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|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript provides a comprehensive integration of corporate strategy and sustainability, addressing a critical intersection for modern business practice. The content is particularly relevant given the growing emphasis on sustainable development and the necessity for businesses to align their strategic objectives with ecological and social imperatives. By synthesizing theoretical frameworks with practical applications, the manuscript serves as an invaluable resource for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers aiming to enhance corporate competitiveness while fostering sustainability. Moreover, its detailed exploration of concepts such as the Balanced Scorecard, value chain analysis, and resource-based perspectives contributes significantly to the academic discourse on sustainable corporate practices. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Chapter 1:**   * The definition of corporate strategy is detailed but could include citations from seminal works for academic rigor. For example, referencing works from Henry Mintzberg or Alfred Chandler would add credibility. * The section could benefit from explicitly linking corporate strategy components (e.g., resource allocation, portfolio management) to established frameworks like the BCG matrix or Ansoff's Matrix. * The integration of sustainability into corporate strategy is discussed well, but more detailed examples from industries or companies successfully implementing these practices (e.g., Patagonia or Unilever) would strengthen the argument. * While barriers are identified, they could be explored further by referencing contemporary studies or frameworks that provide solutions to these barriers, such as stakeholder engagement models or ESG reporting standards.   **Chapter 2:**   * The discussion on competitive advantage would benefit from incorporating Porter’s Generic Strategies more explicitly to frame the cost leadership, focus, and differentiation strategies. * Expand on how sustainability initiatives can drive differentiation or cost leadership in specific industries. Case studies from businesses like Tesla (differentiation) or IKEA (cost leadership) could provide valuable context. * The chapter should explore the role of dynamic capabilities in sustaining competitive advantage, referencing David Teece’s framework.   **Chapter 4:**   * Clarify the distinction between corporate strategy and competitive strategy by referencing academic definitions and models, such as the strategic alignment model (SAM). * Include empirical evidence or case studies illustrating how value creation is achieved through the alignment of corporate and competitive strategies. * Add a subsection on how digital transformation and global competition are shaping the need for alignment.   **Chapter 5:**   * The section provides a general overview of the Balanced Scorecard framework by Kaplan and Norton. However, it lacks an in-depth explanation of its theoretical underpinnings and evolution. Expanding the theoretical discussion to include its origin, scholarly critiques, and alternative perspectives would provide a more robust foundation. For instance, a discussion on the interplay between the four metrics (financial, customer, internal processes, and learning/growth) and their alignment with strategic goals would deepen the theoretical rigor. * The integration of the Balanced Scorecard into competitive strategy could be strengthened by including real-world case studies or empirical examples. For instance, demonstrating how specific companies have used the Balanced Scorecard to navigate competitive challenges would enhance the practical relevance of the theoretical discussion. * While the chapter outlines the metrics, it does not critically examine potential limitations of the Balanced Scorecard. Including a discussion on its constraints, such as challenges in implementation, potential biases in metric selection, or its applicability across industries, would contribute to a balanced scholarly approach. * The Balanced Scorecard has evolved since its inception, with contemporary adaptations integrating sustainability metrics or digital transformation indicators. Incorporating these developments would make the section more relevant to current business contexts and highlight its dynamic applicability. * The discussion on how the Balanced Scorecard directly links to competitive strategy could be expanded. Specifically, elaborating on how the metrics collectively create a synergy that enhances competitive positioning would clarify its strategic value. For example, how does the internal process metric interact with customer satisfaction to drive market differentiation? * The methodology for implementing the Balanced Scorecard framework is underexplored. Adding a detailed process or step-by-step guide for aligning the framework with competitive strategy would provide practical insights for practitioners and academics alike.   **Chapter 6:**   * The section could benefit from a more robust integration of foundational theories and frameworks. While Porter's Value Chain is mentioned, expanding on the theoretical basis, such as detailing its evolution and variations in different industries, would provide a deeper academic grounding. Additionally, referencing more recent studies or critiques of the value chain model would add scholarly depth. * The chapter primarily focuses on theoretical explanations but lacks integration of empirical data or real-world examples to substantiate claims. Including case studies or statistical findings on how successful firms leverage value chain analysis for competitive strategy would enhance the section's practical relevance and academic rigor. * The discussion could be enriched by contextualizing the value chain within contemporary challenges, such as digital transformation, globalization, and sustainability. For instance, discussing how digitization impacts the primary and support activities of the value chain would provide a modernized perspective. * While the value chain is discussed in a positive light, the section would benefit from addressing its limitations. For example, critiques could include its potential rigidity in rapidly changing environments or its difficulty in capturing intangible assets like intellectual capital. * Considering the overarching theme of the book is corporate strategy and sustainability, the chapter could more explicitly discuss how the value chain can be adapted to incorporate sustainable practices. This could include strategies for reducing the environmental impact of primary activities or enhancing social responsibility in support activities.   **Chapter 7:**   * The section introduces the Resource-Based View (RBV) framework, but its theoretical underpinnings could be better defined. For example, it could expand on the origins of RBV, such as the works of Barney (1991), and explain its key assumptions in greater detail. This would provide a stronger scholarly foundation for the discussion. * The connection between RBV and competitive strategy is mentioned but not fully explored. The chapter should explicitly detail how the RBV informs strategic decision-making at different levels (corporate, business, and functional). For instance, examples of how unique resources (e.g., brand equity, organizational culture, or technological know-how) translate into sustained competitive advantages could make the section more practical and theoretically grounded. * The chapter touches on concepts like "valuable," "rare," "inimitable," and "non-substitutable" (VRIN) resources but does not delve deeply into these criteria. Expanding on each element with real-world or hypothetical examples would enrich the discussion. Moreover, it could contrast the VRIN framework with complementary models, such as the Dynamic Capabilities Framework. * The section could be improved by referencing recent empirical studies that validate or critique the RBV. This addition would not only enhance the scholarly rigor but also demonstrate the framework's applicability to contemporary business contexts. * While the chapter discusses competitive strategy, it would benefit from examples across industries or business sizes, including SMEs, startups, and multinational corporations. These diverse applications would highlight the versatility of RBV and its relevance in varied competitive landscapes. * The chapter could include a subsection on criticisms of RBV. For instance, it could explore the challenges in measuring intangible resources, the dynamic nature of competitive advantages, and the criticisms that RBV focuses more on internal resources than on external market factors. * Since the overarching theme of the book emphasizes sustainability, the chapter could explicitly integrate RBV's role in sustainable competitive strategies. For instance, it could discuss how organizations can utilize unique resources to meet environmental, social, and governance (ESG) objectives. * The addition of diagrams or conceptual frameworks to visually represent RBV and its application to competitive strategy could enhance reader comprehension. For example, a flowchart showing how resources transform into competitive advantages through strategic implementation would be valuable.   **Chapter 8:**   * The chapter could incorporate established theoretical frameworks more explicitly. For example, linking competitiveness to Michael Porter's theories on competitive advantage or resource-based views could strengthen the scholarly foundation. This connection would contextualize how sustainability contributes to a firm's competitive edge within a structured theoretical lens. * While sustainability is discussed, the chapter could delve deeper into its dimensions (economic, environmental, and social) and their interactions with competitiveness. Citing specific cases or studies demonstrating successful integration of these dimensions into corporate strategies would enrich the discussion and provide practical applicability. * The chapter would benefit from more empirical data or case studies to support its claims. For instance, examples of companies that achieved competitiveness through sustainability practices, backed by measurable outcomes like market share growth or profitability, would enhance the credibility and relevance of the arguments. * A comparative discussion of organizations operating in similar industries but with differing levels of sustainability integration could offer critical insights. This could highlight the tangible impact of sustainability practices on competitiveness, making the chapter more analytically rigorous. * The chapter could discuss the role of government policies or international agreements in shaping corporate sustainability strategies. A focus on regulatory drivers and how companies navigate these frameworks to maintain competitiveness would provide a broader perspective. * While the chapter addresses barriers to integrating sustainability, it could provide more actionable recommendations. For instance, strategies for overcoming resistance within organizations or aligning sustainability goals with financial performance objectives could make this section more pragmatic and insightful. * The methodology used for "assessing competitiveness" should be clarified. Whether this involves qualitative case studies, quantitative metrics, or a hybrid approach, a detailed explanation would enhance the academic rigor and allow readers to evaluate the robustness of the conclusions. |  |
| 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. | The abstract would benefit from shorter, more concise sentences to improve readability and comprehension, avoiding overly complex phrasing. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the provided content. It integrates theoretical knowledge and practical applications of corporate strategy with sustainability principles. Each section is supported with relevant citations and frameworks like the Balanced Scorecard, Value Chain, and sustainability dimensions (economic, environmental, social). The inclusion of definitions, conceptual frameworks, and evidence-based discussions further substantiates its scientific validity. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | The references seem comprehensive, addressing both theoretical and practical aspects of corporate strategy, competitiveness, and sustainability. However, their recency varies, with many references from 2022 and a few earlier ones (e.g., 2013). The author should looking for the most up-to-date resources or a broader scope, consider adding references from 2023 or 2024. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language quality of the article appears suitable for scholarly communications. It demonstrates a formal tone, clear structure, precise use of terminology, and coherent presentation of ideas, which are all hallmarks of academic writing. However, there are some areas where improvements might enhance the clarity and engagement of the article:   * Ensure that key terms are consistently used throughout to maintain clarity. * While the language is formal, some sentences are overly long or complex. Breaking these into shorter, more digestible sentences can improve readability. * The references provided are appropriate, but ensure they strictly follow the selected citation style. * Some sections might benefit from smoother transitions between ideas to enhance the logical flow of arguments. |  |
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