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What an interesting paper! While much is new to me, what I learned is immediately useful. Thank you!

Overall, the paper describes a worthy effort to show how an existing method can be expanded to provide powerful insights into managing and sustaining the complexity of innovations today. My sense, however, is that to be publishable, it needs to be significantly shortened and its arguments tightened up.

To get us started, I have summarized (first draft only) what I think are your main points and contributions (for the Abstract) and I significantly revised and shortened Section 1 (the Introduction).

Here are the main points for the Abstract:

1. As an approach to anticipating, avoiding and/or preparing for the potential implications of innovation, Foresight can be an effective innovation management tool. [The first sentence needs to include a definition of Foresight.]
2. Typically, however, it has been applied in ways that limit its utility for capturing the complex, multidimensional nature of sustainability in innovation. [[OR: Typically, however, it has been applied in a goal-oriented manner, limiting its utility for capturing…. This sentence is really important. The reader should know almost immediately why the rest of the paper is worth reading.]]
3. The risk of applying a typical Foresight approach is that resulting innovations may contribute to creating socio-technical systems in which existing sustainability issues are either exacerbated or reproduced, or in which unanticipated sustainability issues emerge.
4. In this paper, we address this shortcoming by developing and piloting a *responsibility-oriented* Foresight approach that goes beyond searching for desirable future options.
5. Using a multi-stage Delphi survey informed by insights from the Responsible Research in Innovation (RRI) literature, we ask 52 public and private sector experts to critically examine 15 potential changes [innovations] in the German agri-food system.
6. The analyses reveal the perceived desirability and the probability of these potential innovations, the level of consensus among experts, as well as possible risks to sustainable development that the 15 changes [or innovations?] carry. We find that risks occur regardless of how desirable the change is perceived to be.
7. The insights emerging from this responsibility-oriented Foresight approach provide points of orientation for future responsible innovation that moves towards systemic, solution-seeking considering identified risks that can undermine good sustainability intentions.

Are these points a generally accurate description of your paper? If so, we can move on to the rest of the paper. I have already tried to significantly shorten the Introduction. Please especially look at the last paragraph in the Introduction. Is the order—and purpose—of the paper's sections accurate?

Much of what is currently in the Introduction can be integrated into Section 2 (Conceptual Framework), which I suggest should be organized in the following three subsections and include some of the material that you originally placed in the Introduction (please see my comments in the text):

* Subsection 1 would describe the Foresight method – both its value and its shortcomings for managing innovation sustainability, as typically applied.
* Subsection 2 would introduce the RRI literature *because* it contains insights that can point to ways for expanding the scope of Foresight processes in ways that address the shortcomings you’ve named in Subsection 1.
* Subsection 3 would introduce the Delphi method as it is typically used in Foresight processes *and* show how it can be expanded to reflect the RRI insights. This will set the stage for Section 3, which should describe how the Delphi method you developed for your study explicitly integrates the RRI insights.

If you can try to draft a revised Conceptual Framework section—removing extraneous information (especially anything that sounds like your opinions or even your reflections), I will then do a full edit of the paper. I especially want to emphasize that your reflections on the value of your study belong only *after* your Results—and should be placed in the Concluding section. The power of your study is that the Results will SHOW how your responsibility-oriented Foresight method makes new insights into managing innovation possible and why that's so important in today's world. It's much more powerful if these insights follow (and not precede) your Results.