

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

Antoine Melki¹

¹ Balamand University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper suffers of lack of originality. As shown by the references – those that could be found – the problem had been tackled since the 1970's. In addition the author pretends that this paper is the result of 40 years of observation, without providing any proof that he had this hypothesis for 40 years. The originality is doubtful.

As for the literature, the volume of references is good, but they are not used systematically as if the author has something in mind and he using the references only to claim a theoretical support in the form of pretend play.

In terms of methodology, the paper's argument is not built on an appropriate base of theory but is relying mainly on the author's experience. The methodology presented is so brief and not relying on any known path. In addition, there are many generalizations in the text which are not always convincing. Not all the online references are available for checking.

The discussion is so short and the conclusions give an impression of hastiness. The recommendations are general and suffer the same broad quality issues.

The topic is very important but very sensible. So it should be tackled with the highest attention to details and conclusions. To create impact a fiull plan should be devised.

The language employed is clear but not very concise with unnecessary jargon although without any complex terminology. The structure needs improvement. The logical flow of ideas is fine but the narrative of the research process is not coherent enough. The background information and context are sufficient to establish the relevance and significance of the study. A good understanding of previous research is not finely demonstrated by the use of relevant sources. Limitations are acknowledged and future research is suggested but the summary of findings and their implications is not concise.