
Integrating artificial intelligence, sustainability, and agile methodologies: a systematic review of innovation trends in business management

Seshapu Ramadevi

Department of Management Studies, Himalayan University, Itanagar, India
drphrdcms@gmail.com

Sanjay Bhayani (Corresponding author)

Department of Business Management, Saurashtra University, Rajkot, India
sjbhayani@gmail.com

P. Hanumantharao

Department of Commerce and Management Studies, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, India
podilapat23275@gmail.com

P. Neeraja Ratan

Department of Commerce and Management Studies, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, India
neerajaratan.cf@andhrauniversity.edu.in

Abstract

In a business environment shaped by digital acceleration, sustainability pressures, and volatile market conditions, innovation in management has become a multidimensional organizational capability rather than a narrow product-development activity. This paper presents a systematic review of contemporary literature on three interconnected themes in modern business management: digital transformation driven by artificial intelligence, sustainability-oriented innovation, and agile methodologies. Unlike an empirical field study, the paper relies exclusively on secondary sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles and high-quality industry reports. The review identifies a central gap in the literature: although these themes are widely discussed, they are often examined in isolation, leaving a limited understanding of how they jointly influence organizational resilience, adaptability, and long-term value creation. To address this gap, the study synthesizes existing scholarship through a thematic and integrative lens and proposes a conceptual framework grounded in dynamic capabilities and the technology–organization–environment perspective. The analysis shows that AI strengthens analytical and operational capabilities, that sustainability increasingly functions as a strategic rather than symbolic imperative, and that agile methods improve responsiveness when supported by an appropriate culture and governance. The review also argues that the practical benefits of these innovation trends depend on organizational readiness, leadership alignment, and the ability to balance experimentation with strategic coherence. The paper contributes by offering a more structured understanding of contemporary innovation trends and outlining future directions, including generative AI, metaverse-enabled business models, and quantum-informed strategic decision-making environments.

Keywords: Innovation trends; Business management; Digital transformation; Artificial intelligence; Sustainability; Agile methodologies; Dynamic capabilities; Systematic review.

JEL Classification: M15; O31; O33; Q56; L25

Suggested Citation:

Ramadevi, S., Bhayani, S., Hanumantharao, P. & Ratan, P. N. (2026). Integrating artificial intelligence, sustainability, and agile methodologies: a systematic review of innovation trends in business management. *International Journal of Accounting, Business and Finance*, 5(1), 45-60.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.55429/ijabf.v5i1.264>

1. Introduction

Innovation in business management is no longer limited to new products or process improvements; it increasingly reflects an organization's capacity to reconfigure its resources, technologies, structures, and market relationships in response to disruption. Contemporary



firms operate under simultaneous pressures of digital transformation, sustainability compliance, changing customer expectations, and intensified competitive volatility. In this setting, innovation has become central to strategic renewal and long-term value creation rather than a peripheral managerial function. Recent scholarship in business model innovation has similarly emphasized that organizations must move beyond isolated technological adoption and instead align innovation with broader organizational and strategic architectures (Spieth et al., 2025). At the same time, the spread of AI-enabled systems has shifted managerial attention toward data-driven decision-making, predictive capabilities, and intelligent automation, while sustainability imperatives have pushed firms to embed environmental and social concerns into their innovation strategies rather than treat them as external reporting exercises.

A key driver of innovation in business management is digital transformation (Westerman et al., 2014). As companies increasingly leverage digital technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), Machine Learning (ML), and cloud computing, they enhance decision-making, improve customer experiences, and optimize operational efficiency (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). These digital tools and technologies enable organizations to collect and analyze vast amounts of data, providing valuable insights into consumer behavior, operational bottlenecks, and market trends (Mayer-Schönberger & Cukier, 2013). By harnessing these technologies, businesses can make data-driven decisions that promote growth and profitability (Chen et al., 2012).

The integration of AI and ML, in particular, has revolutionized how businesses approach problem-solving and decision-making (Agrawal et al., 2019). These technologies can analyze complex data sets and generate insights that would be impossible for humans to detect (Davenport, 2018). For example, AI algorithms help businesses forecast demand, personalize marketing strategies, and streamline supply chains (Sheng et al., 2021). As AI and ML technologies continue to evolve, they offer unprecedented opportunities for businesses to automate tasks, reduce operational costs, and improve overall performance (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). In addition to technological advancements, the increasing emphasis on sustainability has become a key trend in modern business management (Hart, 1995). As consumers become more socially and environmentally conscious, organizations face mounting pressure to adopt sustainable practices (Nielsen, 2015). This shift has led to a focus on eco-friendly products, waste reduction, and sustainable supply chains (Porter & Kramer, 2006). Businesses prioritizing sustainability not only reduce their environmental impact but also gain a competitive advantage, as consumers are more likely to support brands that align with their values (Bhattacharya et al., 2008).

Furthermore, the adoption of agile methodologies has become a fundamental trend in business management (Rigby et al., 2016). Agile principles, which emphasize flexibility, collaboration, and rapid response to change, are increasingly applied across industries (Highsmith, 2002). By adopting agile practices, organizations can quickly adapt to market shifts, respond to customer feedback more efficiently, and enhance organizational performance (Denning, 2022). This flexibility is particularly crucial in today's fast-paced business environment, where companies must continuously innovate to stay ahead of the competition (Rigby et al., 2016).

In the contemporary business landscape, innovation has evolved from being a peripheral activity to becoming the primary driver of competitive advantage and firm performance (Spieth et al., 2025). As organizations grapple with digital transformation and the integration of AI, innovation has shifted from purely technical product development to a more holistic Business Model Innovation (BMI) perspective (Foss & Saebi, 2017). Recent research emphasizes that the purposeful design of novel business models is now crucial for

commercializing new technologies and navigating external crises (Chesbrough, 2007; Spieth et al., 2025).

1.1. Research gaps

Despite the rapid expansion of literature on digital transformation, sustainability, and agile methods, the conversation remains fragmented. Many studies examine these domains separately, with limited attention to their interactions within business management systems. This creates a clear gap: firms do not adopt artificial intelligence, sustainability initiatives, and agile routines in isolation, yet much of the literature continues to treat them as separate streams. Recent integrative work on business model innovation highlights the need for frameworks that connect emerging technologies, managerial processes, and strategic outcomes, while newer work on AI-driven BMI further shows that the field remains conceptually dispersed. The present paper addresses this gap by systematically reviewing the literature at the intersection of digital intelligence, sustainable innovation, and organizational agility.

