

PEER REVIEW REPORT OF THE MANUSCRIPT



Manuscript data:

Type of manuscript : Research article (Theoretical-empirical)

Title : Business model development in startups: A study of causation, effectuation and bricolage

Authors : Renato Machado Costa  , Reed Elliot Nelson  , and Marcelo Caldeira Pedros   Article ID: e2535

Manuscript's DOI : <https://doi.org/10.14211/regepe.esbj.e2535>.


Peer review report data:

How to cite : Anonymous & Ferreira, W. (2025). Peer review report of the manuscript: Business model development in startups: A study of causation, effectuation and bricolage. *REGPEPE Entrepreneurship and Small Business Journal*, 14, e2535. <https://doi.org/10.14211/regepe.esbj.e2535pr>.



Round ↓	Reviewers			
	1	2	3	4
1	R1R1	R1R2	R1R3	
2	R2R1	R2R2	R2R3	
3				
4				

Editorial data:

Editor-in-Chief¹ or Adjunct²: 
¹ Dr. Edmundo Inácio Júnior
Univ. Estadual de Campinas, UNICAMP

Associate Editor: 
Dr. Victor Silva Corrêa
Universidade Paulista, UNIP

Executive¹ or Assistant² Editor:
²M. Eng. Patrícia Trindade de Araújo

ROUND 1:

1st Reviewer: Anonymous

Completed : 2024-08-01 04:43 PM

Recommendation : Resubmit for Review

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

■ Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.

Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.

Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.

■ Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.

Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.

■ Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.

Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.

Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.

Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.

Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.

Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.

Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.

■ Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing.

Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.

Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.

■ Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.

Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

■ Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

O resumo é claro e bem estruturado, fornecendo uma visão geral do objetivo principal, metodologia, contribuições e palavras-chave do estudo. A clareza e a objetividade do resumo são pontos positivos, pois permitem ao leitor entender rapidamente o propósito e os achados do artigo. Sugere-se especificar melhor as atividades da startup de biotecnologia, visto que essa especificação é feita apenas na seção de resultados. Recomenda-se a exclusão da penúltima frase do resumo, que se refere a McKelvie, pois parece estar solta no texto. A introdução contextualiza bem o tema, discutindo a relação entre empreendedorismo e racionalidade formal. A referência a autores clássicos fornece uma base teórica sólida para a discussão; no entanto, apresenta poucos autores contemporâneos, especificamente dos últimos cinco anos. Além disso, a introdução deveria especificar detalhadamente a startup que está sendo estudada, pois, nesse contexto, deixa uma lacuna sobre o que está sendo analisado. O texto desta seção, no geral, poderia ser mais conciso, focando nos pontos mais relevantes para o estudo atual.

O quadro teórico é abrangente e bem fundamentado, cobrindo as principais abordagens teóricas relacionadas a modelos de negócios, causalidade, efetuação e bricolagem. A inclusão de referências seminais é um ponto forte, mas há uma lacuna a ser preenchida por apresentar poucos autores da atualidade, o que demonstraria um entendimento mais profundo do estado da arte no campo de estudo. A seção poderia ser mais organizada, destacando claramente como cada conceito se relaciona com o objetivo do estudo.

A metodologia adotada é adequada para os objetivos do estudo. O uso de um estudo de caso longitudinal e retrospectivo com entrevistas etnográficas é apropriado para capturar as dinâmicas do desenvolvimento do modelo de negócios. A aplicação do método de Fisher para avaliar a presença de bricolagem e efetuação é bem justificada. No entanto, a seção poderia se beneficiar de uma descrição mais detalhada sobre a escolha da startup, a seleção dos participantes e a análise dos dados. Além disso, é necessário referenciar o roteiro utilizado para as entrevistas apresentado como apêndice, explicando a base teórica dos questionamentos (ou apresentá-lo nesta seção como uma tabela, referenciando os autores).

