International Journal of Academic and Applied Research (IJAAR)
ISSN: 2643-9603
Vol. 9 Issue 10 October - 2025, Pages: 173-181

The Prototype Valley of Death: Analyzing Systemic Bottlenecks in the Commercialization of Scientific Research in Uganda

Dr. Arinaitwe Julius, Asiimwe Isaac Kazaara

1,2 Metropolitan International University

***ABSTRACT: Background**: Uganda faces persistent challenges in translating scientific research into commercially viable products and services, with the "valley of death" between research prototypes and market applications resulting in lost economic opportunities and underutilization of research investments. Despite substantial government expenditure on research and development and growing numbers of research outputs from universities, commercialization rates remain dismally low, with systemic barriers impeding the innovation ecosystem **Main Objective**: To analyze the systemic bottlenecks that prevent the commercialization of scientific research in Uganda and to develop a framework for bridging the "valley of death" between research prototypes and market applications. **Methods**: This study employed a mixed-methods convergent parallel design with stratified random sampling to recruit 600 participants comprising university researchers and administrators (n=245), government policy makers and regulatory officials (n=158), and private sector representatives (n=197), achieving 80% statistical power to detect medium effect sizes. **Key Results**: All barrier categories scored above 3.95 on 5-point scales, indicating moderate to high severity, with significant differences across stakeholder groups (all $p<0.001$, $\eta^2=0.079\text{-}0.151$). Financial barriers emerged as the strongest negative predictor of commercialization success ($\beta=-0.298$, $p<0.001$), with funded projects being five times more likely to result in patents than unfunded projects (42.1% vs 8.3%, $\chi^2(2)=89.56$, $p<0.001$, Cramer's V=0.387). **Conclusion and Recommendations**: The study successfully identified financial, institutional, regulatory, and capacity-related barriers as interconnected obstacles creating Uganda's research commercialization valley of death, with multivariate analyses revealing that these barriers operate synergistically rather than independently. The framework developed through structural equation modeling demonstrated that bridging this gap requires simultaneous multi-level interventions addressing funding gaps, institutional capacity, regulatory complexity, and private sector engagement. Key recommendation emerged: establishing a National Research Commercialization Fund with staged financing mechanisms to address the critical funding bottleneck*

Keywords: research commercialization, valley of death, technology transfer, innovation ecosystem

Introduction

The phenomenon known as the "valley of death" in innovation ecosystems describes the challenging transition phase where promising research findings, prototypes, or technological innovations fail to progress from laboratory or proof-of-concept stages to commercial applications that deliver economic value and social benefit, often due to gaps in funding, technical development capacity, market knowledge, or entrepreneurial support that leave innovations stranded between academic research and commercial viability (Blicharz, 2022; Guindalini et al., 2021). In developed economies with mature innovation ecosystems, various mechanisms including venture capital, technology transfer offices, incubators and accelerators, industry partnerships, and government commercialization programs help bridge this valley, yet in contexts like Uganda where these support structures remain underdeveloped or absent, the valley of death becomes less a challenging transition and more an seemingly impassable chasm where research outputs rarely if ever achieve commercialization regardless of their potential merit or social relevance (Malec et al., 2020; Perkmann et al., 2021). This analysis examines the systemic bottlenecks that constitute Uganda's prototype valley of death, exploring why research conducted in universities and research institutions so rarely translates into commercial products, services, or processes despite regular production of research publications, theses, and prototypes that ostensibly address local problems and opportunities.

Background

Uganda's research landscape includes universities both public and private conducting research across disciplines, specialized research institutions focusing on areas such as agriculture, health, and industrial research, and international research collaborations that bring external funding and expertise to address development challenges in the Ugandan context, collectively producing substantial research output in the form of publications, conference presentations, thesis work, and prototype developments that demonstrate technical feasibility of various innovations (Caulfield & Ogbogu, 2015; Siegel & Guerrero, 2021).

However, the pathway from research output to commercial application involves multiple stages beyond initial research including technology development and refinement to transform laboratory demonstrations into robust, scalable solutions; protection of intellectual property through patents or other mechanisms that enable commercial exploitation while preserving inventor rights (Anderson et al., 2022; Fini et al., 2018); assessment of market demand and willingness to pay that validates commercial viability; securing of commercialization funding substantially larger than research grants to support product development, testing, regulatory compliance, and market entry; development of business models and operational capacity to manufacture, market, and distribute innovations; and navigation of regulatory requirements and quality standards that govern commercial products, each of which presents potential bottlenecks where innovations may stall or fail (Jonek-Kowalska, 2022; Reymert & Thune, 2023).

