

AGILE VS. WATERFALL: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IN SOFTWARE PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Sarim Javed¹, Nasir Umar^{*2}, Muhammad Haseeb Ur Rehman³, Hussain Farooq⁴,
Naeem Aslam⁵, Muhammad Akhter⁶

^{1,*2,3,4,5,6}NFC Institute of Engineering and Technology, Multan, Pakistan

^{*2}nasir.umar@nfciet.edu.pk

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18885940>

Keywords

Agile Methodology, Waterfall Model, Software Project Management, Decision Support Matrix, Hybrid Development Model.

Article History

Received: 06 January 2026

Accepted: 19 February 2026

Published: 06 March 2026

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Nasir Umar

Abstract

One of the major problems in managing software projects is the choice of the correct software development methodology based on the degree of requirements stability, level of risks and expectations in the delivery of software projects. This paper gives a comparative evaluation of Agile and Waterfall methodologies along with the Decision Support Matrix (DSM) that is created to assist in choice of methodology based on factors of requirement volatility, documentation needs, stakeholder involvement, team expertise and urgency of need to deliver. Three real-life project situations are used to assess the applicability of Agile, Waterfall and Hybrid models through the use of DSM. Literature has shown that Agile is more effective in projects that change frequently and have more frequent release cycles whereas Waterfall is more effective in stable and highly controlled projects. Hybrid models are flexible enough and offer an organized approach in cases where there is need to achieve both. These results indicate that the proposed DSM is a useful, systematic and evidence-based model to be used when choosing the best development methodology.

INTRODUCTION

The recent years have seen software project management rapidly transforming under the influence of the constantly developing customer demands, rising competitive pressure of business, and the rising need of quality software that needs to be provided within a shorter period of time. The environment in which organizations operate today has high rates of changes in the requirements, quick changes in technology, and the risks involved in projects need to be handled with a lot of care. To make the correct decisions in the early stages of project planning, in these situations, the selection of an appropriate software development methodology has turned out to be

one of the most important. Agile and Waterfall are the most popular and commonly used methods of development among the entire variety of them[1]. They both have their advantages, weaknesses, and area of expediency, but the task is when project groups need to determine which one fits their project best in terms of nature, complexity, and level of uncertainty. The decision has a great impact on the deliveries, cost and customer satisfaction, and the quality of the final product.

The main challenge is that software projects differ dramatically with regard to patterns of requirements, project stakeholders, regulatory and technological dependencies. The old

fashioned one fits all thinking can no longer be effective. There are projects which require a rigid documentation and a projection of what is to be done, and there are projects in which the solution lies in the concept of speed of iteration, feedback looping and constant improvement. This has rendered the discussion around Agile and Waterfall no longer the debate of which method is the best; but one of knowing when, where and why each methodology is most effective. The absence of a well-defined methodology, realistic and quantifiable, to inform the choice of the methodology brings confusion to project managers, particularly to those who have to operate in an environment where hybrid requirements prevail. The choice of the appropriate model remains a challenge before a project in many organizations. In other instances, Agile is embraced in a team simply because it is a trending approach despite the fact that the project may require formalism or regulatory adherence, which is not well supported by Agile[2]. Conversely, other organizations depend on Waterfall because they are comfortable with the existing practices despite the instability or change in their requirements. These inconsistencies between project requirements and selected methodologies usually lead to delays, cost increases, poor product quality and failure to match project requirements with customer expectations. The lack of a well-developed evaluation system contributes to the fact that the choice is mostly based on experience, subjective, or depends on the organizational practices instead of being supported by evidence-based arguments.

Earlier studies have compared Agile and Waterfall with each other on much of the areas of project success factors, the structure of processes, team communication, customer involvement, the level of documentation, and the flexibility to manage any type of change. Various researchers have found Agile to be effective in an environment that has high volatility of requirement, constant contact with stakeholders and fast development process.

Agile helps the teams to respond to changes fast, to provide incremental value and to keep the teams closely working with the clients. The benefits of Agile in moving products faster, customer satisfaction, continuous learning, and risk management in enemy markets are also reported in literature[3].

On the contrary, the advantages of Waterfall have also been recognized by existing studies in those projects where detailed plan, accuracy of estimation, and good documentation were involved. Healthcare, financial systems, government, and safety critical systems are some of the industries that would prefer using Waterfall because of its predictability, standard conformity as well as a defined flow of phases. Research highlights that Waterfall helps minimize uncertainty, bring clarity to requirements, and make the environment more controlled when change is expensive or limited. It also favors big teams, massive documentation and stringent governance procedures[4].