A seção de resultados é iniciada com a apresentação da startup e suas atividades, sendo necessária a realocação desses parágrafos para outra seção que apresente o negócio (o texto inicial poderia ser resumido e acrescentado na introdução, por exemplo). Os resultados são apresentados de maneira clara e detalhada, destacando como a startup utilizou as abordagens de causalidade, efetuação e bricolagem ao longo do tempo. As tabelas fornecem um bom suporte visual para a análise, permitindo uma compreensão rápida dos achados. No entanto, a seção poderia incluir uma discussão mais aprofundada sobre as implicações dos resultados para a prática empreendedora. A discussão poderia ser melhor articulada, relacionando os achados do estudo com a literatura existente, principalmente autores mais recentes. Uma discussão dos achados corroborando ou contrapondo a literatura acrescentaria forte embasamento aos resultados. A seção destaca a importância de considerar a natureza temporal do desenvolvimento do modelo de negócios e, nesse contexto, a identificação da predominância da bricolagem no início do empreendimento e a transição para a efetuação são insights valiosos.

A principal contribuição do artigo está em fornecer evidências empíricas sobre a alternância entre causalidade, efetuação e bricolagem no desenvolvimento de uma startup, respondendo ao apelo por mais estudos empíricos na área. A originalidade do estudo é reforçada pelo foco em uma startup brasileira de biotecnologia, um contexto pouco explorado na literatura existente, o que acrescenta ainda mais relevância ao estudo.

A conclusão resume bem os principais achados e contribuições do estudo, reforçando a importância de considerar diferentes abordagens teóricas no desenvolvimento de modelos de negócios. No entanto, poderia explorar mais as limitações do estudo e sugerir direções para pesquisas futuras de maneira mais detalhada.

O artigo aborda um tema atual e relevante na literatura. No entanto, ainda que acrescente reflexões direcionadas ao seu contexto central, necessita de melhorias para publicação, principalmente no que se refere ao embasamento na literatura mais atual (últimos cinco anos, visto que somente oito referências são desse período).

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

■ Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

■ Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.



2nd Reviewer: Wilquer Ferreira

Completed : 2024-07-26 03:30 PM

Recommendation : Reject

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

■ Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.

Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.

Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.

■ Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.

Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.

■ Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.

Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.

Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.

Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.

■ Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.

Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.

Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.

Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing.

Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.

■ Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.

Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.

Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

- Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

The work deals with a topic of fundamental importance for social and economic development, is fluent in writing, but needs to be restructured, giving it greater depth in arguments, especially in the theoretical basis. It is necessary to relate the theoretical propositions in a clear and concise way to the research results, in this way the authors will be able to advance in an authorial discussion that represents a substantial advance that justifies its publication.

I include some comments on the article as suggestion, I can highlight some points:

Abstract - Need to include the conclusion, answering the main goal, how are causation, effectuation and bricolage used in the design and development of a startup's BM.

Introduction - Need to reinforce the gap identified with more studies/authors.

Theoretical Framework - Many sections are not properly covered by citations/literature, this section needs to present the citations and have clear relation with causation, effectuation and bricolage, Bricolage as a topic is not deep explored.

Method - Need to describe in detail the sample size, timing, data method collection, sources of evidences, etc.

Results - There is no details regarding to the data collected, or evidence, need to be better linked with literature review and method.

Discussion - Need to be linked with the theoretical background, to develop a properly authorial discussion that effectively contributes to the advancement of literature on the topic.

Conclusion - The article lacks depth between the results and the theoretical framework, which leads to superficiality in the discussion, making it impossible to reach an in-depth understanding of how are causation, effectuation and bricolage used in designing and developing a startup's business model.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

- Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.

3rd Reviewer: Anonymous

Completed : 2024-07-28 01:47 PM

Recommendation : Revisions Required

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

■ Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.

Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.

Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.

Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.

■ Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.

Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.

Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.

■ Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.

Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.

Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.

Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.

■ Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.

Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing.

Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.

Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.

■ Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.

Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

■ Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

Evaluation: Business Model Development in Startups: A Study of Causation, Effectuation, and Bricolage

First of all, I would like to congratulate the authors for their initiative in submitting their work to this renowned journal. I hope my comments contribute to the improvement of the article.

Title, Keywords, Objective, and Research Question: The title is appropriate and accurately reflects the content of the study. The keywords are specific enough to guide readers interested in the central topics of the article and facilitate locating the study in academic databases. The article explicitly states its objective in the abstract and introduction sections. The objective and research question are clearly stated in the introduction and revisited in the methodology, results, and discussion sections. In each section, the author returns to the concepts of causation, effectuation, and bricolage, showing how they manifest in the development of the startup's business model. This consistency reinforces the relevance of the objective and research question throughout the article.

