



Peer Review Report

PEER REVIEW REPORT FOR:

Salles-Filho, S., Bin, A., Bonilla, K., & Colugnati, F. A. B. (2021). Effectiveness by design: Overcoming orientation and transaction related barriers in research-industry linkages. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 25(5), e190346. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-7849rac2021190346.en>

HOW TO CITE THIS PEER REVIEW REPORT:

Salles-Filho, S., Bin, A., Bonilla, K., Colugnati, F. A. B., & Perez, G. (2021). Peer review report for: Effectiveness by design: Overcoming orientation and transaction related barriers in research-industry linkages. RAC. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4560659>

REVIEWERS:

 Gilberto Perez (Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, CCSA, Brazil)

ROUND 1

Reviewer 1 report

Reviewer 1 for this round chose not to disclose his/her review report.

Reviewer 2 report

Reviewer: Gilberto Perez

Date review returned: May 04, 2020

Recommendation: Major revision

Comments to the authors

I suggest proposing a research question for which the answer to the study was sought.

The theme of innovation appears in different parts of the literature review and needs to be better connected to the study.

The sections on methodological procedures and conclusions need to be improved. See the various comments in the text.
[See appended file in the Zenodo platform]

The author indicates that interviews were conducted, but does not indicate how they were analyzed, and what criteria were used in the analysis.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: Yes

Are the methods described comprehensively?: No

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: No

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: Yes

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).:
Nothing to declare.

Rating:

Interest: 2. Good

Quality: 3. Average

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 2. Good

Authors' Responses

Letter for Submitting the Revised Manuscript: Reducing Orientation and Transaction Barriers in Research Industry-Linkages:
A Study of the Brazilian-Industrial Innovation-Agency

June, 8th, 2020

Dr. Wesley Mendes-da-Silva

Editor-in-Chief, Revista de Administração Contemporânea

Please receive kind greetings. The authors of the work identified in the head of this letter, present to you the revised text with deep appreciation to the two reviewers for their valuable comments and recommendations. Their insights helped us to improve the structure and the clarity of the manuscript. Also, we appreciate the work of the editing team. Please find below the detailed description of how we addressed the comments and suggestions from the reviewers. We also attach two versions of the manuscript. One using the track-changes tool in PDF and the second a final (clean) version in MSN Word.

We are ready to perform any further action to ensure a successful publication of the article.

Sincerely,

Corresponding Author

[The authors' responses to the comments of Reviewer 1 for this round were omitted from this report, since the reviewer did not authorize the disclosure of his/her report.]

Reviewer 2

- I suggest proposing a research question for which the answer to the study was sought.

For the sake of clarity, two research questions were incorporated in page 3:

- What are the policy features that contribute more to a successful implementation of RO-industry linkages in particular socio-economic environment such as those of less developed or emerging countries?

- What are the requirements of policy beneficiaries to support the implementation of such policies?

- The theme of innovation appears in different parts of the literature review and needs to be better connected to the study.

Various modifications in the structure of the article obeyed to this comment. Also, the theme of innovation was further elaborated as an introduction to Literature Review in order to connect it better with the study.

- The sections on methodological procedures and conclusions need to be improved. See the various comments in the text.

The section of methodological procedures was expanded in order to bring all the required clarifications, mainly about the involvement of experts and the interviews with the research organizations. We also included a justification of the use of hierarchical cluster analysis and a new Annex with the dendrogram.

New insights were added about cluster analysis findings, bringing connections with literature review and theory.

The conclusion was also expanded, bringing conceptual, empirical, methodological and policy implications, as well as the limitations of the study.

- The author indicates that interviews were conducted, but does not indicate how they were analyzed, and what criteria were used in the analysis.

A new paragraph was introduced to explain how interviews were conducted and analyzed, as well as how they connect with other data collection instruments.

Finally, the text was revised by a professional proof-reader to identify errors in the correctness of English language use.

ROUND 2

Reviewer 1 report

Reviewer: Gilberto Perez

Date review returned: July 13, 2020

Recommendation: Accept

Comments to the authors

The author presented a text with good quality evolution in relation to the first text.

I consider that all recommendations and adjustments made have been satisfactorily met by the author. I believe that the article has good conditions for publication.

Additional Questions:

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?: Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?: Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?: Yes

Are the methods described comprehensively?: Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?: Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?: Yes

Is the language acceptable?: Yes

Does the article have data and / or materials that could be made publicly available by the authors?: Yes

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state “none” if this is not applicable).: ND.

