

Review of: "Agile Learning: An innovative curriculum for educators"

Roland Hellberg¹

1 Swedish Defence University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors of "Agile Learning: An Innovative Curriculum for Educators"

I hope this message finds you well. I have had the opportunity to review your article, which addresses crucial pedagogical tools for enhancing learning effectiveness. However, I would like to bring to your attention certain areas where the article could benefit from improvement in terms of academic and scientific quality. Please note that the following suggestions are not exhaustive but rather examples of areas that could be enhanced:

Introduction:

- Legitimize claims made in the introductory chapter, especially in the paragraph that begins with "Originating from agile methodologies," by providing relevant references. Ensure that all assertions throughout the article are properly substantiated.
- In chapters 2 and 4, supplement the content with more references to establish credibility as a solid frame of reference.

Chapter 2:

Reframe the description of Kanban in a way that aligns with its original meaning as a signal of need, as opposed to
merely a "playing card." While the statement may be supported by Andersson (2010), it may present a misleading
general description of Kanban.

Chapter 3:

 Address errors with commas and periods in the paragraph starting with "Digital Competence Framework for Educators."

Methodology Chapters:

- Clearly articulate how the work was conducted in the methodology chapters. Integrate references to relevant methodological literature to legitimize and support the research approach.
- Provide detailed descriptions for key aspects:
 - Clarify the process of arriving at the 25 key areas, including the keywords used and databases searched.
 - Explain the criteria and methodology used in selecting the 12 experts.



- Elaborate on how the 12 experts processed the 25 areas to reduce them to 21.
- Clearly state whether Figure 1 is an original creation or based on the work of others.

Chapter 5:

• Correct discrepancies regarding the number of areas listed in Chapter 5.2, specifically in the Transversal Competencies section. Ensure consistency with the information provided in Figure 2.

Chapter 6:

• Establish a clear link between the reasoning presented in Chapter 6 and the content discussed in chapters 2 and 4.

These suggestions aim to enhance the overall quality and coherence of your article. I appreciate your attention to these points and believe that addressing them will strengthen the academic and scientific merit of your work.

Best regards

Qeios ID: UNWNR7 · https://doi.org/10.32388/UNWNR7