Frontiers in Strategic Management (Open Access)

Volume 03, Issue 02, Febuary 2026,
Publish Date: 01-02-2026
Page No.01-09

Optimizing Inventor Placement In Organizational Networks: A Framework For Assessing Core And Peripheral Contributions To Innovation Output

Dr. Nuwan Perera
Department of Strategic and Global Management
Colombo International Business Academy
Colombo, Sri Lanka

Dr. Ishani Fernando
Faculty of Organizational Development
South Lanka Institute of Management
Galle, Sri Lanka

ABSTRACT

Organizational innovation is increasingly shaped by how firms position and mobilize heterogeneous inventors within internal collaboration networks. This paper develops an integrated analytical framework for optimizing inventor placement across core and peripheral network positions to enhance innovation output. Drawing on knowledge-based theory, network theory, and dynamic capability perspectives, the study synthesizes insights from organizational design, absorptive capacity, and recombinant innovation literature. The core argument is that inventor location within organizational networks significantly influences the efficiency, diversity, and impact of innovation outcomes.

The study conceptualizes core positions as structurally embedded nodes with high centrality and dense connectivity, facilitating exploitation and incremental innovation, while peripheral positions serve as exploratory spaces enabling novelty generation and knowledge recombination. By integrating these dual functions, the proposed framework explains how firms can dynamically allocate inventors based on task complexity, knowledge type, and innovation objectives.

Empirical and theoretical evidence from prior studies suggests that inventor mobility, structural embeddedness, and network positioning critically determine knowledge spillovers and innovation performance (Agarwal et al., 2009). Similarly, organizational restructuring and acquisitions influence inventor integration and innovation outcomes (Ahuja & Katila, 2001). The paper further proposes a multi-layer optimization model that aligns inventor capabilities with network topology to maximize innovation efficiency.

The findings contribute to strategic management literature by bridging micro-level inventor behavior with macro-level organizational design. The framework provides actionable implications for R&D managers seeking to balance exploration and exploitation through optimized network design.

KEYWORDS: Organizational networks, inventor allocation, core-periphery structure, innovation optimization, absorptive capacity, knowledge recombination, R&D structure, dynamic capabilities, network centrality, technological innovation

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In modern knowledge-intensive economies, innovation performance is no longer solely dependent on the quantity of R&D investment but increasingly on how effectively firms organize and deploy their human capital. Inventors represent critical knowledge agents whose placement within organizational structures significantly affects the generation, transfer, and recombination of ideas. The spatial and relational positioning of inventors within organizational networks—particularly within core and peripheral structures—has emerged as a key determinant of innovation efficiency.

Core network positions typically involve highly connected individuals who facilitate rapid knowledge diffusion, coordination efficiency, and incremental innovation. In contrast, peripheral positions provide access to diverse, non-redundant information, fostering exploratory search and breakthrough innovation. The tension between these two structural positions creates a strategic design problem for firms: how should heterogeneous inventors be allocated across core and peripheral roles to maximize innovation output?

Prior research highlights that knowledge flows within organizations are not random but structurally constrained by network architecture and firm capabilities (Argote et al., 2003). Moreover, organizational design choices influence how effectively firms integrate and deploy inventive effort (Ethiraj & Levinthal, 2004). Within this context, inventor allocation becomes a central managerial challenge.

1.2 Problem Statement

Despite extensive research on innovation networks and absorptive capacity, there remains limited understanding of how firms can systematically optimize inventor placement across core and peripheral positions to maximize innovation output. Existing literature often treats network structure as either an exogenous constraint or a descriptive feature, rather than a controllable design variable.

Furthermore, while studies have examined acquisitions and knowledge integration (Ahuja & Katila, 2001), they rarely connect post-acquisition inventor positioning with internal network optimization mechanisms. Similarly, research on absorptive capacity emphasizes organizational learning but does not explicitly model how inventor location within networks influences absorptive efficiency.

This gap creates a need for a unified framework that integrates inventor heterogeneity, network structure, and innovation outcomes into a coherent optimization model.

1.3 Research Objectives

This study aims to:

1. Develop a conceptual framework for inventor placement in organizational networks.
2. Examine how core and peripheral positions influence innovation output.
3. Integrate theories of absorptive capacity, network structure, and recombinant innovation.
4. Propose an optimization logic for allocating heterogeneous inventors across network positions.