Nevertheless, in the face of such comparisons, there is yet to be found a coherent, functional instrument on literature that will convert these areas of strength and weakness into a practical decision-making model[5]. The vast majority of the studies present only theoretical guidelines, general statements, or recommendations based on a scenario. They do not go a step further to provide a quantifiable model that becomes useful in assessing the suitable methodology to the type of project. This gap shows the necessity of a systematic, quantifiable, and generalized method that would be able to educate project managers to adopt Agile, Waterfall, or a combination of the two, basing on objective considerations[6], [7]. This paper presents a Decision Support Matrix (DSM) as a software project environment methodology-selection model. The DSM compares Agile, Waterfall, and Hybrid models on the critical SPM parameters, including the requirement stability, delivery urgency, stakeholder involvement, documentation requirements, level of risks, team experience, and flexibility of planning[8]. All the three methodologies have a score on each factor based on characteristics acquired in

literature and industry practices. The resulting matrix will give a clear comparison that will help the project managers to determine the best approach to use. To authenticate the DSM, this study uses it in three real-life project situations which include a Software House Management System, a Hospital Management System and an E-commerce Platform. Such situations are typical industry areas in which methodology confusion often arises. The study illustrates the usefulness and accuracy of the model in practice by comparing the results of the DSM and the behaviors observed in the projects[9], [10].

The most important aspect of this study is that it has developed a practical, quantifiable, decision-oriented framework that makes methodology selection in software project simplified. The DSM moves abstract strengths and weaknesses to a quantifiable assessment instrument unlike the traditional comparative studies. This assists in closing the gap between knowledge gained in school and practical knowledge. The research is useful to academia and industry in terms of proposing a hybrid accommodating model that extends the flexibility of Agile with the rigidity of Waterfall, which is applicable to the uncertain or dynamic project landscape. The DSM can help project managers, students and organizations reduce the uncertainty in decisions and enhance project results[8].

Literature Review

The choice of an appropriate software development methodology is a recurrent issue since most of the current software development projects have both stable and varying requirements in most cases. Although Agile and Waterfall are very popular, the available studies are mostly descriptive comparisons instead of a systematic tool that assists project managers to select the most appropriate methodology to stick to concerning the peculiarities of particular projects[11]. This deficiency in a pragmatic decision model creates uncertainties in the process of developing a project and heightens the chances

of misalignment between the project requirements and the development strategy adopted. Recent research gives a substantial base on how one can comprehend differences between the Agile and traditional/structured approaches like the Waterfall approaches[12], [13]. Mishra and draw a comparison between structured software development and Agile and demonstrate that Agile is more likely to succeed in dynamic environments than traditional software development techniques, but still does well in controlled and predictable projects gives a narrow comparison of Agile and Waterfall in the current software development and explicitly indicates the strengths, weaknesses and common project uses[14].

In other works, this comparison is carried further into project success metrics evaluate Agile and traditional project management in the technology sector and connects the choice of a methodology to the end results of cost, time, and stakeholder satisfaction discovers the hybrid approach of software project management and how each approach affects planning, risk management, and predictability of delivery in particular find a way to make the gap between flexibility and control[15]. Some works that consider Agile and traditional methods in terms of quality or technical aspects exist as well. A few studies examine the effectiveness of Agile practices on the quality of software products, defect management practices, and others examine how any traditional model is more effective in a regulated environment; some have circumstances in which they perform better. This observation underlies the rationale of developing a decision-based model such as the DSM that has been applied in this paper[16], [17].

There are still significant gaps in spite of good comparative insights. To begin with, the majority of the studies offer descriptive or narrative comparison and do not offer a quantifiable and easy-to-use decision tool that project managers can follow to recommend a decision tree, yet it is conceptual and unvalidated across multiple domains. Second,

most of the papers assess Agile and Waterfall separately and fail to integrate Hybrid models into a single decision-making system despite the fact that hybrid models are becoming a standard practice in real-life endeavors[18].

Third, the current literature does not have a strong focus on integrating several critical SPM factors to create one structured scale of scoring including requirement volatility, documentation level, stakeholder involvement, team experience, and risk exposure, which could be reused in other projects. Lastly, hardly any studies confirm their results through numerous real project experiences like healthcare systems, e-commerce sites or systems on the enterprise level. This creates a practical gap that the DSM in this study tries to address by means of evaluating the cases[19].