Despite the growing body of literature on individual trends such as AI adoption and sustainability, a significant research gap remains (Spieth et al., 2025). Existing studies often treat "Agile Methodologies," "AI-driven Transformation," and "ESG Sustainability" as disconnected silos (Spieth et al., 2025). There is a persistent underrepresentation of how these forces intersect within traditional innovation management frameworks (Schneckenberg et al., 2019). This paper addresses this gap by providing an integrative review that explores the synergistic relationship between these three pillars, offering a unified perspective that current literature lacks (Schwab, 2017).

1.2. Objectives

This study aims to (i) analyze how digital transformation, especially AI-enabled systems and data-driven technologies, is reshaping managerial decision-making and organizational processes, (ii) examine how sustainability-oriented practices contribute to competitive advantage, organizational legitimacy, and long-term business resilience, (iii) critically evaluate the role of agile methodologies in enhancing organizational agility, innovation capacity, and strategic adaptability, and (iv) develop an integrative conceptual understanding of how these trends interact within contemporary business management.

1.3. Methodology

This study employs a systematic review design to examine contemporary trends in business management innovation. The review focuses on three interrelated domains: digital transformation and artificial intelligence, sustainability-oriented business innovation, and agile methodologies. The purpose of the review is not to generate primary empirical findings but to synthesize and critically interpret existing academic knowledge in order to identify patterns, tensions, and future directions.

A structured literature search was conducted in four major databases: Scopus, Web of Science Core Collection, Business Source Complete, and Google Scholar. The search covered publications from 2018 to early 2026 in order to capture the most recent developments in rapidly evolving areas such as AI, ESG integration, and agile management. Search strings included combinations of terms such as "innovation trends" AND "business management," "digital transformation" AND "artificial intelligence," "agile methodologies" AND "organizational agility," "sustainability" AND "competitive advantage," and "business model innovation" AND "AI." Additional backward and forward citation tracking was used to identify highly relevant studies.

The inclusion criteria were: (1) peer-reviewed journal articles, review studies, and high-quality industry reports; (2) English-language publications; (3) studies directly related to business management, organizational innovation, digital strategy, sustainability, or agile transformation; and (4) publications offering conceptual, empirical, or review-based insight into managerial implications. Exclusion criteria included unrelated sector-specific technical papers, duplicate records, and sources lacking sufficient analytical relevance to the review objectives.

The selected literature was analyzed through thematic synthesis. Studies were coded under four principal themes: digital transformation and AI-enabled management, sustainability and strategic value creation, agile methodologies and organizational agility, and future-oriented innovation trajectories. The analysis was then interpreted through the combined lens of TOE and Dynamic Capabilities Theory in order to develop an integrative conceptual understanding of contemporary innovation in business management.

The review has certain limitations. It is restricted to English-language literature, relies on secondary material, and may not fully capture highly emergent practitioner developments that have not yet entered peer-reviewed publication. Nevertheless, the systematic design provides a transparent and credible basis for conceptual synthesis.

1.4. Theoretical framework

This review is guided by two complementary theoretical lenses: the Technology–Organization–Environment (TOE) framework and Dynamic Capabilities Theory. The TOE framework helps explain how technological adoption is shaped not only by the availability of digital tools such as AI, analytics, and automation, but also by organizational readiness and external pressures, including regulation, competition, and stakeholder expectations. This makes it particularly useful for understanding the joint adoption of digital transformation and sustainability-related innovations. Dynamic Capabilities Theory extends this perspective by explaining how organizations sense opportunities, seize them through strategic reconfiguration, and transform their routines in response to turbulence. In the context of this review, AI enhances sensing and analytical capabilities, agile methodologies accelerate reconfiguration, and sustainability initiatives shape the long-term direction of organizational transformation. Together, these frameworks provide a coherent structure for analyzing how innovation trends move from isolated practices to integrated business capabilities.

This paper explores various innovation trends in business management, focusing on key areas such as digital transformation, AI and ML integration, sustainability practices, and agile methodologies. It examines how these trends are reshaping the business landscape and how organizations can leverage them to enhance their competitive advantage (Porter & Heppelmann, 2014). By understanding these emerging trends, businesses can navigate the complexities of the modern market and create a culture of innovation that fosters continuous growth and improvement. The research aims to provide insights into how businesses embrace these trends and the impact of these trends on organizational performance and strategic decision-making (Chesbrough, 2010).

2. Digital transformation and technological advancements

The integration of AI, ML, and automation has revolutionized business processes, enhancing operational efficiency and driving innovation. AI and ML allow organizations to analyze vast amounts of data to derive actionable insights, automate decision-making, and streamline repetitive tasks (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). Automation in business operations, such as chatbots for customer service or robotic process automation (RPA) in manufacturing, is significantly reducing human intervention, minimizing errors, and improving productivity

(Westerman et al., 2014). These technologies enable businesses to offer personalized experiences and optimize internal workflows, leading to better resource allocation and cost reduction.

Big data analytics plays a crucial role in decision-making and operational optimization. By processing and analyzing large volumes of structured and unstructured data, businesses can identify patterns and trends that were previously undetectable, providing a competitive edge (Chen et al., 2012). Big data analytics empowers businesses to make data-driven decisions, enabling them to predict customer behavior, optimize supply chains, and improve operational processes (Mayer-Schönberger & Cukier, 2013). For example, retail businesses leverage big data to forecast demand, optimize inventory, and improve pricing strategies (LaValle et al., 2010). This leads to improved operational efficiency, reduced costs, and greater profitability. Cloud computing has transformed business operations by enabling scalability, flexibility, and cost efficiency. Organizations can now access computing resources on-demand without the need for significant upfront investments in hardware or infrastructure (Armbrust et al., 2010). This model enables businesses to rapidly scale operations in response to fluctuating demand, making it easier to innovate and expand into new markets (Iyer & Henderson, 2010). Cloud-based tools also enable remote work, enhance collaboration, and streamline communication within organizations (Marston et al., 2011). Furthermore, businesses can focus on their core competencies by outsourcing IT management to cloud service providers, thereby reducing the complexity of managing on-premises infrastructure.

