

To Professor Mitev

I thank you very much for your feedback. I will next specify in detail what changes were made according to it.

The cases are constructed as a sequence of interviews with multiple respondents. As new findings were identified, some respondents were contacted again to clarify them. Some details concerning each organization and its history has been given in Data sources. This section has been moved up in the methodology and now has the heading 3.3.2.

The paragraphs concerning within-case and cross-case analysis have been removed, as the data consists in a series of interviews. The methodology chapter has been adjusted to make it more readable, to avoid repetition and to make the research design clearer. The data and interviews allowed to identify the main codes and sub-codes. The main codes are labelled as activities of information acquisition and knowledge conversion and can be routinized to show that this is an iterative process.

The figure 2-2 and the section that it was included in: A comparison with the knowledge spiral, have been moved in the methodology below the results of coding. In this way, the codes are not discussed in the literature review. The figure just shows an example of the sub-codes. All the codes and sub-codes are listed in table 3-24 in the results of coding.

The generative mechanisms have been included in the discussion chapter. They can be found in section 5.3.5 The generative mechanisms of the innovation process. This section reinforces the need for considering the context of the organization and its structure. The generative mechanisms are factors that have the potential to produce an outcome and to support innovation if the context of the organization allows them to do so. Approaches that have been documented to support innovation, such as creating an innovation group, require a change in paradigm so that the company needs to do things differently to have an innovation orientation. The generative mechanisms have been identified as creativity, flexibility, communication and feedback. This allows the research to be more in line with the critical realism approach.

It is true that there are less interviews that question the organizational structure, but this is because it was a later finding. The validation interviews with professors and innovation managers still contain the questions about generative mechanisms and organizational structure and the respondents do not deny that they can have an influence.

I hope that I have addressed your comments and that the adjustments are done in such a way to make the research better.