

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

Francesca Sgobbi¹

¹ University of Brescia, Italy

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper "Organizational Agility and Performance: A Time-Series Analysis of Crisis Response" presents the evolution of selected economic and financial variables over the period 2008–2023 and their projection for 2025–2030 for four multinational corporations. These variables are taken as proxies for financial performance during a period marked by successive crises.

I find it difficult to appreciate the contribution of the authors because the paper does not position itself within the existing literature. Which other works have empirically addressed the relationship between organizational agility and performance? With what methods, and with what results?

The objective of the paper is unclear.

- The abstract states: "The paper discusses how this (?) affects the financial resilience across industries."
- The introduction suggests: "how and under what conditions agility translates into measurable financial performance and resilience."
- The objectives section notes: "Considering the difference in the line of thinking regarding how agility influences financial robustness, the subsequent ones (?) shall try to establish under which circumstances, across industries, agility would result in increased financial performance."

However, the questions detailed on page 3 ("How is organizational agility shaping financial resilience and performance in times of crisis? Which one among operational, financial, and strategic agility is more important to turn possible, enable a sustainable long-term recovery and development? What impact do sectoral and structural variations have on the effectiveness of agility in improving resilience and ensuring financial stability?") are not explicitly connected to the general research question and remain untested in the empirical analysis. The same considerations apply to the hypotheses detailed on page 8.

Key terms, subject to diverse interpretations in literature and practice, are introduced in the introductory sections without clear definitions (agility, resilience, performance, etc.). For example, in my opinion, agility in a manufacturing context has different implications compared to agility in innovation activities. This lack of clarity confuses the reader and leads to inconsistent engagement with the literature by the authors (e.g., agility in Toyota; opposition between efficiency and effectiveness objectives irrespective of environmental conditions).

The paper does not justify the choice of specific companies examined in the empirical analysis, fails to articulate the connection between the measured variables and underlying constructs, and does not detail which controls complement the autoregressive analysis. Furthermore, the paper provides no information to assess the quality of this analysis (e.g.,

tests for parameter selection).

The structure of the paper requires revision both to enhance readability through a more concise manuscript and to make the discourse more coherent by revisiting its content. Section 5, placed where the reader would expect an empirical analysis applying the previously presented methodology, should be moved earlier in the paper. Additionally, it is unclear why this section references examples used in the subsequent empirical analysis alongside other examples arbitrarily excluded from that analysis.

The paper requires significant editing efforts to address typos, incoherent sentences, conceptual errors (e.g., p. 9, “at any moment, which can be a month or even a year”), and logical inconsistencies.

In conclusion, while the paper addresses an important and timely topic, unclear positioning, insufficient methodological transparency, and a lack of structural coherence need to be addressed for its contribution to be fully appreciated.