

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

Addisu Melake¹

¹ Debre Tabor University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments to Authors

Strengths:

- The manuscript addresses a significant topic, and the chosen research design appears appropriate. The conclusions are well-aligned with the study's findings.

Areas for Improvement:

- The abstract lacked information regarding the search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and data analysis methods that will be used in the review, if any.
- Too much information was provided in the background section.
- The search term needs to be improved; it is very limited.
- Why didn't the authors search PubMed, Scopus, Web of Sciences, Hinari, and Embase?
- Authors listed searching news articles, magazine articles, blogs, conference proceedings, posters, and essays but didn't mention the database or website to perform such searches.
- Authors haven't mentioned mechanisms to search for grey literature.
- Authors have mentioned that "The study protocol has been registered in OSF for transparency and to facilitate peer review and replication of the research." If the protocol is registered in OSF, what is the need to submit it to publish in the current journal under consideration?