In Uganda's case, systemic bottlenecks emerge at multiple points in this commercialization pathway including limited commercialization funding where the gap between research grants covering proof of concept and the much larger investments required for commercial development lacks bridging mechanisms such as venture capital, angel investors, or government commercialization funds; weak intellectual property protection and enforcement that discourages investment in innovation commercialization when investors fear inability to prevent copying or piracy (Sapir, 2020; Yermachenko et al., 2023); absence of technology transfer infrastructure where universities and research institutions lack offices, expertise, or incentive structures to facilitate commercialization of research produced within their institutions; limited entrepreneurial capacity among researchers who possess technical expertise but lack business knowledge, market understanding, or inclination to transition from research to commercial ventures;

Disconnection between research priorities and market needs where research responds to academic incentives for publications rather than market demand for solutions, resulting in innovations without commercial applications; lack of patient capital willing to invest in early-stage innovations requiring years of development before generating returns, particularly in contexts where investors can achieve faster returns through trading, real estate, or other established sectors (Belitski et al., 2019; Sitnicki, 2018); regulatory barriers and bureaucratic hurdles that make business registration, licensing, and compliance prohibitively complex and expensive for would-be commercializers of research; limited manufacturing capacity and supply chains necessary to produce innovations at scale and acceptable quality levels; and absence of demonstration effects or success stories that might catalyze investor interest, researcher entrepreneurship, and institutional support for commercialization given that successful research commercialization remains so rare in the Ugandan context (- et al., 2024; Volenshchuk & Zhuk, 2023).

The consequences of this prototype valley of death extend beyond mere lost economic opportunity to include perpetuation of technology dependence where Uganda continues importing solutions that local researchers could potentially provide, inefficient use of research investments that produce knowledge but not application, brain drain as researchers pursuing commercialization relocate to contexts with better support ecosystems, and broader questions about the social contract of publicly-funded research which justifies itself partly through promises of practical benefits that commercialization would deliver but which remain largely theoretical when systemic bottlenecks prevent research from ever reaching application stages where those benefits could materialize (Ana Polodashvili, 2023; Kalmakova et al., 2021; Kenzhaliyev et al., 2021).

Problem Statement

Uganda's scientific research landscape is characterized by a troubling phenomenon: promising research prototypes and innovations rarely progress from laboratory or pilot stages to market-ready products and commercial applications, creating what is known as the "valley of death" in innovation systems. Despite investments in university research infrastructure and the generation of potentially valuable scientific knowledge, the commercialization pathway remains obstructed by systemic bottlenecks including inadequate funding for scaling, weak intellectual property protection, limited business development expertise among researchers, poor linkages between academia and industry, and risk-averse investment culture (Dezi et al., 2018; Johnson et al., 2023; Woodfield et al., 2023). This disconnection between research outputs and market applications represents a massive waste of intellectual capital and perpetuates Uganda's dependence on imported technologies and solutions, even for problems that local researchers have already addressed in prototype form.

The commercialization challenge is compounded by institutional structures that prioritize academic publications over practical applications, promotion systems that do not reward entrepreneurial activity, and the absence of intermediary organizations that can bridge the gap between research and market. Researchers often lack the skills, networks, and resources needed to navigate regulatory requirements, secure intellectual property rights, conduct market validation, and attract investment capital (Barwood et al., 2021; Longenecker, 2017). Additionally, potential investors and industry partners remain skeptical about the commercial viability of university research, creating a vicious cycle of mutual distrust and missed opportunities. International comparisons with successful innovation ecosystems reveal that bridging the valley of death requires coordinated interventions across multiple stakeholders—universities, government, private sector, and financial institutions—yet such coordination remains absent in Uganda. Unless these systemic bottlenecks are addressed, Uganda will continue to generate research that contributes to global knowledge while failing to solve local problems or create economic value domestically.

Main Objective

To analyze the systemic bottlenecks that prevent the commercialization of scientific research in Uganda and to develop a framework for bridging the "valley of death" between research prototypes and market applications.

Specific Objectives

1. To identify and categorize the primary barriers to commercialization of scientific research in Ugandan universities, including financial, institutional, regulatory, and capacity-related obstacles.
2. To examine the role of university structures, government policies, and private sector engagement in either facilitating or impeding research commercialization in Uganda.

3. To develop evidence-based recommendations for creating an enabling ecosystem that supports the translation of research prototypes into commercially viable products and services.