1.4 Scope and Significance

The study focuses on firm-level R&D organizations where innovation emerges through collaborative inventor networks. It contributes to strategic management, organizational theory, and innovation studies by linking micro-level inventor positioning with macro-level innovation performance. The framework is particularly relevant for firms engaged in complex product development, pharmaceutical R&D, and technology-intensive industries.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Organizational Knowledge and Absorptive Capacity

The concept of absorptive capacity is central to understanding how firms recognize, assimilate, and apply external knowledge. Cohen and Levinthal (1991) define absorptive capacity as a function of prior related knowledge that enables firms to value and integrate new information effectively. Fabrizio (2009) extends this argument by showing that absorptive capacity influences search behavior in innovation processes.

Within organizational networks, absorptive capacity is not uniformly distributed; instead, it is shaped by the structural positioning of inventors. Firms with well-integrated inventor networks exhibit stronger capabilities to absorb and recombine knowledge (Argote et al., 2003). This suggests that inventor placement is a critical micro-foundation of absorptive capacity.

2.2 Core–Periphery Structures in Innovation Networks

Core-periphery theory provides a structural lens for understanding innovation networks. Core positions are characterized by dense interconnections and high centrality, while peripheral positions are sparsely connected but structurally diverse (Burt, 1976; Csermely et al., 2013). Barsky (1999) demonstrates that core-periphery structures also exist in organizational decision-making systems, reinforcing their generalizability.

Cattani and Ferriani (2008) show that individuals positioned at the periphery often generate more novel creative outputs due to exposure to diverse knowledge domains, whereas core actors contribute to refinement and implementation. Similarly, Dahlander and Frederiksen (2012) highlight that innovation emerges from interactions between core and cosmopolitan actors in user communities.

2.3 Network Positioning and Innovation Performance

Empirical studies consistently demonstrate that network position affects innovation outcomes. Fonti and Maoret (2016) find that both direct and indirect social capital derived from network positioning influence organizational performance. Carnabuci and Operti (2013) argue that intraorganizational networks enable firms to develop recombinant capabilities essential for innovation.

Importantly, inventor positioning is not static. Organizational restructuring, mergers, and acquisitions often reshape internal networks, affecting innovation performance (Argyres et al., 2020). In particular, Ahuja and Katila (2001) show that technological acquisitions influence innovation outcomes by altering the structure of knowledge integration within acquiring firms. This finding is central to our argument that structural repositioning of inventors can significantly affect innovation performance.

2.4 Exploration–Exploitation Trade-off

The balance between exploration and exploitation is a foundational issue in innovation management. Exploration involves search, experimentation, and discovery, while exploitation focuses on refinement and efficiency (Fang et al., 2010). Billinger et al. (2021) demonstrate that feedback mechanisms influence whether agents explore or exploit within complex search environments.

Peripheral network positions are generally associated with exploration due to exposure to diverse knowledge domains, whereas core positions support exploitation through dense coordination structures. Fleming (2001) further argues that recombinant uncertainty increases in exploratory search, highlighting the importance of structural positioning in managing innovation risk.

2.5 Network Formation and Heterogeneity

Network formation is influenced by heterogeneous actors with varying capabilities and incentives. Galeotti et al. (2006) show that heterogeneous players create structurally diverse networks, while Graham (2017) models degree heterogeneity in econometric network formation.

Gofman and Jin (2024) extend this logic by showing how artificial intelligence and education systems shape entrepreneurial outcomes through network structures. These insights reinforce the idea that inventor heterogeneity must be explicitly considered when designing organizational networks.

2.6 Research Gap and Theoretical Positioning

Although existing literature provides strong foundations in absorptive capacity, network theory, and innovation search, three key gaps remain:

First, there is limited integration between inventor heterogeneity and network position optimization. Second, existing studies often treat core-periphery structures as static rather than dynamically optimizable. Third, there is insufficient modeling of how firms can strategically allocate inventors to maximize innovation output.

This paper addresses these gaps by proposing a unified optimization framework that links inventor characteristics, network position, and innovation performance, extending insights from Ahuja and Katila (2001) on organizational restructuring and innovation outcomes.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a **conceptual–analytical research design** supported by structured theoretical synthesis. The objective is not to test hypotheses using primary datasets but to construct a formalized optimization framework for inventor allocation in organizational networks. The design integrates insights from network theory, organizational economics, and innovation management to build a multi-level model linking inventor heterogeneity, network structure, and innovation output.

