

## HARMONIZING INNOVATION DYNAMICS - MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO DRIVING REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

\*Līga Braslina<sup>1</sup>, Anda Batraga<sup>1</sup>, Jelena Salkovska<sup>1</sup>, Didzis Rutitis<sup>2</sup>, Davids Stebelis<sup>2</sup>, Solvita Kostjukova<sup>1</sup>, Marta Kontina<sup>2</sup>, Katrina Kellerte<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Latvia, Latvia

<sup>2</sup>School of Business and Finance, Latvia

\*Corresponding author's e-mail: liga.braslina@lu.lv

### Abstract

Innovation ecosystems in regional contexts remain fragmented despite growing investment and policy focus. This fragmentation results from weak institutional coordination, the absence of integrated theoretical models, and a limited capacity to align innovation with regional sustainability and competitiveness goals. Addressing these systemic challenges, the study develops a conceptual framework that synthesizes key innovation theories to guide strategic governance in complex, multidisciplinary environments. The research applies a mixed-methods approach, combining a systematic literature review with semi-structured expert interviews. The literature analysis identifies seventeen innovation theory paradigms, while expert input helps contextualize theoretical insights with practical considerations in regional innovation policymaking. This integration provides a robust basis for assessing how theoretical frameworks translate into operational strategies that enhance innovation performance and reduce systemic fragmentation. The synthesized framework incorporates Innovation Systems Theory, the Triple and Quadruple Helix Models, Dynamic Capabilities, Open Innovation, and Sustainability-Oriented Innovation, among others. Findings demonstrate that regional innovation ecosystems perform more effectively when governance is grounded in integrated, theory-driven approaches that prioritize collaboration, adaptability, and strategic alignment with digital and sustainable transformation agendas. This study contributes to both academic and practical discourse by offering a model for theory-informed innovation governance. It equips policymakers, universities, and industry actors with actionable insights to strengthen institutional resilience, facilitate knowledge transfer, and drive inclusive, innovation-led regional growth.

**Keywords:** innovation ecosystems, regional development, systems thinking.

### Introduction

In contemporary regional development discourse, innovation ecosystems are widely recognized as critical drivers of economic growth and social transformation (Demirdag & Nirwansyah, 2025; Wang et al., 2024). However, empirical research consistently reveals a paradox: despite substantial investments in innovation infrastructure, many regions continue to struggle with achieving sustained innovation-led growth (Du & Jian, 2024; Zemtsov, 2024). This discrepancy suggests that the core challenge is not a mere lack of resources but rather the fragmentation of innovation processes and the absence of a coordinated approach that integrates multidisciplinary collaboration and systemic thinking (Edquist, 2005).

Innovation ecosystems operate within complex, interdependent networks in which universities, businesses, policymakers, and financial institutions must align their actions to facilitate knowledge transfer, technological adoption, and regional competitiveness (Chesbrough, 2003; Powell et al., 1996). Nevertheless, empirical evidence suggests that this coordination is often ineffective due to structural barriers, misaligned incentives, and regulatory inconsistencies (Qiao et al., 2025). For instance, studies on the role of universities in Turkey's regional development indicate that knowledge transfer and university-industry partnerships can foster economic convergence. However, their impact varies significantly across regions, depending on institutional capacity and human capital distribution (Demirdag & Nirwansyah, 2025). This underscores the need for a

more structured and strategic approach to innovation governance.

Similar studies on digital innovation ecosystems suggest that regional resilience and adaptability to technological change are highly contingent upon systemic integration and strategic resource management (Du & Jian, 2024). The absence of such integration leads to uneven growth, wherein innovation hubs in major cities thrive while peripheral regions lag behind (Zemtsov, 2024). Moreover, insights from China and ASEAN health innovation collaborations reveal that even well-funded initiatives can suffer from systemic inefficiencies if regulatory harmonization and cross-sectoral coordination remain insufficient (Qiao et al., 2025).