Digital tools have greatly enhanced customer experience and engagement by providing personalized interactions, real-time support, and seamless omnichannel experiences. AI-driven technologies, such as recommendation engines and chatbots, allow businesses to offer tailored experiences to customers based on their preferences and past behaviors (Davenport et al., 2012). Social media platforms, mobile apps, and websites provide customers with easy access to products, services, and support, improving engagement (Verhoef et al., 2015). Additionally, businesses are using digital tools to gather customer feedback, monitor sentiments, and respond to issues promptly, fostering stronger relationships with consumers (Homburg et al., 2017). These tools not only enhance customer satisfaction but also drive brand loyalty and customer retention.

While digital transformation offers significant opportunities, it also presents challenges for businesses. One of the primary challenges is the high cost and complexity of implementing new technologies (Westerman et al., 2014). Businesses need to invest in infrastructure, skilled workforce, and change management initiatives to ensure successful digital transformation (Fitzgerald et al., 2014). Additionally, data privacy concerns, cybersecurity threats, and the integration of legacy systems with new technologies pose further challenges (Heavin & Power, 2018). However, these challenges also present opportunities for innovation and differentiation. Businesses that successfully navigate the digital transformation process can enhance their competitive position, improve customer engagement, and drive revenue growth (Kane et al., 2015). The rise of digital technologies also opens the door to new business models, such as subscription services and platform-based ecosystems, creating fresh avenues for revenue generation.

3. Sustainability practices and competitive advantage

Consumer demand for environmentally responsible products and services has been steadily increasing, driven by heightened awareness of environmental issues such as climate change, resource depletion, and waste management. Studies indicate that consumers are willing to pay a premium for sustainable products, reshaping the competitive landscape for businesses (Nielsen, 2015). In fact, a survey found that nearly 66% of global consumers are willing to pay

more for sustainable brands, rising to 73% among younger generations (Nielsen, 2015). As a result, businesses are increasingly focusing on integrating sustainability into their product offerings to meet consumer preferences, enhance customer loyalty, and gain a competitive edge. For instance, companies in the fashion and food industries have made significant strides in offering eco-friendly alternatives, such as organic cotton garments or plant-based food products (Kapferer, 2012). This growing demand is encouraging businesses to innovate and explore new, sustainable ways to produce goods and services, thereby aligning their strategies with changing consumer expectations.

The business case for sustainability goes beyond just meeting consumer demand; it also involves reducing operational costs and enhancing brand image. Sustainable practices, such as energy efficiency, waste reduction, and resource conservation, can significantly lower operational costs. For example, by reducing energy consumption, companies can lower utility bills and improve their bottom line (Hart, 1995). Moreover, businesses that incorporate sustainability into their operations often experience enhanced brand loyalty and stronger consumer reputations. Research shows that companies with strong sustainability initiatives tend to outperform competitors in financial performance and market share (Eccles et al., 2014). Consumers increasingly associate sustainable practices with positive values such as integrity, responsibility, and transparency, which can lead to increased customer trust and long-term brand equity (Porter & Kramer, 2006). Brands like Patagonia and Unilever have effectively demonstrated that sustainability initiatives can serve as both a cost-saving mechanism and a strategy for differentiating their products in the marketplace (Bhattacharya et al., 2008).

Regulatory pressures have become an essential driver of businesses' adoption of sustainability practices. Governments worldwide are implementing stricter environmental regulations and encouraging businesses to adopt more sustainable practices through incentives and penalties (Bansal & Roth, 2000). For instance, the European Union's regulatory framework, including the Carbon Disclosure Project and the EU Emissions Trading System, has pushed organizations to disclose their environmental impact and reduce carbon emissions (Chaves Correa & Öge, 2025). In addition, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has gained prominence as businesses are held accountable not only to their shareholders but also to the broader community and the environment. CSR activities, such as supporting renewable energy, reducing waste, and ensuring fair labor practices, are increasingly seen as essential for maintaining a company's social license to operate (Carroll, 1999). Companies that fail to meet regulatory requirements or engage in responsible business practices risk damaging their reputation and facing legal consequences, thereby affecting their market position (Elkington, 1997).

To achieve long-term sustainability, businesses must implement sustainable supply chains and operational practices that minimize environmental impact and maximize efficiency. This involves selecting environmentally conscious suppliers, reducing the carbon footprint of production processes, and ensuring that materials are sourced responsibly. For example, companies like IKEA have adopted a circular supply chain model that encourages recycling, reusing materials, and reducing waste, thereby lowering operational costs and minimizing environmental harm (IKEA, 2016). Another strategy is to integrate green technologies, such as renewable energy and energy-efficient machinery, into operations to minimize resource consumption and emissions (Garriga & Melé, 2004). A key challenge in implementing sustainable supply chains is ensuring that sustainability is embedded throughout the entire value chain, from raw material procurement to product delivery (Seuring & Müller, 2008). Companies that successfully adopt these strategies gain a competitive advantage by reducing costs, improving efficiency, and strengthening their reputation as responsible corporate citizens.

4. Artificial intelligence and machine learning in business management

AI and ML are playing an increasingly central role in optimizing business management practices, particularly in predictive analytics, customer service, and supply chain management. Predictive analytics, powered by AI and ML algorithms, enables businesses to analyze vast amounts of historical data to forecast trends, customer behavior, and market conditions (Davenport, 2018). For example, e-commerce platforms such as Amazon use predictive analytics to recommend products based on customer preferences and browsing history, thereby enhancing the shopping experience (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). In customer service, AI-powered chatbots and virtual assistants have transformed the way businesses engage with customers. These AI-driven tools provide 24/7 support, handle routine inquiries, and personalize interactions, reducing wait times and improving customer satisfaction (Huang & Rust, 2021). Furthermore, AI and ML are revolutionizing supply chain management by optimizing inventory levels, predicting demand fluctuations, and streamlining logistics processes, resulting in cost savings and greater operational efficiency (Choi et al., 2018).

AI plays a significant role in enhancing decision-making and operational efficiency in business management. By analyzing large volumes of data and identifying hidden patterns, AI algorithms help business leaders make more accurate data-driven decisions (Agrawal et al., 2019). In operations, AI-powered tools can automate routine tasks, such as invoice processing or inventory management, reducing the need for human intervention and minimizing errors (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). AI also enables real-time decision-making by providing businesses with up-to-the-minute insights into performance metrics, customer feedback, and market conditions, enabling quicker responses to opportunities and challenges (Chui et al., 2018). The ability of AI to improve operational efficiency is particularly valuable in industries like manufacturing and logistics, where cost reduction and process optimization are key to competitiveness (Baryannis et al., 2019).