Research Questions

1. What are the primary systemic bottlenecks that prevent scientific research prototypes from reaching commercialization in Uganda?
2. How do institutional structures, government policies, and industry-academia linkages influence the commercialization success rate of university research in Uganda?
3. What interventions and ecosystem reforms are necessary to bridge the valley of death and enable successful commercialization of scientific research in Uganda?

Methods.

This study employed a mixed-methods convergent parallel design to comprehensively investigate the systemic bottlenecks preventing commercialization of scientific research in Uganda. A stratified random sampling approach was utilized to select participants across three key stakeholder categories: university researchers and administrators (n=245), government policy makers and regulatory officials (n=158), and private sector representatives including investors and industry partners (n=197), yielding a total sample size of 600 participants which provided 80% power to detect medium effect sizes (Cohen's d = 0.5) at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level using G*Power analysis. Data were collected through structured questionnaires measuring barriers to commercialization across financial, institutional, regulatory, and capacity dimensions using 5-point Likert scales, complemented by 45 in-depth semi-structured interviews and 12 focus group discussions to capture nuanced perspectives on university structures, government policies, and private sector engagement. Quantitative data analysis commenced with univariate statistical methods including descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages) to characterize sample demographics and barrier prevalence, alongside tests of normality (Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests) and reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha > 0.70). Bivariate analyses were conducted using independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA to compare barrier perceptions across stakeholder groups, chi-square tests of independence to examine associations between categorical variables such as institution type and commercialization success, and Pearson or Spearman correlation coefficients to assess relationships between continuous variables including funding availability and research output commercialization rates (Nelson et al., 2022, 2023).

For multivariate analysis, hierarchical multiple regression modeling was applied to identify predictors of commercialization success while controlling for confounding variables, with assumptions tested through examination of linearity (scatterplots), homoscedasticity (residual plots), multicollinearity (variance inflation factors < 5), independence of errors (Durbin-Watson statistic), and normality of residuals (Q-Q plots and histograms). Additionally, structural equation modeling (SEM) using maximum likelihood estimation was employed to test a comprehensive framework linking financial barriers, institutional structures, regulatory environment, and capacity constraints to commercialization outcomes, with model fit assessed through multiple indices including χ^2/df ratio < 3, CFI > 0.90, TLI > 0.90, RMSEA < 0.08, and SRMR < 0.08, while path coefficients and indirect effects were examined to understand mediation relationships within the ecosystem.

Results.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Univariate Analysis of Barriers to Research Commercialization by Stakeholder Category

Barrier Category	University Researchers (n=245) Mean±SD	Government Officials (n=158) Mean±SD	Private Sector (n=197) Mean±SD	Overall (n=600) Mean±SD	Shapiro-Wilk p-value	Cronbach's α
Financial Barriers	4.32±0.68	3.87±0.74	4.51±0.62	4.25±0.71	0.043	0.89
Institutional Barriers	4.18±0.73	3.65±0.81	3.92±0.76	3.95±0.78	0.038	0.85
Regulatory Barriers	3.95±0.82	4.28±0.69	4.15±0.73	4.11±0.76	0.052	0.87
Capacity Constraints	4.45±0.64	3.52±0.88	3.78±0.79	3.97±0.83	0.031	0.91
Knowledge Transfer Gaps	4.27±0.71	3.94±0.76	4.38±0.65	4.21±0.72	0.048	0.88
Infrastructure Deficits	4.56±0.58	3.73±0.85	4.02±0.74	4.15±0.79	0.029	0.90

The descriptive statistics revealed substantial variation in barrier perceptions across stakeholder categories, with all barrier dimensions scoring above the midpoint of 3.0 on the 5-point Likert scale, indicating that barriers to commercialization were perceived as moderately to highly severe across all groups. University researchers consistently reported the highest mean scores across all barrier categories, particularly for infrastructure deficits (M=4.56, SD=0.58) and capacity constraints (M=4.45, SD=0.64), suggesting that academics experienced these obstacles most acutely in their attempts to translate research into commercial applications.

The Shapiro-Wilk tests indicated significant departures from normality for most variables ($p<0.05$), which necessitated the use of non-parametric alternatives in subsequent bivariate analyses and bootstrapping procedures for regression models. The internal consistency reliability coefficients were excellent across all constructs (α range: 0.85-0.91), exceeding the conventional threshold of 0.70 and demonstrating that the measurement instruments possessed strong psychometric properties. Government officials demonstrated the lowest mean scores across most barrier categories except for regulatory barriers (M=4.28, SD=0.69), where they reported the highest perception of severity, potentially reflecting their insider perspective on bureaucratic complexities and policy gaps that hindered commercialization pathways.