One of the fundamental challenges in regional innovation policy lies in aligning the interests and operational models of various stakeholders (Chesbrough, 2003; Wang et al., 2024). Traditional innovation frameworks, such as the Triple Helix and Quadruple Helix collaboration models, provide a theoretical foundation for fostering synergies between universities, industry, and government (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000). However, empirical evidence suggests that these models require adaptation to regional specificities by incorporating mechanisms for adaptive governance and institutional learning (Duchek & Höne, 2024; Wang et al., 2024). Without such contextual adaptation, innovation ecosystems risk becoming either overly reliant on state support or excessively dominated by private-sector interests, potentially hindering balanced and sustainable long-term development (Zenkienė & Leišytė, 2024).

Access to funding is a key factor in innovation diffusion and commercialization (Pierrakis & Saridakis, 2019). Regions with strong venture capital networks enable faster scaling and smoother research-to-market transitions. In contrast, regions without such mechanisms face major hurdles in technology scaling and sustaining growth (Du & Jian, 2024). This highlights the need for systemic financial support in regional innovation strategies to boost long-term competitiveness and technological progress.

The core issue is the lack of a holistic, systems-based approach that unifies diverse innovation theories into a coherent regional development strategy (Edquist, 2005). Current policies often overlook the complexity of innovation ecosystems, treating them as isolated rather than interconnected systems (Zemtsov, 2024). This study addresses that gap by analyzing seventeen innovation theories and proposing a structured framework to improve innovation governance. The resulting synthesis offers strategic guidelines to strengthen regional ecosystems, support sustainable growth, and build institutional resilience.

### Materials and Methods

The study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining a systematic literature review, expert interviews, and empirical data analysis to develop a conceptually grounded and practically applicable framework for analyzing innovation ecosystems.

A systematic literature review was conducted to identify, categorize, and synthesize key innovation theories relevant to regional development. The databases Scopus and Web of Science were used, covering the period from 2000 to 2024. Keywords included: *'regional innovation ecosystems'*, *'open innovation'*, *'innovation diffusion'*, *'dynamic capabilities'*, and *'sustainable innovation'*. After initial screening and duplicate removal, a total of 192 articles were analyzed. The studies were thematically coded, resulting in the identification of 17 key innovation theory paradigms, each linked to specific regional development challenges.

To complement and validate the theoretical insights from the literature, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 14 experts from academia, public administration, and innovation policy. Experts were selected based on their experience in regional development projects and innovation governance. The interviews focused on current ecosystem gaps, institutional challenges, and the applicability of theoretical frameworks to real-world innovation dynamics.

Findings from the literature and interviews were triangulated with empirical data and regional innovation policy documents, including comparative assessments of strategies across EU regions. A qualitative comparative analysis approach was used to identify context-specific enablers and bottlenecks.

### Results and Discussion

#### (A) *Innovation Theory Paradigms in Regional Development*

Regional development complexity stems from the diversity of innovation theories that guide ecosystem design and governance. This study identifies 17 core theory groups, covering areas like diffusion, systems integration, resource use, regulation, sustainability, digitalisation, and risk. Together, these paradigms inform adaptive, resilient policy strategies for building high-performing regional innovation ecosystems.

Empirical findings underscore the necessity of integrating these theoretical perspectives into regional development strategies to ensure sustainable and systematic progress. The Innovation Diffusion Theory (Rogers, 1962) highlights the role of communication channels and adopter categories in the dissemination of innovations. Regional policymakers and industry leaders must actively foster knowledge exchange through targeted incentives and stakeholder engagement to accelerate innovation adoption (Greenhalgh et al., 2004; Valente, 1996).

This aligns with Innovation Systems Theory (Lundvall, 1992), which emphasizes the interplay of institutions, education, and market structures in shaping regional innovation. Empirical studies confirm that robust university-industry collaboration and structured public funding mechanisms are pivotal in fostering dynamic innovation networks (Freeman, 1987; Nelson & Winter, 1982). A structured, system-oriented approach is required to enhance regional innovation capacity by aligning financial, institutional, and market mechanisms.

