ISSN 2616-5902 Vol. 7, Issue 8: 172-176, DOI: 10.25236/AJBM.2025.070820

Analysis of Market Performance Improvement and Incentive Mechanisms for Sample Tube Management Equipment

Ren Jing

Brooks Technology (Shanghai) Ltd, Shanghai, China, 201203

Abstract: *This paper provides an-depth analysis of the challenges facing the sample tube management equipment market and proposes a systematic approach to enhance market performance through the strategic redesign of incentive mechanisms. The analysis begins by diagnosing the current product line and market status, identifying a fundamental disconnect between a one-size-fits-all incentive model and a diverse product portfolio comprising both high-volume standalone units and complex integrated systems. Key factors affecting market performance are identified, including misaligned performance evaluation metrics and an incentive structure that fails to motivate strategic, long-cycle sales. Based on this diagnosis, this paper presents an optimized incentive framework built on the principles of strategic alignment, differentiation, and fairness. It proposes a differentiated performance appraisal indicator system and diversified incentive schemes tailored to distinct product strategies. Furthermore, it introduces a balancing mechanism to foster team collaboration while rewarding individual contributions. The final section outlines a practical implementation path, including necessary organizational safeguards, a risk assessment, and a dynamic evaluation mechanism to ensure the long-term effectiveness and sustainability of the new system. The proposed framework aims to align employee behavior with corporate strategic goals, thereby driving sales of high-value products, improving profitability, and securing a sustainable competitive advantage in the dynamic life sciences market.*

Keywords: *Sample Tube Management Equipment, Incentive Mechanism, Market Performance, Performance Appraisal, Product Strategy, Differentiated Incentives*

1. Introduction

In the competitive life sciences market, a sample tube management equipment company may face stagnant growth despite a strong product portfolio. The core problem often lies in its undifferentiated, volume-focused incentive mechanism, which favors quick, transactional sales of standalone units over the complex, consultative sales required for high-value integrated systems. This analysis diagnoses this strategic misalignment and proposes a new, differentiated incentive structure. By tailoring rewards to diverse product strategies and balancing individual and team efforts, the redesigned plan aims to motivate the workforce, unlock market potential, and drive sustainable long-term growth.

2. Analysis of Product Line and Market Status

A precise understanding of a company's product portfolio and its market environment is foundational to diagnosing performance issues. Typically, a firm in this sector offers a range of preanalytical automation solutions, which can be clearly segmented into two strategic categories. The first, Standalone and Modular Units, includes benchtop robotic workstations such as automated tube sorters and decappers. These products are designed to solve specific, discrete tasks within a laboratory's workflow. They are characterized by a transactional, shorter sales cycle, where purchasing decisions are often driven by immediate need and competitive pricing. The second category is the Integrated System, exemplified by a flagship total automation platform. This comprehensive, floor-standing system is not just a single-task device but a total workflow solution, integrating sorting, decapping, aliquoting, recapping, and archiving into one automated process. Its sale is a consultative, long-cycle endeavor requiring deep workflow analysis and significant capital investment from the client. The market is increasingly demanding end-to-end automation to improve efficiency and reduce errors, reflecting a broader trend towards the scientific management of equipment in medical laboratories [2]. This creates a strong pull for sophisticated, integrated platforms. However, the market performance of many companies is skewed,

ISSN 2616-5902 Vol. 7, Issue 8: 172-176, DOI: 10.25236/AJBM.2025.070820

showing stable but low-margin sales of their modular units while consistently underperforming on sales targets for their strategically vital integrated systems.

3. Diagnosis of Factors Affecting Market Performance and the Incentive Mechanism

3.1 Identification of Key Factors Affecting Market Performance

A firm's underperformance, particularly the failure to capitalize on market demand for its total automation platforms, is often rooted in several interconnected internal factors. The primary issue is a stark strategic misalignment: while executive strategy prioritizes establishing integrated systems as market-leading platform solutions, the operational incentives driving the sales team favor the quicker, easier sales of benchtop units, such as individual sorters or decappers. This creates a daily conflict between strategic goals and rewarded behaviors. This is compounded by a skills gap, as the consultative, workflow-centric expertise required to sell a complex integrated system—which involves discussions about LIS integration, physical lab layout, and long-term ROI—is fundamentally different from the product-focused knowledge needed to sell a standalone device. Furthermore, performance is measured by inadequate metrics that value immediate revenue over long-term strategic wins. All these issues culminate in the central problem: a flawed incentive mechanism. This mechanism makes it financially irrational for a sales representative to invest the many months required to close a major integrated system deal when they can meet their quarterly quota by selling several smaller, simpler standalone units.