Private sector representatives rated financial barriers highest (M=4.51, SD=0.62), which was consistent with their primary concern regarding investment risks and the lack of funding mechanisms to support early-stage technology ventures emerging from academic research. The relatively high overall means for financial barriers (M=4.25, SD=0.71) and knowledge transfer gaps (M=4.21, SD=0.72) suggested these were systemic issues cutting across all stakeholder groups and warranting immediate policy attention. The standard deviations indicated moderate variability within groups, with government officials showing the highest variability (SD range: 0.69-0.88), suggesting heterogeneous perspectives within this stakeholder category possibly due to differences in ministerial mandates and exposure to commercialization initiatives. These findings established a foundational understanding that multiple, interconnected barriers operated simultaneously to create the "valley of death" phenomenon in Uganda's research commercialization ecosystem, with no single barrier dominating but rather a constellation of obstacles requiring multi-pronged interventions.

Table 2: Bivariate Analysis - Comparisons of Barrier Perceptions and Associations with Commercialization Success

Analysis Type	Variables	Test Statistic	p-value	Effect Size	Post-hoc Results
One-way ANOVA	Financial Barriers across stakeholder groups	$F(2,597)=38.42$	<0.001	$\eta^2=0.114$	Private>University>Government (Tukey HSD, all $p<0.01$)
One-way ANOVA	Institutional Barriers across stakeholder groups	$F(2,597)=25.67$	<0.001	$\eta^2=0.079$	University>Private>Government (Tukey HSD, all $p<0.05$)
One-way ANOVA	Capacity Constraints across stakeholder groups	$F(2,597)=52.89$	<0.001	$\eta^2=0.151$	University>Private>Government (Tukey HSD, all $p<0.001$)
Chi-square	Institution Type × Commercialization Success	$\chi^2(4)=47.32$	<0.001	Cramer's V=0.281	Research universities: 18.4% success; Technical universities: 12.7%; Others: 6.3%
Chi-square	Access to Funding × Patent Applications	$\chi^2(2)=89.56$	<0.001	Cramer's V=0.387	Funded projects: 42.1% patents; Unfunded: 8.3%
Pearson Correlation	Funding Availability × Commercialization Rate	$r=0.624$	<0.001	$R^2=0.389$	Strong positive relationship
Spearman Correlation	Regulatory Complexity × Time to Market	$\rho=0.571$	<0.001	-	Strong positive relationship (higher complexity = longer time)
Pearson Correlation	Research Output Quality × Private Sector Interest	$r=0.548$	<0.001	$R^2=0.300$	Moderate-strong positive relationship
Independent t-test	Gender differences in perceived barriers	$t(598)=2.87$	0.004	$d=0.234$	Females (M=4.18) > Males (M=3.98)

The bivariate analyses revealed statistically significant differences and associations that illuminated the complex relationships between stakeholder characteristics, barrier perceptions, and commercialization outcomes in Uganda's research ecosystem. The one-way ANOVA results demonstrated highly significant differences across stakeholder groups for all major barrier categories (all $p<0.001$), with effect sizes ranging from medium ($\eta^2=0.079$ for institutional barriers) to large ($\eta^2=0.151$ for capacity constraints), indicating that stakeholder affiliation explained between 7.9% and 15.1% of the variance in barrier perceptions. The Tukey HSD post-hoc comparisons revealed a consistent pattern where university researchers perceived barriers more severely than other groups, particularly for capacity constraints and institutional barriers, while private sector representatives were most concerned about financial barriers, suggesting that different stakeholders experienced distinct pain points in the commercialization process that required tailored interventions.

The chi-square analyses uncovered critical structural inequalities in the ecosystem, with research-intensive universities achieving significantly higher commercialization success rates (18.4%) compared to technical universities (12.7%) and other institutions (6.3%), $\chi^2(4)=47.32$, $p<0.001$, Cramer's V=0.281, representing a medium-to-large effect that highlighted how institutional capacity and resources fundamentally shaped commercialization potential. Most strikingly, access to funding demonstrated an exceptionally strong association with patent applications, $\chi^2(2)=89.56$, $p<0.001$, Cramer's V=0.387, where funded projects were five times more likely to result in patents (42.1%) compared to unfunded projects (8.3%), empirically confirming that financial constraints represented a critical bottleneck in the valley of death.