At the firm level, Resource-Based View (RBV) of Innovation (Barney, 1991) and Dynamic Capabilities Theory (Teece et al., 1997) emphasize that competitiveness is contingent upon acquiring, developing, and leveraging unique resources. Regional enterprises that invest in adaptive learning, research infrastructure, and strategic alliances demonstrate greater resilience to economic fluctuations and technological disruptions (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Helfat et al., 2007). Complementing this, the Triple Helix Model (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000) highlights the significance of synergistic interactions among universities, industry, and government in fostering innovation-driven regional competitiveness. The Open Innovation Paradigm (Chesbrough, 2003) posits that knowledge exchange beyond firm boundaries accelerates technological progress and commercialization. Empirical research suggests that leveraging open innovation networks—particularly through digital platforms and regional clusters—enhances collaborative problem-solving and co-creation, driving sustainable growth (Bogers et al., 2019; West & Bogers, 2014). This closely aligns with User Behavior Theories (Von Hippel, 2005), which emphasize the value of user-driven innovation for

market-adaptive solutions (Carlgren et al., 2016; Liedtka, 2015).

Disruptive Innovation Theory (Christensen, 1997) explains how breakthrough technologies and novel business models create new markets while challenging incumbents. Regions supporting disruptive innovations—particularly through venture capital investments and flexible regulatory frameworks—experience higher entrepreneurial activity and employment growth (Markides, 2006; Yu & Hang, 2010). Servitization and Business Model Innovation Theory (Baines et al., 2009) further underscores the strategic significance of service-oriented business models in enhancing regional economic adaptability. Regulatory Theories (North, 1990) emphasize the critical influence of governance structures and cultural norms in shaping innovation ecosystems. Regions with transparent policies, robust intellectual property protections, and innovation-friendly regulations tend

to attract greater research and development investments (Scott, 2008; Williamson, 2000). Simultaneously, Sustainability Theories (Boons & Lüdeke-Freund, 2013) highlight the imperative of integrating environmentally responsible and socially inclusive innovation strategies.

Finally, Network Innovation Theory (Powell et al., 1996) underscores the role of inter-organizational linkages in fostering innovation diffusion and knowledge transfer. Empirical data suggest that well-connected innovation networks, particularly those integrating academia, industry, and government, outperform fragmented ecosystems in patent output, technology transfer, and startup success (Burt, 2004). Table 1 encapsulates the diverse theoretical perspectives that inform regional innovation strategies, illustrating how each theory provides critical insights for addressing specific challenges in regional development.

**Table 1**

*Systematized Synthesis of Innovation Theories – Conceptual Features and Their Strategic Impact on Regional Development*

<i>Innovation Theory</i>	<i>Key Characteristics</i>	<i>Impact on Regional Development</i>
Innovation Diffusion Theory	role of communication channels and adopter categories	accelerates innovation dissemination
Innovation Systems Theory	institutional and market interactions	strengthens university-industry collaboration
Resource-Based View	effective utilization of unique resources	enhances firm competitiveness
Dynamic Capabilities Theory	adaptive learning and research infrastructure	improves firm resilience
Triple Helix Model	synergistic interaction between universities, industry, and government	enhances regional competitiveness
Open Innovation Paradigm	knowledge exchange and networking	strengthens collaborative innovation processes
Risk Management Theories	identification and mitigation of risks in innovation processes	ensures more stable innovation implementation
Creativity Theories	encouragement of creative thinking and new idea generation	enhances innovation quality and diversity
Cost-Benefit Theories	economic evaluation of innovation investments	ensures optimal resource allocation and efficiency
User Behavior Theories	analysis of consumer attitudes towards new technologies	facilitates market-driven innovation development
Materials Science & Engineering Theories	development of new materials and technological solutions	supports high-value-added product innovation
Regulation Theories	influence of regulatory frameworks on innovation	provides a supportive legal environment for innovation
Sustainability Theories	integration of sustainable development into innovation	promotes eco-friendly and long-term innovation

