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| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript presents a meaningful topic, exploring how transformational leadership could improve healthcare practitioner performance, particularly within African healthcare systems. It addresses a vital aspect of healthcare management, emphasizing that effective leadership is crucial to enhancing work conditions, practitioner satisfaction, and patient outcomes. The study effectively utilizes a structured literature review to gather insights and establish a foundation for transformational leadership's potential benefits.  However, there are notable areas for improvement that would enhance the manuscript's rigor and applicability. Firstly, the literature review is limited primarily to studies within African contexts; broadening the scope to include global examples could provide a more comprehensive understanding of transformational leadership's impacts and applicability in varied healthcare environments. Additionally, the manuscript could benefit from deeper analysis and critical comparison of transformational leadership with other styles, such as transactional and servant leadership, which might yield equally valuable insights for healthcare settings. Lastly, while the manuscript emphasizes the theoretical basis and leadership benefits, a more robust methodology and detailed data synthesis—perhaps through meta-analytic techniques—would add to the scientific depth and allow for stronger, evidence-based conclusions that are actionable for healthcare leaders. These improvements would significantly enhance the manuscript's contribution to the scientific community and its practical relevance for healthcare organizations. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title, "Effective Care by Healthcare Providers to Increase Work Productivity: A Look at the Theory of Transformational Leadership," could be refined to better reflect the focus and content of the manuscript. The phrase “Effective Care by Healthcare Providers” may not clearly convey that the primary emphasis is on leadership's role in improving healthcare practitioners' work productivity. Additionally, “A Look at the Theory of Transformational Leadership” suggests a broad overview rather than a focused review of empirical evidence and practical implications.  A more precise and engaging title could be:  "Transformational Leadership in Healthcare: Enhancing Practitioner Performance and Work Productivity through Effective Leadership Strategies" |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract provides a solid overview of the manuscript's purpose, focus on transformational leadership, and its relevance to healthcare practitioner performance. However, it could be more comprehensive by clarifying certain aspects and enhancing coherence. Here are some suggested improvements:  Clarify Research Scope and Methods: The abstract should mention the specific focus on African healthcare settings, as this regional context is crucial to understanding the study’s relevance and findings. Adding a brief statement about the research methodology—specifically, the structured literature review approach—would also give readers a clearer understanding of the research design.  Expand on Key Findings: While the abstract touches on outcomes like job satisfaction and motivation, it could benefit from a slightly expanded summary of the main findings. Including additional specific outcomes, such as teamwork, job commitment, and reduced burnout, would make the abstract more robust.  Specify Practical Implications: The recommendation that healthcare leaders should adopt transformational leadership is mentioned briefly, but it could be strengthened. Consider adding a sentence on how these leadership strategies can be applied practically within healthcare organizations to improve performance, which would enhance the abstract’s relevance to practitioners and policymakers.  Refine Language and Flow: Minor adjustments to the language can improve readability. For example, “transforming the healthcare environment to be more supportive of healthcare practitioners…” could be rephrased for conciseness, such as “creating a supportive healthcare environment through effective leadership…” |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The structure and subsections of the manuscript are generally appropriate, following a logical flow from the introduction through the literature review, methodology, results, and discussion. However, certain areas could be improved to enhance clarity and coherence, especially for readers seeking specific insights. Here are some recommendations:  Introduction: This section introduces the study effectively but could benefit from a more explicit outline of the research problem and objectives. A clear statement on the need for this study and the knowledge gap it addresses would strengthen the introduction.  Background of the Study: The "Background" section is essential, but it might be better integrated into the “Introduction” to avoid redundancy. By combining these sections, the manuscript can provide a more streamlined overview, leading into a focused literature review.  Literature Review: The literature review is comprehensive but might benefit from a clearer organization. Dividing this section into subtopics that focus on specific components of transformational leadership (e.g., idealized influence, inspirational motivation) as they relate to healthcare could improve readability and comprehension.  Methods: The methods section is well-defined, covering the structured literature review approach and inclusion criteria. However, separating the “Data Analysis” and “Statistical Data Analysis” sections could make it clearer for readers to distinguish between qualitative and quantitative analysis aspects.  Results and Discussion: While these sections provide detailed insights, they could benefit from further integration. Currently, there is some overlap between findings and interpretations that might be streamlined by clearly distinguishing between the results (specific findings from the reviewed studies) and the discussion (interpretation of those findings within the context of existing literature).  