Review of: "Organizational Agility and Performance: A Time-Series Analysis of Crisis Response"

Marco Aurélio De Oliveira[1]

1 Sociedade Educacional de Santa Catarina (SOCIESC), Joinville, Brazil

Dear all,

The article deals with the analysis of the relationship between the organization's agility and performance and its response to crisis situations. The method chosen for analysis is the time series (ARIMA). Although presenting a very relevant and current subject, the article still needs important improvements for its publication purposes, as follows:

1) Abstract: must be revised. It demands better contextualization and justification for the choice of the analysis method. It focuses too much on presenting the results.

2) Introduction (section 1): The description of the relationship between organizational performance and agility is vague. It is important to make clear the differences between the different concepts/definitions of agility, flexibility, and resilience found in the literature. Likewise, the respective adopted concepts for agility, flexibility, and resilience must be shown in the manuscript. Another question to be answered is about the criteria used to select the companies analyzed (size, representativeness, branch, revenue, level of innovation, etc.).

3) Objectives (section 2): The origin and association of the research questions with section 1 (introduction) are not clear. What are the variables considered? What are the specific objectives? What is the general objective? The content of section 2 should be the final part of section 1 (merge them).

4) Section 5 should be presented before the methodology (section 4).

5) Methodology (section 4): I miss a flowchart showing all the steps involved in building the model. The understanding of the methodology is impaired without the help of this figure. In these cases, make it clear what an agile organization is, what a traditional company is, and what an innovative company is. Section 4.6 seems to be redundant to me and could be deleted. I miss the justification for the choice of the ARIMA method. A discussion about the levels of accuracy and uncertainty involved in the analyses is very important. In general, section 4 demands an in-depth review.

6) Sections 5.5 and 5.6 seem out of place in the text. They could be in the contextualization of the research (section 1).

7) Results (section 6): The conclusions drawn from the analyses and graphs do not seem robust to me. They require deeper statistical proof of the relationships between the model variables for each of the case studies carried out. I suggest, in future works, the use of AI techniques such as Bayesian causal networks, for example. A combined analysis of

model uncertainty and accuracy is lacking. The scope of the validity of the model is not clear. As it stands, it is very broad and generic. I missed an analysis/discussion about the transferability of the results.

8) Section 8.2 (contributions to the literature) does not offer any additions, incorporations, or changes to the concepts/definitions of agility, flexibility, and resilience found in the literature. In fact, sections 7 (results) and 8 (conclusions) are superimposed rather than complementary.

9) Section 9 (limitations and future work) should be in section 8 (conclusions) (could be merged).

10) I suggest revising the written English found in this version of the manuscript.

I hope these comments can provide some insights to the authors, contributing to the increase of the number of future readers of the article.

Best regards,