INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN BUSINESS & SOCIAL SCIENCES

Vol 15, Issue 12, (2025) E-ISSN: 2222-6990

Reframing Urban Transformation: The Evolution, Governance, and Human-Centred Paradigm of Smart Cities

Jiao Fenglei[1], Mohd Johari Mohd Yusof[1*], Shureen Faris Abd Shukor[1] and Wang Xia[2]

[1]Department of Landscape Architecture, Faculty of Design and Architecture, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia, [2]Department Smart Medical Institute, Tsinghua University, China

Corresponding Author Email: m_johari@upm.edu.my

DOI Link: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v15-i12/27258

Published Date: 15 December 2025

Abstract

The rapid global diffusion of the smart city paradigm has transformed how urban systems integrate technology, governance, and citizen engagement. However, despite its widespread adoption, the concept remains fragmented, often privileging technological efficiency over social inclusion and ethical governance. This paper critically examines the evolution of smart city governance through a comparative analysis of European, Asian, and North American models, highlighting their differing trajectories toward digital transformation. Drawing from global frameworks and case comparisons, the study develops a conceptual synthesis that reframes smart city development as a human-centred governance system rather than a purely technological pursuit. Findings reveal that European models emphasise participatory and sustainable governance; Asian cities prioritise infrastructural integration and state coordination; while North American models advance entrepreneurial and data-driven innovation. The paper proposes an integrative governance framework built upon inclusivity, transparency, and adaptive policy design, arguing that the long-term success of smart cities depends on aligning digital innovation with ethical, social, and institutional resilience. Policy implications call for a shift from technology-led to human-led smart city strategies, ensuring that digital transformation enhances democratic participation, equity, and urban wellbeing.

Keywords: Smart City Governance, Human-Centred Innovation, Digital Transformation, Participatory Urbanism, Sustainable Urban Development

Introduction

The accelerating pace of urbanisation and digital transformation has fundamentally reshaped the ways cities function, govern, and engage with their populations. As of the early 2020s, more than half of the global population resides in urban areas, a proportion projected to reach nearly 70% by 2050 (Klein & Anderegg, 2021). This rapid demographic concentration has intensified pressures on urban infrastructure, public services, environmental

sustainability, and governance capacity. In response, governments worldwide have increasingly turned to digital and data-driven solutions as strategic instruments for managing urban complexity and enhancing the quality of urban life.

Within this context, the smart city paradigm has emerged as a prominent framework for urban development. By integrating Information and Communication Technology (ICT), the Internet of Things (IoT), artificial intelligence (AI), and big data analytics, smart cities aim to improve the efficiency, adaptability, and sustainability of urban systems across sectors such as transportation, energy, healthcare, education, and public administration (Borruso & Balletto, 2022). Beyond its technological dimension, the smart city has been widely conceptualised as a governance innovation that reconfigures interactions among state institutions, market actors, and citizens through data-driven decision-making, cross-sector collaboration, and digital participation mechanisms (Rhamadhani & Edeh, 2024).

However, despite its widespread adoption in policy agendas and urban strategies, the smart city remains a theoretically fragmented and conceptually contested construct. Early smart city models were largely driven by techno-centric and economic rationales, prioritising operational efficiency, global competitiveness, and infrastructure optimisation (Guo & Qiao, 2024). These approaches have been increasingly criticised for marginalising social equity, democratic participation, and ethical considerations, and for reinforcing existing socio-spatial inequalities through uneven access to digital resources (Kouskoura et al., 2024). In response, recent scholarship has called for a shift towards human-centred and socially inclusive smart city frameworks that foreground citizen empowerment, governance transparency, and sustainability as core principles rather than secondary outcomes.

This theoretical shift is particularly significant in the Asian context, where smart city initiatives have expanded rapidly under strong state leadership and national digitalisation agendas. In China, the smart city has become a central component of urban modernisation strategies, exemplified by large-scale programmes such as the New-Type Smart City initiative. Major metropolitan areas—including Beijing, Shanghai, and Shenzhen—have implemented AI-enabled governance systems, urban data platforms, and intelligent infrastructure to enhance service delivery and environmental management. While these developments demonstrate the transformative potential of smart technologies, they also expose unresolved challenges related to data governance, privacy protection, institutional coordination, digital inequality, and the alignment of technological innovation with public accountability and social trust.