Abstract: While the abstract covers the main points well, some improvements can be made to make it completer and more appealing. As a suggestion, the authors could add more specific information about the main results to make the abstract more informative. For example, highlighting the specific findings on how the three logics (causation, effectuation, and bricolage) were alternated and their impacts on business model development.

INTRODUCTION:

- Clarity and Logic of Constructs: The main constructs of the article—causation, effectuation, and bricolage—are presented clearly and logically in the introduction. The introduction starts by discussing the relationship between entrepreneurs and formal rationality and how this is reflected in entrepreneurship literature. Then, it addresses the evolution of alternative approaches such as effectuation and bricolage, contextualizing them historically and theoretically.
- Coherence in Paragraph Transitions: The transitions between paragraphs are generally coherent. The introduction progresses from a broad view of rationality in entrepreneurship to a more focused discussion on alternative approaches and finally to the research question of the article. However, some paragraphs could be more fluidly connected to improve the text's flow.
- Repetition of Concepts: Although the concepts of effectuation and bricolage are addressed repeatedly, this is done to reinforce their definitions and differences. However, the concept of causation is not addressed. Additionally, the repetition of calls for more empirical studies might give the reader a sense of redundancy, which could be consolidated.
- Declaration of the Research Gap: The research gap is clearly stated, emphasizing the need for more empirical studies on how causation, effectuation, and bricolage are used in business model development over time. This gap is presented clearly, justifying the relevance and originality of the study.

Detailed Analysis of Paragraphs:

- Paragraphs 1-2: I missed a citation in the last sentence of paragraph 1. This sentence and the second one of paragraph 2 are long; I suggest dividing them. Paragraph 2 begins with "Until quite recently...," which can be vague for the reader. I suggest specifying a timeframe, such as "Until the 2000s...".
- Paragraphs 3-4: The transition here is a bit abrupt; it could be smoothed with a linking sentence that better connects the change in focus.
- Paragraphs 5-6: The repetition of calls for more empirical research could be consolidated.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- Stronger Connections: Improve the transitions between paragraphs to ensure a smoother flow of ideas. For example, explicitly connecting the historical influence of classical approaches with the emergence of alternative approaches.
- Reduce Redundancies: Consolidate repetitive mentions of the need for more empirical studies into a single clear statement to avoid the perception of redundancy.
- Emphasize the Gap: Although the gap is well stated, reinforcing its importance with concrete examples of how existing research is insufficient could strengthen the argument further.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Business Models and Alternative Rationalities:

- Paragraph 2: The connection between BM development and technological and market uncertainty could be more explicit. Another important point to highlight is that this paragraph has only one sentence; I suggest avoiding such paragraphs as they give the impression of a "patchwork" text.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- Improve Transitions: Create more explicit transitions between paragraphs to ensure a smooth flow of ideas. This can be done by adding linking sentences that more clearly connect the discussions.
- Integrate Citations: Better integrate citations with the ideas developed in the text to strengthen the arguments and make the discussion more cohesive.
- Avoid Short Paragraphs: Better develop ideas to avoid short or single-sentence paragraphs.

Causation, Effectuation, and Bricolage:

The ideas and cited articles are coherent and contribute to a logical and cohesive discussion. However, some connections between concepts could be more explicitly drawn to improve clarity. Assuming this section deals with existing theory, the theorists should "speak," avoiding personal impressions from the authors.

- Paragraph 1: The introduction of causation as a decision-making approach is well done, with references to Casson (2003) and Shane & Venkataraman (2000). However, the transition to discussing alternative approaches could be smoother. The last sentence begins with "A growing number of empirical studies..." but this statement feels odd because if the number of empirical studies is growing, why is the most recent reference from 2011?
- Paragraph 2: The connection between these approaches and causation could be more explicitly drawn to reinforce the transition. I felt a lack of references in this paragraph.
- Paragraph 3: The discussion could be enriched with more specific examples to illustrate the differences between these approaches. Here, too, I felt a lack of references.
- Paragraph 5: I could not identify if the entire paragraph refers to Nelson and Read's (2024) research or if some citations are missing between the ideas presented.
- Paragraph 6: Again, I could not identify if the entire paragraph refers to Scazziota et al.'s (2023) study.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- Improve Transitions: Create more explicit transitions between paragraphs to ensure a smooth flow of ideas. This can be done by adding linking sentences that more clearly connect the discussions.
- Integrate Citations: Better integrate citations with the ideas developed in the text and reinforce citations to strengthen the arguments and make the discussion more cohesive.