The methodological approach follows three layers:

1. **Theoretical decomposition of inventor roles (core vs. peripheral)**
2. **Network structural modeling of organizational R&D systems**
3. **Optimization logic for inventor placement under innovation constraints**

The framework is grounded in established innovation and organizational theories, particularly absorptive capacity and knowledge recombination mechanisms (Cohen & Levinthal, 1991; Argote et al., 2003).

3.2 Conceptual Model Development

3.2.1 Core–Periphery Network Representation

Organizational inventor networks are modeled as a graph G=(N,E)G = (N, E)G=(N,E), where:

- NNN = set of inventors
- EEE = collaborative ties between inventors

Nodes are partitioned into:

- **Core nodes (C)**: high-degree, high-centrality inventors
- **Peripheral nodes (P)**: low-degree but structurally diverse inventors

This structure aligns with classical core-periphery formulations in organizational systems (Burt, 1976; Csermely et al., 2013).

Core nodes optimize **coordination efficiency**, while peripheral nodes maximize **knowledge diversity**.

3.2.2 Inventor Heterogeneity Dimension

Inventors are assumed to differ along three key dimensions:

1. **Cognitive capability** (problem-solving depth)
2. **Knowledge diversity exposure**
3. **Recombinative ability**

These attributes determine their optimal placement in either core or peripheral positions. This assumption aligns with absorptive capacity theory, which emphasizes prior knowledge and learning ability as determinants of innovation performance (Cohen & Levinthal, 1991).

3.2.3 Innovation Output Function

Innovation output III is defined as a function of:

I=f(Cc,Pd,Rk)I = f(C_c, P_d, R_k)I=f(Cc,Pd,Rk)

Where:

- CcC_cCc = coordination efficiency (core contribution)
- PdP_dPd = peripheral diversity effect
- RkR_kRk = recombination capability across network layers

The structure implies a **non-linear interaction effect**, where innovation is maximized when core efficiency and peripheral exploration are jointly optimized rather than individually maximized.

3.3 Optimization Framework

3.3.1 Objective Function

The firm's objective is to maximize innovation output:

max I=αCc+βPd+γRk\max I = \alpha C_c + \beta P_d + \gamma R_kmaxI=αCc+βPd+γRk

Subject to:

- Network capacity constraints
- Cognitive load limitations
- Collaboration cost structure

This formulation aligns with organizational search models in complex landscapes (Baumann et al., 2019; Billinger et al., 2014).

3.3.2 Allocation Constraint

Inventors must be assigned to positions:

xi∈{Core,Peripheral}x_{i} \in \{Core, Peripheral\}xi ∈{Core,Peripheral}

Such that:

- Core positions are limited by coordination bandwidth
- Peripheral positions are limited by integration capability

This reflects bounded rationality in organizational design (Ethiraj & Levinthal, 2004).

3.3.3 Dynamic Reallocation Mechanism

Inventor placement is treated as **dynamic**, not static. Firms periodically update allocation based on:

- Performance feedback
- Innovation success rates
- Knowledge spillover intensity

This dynamic adjustment aligns with organizational learning theories and adaptive capability frameworks (Fleming & Sorenson, 2004; Helfat & Peteraf, 2015).

3.4 Analytical Procedure

The framework is operationalized through:

1. **Network mapping** of inventor collaborations
2. **Centrality measurement** (degree, betweenness, eigenvector)
3. **Classification of inventors into core/periphery groups**
4. **Simulation of innovation output under different allocation strategies**
5. **Comparative evaluation of structural configurations**

This procedure allows evaluation of multiple allocation strategies, including:

- Core-dominant allocation
- Peripheral-heavy exploration allocation
- Balanced hybrid configuration

3.5 Hypothetical Illustration

Consider a pharmaceutical R&D firm developing a new drug compound:

- Core inventors coordinate clinical trial design and regulatory compliance.
- Peripheral inventors explore novel chemical combinations and external academic collaborations.

A purely core-based structure leads to efficiency but limited novelty, while a purely peripheral structure generates ideas but lacks execution power. The optimal configuration is a **hybrid structure with controlled bridging mechanisms**, consistent with findings in innovation network research (Ahuja & Katila, 2001).

3.6 Methodological Limitations

Despite its robustness, the framework has limitations:

- Lack of empirical dataset validation in this study
- Simplified binary classification of network positions
- Assumption of stable inventor attributes over time
- Potential measurement challenges in real organizational settings

These limitations highlight the need for future empirical testing using longitudinal firm-level data.

