

Jury Member Report – Doctor of Philosophy thesis.

Name of Candidate: Anja Tekic

PhD Program: Engineering Systems

Title of Thesis: Contextualized intellectual property management in co-creation: a configuration approach to strategy development

Supervisor: Prof. Kelvin Willoughby

Chair of PhD defense Jury: Prof. Clement Fortin

Email: C.Fortin@skoltech.ru


Date of Thesis Defense: 24 September 2019

Name of the Reviewer: Prof. Katja Hutter

I confirm the absence of any conflict of interest

(Alternatively, Reviewer can formulate a possible conflict)

Signature:



24-08-2019

Date: DD-MM-YYYY

The purpose of this report is to obtain an independent review from the members of PhD defense Jury before the thesis defense. The members of PhD defense Jury are asked to submit signed copy of the report at least 30 days prior the thesis defense. The Reviewers are asked to bring a copy of the completed report to the thesis defense and to discuss the contents of each report with each other before the thesis defense.

If the reviewers have any queries about the thesis which they wish to raise in advance, please contact the Chair of the Jury.

Reviewer's Report

Reviewers report should contain the following items:

- Brief evaluation of the thesis quality and overall structure of the dissertation.
- The relevance of the topic of dissertation work to its actual content
- The relevance of the methods used in the dissertation
- The scientific significance of the results obtained and their compliance with the international level and current state of the art
- The relevance of the obtained results to applications (if applicable)
- The quality of publications

The summary of issues to be addressed before/during the thesis defense

The submitted PhD thesis deals with IP management in a specific manifestation of open innovation, namely co-creation. While co-creation requires the contribution of information, knowledge and IP from both the company's side and the co-creator's side as well as the generation of new intellectual assets and associated IP rights (e.g. patents, copyrights, design rights, trademarks, etc.) accurate IP management strategies are needed in order to match the specific characteristics of particular co-creation projects. Therefore, the overall goal of the PhD thesis is to identify the best practices for configuring IP management strategies across a variety of co-creation contexts. While it is very complex to manage IP strategies properly to foster collaborative innovation, the author distinguishes between company-to-one and company-to many formats in an online as well as offline setting. Offering a detailed description of these four co-creations settings the author further provides an in-depth analysis showing which IP configurations can be found in which setting and explains best working IP management strategies in each setting. While only a couple of papers exists dealing with these research stream, the thesis addresses a very attractive topic with respect to the relevance and significance for science, innovation and technology.

Contingency theory – suggesting best practices should be investigated in a specific context – and configuration theory – suggesting best practices should be based on a combination of multiple elements rather than an isolate single element – form the theoretical foundation of the thesis. These theories provide a rigorous foundation to follow the overall objective to develop the concept of contextualized IP management strategies across a various co-creation contexts.

This PhD thesis is well structured, correctly presented and very well documented. The text is written in a clear and conceive manner. The introduction offers the reader a comprehensive overview of the PhD topic followed by a three-stage research process: (1) the literature review, (2) the preliminary empirical study and (3) the main empirical study. The three main parts are very sound elaborated (see comments below). The overall discussion further summarizes the findings and concludes with well-grounded propositions. The arguments are formulated with creditable conclusions based on valuable and actual literature. The figures, schemes and tables are shown properly as well. Furthermore, the PhD candidate proofed her qualification through publishing in internationally well recognized journals. While these papers have already been exposed to a rigorous peer-review procedure they are not further considered in this report.

Within the first part of the PhD thesis the author provides a critical literature review of extant literature on innovation management, co-creation and related IP management topics. The literature review critically distinguishes the concepts of open innovation, co-creation and related fields such as collaborative innovation and further offers a sound understanding of IP management in the context of co-creation. This is of importance since these concepts are often interchangeably used and discussed. literature review is very accurate and moved from a general, wider view of the literature being reviewed to the specific focus of the co-creation research. While significant flaws or gaps in existing literature are identified, the literature review could have revealed detailed questions which call for further investigation above and beyond the PhD thesis.

Based on the critical literature review the second part of the thesis offers the conceptual synthesis of the contextual and configurational perspectives of IP management in co-creation. An exploratory qualitative research approach was selected to answer the following research questions: (1) what IP management strategies do companies actually adopt in distinctive co-creation contexts; and (2) how do those IP management strategies differ across the co-creation contexts? The research setting encompasses the automotive industry. While the identification and analysis of 111 co-creation projects (online/offline and company-to-one/company-to-many) is very powerful, the author mentions the focus on a single industry

within the limitations. It is of interest why the automotive sector is the focus within the study and how this industry might differentiate from other industries/branches in the co-creation context.

While the study in section two offers strong evidence that different configurations are chosen (and not randomly selected) in different contexts – detailed investigations about the effects of these configuration on the co-creation performance are needed and tackled in the main study. The main empirical study employed a Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) including 116 co-creation projects run by HYVE and further data sources like project documentations (> 3,312 documents) and data on project performance. The QCA methodology is presented in a very logical manner as well as the presented results seem to be reliable and well documented. I acknowledge the author's ability apply and further develop the fundamentals of the subject.

Overall evaluation:

To sum up, the PhD thesis represents high level scientific work. The introduction gives a clear idea why the research was carried out and the novelty and topicality of the thesis. The gaps/conflicts in current research are highlighted and the author clearly explained the need for investigations in the topic area. The scientific findings (literature review / preliminary study / main study) are presented in a comprehensive manner and the author thoroughly compared the findings with current state of scientific research. The results are well presented and their interpretation is at a high scientific level. I really appreciate the candidate expertise in the field of IP management strategies. Overall the author highlights the contribution of the thesis and also notices its limitations, showing clearly that the PhD student has a comprehensive understanding of the context of her work. The research it describes is of high-quality results which can be a stimulus for future research and corresponds with international standards. Furthermore, it is complemented by an excellent publication list of Mrs. Tekic.

Provisional Recommendation

I recommend that the candidate should defend the thesis by means of a formal thesis defense

I recommend that the candidate should defend the thesis by means of a formal thesis defense only after appropriate changes would be introduced in candidate's thesis according to the recommendations of the present report

The thesis is not acceptable and I recommend that the candidate be exempt from the formal thesis defense