

The paper aims to offer some empirical evidence of the relevance of springboard country and springboard subsidiary concepts. However, Introduction does not make a proper context and does not attract the attention of readers. Even more, at the end of the Introduction such concepts are mentioned but never described. I suggest to introduce in the Introduction the concepts and the challenge that the paper is aiming to confront.

Later, the model put forward by Gupta and Govindarajan is mentioned and it seems to play an important role. However, the concept of knowledge flow and its implications are not well developed. I believe that a better description of those concepts may help in the conceptualization of the springboard subsidiary and its role. How this concept is making an incremental contribution? How is it related to the mentioned model of Gupta and Govindarajan? Does it play a dual role (in terms of the mentioned model)?

In the Hypotheses chapter I'd suggest to spend more time describing and discussing some variables. This is pretty clear in the case of "technological relationship" that is included in H 1c without (almost) any explicit discussion. Actually, before H1 authors discuss "knowledge absorption" (explicitly related to another H) but not "tech relationship". Perhaps authors may want to include the discussions in the literature review.

In addition, some hypothesis are not clear. For instance, H2, where "a change" (increase? decrease?) impact in another change.

Finally, I suggest to spend more time in two chapters: discussion and conclusions. I believe that discussion could be improved if it is not taken just as a mere description of statistic results; a discussion of the academic impact might be included. Conclusions might be taken to another level if it includes a discussion of managerial implications: what is relevant for decision makers?