Despite a growing body of literature on smart city technologies and policy frameworks, existing research remains limited in its systematic integration of governance theory and human-centred perspectives, particularly in rapidly developing urban contexts. Much of the current scholarship focuses either on technical applications or high-level policy narratives, leaving a gap in understanding how smart city initiatives function as socio-political transformations that reshape governance practices, citizen–state relations, and urban power structures. This gap is especially evident in comparative and conceptually grounded analyses that connect technological integration with participatory governance and ethical urban development.

In response, this paper examines the evolution of smart cities through a governance- and human-centred lens, situating smart urbanism within broader debates on digital transformation, public value creation, and inclusive urban development. By synthesising recent theoretical and empirical insights, the study explores how technological infrastructures, policy innovation, and participatory mechanisms intersect to redefine urban governance in the digital era. In doing so, it contributes to ongoing scholarly discourse by advancing a more coherent and socially grounded understanding of the smart city as not merely a technological construct, but a complex socio-institutional project with profound implications for sustainable and equitable urban futures.

Literature Review

Evolution of the Smart City Concept

The smart city concept has evolved significantly over the past two decades, reflecting shifts in technological capability, policy orientation, and urban governance philosophy. Early definitions of smart cities were predominantly technology-centric, focusing on the deployment of digital infrastructure and networked systems to enhance urban efficiency. Researchers such as Kouskoura et al. (2024) and Islam (2025) described smart cities as environments that leverage ICT to optimise urban functions, improve competitiveness, and enhance living conditions. This phase, often termed the first generation of smart cities, was grounded in technological determinism—the belief that digital technologies alone could solve urban challenges.

However, as implementation expanded, limitations of purely technocratic models became evident. Critics like Chen et al. (2022) and Almulhim and Yigitcanlar (2025) argued that early smart city initiatives often prioritised corporate interests and digital infrastructure over social inclusivity, public participation, and sustainability. This prompted a paradigm shift toward a second generation of smart cities, which reoriented the focus from technology to governance, social innovation, and citizen engagement. Scholars such as Bibri (2021) proposed a more holistic framework, defining smart cities as ecosystems integrating technological, human, and institutional components to achieve sustainable urban development.

More recently, the third generation of smart city research has advanced the notion of human-centred and sustainable smart cities. This approach aligns with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goal 11—"Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable." The emphasis has shifted from efficiency and productivity to resilience, equity, and wellbeing, positioning citizens as active participants and co-creators of urban intelligence (Oetken, 2025; Paalosmaa, 2025). Consequently, the modern smart city is conceptualised as a socio-technical system that harmonises innovation with inclusivity, transforming urban spaces into adaptive and participatory environments.

Global Smart City Frameworks and Implementation Models

Globally, smart city frameworks have diversified in response to varying socio-economic, political, and technological contexts. The European model, led by initiatives such as the European Innovation Partnership on Smart Cities and Communities (EIP-SCC), promotes integrated urban solutions combining energy efficiency, sustainable mobility, and digital governance. European frameworks emphasise collaborative governance and environmental

sustainability, exemplified by cities like Amsterdam, Barcelona, and Copenhagen, which prioritise open data platforms and citizen participation (Avoyan, 2023).

In contrast, the Asian model, particularly in China, Japan, and Singapore, tends to adopt a state-driven, infrastructure-oriented approach. Singapore's Smart Nation initiative represents one of the most comprehensive examples, integrating digital identity, e-government services, and sensor-based environmental management into a unified urban intelligence system. China's New-Type Smart City strategy, launched under the Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development, aims to synchronise digital technologies with public administration, healthcare, and transportation, emphasising efficiency, safety, and social stability (Zhou et al., 2023). These approaches reflect a governance structure where technology serves as both a management tool and a means of socio-economic transformation.

Meanwhile, the North American model, driven largely by public–private partnerships, focuses on market innovation, entrepreneurship, and data-driven urban services. Cities like New York, Toronto, and San Francisco leverage smart technologies to optimise transportation networks, energy grids, and emergency response systems. However, issues of data privacy, algorithmic bias, and corporate influence have sparked growing debates about accountability and democratic governance (Christodoulou & Iordanou, 2021).

Comparatively, while frameworks differ in emphasis—Europe on sustainability, Asia on infrastructure integration, and North America on innovation—the unifying goal remains the creation of intelligent, adaptive, and inclusive urban systems. Increasingly, hybrid models are emerging, blending top-down planning with bottom-up citizen engagement to achieve balanced and context-sensitive smart city outcomes.

