

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

Cheng-Feng Cheng¹

¹ National Taichung University of Science and Technology, Taichung, Taiwan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this research. This study examines the effectiveness of agility using the lens of dynamic capability theory, with a focus on Amazon, Ford, Toyota, and Pfizer. I find the topic both engaging and significant. However, I have noted several areas of concern that, if addressed, could enhance the manuscript. I outline these points below in the hope that they will assist the author(s) in refining the paper.

1. Introduction: The author(s) should clearly articulate the research gaps, research questions, contributions, and the specific problems this study aims to address. Clarifying these elements would provide readers with a more structured framework. Additionally, the seven references cited in the Introduction section all appear to be from studies conducted before 2013, suggesting that this research may have overlooked theoretical developments from the past decade.

2. Hypothesis Development: This study develops 4 hypotheses to identify the impacts of agility on financial outcomes. However, it is not evident what new insights this research brings. Additionally, the theoretical foundation appears somewhat unclear and incomplete.

3. ARIMA Modelling: Theory and Application: Section 4.3 should provide a more detailed explanation of how ARIMA models were applied to the four case companies in this study. Additionally, please clarify the sources of the data used for the analysis.

4. Case Studies and Analysis: Section 5 examines organizational agility during historical crises, focusing on Amazon, Ford, Toyota, and Pfizer. The author(s) should more clearly specify the selection criteria for these four companies from different industries and their representativeness. Additionally, it would be beneficial to clarify the basis for the analyses in Sections 5.1 to 5.6, as well as the research methods used (e.g., field studies, observation, archival analysis, or the Delphi method).

5. Potential Success Bias: Table 1 shows that Amazon, Ford, Toyota, and Pfizer all experienced a positive Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) during various crises, suggesting that these four companies maintained stable growth from 2008 to 2023. However, many global corporations have struggled with poor performance during crises, indicating that these four case companies may not accurately represent the broader corporate landscape.

6. Theoretical contributions: This study completely missed the theoretical contributions section, so please provide contributions to the literature and/or knowledge based on the findings of this research.

In summary, I hope these comments assist the author(s) in refining the paper for future submission and encourage them to continue their work in this important field.