

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCOS_120949</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Comparative Analysis of Traditional versus Agile Project Management Methodologies on IT Project Outcomes</b>
Type of the Article	Systematic review

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>"There is a good reason why agile management consistently improves project success through increased freedom, prioritizing the needs of the customer, and empowering team orchestration that focuses on openness and skills rather than controlled behaviors. First, agile methods allow for change through incremental release and feedback from users instead of resisting it. This works better for software development than for manufacturing (Stoica, Ghilic, &amp; Chitoran, 2016)."; "The organized quantitative data clearly shows that agile methods give bigger and better results than the most common project management methods in a number of important measures of the health of IT projects. When it came to important measures like meeting deadlines, keeping customers happy after the implementation, and keeping team members involved during the project, agile methods consistently did better than more rigid and plan-driven management styles that are currently used in almost half of ongoing IT upgrades. A comparison of over 1200 current and finished IT projects that used either agile or waterfall methods shows that Scrum and Kanban structured adaptive delivery are 21% more likely to meet baseline project result specifications."</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract can be more short, concise, direct and avoid repeated information.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes. When thinking about a systematic review, it is important to open a section on the methodology and describe how the documents were chosen, especially the databases used, the eligibility criteria and how they were evaluated, and the roles of each researcher.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>"Agile initiatives exhibited a 20% increase in customer satisfaction ratings, and team members were more involved across various aspects like motivation, empowerment, and work-life balance. The study delves into why agile outperforms older, more inflexible methodologies in these areas. Agile methodology's iterative approach, continuous user feedback, and autonomous teams provide projects with more flexibility, customer-centric emphasis, and empowerment of individuals. This is crucial for IT projects that undergo rapid changes."</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Make minor corrections to the writing.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rosane Malvestiti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil</b>