

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled University–industry technology transfer: empirical findings from Chinese industrial firms (ID: sustainability-1791703). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our future research. We have studied comments carefully and have made substantial revision which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

1. there is insufficient review of relevant research progress in the introduction part.

**Response to 1:** We added Literature Review and theoretical background in section2.

2. In terms of the methods, the part of Geographic technology transfer and Dynamics of Chinese university–industry technology transfer network is just the way the results are presented and should not be listed as a method.

**Response to 2:** We removed them.

3. In terms of the results, you mentioned the license contracts collected between 2009 and 2014. I am not sure which year's results are presented in the part of the Overview of full network representing Chinese university-firm knowledge transfer. Besides, the Geographically mapped in the Figure6 is just up to 2013. Based on which year were the BGRM and BiRank centrality calculated? intrinsic mechanism.

**Response to 3(1):** The figure 5~7 represent the appearance of the licensing network in 2009,2011,2013 respectively, not accumulated. We calculate BGRM and BiRank centrality based on the whole sample from 2009 to 2014. The Fig 8 also shows the overview of full network. We added the interpretation, find in line 340.

Moreover, the Chinese map omitted Taiwan, it is one part of China.

**Response to 3(2):** All the figures are generated electronically, we are really sorry for that, and we added Taiwan manually.

What's wrong with the table3 and table 4, all ten columns are the same. The analysis for the results is relatively superficial and does not reveal some.

**Response to 3(2):** There exist several missing data for the labor variable. To solve this missing data issue, we applied the method of multiple imputation and created ten different datasets. Since the ten datasets share a very similar distribution to each other and to the original dataset, the estimated results are extremely similar. This is a good

observation, because if the estimates differ significantly among the different data sets, the missing data issue needs to be reconsidered. To further clarify this missing data issue, we added the results of multiple imputation in Section 4.5.2.

4. On the basis of this empirical analysis, possible recommendations can be provided.

**Response to 4:** We added discussion section give recommendations in this section.