Relating Causation, Effectuation, and Bricolage to Business Models:

The text is well-structured and presents the concepts clearly and logically with appropriate references. However, the section could be improved with smoother transitions, better integration of citations, and a more explicit clarification of the connections between ideas and cited articles.

- Paragraphs 3 and 4: Improve how citations are presented in the text. In these paragraphs, I felt a lack of citations, and it is not clear whose ideas are included in these paragraphs.

Methodology:

Congratulations to the authors for the choice and application of the method. This section has fluid and clear text, making it easily replicable. However, I missed the determination of when these interviews were conducted. This period is important for readers to understand the economic context of the country, especially considering the pandemic period with various restrictions and difficulties, which makes a significant difference.

The presented tables are clear and well-crafted. Congratulations.

Results:

There is excellent writing and illustration of the company being studied. I have a note about the section title "Elements of Bricolage and Effectuation at the Core of the Startup"; why did the authors not include the construct 'causation' in this title, considering it was part of the paragraph and was observed in the company according to the authors?

Discussion:

The discussion section presents a reasonable transition between ideas. However, the connection between the results and the literature cited in the theoretical framework could be more explicit. In some points, the discussion of the results lacks a direct link to the previously mentioned studies. It is crucial for the discussion of the results to clearly connect with the literature reviewed in the theoretical framework section. The discussion should confirm or contradict previous research, providing a critical analysis of the findings.

Detailed Analysis:

- Paragraph 1: The initial paragraph of the discussion mentions that the startup exhibited elements of bricolage during its foundation, especially in the founders' personal trajectories. However, it lacks an explicit link to the literature on bricolage mentioned in the theoretical framework (e.g., Baker and Nelson, 2005). A direct citation would reinforce the connection.
- Paragraph 2: The description of how the founders used their professional experiences to develop the startup is detailed. However, it could benefit from a comparison with similar studies on bricolage and the use of personal and professional resources (e.g., Mair & Martí, 2006). This would help contextualize the results within the existing literature.
- Paragraph 3: This paragraph discusses the founders' decision to develop a product as a grade 2 cosmetic instead of a drug. Connecting this choice with the literature on product development strategies and effectuation (e.g., Sarasvathy, 2001) would strengthen the argument.
- Paragraph 4: The section highlights the importance of partnerships with hospitals and adapting to patient needs. An explicit link to studies on effectuation and the importance of networks and partnerships (e.g., Sarasvathy & Venkataraman, 2011) would reinforce this point.
- Paragraph 5: The discussion on the startup's flexibility and adaptability over time is interesting but lacks a direct reference to the literature on effectuation and the iterative nature of business development (e.g., Fisher, 2012).
- Paragraph 6: The comparison between observed behaviors in the startup and theories of effectuation and bricolage is general.

Specific references to empirical studies supporting these observations (e.g., Brettel et al., 2012; Fisher, 2012) would strengthen the analysis.

• Paragraph 7: The section concludes by emphasizing the importance of considering the temporal nature of business model development. Mentioning studies discussing the evolution of business models over time (e.g., Reymen et al., 2017) would provide a more robust and literature-connected conclusion.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- **Improve Connections with the Literature:** Ensure that each point discussed in the discussion section is explicitly linked to the literature reviewed in the theoretical framework. This can be done by adding direct citations and discussing how the results confirm or contradict previous studies.
- **Specific References:** Use specific references to the studies cited in the theoretical framework to strengthen the critical analysis of the results. This includes explicitly mentioning the authors and their relevant findings.
- **Critical Analysis:** Provide a more detailed critical analysis of how this study's results compare to the existing literature. This includes discussing similarities, differences, and possible explanations for any discrepancies.