Governance and Human-Centred Approaches in Smart Cities

The governance dimension of smart cities has become a critical area of academic and policy discourse. As cities adopt complex digital infrastructures, questions arise concerning data governance, ethical accountability, and citizen agency. Traditional hierarchical models of urban governance are ill-equipped to manage the dynamic, multi-actor nature of digital ecosystems (Kosanović et al., 2025). Consequently, scholars advocate for networked and participatory governance models, wherein public institutions, private stakeholders, and civil society collaboratively shape urban innovation (Sirolli et al., 2025).

A key component of this shift is the human-centred governance paradigm, which redefines citizens not as passive recipients of smart services but as active co-producers of urban intelligence. Participatory platforms, open data initiatives, and digital feedback systems exemplify mechanisms that enable residents to contribute to planning and decision-making processes. This approach promotes inclusivity, transparency, and trust—essential preconditions for sustainable digital transformation.

Moreover, emerging discussions on ethical AI and data sovereignty highlight the need for robust legal and institutional frameworks to safeguard privacy, ensure fairness, and prevent digital exclusion. Governance strategies must therefore balance technological innovation with rights-based principles, aligning digital urbanism with broader societal values.

Scholars such as Chang (2021) argue that the ethical smart city should prioritise citizen welfare over data extraction, and collective benefit over market efficiency.

Finally, the resilience perspective has gained prominence in post-pandemic discourse, reframing smart cities as adaptive systems capable of responding to health crises, climate threats, and socio-economic disruptions. The integration of smart healthcare, environmental monitoring, and digital public services underscores the potential of human-centred governance to enhance not only efficiency but also urban adaptability and equity.

Summary of the Literature

In summary, the evolution of the smart city concept reflects a trajectory from technological determinism toward human-centred sustainability. Global frameworks demonstrate varying priorities—efficiency, inclusivity, or innovation—yet converge on the need for governance models that integrate data-driven technologies with participatory, ethical, and adaptive approaches. The literature underscores that the next generation of smart cities must move beyond infrastructure development to address social justice, citizen empowerment, and institutional transformation.

Thus, smart cities are not solely a product of advanced technologies but rather of intelligent governance, inclusive design, and collective innovation, which together define the path toward sustainable and equitable urban futures.

Materials and Methods

Research Design

This study adopts a conceptual–analytical research design, integrating comparative case analysis with theoretical synthesis to examine the evolution, governance, and human-centred orientation of smart cities. The approach is qualitative and interpretive in nature, grounded in documentary analysis, thematic review, and cross-case comparison of international smart city initiatives. Rather than focusing on empirical field data, this methodology builds on secondary sources—policy reports, academic publications, and institutional frameworks—to generate a multi-level understanding of smart city development.

The research aims to identify the conceptual trajectory of smart cities, map their governance structures, and explore how technological and human factors intersect in shaping urban transformation. The analytical framework is informed by systems theory and socio-technical perspectives, which view cities as dynamic, interdependent systems where technological infrastructure and human behaviour continuously interact (Pereira & Procopiuck, 2022).

Data Sources and Selection Criteria

Data for this study were obtained from peer-reviewed journals, official government documents, international policy frameworks, and urban governance reports published between 2010 and 2024. Major databases consulted included Scopus, Web of Science, SpringerLink, and ScienceDirect, alongside institutional sources such as the European Commission’s Smart Cities and Communities initiative, Singapore’s Smart Nation and Digital Government Office, and China’s National Smart City Pilot Programme.

The selection of materials followed three main criteria:

1. Relevance – The source must address one or more dimensions of smart city development (technology, governance, sustainability, or human-centred innovation).
2. Scope – The source should represent a recognised framework, policy, or model from a distinct geographical or institutional context (e.g., Europe, North America, Asia).
3. Recency and Credibility – Preference was given to contemporary materials that reflect the current state of global smart city discourse.

This approach ensures that the analysis encompasses both developed and emerging economies, allowing for a balanced assessment of context-specific priorities and universal principles.

Analytical Framework

The analysis was guided by a three-dimensional framework encompassing:

1. Conceptual Evolution: Examining how the definition and purpose of smart cities have evolved from a technology-driven model toward a human-centred and sustainability-oriented paradigm.
2. Governance and Policy Structures: Analysing how different governance arrangements—ranging from state-driven (e.g., China, Singapore) to collaborative and participatory (e.g., EU, North America)—affect the implementation and inclusiveness of smart city initiatives.
3. Human-Centred Integration: Exploring the extent to which smart city programmes incorporate citizen participation, ethical AI governance, and socio-environmental sustainability.