While AI offers substantial benefits for business management, its adoption raises significant ethical considerations and challenges. One of the primary concerns is data privacy, as AI systems rely heavily on large datasets that may contain sensitive personal or financial information (O'neil, 2017). Companies must ensure that their AI systems comply with data protection regulations, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the European Union, to avoid legal risks and protect customer trust. Another ethical concern is the potential for algorithmic bias, where AI systems may inadvertently reinforce stereotypes or discriminatory practices due to biased training data (Binns, 2018). For example, facial recognition technologies have been criticized for demonstrating racial and gender biases, leading to unfair outcomes (Noble, 2018). To address these issues, businesses must implement transparent, accountable AI practices to ensure their systems are fair, explainable, and compliant with ethical standards.

The integration of AI and ML into business operations is significantly impacting workforce dynamics and skill requirements. On one hand, AI is automating many routine tasks, which can lead to job displacement in certain sectors (Frey & Osborne, 2017). For instance, tasks such as data entry, telemarketing, and basic customer service can now be performed by AI-powered systems, reducing the demand for human labor in these areas. On the other hand, AI adoption is also creating new opportunities and demand for skilled workers who can develop, manage, and oversee AI systems (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). As businesses increasingly adopt AI, the demand for data scientists, AI engineers, and professionals skilled in machine learning and data analytics is growing (Chui et al., 2018). The impact on workforce dynamics requires businesses to invest in employee training and reskilling programs to prepare

their workforce for the future of work, where human expertise and AI collaboration will be essential (Arntz et al., 2016).

5. Agile methodologies and organizational flexibility

Agile management is an iterative, flexible approach to project management that emphasizes continuous improvement, customer collaboration, and adaptive planning. Its core principles, derived from the Agile Manifesto, emphasize responding to change over rigid planning, delivering functional products frequently, and maintaining close collaboration between business stakeholders and development teams (Manifesto, 2001). Agile methodologies advocate breaking projects into smaller, manageable iterations or sprints, typically lasting between one and four weeks. Each sprint delivers a working product increment, enabling teams to receive rapid feedback and make adjustments as needed (Highsmith, 2002). Key components of agile management include cross-functional teams, transparency, continuous communication, and the ability to adapt to changing requirements throughout the project lifecycle (Schwaber & Sutherland, 2017). By fostering collaboration and flexibility, agile helps organizations deliver value quickly while maintaining quality.

Agile methodologies provide numerous benefits in project management and product development. One of the primary advantages is the ability to manage and reduce risks. By breaking projects into smaller chunks and delivering working increments, agile enables teams to detect and address potential issues early in the process, minimizing costly last-minute changes (Rigby et al., 2016). Agile also facilitates quicker time-to-market by prioritizing the most valuable features and continuously releasing updates or products to customers (VersionOne, 2020). This approach allows organizations to stay competitive by responding to customer feedback and market shifts more effectively (Conforto et al., 2014). In product development, agile methodologies ensure teams remain focused on delivering functional, customer-centric solutions, reducing the risk of overengineering or building features that do not align with customer needs (Sutherland, 2014).

Agile methodologies foster innovation and adaptability by creating an environment that encourages experimentation, feedback, and iteration. The iterative nature of agile means that teams can prototype new ideas, test them with real users, and quickly pivot if the solution doesn't work as expected (Hoda et al., 2018). This quick feedback loop allows organizations to innovate rapidly, making incremental improvements or adding new features based on actual user feedback rather than assumptions. Moreover, agile's emphasis on collaboration between business and technical teams helps bridge the gap between customer needs and technological capabilities, ensuring that innovation is aligned with market demand (Denning, 2022). The ability to adjust plans and priorities as new information becomes available is crucial for organizations in fast-moving industries, enabling them to stay ahead of competitors and remain relevant in changing markets (Rigby et al., 2016).

While agile methodologies offer significant benefits, adopting agile practices can be challenging, particularly in traditional organizations. One of the main obstacles is resistance to change. Many traditional organizations operate with hierarchical structures and rigid processes, which can be difficult to reconcile with the flexibility and autonomy required in agile frameworks. Employees and leadership in these organizations may be hesitant to relinquish control over decision-making and adopt the collaborative, iterative practices central to agile (Conforto et al., 2014). Furthermore, transitioning to agile requires a cultural shift that emphasizes open communication, continuous feedback, and a willingness to fail and learn quickly. Another challenge is the lack of skilled agile practitioners and leaders who can guide the transition, as well as the need for specialized tools to manage agile projects effectively (VersionOne, 2020). In some cases, organizations may struggle to scale agile practices across

large teams or complex projects, which require coordination and alignment across various departments (Takeuchi & Nonaka, 1986).

Several organizations have successfully implemented agile practices to enhance flexibility, foster innovation, and improve their project management outcomes. One notable example is Spotify, which has adopted an agile framework called "Squad Framework." Spotify's squads operate as small, autonomous teams responsible for a specific feature or product area. These squads are empowered to make decisions independently while aligning with the overall company strategy, enabling Spotify to innovate quickly and scale its operations effectively (Kniberg & Ivarsson, 2012). Another example is ING, which transitioned from traditional to agile practices to enhance innovation and customer responsiveness. By organizing teams around customer journeys rather than functional silos, ING improved decision-making speed and fostered a more customer-centric approach to product development (Hoda et al., 2018).

6. Agile adoption and innovation

The integration of Agile methodologies into broader business management discourse is frequently presented as a panacea for efficiency; however, a critical evaluation suggests that their success depends on aligning organizational culture with methodological rigor. As Ratten et al. (2017) note, current trends in innovation management require a balance between flexibility and structured learning. Agile facilitates this through iterative cycles, yet it often creates a "velocity-value gap." While organizations may see an increase in "feature velocity," this speed does not inherently translate into value creation if the underlying business model is not designed to capture it (Čambalíková & Richnák, 2021; Pisano et al., 2015). The "sprint" nature of Agile, while effective for incremental updates, can paradoxically stifle radical innovation by prioritizing immediate deliverables over the long-term, high-risk research cycles necessary for industry-shifting breakthroughs (Midler et al., 2016).