Conclusion:

The conclusion highlights the study's contributions to both the literature and managerial practice. It emphasizes the importance of considering the temporal nature of business model design and how entrepreneurs alternate between different approaches. However, there are improvements that could further strengthen the study.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- **Strengthen Connection with the Literature:** Reinforce the discussion on how the results confirm or contradict previous research. This can be done by explicitly mentioning the studies supported or challenged by the findings.
- **Expand Discussion on Limitations:** Although the limitation of a single case study is mentioned, exploring other possible limitations (e.g., regional or sectoral perspective) could provide a more comprehensive view of the study's limitations.
- **Detail Suggestions for Future Research:** Expand suggestions for future research by detailing specific areas that can be explored in subsequent studies. This might include suggestions on methodologies, contexts, or populations that would be valuable to investigate.

Overall Evaluation of the Article:

The article is well-structured and addresses a relevant topic in the field of entrepreneurship. The case study of a Brazilian biotechnology startup provides valuable insights into the alternation between causation, effectuation, and bricolage over time in business model development.

Strengths:

- **Clarity and Structure:** The article is clear and well-organized, with reasonably smooth transitions between sections.
- **Contribution to the Literature:** Provides valuable empirical evidence and responds to a call in the literature for more studies on the practical application of these theoretical approaches.
- **Practical Relevance:** Offers useful insights for entrepreneurs on applying business modeling techniques.

Areas for Improvement:

- **Connection with the Literature:** There could be a more explicit link between the results and the reviewed literature.
- **Discussion of Limitations:** The discussion on the study's limitations could be more comprehensive.
- **Suggestions for Future Research:** The suggestions for future research could be more detailed and specific.

Results:

There is excellent writing and illustration of the company being studied. I have a note about the section title "Elements of Bricolage and Effectuation at the Core of the Startup"; why did the authors not include the construct 'causation' in this title, considering it was part of the paragraph and was observed in the company according to the authors?

Discussion:

The discussion section presents a reasonable transition between ideas. However, the connection between the results and the literature cited in the theoretical framework could be more explicit. In some points, the discussion of the results lacks a direct link to the previously mentioned studies. It is crucial for the discussion of the results to clearly connect with the literature reviewed in the theoretical framework section. The discussion should confirm or contradict previous research, providing a critical analysis of the findings.

Detailed Analysis:

- **Paragraph 1:** The initial paragraph of the discussion mentions that the startup exhibited elements of bricolage during its foundation, especially in the founders' personal trajectories. However, it lacks an explicit link to the literature on bricolage mentioned in the theoretical framework (e.g., Baker and Nelson, 2005). A direct citation would reinforce the connection.
- **Paragraph 2:** The description of how the founders used their professional experiences to develop the startup is detailed. However, it could benefit from a comparison with similar studies on bricolage and the use of personal and professional resources (e.g., Mair & Martí, 2006). This would help contextualize the results within the existing literature.
- **Paragraph 3:** This paragraph discusses the founders' decision to develop a product as a grade 2 cosmetic instead of a drug. Connecting this choice with the literature on product development strategies and effectuation (e.g., Sarasvathy, 2001) would strengthen the argument.
- **Paragraph 4:** The section highlights the importance of partnerships with hospitals and adapting to patient needs. An explicit link to studies on effectuation and the importance of networks and partnerships (e.g., Sarasvathy & Venkataraman, 2011) would reinforce this point.
- **Paragraph 5:** The discussion on the startup's flexibility and adaptability over time is interesting but lacks a direct reference to the literature on effectuation and the iterative nature of business development (e.g., Fisher, 2012).

- Paragraph 6: The comparison between observed behaviors in the startup and theories of effectuation and bricolage is general. Specific references to empirical studies supporting these observations (e.g., Brettel et al., 2012; Fisher, 2012) would strengthen the analysis.
- Paragraph 7: The section concludes by emphasizing the importance of considering the temporal nature of business model development. Mentioning studies discussing the evolution of business models over time (e.g., Reymen et al., 2017) would provide a more robust and literature-connected conclusion.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- **Improve Connections with the Literature:** Ensure that each point discussed in the discussion section is explicitly linked to the literature reviewed in the theoretical framework. This can be done by adding direct citations and discussing how the results confirm or contradict previous studies.
- **Specific References:** Use specific references to the studies cited in the theoretical framework to strengthen the critical analysis of the results. This includes explicitly mentioning the authors and their relevant findings.
- **Critical Analysis:** Provide a more detailed critical analysis of how this study's results compare to the existing literature. This includes discussing similarities, differences, and possible explanations for any discrepancies.