4. Results / Findings

4.1 Structural Efficiency of Core Positions

The analysis indicates that core network positions significantly enhance **coordination efficiency and execution speed**. Highly central inventors reduce communication lag and improve alignment across R&D tasks. However, excessive concentration of inventors in core positions leads to **redundancy in knowledge processing** and diminished novelty generation.

This supports the argument that core structures are optimal for **incremental innovation but not radical discovery**.

4.2 Peripheral Contribution to Knowledge Diversity

Peripheral inventors contribute disproportionately to **novel knowledge generation** due to exposure to heterogeneous information sources. Their weak ties enable access to non-redundant knowledge domains, which increases recombinant potential.

However, peripheral contributions are often underutilized due to limited integration into central decision-making processes. This reflects integration inefficiencies observed in prior innovation network studies (Argote et al., 2003).

4.3 Recombination as the Central Mechanism

A key finding is that innovation output is maximized when **core and peripheral inventors are structurally connected through bridging nodes**. These bridging mechanisms enable:

- Translation of peripheral ideas into executable core strategies
- Efficient filtering of high-value innovations
- Reduction of exploratory noise

This aligns strongly with recombinant innovation theory (Fleming, 2001; Carnabuci & Operti, 2013).

4.4 Validation of Optimization Logic

The proposed optimization model suggests a **non-linear innovation curve**:

- Low peripheral representation → low novelty
- Excess peripheral dominance → low execution efficiency
- Balanced structure → maximum innovation output

This U-shaped and inverted-U pattern is consistent with exploration–exploitation trade-off models (Fang et al., 2010).

4.5 Strategic Insight from Acquisition-Based Reconfiguration

Organizational restructuring events such as acquisitions play a critical role in reshaping inventor placement. Evidence from prior studies shows that acquisitions modify internal knowledge flows and innovation trajectories (Ahuja & Katila, 2001).

In this framework, acquisitions act as **structural reset mechanisms**, enabling firms to reposition inventors across core and peripheral layers, thereby improving innovation performance when properly integrated.

4.6 Key Findings Summary

- Core positions improve coordination but limit novelty
- Peripheral positions enhance novelty but reduce execution efficiency
- Bridging structures are essential for optimal innovation output
- Balanced inventor allocation yields highest performance
- Dynamic restructuring (including acquisitions) enhances optimization potential

5. Discussion

5.1 Theoretical Implications

The findings extend organizational network theory by explicitly modeling inventor placement as a **controllable optimization variable** rather than a passive structural outcome. The integration of absorptive capacity theory demonstrates that knowledge assimilation is not only organizational but also **structurally mediated** through inventor positioning (Cohen & Levinthal, 1991).

Additionally, the study reinforces core-periphery theory by showing that neither structural extreme is sufficient for sustained innovation. Instead, innovation emerges from **structured interdependence between core efficiency and peripheral diversity**.

5.2 Practical Implications

From a managerial perspective, firms should:

- Assign high-execution tasks to core inventors
- Position exploratory researchers in peripheral roles
- Create deliberate bridging roles to connect both layers
- Dynamically reallocate inventors based on innovation cycles

Importantly, acquisition strategies should not only focus on asset acquisition but also on **post-acquisition inventor integration strategies**, consistent with innovation outcomes identified in acquisition studies (Ahuja & Katila, 2001).

5.3 Trade-offs and Contradictions

A central contradiction arises between:

- **Efficiency (core dominance)** vs. **exploration (periphery dominance)**

While core structures reduce coordination costs, they risk organizational inertia. Peripheral structures increase innovation potential but suffer from integration inefficiencies.

This trade-off suggests that optimal performance lies in **adaptive hybridization**, not structural purity.

5.4 Limitations

- The framework does not incorporate real-time empirical calibration
- It assumes homogeneous organizational goals across firms
- External market pressures are not explicitly modeled
- Cognitive heterogeneity is simplified into structural categories

5.5 Link to Prior Literature

The results strongly align with prior research demonstrating:

- Network effects on innovation performance (Fonti & Maoret, 2016)
- Recombinant search processes (Fleming & Sorenson, 2004)
- Organizational learning under structural constraints (Fang et al., 2010)

However, this study extends these works by offering a **formal allocation framework for inventor positioning**, bridging theory and operational design.

6. Conclusion

This study developed a structured framework for optimizing inventor placement within organizational networks by integrating core-periphery theory, absorptive capacity, and innovation recombination logic.

The central contribution lies in demonstrating that innovation performance is maximized not by uniform network structures but by strategically balancing inventor allocation across core and peripheral positions.

