

Identifying the Antecedents and Consequences of Health Leadership in the Hospitals of Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, Health and Medical Services

Farideh. Beiranvand¹, Ahmad. Vedadi^{1*}, Alireza. Amir Kabiri¹, Zahra. Boroumand¹



¹ Department of Public Administration, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Ahvedadi@gmail.com

Editor

Marion Fortin¹
Full Professor, TSM-Research,
CNRS, University Toulouse
Capitole, France
marion.fortin@tsm-education.fr

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Manijeh Haghighinasab¹
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran
Email: haghighinasab@srbiau.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Marco Yamba-Yugsi¹
Unidad Académica de Posgrado, Universidad Católica de Cuenca, Azuay 010101,
Ecuador
Email: marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Expand the theoretical framework section to include a detailed discussion of the theories underpinning health leadership, including transformational leadership, servant leadership, and other relevant models. Explain how these theories inform the study's hypothesis and methodology, and how the findings contribute to or challenge existing theoretical understandings.

While the manuscript references various studies, it lacks a critical analysis of the current state of research on health leadership, particularly in the context of hospitals within the Lorestan University of Medical Sciences. Conduct a more exhaustive literature review that critically examines the current research landscape on health leadership in healthcare settings. Identify gaps that your study aims to address, emphasizing how your research contributes new insights or empirical evidence to the field.

The discussion section briefly mentions the implications of the findings but does not sufficiently link these back to broader leadership theories or the implications for healthcare management practice. Strengthen the discussion by more explicitly

connecting your findings to broader leadership theories, discussing the potential implications for healthcare managers and policy-makers. Offer specific, actionable recommendations based on your findings.

Authors revised the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Describe the methodology in greater detail, including the rationale for the chosen sample, the development and validation of the survey instruments, and the statistical methods used for data analysis. This should include a discussion of any measures taken to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings.

The results are presented in a manner that is somewhat difficult to follow, with limited discussion on how the analysis supports the study's hypotheses or the implications of these findings for the development of health leadership in hospitals. Present the data analysis results more clearly, using tables, figures, or models to summarize key findings. Provide a detailed interpretation of how these results support or refute the study's hypotheses, and discuss the implications for health leadership theory and practice.

The manuscript briefly acknowledges limitations but does not fully explore their implications for the study's findings or offer detailed suggestions for future research. Offer a more comprehensive discussion of the study's limitations, including any methodological constraints, potential biases, or generalizability issues. Propose specific directions for future research to build on your findings, such as longitudinal studies or interventions aimed at enhancing health leadership in hospital settings.

While the study aims to inform healthcare management practice, the practical implications of the findings are not clearly articulated. Clearly articulate the practical implications of your findings for healthcare managers and leaders. Discuss how the identified antecedents of health leadership can be leveraged to improve leadership development programs and ultimately enhance healthcare delivery and patient outcomes.

Authors revised the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.