





# The Model of Innovative Challenges with the Approach of Responding to Industrial Demands




Hadi Hosseini<sup>1</sup>, Naser Azad<sup>2\*</sup>, Mahmoud Modiri<sup>2</sup>, Manochehr Mantegi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> PhD Student, Department of Technology Management, Faculty of Management, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Business Management, Faculty of Management, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Professor, Department of Management, Faculty of Management and Industrial Engineering, Malek Ashtar University of Technology, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: n\_azad@azad.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Leila Youzbashi  Department of sport science, Faculty of Humanities, University of Zanjan, Zanjan, Iran l.youzbashi@znu.ac.ir	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Farhad Namjoo  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: farhadnamjoo@kmanresce.ca <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Kamdin Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The explanation of Chesbrough's open innovation model (Introduction, lines 3–5) is adequate but would benefit from clarifying the distinction between inbound and outbound open innovation, as originally conceptualized.

The article outlines two research questions but does not sufficiently articulate the gap in the current literature that this study fills. Add a paragraph explicitly detailing what previous models lack in addressing industrial demands through innovation challenges.

The use of historical examples such as the "Longitude Prize" (Paragraph 1) is engaging but should be more directly connected to how such competitions inform contemporary innovation challenges structurally.

The review of literature is thorough but reads as a summary list. Add a comparative paragraph synthesizing these studies to draw out overarching themes and highlight their limitations relative to your study.

The explanation "experts have related bachelor's, master's and doctorate degrees..." is vague. Clarify the inclusion criteria (e.g., minimum years of experience or publication record).

The sentence "The validity of the structure has been ensured by using multiple evidences..." should reference specific methodological sources (e.g., Yin, 2018 is mentioned later but not formally cited here).

The paper states that interviews were conducted with “ten seasoned professionals.” Clarify how these participants were selected and whether saturation was reached in coding.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The categorization of stakeholders as “Challenge Sponsor,” “Solvers,” and “Intermediaries” (Theoretical Foundations, Paragraph 4) is helpful. However, the article should integrate examples from real-world platforms to clarify these roles in practice.

The paragraph beginning “Compared to traditional innovation models...” (ending with Pollok et al., 2018) presents numerous claims. Consider breaking it into two and aligning each claim more clearly with its cited source.

The list of crowdsourcing risks (Paragraph 6) is comprehensive, but lacks integration with strategies for mitigation. Recommend including a brief synthesis of best practices for risk management from the cited sources.

In open coding results (Table 3), terms like “Suitable poster and clip design” are used. Explain how these labels were derived from semantic expressions to enhance transparency in theme construction.

The term “Effective identification and introduction of the applicant” appears multiple times (see entries 11, 13, 15 in Table 4). Please clarify if this is intentional or a labeling error.

The rationale for excluding the “Paying a suitable bonus” factor is sound. However, briefly contextualizing its conceptual importance despite statistical rejection could provide depth.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.