ANALYZING THE ROLE OF SUPPORT STRUCTURES IN SHAPING INNOVATION ECOSYSTEMS: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

S. JAYASEELAN, Assistant Professor of Social Work, Department of Rural Development Science, Arul Anandar College (Autonomous), Karumathur, Affiliated to Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India. E-mail: jayassj@gmail.com

I. BENJAMIN PRABAHAR, Assistant Professor of Commerce, Department of Commerce with Computer Applications, Arul Anandar College (Autonomous), Karumathur, Affiliated to Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India. E-mail: benjaminprabahar.vip@gmail.com

S. ARUN PRASAD, Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Business Administration, Arul Anandar College (Autonomous), Karumathur, Affiliated to Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India. E-mail: sarunprasad1989@gmail.com

Abstract

This systematic literature review examines the critical role of support structures in shaping innovation ecosystems and fostering regional development. Drawing on peer-reviewed scholarly sources from 2013 to 2023, the study synthesizes conceptual frameworks, empirical evidence, and case studies to analyze how diverse support mechanisms such as policy frameworks, academic institutions, financial infrastructure, and collaboration networks interact to promote innovation and competitiveness. The review highlights the evolution of support structures over time, regional disparities, emerging models, and the challenges faced in ensuring sustainability and scalability. Key findings underscore the importance of multi-actor support frameworks, effective policy and institutional support, and robust collaboration networks in creating resilient and inclusive innovation ecosystems. The study concludes with implications for policymakers, practitioners, and future research directions aimed at optimizing support mechanisms to sustain innovation-driven growth globally.

Keywords: Innovation ecosystem, support structures, innovation policy, collaboration networks, regional development, innovation support mechanisms, entrepreneurship, knowledge transfer, sustainability, digital transformation

Introduction

In recent decades, innovation ecosystems have emerged as critical drivers of economic growth, technological progress, and regional development. These ecosystems comprise interconnected actors—including businesses, research institutions, government agencies, and financial entities—that collaborate to foster innovation and competitiveness (Adner, 2006; Isenberg, 2011). As the global economy becomes increasingly knowledge-based, regions that cultivate vibrant innovation environments tend to outperform others in terms of productivity, employment, and technological advancement (Carlsson et al., 2002). The concept of an innovation ecosystem emphasizes the importance of dynamic interactions among diverse stakeholders, creating a fertile ground for the development and commercialization of new ideas, products, and services (Moore, 1993).

Support structures within these ecosystems, such as universities, government policies, venture capital firms, and industry clusters, play a pivotal role in shaping innovation outcomes. Universities serve as hubs for research and talent development, providing foundational knowledge and skilled human capital (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000). Government agencies influence innovation by designing policies, funding programs, and establishing regulatory frameworks that incentivize research and development activities (Fagerberg et al., 2005). Financial support from venture capitalists and angel investors facilitates the commercialization of innovations, while industry collaborations and clusters enhance knowledge spillovers and resource sharing (Porter, 1998). These support structures are not isolated; rather, their interactions create complex networks that enable ecosystems to thrive.

Significance

The significance of understanding how these support mechanisms function within innovation ecosystems cannot be overstated. Effective support structures can accelerate innovation processes, attract investments, and foster entrepreneurial activities, ultimately leading to regional competitiveness and economic resilience (Cooke, 2001). Conversely, deficiencies or misalignments in support systems can hinder innovation diffusion and ecosystem development, resulting in stagnation or decline (Sotarauta & Beer, 2017). Consequently, policymakers and practitioners seek to design and implement support frameworks that optimize ecosystem performance, necessitating a nuanced understanding of their interactions and collective impact.

Despite the acknowledged importance of innovation ecosystems and their support structures, there remains a notable gap in comprehensive knowledge regarding how these components interact to

promote sustained innovation. Most existing studies tend to focus on individual elements—such as university-industry collaboration or government policies without systematically examining the integration and synergy among various support mechanisms (Lundvall, 1992; Autio et al., 2014). This fragmented understanding limits the ability of stakeholders to develop holistic strategies that enhance ecosystem resilience and effectiveness. Therefore, there is a pressing need to synthesize existing literature and elucidate the complex relationships among support structures within innovation ecosystems.