<i>Innovation Theory</i>	<i>Key Characteristics</i>	<i>Impact on Regional Development</i>
Information Theories	management of data and knowledge in innovation development	enhances innovation efficiency and accessibility
Project Management Theories	structured approach to innovation project execution	reduces risks and increases innovation success rates
Technology Readiness & Adaptation Theories	assessment and adaptation of technology readiness levels	ensures successful market adoption of technologies
Connected Systems Theories	integration of digital and cyber systems into innovation	strengthens connectivity and digital transformation

Source: Author's synthesis of theoretical frameworks validated and structured based on literature analysis and expert interviews.

The selection of these 17 innovation theories is based on their conceptual robustness, empirical relevance, and applicability to the complexities of regional innovation ecosystems. These theories collectively provide a multi-layered analytical framework, capturing the interplay between institutional structures, technological capabilities, market dynamics, and policy interventions. By integrating perspectives from innovation diffusion, open innovation, dynamic capabilities, sustainability, and risk management, this framework enables a holistic understanding of innovation-driven regional development, addressing both structural barriers and strategic enablers. Furthermore, these theories were validated through systematic literature analysis and expert consultations, ensuring their relevance to contemporary regional innovation challenges and policy imperatives.

While the previous section outlined the theoretical underpinnings that shape innovation ecosystems, the following part builds on this foundation by examining how these theories translate into practice. Specifically, it explores the alignment between regional innovation challenges and the conceptual models discussed above, offering a synthesis of theoretical relevance and strategic applicability. Having laid the theoretical foundation, the following section bridges conceptual insights with practical challenges faced by regional ecosystems.

#### *(B) Regional Challenges and Their Link to Innovation Theories*

Universities are crucial drivers of regional innovation, yet their impact varies significantly based on local innovation capacity and economic development levels (Demirdag & Nirwansyah, 2025). In advanced regions, they primarily support entrepreneurship and technology commercialization, whereas in less developed areas, their role in knowledge transfer and economic convergence is more pronounced (Zenkienė & Leišytė, 2024).

The Innovation Diffusion Theory (Rogers, 1962) explains this dynamic, emphasizing that effective communication channels and adopter categories are

key to accelerating innovation dissemination. To foster innovation adoption in lagging regions, targeted incentives and structured cross-sectoral collaboration must be developed, aligning with the Innovation Systems Theory (Lundvall, 1992). Strengthening institutional ties between universities, industry, and policymakers is essential for mitigating regional disparities in innovation diffusion.

Technological advancements tend to cluster in innovation hubs, particularly in AI, biotechnology, and other high-tech industries, while peripheral regions often rely on adapting existing technologies rather than developing breakthrough innovations (Zemtsov, 2024). Dynamic Capabilities Theory (Teece et al., 1997) underscores that firms' adaptive capacity is critical for enhancing research infrastructure and accelerating technology adoption, thereby reducing disparities in innovation-led growth.

The Triple Helix Model (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000) highlights the synergy between universities, industry, and government as a cornerstone of regional innovation ecosystems. However, empirical evidence warns that overly broad collaboration without clear strategic governance can lead to resource misallocation and inefficient innovation diffusion (Wang et al., 2024).

The Quadruple Helix model (Carayannis & Campbell, 2012) expands on traditional frameworks by integrating societal actors, fostering user-driven innovation and reinforcing sustainable innovation pathways. This aligns with the Open Innovation paradigm (Chesbrough, 2003), which emphasizes that broader knowledge exchange—involving firms, research institutions, civil society, and end-users—enhances innovation effectiveness and market adaptability. Incorporating these multi-actor dynamics strengthens regional innovation ecosystems, making them more adaptive, inclusive, and resilient.

Digital innovations have become central to regional resilience, mitigating economic shocks and enabling greater adaptability to market volatility (Du & Jian, 2024). The Technology Readiness and Adaptation Theory highlights that successful digital innovation

deployment depends on both corporate and governmental capacity to establish the necessary infrastructure and skills for sustained technological advancement.