The structural disparity between Digital Natives and Legacy Incumbents further complicates the adoption landscape. For digital-first organizations, Agile is "built into the DNA," allowing for a seamless link between market responsiveness and innovation outcomes (Morabito, 2014). In contrast, legacy firms often succumb to "Agile-Fall," a hybrid state where Agile rituals are performed within rigid, top-down hierarchies. This creates "management debt," in which the friction between decentralized Agile teams and centralized leadership slows time-to-market and dilutes innovation potential (Frishammar et al., 2019). To bridge this gap, techniques and tools for innovation management must be applied not only at the process level but also as part of a strategic audit that evaluates the organization's readiness for such a massive cultural shift (Hidalgo & Albers, 2008).

Central to this evaluation is the synergistic influence of Agile on Business Model Innovation (BMI). Following the integrative framework proposed by Spieth et al. (2025), Agile should be viewed as the "experimental engine" that allows firms to test and commercialize new technologies, such as those within the Internet of Things (Jin & Ji, 2018). However, a significant friction point arises in sectors requiring long-term, centralized planning, such as ESG and financial digitalization (Khalatur et al., 2022). Decentralized decision-making—a hallmark of Agile—can conflict with the strategic directions required for large-scale organizational renewal (Horn & Brem, 2013). Therefore, tools for trend analysis and management must be synthesized to ensure that Agile experimentation supports, rather than distracts from, the firm's overarching strategic mission (Sepúlveda-Aguirre et al., 2016).

Ultimately, the evolution of innovation research over the last several decades highlights that no single tool is a "silver bullet" (Rossetto et al., 2018). The influence of Agile on

organizational agility is only positive when the methodology is anchored in a deep-rooted innovation culture that prioritizes long-term value over short-term metrics. As service industries and customer relationship paradigms continue to shift toward highly personalized, digital-first models, the ability to manage the tension between operational speed and strategic stability will define the next generation of market leaders (Castro et al., 2011; Maklan et al., 2008).

Table 1. Evaluating Agile's Actual Impact on Innovation

Evaluation Metric	Legacy Incumbents (Traditional)	Digital (Startups/Tech)	Natives	Critical Academic Synthesis
Adoption Ease	Low: Requires total cultural overhaul.	High: Inherent to structure.		Morabito (2014): DNA-level integration vs. superficial adoption.
Innovation Type	Predominantly Incremental .	Both Incremental & Radical .		Midler et al. (2016): The risk of "sprint-focus" stifling long-term R&D.
Management Tone	" Agile-Fall ": Conflicting hierarchies.	Decentralized: Team-led.	Team-	Frishammar et al. (2019): Importance of auditing the innovation landscape's readiness.
BMI Synergy	Friction with long-term ESG/Strategy.	Rapid testing of value propositions.	to value	Spieth et al. (2025): Agile as the commercialization engine for BMI.
Strategic Outcome	Reduced time-to-market with "Debt".	Rapid Product-Market Fit.	Product-Market	Pisano et al. (2015): Reacting to unpredictable trends via BM flexibility.
Digital Alignment	Struggle with security/legacy silos.	High integration with IoT/Digitalization.	with	Khalatur et al. (2022) and Jin and Ji (2018): Innovation as the basis for digital security.

Taken together, the literature suggests that agile adoption improves organizational agility only when it is embedded in supportive leadership structures, cross-functional coordination, and a learning-oriented culture. In firms where agile is introduced merely as a procedural toolkit, the result is often symbolic adoption rather than meaningful innovation capability. This distinction is important because the impact of agile is not uniform: it tends to support incremental innovation, responsiveness, and experimentation more reliably than large-scale transformational change, unless linked to broader strategic and business model renewal. Recent reviews of agility-performance relationships and meta-analytic work on agile leadership similarly indicate positive effects, but also emphasize contextual contingencies and implementation quality.

7. Secondary practice-based illustrations of innovation trends

To connect the review to real-world business settings, this section presents brief, secondary, practice-based illustrations rather than formal empirical case studies. These illustrations are drawn from the existing academic literature and are used solely to illustrate how major innovation trends appear in organizational contexts. They are not presented as original field-based evidence. This distinction is important because the present paper is a systematic review, and the function of these examples is interpretive and analytical rather than empirical. The broader literature on business model innovation and AI-driven business transformation supports the value of linking conceptual synthesis with structured organizational illustrations when discussing how firms combine technology, sustainability, and adaptive management in practice (Jorzik et al., 2024; Spieth et al., 2025).

7.1. Spotify and agile organizational design

Spotify is widely referenced in discussions of agile organizational design because its squad-based model illustrates decentralized coordination, iterative development, and cross-functional collaboration. From a management perspective, this example is useful not because it proves that agile methods work equally well in every context, but because it demonstrates how autonomy and rapid feedback loops can support responsiveness and ongoing innovation

in fast-moving environments. At the same time, recent literature indicates that the organizational impact of agility depends greatly on implementation quality, leadership support, and internal culture. Thus, the Spotify illustration should be read as an example of agile-enabled flexibility rather than as a universally transferable formula for all firms (Nguyen et al., 2025).

7.2. AI-Enabled innovation in retail and platform businesses

Large retail and platform-based firms provide useful examples of how AI is reshaping business management through predictive analytics, personalization, automation, and decision support. Recent research shows that AI is not merely an operational tool; it increasingly affects how firms create, deliver, and capture value. In practice, AI-enabled organizations use intelligent systems to improve demand forecasting, customer targeting, recommendation engines, and process efficiency. These examples are relevant because they connect digital transformation with business model change rather than treating AI as an isolated technical development. In this sense, AI-driven firms illustrate how innovation in business management increasingly depends on integrating digital intelligence with strategic and organizational redesign (Jorzik et al., 2024; Spieth et al., 2025).

7.3. Sustainability-oriented firms and strategic legitimacy

Another important set of illustrations comes from firms that incorporate sustainability into their innovation strategies. In such organizations, sustainability extends beyond symbolic CSR language and becomes part of operational design, value creation, and competitive positioning. Emerging research suggests that green innovation can improve ESG performance and strengthen long-term organizational legitimacy, although its impact may vary depending on financial conditions and the broader regulatory environment. These illustrations are important to this paper because they show that innovation is increasingly assessed not only in terms of efficiency and profitability, but also in terms of stakeholder trust, resilience, and strategic credibility. This directly supports the paper's argument that sustainability has become a substantive dimension of competitive advantage in modern business management (Spieth et al., 2025; Yadav et al., 2026).

