

Review of: "Business Model Innovation as a Structural Framework for Business Sustainability Growth: A Systematic Review"

Carlo Bagnoli¹

¹ Ca' Foscari University of Venice

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors,

Thanks for the opportunity to read and review your paper.

Although the theme under investigation is definitely interesting and topical, I think that much work needs to be done before your article can be published. Mainly, your paper is weak from a methodological perspective. You neither specify how your SLR was conducted nor explain how the selected papers were analyzed. While most of your results are purely bibliometric and could be easily retrieved from Scopus without any analytical effort, they cannot justify your discussion points. Therefore, your paper cannot contribute to the academic debate due to a lack of critique.

Here are some detailed comments which I hope will be useful in refining your research piece.

Introduction:

Even if some meaningful pieces are cited (e.g., Osterwalder, Cosenz, ...), you should better justify your choices regarding one specific framework. For instance, what is claimed in Table 1 is not the only framework that is present in the current literature. See, for instance, the value triangle model (ref. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.281>), which has been used in several papers (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.138764>). Therefore, you should present each framework by highlighting that there may be different paradigms and models, as the current scenario is moving fast. Hence, there is a need for a rigorous literature review (which may serve as an interesting "why" for your study).

Methodology:

The start of this section is promising, as two major datasets are used, and the number of results is more than appropriate. Still, you should refer to some methodological papers about the use of the SLR. Moreover, the choice to cut down the sample based on journals with an IF <1.5 is not supported by any evidence. At least, you should find some other papers (better if methodologically robust and published in some high-end journals) that followed a similar approach.

In this section, some results are presented. I am not sure that this choice is correct. Indeed, all results should be pictured under a "findings" or "results" section. Figure 1 should be moved under the "results" section, and the PRISMA flow (Figure 2) should be moved up to show the selection process.

Again, the methods used in the selected papers should be moved to the "results" section.

The kind of analysis conducted should be better specified: how did you analyze those 213 papers? This represents a relevant weakness of your study that compromises the validity and reliability of your results and subsequent discussion.

As I said above, most (if not all) of your results could be easily retrieved by the automatic analysis given by Scopus.

Results:

Please see my comments above about the need to include all the results in the same section. My major concern here is that most of the findings are purely bibliometric, and they do not add anything relevant to the academic debate. For instance, Figure 5 (100% of the sample being represented by articles) has no meaning at all as it was your choice to limit your search to journal papers, so what is the point here?

Table 2 is not grounded in any specific analysis.

Aspects you could have explored (but you did not) include the types of mentioned business models, the technologies related to them, the impacts on the building blocks, the role of sustainability, the stakeholders involved, the location of the (eventual) study, the sectors under analysis, and so on.

Discussion:

It is not clear how the discussion is linked to the results. You selected Amazon and Airbnb as case studies, but it is not clear how these are linked to the literature review and why they should be interesting.

All the other points that you raised here are not connected to your results either.

I understand that my review can be tough. Still, contributing to the academic debate is challenging, especially when you try to conduct a comprehensive literature review, which should:

- be methodologically robust and grounded in some methodological works, by following their steps and recommendations;
- rely on some sound analysis, which should lead to interesting insights to sum up the state-of-the-art and the way the academic dialogue is conducted;
- discuss these results by defining some open issues, relevant research avenues, and future perspectives.

I hope that my comments will be useful.