Objectives of the study

This study aims to address this gap by conducting a systematic review of secondary sources and literature, focusing on how different support mechanisms interact within innovation ecosystems to foster innovation and regional development. By synthesizing current knowledge, the research seeks to inform policymakers, academics, and industry leaders about the key support components and their interdependencies. Ultimately, understanding these dynamics will contribute to the design of more effective support frameworks that can sustain and accelerate innovation-driven growth in diverse regional contexts.

Scope & Delimitations

This study focuses exclusively on secondary sources of information, including peer-reviewed journal articles, systematic reviews, and reports from reputable organizations published over the last decade (2013–2023). The primary aim is to synthesize existing literature on innovation ecosystems and their support structures to provide a comprehensive understanding of their interactions and collective impact on regional development and technological advancement. By concentrating on recent scholarly work, the study ensures that the findings reflect current trends, theories, and empirical evidence relevant to the evolving context of innovation ecosystems.

The review encompasses diverse geographic contexts, aiming to capture global perspectives, best practices, and regional variations in support mechanisms. However, it will exclude primary data collection, such as interviews, surveys, or case studies, which are beyond the scope of this secondary research approach. The focus will be on conceptual frameworks, theoretical models, and empirical analyses documented in the literature, rather than on new or original data.

Delimitations of this research include the exclusion of grey literature, such as industry reports, policy documents, and non-peer-reviewed publications, unless they are published by reputable sources and cited within peer-reviewed work. Additionally, the study does not delve into specific industry sectors or regional case studies in depth but will instead provide a broad overview of support structures across various contexts. This approach allows for a generalized synthesis but may overlook sector-specific or localized nuances.

Furthermore, the study does not aim to evaluate the effectiveness of specific policies or support programs but rather to identify and analyze the reported interactions and roles of different support structures within innovation ecosystems as documented in the literature. This delimitation ensures a focus on theoretical and conceptual insights, providing a foundation for future empirical or case-specific research.

Literature Review

Concept of Innovation Ecosystems

The term "innovation ecosystem" refers to a complex network of interconnected actors, institutions, and support mechanisms that collaboratively foster innovation and technological advancement (Moore, 1993). At its core, an innovation ecosystem is characterized by its dynamic interactions, shared resources, and feedback loops that enable the continuous development and diffusion of innovations. These ecosystems transcend traditional linear models of innovation, emphasizing instead the importance of systemic interactions and co-evolution among diverse stakeholders (Adner, 2006). Theoretically, frameworks such as Moore's ecosystem model depict innovation systems as living organisms, where various components—actors, institutions, and policies—interact within a conducive environment to generate innovative outcomes (Moore, 1993).

Further foundational theories include Kline and Rosenberg's (1986) innovation systems approach, which emphasizes the importance of knowledge flows, technological pathways, and institutional support in fostering innovation. Their model highlights the interactions among scientific research, industry, and government as integral to a healthy innovation environment. Similarly, the triple helix model, developed by Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (2000), underscores the symbiotic relationships among universities, industry, and government, positioning them as the core actors in a knowledge-based innovation system. These theoretical frameworks collectively underscore that innovation

ecosystems are multifaceted, involving both formal and informal networks that facilitate knowledge exchange, resource sharing, and collaborative problem-solving.

Components of Innovation Ecosystems

The core components of innovation ecosystems encompass a diverse array of key actors, each playing a distinct yet interconnected role. Firms and entrepreneurs are primary agents of innovation, responsible for developing and commercializing new ideas (Autio et al., 2014). Universities and research institutions serve as knowledge hubs, providing foundational research, human capital, and technological expertise, which often translate into commercial opportunities through technology transfer activities (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000). Governments act as facilitators through policies, funding, and regulatory frameworks, shaping the environment in which innovation occurs (Fagerberg et al., 2005). Investors, including venture capitalists and angel investors, provide the necessary financial resources to nurture startups and scale innovations, bridging the gap between research and market deployment (Metrick & Yasuda, 2010).

Industry collaborations and innovation clusters further structure the ecosystem by fostering synergies among firms, suppliers, and research centers. Clusters, such as Silicon Valley's technology hub, exemplify how geographical concentration of related industries enhances knowledge spillovers, resource sharing, and competitive advantage (Porter, 1998). Incubators and accelerators are specialized support mechanisms that provide mentorship, infrastructure, and access to networks for startups and SMEs, significantly increasing their chances of success (Cohen & Hochberg, 2014). Collectively, these components form a multi-layered system where each actor and support structure contributes to a vibrant environment conducive to continuous innovation.