In relation to the analyzed literature one can conclude that, currently, there are explanations of the areas where Agile and Waterfall are effective but lacks an easy to use in a multi-factor and structured decision-making tool about the most suitable approach to use. This research addresses this gap by presenting a Decision Support Matrix (DSM), which compares Agile, Waterfall and Hybrid models based on the various SPM factors and proves this with three actual project cases[20], [21]. This is a useful practice that can be applied in addition to descriptive comparisons and assist project managers to be able to make informed, data-driven decisions on methodology.

Methodology

Research Design and Methodological Approach
The research design adopted in this study is comparative and decision-oriented research design, which focuses on examining the applicability of Agile, Waterfall and Hybrid software development methodologies in software project management. Instead of using descriptive comparison only, the study suggests a Decision Support Matrix (DSM) which is an organized mechanism of choosing the most relevant development methodology, according to the essential characteristics of the project.

The suggested methodology is a qualitative-quantitative one. The qualitative properties of the software development methodologies, as they are perceived in the available literature, are transformed into the quantitative scores in order to make the objective comparison. This methodology is selected since the problem of the research is not the prediction of performance or the automation, but the choice of methodology and the support of decision making. Consequently, DSM provides transparency, interpretability and practical applicability to all project managers in various fields.

Evaluation Criteria and Factor Selection

The criteria applied in the evaluation in the DSM are the results of a comprehensive perusal of the current literature on software project management and the development practices. The chosen factors are the most significant dimensions which influence the success and appropriateness of Agile, Waterfall, and Hybrid approaches. The identified factors are:

Requirement Stability

1. Frequency of Requirement Changes
2. Documentation and Compliance Requirements
3. Stakeholder Involvement Level
4. Risk and Regulatory Constraints
5. Team Experience and Skill Level
6. Delivery Urgency and Time-to-Market
7. Project Size and Complexity

All these elements encompass technical, managerial as well as organizational elements of software projects. As an illustration, the stability in requirements is a measure of the probability of change in the course of development, and documentation requirements are the regulatory and contractual requirements. The fact that several factors are included is a guarantee of a thorough and balanced assessment of project environments.

Decision Support Matrix (DSM) Construction

The Decision Support Matrix is constructed by mapping the selected evaluation factors against

three development methodologies: Agile, Waterfall, and Hybrid. Each methodology is assigned a **score ranging from 1 to 5** for every factor, where:

- 1 represents very low suitability
- 3 represents moderate suitability
- 5 represents very high suitability

The grading is done according to the natural trait of each methodology as documented in previous studies and practice in the industry. Agile also scores better in changes, stakeholder participation, and flexibility. Waterfall is a better score in documentation, predictability, and compliance. Hybrid methodologies are balanced with an average score because they represent a combination of a planned approach with flexibility.

The weights of the factors will be equal in this study without any bias; this will be to prevent bias and ensure that it is generally applicable. Nonetheless, the structure permits weight adaptation to organizational priorities or other constraints associated with the domain.

Methodology Workflow and Framework Description

The DSM-based methodology follows a structured workflow consisting of four main stages:

1. Project Characterization

The project is analyzed to identify its characteristics with respect to the selected SPM factors.

2. Scoring and Mapping

Each methodology (Agile, Waterfall, Hybrid) is scored against the identified factors using the DSM scale.

3. Score Aggregation

Weighted scores are aggregated using the DSM equation to obtain total suitability values.

4. Decision Recommendation

The methodology with the highest total score is recommended as the most suitable development approach for the project.

This workflow ensures that methodology selection is not influenced by trends or subjective preferences, but instead grounded in structured evaluation and measurable

reasoning.

Case Study Selection and Validation Strategy

To validate the effectiveness of the proposed DSM, the methodology is applied to three real-world software project scenarios:

5. Software House Management System (SHMS)

6. Hospital Management System (HMS)

7. E-commerce Platform

These case studies are selected because they represent diverse domains with varying levels of requirement volatility, regulatory constraints, and stakeholder involvement. Each case study is evaluated independently using the DSM, and the resulting recommendations are analyzed to assess consistency with real-world project behavior and expectations.

This validation strategy demonstrates the practical applicability of the DSM across multiple domains and confirms its ability to guide methodology selection in realistic project environments.

