

Commercial Strategy Pressure-Test Framework

For biotech commercial leaders preparing for launch, market entry, or in-market strategic resets

Use this framework to surface hidden assumptions, tighten trade-offs, and clarify where leadership needs evidence or decisions now. The objective is not more content - it is better choices before execution starts to absorb the ambiguity.

How to use it

Run the six dimensions in one working session with launch, access, medical, analytics, and brand owners. Score each dimension red, amber, or green based on evidence and execution confidence.

Expected outputs

- A red/amber/green score by dimension
- The top assumptions that still need evidence
- Cross-functional decisions that cannot wait
- Three highest-priority actions for the next 30-60 days

The six pressure-test dimensions

1. Market reality

Are you designing around actual market conditions or internal optimism?

- Current treatment dynamics and category momentum
- Competitive moves likely to reshape launch assumptions

2. Unmet need and adoption friction

Where will stakeholders hesitate even if the data are strong?

- Clinical, operational, financial, or behavioral barriers
- Likely points of resistance for HCPs, payers, and patients

3. Differentiation under pressure

Would your positioning still hold if a competitor reframed the category tomorrow?

- What is truly distinctive versus merely different
- Whether field, medical, and leadership teams tell the same story

4. Access and value story

Is the value proposition strong enough for payers, providers, and internal governance?

- Evidence needed for access and reimbursement conversations
- Gaps that could slow formulary or pathway adoption

5. Execution feasibility

Can the strategy be delivered consistently across functions?

- Readiness of field, medical, access, analytics, and operations
- Places where sequencing is unrealistic or overloaded

6. Decision rights and metrics

Do leaders know who owns the trade-offs and what will trigger change?

- Decision owners for each major strategic choice
- Leading indicators and thresholds for course correction

Pressure-test worksheet

Use the prompts below to move each dimension from discussion to decision.

Dimension	Key questions to answer now	Evidence to review	Red flags
1. Market reality	Are you designing around actual market conditions or internal optimism? - Current treatment dynamics and category momentum - Competitive moves likely to reshape launch assumptions	- Primary research - Competitive intelligence - Access feedback - Internal readiness	- Untested assumptions - Inconsistent story - No clear owner
2. Unmet need and adoption friction	Where will stakeholders hesitate even if the data are strong? - Clinical, operational, financial, or behavioral barriers - Likely points of resistance for HCPs, payers, and patients	- Primary research - Competitive intelligence - Access feedback - Internal readiness	- Untested assumptions - Inconsistent story - No clear owner
3. Differentiation under pressure	Would your positioning still hold if a competitor reframed the category tomorrow? - What is truly distinctive versus merely different - Whether field, medical, and leadership teams tell the same story	- Primary research - Competitive intelligence - Access feedback - Internal readiness	- Untested assumptions - Inconsistent story - No clear owner
4. Access and value story	Is the value proposition strong enough for payers, providers, and internal governance? - Evidence needed for access and reimbursement conversations - Gaps that could slow formulary or pathway adoption	- Primary research - Competitive intelligence - Access feedback - Internal readiness	- Untested assumptions - Inconsistent story - No clear owner
5. Execution feasibility	Can the strategy be delivered consistently across functions? - Readiness of field, medical, access, analytics, and operations - Places where sequencing is unrealistic or overloaded	- Primary research - Competitive intelligence - Access feedback - Internal readiness	- Untested assumptions - Inconsistent story - No clear owner
6. Decision rights and metrics	Do leaders know who owns the trade-offs and what will trigger change? - Decision owners for each major strategic choice - Leading indicators and thresholds for course correction	- Primary research - Competitive intelligence - Access feedback - Internal readiness	- Untested assumptions - Inconsistent story - No clear owner

Decision prompts

• Which two assumptions, if wrong, would most damage launch performance?
• What are we explicitly not prioritizing - and is leadership aligned on that choice?
• Where are access, field, medical, or analytics dependencies most likely to slow execution?
• What leading indicator would tell us early that the strategy needs adjustment?
• If a new competitor entered six months from now, what part of our strategy would be most exposed?

Status	What it means
Red	Major assumptions are not yet evidenced, owned, or operationalized.
Amber	The direction is plausible, but important risks or dependencies still need work.
Green	The strategy is supported by evidence and can be executed with clear ownership.

30-60-90 day action page

Capture the few actions that will reduce ambiguity and improve launch confidence fastest.

Time frame	Priority action	Owner	Evidence / decision needed	Status
Next 30 days				
Next 60 days				
Next 90 days				

Leadership alignment checklist

- Leadership agrees on the target segments and what will not be prioritized first.
- There is one shared narrative across brand, medical, access, and field teams.
- Critical launch risks have named owners and dates for resolution.
- Leading indicators are defined, visible, and linked to action thresholds.
- Teams know which decisions must be escalated versus resolved in line.

Use this framework as a working tool - not a one-time workshop artifact. Re-run it whenever the market shifts, evidence evolves, or launch confidence starts to depend on hope instead of proof.