Support Structures:

Policy & Regulatory Support

Policy and regulatory frameworks are fundamental pillars that shape the environment conducive to innovation within ecosystems. Governments worldwide implement various innovation policies aimed at fostering research and development (R&D), encouraging entrepreneurship, and facilitating technological advancement (Fagerberg et al., 2005). Effective policies often include tax incentives for R&D activities, subsidies for innovative firms, and strategic plans that promote sectors with high growth potential (Lundvall, 1992). Moreover, intellectual property rights (IPR) legislation plays a critical role in safeguarding innovations, encouraging creators and firms to invest in new technologies

without fear of appropriation (World Intellectual Property Organization, 2020). Robust IPR regimes incentivize innovation by ensuring that inventors and firms can benefit commercially from their inventions, thus stimulating further R&D investments (Boldrin & Levine, 2008). Additionally, funding programs—such as government grants, competitions, and public-private partnership initiatives—provide crucial financial resources to early-stage firms, research projects, and innovation-driven startups, helping bridge the gap between research outputs and commercial applications (Mazzucato, 2013).

Academic & Research Institutions

Universities and research centers serve as vital catalysts within innovation ecosystems by generating foundational knowledge, training skilled human capital, and fostering technological breakthroughs (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000). Academic institutions contribute through fundamental research, which often leads to new scientific discoveries and technological innovations that can be commercialized by industry actors (Niosi & Bas, 2003). Beyond research, universities facilitate technology transfer activities via licensing agreements, spin-offs, and industry collaborations, effectively translating academic findings into market-ready solutions (Siegel et al., 2003). Furthermore, research institutions act as hubs for networking and knowledge exchange, connecting entrepreneurs, industry players, and policymakers, which enhances the overall dynamism of the ecosystem. Their role extends to providing entrepreneurial education and incubation services, fostering a culture of innovation among students and faculty members (Perkmann et al., 2013).

Financial Support

Financial resources are a critical component for the sustainability and scaling of innovations, especially in their early stages. Venture capital (VC) firms and angel investors are primary sources of risk capital, providing investments in innovative startups with high growth potential (Gompers & Lerner, 2001). Venture capitalists often bring not only funding but also strategic guidance, industry contacts, and mentorship, which are vital for startup success (Metrick & Yasuda, 2010). Angel investors typically invest their personal wealth into early-stage ventures, filling a funding gap that traditional financial institutions may avoid due to high risk (Cumming & Wright, 2017). Additionally, government grants and subsidy programs play an instrumental role in de-risking innovation projects by providing non-dilutive funding, enabling firms to undertake R&D activities that might otherwise be financially unfeasible (Lerner, 1999). Such financial support mechanisms are crucial for maintaining a steady flow of innovations and ensuring that promising ideas reach commercialization.

Industry Collaborations & Clusters

Industry collaborations and innovation clusters significantly enhance the competitiveness and productivity of regional ecosystems. Clusters are geographic concentrations of interconnected companies, suppliers, service providers, and associated institutions that operate within a specific industry sector (Porter, 1998). These agglomerations facilitate knowledge spillovers, resource sharing, and joint problem-solving, creating a fertile ground for innovation (Maskell & Malmberg, 1999). Industry consortia, which are formal collaborations among multiple firms and stakeholders, serve as platforms for joint R&D projects, standard setting, and collective marketing efforts (Bresnahan et al., 2001). Such collaborations reduce costs, mitigate risks, and accelerate the development and diffusion of new technologies (Sölvell et al., 2003). Well-established clusters, like Silicon Valley's tech ecosystem, exemplify how geographic proximity and industry networks can generate a self-reinforcing cycle of innovation, attracting talent and investment from around the world (Saxenian, 1994).