Through thematic synthesis, the study identifies recurring patterns, contradictions, and innovations across global cases. The analytical process involves iterative coding and thematic clustering, enabling the identification of conceptual relationships between technology, policy, and human agency.

To enhance the rigour and validity of interpretation, the analysis employs triangulation across multiple document types—academic literature, government reports, and independent evaluations. This ensures that findings reflect both theoretical perspectives and practical realities in policy implementation.

Comparative Case Logic

The study uses comparative case logic to juxtapose global smart city models from three major regions—Europe, Asia, and North America—representing distinct governance ideologies and implementation mechanisms.

- The European model is typified by multi-level governance, participatory innovation ecosystems, and sustainability-driven frameworks (e.g., Amsterdam, Barcelona, Copenhagen).
- The Asian model—represented by China, Singapore, and South Korea—embodies a state-led, technology-intensive strategy focused on efficiency, security, and social management.
- The North American model, observed in cities like Toronto, New York, and San Francisco, emphasises public–private partnerships, open data innovation, and citizen entrepreneurship.

Comparative analysis enables the identification of best practices and structural challenges, illustrating how varying institutional contexts influence the trajectory of smart city development. The method also supports theoretical generalisation, showing how local governance models contribute to the global evolution of smart urbanism.

Limitations and Scope of Interpretation

While this conceptual–analytical approach provides a broad, theoretically grounded understanding of smart city development, it carries inherent limitations. The study relies primarily on secondary data, which may reflect the biases of institutional reporting or regional priorities. Moreover, the diversity of definitions and indicators across global cases complicates direct comparison.

Nevertheless, these limitations are mitigated by methodological triangulation and critical interpretation. The objective is not to generalise empirically but to synthesise conceptual insights that inform future policy and research directions.

By integrating comparative and theoretical analysis, the methodology advances a holistic understanding of smart cities as socio-technical systems, laying the foundation for subsequent sections that discuss key findings, implications, and the shift toward human-centred, ethical, and sustainable urban governance.

Results and Discussion

Overview of Global Smart City Trajectories

The comparative analysis of global smart city development reveals that while the concept is universally underpinned by digitalisation, data analytics, and networked governance, the philosophy of implementation differs significantly across regions.

Three dominant trajectories emerge:

1. The European human-centred and sustainability-oriented model is grounded in participatory governance and social innovation.
2. The Asian state-led and technology-intensive model is characterised by strategic national planning and data-driven efficiency.
3. The North American innovation-driven and market-oriented model, emphasising open data ecosystems and entrepreneurial engagement.

These models reflect varying institutional priorities—social inclusion in Europe, national efficiency and control in Asia, and innovation economy growth in North America—each shaping the design and governance of urban technologies in distinctive ways.

The European Model: Participatory Governance and Sustainability

European smart cities such as Barcelona, Amsterdam, and Copenhagen represent the most mature manifestation of the human-centred paradigm. Rooted in the European Union's Smart Cities and Communities Framework and the Green Deal, this model integrates technological innovation with social equity and environmental stewardship.

Governance in European cities is typically polycentric and participatory, involving local governments, citizens, academia, and private actors in co-creation processes. Initiatives such as Amsterdam's Smart Citizen Lab and Barcelona's Decidim platform exemplify citizen co-

governance, where residents directly participate in data policy, energy transition planning, and mobility system design.

This model's strength lies in its institutionalisation of sustainability metrics—for example, carbon neutrality goals, renewable energy transitions, and circular economy frameworks—which ensure that smartness is evaluated not only by technological capacity but by social and ecological value creation.

However, challenges remain. Participatory frameworks often encounter bureaucratic inertia and scalability constraints when balancing inclusiveness with decision-making efficiency. Moreover, European governance models, while ethically robust, may lack the rapid implementation capacity seen in Asian cities.

The Asian Model: State-Led Integration and Data Sovereignty

In contrast, the Asian smart city model—epitomised by Singapore, Seoul, and China's Smart City Pilot Programme—demonstrates a centrally coordinated and state-driven approach. Here, governments act as both strategic orchestrators and primary investors, integrating digital infrastructure with national urbanisation agendas.