Rating:

Interest: 2. Good

Quality: 1. Excellent

Originality: 2. Good

Overall: 2. Good

Reviewer 2 report

Reviewer 2 for this round chose not to disclose his/her review report.

Authors' Responses

Letter Adjustments for Publication Article: Effectiveness by Design: overcoming orientation and transaction related barriers in research-industry linkages

Campinas, August 24th, 2020

Dr. Wesley Mendes-da-Silva

Editor-in-Chief, Revista de Administração Contemporânea

Please receive kind greetings. The authors of the work: Effectiveness by Design: overcoming orientation and transaction related barriers in research-industry linkages, present to you the adjustments to the article for publication based on the valuable comments and recommendations from the reviewers and the RAC's editorial team. Please find details of the performed adjustments below.

We are ready to perform any further action to ensure the successful publication of the article.

Sincerely,

Corresponding Author

. A RAC adota um modelo de resumo estruturado, convidamos os autores a conhecer as orientações aos autores, e ajustar/adequar o seu texto ao formato adotado pela RAC.

This comment was addressed by restructuring the abstract based on RAC's guidelines.

. Sugiro fortemente aos autores que adotem/revise o título do manuscrito, de modo que se torne sugestivo do resultado principal da pesquisa.

This comment was addressed by modifying the title from “Reducing Orientation and Transaction Barriers in Research Industry-Linkages: A Study of the Brazilian-Industrial Innovation-Agency” to “Effectiveness by Design: overcoming orientation and transaction-related barriers in research industry-linkages”.

. Convém uma versão de formato e norma, e.g. rigorosamente tabelas não possuem linhas verticais.

This comment was address by removing vertical lines from all the 3 tables.

. Cada ilustração deve trazer uma nota explicativa que permita entender seu conteúdo sem necessariamente recorrermos ao corpo do artigo. Por exemplo, a Table 2, seria possível entender seu conteúdo sem maiores esforços de procurar no corpo do texto?

This comment was address by rewriting the titles, labels and adding some complementary notes in Table 2 and Figures 1, 2 and 3.

. Cada ilustração deve ser anunciada e discutida no corpo do texto, antes de ser apresentada no texto. Por exemplo, na p. 25: ".....A table displaying indicators employed in the evaluation in I1, I2, and I3 is presented in Annex 1. Data collection occurred between October 2015 and April 2016," de que se trata?

This comment was address by checking if all Figures and Tables were mentioned in the text before their presentation. Figures 1 and 2 were already mentioned (pages 26 and 27), as well as Tables 1 and 2 (pages 21-22 and 23). An explicit mention to Figure 3 was added to the text (page 31).

The Annexes were substituted by Appendixes and moved to the end of the article (after references). Table and Figure from respectively Appendixes I and II were correctly nominated (Table A1 and Figure A1) and explicitly mentioned in the main text.

The text "Data collection occurred between October 2015 and April 2016..." was relocated and rewritten to clarify what the authors mean ("Data collection was conducted between October 2015 and April 2016, beginning with I4, followed by I1 and I2 and finally I3", page 22).

. Quais os procedimentos utilizados para assegurar a validade dos resultados do estudo? Esse detalhamento precisa estar presente na seção de Método.

We understand that the use of different data collection instruments, orientated to different respondents, about the same key features of EMBRAPPI's projects, brought the guarantee of this validity. A new sentence explaining this aspect was added in methodological procedures section (page 23). To deal with possible conflicts of information from different sources, two indicators were used: indicator of the discrepancy of figures, and indicator of the opposition of figures. These indicators were already explained in data analysis subsection (page 24).

. Equações devem estar: escritas com microsoft equation, numeradas, e devidamente discutidas no texto. Veja na p. 23, existe uma equação sem esses cuidados.

This comment was address by using Microsoft Equation and numbering in page 20. The paragraphs before and after the equation we slightly modified in order to better clarify the equation and its use.

. Notas de rodapé devem ser usadas apenas quando inevitável.

This comment was address by deleting all 5 footnotes and bringing relevant information to the main text.

. A declaração da contribuição do estudo para a literatura deve estar acompanhada das referências que permitam tratar-se de algo que possui coerência com as lacunas eventualmente constatadas na literatura (Estado da Arte).

This comment was address by including the pertinent references to the paragraph about the contribution of the study to the literature (page 39).