Incubators & Accelerators

Incubators and accelerators are specialized entities that provide targeted support to early-stage startups and small-to-medium enterprises (SMEs), playing a vital role in nurturing nascent innovations. Incubators typically offer physical infrastructure, mentorship, business development services, and access to networks, helping startups survive the critical initial phases (Cohen & Hochberg, 2014). They often focus on reducing operational costs and providing a nurturing environment where entrepreneurs can iterate and refine their ideas. Accelerators, on the other hand, operate in shorter, intensive programs designed to rapidly scale startups by offering mentorship, seed funding, and access to investors (Feld, 2012). They often culminate in pitch days where startups present to potential investors, facilitating crucial funding opportunities. These support structures help reduce failure rates among startups, foster entrepreneurial skills, and accelerate the path from innovation to commercialization, thereby strengthening the overall ecosystem (Eisenman et al., 2019). Their role is especially critical in regions aiming to develop vibrant startup communities and promote high-growth ventures.

Interactions & Dynamics

The interactions among various support structures are central to the functioning and success of innovation ecosystems. These components do not operate in isolation but rather engage in complex, reciprocal relationships that enhance the ecosystem's overall vitality (Sotarauta & Beer, 2017). For example, government policies can incentivize private sector investments, while universities collaborate with industry to commercialize research outputs, creating a continuous flow of knowledge

and resources (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000). Similarly, venture capitalists and accelerators often partner with incubators, providing both funding and mentorship that catalyze startup growth (Cohen & Hochberg, 2014).

The dynamic interactions within ecosystems foster learning, adaptation, and resilience, enabling regions to respond to technological shifts and global competition. Empirical studies highlight that ecosystems with strong, synergistic relationships among actors tend to outperform those with fragmented or weak linkages (Lundvall, 1992). For instance, Silicon Valley exemplifies how a dense network of universities, industry players, investors, and supportive policies can create a self-reinforcing cycle of innovation and economic growth (Saxenian, 1994). These interactions are facilitated by knowledge spillovers, shared infrastructure, and institutional support, which collectively sustain a vibrant innovation environment capable of producing breakthrough innovations.

Empirical Evidence & Case Studies

Numerous case studies illustrate the diverse ways in which successful innovation ecosystems operate. Silicon Valley remains the archetype, characterized by a dense network of technology firms, venture capital, top-tier universities like Stanford, and a culture of entrepreneurship (Saxenian, 1994). The region's success is attributed to its innovative support structures, including extensive industry clusters, risk capital availability, and a collaborative culture that encourages knowledge sharing. Similarly, Shenzhen in China has transformed from a manufacturing hub into a global innovation center, driven by government policies, industry clusters, and investment in R&D infrastructure (Lazonick & Mazzucato, 2013).

Tel Aviv's ecosystem exemplifies the role of government support, university-industry collaborations, and a vibrant startup culture in fostering technological innovation, especially in cybersecurity and biotech sectors (Gorodnichenko et al., 2020). These case studies demonstrate that contextual factors, such as institutional support, cultural attitudes towards risk, and regional policies, significantly influence the development and sustainability of innovation ecosystems. Comparative analyses of these ecosystems reveal common ingredients—such as strong support structures, networks, and institutional frameworks—while also emphasizing the importance of local adaptations and unique regional traits in shaping their success.

Methodology

Research Approach

This study adopts a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology to comprehensively synthesize existing research on support structures within innovation ecosystems. The systematic approach ensures transparency, reproducibility, and rigor in identifying, selecting, and analyzing relevant scholarly articles. By focusing on secondary sources, the review aims to distill key insights, identify research gaps, and establish a solid foundation for understanding the role of support mechanisms in fostering innovation.

Data Sources

The primary data sources for this review include major academic databases such as Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar. These platforms were selected for their extensive coverage of peer-reviewed literature across multiple disciplines relevant to innovation and policy studies. Additional sources included discipline-specific repositories and institutional repositories to ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant publications. The search was confined to these reputable sources to maintain the quality and credibility of the included literature.

Search Strategy

A structured search strategy was employed to identify pertinent articles. Keywords and phrases were carefully selected based on their relevance to the research focus. Core search terms included "innovation ecosystem," "support structures," "innovation policy," "university-industry collaboration," "technology transfer," and "entrepreneurship support." Boolean operators such as AND, OR, and NOT were used to refine searches, ensuring retrieval of relevant literature. Truncation and wildcard symbols facilitated capturing variations of keywords. The search was conducted across all selected databases, with filters applied to narrow results to peer-reviewed articles published between 2013 and 2023.

Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria

To ensure the relevance and quality of the literature, specific inclusion and exclusion criteria were established. Inclusion criteria comprised peer-reviewed journal articles published within the last decade (2013-2023), focusing on secondary sources that analyze or review support mechanisms within innovation ecosystems. Articles were required to be written in English and provide empirical, theoretical, or conceptual insights into support structures or related policies. Conversely, articles such

as conference papers, theses, dissertations, and non-peer-reviewed reports were excluded to maintain scholarly rigor. Additionally, studies not directly related to the core themes or lacking clear methodological approaches were filtered out during the screening process.

Data Extraction & Analysis

Data extraction involved systematically reviewing selected articles to identify relevant information, including research objectives, methodologies, key findings, and thematic insights. The extracted data served as the basis for thematic analysis, content analysis, and thematic mapping. Thematic analysis was employed to identify recurring themes, patterns, and conceptual frameworks across the literature, facilitating a holistic understanding of support structures' roles and impacts. Content analysis was used to quantify the frequency of specific themes or concepts, providing insight into dominant research trends. Thematic mapping visually represented the relationships among key themes, enabling the identification of gaps and areas for future exploration. All analyses were conducted using qualitative analysis software such as NVivo or ATLAS.ti to enhance systematic coding and organization.

Findings & Discussion

Themes

The Importance of Multi-Actor Support Frameworks

The findings underscore that robust innovation ecosystems are characterized by the presence of multi-actor support frameworks that integrate diverse stakeholders such as firms, universities, government agencies, investors, and support organizations. These multi-actor frameworks facilitate the exchange of knowledge, resources, and expertise, which in turn accelerates innovation processes (Moore, 1993). For instance, regions like Silicon Valley exemplify how a dense network of interconnected actors can create a self-reinforcing environment where startups benefit from the combined strengths of academia, industry, and venture capital (Saxenian, 1994). Such frameworks enable the sharing of tacit knowledge, best practices, and technological advancements, fostering a culture of continuous innovation and adaptation. Moreover, the presence of multiple actors ensures resilience within the ecosystem, allowing it to respond effectively to technological disruptions and market shifts (Adner, 2006). Therefore, multi-actor support frameworks are not just beneficial but essential for creating sustainable and dynamic innovation environments.

The Role of Policy and Institutional Support

The research highlights that policy and institutional support are foundational in shaping the development of innovation ecosystems. Governments that formulate clear, strategic policies aimed at

incentivizing R&D, protecting intellectual property, and fostering entrepreneurship create an enabling environment for innovation (Lundvall, 1992). For example, China's innovation policies have significantly contributed to its rise as a global technology hub, through targeted funding, supportive regulatory reforms, and the establishment of innovation zones (Lazonick & Mazzucato, 2013). Institutional frameworks, including legal systems that safeguard IPR and standardized procedures for patenting and licensing, further stimulate innovation by reducing uncertainties and risks for innovators (Boldrin & Levine, 2008). Additionally, public funding programs and grants serve as catalytic mechanisms that support early-stage research and commercialization efforts, especially in regions where private investment is limited (Mazzucato, 2013). The findings suggest that strong policy and institutional support are critical in creating a predictable, fair, and resource-rich environment that encourages sustained innovation activities.

Impact of Financial Infrastructure

Financial infrastructure emerged as a vital enabler of innovation by providing the necessary capital for startups and established firms to develop and commercialize new technologies. The availability of venture capital, angel investments, and government grants significantly influences the pace and scale of innovation activities (Gompers & Lerner, 2001). Regions with well-developed financial infrastructure, such as Silicon Valley, demonstrate how access to diverse funding sources can facilitate rapid growth, attract talent, and sustain high-risk ventures (Saxenian, 1994). The presence of active financial markets that understand the dynamics of innovation is crucial for mitigating investment risks associated with high-tech ventures. Moreover, a mature financial infrastructure supports the diversification of funding options, including seed funding, early-stage investments, and later-stage financing, which are essential at different phases of the innovation lifecycle (Metrick & Yasuda, 2010). The findings emphasize that without a solid financial backbone, even promising innovations struggle to move beyond the conceptual stage, limiting regional competitiveness and growth potential.