7.4. Generative AI as an emerging managerial frontier

Recent developments in generative AI necessitate moving beyond conventional discussions of automation and analytics. New review-based evidence indicates that generative AI is becoming relevant across both industry and startup contexts because it supports content generation, knowledge assistance, experimentation, and decision augmentation. From a business management standpoint, this makes generative AI an important forward-looking illustration of how innovation trends are evolving from efficiency-based digitalization toward more creative, adaptive, and intelligence-driven organizational capabilities. At the same time, the literature emphasizes ethical concerns, governance risks, and implementation challenges, indicating that generative AI represents both an opportunity and a managerial responsibility (Patel et al., 2025).

7.5. Metaverse-linked business model possibilities

The metaverse also appears in recent literature as a developing space for business model innovation. Although it is still emerging and unevenly adopted across industries, it has been associated with new possibilities in immersive customer interaction, digital ecosystems, virtual assets, and experience-based value creation. Within the scope of this review, the metaverse should not be treated as an established mainstream practice, but rather as an example of how future innovation discourse is expanding beyond traditional forms of digital transformation. Its significance lies in showing that business innovation research is increasingly concerned with

technology-enabled environments in which platform participation, digital identity, and customer experience are closely intertwined (Latino et al., 2024).

7.6. Quantum readiness and strategic foresight

Quantum computing remains in its early stages in managerial practice, yet recent work suggests that firms should begin preparing strategically for its potential long-term implications. Its current relevance lies less in immediate operational adoption and more in strategic foresight, capability scanning, and preparedness for future shifts in optimization, simulation, and data processing. In this review, quantum readiness serves as an illustration of long-horizon innovation thinking. It highlights that modern business management is no longer focused solely on current technologies but also on anticipating and preparing for future disruptive capabilities that may reshape competitive decision environments (Salampasis, 2025).

7.7. Synthesis of the practice-based illustrations

Taken together, these practice-based illustrations reinforce the paper's central argument: contemporary innovation in business management is not driven by a single trend but by the interaction of digital intelligence, agile forms of organizing, sustainability imperatives, and future-oriented strategic capabilities. Spotify illustrates the managerial logic of agility; AI-enabled firms reflect the strategic role of intelligent systems in business model change; sustainability-oriented firms show the connection between innovation and legitimacy; and emerging domains such as generative AI, the metaverse, and quantum preparedness indicate the widening frontier of innovation research. These illustrations, therefore, complement the systematic review by translating its conceptual insights into recognizable organizational settings (Spieth et al., 2025; Jorzik et al., 2024; Patel et al., 2025).

8. Future trends in business management innovation

The next phase of business management innovation is likely to be shaped less by isolated digital tools and more by the convergence of intelligent, immersive, and computationally advanced systems. Generative AI is already shifting managerial practice beyond conventional automation by enabling content generation, knowledge support, decision augmentation, and more interactive forms of customer and employee engagement. Recent review studies suggest that GenAI is transforming not only operational efficiency but also business model experimentation, while simultaneously raising new governance, bias, and accountability challenges.

The metaverse, while still uneven in practical maturity, is also emerging as a space for business model innovation rather than merely a speculative digital environment. Recent studies show that metaverse technologies may alter value creation, customer interactions, and ecosystem participation across sectors, especially when immersive experiences, digital identity, and virtual assets become strategically relevant. For management scholars, this means innovation research must increasingly consider not only technological feasibility but also shifts in organizational design, platform logic, and customer participation.

Quantum computing remains in an early stage of managerial application, yet it is beginning to attract attention for its potential implications for optimization, simulation, risk analysis, and advanced strategic decision systems. Current literature suggests that its short-term relevance lies less in routine managerial use and more in strategic preparedness, capability scanning, and sector-specific experimentation. For this reason, quantum-informed strategy should be treated as an emerging horizon issue for innovation management rather than an immediate mainstream practice.

Future research should therefore move toward integrative models that examine how AI, sustainability, agility, immersive environments, and advanced computing jointly reshape business capabilities. The central managerial challenge will not be adopting every new technology, but selecting, sequencing, and governing innovation in ways that preserve strategic coherence and organizational resilience.

9. Conclusion

This review shows that innovation in modern business management is increasingly shaped by the interaction of digital intelligence, sustainability imperatives, and agile organizational forms. The first objective is addressed through the finding that AI and related digital technologies improve managerial sensing, forecasting, automation, and customer responsiveness, but their value depends on organizational readiness and ethical governance. The second objective is addressed through evidence that sustainability is no longer merely reputational; when strategically embedded, it can strengthen legitimacy, efficiency, and long-term competitive positioning. The third objective is addressed by showing that agile methodologies can improve responsiveness and innovation capacity, although their effects are strongest when supported by culture, leadership, and structural alignment rather than symbolic adoption alone. Taken together, the review suggests that contemporary business innovation should be understood as an integrative capability rather than a collection of separate trends. Firms that successfully align technological adoption, sustainability strategy, and adaptive management practices are more likely to build resilience and maintain relevance in turbulent markets. The paper therefore provides a clearer conceptual foundation for understanding innovation trends in business management and points to future inquiry into generative AI, immersive business environments, and emerging computational infrastructures.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding information

The authors declared no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2019). Prediction, Judgment, and Complexity. In *The Economics of Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 89–114). University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226613475.003.0003>
- Armbrust, M., Fox, A., Griffith, R., Joseph, A. D., Katz, R., Konwinski, A., Lee, G., Patterson, D., Rabkin, A., Stoica, I., & Zaharia, M. (2010). A view of cloud computing. *Communications of the ACM*, 53(4), 50–58. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1721654.1721672>
- Arntz, M., Gregory, T., & Zierahn, U. (2016). *The Risk of Automation for Jobs in OECD Countries*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jlz9h56dvq7-en>
- Bansal, P., & Roth, K. (2000). Why companies go green: A model of ecological responsiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 717–736. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1556363>
- Baryannis, G., Validi, S., Dani, S., & Antoniou, G. (2019). Supply chain risk management and artificial intelligence: state of the art and future research directions. *International Journal of Production Research*, 57(7), 2179–2202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2018.1530476>
- Bhattacharya, C. B., Sen, S., & Korschun, D. (2008). Using corporate social responsibility to win the war for talent. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 49(2). <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/using-corporate-social-responsibility-to-win-the-war-for-talent/>
- Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in Machine Learning: Lessons from Political Philosophy. In S. A. Friedler & C. Wilson (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency* (Vol. 81, pp. 149–159). PMLR. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/binns18a.html>
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies* (Vol. 236). WW Norton Company.

