Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Agile Management as a Virtuous Practice: Integrating Ancient Greek Philosophy into Contemporary Organizational Theory"

Dr. Anuva Choudhury[1]

1. Berhampur University, India

Reviewer's Report

Manuscript Title: *Agile Management as a Virtuous Practice: Integrating Ancient Greek Philosophy into Contemporary Organizational Theory*

1. Overview

This manuscript presents a novel **and thought-provoking conceptual study** of Agile Management through ancient Greek philosophy. The paper is conceptually rich and well-organised. By combining modern organisational theory with the ideas of Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, it is innovative. The proposed Virtuous Agile Paradigm (VAP) is a significant theoretical contribution that broadens the current agile discourse beyond its primarily technical focus.

However, to improve its scholarly rigour and clarity, the manuscript may further be improved by modest revisions, especially with regard to methodological transparency, connecting to recent literature, and practical applicability.

2. Major Strengths

2.1 Originality and Theoretical Contribution (Sections 1, 4.2, 6)

The manuscript makes a **significant conceptual contribution** by positioning Agile Management as a **virtue-based organizational philosophy** rather than merely a methodological toolkit. The development

doi.org/10.32388/QHMIJL

of the **Virtuous Agile Paradigm (VAP)** (Section 4.2) is especially good, offering a **coherent four-dimensional framework (leadership, organizational, epistemic, teleological)**.

2.2 Conceptual Integration (Section 4.1)

The **mapping of agile principles with classical philosophical constructs** is insightful and systematically developed. In particular:

Section 4.1.1 (Self-Organization vs Phronesis) is well-argued.

The linkage of **simplicity with eudaimonia and mesotes (Section 4.1.5)** is conceptually compelling.

These sections demonstrate strong analytical depth and interdisciplinary integration.

2.3 Structure and Logical Flow

The manuscript follows a **clear and logical progression**, moving from problem identification to theoretical development and synthesis. The organisation of sections enhances readability and coherence.

3. Major Areas for Improvement

3.1 Clarification of Research Questions (Section 1: Introduction)

While the research gap is clearly articulated, the manuscript does not explicitly state **research questions**.

Suggestion:

Include 2–3 clearly defined research questions at the end of the Introduction to improve focus and analytical direction.

3.2 Strengthening the Literature Review (Section 2)

The theoretical discussion is strong but would benefit from **greater engagement with recent empirical and review-based studies**.

Suggestions:

Incorporate recent literature (last 5–7 years) on:

1. Organisational agility
2. Agile leadership (SLR article by Muduli & Choudhury and similar others may be included)
3. Digital transformation and dynamic capabilities

Balance the discussion by including a wider range of scholarly perspectives beyond those currently emphasised.

3.3 Methodological Transparency (Section 3)

The methodology section lacks sufficient detail regarding:

1. Selection of text
2. Analytical procedures
3. Thematic mapping process

Suggestions:

Clearly specify:

1. Criteria for selecting Agile and philosophical sources
2. Steps followed in the hermeneutic and comparative analysis
3. Consider adding a **summary table** outlining:
4. Sources
5. Key concepts
6. Mapping logic

This will enhance the **rigour and reproducibility** of the study.

3.4 Justification of Conceptual Mapping (Section 4.1)

Some conceptual linkages (e.g., **Empathy vs Sympatheia in Section 4.1.3**) appear interpretive and would benefit from stronger justification.

Suggestions:

1. Provide additional scholarly references supporting these mappings
2. Briefly acknowledge the **interpretive nature and limitations** of such comparisons

3.5 Readability (Section 4)

Certain sections, particularly **4.1.4 and 4.1.5** , are dense and may affect readability.

Suggestions:

1. Break longer paragraphs into shorter segments

2. Simplify complex sentences

3. Use subheadings or brief summaries where appropriate

3.6 Development of the VAP Framework (Section 4.2 & Table 1)

This is the **core contribution** of the paper.

Areas for Improvement:

(a) Visual Representation

The framework would benefit from a **conceptual diagram** illustrating relationships among the four dimensions.

(b) Operationalization

Clarify how each dimension can be **applied or observed in practice**.

Suggestion:

Provide examples (e.g., leadership behaviours, learning mechanisms, decision-making processes) to enhance practical relevance.

3.7 Discussion and Theoretical Positioning (Section 5)

The discussion does not sufficiently position the VAP relative to existing frameworks.

Suggestions:

Compare VAP with:

Agile maturity models

Dynamic capability theory

Learning organisation frameworks

Highlight how VAP **extends or differs from these approaches**

3.8 Limitations and Future Research (Section 6)

The manuscript lacks an explicit discussion of limitations.

Suggestions:

Acknowledge:

Conceptual nature of the study

Potential interpretive bias

Lack of empirical validation

Expand future research directions, particularly:

Empirical testing of the VAP

Cross-cultural or sectoral applications

4. Minor Comments

Ensure consistency in formatting and spacing

Simplify overly long sentences for better clarity

5. Recommendation

Major Revision

The manuscript is **strong in originality and conceptual contribution**, and with the suggested revisions, it has the potential to make a **significant impact in the field of organisational theory and agile management**.

6. Concluding Remark

This is a **thought-provoking paper. W**ith improvements in methodological clarity, literature integration, and practical articulation, the manuscript can achieve a high level of scholarly contribution.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.