

**Paper: “Challenges of Implementing Agile Methodology in the Jordanian Banking Sector”**

**Submitted: 18 February 2025**

**Accepted: 01 April 2025**

**Published: 30 April 2025**

Corresponding Author: Abdal Hafeth Alaraj

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n10p146

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Róbert Szűcs  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Rashidat Ayanbanke Busari  
Robert Gordon University (RGU), UK

-----  
Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----  
**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

yes it is

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is well structured ,however Some of the sentences are look complex ,author should consider simplifying phrasing and to improve clarity It should improve on making the sentences easier to read

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Few spelling errors and typographical errors, proofreading will help make necessary corrections

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

method was well explained however the Autor should consider adding the following for the Survey design

Sample size

Question type used

Interview methodology(face-to-face or otherwise)

Survey strategy(random sampling or purposive)

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper is clear. How ever the research questions and objectives can be merge to reduce duplication.

Some of the sentences are difficult to read and Some the tenses used are not consistent (past and present).

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Okay

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Reference style is not consistent and there are some duplication

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Well done, interesting topic. Please consider including the suggestions to make it more engaging to the reader

-----

-----

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title "Challenges of Implementing Agile Methodology in the Jordanian Banking Sector" is clear and accurately reflects the content of the article, which discusses the specific difficulties encountered in applying Agile methodologies within the Jordanian banking context.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract succinctly outlines the objectives, methods, and key findings of the study, providing a comprehensive snapshot of the research which includes the identification of barriers and the proposition of solutions for Agile implementation in Jordanian banks.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The article is generally well-written but contains some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. For example, there are agreement errors and some missing punctuation marks. However, these errors do not significantly affect the comprehensibility of the article.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The "Materials and Methods" section is particularly weak. It is excessively verbose, yet we essentially learn nothing about the methods applied. It is not at all clear what kind of qualitative and quantitative research was conducted. We also receive no information about the research conditions.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body section is also weak. Instead of a lengthy and verbose introduction, authors should focus on presenting actual research findings. The secondary literature review constantly repeats itself. The authors do not adequately support subjective statements with either secondary or primary data.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Weak and subjective.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Although the authors apparently use a sufficient number of sources, this is not reflected in the quality of the article.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The literature review is too long, unnecessarily verbose, and repetitive. The methodology of the primary research is unacceptable, as no concrete details are provided about the survey's circumstances. What was the sample size of the questionnaire survey? Was there even a survey conducted? Regarding the qualitative research, we learn almost nothing about the 10 participants. Instead of unnecessary digressions, facts are needed.

-----