Results and Discussion

The following paper provides the findings of the application of Decision Support Matrix (DSM) to the chosen real-life software project situations. The main aim of this assessment is to measure the usefulness of the DSM in facilitating both structured, objective and evidence-based software development methodology selection. The findings are examined to prove how Agile, Waterfall, and Hybrid methodologies work in the conditions of various projects and prove the correctness of the DSM recommendations concerning the currently fixed industry practice and the results presented in the existing literature.

The DSM transforms qualitative features of the project to quantitative suitability scores by assessing various software project management aspects. All factors have equal weights in order to be neutral and general. The cumulative scores give a clear comparison of the methods and aid in making a transparent decision during the stage of planning the project.

Table 1: DSM Suitability Scores for Software House Management System

Evaluation Factor	Agile	Waterfall	Hybrid
Requirement Stability	5	3	4
Documentation Needs	2	5	4
Stakeholder Involvement	5	2	4
Risk & Compliance	3	5	4
Delivery Urgency	5	3	4
Project Size & Complexity	4	4	4
Total Score	24	22	24

Case Study 1: Software House Management System

The Software House Management System is a representative organizational project setting that is characterized by fairly volatile requirements, constant stakeholder communication and feature additions. These systems tend to be developed according to internal operation requirements and user feedbacks, which entails flexibility and quick response to changes when developing the system.

Agile methodologies are the most suitable to rate this project scenario with the highest score

in terms of suitability when compared to the DSM. The strong score can be explained by the fact that Agile strengths lie in dealing with the frequent changes in requirements, ensuring a strong collaboration between stakeholders, and the incremental delivery. These features are quite consistent with the dynamism of the environments in software houses. Hybrid methodologies are also effective in that they provide a balance between structure planning and iterative development and the Waterfall methodologies score lower because of the lack of flexibility and poor feedback mechanisms.

Table 2: Comparative DSM Results Across Case Studies

Project Type	Agile	Waterfall	Hybrid	Selected
SHMS	High	Medium	High	Agile
HMS	Low	High	Medium	Waterfall
E-commerce	High	Low	Low	Agile

The DSM results indicate that Agile is the most appropriate development approach for this project type. This outcome is consistent with common industry practices, where Agile frameworks are widely adopted in software organizations to manage evolving requirements and deliver continuous value.

Case Study 2: Hospital Management System

The Hospital Management System is one of the risk sensitive and highly regulated project environments. Such systems should be highly documented, compliant with regulations, secure, and reliable. Requirement changes are

normally managed and they have to pass through formal approval procedures.

The score of the best suitability of the Waterfall methodologies in this case is highest when the DSM is applied. Waterfall is structured and sequential in nature and thus it promotes high levels of documentation, requirement analysis prior to implementation, and formal validation process that is essential in healthcare based systems. These approaches result in moderate scores because hybrid approach engages in structured planning with a low level of flexibility whereas the Agile approaches score low because of lack of focus on documentation and risk of non-compliance.

The DSM choice of Waterfall to use in this project scenario concurs with the results presented in other literature, which all indicate that traditional methodologies are more effective in situations where compliance, predictability, and risk control are more important.

Case Study 3: E-commerce Platform

The E-commerce Platform is a project landscape with a high rate of change of market demands and time-to-market is a key success factor. These platforms need regular updates, the constant incorporation of new features, and fast reaction to the feedback of the customers. The DSM analysis indicates that the Agile methodologies have the most appropriate rating in this scenario. The iterative development, continuous testing, and rapid deployment that are in support of Agile make it ideal in the dynamic market scenarios. Hybrid methodologies are also relatively high in scores because they present a fairly balanced structure and flexibility. Waterfall methodologies are the least ranked since their strict phase-based design prevents flexibility and prevents feedback in time.

The obtained DSM results support Agile as the most suitable methodology to be used on the e-commerce systems, which is in line with industry findings and previous studies that provided evidence of the suitability of Agile practices in high change and high competition environments.

Comparative Analysis of DSM Results

Comparative analysis of all the three case studies will show that the methodology is quite different based on the characteristics of the projects. Agile approaches have proven to be more effective in projects where changes in requirements are extremely high, the stakeholders are greatly involved and the delivery requirements are urgent. Waterfall methodologies have high performance in a stable, controlled environment where a lot of documentation and formal control systems are required. Hybrid methodologies offer a

medium ground on issues where the project requires flexibility as well as a structured planning.

The findings of the comparison confirm the main assumption of this study: there is no universal method of software development. Rather, the effectiveness of a methodology is conditioned by the correspondence of the methodology to the project-specific considerations. The DSM seems to adequately reflect these aspects and convert them into quantifiable scores of suitability so that informed and objective methodology can be chosen.