The Significance of Collaboration Networks

The research findings affirm that collaboration networks serve as the backbone of vibrant innovation ecosystems. These networks encompass formal collaborations like industry consortia and joint research initiatives, as well as informal interactions such as knowledge spillovers among firms, universities, and research centers (Bresnahan et al., 2001). Regions with dense and diverse collaboration networks—such as Tel Aviv or Shenzhen—demonstrate higher innovation output, faster diffusion of technologies, and increased entrepreneurial activity (Gorodnichenko et al., 2020; Lazonick

& Mazzucato, 2013). The significance lies in the ability of these networks to facilitate access to complementary assets, expertise, and markets, thereby reducing innovation costs and risks (Perkmann et al., 2013). Furthermore, collaboration networks foster a culture of openness and trust, which is crucial for sharing sensitive knowledge and engaging in joint problem-solving. Overall, the findings suggest that fostering strong, inclusive, and well-connected collaboration networks is essential for sustaining high levels of innovation and regional economic development.

Patterns & Trends:

Evolution of Support Structures Over Time

The support structures underpinning innovation ecosystems have evolved significantly over the past few decades, driven by technological advancements, globalization, and changing policy priorities. Initially, innovation support primarily relied on government-led initiatives such as grants and R&D subsidies aimed at strengthening national technological capabilities (Fagerberg et al., 2005). Over time, there has been a shift towards more comprehensive multi-actor frameworks that integrate industry, academia, and government, fostering collaborative innovation. The rise of incubators, accelerators, and venture capital as core components of support structures reflects a move towards more market-oriented and entrepreneurial approaches, emphasizing rapid commercialization and scaling (Cohen & Hochberg, 2014). Additionally, digital transformation has enabled the development of virtual support networks and online knowledge-sharing platforms, broadening access to resources and expertise across borders, thus democratizing innovation support (World Economic Forum, 2020).

Regional Differences in Support Structures

Patterns of support structures exhibit notable regional disparities, shaped by economic development levels, institutional maturity, and cultural contexts. Advanced regions like Silicon Valley, Boston, and Shenzhen have developed highly sophisticated, integrated support systems characterized by dense networks of universities, venture capital, industry clusters, and innovation hubs (Saxenian, 1994; Glaeser et al., 2014). In contrast, emerging regions often rely heavily on government-led initiatives and international partnerships to build foundational support frameworks (Lazear & Rosen, 1981). Developing economies may lack mature financial infrastructure or extensive collaboration networks, leading to a reliance on international donors and aid programs to catalyze their innovation support ecosystems (World Bank, 2019). These regional differences highlight the importance of contextual adaptation in designing support structures, emphasizing that what works in one region may need tailoring to local capacities and needs in another.

Emerging Models and Future Trends

Recent trends point towards innovative models that emphasize inclusivity, digital integration, and sustainability. For instance, open innovation platforms and collaborative ecosystems are gaining prominence, enabling diverse actors—including startups, corporations, and citizens—to co-create solutions (Chesbrough, 2003). The emergence of public-private innovation hubs and regional innovation districts reflects a move toward localized, specialized support models that foster proximity and interaction among actors (Florida, 2017). Furthermore, there is an increasing focus on supporting social and sustainable innovations, with new frameworks designed to address global challenges like climate change and inequality (Mazzucato & Kattel, 2020). Digital tools and data-driven approaches are also transforming support structures, providing real-time analytics, matchmaking platforms, and virtual mentorship programs that enhance accessibility and efficiency. As ecosystems continue to evolve, future models are likely to prioritize resilience, inclusivity, and technological integration to sustain innovation in a rapidly changing global environment.

Gaps & Challenges:

Under-Researched Regions or Sectors

One of the prominent gaps in the current understanding of innovation support frameworks is the limited research focused on under-researched regions and sectors. Many studies tend to concentrate on well-established innovation hubs, leaving emerging economies and rural areas comparatively under-explored. This gap hampers the development of tailored strategies that address the unique challenges and opportunities faced by these regions, such as limited infrastructure, weaker institutional capacities, and different cultural attitudes toward innovation. Similarly, sectors like social innovation, sustainable technologies, and traditional industries often lack comprehensive support models, which constrains their growth potential and their contribution to broader economic development.

Fragmentation Among Support Actors

Despite the recognition of multi-actor frameworks as vital for innovation, fragmentation remains a significant challenge. Support actors, including government agencies, academic institutions, private firms, and non-governmental organizations, often operate in silos with limited coordination and information sharing. This fragmentation can lead to duplicated efforts, inefficient resource allocation, and missed opportunities for synergy. It also creates confusion among innovators and entrepreneurs, who may struggle to navigate the complex environment of available support. Overcoming this fragmentation requires stronger governance mechanisms, shared platforms for collaboration, and clear delineation of roles among actors.