3.2 Analysis of Performance Evaluation Issues Based on the Product Portfolio

A company's reliance on a uniform performance metric—total sales revenue recognized per quarter—is fundamentally incompatible with a diverse product portfolio. This evaluation method actively distorts sales priorities and penalizes strategic action. For standalone units, such as benchtop sorters, the metric encourages a focus on volume but is blind to profitability, leading representatives to offer deep discounts to secure orders before a quarterly deadline. For an integrated total automation system, the evaluation model is profoundly damaging. A salesperson dedicating their efforts to a complex integrated system sale might show zero recognizable revenue for two or three consecutive quarters, making them appear as a severe underperformer under such a system. This creates immense pressure to abandon these long-term, high-value pursuits. The system fails to differentiate between the strategic value of a sale; a dollar of revenue from a standalone sorter is treated identically to a dollar from an integrated system, completely ignoring that the latter establishes a deep, multi-year partnership with a client, locking in service contracts, and creating a powerful market reference. This flawed evaluation process doesn't just measure performance; it actively steers the sales team away from a firm's most important products.

3.3 Diagnosis of the Suitability of the Existing Incentive Mechanism for Different Product Strategies

An existing incentive mechanism, such as a straightforward commission plan tied to quarterly revenue, is dangerously misaligned with a firm's product strategy. For modular units, such as automated decappers, the plan is partially functional in driving unit volume but suboptimal as it fails to protect margins. However, for a flagship integrated system, the mechanism is actively detrimental. It punishes the long sales cycle and, critically, fails to promote the teamwork essential for such a complex sale. Selling such a system requires a tightly integrated team of sales leads, application specialists, and service engineers, reflecting the modern paradigm of shared responsibility in managing complex technical facilities [1]. An individual-based commission structure discourages this vital collaboration. Moreover, the plan's exclusive focus on short-term cash flow completely neglects the proven link between long-term incentives and sustained enterprise performance [3]. By not offering incentives like equity or multi-year bonuses for strategic wins, such as placing a total automation platform, a company fails to align its top sales talent with its long-term health and market leadership goals, a factor shown to impact not just financial results but also broader metrics like ESG performance [4]. Such an incentive plan is thus a strategic liability, actively hindering the success of the most advanced solutions.

4. Optimized Design of an Incentive Mechanism to Enhance Market Performance

4.1 Principles and Objectives for Incentive Mechanism Optimization

To rectify the diagnosed flaws, the design of a new incentive mechanism must be anchored in a set

ISSN 2616-5902 Vol. 7, Issue 8: 172-176, DOI: 10.25236/AJBM.2025.070820

of clear, guiding principles. The foremost principle is Strategic Alignment, ensuring that every component of the plan directly encourages and rewards behaviors that advance corporate goals, particularly the growth of integrated systems. Secondly, Differentiation is critical; the system must abandon its one-size-fits-all approach and be explicitly tailored to the distinct sales cycles, complexities, and strategic values of standalone units and integrated systems. The principles of Fairness and Transparency are essential for employee buy-in, requiring that the plan's mechanics are easily understood and that compensation is perceived as commensurate with contribution and effort. Finally, the principle of Balance must be maintained, skillfully managing the tension between individual accountability and team collaboration, as well as between short-term financial results and long-term strategic objectives. The primary objectives stemming from these principles are to significantly increase the market share of integrated systems, protect and enhance the profitability of the standalone product line, foster a culture of collaborative, solution-oriented selling, and ultimately, attract and retain top-tier sales talent capable of executing the company's strategic vision.

