

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Business, Management and Economics: Research Progress</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2916
Title of the Manuscript:	The Strategy of Developing New Products: A Requisite For The Development And Survival Of The Businesses
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript addresses a significant topic in the realm of business strategy by exploring the role of new product development (NPD) in ensuring business survival and competitiveness. Its case study approach provides practical insights, making it valuable for both academics and industry professionals. However, the study's heavy reliance on a single case limits its broader applicability and reduces its overall impact on the scientific community. While the manuscript offers useful information, a multi-case approach would enhance its contribution and relevance.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title, "The Strategy Of Developing New Products: A Requisite For The Development And Survival Of The Businesses," captures the essence of the paper but could be more concise and impactful. An alternative title could be: "Strategies for New Product Development: Ensuring Business Survival and Growth."	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract provides a general overview of the study but lacks specificity regarding the main findings and contributions. It would benefit from a clearer statement of the key results and how the chosen model contributed to the company's NPD strategy. Including a sentence or two about the implications of the findings would make the abstract more informative and comprehensive.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally well-organized, following a logical flow from introduction to methodology, analysis, and conclusions. However, some sections are overly descriptive, lacking critical analysis. Adding more interpretative commentary, especially when discussing the case study findings, would strengthen the manuscript's academic rigor.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically sound in applying the Panizzolo, Biazzo, and Garengo model to the case study. However, its robustness is undermined by the reliance on qualitative interviews with a small sample size, which may not capture the full complexity of NPD strategies. Incorporating quantitative data or expanding the sample size would enhance the reliability and depth of the study's conclusions.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	While the manuscript includes a range of references, many are outdated, with some over 20 years old. This weakens the study's relevance to current NPD practices. To strengthen the literature review, it is recommended to include more recent research on NPD, innovation management, and business strategy from the last 5-10 years.	

**Review Form2**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are instances of awkward phrasing and grammatical errors. A thorough proofreading would help improve clarity and readability.</li><li>➤ Ensure consistency in the use of terminology, such as abbreviations (e.g., consistently use "NPD" after introducing it).</li></ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b>comments</p>	<p>There do not appear to be any significant ethical issues in this manuscript. The study primarily focuses on a case study of the Ohonos Snack S.A. Company, and the research methodology involves interviews with company executives. However, it would be beneficial for the authors to confirm that informed consent was obtained from all interview participants and that their responses were handled with confidentiality. Including a statement on ethical considerations would strengthen the manuscript's adherence to ethical research standards.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Animesh Agrawal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mats University, India</b>