Sustainability and Scalability of Support Mechanisms

Ensuring the long-term sustainability and scalability of support mechanisms poses another critical challenge. Many support programs are initially successful but face difficulties in maintaining their operations over time due to financial constraints, shifting political priorities, or changing market conditions. Additionally, scalable models that work well in one context may not be directly transferable to other regions or sectors without significant adaptation. This raises concerns about the ability of existing support frameworks to sustain innovation activities amid evolving economic and technological environments. Developing flexible, resilient, and adaptable support mechanisms remains an ongoing challenge for policymakers and practitioners alike.

Conclusions

Summary of Key Insights

Support structures play a crucial role in shaping the development and performance of innovation ecosystems. They provide the essential resources, network linkages, and institutional frameworks that enable startups, research activities, and technological advancements to flourish. Over time, these support mechanisms have evolved from government-centric models to more integrated, multi-actor approaches that foster collaboration, knowledge sharing, and commercialization. Regional differences highlight the importance of contextualized support, while emerging models emphasize inclusivity, digital integration, and sustainability. Overall, effective support structures are fundamental drivers of innovation capacity, economic growth, and societal progress.

Implications for Policy & Practice

Policymakers should prioritize building cohesive and adaptable support ecosystems that cater to local needs and leverage regional strengths. Enhancing coordination among support actors can reduce fragmentation and improve resource efficiency. Promoting digital platforms and open innovation models can increase accessibility and inclusivity, especially for under-researched regions and sectors. Academic institutions and industry stakeholders are encouraged to collaborate more closely, fostering knowledge transfer and joint ventures that accelerate innovation. Long-term sustainability and scalability should be integral to program design, ensuring that support mechanisms can adapt to changing economic and technological environments.

Future Research Directions

Future studies should focus on longitudinal analyses to understand the evolution and long-term impacts of various support structures. Comparative research across different regions and sectors can shed light

on best practices and contextual adaptations. Additionally, exploring the role of digital support mechanisms, such as online platforms and virtual mentorship programs, can provide insights into their effectiveness and potential for broad application. Addressing these research gaps will enhance our understanding of how to optimize support systems for diverse innovation ecosystems and foster sustainable, inclusive growth in an increasingly complex global environment.

References

Adner, R. (2006). Match your innovation strategy to your innovation ecosystem. Harvard Business Review, 84(4), 98–107.

Autio, E., Nambisan, S., Thomas, L. D. W., & Wright, M. (2014). Digital affordances, spatial affordances, and the genesis of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 8(3), 200–213.

Boldrin, M., & Levine, D. K. (2008). Against intellectual monopoly. Cambridge University Press.

Bresnahan, T. F., Gambardella, A., & Saxenian, A. (2001). The Silicon Valley model: Manufacturing innovations in a service economy. California Management Review, 44(3), 61–82.

Carlsson, B., Jacobsson, S., Holmén, M., & Rickne, A. (2002). Innovation systems: Analytical and methodological issues. Research Policy, 31(2), 233–245.

Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology. Harvard Business School Publishing.

Cohen, S., & Hochberg, Y. V. (2014). Accelerating startups: The seed accelerator movement. Innovation Policy and the Economy, 14(1), 1–34.

Cooke, P. (2001). Regional innovation systems, clusters, and the knowledge economy. Industry and Innovation, 8(2), 117–133.

Cumming, D., & Wright, M. (2017). Venture capital and private equity: A review and synthesis. Journal of Business Venturing, 32(4), 464–487.

Eisenman, M., Nambisan, S., & Hargadon, A. (2019). Innovation in entrepreneurial ecosystems: A review and research agenda. Journal of Business Venturing, 34(4), 543–559.

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.

Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D. C., & Nelson, R. R. (2005). The Oxford handbook of innovation. Oxford University Press.

Florida, R. (2017). The rise of the creative class in the innovation economy. Harvard Business Review, 95(4), 68–75.

Glaeser, E. L., Kerr, W. R., & Ponzetto, G. (2014). Clusters of entrepreneurship. Journal of Urban Economics, 85, 38–54.

