

A New Methodology to Assess the Relevancy of the Division of Labor in Medical Innovation

Dissertation

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades
Doctor of Philosophy
(Ph.D.)

vorgelegt dem Rat der Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät
der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena
am 10.02.2016

von MSc. Florence Blandinieres

geboren am : 24.02.1988 in : Bayonne, France

Contents

Deutsche Zusammenfassung	IX
List of Figures	XIII
List of Tables	XVI
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Industrial dynamics lens and justification of the division of innovative labor	3
1.2.1 Previous examples of division of labor and Schumpeterian event	4
1.2.2 Actors complementarity and comparative advantages	5
1.2.3 Assumptions about the nature and structure of knowledge . .	7
1.3 Innovation as the result of three co-evolving pathways	9
1.3.1 Dynamic process and ever-changing division of labor	10
1.3.2 The multifaceted role of actors	11
1.3.3 Medical devices vs pharmaceuticals	12
1.3.4 Nature of biological knowledge	12
1.4 Methodological issues and medical innovation: implications on the division of labor	14
1.4.1 Partial innovation process	15
1.4.2 Lack of accurate indicators to qualify public biomedical research	16
1.5 Justification of the case, research goals and summary	18
1.5.1 Case study: heterogeneity of technologies and disease areas	19
1.5.2 Research questions and summary of the different chapters . .	20
2 Openness and technology selection in the Oncology Health Innovation System	25
2.1 Introduction	25

2.2	Theoretical and contextual frameworks	27
2.2.1	The three co-evolving pathways of medical innovation	28
2.2.2	Cancer: an old enemy but not defeated	30
2.3	Building the interrelationship between the Medical Domains	31
2.3.1	Technological push with the emergence of the HIS standard	32
2.3.2	Institutional change: Bridging the Innovation Pathways	33
2.3.3	Reinforcement mechanisms: technological complementarity and payment structure	37
2.4	Consequences on the selection of new therapies	38
2.4.1	Rules of selection of compounds	39
2.4.2	Failures of targeted therapies: going against the cell-kill heuristic	39
2.4.3	Success of targeted drug deliveries: benefits from the cell-kill paradigm	41
2.5	Conclusion	43
3	Institutional frameworks and health academic inventors: Insights from liposomal chemotherapy	47
3.1	Introduction	47
3.2	Theoretical and contextual background	50
3.2.1	Characteristics of instrumentalities	50
3.2.2	Contextual background	53
3.3	Methodology	56
3.3.1	Assumptions about the key trajectories	56
3.3.2	Selecting relevant knowledge to perform the analysis	58
3.3.3	Descriptive statistics	62
3.4	Results	64
3.4.1	Testing to learn: a tool vs a carrier	67
3.4.2	Issues of replicability of experiments	68
3.4.3	Clinical practice: re-alignment of selection and 2nd dominant design	70
3.5	Discussion: the role of the National Innovation System	72
3.5.1	Initial tension between academia and industry: diverging visions	72
3.5.2	Informal rules: the way of organizing biomedical research and innovation	73

3.5.3	Formal rules: regulatory bodies in organizing innovative development efforts	74
3.6	Conclusion	76
4	Mapping the dynamics of medical knowledge: a meso-micro approach. The example of liposomal chemotherapy in cancer	79
4.1	Introduction	79
4.2	Theoretical and contextual frameworks	82
4.2.1	Author-Inventor: a specific interface in medical innovation	83
4.2.2	Contextual elements: institutional changes	85
4.3	Methodology	89
4.3.1	Data sources and sampling	89
4.3.2	Subsetting periods: historical time and medical progress	92
4.3.3	Meso-level analysis: assessing the dynamic of knowledge	93
4.3.4	Micro-level analysis: mapping the knowledge recombination of author-inventors	97
4.4	Results	101
4.4.1	Evolution of the knowledge flows	102
4.4.2	Mapping the combination of knowledge over time	107
4.5	Conclusion	112
4.6	Policy implications	113
4.6.1	Implications of the current IPR design	113
4.6.2	Implications of the publish or perish culture	114
4.7	Limitations	115
4.8	Appendix	116
5	Diversity, novelty, feasibility: exploring the link between public funding and translation capacity in Oncology	119
5.1	Introduction	119
5.2	Theoretical framework	121
5.2.1	Orientation of problem-solving	121
5.2.2	Types of search to ensure scientific knowledge growth: diversity at the topic and disciplinary levels	124
5.3	Methodology	126
5.3.1	Defining samples	126
5.3.2	Definition of variables	128
5.3.3	Econometric model	135
5.4	Results	136
5.4.1	Governmental funded research and translation of scientific knowledge	141
5.5	Discussion and implications	148

5.6	Conclusion	149
5.7	Limitations	150
5.8	Appendix	152
6	Conclusion	167
6.1	Summary and overview of results	167
6.2	Policy implications	169
6.2.1	Science policy	169
6.2.2	Technology policy	171
6.2.3	Clinical research measures: selecting relevant scientific areas and technological features	173
6.2.4	Parasitic vs synergistic relationship with public and private collaborations	174
6.3	Limitations and further research avenues	176
6.3.1	The limited scope of results	176
6.3.2	Methodological caveats	177
	References	180
	Curriculum Vitae	205
	Erklärung	207