Nr crt	Viva feed-back		How the feedback was addressed
CHAPTER 1			
1	P14 – is engagement research only underpinned by SDL? What about the following authors {Kumar, 2010 #1707}{Vivek, 2012 #2720}{Verhoef, 2010 #1704}, suggest addition of paragraph which outlines relationship marketing roots of engagement.		I added a paragraph outlining the Relationship marketing and engagement (page 15, second paragraph).
2	p17 – what do you mean by a 'business' is it the engagement of business-to-business actors or the collective engagement of a group of actors or the engagement of a 'business'. This should be clarified here. BE is collective or b2b actors/ individual – clarify!		I added a sentence on page 18 to clarify that BE refers it the engagement of individual business-to-business actors, reflecting however the social context and structures that influence them (Schatzki, 2001a, Schatzki, 2001b).
CHAPTER 2			
3	p24-26 – we felt the discussion of S-D Logic was limited. We would like to you add a section which outlines its development (2004 – 2016) and then a discussion on the 5 Axioms.		I added section 2.2.1 (from page 26 to 29)
4	The relationship between SDL and engagement should be outlined, here focus on the respective roles of S-D Logic at the meta theory and Engagement as the 'mid-range theory'. This is critical for your ability to theorise from engagement. Helpful papers as follows {Vargo, 2017 #2623}{Brodie, 2011 #2489}.		SDL as meta-theory, engagement as midrange theory, and BE were detailed on pages 30, 31, and 32.
			To accommodate the requests #5 and #6, but also to make the lit review more focused on the thesis topic, I adjusted the lit review sections. Section 2.3.2 'From Customer Engagement to AE and BE' has been renamed 'Customer engagement (CE) research', capturing CE literature main works that have served as foundational work for actor engagement. Section 2.3.3 Engagement - Broadening the scope remained.
5	The discussion on engagement does need to be expanded. We would expect to see some more in-depth discussion of, for example, Brodie et al 2019 and the 5 FPs of engagement.		Discussion on engagement has been expanded (pages 43-44). I also included Brodie et al. (2019) in this chapter and in the chapter 7.
6	In addition, the inclusion of **a section** which articulates the difference between: customer, actor, collective, stakeholder, brand, social media etc forms of engagement. This will be critical to		Added section 2.3.4. that includes three tables summarizing works, different definitions of engagement and implications for BE.

	differentiate your Business Engagement concept later – a table might work well.		
7	The removal of Bourdieu's theory of capital from the thesis, we don't think it adds a great deal and will simplify the overall narrative.		I removed Bourdieu's theory of capital
8	Value Co-Destruction – you have two options here: 1) remove VCD from the thesis and focus, instead on negative engagement {see\ Hollebeek, 2014 #2368}{Dolan, 2016 #2705}{Azer, 2018 #2712}, 2) retain VCD but disentangle it from S-D Logic. It can't (in my view) be used as an 'opposing' construct to VCC as VCC is a positive statement about how value is created not an outcome or normative goal of a firm. Echeverri and Skalen do use VCD as a practice but my issue there is that it is very difficult to see what is 'destroyed' and where the 'co' comes in – but I do recognise there is a literature here, so I leave it to you.		Option 2. Value co-destruction means both parties are destroying something, simultaneously, a common/ shared goal. However, it should not be seen as opposite of value co-creation. I use term 'Value destruction'. Additionally, the argument why value destruction is used is included in the section 2.2.3.
9	p34 "the article by Brodie et al (2011)…" – what is your evidence for this?		I eliminated the "greatest impact" due to lack of evidence.
10	We liked 'tendency' in your definition and discussed how this term could account for the 'non-voluntary' nature of BE. **We <u>recommend</u>** adding 'beyond contractual' as this also helps to articulate the concept and its difference from other forms of engagement. This could appear strongly in your contribution chapter as well, but this would require additional writing in various places in the thesis		I added in the definition and throughout the thesis where appropriate. This theme is now included in chapter 7 as a main contribution. It has also been emphasized in various placed throughout the thesis. Chapter 7 also includes a new that reflects on BE, tendency versus disposition and behaviours that go beyond contractual obligations.
CHAPTER 3			
11	p64-65 – you say Jonas et al 18 identify seven conditions you articulate only six? Hierarchical Level missing?		I corrected: there are Six conditions that affect BE.
12	You need to add a section outlining the process of ethical approval for the research. Your ethics form/participant information sheet/consent form should be added as an appendix		Info Process of ethical approval section added (please see section 3.5.1). Participant consent form was included as appendix 1.
13	Ethical & protecting respondents anonymity (Brendon)		This info is included in the Respondent form (Appendix 1) and also detailed in 3.5.2 and 3.5.3.
14	We suggest you change your data collection methods to interviews and non-participant observation. It was clear in your viva that by articulating your role as a researcher you could not really claim participant observation.		I changed to non-participant observation.
CHAPTER 4			
15	We would like you to reorganise the chapter so that you <u>include representative quotes in each of the sections</u> within the main body of the chapter.		Chapter 4 now includes representatives quotes.

