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COMMENTS
To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) **Suggestions which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication**

(2) **Changes which must be made before publication**

- Paper has 3040 words, given the current content the paper can be more elaborate as it is vague and general in a number of sections.
- Be careful in claiming that Barcelona is a smart city. That brings questions about what you mean. Better is to present indicators and show the scoring on indicators.
- Introduction: this sets the criteria for being a smart city but they are so vague that it will be easy to fulfill them. Section 3 again has different definition. This all should be more consistent.
- Objectives in section 2: this short section can be integrated with the objectives. Objective should be defined more precise.
- City Hall seems to be central as actor however what does smart city imply for citizens, the city at large, development? How about participation in developing towards smarter cities?
- Avoid prejudice and take a more scientific neutral approach by mentioning Barcelona already smart city in the beginning of the paper. Later in the paper it seems that Barcelona is not yet a smart city because the infrastructure needs improvement. What is truth? What are the facts?
- Section 3 on literature remains too general and it is not clear what the lessons are that we can learn.
- Section 4 on methodology is weak, a more rigorous approach is necessary. Just mentioning two interview partners is insufficient.
- Section 5 business case description: analysis should be more extensive, neutral, factual and empirical and less marketing / PR. Analysis is weak. Impacts of initiatives should be identified and analyzed based on facts. What was learned from trials, which methodology has been developed and implemented, etc. All claims, statements need checking whether empirical observations exist that support these. Same for living labs, they are mentioned in the abstract but not as empirical cases.
- Many statements e.g. about meeting citizens demands, and services that make life easier, are too general and not demonstrated by any facts.
- **Conclusion**: must add specific elements throughout the paper, methodology and actual case study observations are to be improved, sound policy analysis necessary, sound empirical foundations necessary etc. Put yourself more in the role of a neutral observer, scientist. Avoid marketing and PR story.
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