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| PART 1: Review Comments |
| 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 is a valuable contribution to the scientific community, particularly as it addresses the essential traits and competencies required for effective digital leadership in a world increasingly dominated by technology. By systematically reviewing a range of literature from reputable databases, it offers a structured understanding of key digital leadership characteristics, helping to clarify and standardize the concept across various fields. The findings, which include qualities such as global vision, adaptability, and a focus on collaboration and innovation, provide a comprehensive framework that can guide future research and practical applications. This work is significant not only for scholars but also for organizations seeking guidance on leadership during digital transformation, making it both relevant and impactful.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title, "Digital Leadership Characteristics: A Systematic Literature Review," is clear and descriptive, effectively communicating the paper's primary focus on digital leadership characteristics through a systematic review approach.** |  |
| 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 is generally well-structured and covers the study's objectives, methodology, and main findings. However, a few refinements could improve clarity and completeness:*** **Clarify the importance of digital leadership: Begin by explaining why digital leadership is crucial for modern organizations, providing a stronger rationale for the study.**
* **Specify the methodology in more detail: While it mentions a "systematic literature review," it would be helpful to add brief details on the selection criteria for the 20 publications to strengthen methodological transparency.**
 |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **The manuscript has a clear and logical structure, generally appropriate for a systematic literature review. The sections include an introduction, literature review, methodology, results, and discussion, as well as practical implications, limitations, and conclusions, covering the essential aspects for this type of paper.****However, a few improvements could further enhance the flow and clarity:****Add subheadings within the Literature Review: Organizing the review into distinct themes or areas (e.g., "Traditional Leadership Characteristics," "Leadership in the Digital Era") helps readers navigate through the historical and theoretical background before focusing on digital leadership.****Enhance the Methodology section: Expanding on the criteria for including/excluding studies and a more detailed search flow could improve transparency and rigor.****Streamline the Results and Discussion sections: Condensing overlapping content, especially in characteristic descriptions, can improve readability and emphasize key findings.** |  |
| **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.** | **This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness by systematically reviewing a well-defined selection of literature sources, employing a reliable, methodologically transparent process to examine digital leadership characteristics. By using multiple, reputable databases and applying inclusion criteria, it minimizes selection bias and enhances the comprehensiveness of its findings. The methodological rigor is further supported by content analysis, which synthesizes complex qualitative data into a coherent set of digital leadership traits. In presenting these results, the paper offers a well-rounded perspective on the key competencies required for digital leaders, making it a valuable, scientifically grounded contribution to leadership studies.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **The references in this manuscript are extensive and cover a range of foundational and contemporary sources, which supports the depth of the review. However, while most references are recent (from 2015 to 2022), a few more current references from 2023-2024 on emerging digital leadership trends and competencies could further enhance the relevance. These could include studies on AI's impact on leadership or the evolving role of digital competencies in organizational resilience.****To strengthen the review, consider adding references like:*** **Recent studies on AI-driven digital leadership competencies, such as how leaders adapt AI insights for strategic decision-making and team management.**
* **Meta-analyses on digital transformation in different industries (e.g., healthcare, finance), which provide insights into digital leadership adaptations in various contexts.**
* **Research on digital resilience and adaptability in leadership, focusing on how leaders foster resilience during rapid technological changes.**
 |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The language quality of the article is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, with clear, formal language used throughout. However, there are minor grammatical issues, such as inconsistent verb tenses and occasional awkward phrasing, which could be refined for greater clarity and readability. For instance, rephrasing certain sentences in the literature review and methodology sections could improve fluency. A final proofreading for grammar, punctuation, and consistency would ensure it meets the highest standards for academic publication.** |  |
| Optional/General comments | **The manuscript provides a well-rounded, insightful examination of digital leadership characteristics, and its systematic approach strengthens its scholarly contribution. The review captures the essential traits for digital leaders, which is particularly relevant as organizations increasingly rely on digital transformation. Minor improvements, such as refining the language, expanding recent references, and clarifying the methodological steps, would enhance its readability and robustness. Overall, this paper holds value for both researchers and practitioners aiming to understand and cultivate effective digital leadership in today’s fast-evolving landscape.****Based on a general review of the structure, depth, and alignment of the content provided in the manuscript, here is an overall assessment:****Strengths:*** **Clarity and Structure: The manuscript is well-organized, with clear sections including an abstract, introduction, literature review, methodology, discussion, and conclusions.**
* **Depth of Research: It employs a systematic literature review approach, which is appropriate for identifying the specific characteristics of digital leadership, and demonstrates a thorough engagement with relevant literature.**
* **Use of Sources: Citations from a variety of scholarly sources indicate that the authors have conducted a broad review of literature on digital leadership.**

**Areas for Improvement:*** **Writing and Language: Some sentences are lengthy or complex, which may impact readability and clarity.**
* **Data Representation: For a systematic review, the inclusion of more detailed figures, tables, or data visualizations could enhance understanding, particularly in the findings and analysis sections.**

***There do not appear to be any ethical issues in this manuscript, as it is based solely on a systematic literature review and does not involve primary data collection, human subjects, or sensitive information. The study follows a standard research methodology that analyzes publicly available literature, which typically does not present ethical concerns. As long as proper citations are used, and sources are accurately represented, this type of research is generally considered ethically sound.*** |  |
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|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
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