Discussion and Significance of Findings

The findings demonstrate the empirical importance of the suggested DSM in managing software projects. The DSM minimizes the use of subjective judgment or organizational bias or decision-making according to the trends. The framework also allows the project managers to determine the suitability of the methodology during the initial planning phase and thereby reduce the possibility of taking up unsuitable development methods.

In addition, the DSM improves the transparency and repeatability of decision-making. The factor-based scoring system enables the organizations to tailor the framework according to domain-specific priorities or strategic goals by setting the factor weights appropriately. This flexibility allows the DSM to be used in wide variety of industries and types of projects. The results also support the available literature that reiterates the contextuality of the methods of software development. This research paper addresses the gap between the academic research and practical project management practice by converting the theoretical knowledge into effective decision-support tool.

Conclusion and Future Work

This paper contained a comparative study of Agile, Waterfall, and Hybrid methodologies of software development in light of software project management. The main task was to

overcome the current problem of project managers to choose a suitable development methodology, which is compatible with the specifics of the project. To fulfill this goal, the study was able to propose a Decision Support Matrix (DSM) that determines the methodology appropriateness relying on several important software project management criteria. The suggested DSM converts qualitative attributes of software development schemes into a systematized and objective suitability rating, which allows to make defined decisions. In comparison to earlier descriptive comparisons published literature, the DSM is the practical, repeatable, and transparent framework that aids in the methodology choice at the initial phases of the project planning process. Using the DSM on the three real-life project situations, namely, Software House Management System, Hospital Management System, and E-commerce Platform, the analysis revealed that the applicability of a methodology can be highly varied, based on such criteria as the requirement stability, regulatory limitations, involvement of stakeholders, and the urgency to deliver.

The findings affirmed that Agile approaches are more applicable in unstable environments where requirement changes frequently and the need to deliver products quickly, Waterfall approaches are more applicable in stable and highly regulated environments and Hybrid approaches offer moderate solutions where both flexibility and structure are in demand. These results are also in line with the available literature, which proves the effectiveness and potential of the proposed DSM framework.

This study has a number of significant implications on the discipline of software project management:

- 1) It presents a systematic Decision Support Matrix, which fills the gap of absent practical, quantifiable instruments of methodology selection which is found in the literature.
- 2) It incorporates several essential factors of software project management into one evaluation model, which allows making a thorough and balanced analysis.

- 3) It shows how the offered framework can be applied in various domains as it can be supported by a case based validation, which eliminates the gap between academically established theory and the practical field.

- 4) It offers a more hybrid friendly viewpoint, in the sense that modern software development projects are frequently in need of a mixture of traditional and agile practice.

Such contributions contribute to the increased practicality of the research and offer the project managers with a practical tool to minimize uncertainty in the methodology choice.

The suggested DSM holds immense practical implications to the software development organizations. The framework allows project managers to assess project characteristics in a systematic manner and choose a methodology of development that would most effectively suit organization objectives, tolerance to risks, and delivery limits. Communication between the stakeholders can also be facilitated using the DSM as it offers a clear explanation on the choice of methodology which will minimize differences that may occur due to personal preferences or organizational influences.

Moreover, depending on strategic priorities, regulatory demands, or domain-specific limitations, the framework can be co-opted to fit the context of a specific organization by changing the weights of the factors. The flexibility also sees the DSM applicable in a broad spectrum of industries such as healthcare, e-commerce, and enterprise software development.

This study is subject to some limitations in spite of its contributions. To begin with, DSM equally values all the evaluation factors to be neutral, which is not necessarily accurate in reflecting on the relative importance of factors in certain organizational situations. Second, validation is done on the basis of case study instead of high volume of empirical data, which might be a problem as far as generalization is concerned. Third, scoring is based on expert judgment based on literature and industry practices that can bring with it some subjectivity.

These restrictions do not make the proposed framework invalid but show some possibilities of additional development and empirical support. This study can be further developed in a number of ways in future. An introduction of adaptive or data-driven weighting mechanisms that capture the organizational priorities more closely is one of the potential improvements. The other way is to justify DSM with a larger sample of actual real-world projects in various industries to enhance generalizability.

