

[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	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><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></p>	<p>This manuscript makes a valuable contribution to the scientific community by providing an in-depth case study of new product development (NPD) within the Ohonos Snack S.A. Company. By applying the Panizzolo, Biazzo, and Garengo model, the study offers practical insights into how strategic NPD can enhance business competitiveness and sustainability, particularly in the highly competitive snack industry.</p> <p>I appreciate the comprehensive approach that combines literature review with qualitative research, as it bridges theoretical frameworks with real-world application. However, the manuscript could be strengthened by expanding the sample size beyond four managers to enhance the generalizability of the findings and by incorporating quantitative data to complement the qualitative insights.</p> <p>Overall, the study is well-structured and provides meaningful recommendations that can benefit both academics and practitioners in the field of product development and strategic management.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>The title of the article although decent but I don't consider it suitable based on the article content.</b></p> <p><b>An alternative suggested title for this manuscript:</b> Strategic Approaches to New Product Development (NPD): A Case Study of Ohonos Snack S.A. in the Competitive Snack Industry.</p> <p>This title better reflects the key themes of the research, including the strategic aspects of NPD and the specific focus on the snack industry.</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

<p><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></p>	<p>The abstract of the article is relatively comprehensive, but it could benefit from some improvements for better clarity and completeness. While it outlines the purpose, methodology, and conclusions, it lacks details about key findings and recommendations. Here are my suggestions:</p> <p><b>Additions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Key findings:</b> Include a brief mention of the primary findings from the research, such as how the development of new products helped Ohonos Snack S.A. maintain market share and adapt to market changes.</li> <li><b>Recommendations:</b> Add a sentence on the practical recommendations provided to the company, such as emphasizing cost efficiency and market-driven innovation.</li> <li><b>Research model:</b> While the abstract mentions the Panizzolo, Biazzo, and Garengo model, it could be briefly explained for readers unfamiliar with it.</li> <li><b>Impact:</b> Highlight the broader implications of the research for businesses facing similar challenges in competitive environments.</li> </ol> <p><b>Deletions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The abstract could be made more concise by eliminating repetitive phrases, such as reiterating that the company "mainly operates in Northern Greece and the Balkans." A more general statement about the company's scope would suffice.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, but some improvements could enhance readability and clarity. The manuscript follows a logical flow, starting from an introduction to the research, followed by a literature review, methodology, analysis, and conclusions. However, a few structural adjustments could improve the overall presentation:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Clear Sections:</b> The manuscript clearly defines key sections such as the introduction, literature review, methodology, data analysis, and conclusions.</li> <li><b>Research Goals and Objectives:</b> It appropriately identifies the research goals and objectives early on, making it easy for the reader to understand the purpose of the study.</li> </ol> <p><b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Abstract Placement:</b> Typically, the abstract appears before the main body of the paper. Ensure it is placed at the very beginning, as it currently seems embedded within the text.</li> <li><b>Introduction Section:</b> The introduction is well-structured but could benefit from a stronger focus on the research problem. A concise problem statement can set the tone more effectively.</li> <li><b>Literature Review:</b> This section could be further divided into subheadings to clarify different aspects of the literature review (e.g., definitions, historical development of NPD models, and specific focus on the snack industry).</li> <li><b>Results Section:</b> The section on "Analysis of Data" could be renamed "Results" to make it clearer that this is where findings from the research are presented.</li> <li><b>Separation of Discussion and Conclusion:</b> Currently, the conclusions and suggestions are combined in the same section. It might be helpful to have a dedicated "Discussion" section where the findings are interpreted and linked back to the research questions and literature. Then, a "Conclusion" section can summarize key takeaways and the implications for practice.</li> </ol>	
<p><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></p>	<p><b>Positive credit to the manuscript</b></p> <p>This publication appears to be scientifically and technically good due to its well-defined research approach and use of a validated model (Panizzolo, Biazzo, and Garengo model) to evaluate new product development (NPD).</p> <p>The qualitative research technique, which includes in-depth interviews with senior executives from Ohonos Snack S.A., gives vital insights into the company's NPD process and how it aligns with theoretical models.</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

	<p>The article also bases its findings on previous research, providing a strong theoretical context. Furthermore, the clear presentation of data and practical recommendations adds to its scientific legitimacy, making it an important contribution to the field of business and marketing research.</p> <p><b>Downside to the Manuscript</b> The small sample size utilized in the qualitative study may make the paper less scientifically strong and technically sound. With just four CEOs interviewed, the findings may lack generalizability and representativeness, lowering the validity of the conclusions.</p> <p>Furthermore, the study's conclusions are limited in depth due to the lack of quantitative data or statistical analysis, as it is entirely dependent on qualitative observations. While qualitative research is vital, integrating it with quantitative methodologies can improve the study's rigor.</p> <p>Finally, the article might benefit from bias reduction, since interviews with corporate management may represent a positive internal picture of the organization's procedures while potentially lacking outsider or critical perspectives.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript cover a broad range of relevant literature, but several of them are quite dated, with many sources from the early 2000s and even earlier. In a field as dynamic as New Product Development (NPD) and business strategy, it's crucial to incorporate more recent references to reflect current trends, methodologies, and technologies in the industry.</p> <p><b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Update the Literature:</b> More recent studies (from the last 5–10 years) on NPD models, particularly those focusing on digital transformation, agile methodologies, and the role of dataanalytics in product development, should be included to make the references more current.</li> <li><b>2. Broader Scope:</b> Consider adding references that focus on how modern technological advancements (e.g., AI, machine learning, and automation) impact NPD processes, which is especially relevant in industries like food and snacks.</li> </ol> <p><b>Potential Reference Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooper, R. G. (2019). The drivers of success in new-product development. <i>Industrial Marketing Management</i>, 76, 36-47.</li> <li>• Eppinger, S. D., &amp; Ulrich, K. T. (2020). <i>Product Design and Development</i> (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.</li> <li>• Kahn, K. B. (2018). <i>The PDMA Handbook of New Product Development</i> (3rd ed.). Wiley.</li> <li>• Luchs, M. G., Swan, K. S., &amp; Griffin, A. (2015). <i>Design Thinking: New Product Development Essentials from the PDMA</i>. Wiley.</li> </ul>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language used in the article is generally clear and understandable but it can be improved to better satisfy academic communication standards.</p> <p>There are occasional grammatical, phrasing, and word choice errors that make some passages less professional or difficult for academic writing.</p> <p>Furthermore, some phrases are too lengthy or repeated, which might impair clarity and reading.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[Review Form2](#)

**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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eneanya C Austin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Lagos, Nigeria</b>