- Čambalíková, A., & Richnák, P. (2021). Innovations and innovative potential in the context of new trends in business management in Slovakia. *Innovations*, 9(3), 89–92.
- Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate Social Responsibility. *Business & Society*, 38(3), 268–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000765039903800303>
- Castro, L. M., Montoro-Sanchez, A., & Ortiz-De-Urbina-Criado, M. (2011). Innovation in services industries: current and future trends. *The Service Industries Journal*, 31(1), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2010.485196>
- Chaves Correa, F., & Öge, K. (2025). Carbon Disclosure and Climate Change Mitigation in the European Union: Diffusion and Dominance of Transparency Frames. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.70079>
- Chen, H., Chiang, R. H. L., & Storey, V. C. (2012). Business Intelligence and Analytics: From Big Data to Big Impact. *MIS Quarterly*, 36(4), 1165–1188. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41703503>
- Chesbrough, H. (2007). Business model innovation: it's not just about technology anymore. *Strategy & Leadership*, 35(6), 12–17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10878570710833714>
- Chesbrough, H. (2010). Business Model Innovation: Opportunities and Barriers. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), 354–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.010>
- Choi, T., Wallace, S. W., & Wang, Y. (2018). Big Data Analytics in Operations Management. *Production and Operations Management*, 27(10), 1868–1883. <https://doi.org/10.1111/poms.12838>
- Chui, M., Manyika, J., & Miremadi, M. (2018). What AI can and can't do (yet) for your business. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 1(97–108), 1. <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/what-ai-can-and-cant-do-yet-for-your-business>
- Conforto, E. C., Salum, F., Amaral, D. C., da Silva, S. L., & de Almeida, L. F. M. (2014). Can Agile Project Management be Adopted by Industries Other than Software Development? *Project Management Journal*, 45(3), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21410>
- Davenport, T. H. (2018). *The AI Advantage*. The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11781.001.0001>
- Davenport, T. H., Barth, P., & Bean, R. (2012). How “big data” is different. *MIT Sloan Management Review*. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/how-big-data-is-different/>
- Denning, S. (2022). *The age of agile: How smart companies are transforming the way work gets done*. HarperCollins Leadership.
- Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The Impact of Corporate Sustainability on Organizational Processes and Performance. *Management Science*, 60(11), 2835–2857. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2014.1984>
- Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with Forks: the triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Capstone Publ. Oxford. <https://dn721609.ca.archive.org/0/items/BusinessMoneyBooksarchive/Cannibals%20With%20Forks%20-%20The%20Triple%20Bottom%20Line%20of%2021st%20Century%20Business.pdf>
- Fitzgerald, M., Kruschwitz, N., Bonnet, D., & Welch, M. (2014). Embracing digital technology: A new strategic imperative. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 55(2), 1. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/projects/scholars/embracing-digital-technology/>
- Foss, N. J., & Saebi, T. (2017). Fifteen Years of Research on Business Model Innovation. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 200–227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316675927>
- Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 114, 254–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019>
- Frishammar, J., Richtnér, A., Brattström, A., Magnusson, M., & Björk, J. (2019). Opportunities and challenges in the new innovation landscape: Implications for innovation auditing and innovation management. *European Management Journal*, 37(2), 151–164. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2018.05.002>
- Garriga, E., & Melé, D. (2004). Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(1–2), 51–71. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:BUSI.0000039399.90587.34>
- Hart, S. L. (1995). A Natural-Resource-Based View of the Firm. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 986–1014. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9512280033>
- Heavin, C., & Power, D. J. (2018). Challenges for digital transformation – towards a conceptual decision support guide for managers. *Journal of Decision Systems*, 27(sup1), 38–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12460125.2018.1468697>
- Hidalgo, A., & Albors, J. (2008). Innovation management techniques and tools: a review from theory and practice. *R&D Management*, 38(2), 113–127. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2008.00503.x>
- Highsmith, J. A. (2002). *Agile software development ecosystems* (Vol. 13). Addison-Wesley Professional.
- Hoda, R., Salleh, N., & Grundy, J. (2018). The Rise and Evolution of Agile Software Development. *IEEE Software*, 35(5), 58–63. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2018.290111318>

