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**Responses to Editor and Reviewers**

**Date:**

**Cycle: 1st**

**Please Write the Article Title**

Dear Editor and Dear Reviewers,

We appreciate you and the reviewers for your precious time in reviewing our paper and providing valuable comments. Thanks to your valuable and insightful comments, we have put our greatest efforts to make improvements in the current version. We have carefully considered the comments and tried our best to address every one of them. We hope the manuscript after careful revisions meet your high standards. Accordingly, we can confirm that the proofreading process was conducted with the utmost care and attention to detail, and we are confident that the article meets the high standards required for publication in your esteemed journal. The proofreading was carried out by a qualified native speaker, who ensured that the manuscript is free of grammatical and spelling errors and that the content is coherent and well-structured. The authors welcome further constructive comments if any. We look forward to hearing from you regarding our submission and to respond to any further questions and comments you may have.

Thank you for considering our article for publication.

Sincerely,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Explanation and Comments for the Author** | **Responses to Comments or Applied process** |
| **Reviewer 1** | |
| Reviewer #1: Repetitive statements should be reviewed in the summary section. | We sincerely appreciate your valuable feedback and insightful suggestions on our manuscript submitted to the journal. In accordance with your suggestions, we have thoroughly reviewed this section and eliminated the repetitive statements to improve clarity and conciseness. We believe these revisions significantly enhance our manuscript and better address your concerns. Once again, we thank you for your constructive feedback and guidance. We hope that these changes meet your expectations and look forward to your further evaluation of our improved manuscript. |
| Reviewer #1: unnecessary space | We appreciate your attention to detail. The unnecessary space you highlighted has been removed to enhance the formatting and presentation of the paper. |
| Reviewer #1: It would be better for the organization of the article to make a smooth transition here and continue after a title that establishes a relationship between leadership and metaphor. | We acknowledge your suggestion for a smoother transition in the article. Accordingly, we have revised the structure. |
| Reviewer #1: Before coming here, a connection with the leadership should be established in the context of some socioeconomic disadvantage. | We agree that establishing a connection between leadership and socioeconomic disadvantage prior to the section in question would strengthen our argument. This connection has now been clearly articulated in the revised manuscript. |
| Reviewer #1: How will participants do this? It seems more appropriate for the researcher to do | Thank you for raising this point. We have amended the manuscript to clarify that the tasks you referred to will indeed be carried out by the researcher, not the participants, to avoid any confusion. We have deleted the related question. |
| Reviewer #1: I think this title is not necessary for the purpose of this research. It distracts the focus and expands it unnecessarily. | We appreciate your critique regarding the unnecessary title. Following your suggestion, we have removed this title to maintain the focus and compactness of the research. |
| Reviewer #1: Unattributed table 1 appears and it is not clear why it is given.  Did the authors create it or was it copy-pasted from somewhere?  If so, it should be removed.  Do not create tables in jpg format. Add a table from Word. | We have deleted the related section. |
| Reviewer #1: The table must be interpreted. | We have deleted the related section. |
| Reviewer #1: The comment I made for Table 1 also applies to Table 2. | We have deleted the related section. |
| Reviewer #1: 12 pages and 53 pages in total are too long for an article, even if it is qualitative, and even if it is an interesting topic, it is too long.  It should definitely be reduced  Essential parts should remain.  As a reader, I want to read the main topic unless there is a very unusual technical detail, and when it is long, it distracts me and can be deterrent.  We come to the literature on page 12. | We recognize your concern regarding the length of the article. Accordingly, we have condensed the manuscript, focusing on retaining essential parts and removing extraneous details. This should make the article more engaging and accessible to readers. |
| Reviewer #1: This is where the literature on management and method continues.  It is not suitable technically and in terms of content. | Thank you for your feedback on the technical and content organization. We have restructured these sections for better alignment with standard practices and improved readability. |
| Reviewer #1: There was also table 1 before. Check the tab names. | The issue with duplicated table names has been rectified. Each table now has a unique and appropriate title. |
| Reviewer #1: Words can be reduced by half. | We have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript and successfully reduced the word count by half, focusing on succinctness without compromising the quality of content. |
| Reviewer #1: Can be shortened | We have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript and successfully reduced the word count by half, focusing on succinctness without compromising the quality of content. |
| Reviewer #1: The quotes are very long, in fact they repeat similar things. | The quotes have been shortened and repetition reduced. We have also revised the narrative style to make it less mechanistic and more engaging, enhancing the readability of the qualitative research. |
| Reviewer #1: This and similar report format was also present in the previous paragraphs. It makes the narrative style in qualitative research very mechanistic. It's not very attractive either. I understand what you want to do is present evidence, list etc. However, it is difficult to read and disrupts fluency. | We have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript. |
| Reviewer #1: This is what I have stated in previous themes in terms of technique and reporting, and it also applies to viewers. That is, it is valid for all findings. | We have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript. |
| Reviewer #1: The effects of this research on theory and practice should be written clearly in an average paragraph. | Your suggestion is well-received. A clear and concise paragraph has been added to explicitly state the effects of this research on theory and practice. |
| **Reviewer 2** | |
| Reviewer #2: | We appreciate your feedback on our revised manuscript and your suggestion to undertake another round of proofreading. In response to your concerns, we have carefully proofread the entire manuscript once more, paying particular attention to grammar, punctuation, and clarity of expression. We have significantly shortened the introduction section, ensuring it is concise yet comprehensive. |
| Reviewer #2: I strognly advise you to shorten the introduction section. This is like a thesis in format and lenght. | Following your suggestion, we have condensed the literature review section, retaining only the most critical references and discussions. |
| Reviewer #2: Also you may shorten the literature. | Following your suggestion, we have condensed the literature review section, retaining only the most critical references and discussions. |
| Reviewer #2: You should use as Türkiye throughout the paper. | We have amended the manuscript to consistently use 'Türkiye' throughout, in line with the recent change in the country's English name. |
| Reviewer #2: There are many redundant information here and in other parts of the paper. You should write in article format rather than a thesis. | We acknowledge your point regarding the redundancy and thesis-like format. The manuscript has been revised to adopt a more article-centric approach, removing redundant information. |
| Reviewer #2: No need to report this information. I mean this saying thesis format. | Based on your feedback, we have eliminated sections of the paper that mirrored a thesis format, focusing instead on conciseness and relevance to the article format. |
| Reviewer #2: What about your ethical committee approval? | We apologize for the oversight. Ethical committee approval was obtained for this study, and the relevant information and approval number have now been included in the Methods section of the manuscript. |

***General comment***

We thank both reviewers for their constructive feedback and hope that these revisions adequately address the concerns raised. We believe that these changes have significantly improved the quality and readability of our manuscript. We believe that these additional revisions have significantly improved the quality of our manuscript and eliminated any remaining language-related issues. We are grateful for your attention to detail and constructive feedback, and we hope that the revised manuscript now meets your expectations.

You can follow the proofreading operations performed in the "track changes" mode.

Thank you for your time and consideration, and we look forward to your further evaluation of our improved manuscript.