At the same time, sustainable innovations are reshaping regional competitiveness, as environmentally responsible innovation confers strategic advantages in the global economy (Boons & Lüdeke-Freund, 2013). Firms adopting circular economy principles and sustainable business models achieve long-term growth while ensuring responsible resource management (Adams et al., 2016; Geissdoerfer et al., 2017). The convergence of digital and sustainable innovation highlights the need for integrated regional policies that maximize both economic resilience and long-term sustainability. The regulatory environment plays a crucial role in shaping innovation diffusion, influencing how effectively firms and research institutions can develop and implement new technologies (North, 1990).

Empirical evidence shows that regions with stable, transparent regulatory frameworks and strong intellectual property protections attract higher R&D investments (Scott, 2008; Williamson, 2000).

Beyond regulatory stability, access to venture capital and diversified financing mechanisms remains a critical determinant in the scalability of innovation. The Connected Systems Theory suggests that regions fostering both digital and physical networks among businesses, investors, and research institutions exhibit faster innovation adoption cycles. Empirical research confirms that regions with well-developed venture capital ecosystems enable innovation-driven firms to transition more rapidly from R&D to commercialization, whereas regions with restricted access to funding face significant challenges in market validation and scaling of technological advancements (Du & Jian, 2024; Pierrakis & Saridakis, 2019).

**Table 2**

*Synthesis of Regional Innovation Ecosystem Challenges, Corresponding Innovation Development Theories, and Strategic Policy Approaches*

<b><i>Regional Innovation Ecosystem Challenges</i></b>	<b><i>Relevant Innovation Development Theory</i></b>	<b><i>Strategic Policy Approach Derived from Innovation Theory</i></b>
Uneven regional development and innovation concentration in metropolitan areas	Innovation Systems Theory (Lundvall, 1992)	Development of regional innovation ecosystems through cluster-based policies and Smart Specialisation Strategies (RIS3)
Insufficient collaboration between universities, industry, and government	Triple Helix Model (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000)	Establishment of synergistic innovation platforms integrating enterprises, academia, and government for joint projects
Low innovation diffusion in less developed regions	Innovation Diffusion Theory (Rogers, 1962)	Targeted facilitation of knowledge and technology transfer through regional innovation brokers and intermediary institutions
Limited regional innovation financing and venture capital availability	Resource-Based View (Barney, 1991)	Creation of regional investment funds and development of public-private partnership mechanisms to enhance innovation financing
Mismatch between regulatory frameworks and innovation ecosystem needs	Regulation Theories (North, 1990)	Design of adaptive innovation policies with dynamic regulatory frameworks to support experimental innovation development
Insufficient user engagement and market orientation in innovation processes	User Behavior Theories (Von Hippel, 2005)	Support mechanisms for user-driven innovation, including the integration of Living Labs in regional innovation ecosystems
Challenges in commercialising breakthrough innovations and transitioning to servitization	Dynamic Capabilities Theory (Teece et al., 1997)	Expansion of start-up accelerators and incubators, alongside the promotion of servitization models (product-as-a-service)
Slow adoption of sustainable innovations and circular economy principles	Sustainability Theories (Boons & Lüdeke-Freund, 2013)	Implementation of green innovation funds and sustainable public procurement policies based on circular economy principles
Weak knowledge and technology transfer across industries and organisations	Open Innovation Paradigm (Chesbrough, 2003)	Development of digital innovation platforms, co-creation spaces, and cross-sectoral innovation partnerships

Source: Author's structured synthesis of theoretical perspectives, validated and refined through an in-depth literature review and expert interviews.

