

Figure 1–2: the duplicated figures seem unnecessary. The clarification of the contribution is useful, but this could be achieved by integrating the annotation/caption of Fig 2 directly into Fig 1 (e.g. lightly highlighting or outlining the focus block of activities)

Section 6.2: move the participant details/quotes into Section 5 to maintain consistency in structure and avoid introducing new results in the Discussion

Replication details: the current placement at the end of the Conclusion is a bit random; consider integrating them earlier

Supplementary materials: editor should verify these as I can't see them in the Review Files; this does not affect the manuscript's standalone clarity

Reviewer Name

Kim Sauvé

ORCID

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4662-7680>

Metareview

Completed: 2026-03-11

Recommendation: Accept

Conflict Declaration

I declare that I have no known conflicts of interest with the authors.

Review

We are pleased to announce that we will accept the article after some light final changes.

The revised submission of the article provides a much enriched picture of the workshop, the produced artifacts and takeaways, and all reviewers agree that the article should be accepted after some light final changes. Please find the detailed reviews at the bottom of this email. Concerning the change requests, please use the list below which paraphrases and summarizes requests made by individual reviewers below.

Revisions Requested

- Please compile the participant statements from the interview video in a text document, attribute identifiers, e.g., participant numbers to interviewees and use these when referring to them. [R1]
- Relatedly, it would be more consistent with common practice to introduce quotes from participants in section 5, which reports outcomes, and thus avoid introducing new results in the discussion section. [R3]
- Enrich figure captions to include key takeaways for each figure. [R1]
- Make sure the OSF repository is public for the final version. [R1, R3]
- Consider merging figures 1 and 2 using the blue highlighting to indicate the scope of the presented work. [R1, R2, R3]
- Please remove the period at the end of the title. [R2]
- Visually indent the block quote in section 2.2 (“the ability to ask...”) [R2]
- Typographical error: “Ffrom that moment” (section 4.1) [R2]
- Be more consistent in the translation of postcards: figure 9 uses “ingenuity” while the main text uses “intellect”. [R2]
- The mentioning of the replication of the workshop in Parma could be moved earlier in the article as it seems disconnected placed as the last sentence of the conclusion. [R3]

Reviewer Name

Yvonne Jansen

ORCID

0000-0001-5092-551X