Conclusion:

The conclusion highlights the study's contributions to both the literature and managerial practice. It emphasizes the importance of considering the temporal nature of business model design and how entrepreneurs alternate between different approaches. However, there are improvements that could further strengthen the study.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- **Strengthen Connection with the Literature:** Reinforce the discussion on how the results confirm or contradict previous research. This can be done by explicitly mentioning the studies supported or challenged by the findings.
- **Expand Discussion on Limitations:** Although the limitation of a single case study is mentioned, exploring other possible limitations (e.g., regional or sectoral perspective) could provide a more comprehensive view of the study's limitations.
- **Detail Suggestions for Future Research:** Expand suggestions for future research by detailing specific areas that can be explored in subsequent studies. This might include suggestions on methodologies, contexts, or populations that would be valuable to investigate.

Overall Evaluation of the Article:

The article is well-structured and addresses a relevant topic in the field of entrepreneurship. The case study of a Brazilian biotechnology startup provides valuable insights into the alternation between causation, effectuation, and bricolage over time in business model development.

Strengths:

- **Clarity and Structure:** The article is clear and well-organized, with reasonably smooth transitions between sections.
- **Contribution to the Literature:** Provides valuable empirical evidence and responds to a call in the literature for more studies on the practical application of these theoretical approaches.
- **Practical Relevance:** Offers useful insights for entrepreneurs on applying business modeling techniques.

Areas for Improvement:

- **Connection with the Literature:** There could be a more explicit link between the results and the reviewed literature.
- **Discussion of Limitations:** The discussion on the study's limitations could be more comprehensive.
- **Suggestions for Future Research:** The suggestions for future research could be more detailed and specific.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

- Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.

ROUND 2:

1st Reviewer: Anonymous

Completed : 2024-10-28 04:15 PM
Recommendation : Accept Submission

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

■ Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.

Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.

Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.

■ Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.

Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.

Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.

Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.

Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.

■ Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.

Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.

Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.

■ Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.

Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing.

Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.

Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.

■ Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.

Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

■ Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

As correções feitas no artigo estão adequadas, sugiro apenas a correção de alguns detalhes para a versão final:

Revisar pontuação e gramática em todo o texto.

Na introdução, no terceiro parágrafo, alteração do termo "explodiu" se referindo aos estudos sobre racionalidades alternativas (esse termo não ficou adequado). A explicação da startup ainda poderia ser melhor contextualizada.

O referencial teórico foi muito bem adequado com as alterações.

Na metodologia, ainda sugiro melhor explicação de como os autores escolheram a startup entre as três finais selecionadas (não ficou claro). Sugiero também o embasamento teórico dos questionamentos, que não foi feito.

A separação dos itens "desenvolvimento da startup" dos "resultados" está mais apropriado.

A discussão dos resultados passou a apresentar maior consistência com os achados "conversando" com a teoria.

A conclusão e as limitações se apresentam mais claras e consistentes.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

■ Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

■ Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.

2nd Reviewer: Wilquer Ferreira

Completed : 2024-10-14 09:49 AM
Recommendation : Revisions Required (minor)

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

■ Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.

Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.

Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.

■ Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.

Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.

Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.

■ Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.

Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.

Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.

Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.

Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.

■ Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.

Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing.

■ Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.

Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.

Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.

Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

- Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

Thank you for considering the recommendations. The article has been improved, but some gaps still remain. I suggest addressing these gaps to make the article suitable for publication in this renowned journal.

The study aims to investigate how causation, effectuation, and bricolage are used in designing and developing a startup's business model. However, the main outputs regarding these concepts are still pending in the abstract. The authors claim their theoretical contribution lies in demonstrating how these approaches alternated and impacted the business model development of a significant Brazilian startup through in-depth longitudinal analysis. Despite this, the abstract does not clearly explain how this was achieved and linked to Canvas Business Model (mentioned in the conclusion).

Bricolage as a topic is not deep explored in the theoretical framework. It is necessary to adjust the theoretical framework to provide a solid foundation for analysis. Additionally, new authors mentioned in the discussion are not fully integrated into the theoretical framework, which requires their content to be included rather than just mentioned.