Conclusion: The conclusion section is appropriate, summarizing the findings and emphasizing the importance of transformational leadership. However, it could be expanded with specific, actionable recommendations for healthcare managers or policymakers, as well as suggestions for future research.  Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research: This section is essential and appropriately placed. However, it could be expanded with additional insights on specific areas for future empirical studies, particularly quantitative studies in other geographic regions, to verify the generalizability of the findings.  Suggested Structural Adjustments:  Combine “Introduction” and “Background” for a more concise overview.  Reorganize “Literature Review” with subheadings that reflect key themes of transformational leadership.  Clarify “Methods” by separating qualitative and quantitative analyses for better readability.  Integrate “Results” and “Discussion” with subheadings to avoid redundancy. |  |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor by employing a structured literature review methodology, which is appropriate for synthesizing existing research on transformational leadership within healthcare settings. The manuscript is technically sound in its focus on peer-reviewed, recent studies conducted between 2020 and 2024, which ensures that the conclusions are based on up-to-date and relevant evidence. Additionally, the use of clear inclusion and exclusion criteria, along with a comprehensive data synthesis approach, strengthens the validity of the results by reducing bias and enhancing replicability. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | The manuscript's references are both sufficient and recent, encompassing studies published between 2020 and 2024. This timeframe ensures that the literature review reflects current research trends and findings in the field of transformational leadership within healthcare settings. The selection of peer-reviewed articles and systematic reviews enhances the credibility and depth of the analysis. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language quality of the manuscript is generally adequate for scholarly communication, though several areas could benefit from refinement to improve clarity and precision. Minor grammatical issues are present, such as subject-verb agreement errors and occasional run-on sentences. Correcting these, along with standardizing terms like “healthcare environment” (instead of “health care enviroment”), would contribute to a more professional presentation. Additionally, certain expressions could be made more concise to maintain a formal academic tone; for instance, “transforming the healthcare environment to be more supportive...” might be better phrased as “creating a supportive healthcare environment…” to enhance readability and precision. Consistency in terminology is another area for improvement, as the manuscript switches between terms like “healthcare practitioners,” “healthcare workers,” and “healthcare providers,” which could confuse readers; choosing a primary term and using it consistently would increase coherence. Further, some sentences and sections would benefit from smoother transitions, particularly in the methodology and results sections, to guide readers more fluidly through the manuscript. Finally, a careful proofreading is needed to correct typographical errors such as “avaialble” instead of “available” and “Practioners” instead of “Practitioners,” which will help uphold a high standard of professionalism. Addressing these issues would enhance the manuscript’s language quality and make it fully suitable for scholarly publication. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript presents a valuable investigation into the role of transformational leadership in enhancing healthcare practitioner performance, especially in challenging environments with limited resources. This focus is timely and relevant, given the current emphasis on effective healthcare management and leadership. However, there are areas where the manuscript could be strengthened to maximize its impact. Broadening the scope of the literature to include studies from various global regions would increase the generalizability of the findings and help situate African healthcare settings within a broader context. Additionally, providing a more balanced comparison between transformational leadership and other leadership styles—such as transactional or servant leadership—could yield insights into when and why transformational leadership is particularly beneficial. Lastly, including a practical guide or framework for implementing transformational leadership within healthcare organizations could make the manuscript more actionable for practitioners and policymakers. Overall, these additions would enhance both the scientific contribution and practical relevance of the work.  The manuscript does not present any obvious ethical issues, as it mainly relies on a structured literature review of previously published studies rather than conducting original empirical research involving humans or animals. Therefore, standard ethical considerations regarding participant consent, data confidentiality, or ethical approval from an institutional review board do not directly apply in this case. However, there are some general ethical considerations that should be taken into account for improvement:  Transparency of data sources: It would be useful to provide transparency regarding the criteria for selecting and including studies. Although the methodology section outlines a structured approach to the literature review, providing more detailed information on search terms, databases, and selection processes would increase reproducibility and allow readers to assess the reliability of the sources used.  Potential for publication bias: There is always a risk of publication bias when relying solely on published research, as it may overrepresent positive findings on transformational leadership. Acknowledging this limitation and discussing how it may affect the findings can add ethical rigor to the research.  Cultural sensitivity: Since the focus is on African healthcare settings, cultural considerations related to leadership styles in this context should be recognized to avoid overgeneralizing findings from one cultural setting to others without due caution. |  |
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