Overall this is a good effort. It appears you have undertaken some ganalysis. However, you will need to follow the specific submission format (you have reported firm by firm - Please read the submission guide carefully, available on the blackboard). As a result, it is really/somewhat difficult to see the comparative strength of your analysis to its best. About the firm, you could have improved the report by discussing and/or elaborating the important aspects of the firm, for example, the degree of innovation in terms of the degree of newness and value creation - there is little and/or no discussion across four cases through connecting and contrasting all cases to support your arguments, in the area of innovation and value creation. You need to be specific in terms of whether the companies are market challengers or market leaders - and be more explicit, remember, large companies may be market leaders in specific product categories but not in the overall market - you will need to be clear and succinct when discussing the firm and product positions in the market. Opportunity identification - you must be more specific. For example, Noja with its extensive industry saw the opportunity to address the problems in conventional electrical transformers. Also, in the idea generation section you had the opportunity to discuss more and present better arguments whether these firms are M-driven or M-driving - you could elaborate more on these points to showcase your market research. There is little or no discussion of these aspects. For example, iOmniscient CEO clearly says they wanted to educate markets - you could have illuminated this aspect more comprehensively from marketing point of view. Likewise, you could have discussed more about Noja and other two firms you have selected for this assessment about their M-driven or M-driving markets – by comparing and contrasting these markets. You have provided the needed information but did not comprehensively and consistently apply this framework. In-text referencing is fine but inconsistent in some areas. The references at the back are fine, but you could have used the references more effectively in the body of your reflection. You should consider including references from a variety academic resources (e.g. journal articles, textbooks, industry reports, product magazines, media releases, product advertisements, real case studies and you could have also used data from research databases such as ABS and IBIS world etc.,) to validate your arguments, and also to showcase your research and marketing knowledge, in the future. You will also need to follow consistently one reference style (e.g. APA or Harvard or Chicago) - the reference style guide can be downloaded from the UQ library for free. Overall, you could use more NPD-NSD concepts and connect them to the case studies to support your arguments better. You could present more in-depth and comparative analysis in each section of the reflection (compared to discussing them firm by firm sequentially) through the effective use of all case studies. UP