4.2 Building a Differentiated Performance Appraisal Indicator System

The foundation of the optimized incentive plan is a move away from a single revenue metric to a multi-faceted, differentiated performance appraisal system based on weighted Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). For sales roles focused on Standalone Units, performance will be measured by a scorecard that balances three core metrics: Sales Revenue (50% weight), to continue driving volume; Gross Margin (30% weight), to directly combat discounting and protect profitability; and New Customer Acquisition (20% weight), to incentivize market expansion. For Integrated Systems sales teams, the KPI structure is fundamentally different to reflect the long-cycle, consultative nature of their work. The primary metric will be Bookings (e.g., Total Contract Value), weighted at 40%, rewarding success upon contract signing rather than delayed revenue recognition. To motivate progress, Sales Funnel Velocity (20% weight) will be introduced, rewarding the achievement of key milestones. A further 20% will be allocated to Strategic Objectives, such as penetrating a key account or displacing a competitor, with the final 20% based on a Team Collaboration Score. This differentiated approach ensures that performance evaluation is no longer a blunt instrument but a precise reflection of an individual’s or team’s strategic contribution.

4.3 Designing Diversified Incentive Schemes Based on Product Strategy

Building upon the differentiated KPIs, the compensation structure itself must be diversified to align financial rewards with the distinct sales motions. For Standalone Unit Representatives, the scheme will consist of a moderate base salary coupled with a high variable component paid quarterly. This commission will be calculated based on their weighted KPI scorecard, featuring significant accelerators for overachievement on gross margin and new customer targets, thus directly linking higher earnings to more profitable business. In stark contrast, the scheme for Integrated Systems Teams will feature a higher base salary to provide financial stability during long sales cycles. Their variable compensation will be multi-layered: smaller, quarterly milestone bonuses tied to sales funnel progression; a significant, lump-sum deal-closing bonus paid upon contract signing and allocated to a team pool; and for top performers, a Long-Term Incentive (LTI) component, such as restricted stock units, to align their personal success with the long-term value creation of the enterprise. These distinct schemes ensure that the financial incentives are not only motivational but are also structurally appropriate for the specific challenges and objectives associated with each product line.

4.4 Balancing Mechanism between Team Collaboration and Individual Incentives

A central challenge in designing incentives for complex sales is fostering genuine teamwork while still recognizing individual drive. The new mechanism addresses this through a "team bonus pool" for integrated system sales. The core of this balancing mechanism is a pre-negotiated allocation agreement. At the outset of a major sales opportunity, the team lead, in consultation with management, will formally define the roles of each key member (e.g., Sales Lead, Solution Architect, Project Manager) and establish a pre-agreed percentage split of the potential deal-closing bonus. This process transforms support functions into vested partners with a direct financial stake in the outcome, formalizing shared accountability and encouraging proactive collaboration. It eliminates ambiguity and potential conflict over commission splits after a deal is won. To further embed a collaborative culture, the system will also incorporate cross-functional incentives, such as spot bonuses for service engineers or application specialists who generate qualified, high-value leads. This balanced approach ensures that while

ISSN 2616-5902 Vol. 7, Issue 8: 172-176, DOI: 10.25236/AJBM.2025.070820

individual excellence is still a path to high earnings, the structure makes it clear that the most significant financial rewards are achieved through collective, synergistic effort.

5. Implementation, Safeguards, and Effectiveness Evaluation of the Incentive Mechanism

5.1 Implementation Path and Key Milestones for the New Mechanism

The successful transition to the new incentive mechanism should be managed through a structured, phased implementation path to ensure clarity, manage change, and minimize business disruption. The initial phase, spanning the first two months, will focus on Design Finalization and Communication. This involves finalizing all KPI weights and bonus structures and launching a comprehensive internal campaign to explain the plan's rationale and benefits. This will be followed by a three-month Pilot Program in a selected sales region, allowing for real-world testing and feedback collection in a controlled environment. The third phase, System & Training Rollout, will involve updating the CRM to accurately track new metrics and conducting mandatory training for all sales personnel and managers on both the mechanics of the plan and the consultative selling skills required. Finally, the Full Implementation will commence company-wide, with key milestones established for the first quarterly and annual reviews. This deliberate, step-by-step approach is designed to build momentum, address challenges proactively, and ensure a smooth and successful adoption of the new strategic incentive framework across the entire organization.

