

Peer Review

Review of: "Driving Circular Innovation: From Business Model to Industrial Ecosystems"

Hany Akeel Al-hussaniy¹

1. University of Baghdad, Iraq

The review article **"Driving Circular Innovation: From Business Model to Industrial Ecosystems"** presents a comprehensive and well-structured narrative synthesis connecting circular economy theory, business model innovation, spatial diffusion of innovation, and the evolution of industrial districts toward circular innovation ecosystems. The manuscript demonstrates strong conceptual integration by linking traditionally separate research streams and provides a useful framework for understanding how territorial industrial systems may transition toward sustainability-oriented innovation ecosystems. The literature coverage is broad and generally relevant, and the inclusion of comparative conceptual tables enhances the clarity of theoretical relationships and improves the practical interpretability of the proposed framework.

However, several limitations reduce the scientific robustness of the study. The narrative review methodology, while appropriate for conceptual exploration, lacks detailed transparency regarding article selection criteria, inclusion/exclusion procedures, and potential bias control, which limits reproducibility. Additionally, the study remains largely descriptive and theoretical, with limited critical appraisal of conflicting viewpoints or empirical validation supporting the proposed circular innovation ecosystem framework. The manuscript would benefit from clearer differentiation between industrial districts, clusters, and ecosystems using measurable indicators, as well as inclusion of case studies or empirical datasets to strengthen practical applicability. Further discussion of implementation challenges, governance barriers, and economic trade-offs in transitioning to circular ecosystems would also improve the managerial and policy relevance of the work.

Overall, the article contributes valuable theoretical insight and offers a useful integrative framework but would benefit from stronger methodological rigor and empirical grounding.

Overall rating: 3.7 / 5.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.