

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

Francesca Gennari¹

¹ University of Brescia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper is about the innovation of BMs in order to make them suitable for dynamic and sustainable growth. This issue is a much-studied topic by researchers, and there is a lot of literature about it. The authors aim at exploring the methods of business model innovation, the impact of technology on the creation of novel models for business growth, and the development of business models in a changing environment. The aim is ambitious, but in my opinion, the paper has serious weaknesses.

First of all, the research gap is not clear. Why should a potential reader read your paper? What could he find innovative compared to the (many) other articles about literature analysis on BM? You should motivate a potential reader in the Introduction with a strong research question (which I hadn't found) and a strong methodology ('through real-world case studies, practical insights, and thought-provoking analyses'...is not the research methodology). Without these essential pieces of information, subsequent reading of the article is very difficult and confusing!

Section 2 is not well structured (e.g., sub-sections consisting of one sentence). Furthermore, there is no reference to a sustainable business model (as Ecocanvas BM), and this clashes with the title.

Section 3. Justify the time frame chosen for the analysis (why from 2010?). Why 1.5 for the impact factor and not less? Without a clear identification of the research question, the search string is not clear. The PRISMA method implies that you have to select articles from the universe given by the database (Scopus or/and WoS) in coherence with the research question (RQ) and search objectives. If you insert 'innovation' in the search string, this could be justified by the RQ. In other words, what are you looking for? In which way is your research different from other similar LR searches on the same topic? 'A comprehensive review of titles, abstracts, and keywords led to the final selection of 213 papers for inclusion in the study': this selection is based on...? (you should define a code for the selection of the articles...why were some articles refused?). 'To provide an inclusive theoretical framework that identifies research trends, gaps, and contradictions in the BMI literature': I don't find it in the results or even in the discussion.

Section 4. In Fig. 3, there is no 2023 (which was included in the search). If you select only articles (as you said in the previous section), Fig. 5 is useless (why only articles, and not book chapters or proceedings?). In the text, there is no reference to the figures. What is the sense of subsections 4.1 (authors' affiliation?) and 4.2 (it is common to have different BMs in different industries or in the same industry. What do you want to say?)

Section 5. The Discussion section is not clear because criteria for coding the selected articles are missing. Some case studies are cited but without a clear development of a debate coming from the results analysis. The fact of selecting some case studies from the literature is not justified. In this section, I notice a confusion of topics (innovation, Canvas again, etc.) and a missing link with the results.

Section 6. Is it based on the literature review? It's not yet clear to me what you're looking for with the literature review and what the originality of your paper is. The bullet point writing style is not suitable for a scientific paper.

Section 7. Are you sure that the impact of your paper on practitioners consists in refining their strategy? What is the impact on the academic field? What is your contribution to the existing literature on BMI? From the abstract: 'This research provides companies and researchers alike with the knowledge and gaps they need to address the challenges and seize the opportunities that arise from the dynamic nature of contemporary business models by real-world case studies, providing practical strategies...' I didn't find these practical strategy suggestions.

In short, I think that the weakness of the whole paper is mainly due to the RQ missing. Saying that you want to explore the BMI is not sufficient or original, considering that many studies exist on this topic (I already knew all that you say in the paper). I suggest to focus more on the potential originality of the research, the gap to fill, and to depict the RQ and the objectives that guide the analysis of the results and their discussion. I hope my criticisms are constructive to improve future research