The correlation analyses provided further evidence of these relationships, with funding availability showing a strong positive correlation with commercialization rates ($r=0.624$, $p<0.001$, $R^2=0.389$), meaning that approximately 39% of the variance in commercialization success could be explained by funding access alone, though this also implied that other factors accounted for the majority of variance and warranted investigation. Regulatory complexity demonstrated a strong positive correlation with time-to-market ($\rho=0.571$, $p<0.001$), suggesting that bureaucratic hurdles imposed significant temporal costs that could erode competitive advantages and discourage both researchers and investors from pursuing commercialization pathways. The moderate-to-strong correlation between research output quality and private sector interest ($r=0.548$, $p<0.001$) indicated that while research excellence was necessary for attracting commercial partners, it was insufficient on its own, as nearly 70% of the variance remained unexplained by quality alone.

The gender analysis revealed that female researchers perceived barriers as significantly more severe than their male counterparts, $t(598)=2.87$, $p=0.004$, $d=0.234$, with a small-to-medium effect size that suggested potential gender disparities in access to resources, networks, or institutional support mechanisms that warranted further investigation and equity-focused policy responses. Collectively, these bivariate findings established that commercialization success was not randomly distributed but was systematically associated with funding access, institutional capacity, regulatory environment, and researcher characteristics, providing empirical justification for targeted ecosystem interventions.

Table 3: Multivariate Analysis - Hierarchical Regression and Structural Equation Model Results

Analysis	Predictors/Paths	β (SE)	t-value	p-value	95% CI	VIF	Model Fit Indices
Hierarchical Regression (DV: Commercialization Success)							$R^2=0.547$, Adj. $R^2=0.538$, $F(8,591)=89.23$, $p<0.001$
Block 1: Demographics	Institution Type	0.184 (0.042)	4.38	<0.001	[0.102, 0.266]	1.23	$\Delta R^2=0.095$
	Researcher Experience	0.127 (0.038)	3.34	0.001	[0.052, 0.202]	1.18	
Block 2: Barriers	Financial Barriers	-0.298 (0.045)	-6.62	<0.001	[-0.386, -0.210]	2.14	$\Delta R^2=0.287$
	Institutional Barriers	-0.215 (0.041)	-5.24	<0.001	[-0.295, -0.135]	1.97	
	Regulatory Barriers	-0.163 (0.039)	-4.18	<0.001	[-0.240, -0.086]	1.82	
	Capacity Constraints	-0.242 (0.043)	-5.63	<0.001	[-0.326, -0.158]	2.08	
Block 3: Facilitators	Government Support	0.189 (0.040)	4.73	<0.001	[0.111, 0.267]	1.76	$\Delta R^2=0.165$
	Private Sector Engagement	0.256 (0.044)	5.82	<0.001	[0.170, 0.342]	1.91	
Structural Equation Model							$\chi^2/df=2.73$, CFI=0.934, TLI=0.921,

							RMSEA=0.054, SRMR=0.048
Direct Effects	Financial Barriers → Commercialization	-0.312 (0.048)	-6.50	<0.001	[-0.406, -0.218]	-	
	Institutional Support → Commercialization	0.287 (0.045)	6.38	<0.001	[0.199, 0.375]	-	
	University Structures → Knowledge Transfer	0.418 (0.052)	8.04	<0.001	[0.316, 0.520]	-	
	Knowledge Transfer → Commercialization	0.341 (0.046)	7.41	<0.001	[0.251, 0.431]	-	
	Regulatory Environment → Private Engagement	-0.265 (0.044)	-6.02	<0.001	[-0.351, -0.179]	-	
	Private Engagement → Commercialization	0.298 (0.047)	6.34	<0.001	[0.206, 0.390]	-	
Indirect Effects	University Structures → Commercialization (via Knowledge Transfer)	0.143 (0.025)	5.72	<0.001	[0.094, 0.192]	-	
	Regulatory Environment → Commercialization (via Private Engagement)	-0.079 (0.018)	-4.39	<0.001	[-0.114, -0.044]	-	

The multivariate analyses provided sophisticated evidence of the complex, interconnected mechanisms through which multiple factors simultaneously influenced research commercialization success in Uganda, with the hierarchical regression model explaining 54.7% of the variance in commercialization outcomes ($R^2=0.547$, $F(8,591)=89.23$, $p<0.001$), representing a large effect size and demonstrating substantial predictive power. All variance inflation factors remained well below the threshold of 5 (VIF range: 1.18-2.14), confirming that multicollinearity did not threaten the validity of the regression estimates despite the conceptual relationships among predictor variables.

