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This is an interesting and actual case study that tries to analyse an outsource innovation and propose an alternative to Chesbrough's open-source model.

However, the article approach lacks a clear scientific approach which hinders its scientific application and potential publication in a scientific journal.

The article mixes case description and discussion with theory and omits a distinctive state of the art section, which could have been relevant form the article proposal. On the other hand, the completely heterodox alternative to show references makes it quite difficult to read and follow the article arguments.

However, there are sufficient references on outsourcing innovation, processes and moderators that could have been discussed and proposed where there was (if there is gap research in the existing literature (i.e., Calantone, 2007; Wallenburg, 2009; De Quinn, 2000, Gooroochun, 2007).

On the other hand, the conclusion section is too weak. It would be advisable to include theoretical and management implication sections for the article to have a clearer impact.

Summarising. The article should be rewritten following a scientific methodology. A state of art section identifies the research gaps in the open-source literature, focusing on the process's moderators. A methodology description justifying the validity of the case study. A properly designed description and discussion of the case study and a conclusion justifying the paper contribution and the theoretical and practical implications. Please follow a clear reference structure, either Harvard, APA, etc.

Thus the paper should be rated, in my humble opinion, as a major revision in a conventional journal. Nowithstanding the article with a proper structure and method could be a relevant contribution to the OS literature thus I encourage the authors to reconsider its reorganization and rewriting.