

Peer Review

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

Hany Akeel Al-hussaniy¹

1. University of Baghdad, Iraq

This scoping review protocol addresses a timely and increasingly relevant psychological construct, and it demonstrates methodological strength by adopting the Arksey and O'Malley framework, PRISMA-ScR guidance, and protocol registration, which collectively enhance transparency and reproducibility. The manuscript is conceptually well-grounded, provides a comprehensive historical and theoretical background, and appropriately recognizes the multidisciplinary nature of toxic positivity. However, the protocol would benefit from several refinements to strengthen methodological clarity and scientific rigor. The search strategy appears relatively narrow and should be expanded by including additional major databases such as PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Embase, alongside a more detailed and reproducible grey literature search methodology. The eligibility criteria require clearer operational definitions, particularly regarding acceptable evidence types and quality thresholds, to reduce potential bias arising from extensive inclusion of non-peer-reviewed sources. Additionally, the research questions are broad and could be strengthened by incorporating methodological and measurement-focused objectives, including how toxic positivity has been operationalized and assessed across studies. The background section is somewhat lengthy and could be streamlined to improve focus, while the protocol should clarify that results sections are prospective rather than analytical. Furthermore, inclusion of a plan for optional quality appraisal or evidence mapping, even if not mandatory for scoping reviews, would enhance credibility. Overall, the protocol presents a valuable foundation for synthesizing emerging literature but would gain greater academic robustness and clarity through expanded search strategies, refined eligibility criteria, clearer operational definitions, and improved structural conciseness.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.