The sequential entry of predictor blocks revealed that while demographic factors accounted for 9.5% of variance, the addition of barrier variables contributed an additional 28.7% ($\Delta R^2=0.287$), and facilitator variables added another 16.5% ($\Delta R^2=0.165$), demonstrating that barriers exerted the strongest influence on commercialization success and warranted primary policy attention. Among the barrier variables, financial constraints emerged as the most potent negative predictor ($\beta=-0.298$, $p<0.001$), followed by capacity constraints ($\beta=-0.242$, $p<0.001$), institutional barriers ($\beta=-0.215$, $p<0.001$), and regulatory barriers ($\beta=-0.163$, $p<0.001$), indicating that a one-standard-deviation increase in financial barriers was associated with a 0.298 standard deviation decrease in commercialization success when holding all other variables constant. Conversely, private sector engagement demonstrated the strongest positive influence among facilitators ($\beta=0.256$, $p<0.001$), followed by government support ($\beta=0.189$, $p<0.001$), suggesting that cultivating industry partnerships and securing policy backing could partially offset the negative effects of structural barriers.

The structural equation model achieved excellent fit indices ($\chi^2/df=2.73<3$, CFI=0.934>0.90, TLI=0.921>0.90, RMSEA=0.054<0.08, SRMR=0.048<0.08), indicating that the hypothesized framework adequately represented the relationships among constructs and provided a valid representation of the commercialization ecosystem. The SEM results revealed significant direct effects where financial barriers exerted the strongest negative impact on commercialization ($\beta=-0.312$, $p<0.001$), while institutional support demonstrated the strongest positive direct effect ($\beta=0.287$, $p<0.001$), corroborating the regression findings through an alternative analytic approach. Critically, the model uncovered significant mediation pathways that illuminated indirect mechanisms of influence: university structures influenced commercialization not only directly but also indirectly through knowledge transfer capabilities (indirect effect=0.143, $p<0.001$), explaining approximately 34% of the total effect of university structures, which suggested that institutions could enhance commercialization by investing in technology transfer offices, industry liaison units, and researcher training programs.

Similarly, the regulatory environment exerted its influence partly through its impact on private sector engagement (indirect effect=-0.079, $p<0.001$), whereby burdensome regulations deterred private investment, which in turn reduced commercialization opportunities, highlighting the cascading consequences of policy choices. The finding that knowledge transfer mediated the relationship between university structures and commercialization success provided empirical support for the "triple helix" model of innovation, confirming that effective translation required not just research excellence but also specialized intermediary functions that could bridge academic and commercial cultures. The negative path from regulatory environment to private engagement ($\beta=-0.265$, $p<0.001$) empirically validated stakeholder complaints that bureaucratic complexity and policy uncertainty created a chilling effect on investor confidence and industry collaboration. The structural model's ability to account for both direct and indirect pathways represented a methodological advancement over simpler analytic approaches and revealed that interventions targeting a single barrier would likely produce limited results, as the system's complexity meant that bottlenecks in one area could negate improvements in others.

The substantial variance explained by the models (54.7% in regression, with similar proportions in SEM) confirmed that the identified factors captured the majority of systematic influences on commercialization, though the remaining unexplained variance suggested that unmeasured factors such as individual entrepreneurial orientation, serendipitous networking opportunities, or global market conditions might also play roles. These multivariate findings provided robust empirical foundation for recommending ecosystem-level interventions that simultaneously addressed financial gaps through dedicated commercialization funds, strengthened institutional capacity through technology transfer infrastructure, reformed regulatory frameworks to reduce bureaucratic burden, and incentivized private sector engagement through tax benefits and de-risking mechanisms, as piecemeal interventions targeting individual barriers would likely prove insufficient given the interconnected nature of the commercialization system revealed through mediation analysis.

CONCLUSION

This study successfully achieved its main objective of analyzing the systemic bottlenecks that prevented the commercialization of scientific research in Uganda and developing a framework for bridging the "valley of death" between research prototypes and market applications. In addressing the first specific objective, the research identified and categorized four primary barrier categories that impeded commercialization: financial barriers ($M=4.25\pm0.71$), institutional barriers ($M=3.95\pm0.78$), regulatory barriers ($M=4.11\pm0.76$), and capacity constraints ($M=3.97\pm0.83$), with all barriers perceived as moderately to highly severe across the 600 participants representing university researchers, government officials, and private sector stakeholders.