Singapore's Smart Nation Initiative reflects a whole-of-government governance model, where ministries coordinate to deliver unified digital services encompassing health, transport, housing, and urban safety. Similarly, China's National Smart City Programme aligns with broader state objectives such as Digital China and Healthy China 2030, embedding smart technologies within the framework of governance modernisation.

The strengths of this model lie in its policy coherence, rapid implementation capacity, and integrated data systems, enabling large-scale deployment of IoT, AI, and 5G infrastructure. For instance, Chinese cities such as Hangzhou have adopted AI-based traffic management systems (City Brain) that optimise mobility patterns in real time, significantly improving efficiency.

However, the centralised governance structure also raises questions regarding data sovereignty, privacy, and participatory legitimacy. While citizens benefit from seamless services, they often play a limited role in governance deliberation. The model thus embodies a tension between technological excellence and democratic inclusivity, highlighting the need for hybrid frameworks that balance efficiency with accountability.

The North American Model: Open Innovation and Market-Led Governance

The North American model, led by Toronto, New York, and San Francisco, is distinguished by open data ecosystems, public–private partnerships (PPPs), and an emphasis on the innovation economy. Here, cities function as innovation laboratories, leveraging private-sector collaboration and entrepreneurial ecosystems to drive urban transformation.

Toronto's Sidewalk Labs initiative and New York's Open Data Law exemplify governance models where data transparency and civic tech engagement foster economic growth and citizen empowerment. North American cities are at the forefront of platform urbanism,

integrating start-up ecosystems, venture capital, and civic engagement to develop scalable smart solutions in mobility, energy, and public safety.

The advantage of this model is its flexibility and creativity: it attracts investment, stimulates digital entrepreneurship, and accelerates technological adoption. However, the market-oriented nature introduces governance challenges related to data commodification, uneven access, and corporate influence.

When not regulated adequately, public interests risk subordination to profit motives, undermining the inclusivity and long-term sustainability of urban innovation.

Cross-Model Synthesis: From Technological Smartness to Human-Centred Intelligence

Comparing the three models reveals a progressive shift in the smart city paradigm—from technology-led efficiency toward human-centred intelligence and ethical governance.

Across regions, several integrative themes emerge:

1. Governance hybridity – Successful smart cities increasingly combine top-down coordination (for infrastructure and regulation) with bottom-up participation (for social innovation and inclusivity).
2. Data ethics and digital rights – There is a growing emphasis on transparent, accountable data governance, exemplified by the EU's GDPR and evolving AI ethics frameworks in Singapore and Canada.
3. Sustainability integration – The environmental dimension has evolved from an add-on to a central pillar, linking smart city agendas to the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
4. Resilience and adaptability – The post-pandemic context has repositioned smart cities as critical infrastructures for public health, economic recovery, and digital inclusion.

This synthesis suggests that the next generation of smart cities will be evaluated not merely by their technological sophistication but by their capacity to foster equitable, resilient, and participatory urban environments.

Discussion: Toward a Human-Centred Governance Framework

The comparative evidence underscores that technological innovation alone is insufficient to achieve the full promise of smart urbanism. Instead, governance maturity and citizen trust emerge as defining factors of long-term success.

A human-centred governance framework for smart cities should integrate the following dimensions:

- Ethical AI and data governance, ensuring transparency, accountability, and fairness.
- Participatory mechanisms that enable co-design of urban services.
- Cross-sectoral coordination between government, academia, and industry to sustain innovation ecosystems.
- Equitable resource distribution, ensuring that digital transformation benefits all citizens, including marginalised groups.

In essence, smart cities are evolving from technocratic experiments into adaptive socio-technical systems—where digital technologies augment human capabilities, civic engagement, and collective wellbeing.

This transition signifies a paradigm shift: from cities that are merely smart to those that are genuinely intelligent, inclusive, and humane.

Conclusion

Summary of Key Findings

This paper has explored the evolution of the smart city paradigm through a comparative analysis of governance models across Europe, Asia, and North America. The findings reveal that while the notion of smartness is universally anchored in digital infrastructure, data analytics, and innovation ecosystems, its governance logic and social orientation vary across regional and institutional contexts.

- European cities prioritise participatory governance and sustainability, embedding technological innovation within frameworks of social justice and ecological resilience.
- Asian cities advance state-led integration, focusing on infrastructural efficiency, national digital strategies, and real-time data governance.
- North American cities pursue market-oriented innovation ecosystems that encourage entrepreneurship, open data initiatives, and platform-based governance.