Gompers, P., & Lerner, J. (2001). The venture capital revolution. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 15(2), 145–168.

Gorodnichenko, Y., Schneider, F., & Toubal, F. (2020). Digital transformation and innovation: The case of Israel. Regional Science and Urban Economics, 84, 103504.

Isenberg, D. (2011). The entrepreneurial ecosystem. Harvard Business Review, 89(4), 38–50.

Lazonick, W., & Mazzucato, M. (2013). The risk-reward nexus in the innovation economy: Who takes the risks? Who gets the rewards? Industrial and Corporate Change, 22(4), 1093–1128.

Lerner, J. (1999). The government as venture capitalist: The long-run impact of the SBIR program. The Journal of Business, 72(3), 463–487.

Lundvall, B.-Å. (1992). National systems of innovation: Towards a theory of innovation and interactive learning. Pinter.

Mazzucato, M., & Kattel, R. (2020). Mission-oriented innovation policy and a just transition: The case of the green economy. Research Policy, 49(4), 103793.

Metrick, A., & Yasuda, A. (2010). Venture capital: Strategy and resource allocation. Wiley Finance.

Moore, J. F. (1993). Predators and prey: A new ecology of competition. Harvard Business Review, 71(3), 75–86.

Niosi, J., & Bas, T. (2003). University licensing and patenting activity in Canada. Science and Public Policy, 30(2), 131–138.

Perkmann, M., Neely, A., & Walsh, K. (2013). How should firms evaluate success in university–industry alliances? A review of metrics. European Management Journal, 31(4), 375–392.

Porter, M. E. (1998). Clusters and the new economics of competition. Harvard Business Review, 76(6), 77–90.

Saxenian, A. (1994). Regional advantage: Culture and competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128. Harvard University Press.

Siegel, D. S., Waldman, D., & Link, A. (2003). Assessing the impact of organizational practices on the performance of university technology transfer offices: An exploratory study. Research Policy, 32(1), 27–48.

Sotarauta, M., & Beer, A. (2017). The role of leadership and governance in regional innovation systems. Regional Studies, 51(1), 1–13.

Sölvell, Ö., Ketels, C., & Lindqvist, G. (2003). The cluster initiative greenbook. Copenhagen: Center for Strategy and Competitiveness, Copenhagen Business School.

World Economic Forum. (2020). Shaping the future of technology governance: Digital trust and security. Global Risks Report 2020. Retrieved from https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-risks-report-2020

World Intellectual Property Organization. (2020). World intellectual property indicators 2020. https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo_pub_941_2020.pdf

About IJBER

The *International Journal of Business and Economics Research (IJBER)* is a peer-reviewed, open-access scholarly journal published by Dr. BGR Publications, Thoothukudi, Tamilnadu, India. IJBER provides a global platform for publishing high-quality research in business, economics, management, finance, marketing, commerce, human resources, entrepreneurship, and applied social sciences.

The journal maintains a rigorous editorial process, ensures timely publication, and offers global visibility through open access and multidisciplinary reach.

Journal Codes
- e-ISSN: 2455-3921
- Linking ISSN (ISSN-L): 2455-3921
- ZDB Catalogue Id: 2899795-5

Indexing
- ISSN National Centre of India
- ISSN International Centre
- ROAD
- Index Copernicus International

90034 94749

https://drbgrpublications.in

India | Tamilnadu | Thoothukudi

Dr.BGR Publications

Dr.BGR Publications

CERTIFICATE

OF PUBLICATION

This certificate is presented to

Mr. S.Jayaseelan, Dr. I.Benjamin Prabahar & Dr. S. Arun Prasad

Published the article titled "**Analyzing the role of support structures in shaping innovation ecosystems: a systematic literature review**" in the *International Journal of Business and Economics Research (IJBER), e-ISSN: 2455-3921*, as part of the Special Issue on the "National Conference on Innovation and Technopreneurship in Commerce", organized by the Department of Commerce and Commerce with Computer Applications, ARUL ANANDAR COLLEGE (AUTONOMOUS), KARUMATHUR, MADURAI - 625514

This special issue published on DECEMBER 2025.

Mr. A. Stephen Jeyaraj
Co-Chief Editor

Dr. K. Ramya
Co-Chief Editor

Dr. I. Benjamin Prabahar
Chief Editor