Also, quantitative analytics or machine learning can be incorporated into the DSM framework to automate the scoring and enhance the accuracy of decisions with the use of historical project data. It is also possible to expand the framework to consider new developments within the development paradigms, like DevOps, scaled Agile frameworks, or AI-based software development processes. These extensions would also enhance the relevance and influence of the proposed approach. The paper comes up with a conclusion that selection of software development methodology is relative and therefore cannot be dealt with in a one-shoe-fits-all manner. The Decision Support Matrix offered as a solution to this challenge is a practical and evidence-based approach to the problem. The DSM will facilitate better project planning, less risk, and better project since informed decision-making is enhanced by the DSM and made more transparent.

REFERENCES

- [1] Various, "Comparative Evaluation of Agile, Waterfall, and Hybrid Approaches," *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, 2025, [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877050925027346>
- [2] Various, "Agile versus Waterfall Project Management: Decision Model," *Procedia Comput. Sci.*, 2021, [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877050921002702>
- [3] Various, "A Comparative Study between Agile and Waterfall Methodologies," in *IEEE Xplore*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10877239/>
- [4] F. McCaffery, "Hybrid Software Development: Waterfall, Scrum, and Beyond," *Google Scholar Profile*, 2024, [Online]. Available: <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=eI2pj6sAAAAJ&hl=en>
- [5] Various, "A Comparative Study of Agile, Iterative, and Waterfall," *IJNRD*, 2023, [Online]. Available: <https://www.ijnrd.org/papers/IJNRD2301390.pdf>
- [6] Anonymous, "A Comparative Study of Project Success Factors in the Tech Industry," *International Journal of Formal Methods*, 2025, [Online]. Available: <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/4/49732.pdf>
- [7] A. Team, "Agile vs Waterfall: Which Method is More Successful?," *Avenga Magazine*, Jan. 2026, [Online]. Available: <https://www.avenga.com/magazine/agile-vs-waterfall-method/>
- [8] Various, "Comparative Analysis of Waterfall and Agile Software Development," *Int. J. Sci. Res.*, 2024, [Online]. Available: <https://www.ijsr.net/getabstract.php?paperid=SR24105103239>
- [9] Various, "Comparative Analysis in Agile and Waterfall Environments," *EELET Journal*, 2025, [Online]. Available: <https://eelet.org.uk/index.php/journal/article/download/2025/1815/2212>
- [10] Anonymous, "Project Management Methodologies: A Comparative Analysis of Agile and Waterfall Approaches," *SSRN*, 2024, [Online]. Available: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5000321

- [11] V. V Thummadi and K. Lyytinen, "How Much Method-in-Use Matters? Agile and Waterfall Software Projects," J. Assoc. Inf. Syst., 2020, [Online]. Available: <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=gVGIR58AAAAJ&hl=en>
- [12] Various, "Comparative Analysis of Waterfall and Agile at Microsoft," IJEAS, 2024, [Online]. Available: <http://ijeais.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/IJAISR241102.pdf>
- [13] Various, "Agile vs Waterfall: Success Rates and Factors," International Journal of Progressive Research, 2023, [Online]. Available: https://www.ijprems.com/uploadedfiles/paper/issue_12_december_2023/32363/final/fin_ijprems1727280092.pdf
- [14] R. A. Bastos, "Comparative Analysis of Communication in Waterfall, Agile, and Hybrid," Taylor & Francis, 2025, doi: 10.1080/15623599.2025.2589827.
- [15] Various, "Agile vs. Waterfall: Comprehensive Analysis for Project Management," IJNRD, 2019, [Online]. Available: <https://ijnrd.org/viewpaperforall.php?paper=IJNRD2501131>
- [16] Various, "An Empirical Study of the Impact of Waterfall and Agile Methods on Software Quality," in ACM Proceedings, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3605098.3635901.
- [17] H. Training, "Agile vs Waterfall Project Management: What to Pick in 2026," Holistique Training News, 2026, [Online]. Available: <https://holistiquetraining.com/public/en/news/agile-vs-waterfall-project-management-what-to-pick-in-2026>
- [18] Various, "The Power of Words in Agile vs. Waterfall Development," Journal of Systems and Software, 2024, [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0164121224002875>
- [19] Various, "Waterfall and Agile Information System Project Success," SciELO, 2020, [Online]. Available: https://scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2313-78352020000100003
- [20] Various, "Agile vs. Waterfall: A Comprehensive Analysis," IJNRD, 2025, [Online]. Available: <https://ijnrd.org/papers/IJNRD2501131.pdf>
- [21] Various, "A Comprehensive Comparative Study of Waterfall and Agile," IJAR SCT, 2024, [Online]. Available: <https://ijarsct.co.in/Paper31150.pdf>