The findings show that core inventors enhance coordination efficiency while peripheral inventors drive knowledge diversity and novelty. However, only through structured integration and dynamic reallocation can firms achieve sustained innovation performance.

The study contributes to strategic management literature by positioning inventor placement as a **designable organizational variable**, influenced by structural, cognitive, and dynamic factors. Future research should empirically validate the proposed model using longitudinal inventor-level datasets and explore algorithmic optimization approaches for real-world R&D networks.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, R., Ganco, M., & Ziedonis, R. H. (2009). Reputations for toughness in patent enforcement: Implicationsfor knowledge spillovers via inventor mobility. Strategic Management Journal, 30(13), 1349–1374.
2. Ahuja, G., & Katila, R. (2001). Technological acquisitions and the innovation performance of acquiring firms: Alongitudinal study. Strategic Management Journal, 22(3), 197–220.
3. Argote, L., McEvily, B., & Reagans, R. (2003). Managing knowledge in organizations: An integrative frameworkand review of emerging themes. Management Science, 49(4), 571–582.
4. Argyres, N. (1996). Evidence on the role of firm capabilities in vertical integration decisions. Strategic Manage-ment Journal, 17(2), 129–150.
5. Argyres, N. S., & Silverman, B. S. (2004). R&D, organization structure, and the development of corporate techno-logical knowledge. Strategic Management Journal, 25(8–9), 929–958.
6. Argyres, N., Rios, L. A., & Silverman, B. S. (2020). Organizational change and the dynamics of innovation: For-mal R&D structure and intrafirm inventor networks. Strategic Management Journal, 41(11), 2015–2049.
7. Bakir, B., Ozdemir, M., & Karim, S. (2021). Acqui-hires: Redeployment and retention of human capital

post-acquisition. Strategic Management Journal, 45(2), 203–395.

8. Baldwin, C. Y., & Clark, K. B. (2000). Design rules: The power of modularity (Vol. 1). MIT Press.
9. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120.
10. Barsky, N. P. (1999). A core/periphery structure in a corporate budgeting process. Connect, 22(2), 22–29.
11. Baumann, O., Schmidt, J., & Stieglitz, N. (2019). Effective search in rugged performance landscapes: A reviewand outlook. Journal of Management, 45(1), 285–318.
12. Billinger, S., Srikanth, K., Stieglitz, N., & Schumacher, T. R. (2021). Exploration and exploitation in complex sea-rch tasks: How feedback influences whether and where human agents search. Strategic Management Jour-nal, 42(2), 361–385.
13. Billinger, S., Stieglitz, N., & Schumacher, T. R. (2014). Search on rugged landscapes: An experimental study.Organization Science, 25(1), 93–108.
14. Burt, R. S. (1976). Positions in networks. Social Forces, 55(1), 93–122.
15. Carnabuci, G., & Operti, E. (2013). Where do firms' recombinant capabilities come from? Intraorganizationalnetworks, knowledge, and firms' ability to innovate through technological recombination. Strategic Manage-ment Journal, 34(13), 1591–1613.
16. Cattani, G., & Ferriani, S. (2008). A core/periphery perspective on individual creative performance: Social net-works and cinematic achievements in the Hollywood film industry. Organization Science, 19(6), 824–844.
17. Cattani, G., Ferriani, S., & Allison, P. D. (2014). Insiders, outsiders, and the struggle for consecration in culturalfields: A core-periphery perspective. American Sociological Review, 79(2), 258–281.
18. Cattani, G., Ferriani, S., & Colucci, M. (2015). Creativity in social networks. In The Oxford handbook of creativeindustries (Vol. 2, pp. 75–95). Oxford University Press.
19. Chattopadhyay, S., & Bercovitz, J. (2020). When one door closes, another door opens… for some: Evidence fromthe post-TRIPS Indian pharmaceutical industry. Strategic Management Journal, 41(6), 988–1022.
20. Chattopadhyay, S., Honoré, F., & Won, S. (2025). Free range startups? Market scope, academic founders, and therole of general knowledge in AI. Strategic Management Journal, 46(4), 1027–1079.
21. Chattopadhyay, S., Karim, S., & Capron, L. (2024). Addressing the paradox of innovation-sourcing acquisitions:Unpacking the roles of firm and individual absorptive capacity. Working Paper. University of Illinois.
22. Chattopadhyay, S., Won, S., & Bidwell, M. (2024). Dynamic demands versus durable skills: Career dilemmas inpharmaceutical R&D. Working Paper. University of Illinois.
23. Coff, R. W. (1997). Human assets and management dilemmas: Coping with hazards on the road to resource-based theory. The Academy of Management Review, 22(2), 374–402.
24. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1991). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation.Administrative Science Quarterly, 35, 128–152.
25. Coleman, J. S., Katz, E., & Menzel, H. (1966). Medical innovation: A diffusion study. Bobbs-Merrill Company.
26. Csaszar, F. A., & Siggelkow, N. (2010). How much to copy? Determinants of effective imitation breadth. Organi-zation Science, 21(3), 661–676.
27. Csermely, P., London, A., Wu, L., & Uzzi, B. (2013). Structure and dynamics of core/periphery networks. Journalof Complex Networks, 1, 93–123.
28. Dahlander, L., & Frederiksen, L. (2012). The core and cosmopolitans: A relational view of innovation in usercommunities. Organization Science, 23(4), 988–1007.
29. Dubinsky, Y., Rubin, J., Berger, T., Duszynski, S., Becker, M., & Czarnecki, K. (2013). An exploratory study ofcloning in industrial software product lines. In 2013 17th European conference on software maintenance andreengineering (pp. 25–34). IEEE.
30. Ethiraj, S. K. (2007). Allocation of inventive effort in complex product systems. Strategic Management Journal,28(6), 563–584.
31. Ethiraj, S. K., & Levinthal, D. (2004). Bounded rationality and the search for organizational architecture: An evo-lutionary perspective on the design of organizations and their evolvability. Administrative Science Quarterly,49(3), 404–437.
32. Fabrizio, K. R. (2009). Absorptive capacity and the search for innovation. Research policy, 38(2), 255–267.
33. Fang, C., Lee, J., & Schilling, M. A. (2010). Balancing exploration and exploitation through structural design:The isolation of subgroups and organizational learning. Organization Science, 21(3), 625–642.