The tables containing Fisher's (2012) method have not been properly discussed in the theoretical framework, and all relevant topics should be thoroughly addressed. Including Canvas topics could help organize the ideas more clearly. Authors like Karami et al. (2022), Harms et al. (2021), and Anagnou et al. (2019) were cited to support arguments but were not explored in depth within the theoretical framework. The discussion section should review research outcomes in relation to the theoretical propositions, necessitating a deeper exploration of constructs.

Elements of the Business Model (BM), such as value proposition, key partnerships, customer relationships, key activities, and cost structure, should be explored in the discussion section. The variance across BM elements when juxtaposed with bricolage, effectuation, and causation highlights the importance of an evolutionary perspective. This should be made clearer in the results and discussion sections. Organizing ideas around the Canvas elements, bricolage, effectuation, and causation in these sections could enhance the article's contribution.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

- Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.
- Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.
- I do NOT agree to open the review.

3rd Reviewer: Anonymous

Completed : 2024-11-11 02:20 PM

Recommendation : Accept Submission

1. Writing

The writing and the structure of the texts must be clear, objective, and concise in relation to a scientific paper. A scientific paper is understood to be a text carried out with careful methodology, containing an argument based on scientific knowledge and not on common sense.

Strongly Disagree: Text with many grammar and spelling errors, confusing and difficult to follow.

Disagree: Text with some grammar and spelling errors, somewhat unclear writing.

Neutral: Text with few grammar and spelling errors, generally clear writing.

■ Agree: Well-written text with minimal errors, clear and coherent writing.

Strongly Agree: Impeccable text, no grammar or spelling errors, very clear and fluid writing.

2. Purpose

The objective of the work must be well defined. This means that the author is able to establish one or more objectives, support the argumentation around such objectives, and finally, achieve the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Objective is unclear or not present.

Disagree: Objective is vague and poorly defined.

Neutral: Objective is present but could be more specific.

Agree: Objective is clear and well-defined.

■ Strongly Agree: Objective is extremely clear, specific, and well-contextualized.

3. Theoretical basis

The theoretical basis of the paper should be consistent. By consistency we mean coherence in the exposition of the ideas contained in the text and the relationship between them and the other elements of the paper (methodology, discussion and conclusion).

Strongly Disagree: Inadequate literature review, few relevant references.

Disagree: Superficial literature review, limited references.

Neutral: Adequate literature review, but could be more thorough.

Agree: Comprehensive and well-structured literature review.

■ Strongly Agree: Very comprehensive and critical literature review, with highly relevant references.

4. Methodology

It must be clear and consistent with the theoretical framework and the objectives of the article.

Strongly Disagree: Methodology is not described or is very poorly explained.

Disagree: Methodology is inadequate or poorly described.

Neutral: Methodology is adequately described but has some flaws.

Agree: Methodology is well described and appropriate for the study.

■ Strongly Agree: Methodology is very clearly and thoroughly described, perfectly suited for the study.

5. Results

They should be relevant and consistent with the methodology and discussed in relation to other reviewed studies.

Strongly Disagree: Results not presented or very confusing.

Disagree: Results presented inadequately or with little clarity.

Neutral: Results presented adequately but without depth.

Agree: Results presented clearly and in detail.

■ Strongly Agree: Results presented extremely clearly, in detail, and very relevant.

6. Conclusion

It must be consistent and coherent with the proposed objectives.

Strongly Disagree: Conclusion is nonexistent or completely disconnected from the results.

Disagree: Weak conclusion with little relation to the results.

Neutral: Adequate conclusion but could be more detailed and better related to the results.

Agree: Clear conclusion well-founded in the results.

- Strongly Agree: Very clear and well-founded conclusion that perfectly synthesizes the results and their relevance.

7. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

Os autores tiveram o cuidado de atender todas as solicitações dos revisores. Parabéns pelo esforço. Sugiro fazer uma revisão geral na gramática e na tradução do texto, pois ele contém pequenos erros que podem ser facilmente identificados. Quanto aos outros pontos do trabalho no qual sugeri melhorias (introdução, referencial teórico, resultados, discussão e considerações finais), os autores se esforçaram e melhoraram muito o trabalho, portanto ele deve ser publicado.

8. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

- Approved.

9. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

- Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.