5.2 Organizational Support and Resource Allocation

For the new incentive mechanism to succeed, it must be underpinned by robust organizational support and dedicated resource allocation. At the highest level, Executive Sponsorship is non-negotiable; senior leadership must consistently and visibly champion the change to signal its strategic importance. The HR and Finance departments are critical operational partners, tasked with the precise administration of the more complex plan, ensuring accurate and timely payouts, and serving as the primary resource for employee inquiries. Significant investment must be made in Sales Operations, specifically in configuring the CRM system to serve as the single source of truth for all new performance data and to provide real-time dashboards for sales reps and managers. Finally, a crucial resource allocation will be for the training and development of Sales Managers. They must be equipped not only to understand the new plan but to effectively coach their teams on how to succeed within it. Their own incentives must also be realigned with the new structure, making them key agents of change rather than passive observers.

5.3 Risk Assessment and Contingency Planning

A proactive approach to risk management is essential for a smooth implementation. The most significant risk is Resistance to Change, particularly from veteran sales representatives accustomed to the old system. This will be mitigated through early engagement, clear communication emphasizing higher earning potential for top performers, and highlighting successes from the pilot program. Another risk is the Perceived Complexity of the differentiated plan. The contingency for this includes developing simple, accessible tools like online commission calculators and providing extensive, ongoing training and support. A critical operational risk is the potential for Unintended Negative Consequences, such as the neglect of the standalone unit business. This is addressed by the balanced KPI design and will be closely monitored through performance dashboards. Should an imbalance occur, KPI weights can be adjusted in the annual review. Finally, the plan's reliance on Data Integrity is a vulnerability. The mitigation strategy involves enforcing strict CRM data entry protocols, making data hygiene a managerial responsibility, and conducting regular data audits to ensure the system's credibility and fairness.

5.4 Performance Tracking and Dynamic Adjustment Mechanism

The new incentive mechanism should be treated as a dynamic tool, not a static policy. To ensure its ongoing effectiveness, a robust performance tracking and adjustment system will be established. The cornerstone of this system will be a Real-Time Performance Dashboard, accessible to all sales staff and management. This dashboard will visualize progress against the new KPIs, tracking both leading indicators like sales funnel velocity and lagging indicators like bookings and margins. Performance will be formally discussed during Quarterly Business Reviews (QBRs), which will provide a forum to analyze

ISSN 2616-5902 Vol. 7, Issue 8: 172-176, DOI: 10.25236/AJBM.2025.070820

the impact of the incentive plan on behaviors and results. Crucially, an organization should commit to a Formal Annual Review of the entire incentive structure. This review will analyze a full year of performance data, gather qualitative feedback from the sales organization, and assess the plan's alignment with any shifts in corporate strategy. Based on this comprehensive review, necessary calibrations will be made—adjusting KPI weights, bonus thresholds, or even structural elements—to ensure the mechanism remains a powerful and relevant driver of market performance.

6. Conclusion

Misaligned incentive structures often create a gap between a company's strategic goals and its market reality. For a sample tube management equipment firm facing these issues, a uniform, revenue-based plan can suppress the growth of high-value systems while eroding margins on volume products. This paper proposes a transformative solution: a differentiated incentive framework. By creating distinct KPIs and team-based rewards tailored to different product lines, the new system aligns sales behavior with strategic priorities. This turns the incentive plan from a liability into a strategic asset, poised to drive market performance, enhance profitability, and secure long-term industry leadership.

References

[1] Breda, M., Pilla, M., & Brazzarola, M. (2024). Test facility management: Responsibilities and paradigms of a new era. Journal of Pharmacological and Toxicological Methods, 127, 107505. https: //doi.org/10.1016/j.vascn.2024.107505

[2] Vincent L. Mbukwana & Ayansola O. Ayandibu. (2023). Impact of performance incentives on employees' performance in a university in KwaZulu-Natal. SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 21 (1), 1-11.

[3] Yu, W. (2024). Research on the relationship between equity incentive and enterprise performance based on propensity score matching. Journal of Statistics and Economics, 1(3).

[4] Zeng, Y., Zhao, X., & Zhu, Y. (2023). Equity incentives and ESG performance: Evidence from China. Finance Research Letters, 58, 104592. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.104592