

Peer Review

# Review of: "When Ambition Overshadows Patients: Reflections on Three Pharmaceutical Leadership Personas and the Role of Integrity"

Elahe Hosseini<sup>1</sup>

1. Yazd University, Yazd, Iran

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this paper.

The literature review must engage with the constructs of your analytical framing in a meaningful way. The literature review section could be improved by being more analytical. In other words, building on the existing literature to highlight what is missing and what is yet to be done, and in so doing, outline the theoretical puzzles or debates to which this work contributes. I have concerns related to theoretical development and note the need for a more rigorous critique of the literature to help deepen the theoretical underpinnings of the study.

The discussion section needs to highlight what is new in your findings and what we can learn from a study conducted in this interesting and understudied context. Whilst the introduction sets the stage for the study by justifying its relevance, the discussion is the most important section as it is in the discussion that it is all brought together, and the authors illustrate how and why the study findings advance the literature. Therefore, the discussion needs to illustrate the new insights—the contributions—in a clear and compelling manner. In other words, illustrate what we know now that we did not know before or, in effect, to clearly illustrate the contribution of the study to the different bodies of literature. Furthermore, what are the future research directions based on this new framework?

What are the theoretical and practical implications of your study, and which limitations and possible future research emerge from it? The authors need to draw substantive conclusions from their results and suggest or develop recommendations for further research.

## **Declarations**

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