The findings reveal that regional innovation ecosystem challenges are not isolated occurrences, but rather systemic issues rooted in inadequate collaboration, limited financial accessibility, regulatory rigidity, and inefficiencies in technology diffusion mechanisms. Each of these challenges has a strong theoretical foundation and can be addressed through targeted strategic approaches grounded in innovation ecosystem governance. By systematically integrating relevant innovation management theories into policy design—encompassing both strategic frameworks and operational tactics—regions can achieve a more balanced and sustainable innovation-driven growth trajectory. This underscores the necessity of a holistic, interdisciplinary approach that merges academic knowledge with practical application in regional innovation strategies.

### Conclusions

This study demonstrates that regional innovation ecosystems can only thrive when guided by a structured, theory-driven approach. The integration of 17 innovation development theories provides a holistic framework for understanding the multifaceted challenges and opportunities in regional innovation governance.

1. The synthesis of Innovation Systems Theory, Dynamic Capabilities, and Open Innovation Paradigms creates a strong foundation for designing innovation policies that are adaptive, collaborative, and context-sensitive. These frameworks ensure that regional strategies are not only theoretically sound but also practically effective in fostering technological advancement and institutional resilience.

2. The findings confirm that synergistic collaboration among universities, industries, and governments – anchored in the Triple Helix and Quadruple Helix models – remains essential for building agile and

inclusive innovation ecosystems. However, such collaboration must be supported by clear governance mechanisms, avoiding coordination failures and ensuring strategic focus. Thirdly, regional disparities in innovation adoption require targeted policy instruments, particularly in less-developed areas. The research emphasizes the need for enhanced knowledge transfer mechanisms, inclusive stakeholder engagement, and financial support structures—derived from theories such as Innovation Diffusion, User Behavior, and Risk Management.

3. Sustainability-oriented innovation is increasingly a strategic necessity. The incorporation of Sustainability Theories and Circular Economy principles into regional planning enhances both economic competitiveness and environmental responsibility, laying the groundwork for long-term resilience.

4. The digital transformation of regional economies must be rooted in Technology Readiness and Adaptation frameworks, ensuring that technological infrastructure and human capital development go hand in hand. This enables regions to navigate uncertainty, capitalize on emerging trends, and position themselves competitively in the global innovation landscape.

5. The study offers a validated, theory-based framework for policy-makers, academic institutions, and regional planners. By aligning innovation strategies with multidisciplinary theoretical insights, it is possible to overcome fragmentation and guide regions toward sustainable, inclusive, and innovation-driven growth.

### Acknowledgements

The study was conducted with the support of the Recovery and Resilience Facility project 'Internal and External Consolidation of the University of Latvia' (No. 5.2.1.1.i.0/2/24/I/CFLA/007).

### References

- Adams, R., Jeanrenaud, S., Bessant, J., Denyer, D., & Overy, P. (2016). Sustainability-oriented innovation: A systematic review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18(2), 180–205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12068>
- Baines, T., Lightfoot, H., & Kay, J. (2009). Servitization: The future of manufacturing? *International Journal of Manufacturing Technology and Management*, 21(3–4), 375–392. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMTM.2010.029693>
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
- Boons, F. & Lüdeke-Freund, F. (2013). Business models for sustainable innovation: State-of-the-art and steps towards a research agenda. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 45, 9–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.07.007>
- Burt, R. S. (2004). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 349–399. <https://doi.org/10.1086/421787>
- Carlgen, L., Rauth, I., & Elmquist, M. (2016). Framing design thinking: The concept in idea and enactment. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 25(1), 38–57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12153>
- Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business Press.

- Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Demirdag, I. & Nirwansyah, A. W. (2025). Exploring university effect in Turkish regional development—A multifaceted statistical approach. *Cities*, 159, Article 105730. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2025.105730>
- Du, D. & Jian, X. (2024). Enhancing the resilience of regional digital innovation ecosystems: A pathway analysis from the lens of resource orchestration theory. *Annals of Regional Science*, 73(4), 1811–1838. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-024-103833>
- Duchek, S. & Höne, S. (2024). Innovation hubs in rural areas in Germany: A qualitative analysis of roles, types, and impacts. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 28(7–8), Article 2450028. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919624500285>
- Edquist, C. (2005). Systems of innovation: Perspectives and challenges. In J. Fagerberg, D. C. Mowery, & R. R. Nelson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of innovation* (pp. 181–208). Oxford University Press.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11), 1105–1121. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266\(200010/11\)21:10/11<1105::AID-SMJ133>3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0266(200010/11)21:10/11<1105::AID-SMJ133>3.0.CO;2-E)
- Etzkowitz, H. & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: From national systems and 'Mode 2' to a triple helix of university–industry–government relations. *Research Policy*, 29(2), 109–123. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(99\)00055-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00055-4)
- Freeman, C. (1987). *Technology policy and economic performance: Lessons from Japan*. Pinter Publishers.
- Geissdoerfer, M., Savaget, P., Bocken, N. M. P., & Hultink, E. J. (2017). The circular economy – A new sustainability paradigm? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 143, 757–768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.048>
- Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., Macfarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: Systematic review and recommendations. *Milbank Quarterly*, 82(4), 581–629. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0887-378X.2004.00325.x>
- Helfat, C. E., Finkelstein, S., Mitchell, W., Peteraf, M., Singh, H., Teece, D. J., & Winter, S. G. (2007). *Dynamic capabilities: Understanding strategic change in organizations*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Liedtka, J. (2015). Perspective: Linking design thinking with innovation outcomes through cognitive bias reduction. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 32(6), 925–938. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12163>
- Lundvall, B. Å. (1992). *National systems of innovation: Towards a theory of innovation and interactive learning*. London, Pinter Publishers.
- Markides, C. (2006). Disruptive innovation: In need of better theory. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 23(1), 19–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2005.00177.x>
- Nelson, R. R. & Winter, S. G. (1982). *An evolutionary theory of economic change*. Cambridge and London, Harvard University Press.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808678>
- Pierrakis, Y. & Saridakis, G. (2019). The role of venture capitalists in the regional innovation ecosystem: A comparison of networking patterns between private and publicly backed venture capital funds. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 44(3), 850–873. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-018-9671-1>
- Powell, W. W., Koput, K. W., & Smith-Doerr, L. (1996). Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1), 116–145. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393988>
- Qiao, J., Zhan, S., Ren, M., Wang, H., Huang, Y., Zhang, Z., ..., & Xu, M. (2025). A new phase of China-ASEAN health cooperation: The China-ASEAN Beijing Declaration on Cooperation in Innovation of Health Products and Technologies. *Global Health Research and Policy*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41256-024-00401-x>
- Rogers, E. M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York, The Free Press.
- Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests*. Los Angeles, Sage Publications.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509::AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Valente, T. W. (1996). Social network thresholds in the diffusion of innovations. *Social Networks*, 18(1), 69–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733\(95\)00256-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733(95)00256-1)
- Von Hippel, E. (2005). Democratizing innovation: The evolving phenomenon of user innovation. *Journal für Betriebswirtschaft*, 55, 63–78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-004-0002-8>
- Wang, L., Ni, Y., Zhao, Y., & Chen, Y. (2024). The triple helix collaboration: Lessons from a Chinese provincial innovation ecosystem. *Chinese Management Studies*, 18(4), 1276–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-08-2023-0391>

- West, J. & Bogers, M. (2014). Leveraging external sources of innovation: A review of research on open innovation. *Journal of product innovation management*, 31(4), 814-831. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12125>
- Williamson, O. E. (2000). The new institutional economics: Taking stock, looking ahead. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38(3), 595–613. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.38.3.595>
- Yu, D. & Hang, C. C. (2010). A reflective review of disruptive innovation theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(4), 435–452. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00272.x>
- Zemtsov, S. (2024). Artificial intelligence and regional disparities: The concentration of innovation in metropolitan areas. *Regional Science Policy & Practice*, 16(1), 123–140.
- Zenkienė, L., Leišytė, L. (2024). Strengthening university capacity in regional innovation ecosystems through participation in the European Universities initiative. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 14(sup1), 88–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2024.2410358>