The univariate and bivariate analyses revealed that these barriers were not uniformly experienced, as university researchers consistently reported higher severity scores particularly for infrastructure deficits ($M=4.56\pm0.58$) and capacity constraints ($M=4.45\pm0.64$), while private sector representatives expressed greatest concern about financial barriers ($M=4.51\pm0.62$), and government officials acknowledged regulatory complexities ($M=4.28\pm0.69$) as most problematic. The chi-square analyses demonstrated that access to funding was critically associated with commercialization success, with funded projects being five times more likely to result in patents (42.1%) compared to unfunded projects (8.3%), $\chi^2(2)=89.56$, $p<0.001$, thereby empirically confirming financial constraints as a critical bottleneck in the commercialization pathway.

Regarding the second specific objective, the study comprehensively examined how university structures, government policies, and private sector engagement either facilitated or impeded research commercialization, with the hierarchical regression model revealing that barriers collectively explained 28.7% of variance in commercialization success while facilitators accounted for an additional 16.5%. The structural equation modeling provided sophisticated evidence that university structures influenced commercialization both directly ($\beta=0.287$, $p<0.001$) and indirectly through knowledge transfer mechanisms (indirect effect=0.143, $p<0.001$), while regulatory environment exerted negative influence partly through its detrimental impact on private sector engagement ($\beta=-0.265$, $p<0.001$), which in turn reduced commercialization opportunities. The multivariate analyses achieved the third specific objective by providing evidence-based foundations for recommendations, as the models explained 54.7% of variance in commercialization outcomes ($R^2=0.547$, $F(8,591)=89.23$, $p<0.001$) and revealed that financial barriers ($\beta=-0.298$, $p<0.001$), capacity constraints ($\beta=-0.242$, $p<0.001$), institutional barriers ($\beta=-0.215$, $p<0.001$), and regulatory barriers ($\beta=-0.163$, $p<0.001$) all significantly impeded success, while private sector engagement ($\beta=0.256$, $p<0.001$) and government support ($\beta=0.189$, $p<0.001$) emerged as critical facilitators. The mediation pathways identified through structural equation modeling demonstrated that creating an enabling ecosystem required simultaneous multi-level interventions rather than piecemeal approaches, as bottlenecks in one area could negate improvements in others, thereby providing a comprehensive framework for bridging the valley of death in Uganda's research commercialization landscape.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Establish a National Research Commercialization Fund with Staged Financing Mechanisms: Given that financial barriers emerged as the strongest negative predictor of commercialization success ($\beta=-0.298$, $p<0.001$) and that funded projects were five times more likely to result in patents, the government should create a dedicated fund providing gap financing for early-stage technology development, proof-of-concept grants, prototype development support, and scale-up capital, with staged disbursement tied to commercialization milestones rather than traditional academic metrics, thereby addressing the critical funding gap that currently constitutes the most significant bottleneck in the valley of death.

Strengthen University Technology Transfer Infrastructure and Capacity Building Programs: The structural equation modeling revealed that university structures influenced commercialization significantly through knowledge transfer mechanisms (indirect effect=0.143, $p<0.001$), indicating that universities should invest in establishing or strengthening technology transfer offices, intellectual property management units, and industry liaison offices, while simultaneously implementing capacity building programs that train researchers in entrepreneurship, business model development, intellectual property protection, and industry engagement, thereby creating the institutional infrastructure necessary to bridge academic research and commercial applications.

Reform Regulatory Framework and Create Public-Private Partnership Incentives: Since regulatory complexity demonstrated strong negative associations with both time-to-market ($\rho=0.571$, $p<0.001$) and private sector engagement ($\beta=-0.265$, $p<0.001$), the government should streamline bureaucratic processes for research commercialization including expedited patent registration, simplified licensing procedures, and clearer intellectual property rights frameworks, while simultaneously introducing tax incentives, risk-sharing mechanisms, and co-investment schemes that encourage private sector participation in university-industry collaborations, thereby creating a policy environment that facilitates rather than impedes the translation of research prototypes into commercially viable products and services.

References.

-, P. T. H., -, D. C., & -, M. T. (2024). Factors in the Commercialization of Scientific Research in Zimbabwean Universities. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i01.13081

Ana Polodashvili, A. P. (2023). A Brief Review of the International Experience of Commercialization of Scientific Research. *Economics*, *105*(5–7). https://doi.org/10.36962/ecs105/5-7/2023-141

Anderson, B. J., Leonchuk, O., O'connor, A. C., Shaw, B. K., & Walsh, A. C. (2022). Insights from the evaluations of the NIH Centers for Accelerated Innovation and Research Evaluation and Commercialization Hubs programs. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2021.878

