**Review of JRCD-1424**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments** | **Revisions** |
| Literature review is very broad - narrow to clear research questions; objectives; or at least a list of key concepts that could form the conceptual framework for the study. Key - institutions; collaboration; learning; etc. more obvious link between the literature and the findings. | Focused the literature review on the context of new regionalism and specifically on TIMs including RIS, the “quadruple helix” and learning regions/smart specialization. The small but growing literature on the applicability of these models in rural regions is also reviewed, discussing how this article contributes to this body of work.  |
| Some weaknesses around the lack of structure and a clear conceptual framework that confuses the focus of the paper. | Paper has been significantly revised to clarify the conceptual framework and limit the literature review to key concepts linked to the findings and analysis. |
| Consider different industries and their innovation dynamics in a more differentiated way – tourism has different innovation challenges than resource industries. | Outlined differences in perceptions of innovation across sectors in the findings  |
| Separate section with a more detailed case study description (either before or after the methods) to introduce the geographic, economic and social/demographic context of the case study region in a bit more detail – history, more background info. | New context section added separate from the introduction on the context of the Northern Peninsula – added a map of the region, a brief history, overview of the key sectors of the economy and key regional players. |
| More information about your interview sample – what sort of stakeholders were interviewed and from which sectors? Were there more public, private or community stakeholders? What criteria were used to qualify them as ‘local innovation system stakeholders’? | Breakdown of who was interviewed provided – included business, government, support organizations and post-secondary institutions including how many of each and the process of identifying respondents outlined. |
| Findings are certainly interesting, but I can’t necessarily see what is new here - in the discussion to emphasize the contribution of the paper, e.g. by building the interpretation or analysis of the findings more around a concrete framework.Contributions to the literature are not clear and should be clarified. | More study of rural areas and in particular remote declining rural areas is needed. The difficulties of applying TIMs and RIS/Quadruple Helix are outlined in the regional context. Issues around governance and collaboration are discussed. Also RIS3 methodology introduced as appropriate planning tool for rural. We more clearly point out the applicability of key elements of territorial innovation models, particularly RIS, in a rural resource-based region and that literature on such regions is weak, with more research needed. In the analysis and conclusions we also discuss strengthening quadruple helix partners missing from regional innovation discussions – entrepreneurs and local municipalities who lack resources and discuss the need for a regional level of government. |
| More critical discussion of the findings, also in relation to the literature. Is access to knowledge and knowledge partnerships (e.g. with external knowledge providers) really the key to innovation in those areas? Or is it more about stimulating entrepreneurial capacity, a critical mass of private businesses who are willing to take risks and invest?  | Added references in the literature review on the limits of quadruple helix in rural regions and also discussed the limits in the analysis, suggesting that more focus is needed in the region on entrepreneurship and involving business in regional innovation discussions and also in strengthening local governance. Also included a section on smart specialization in the findings and in the analysis.  |
| There is no questioning of whether transplanting the “quadruple helix” model is appropriate for peripheral locations. | More critical view of the applicability of the quadruple helix in rural contexts is added the literature review, the findings and in the analysis.  |
| Recommendations section needs to be rewritten as an academic discussion tying back to the literature and results in a more meaningful and more specific way | Section rewritten to focus on analysis of the findings. Focus is on the need to strengthen local elements of the quadruple helix – entrepreneurship and local government. As noted above, references are made back to the academic literature and how our work contributes to it. |
| Several references used in the text are not in the reference list | Reference list has been checked and now matches references cited in the article. |