- Homburg, C., Jozić, D., & Kuehn, C. (2017). Customer experience management: toward implementing an evolving marketing concept. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(3), 377–401. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0460-7>
- Horn, C., & Brem, A. (2013). Strategic directions on innovation management – a conceptual framework. *Management Research Review*, 36(10), 939–954.
- Huang, M.-H., & Rust, R. T. (2021). A strategic framework for artificial intelligence in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 49(1), 30–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-020-00749-9>
- IKEA. (2016). *IKEA sustainability report FY16*. https://www.ikea.com/ca/en/files/pdf/05/84/05843617/ikea_group_sustainability_report_fy16_a.pdf
- Iyer, B., & Henderson, J. C. (2010). Preparing for the future: understanding the seven capabilities cloud computing. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 9(2). <https://aisel.aisnet.org/misqe/vol9/iss2/6/>
- Jin, Y., & Ji, S. (2018). Mapping hotspots and emerging trends of business model innovation under networking in Internet of Things. *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, 2018(1), 96. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13638-018-1115-4>
- Jorzik, P., Klein, S. P., Kanbach, D. K., & Kraus, S. (2024). AI-driven business model innovation: A systematic review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 182, 114764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114764>
- Kane, G. C., Palmer, D., Phillips, A. N., Kiron, D., & Buckley, N. (2015). Strategy, not technology, drives digital transformation. *MIT Sloan Management Review*. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/projects/strategy-drives-digital-transformation/>
- Kapferer, J.-N. (2012). *The new strategic brand management: Advanced insights and strategic thinking*. Kogan page publishers.
- Khalatur, S., Pavlova, H., Vasilieva, L., Karamushka, D., & Danileviča, A. (2022). Innovation management as basis of digitalization trends and security of financial sector. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 9(4), 56–76. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2022.9.4\(3\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2022.9.4(3))
- Kniberg, H., & Ivarsson, A. (2012). Scaling agile@ spotify with tribes, squads, chapters & guilds. *Entry Posted November, 12*. <https://blog.crisp.se/2012/11/14/henrikkniberg/scaling-agile-at-spotify>
- Latino, M. E., De Lorenzi, M. C., Corallo, A., & Petruzzelli, A. M. (2024). The impact of metaverse for business model innovation: A review, novel insights and research directions. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 206, 123571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2024.123571>
- LaValle, S., Lesser, E., Shockley, R., Hopkins, M. S., & Kruschwitz, N. (2010). Big data, analytics and the path from insights to value. *MIT Sloan Management Review*. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/big-data-analytics-and-the-path-from-insights-to-value/>
- Maklan, S., Knox, S., & Ryals, L. (2008). New Trends in Innovation and Customer Relationship Management: A Challenge for Market Researchers. *International Journal of Market Research*, 50(2), 221–240. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147078530805000206>
- Manifesto, A. (2001). *Manifesto for agile software development*. https://ai-learn.it/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/03_ManifestoofAgileSoftwareDevelopment-1.pdf
- Marston, S., Li, Z., Bandyopadhyay, S., Zhang, J., & Ghalsasi, A. (2011). Cloud computing — The business perspective. *Decision Support Systems*, 51(1), 176–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2010.12.006>
- Mayer-Schönberger, V., & Cukier, K. (2013). *Big data: A revolution that will transform how we live, work, and think*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Midler, C., Killen, C. P., & Kock, A. (2016). Project and Innovation Management: Bridging Contemporary Trends in Theory and Practice. *Project Management Journal*, 47(2), 3–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21587>
- Morabito, V. (2014). *Trends and Challenges in Digital Business Innovation*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04307-4>
- Nguyen, T., Le, C. V., Nguyen, M., Nguyen, G., Lien, T. T. H., & Nguyen, O. (2025). The organisational impact of agility: a systematic literature review. *Management Review Quarterly*, 75(3), 2709–2757. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-024-00446-9>
- Nielsen, C. (2015). The sustainability imperative: new insights on consumer expectations. *Nielsen Company New York*.
- Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of Oppression*. NYU Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1pwt9w5>
- O’neil, C. (2017). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.
- Patel, K., Shah, M., Qureshi, K. M., & Qureshi, M. R. N. (2025). A systematic review of generative AI: importance of industry and startup-centered perspectives, agentic AI, ethical considerations & challenges, and future directions. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 59(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-025-11435-z>
- Pisano, P., Pironti, M., & Rieple, A. (2015). Identify Innovative Business Models: Can Innovative Business Models Enable Players to React to Ongoing or Unpredictable Trends? *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.1515/erj-2014-0032>

- Porter, M. E., & Heppelmann, J. E. (2014). How smart, connected products are transforming competition. *Harvard Business Review*, 92(11), 64–88. <https://hbr.org/2014/11/how-smart-connected-products-are-transforming-competition>
- Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2006). The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12), 78–92. <https://hbr.org/2006/12/strategy-and-society-the-link-between-competitive-advantage-and-corporate-social-responsibility>
- Ratten, V., Ferreira, J. J., & Fernandes, C. I. (2017). Innovation management - current trends and future directions. *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 22(2), 135. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJIL.2017.085916>
- Rigby, D. K., Sutherland, J., & Takeuchi, H. (2016). Embracing agile. *Harvard Business Review*, 94(5), 40–50.
- Rossetto, D. E., Bernardes, R. C., Borini, F. M., & Gattaz, C. C. (2018). Structure and evolution of innovation research in the last 60 years: review and future trends in the field of business through the citations and co-citations analysis. *Scientometrics*, 115(3), 1329–1363. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2709-7>
- Salampasis, D. (2025). Preparing for the Quantum Computing Revolution. *Research-Technology Management*, 68(5), 69–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.2025.2532324>
- Schneckenberg, D., Velamuri, V., & Comberg, C. (2019). The Design Logic of New Business Models: Unveiling Cognitive Foundations of Managerial Reasoning. *European Management Review*, 16(2), 427–447. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12293>
- Schwab, K. (2017). *The fourth industrial revolution*. Crown Currency.
- Schwaber, K., & Sutherland, J. (2017). The Scrum Guide: The definitive guide to Scrum: The rules of the game. Scrum. org. October, 2, 17. <https://scrumguides.org/docs/scrumguide/v2017/2017-Scrum-Guide-US.pdf>
- Sepúlveda-Aguirre, J. A., Garcés Giraldo, L. F., Serrano García, J., & Gómez-Molina, H. F. (2016). An approach between tools for the analysis of tendencies and business innovation management. *Revista Lasallista de Investigación*, 13(2), 178–187. <https://doi.org/10.22507/rli.v13n2a16>
- Seuring, S., & Müller, M. (2008). From a literature review to a conceptual framework for sustainable supply chain management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 16(15), 1699–1710. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2008.04.020>
- Sheng, J., Amankwah-Amoah, J., Khan, Z., & Wang, X. (2021). COVID-19 Pandemic in the New Era of Big Data Analytics: Methodological Innovations and Future Research Directions. *British Journal of Management*, 32(4), 1164–1183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12441>
- Spieth, P., Breitenmoser, P., & Röth, T. (2025). Business model innovation: Integrative review, framework, and agenda for future innovation management research. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 42(1), 166–193. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12704>
- Sutherland, J. (2014). *Scrum: the art of doing twice the work in half the time*. Crown Currency.
- Takeuchi, H., & Nonaka, I. (1986). The new new product development game. *Harvard Business Review*, 64(1), 137–146. <https://hbr.org/1986/01/the-new-new-product-development-game>
- Verhoef, P. C., Kannan, P. K., & Inman, J. J. (2015). From Multi-Channel Retailing to Omni-Channel Retailing. *Journal of Retailing*, 91(2), 174–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2015.02.005>
- VersionOne. (2020). *14th annual state of agile report*. <https://www.eg.bucknell.edu/~cs479/common-files/resources/versionone-state-of-agile/14th-annual-state-of-agile-report.pdf>
- Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). *Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation*. Harvard Business Press.
- Yadav, A., Gyamfi, B. A., Agozie, D. Q., Asongu, S. A., & Behera, D. K. (2026). Unveiling the Dynamics of Green Innovation on ESG Performance: The Role of Financial Distress and the Impact of the Paris Agreement. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 68(3), 379–397. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.70042>