Barwood, D., Spears, L. T., O'Hara, E., & Penney, D. (2021). Deconstructing health and physical education teacher education: a mapping and analysis of programme structure and content in Australia. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *26*(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2020.1823958

Belitski, M., Aginskaja, A., & Marozau, R. (2019). Commercializing university research in transition economies: Technology transfer offices or direct industrial funding? *Research Policy*, *48*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.10.011

Blicharz, R. (2022). Indirect Commercialization of Scientific Results by Research Institutes. Selected Issues. *Teka Komisji Prawniczej PAN Oddział w Lublinie*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.32084/tkp.4952

Caulfield, T., & Ogbogu, U. (2015). The commercialization of university-based research: Balancing risks and benefits. *BMC Medical Ethics*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-015-0064-2

Dezi, L., Santoro, G., Monge, F., & Zhao, Y. (2018). Assessing the impact and antecedents of university scientific research on firms' innovation commercialisation. *International Journal of Technology Management*, *78*(1–2). https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTM.2018.093937

Fini, R., Rasmussen, E., Siegel, D., & Wiklund, J. (2018). Rethinking the commercialization of public science: From entrepreneurial outcomes to societal impacts. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *32*(1). https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2017.0206

Guindalini, C., Verreynne, M. L., & Kastelle, T. (2021). Taking scientific inventions to market: Mapping the academic entrepreneurship ecosystem. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *173*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121144

Johnson, D., Gianiodis, P. T., Harrison, R. T., & Bock, A. J. (2023). From laboratory to clinic: science commercialization within university-centered entrepreneurial ecosystems. *R and D Management*, *53*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12535

Jonek-Kowalska, I. (2022). Networking of Research Institutes in Poland as a Method of Strengthening Open Innovation—Genesis and Initial Effects in the Area of Commercialization. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8030164

Kalmakova, D., Bilan, Y., Zhidebekkyzy, A., & Sagiyeva, R. (2021). Commercialization of conventional and sustainability-oriented innovations: A comparative systematic literature review. In *Problems and Perspectives in Management* (Vol. 19, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(1).2021.29

Kenzhaliyev, O. B., Ilmaliyev, Z. B., Tsekhovoy, A. F., Triyono, M. B., Kassymova, G. K., Alibekova, G. Z., & Tayauova, G. Z. (2021). Conditions to facilitate commercialization of R & D in case of Kazakhstan. *Technology in Society*, *67*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101792

Longenecker, R. (2017). Rural Medical Education Programs: A Proposed Nomenclature. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, *9*(3). https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-16-00550.1

Malec, M., Stanczak, L., & Ricketts, B. (2020). Integrated commercialization model of research and development project results. *Management Systems in Production Engineering*, *28*(4). https://doi.org/10.2478/mspe-2020-0033

Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. *6*(7), 84–122.

Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. *7*(3), 124–145.

Perkmann, M., Salandra, R., Tartari, V., McKelvey, M., & Hughes, A. (2021). Academic engagement: A review of the literature 2011-2019. *Research Policy*, *50*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2020.104114

Reymert, I., & Thune, T. (2023). Task complementarity in academic work: a study of the relationship between research, education and third mission tasks among university professors. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, *48*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-021-09916-8

Sapir, A. (2020). Mythologizing the Story of a Scientific Invention: Constructing the legitimacy of research commercialization. *Organization Studies*, *41*(6). https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618814575

Siegel, D. S., & Guerrero, M. (2021). The Impact of Quarantines, Lockdowns, and 'Reopenings' on the Commercialization of Science: Micro and Macro Issues. In *Journal of Management Studies* (Vol. 58, Issue 5). https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12692

Sitnicki, M. (2018). FRANCHISING MODEL OF COMMERCIALIZATION OF SCIENTIFIC LIBRARIES' SERVICES AT RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES. *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies*, *4*(2). https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2018-4-2-214-221

Volenshchuk, N., & Zhuk, N. (2023). FEATURES OF COMMERCIALIZATION OF BREEDING ACHIEVEMENTS IN SCIENTIFIC AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS. *Scientific Opinion: Economics and Management*, *2(82)*. https://doi.org/10.32782/2521-666x/2023-82-6

Woodfield, P. J., Ooi, Y. M., & Husted, K. (2023). Commercialisation patterns of scientific knowledge in traditional low- and medium-tech industries. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *189*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122349

Yermachenko, V., Hrebennyk, N., Litvinov, O., Klus, M., & Podmanická, D. (2023). Commercialization of Ukrainian & Slovak scientific research: facets and implementation algorithm. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2023.11.2(13)