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| **PART 1: Comments** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part** | This manuscript provides significant insights into the adaptation of leadership styles within Chinese firms amid cross-cultural pressures and organizational change. It enhances comprehension of leadership dynamics in non-Western contexts, pertinent for scholars in global and comparative leadership study. | The manuscript has focused on exploring the recent leadership trends within the Chinese organisations observed since 2020. The article has emphasised on global and cultural shifts encountered in the Chinese corporate firms. The research has also focused on the leadership styles used in the Chinese firms with relevance to the influence of Western culture. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is structurally coherent and has the right keywords, although the word "evolution" may be deceptive because the review only looks at research published after 2020. The idea of "evolution" means looking at how things evolve over time, but the chosen literature doesn't do a good job of doing so because it only covers a short period of time. The authors should either change the title to show that it focuses on current developments or make the study's coverage bigger to make the evolutionary framing make sense. | Thanks for your comment. Yes it is true that, the time span is really short, and it is the reason, I will also revise the research title by specifying the time period, “RESEARCH ON EVALUATING THE RECENT LEADERSHIP TRENDS IN THE CHINESE CORPORATE FIRMS FROM 2020 TO 2025: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW” |
| **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 gives a general idea of what the study was about, how it was done, and what the main results were. It would be better, though, if it were clearer and more complete. The authors should begin with one or two sentences that explain the study's background or purpose (introduction). Second, the abstract should quickly state when the literature was examined and what the criteria were for included it, especially given the study says it is looking at "evolution." Third, the findings should be more carefully expressed because there are only 10 research in the data set. Finally, adding a phrase addressing the theoretical framework and real-world effects would make the abstract more useful for scholars. A more organized and to-the-point abstract would better show what the study is about and how important it is. | I have understood your comment and I will also revise the abstract accordingly through highlighting introduction, inclusion criteria and theoretical framework for improving the overall abstract of the research. |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | * The manuscript does not specify the number of reviewers engaged in the selection, screening, and data extraction processes. Please tell us if at least two reviewers did these steps on their own. If this is the case, please explain how the differences were settled, such as by reaching a consensus or having a third party decide. If there was only one reviewer, this should be made apparent and talked about as a methodological limitation because it makes bias more likely. * The manuscript often talks about the "evolution" of leadership methods, like in the title, abstract, and goals. The inclusion criteria, on the other hand, limit the review to research that were published after 2020, hence hindering the evaluation of temporal trends. In my opinion, this time range is too short to show how something has changed over time. The authors could either expand the literature review to encompass previous investigations or reframe the study to concentrate on recent advancements instead of evolution. * The manuscript delineates three distinct study aims; but, only the first and third are adequately covered. The examination of diverse leadership styles is illustrative however deficient in a unified or comparative structure. The evaluation of leadership efficacy in fostering innovation is credible, however slightly exaggerated due to the restricted and contemporary evidence base. The second objective—assessing the determinants of leadership behaviors “over the past decades”—is the least substantiated. The study only looks at papers that were published after 2020, as we said in the note on the inclusion criteria. This short time span doesn't let us look at how leadership techniques have changed over time or how they have changed in the past. To enhance the congruence between the articulated objectives and the actual analytical scope, the authors should either (1) amend the temporal framing of the goals to emphasize recent developments, or (2) broaden the inclusion criteria to encompass prior studies that more effectively demonstrate longitudinal change. * The manuscript fails to recognize the omission of Chinese-language literature in both the discussion and restrictions sections. This absence is notable because the study focuses on leadership practices in Chinese companies, where research published in China may provide important cultural and contextual insights. Limiting the inclusion criteria to English-language peer-reviewed journals creates a linguistic bias that could lead to a fragmented or Western-centric comprehension of the leadership landscape in China.  This issue is especially important in areas like leadership and organizational behavior, where cultural differences have a big impact on both theory and practice. Furthermore, the manuscript fails to elucidate whether the authors possess the requisite fluency in the Chinese language or acquaintance with its culture to engage with native-language sources. If this kind of expertise isn't present, it should be recognized as a restriction, along with how it affects the depth and legitimacy of the findings. Future studies ought to integrate Chinese-language literature to achieve a more thorough and culturally informed synthesis. | * The manuscript has an involvement of three reviewers and I will add this information in the methodology section of the research. * I understood that the duration is short to observe the evolution of leadership practices. It is the reason I have also specified the duration in the research objectives. * The objectives have been revised based on your comment and I have also specified them by removing the term decades to the duration between 2020 to 2025. * I totally agree with your concern regarding omission of Chinese-language literature. The main reason behind limiting the article to English language is increasing its reach worldwide to a broader level as English language is globally used and prioritised. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** |  | I have used the recent studies published after 2020 to avoid the outdated information. |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The writing in the article is mostly clear, but it needs a lot of editing to be good enough for a high-quality academic journal. Some parts are too long, have grammar mistakes, use strange language, and aren't very precise academically. The authors should get help from a native English-speaking academic editor or a professional proofreading service to improve the tone, grammar, and style of the paper. | I will effectively focus on identifying the grammatical errors across the manuscript article to address them and enhancing the quality. |
| **Optional/General** comments |  |  |
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| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)*  No | The study completely relied upon the secondary data sources, therefore no ethical issues were identified which are usually observed in case of human involvement. |