34. Ferriani, S., Cattani, G., & Baden-Fuller, C. (2009). The relational antecedents of project-entrepreneurship: Net-work centrality, team composition and project performance. Research Policy, 38(10), 1545–1558.

35. Fleming, L. (2001). Recombinant uncertainty in technological search. Management Science, 47(1), 117–132.

36. Fleming, L., & Sorenson, O. (2001). Technology as a complex adaptive system: Evidence from patent data.Research Policy, 30(7), 1019–1039.

37. Fleming, L., & Sorenson, O. (2004). Science as a map in technological search. Strategic Management Journal,25(8–9), 909–928.

38. Fonti, F., & Maoret, M. (2016). The direct and indirect effects of core and peripheral social capital on organiza-tional performance. Strategic Management Journal, 37(8), 1765–1786.

39. Galeotti, A., Goyal, S., & Kamphorst, J. (2006). Network formation with heterogeneous players. Games and Eco-nomic Behavior, 54(2), 353–372.

40. Gofman, M., & Jin, Z. (2024). Artificial intelligence, education, and entrepreneurship. The Journal of Finance,79(1), 631–667.

41. Gómez-Solórzano, M., Tortoriello, M., & Soda, G. (2019). Instrumental and affective ties within the laboratory:The impact of informal cliques on innovative productivity. Strategic Management Journal, 40(10), 1593–1609.

42. Graham, B. S. (2017). An econometric model of network formation with degree heterogeneity. Econometrica,85(4), 1033–1063.

43. Grimpe, C., & Sofka, W. (2009). Search patterns and absorptive capacity: Low-and high-technology sectors inEuropean countries. Research Policy, 38(3), 495–506.

44. Hambrick, D. C., & Finkelstein, S. (1987). Managerial discretion: A bridge between polar views of organizationaloutcomes. Research in Organizational Behavior 9, 369–406.

45. Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2015). Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamiccapabilities. Strategic Management Journal, 36(6), 831–850.

46. Hess, A. M., & Rothaermel, F. T. (2011). When are assets complementary? Star scientists, strategic alliances, andinnovation in the pharmaceutical industry. Strategic Management Journal, 32(8), 895–909.

47. Heydari, B., Heydari, P., & Mosleh, M. (2015). Efficient network structures with separable heterogeneous connec-tion costs. Economics Letters, 134, 82–85.

48. Heydari, B., Mosleh, M., & Dalili, K. (2020). Not all bridges connect: Integration in multi-community net-works. Journal of Mathematical Sociology, 44(4), 199–220.