

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

Jason Timothy Palframan

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall, toxic positivity is an interesting concept, and a thorough examination of how it is conceptualised, its antecedents, and consequences would be of benefit at both the individual and organisational levels.

Thus, the current paper is timely and could potentially be beneficial to both individuals and organisations. Furthermore, the chosen methodology used by Arskey and O'Malley (2005) is useful, as are the scope of questions used. The following points, however, attempt to strengthen the paper in its current form:

1. The paper, in its current form, could be considered incomplete as no 'scoping review' or results from the review have been cited. Thus, the abstract and the results and discussion sections are currently descriptive, suggesting what the paper aims to achieve. The method would then also need to be written in the past tense.
2. Maybe delete the word 'protocol' in the title, as it is not needed.
3. The background is useful, but maybe you could consider the argument in a more linear format, as currently, the themes jump back and forth in date order.
4. The rationale for the study needs to be more concise. The rationale states there is limited research before the review has been carried out. Note that there has also been some recent research on "Toxic positivity intentions." See Salopek, A.H. and Eastin, M.S. (2024) 'Toxic positivity intentions: an image management approach to upward social comparison and false self-presentation', *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, 29(3). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmae003>.
5. With the questions in the abstract and background, state how many questions you pose.
6. The scoping review questions could also include 'key concepts and/or definitions' and "methodological design of studies," which could also examine how the concept is measured. See the paper by Munn, Z., Peters, M.D.J., Stern, C. *et al.* Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Med Res Methodol* **18**, 143 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>
7. Also, note that the model by Arskey and O'Malley (2005) has been expanded on by Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implement Sci.* 2010;5(1):1, so you could use that model too if required.
8. When searching and the criteria used, you could consider the sub-dimensions of toxic positivity, such as emotional suppression. See Shipp, H.G. and Hall, K.C. (2024) 'Analyzing the concept of toxic positivity for nursing: A dimensional analysis approach', *Journal of advanced nursing* 80(8), pp. 3146–3157. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16057>.