16	The chapter is currently quite dense, we suggest adding additional level two headings just to break up the text. Consistent formatting of tables (noted in pre-viva reports) important here also. we recommend revisiting the appendix tables and ensuring that quotes there fit with your revised definition of BE i.e. that they represent investment of resources in the relationship (as the engagement object) and go **beyond contractual obligations**.		All tables have now the same format. Implemented this recommendation, bolded headings, including level two headings, to break up the text.
CHAPTER 5			
17	We advise enhancing the discussion of engagement intensity with existing research (van Doorn et al, 2010; Vivek et al, 2012; Azer and Alexander 2020)		I added more insights about intensity based on these three recommended studies. This additional literature has been included in the section 5.4. (page 140). This is in addition to the literature review of intensity (section 2.3.6/ page 52 -57)
CHAPTER 6			
18	~~Role of conflictual patterns interesting. Does this elevate negatively valenced customer engagement from episodic to systemic? What might the implications be for the object of engagement (the relationship) - recommendation~~		I did not address as this – it was a recommendation.
CHAPTER 7			
19	We felt that this chapter was too long and included repetition. Here we would like a much clearer articulation of the theoretical contributions of the thesis alongside managerial implications and future research questions. Could easily be cut to something more **manageable around 10 pages.**		Theoretical contributions are now re-arranged around the 5 FPs of Brodie et al (2019). This adds more structure and clearer articulation of contributions. The chapter was reduced from +20 pages to 13 pages.
20	We recommend the inclusion of a table here which shows the 5 FPs of engagement (Brodie et al, 2019) and how your research extends these ideas.		I added the table (Table 26/ page 184) in the chapter seven.
21	Why this case (Romania) is welcome- extend case study background and why pharma CS is valuable for investigating.		RO pharma impact in GDP – is a sizeable contribution to GDP (depicted in the section 3.4.3), a growing and critical sector in general. I also added a paragraph at the end of 3.4.3 to highlight why case study in pharmaceutical industry. I added info in the section 3.4.3. Pharma industry is a significant sector that contributes to the GDP. Therefore, knowledge about it is important for decision makers.
23	Why B2B engagement is significant/ urgent topic?		I emphasized again in section 7.2. Brodie et al. (2019) recognize the importance of service ecosystem and network connections. Their foundational propositions advance the idea that AE occurs in connection with other actors (FP1) affecting actors' network

			connections (FP2). Their ideas are based on S-D Logic perspective that stresses the importance of service ecosystem (Lusch and Vargo, 2014, Vargo and Lusch, 2016). Value co-creation happens as actors establish relationships (Vargo and Lusch, 2004). The body of knowledge on versatile players in networks is still dispersed (Brodie et al., 2019), and there is a dearth of research on engagement in business-to-business (B2B) settings that addresses many actors in networks (Brodie et al., 2019, Wilson, 2019, Jaakkola and Aarikka-Stenroos, 2018). Understanding business-to-business engagement (BE) is equally essential to academia and industry since the construct has been theorized to be related to value co-creation processes (Storbacka, 2019). Moreover, BE is a critical construct since it influences the actors' consideration set, dependence on other interacting actors and willingness to pay a premium (Nyadzayo, Casidy and Thaichon, 2020), linking it to financial rewards (Sands, Campbell, Ferraro, and Plangger, 2022).
24	The service ecosystem perspective might likewise be expanded upon and further emphasized.		I addressed it. Please see section 7.2.1.
25	Emphasis on pharmacists as interviewees. Does this shape/ bias/ limit the ability to look at broader practices or networks?		Business model determined this sampling approach. The ratio of customers to distributor is in favour of pharmacists. However, I included interviews with the distributor's representatives (4), field visits (observing both sides of interaction: distributor's representatives and pharmacists) and manufacturer. Doctors or other stakeholders (governmental org) interactions are scarce or occur via different platforms (online, phone) and could not be captured – limitation (limitations – last paragraph). In addition, data collection being done just before/ at the start of pandemic limited possibility to include other stakeholders' interactions (that were, as said scare/ carried out through other platforms not in scope of this research).
26	How theoretical contributions extend existing discussions		Inclusion of Brodie et 19 and how the present study extends these ideas – chapter 7 & table 26.
27	How significant is the difference between B2C and B2B? Does the latter add that the former has not already?		The difference B2B vs B2C addressed using literature → pg 13.

			There are notable differences between consumers and businesses, which calls for this approach. Among these differences, the most significant ones that warrant specific research are the nature of demand and the formalisation of interactions (Reinartz and Berkmann, 2018). First, the nature of demand is different, with consumers using the solution for their own benefit, while firms use solutions for the benefit of other customers (Reinartz and Berkmann, 2018, Grewal et al., 2015, Lilien, 2016). This highlights again the importance of understanding interactions that are dyadic but also embedded in the network of relationships with other actors. Second is the fact that in B2B there are specific rules, norms and structures of interactions, while B2C tends to be free from constraints (Reinartz and Berkmann, 2018, Vivek et al., 2015, Grewal et al., 2015). However, there is a need to understand these specific BE rules and norms. I addressed the difference B2B vs B2C in chapter 7. I included Brodie et al (2019) propositions and showed how B2B is different from conceptual/ B2C or conceptual research. The findings of this research, included in theoretical contributions, demonstrate the B2B engagement is different than B2C. First, it is about the tendency to invest resources beyond contractual obligations. Additionally, the CE dimensions include behavioural, cognitive, emotional/ affective. Taking Practice theory approach, the BE is represented by cognitive, social and transformative practices.
Others			
	Practises → practices		Typos correction
	Tables – renumbered and reformatted		Throughout the thesis