

Editors Comments

It is still recommended for the author to provide certain sufficient rationale as well as associated importance or implications regarding the first conclusion. This discussion is better to be organized in the section of discussion, or any place the author deems proper. BY doing this, the article can attract more readers and would be beneficial to the industrial readers as well.

Author's feedback

Highlighted in the discussion is a supplemented text that outlines the importance of the presented model. In particular the model allows a specification of a good into heterogeneous and nearly homogeneous. The point is that for a nearly homogeneous good Eq.(44) is not applicable. That means, that if generations suffer from large fitness fluctuations they are not able to replace previous generations (Think for example of Microsoft windows versions, where new windows generations e.g. Windows 8 were not able to replace Windows XP). Only if a considerable fitness advantage exists, the good can be interpreted as heterogeneous and exhibits the predicted Fisher-Pry replacement dynamics. If this fitness advantage can be determined in the initial stages of the sales evolution of a generation, the model can be used as a forecast tool.