

Review of: "Conceptualizing Toxic Positivity: A Scoping Review Protocol"

Latha Lavanya

Potential competing interests: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, MEASI INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT, CHENNAI

To assess the **validity** of the proposed study on toxic positivity, the article sounds to be good. I have stated the following comments.

1. Construct Validity

The Arksey and O'Malley framework adds credibility, as it's a well-established method for conducting scoping reviews, enhancing construct validity.

2. Content Validity

The study plans to review both **academic and grey literature**, providing a comprehensive analysis. This inclusivity helps in covering a wide range of perspectives and sources, increasing content validity.

3. Internal Validity

Since the study is a **scoping review** rather than an experimental or correlational study, internal validity (the degree to which cause-and-effect relationships are established) is less relevant. However, ensuring **methodological rigor** in selecting and reviewing the literature is essential for maintaining the integrity of the findings.

4. External Validity

The use of a wide range of literature, especially including both **peer-reviewed** and **grey literature**, can strengthen external validity by making the findings more generalizable across different contexts. Since the focus is on the broad implications of toxic positivity in contexts like social media and during the COVID-19 pandemic, the conclusions drawn could be applied across similar social and cultural situations.

5. Face Validity

At face value, the study appears to be valid as it aims to explore an increasingly recognized psychological and societal phenomenon. The key questions and focus areas are relevant to understanding the broader mental health implications of toxic positivity.

Enhancing the Study's Validity:

Clear operational definitions of terms like toxic positivity, dimensions, and antecedents should be well-defined to

maintain clarity.

Systematic inclusion/exclusion criteria for selecting literature will improve the robustness and reduce the potential for bias in the findings.

Transparency in reporting the review process and findings will ensure that readers can trust the methodology and the conclusions drawn.

In conclusion, the study design appears to have strong potential for validity, particularly if methodological rigor is maintained throughout the scoping review process.

Here's feedback on the article overview on toxic positivity:

Strengths:

Clear Purpose and Objective:

The study has a well-defined aim: to synthesize existing literature on toxic positivity. The use of **scoping review** is appropriate given the broad scope of this topic.

Research questions and data analysis add focus and make the article's intention explicit.

Relevance and Timeliness:

The topic of toxic positivity is highly relevant, especially given its rise in social media and its prominence during the COVID-19 pandemic. The mental health implications make this study particularly timely. Highlighting both **academic** and **grey literature** (e.g., reports, blogs, non-peer-reviewed articles) indicates that it is taking a comprehensive approach, which will likely provide a holistic understanding of the phenomenon.

1. Methodological Rigor:

- The decision to use the **Arksey and O'Malley framework** for conducting the scoping review suggests a structured and well-thought-out methodology. This adds credibility and suggests that your review will be systematic and thorough.

Suggestions for Improvement:

1. Clarification of Key Concepts:

- It would be helpful to provide a brief working **definition of toxic positivity** up front, rather than waiting to synthesize definitions from the literature. This ensures that readers who may not be familiar with the term have an initial understanding of what the study is about.
- Additionally, you could briefly explain the **dimensions, antecedents, and consequences** in a general sense to frame the upcoming synthesis better.

2. Specify the Literature Scope:

- You mention that both **academic and grey literature** will be reviewed. It might be helpful to briefly outline what specific kinds of grey literature will be included (e.g., social media analyses, blog posts, reports from non-governmental organizations). This helps to clarify the comprehensiveness of the review.
- Will you focus on literature from specific regions, demographics, or time frames? Defining these parameters will provide clearer boundaries for your study and enhance its validity.

3. Potential Research Gaps:

- The statement about identifying **gaps in current research** is great, but consider specifying some **potential gaps** (e.g., the lack of research on toxic positivity in workplace settings, the long-term mental health consequences, or specific demographics affected) to guide the reader. This could also highlight the novelty of your study.

4. Balanced Approach to Emotional Well-Being:

- The final sentence suggests advocating for a **balanced approach** to emotional well-being, which is an excellent conclusion. However, expanding on this idea briefly in the overview might help clarify the significance of your study. You could reference existing theories or frameworks on emotional regulation to emphasize this advocacy.

5. Mental Health Implications:

- Since the study will address the **mental health implications** of toxic positivity, consider mentioning some possible **connections to psychological theories** (e.g., emotional suppression, positive psychology) that will be explored. This can give readers an idea of the theoretical framework guiding the review.

Final Thoughts:

The article tackles a highly relevant and contemporary issue, and the methodology seems solid but lacks figures or tables. Clarifying some of the concepts and literature boundaries upfront and briefly discussing possible theoretical implications can strengthen the depth and focus of your work. Overall, it's a promising study that will likely contribute valuable insights into the mental health effects of toxic positivity. To strengthen the research on toxic positivity, the author could complement the scoping review with additional empirical experiments and data collection. Use validated psychological scales to assess emotional suppression, well-being, and psychological distress related to toxic positivity (e.g., using the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire or Perceived Stress Scale). Sample populations can include people from different demographics, social media users, or employees in work environments to see if the effects vary by context. Conduct a longitudinal study to track how repeated exposure to toxic positivity (e.g., via social media or interpersonal interactions) affects mental health outcomes over time. By incorporating surveys, experiments, longitudinal data, qualitative insights, and possibly cross-cultural comparisons, the author could significantly enhance the empirical foundation of the study. These methods would complement the scoping review, providing deeper insights and helping to draw more robust conclusions about the mental health implications of toxic positivity.

This study aims to synthesize existing literature on toxic positivity through a comprehensive scoping review. Toxic positivity, characterized by an overemphasis on maintaining a positive outlook while suppressing negative emotions, has been increasingly prevalent, particularly in the context of social media and the COVID-19 pandemic. This review will follow the Arksey and O'Malley framework and include both academic and grey literature to provide a broad understanding of toxic positivity. The review will address key research questions: What is the definition of toxic positivity? What are its dimensions, antecedents, and consequences? This synthesis aims to identify gaps in current research and offer insights into the mental health implications of toxic positivity, advocating for a balanced approach to emotional well-being.