

Review of: "Strategies to Resolve Toxic Leadership Actions in Engineering Institutions which Impede Faculty Performance and Innovation"

Mohammad Sadegh Sharifirad¹

¹ Ardakan University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

First of all, thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to review this paper. This paper endeavors to offer the strategies to attenuate the detrimental effects of toxic leaders on performance and innovation in engineering institutions. The topic is very interesting. However, despite all the merits of this paper, there are some points to be considered to increase the quality of this paper for publication.

1. Some sentences in the abstract are based on the perception of the author (s). For example, "In developing countries, many average leaders have been selected to head the institutions due to political pressure. These average leaders turn to toxic leaders who control the growth of knowledge capital and human capital." These sentences do not have any references and no formal statistics. Moreover, in some sections of the abstract we have some literature review which is not normally included in the abstract (e.g., Radical Activity Theory (RAT) is explained in the abstract, which is normally done in the literature review.
2. The literature review does not give the reader a panoramic view of which research has already been conducted in the realm of toxic leadership. As evidence, very limited numbers of references, especially up-to-date references are seen in the literature review.
3. In terms of word selection, instead of literature survey, literature review is suggested.
4. At the beginning of the literature review section, we have diverse definitions of toxic leadership which is not necessary. A couple of definitions suffice. We expect this part to be organized from the definition and then see different detrimental effects of toxic leadership in diverse contexts, including engineering institutions and universities. After that, we look forward to read some sentences about the research on the effects of toxic leadership. More importantly, we need to know whether there has been some research on the strategies to overcome the insidious effects of toxic leadership on performance and innovation.
5. Generally speaking, we don't have the section of objectives in top journals. The literature and the objectives are intertwined and are not separated. In top journals, we normally talk about our hypotheses and prepositions and we then present them concretely and very briefly after each.
6. The research methodology section is very confusing and very little is mentioned on the steps after which we have the findings of this paper. I think this needs more organizing so that we know that how the findings are extracted in this paper.

7. After the research methodology section, we have some sections which seem to be some parts of the literature review and this is not something common in journals.
8. The discussion section is a very important section. I think this part is rather short and needs more elaboration.
9. We normally summarize what we have already mentioned in the conclusion and no new subject is normally offered.
10. The limitations and future research sections are normally in the discussion section.

Thank you for this research.