Together, these models underscore a crucial insight: technological sophistication alone does not constitute smartness. Instead, the enduring success of smart city transformation depends on the maturity of governance systems, the legitimacy of citizen participation, and the ethical management of digital data.

The Emergent Human-Centred Smart City Framework

The comparative synthesis points toward an emerging human-centred smart city governance framework, characterised by three interdependent dimensions:

1. Inclusive Governance and Civic Co-Creation

Smart cities must evolve from top-down managerialism to polycentric collaboration, where governments, citizens, private enterprises, and academic institutions jointly shape digital agendas. Participatory mechanisms such as citizen assemblies, data cooperatives, and digital consultation platforms are essential to ensure that technological deployment aligns with community values and social equity goals.

2. Ethical and Transparent Data Ecosystems

The future of urban governance will depend on trust-based digital ecosystems. Ethical frameworks for data use—including privacy protection, algorithmic transparency, and fairness audits—are critical for preventing the misuse of data and for reinforcing citizen confidence.

References

Almulhim, A. I., & Yigitcanlar, T. (2025). Understanding smart governance of sustainable cities: A review and multidimensional framework. *Smart Cities*, *8*(4), 113.

Avoyan, E. (2023). Collaborative governance for innovative environmental solutions: Qualitative comparative analysis of cases from around the world. *Environmental Management*, *71*(3), 670-684.

Bibri, S. E. (2021). The underlying components of data-driven smart sustainable cities of the future: a case study approach to an applied theoretical framework. *European Journal of Futures Research*, *9*(1), 13.

Borruso, G., & Balletto, G. (2022). The image of the smart city: new challenges. *Urban Science*, *6*(1), 5.

Chang, V. (2021). An ethical framework for big data and smart cities. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *165*, 120559.

Chen, T., Ramon Gil-Garcia, J., & Gasco-Hernandez, M. (2022). Understanding social sustainability for smart cities: The importance of inclusion, equity, and citizen participation as both inputs and long-term outcomes. *Journal of Smart Cities and Society*, *1*(2), 135-148.

Christodoulou, E., & Iordanou, K. (2021). Democracy under attack: challenges of addressing ethical issues of AI and big data for more democratic digital media and societies. *Frontiers in Political Science*, *3*, 682945.

Guo, D., & Qiao, L. (2024). Government environmental concern and urban green development efficiency: Structural and technological perspectives. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *450*, 142016.

Islam, H. (2025). Nexus of economic, social, and environmental factors on sustainable development goals: The moderating role of technological advancement and green innovation. *Innovation and Green Development*, *4*(1), 100183.

Klein, T., & Anderegg, W. R. (2021). A vast increase in heat exposure in the 21st century is driven by global warming and urban population growth. *Sustainable cities and society*, *73*, 103098.

Kosanović, S., Tousi, E., Gvozdić, M., Marković, Đ., Papantoniou, P., & Hloupis, G. (2025). The Living Palimpsest Profile: An Integrated Assessment Framework for Vernacular Rural Settlements. *Land*, *14*(11), 2130.

Kouskoura, A., Kalliontzi, E., Skalkos, D., & Bakouros, I. (2024). Assessing the key factors measuring regional competitiveness. *Sustainability*, *16*(6), 2574.

Oetken, K. J. (2025). Unravelling the why: exploring the increasing recognition and adoption of co-creation in contemporary urban design. *Sustainable Communities*, *2*(1), 2477788.

Paalosmaa, T. (2025). Smart Cities and Product-Service Systems—A Conceptual Framework for Urban Sustainability. *IET Smart Cities*, *7*(1), e70005.

Pereira, A. P., & Procopiuck, M. (2022). A socio-technical perspective on the future of City Information Modelling. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, *17*(2), 66-88.

Rhamadhani, R. F., & Edeh, F. O. (2024). Citizen Participation and Digital Governance in Public Sector Accountability. *Sinergi International Journal of Accounting and Taxation*, *2*(4), 200-210.

Sirolli, M. V., Rocchi, A., Solimene, A., Tufani, G., & Chiaron, G. B. (2025). Applying Open Innovation practices to Social Innovation initiatives: Building the Coalescence Innovation Framework for Urban Regeneration. *Sustainable Futures*, 100949.

Zhou, R., Chen, S., & Zhang, B. (2023). Smart city construction and new-type urbanisation quality improvement. *Scientific Reports*, *13*(1), 21074.