Comprehensive Health and Biomedical Studies
Volume 3 · Issue 3 · e161245

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Investigating the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Academic Performance Among Medical Student

Elahe Haghighat-Manesh, Farzad Ghasemzadeh Ajirlou, Soudabeh Hamedi-Shahraki, Fatemeh Shahriari

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
2 Nov 2024	15 Dec 2024	25 Jan 2025	10.5812/chbs-161245

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 3, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 5

Authors' reply to reviewers 6

Reviewer and editor comments 18

1 Original submission

3 comments · 10 Apr 2025 – 5 May 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 10 Apr 2025

I accept your valuable work.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 1 May 2025

- Subject
- 1) Is the article within the scope of the journal? Yes
- 2) Does the article have novelty? Yes
- Title
- 3) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? It is better to write: Investigating the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and academic performance among medical students
- 4) Is there any abbreviation in the title? No
- Abstract
- 5) Is there a structured Abstract? Yes
- 6) Are Keywords (3-10) selected from MESH? Yes
- Introduction
- 7) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) Yes
- 8) Does the Introduction include: "What we know," "What we don't know" and "Aims"? Start with an introduction to artificial intelligence and then discuss the education of medical students and its problems.
-
- Materials And Methods
- 9) Is the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls) clearly described? Yes
- 10) Study Design Described Sufficiently? A cross-sectional descriptive-analytical study
- 11) Adequacy of the sample studied? Yes
- 12) Subjects Representative of Target Population?
- 13) Provided sample size calculation or justification? No
- 14) Control Subjects Appropriate?
- 15) Power of study declared? Yes
- 16) Reported actual P values for primary analyses? Yes
- 17) Blinding of Investigators (if applicable)?
- 18) Blinding of subjects (if applicable)?
- 19) Are the methods and apparatus identified (give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses)?
- 20) Are procedures identified in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?
- 21) Are all drugs and chemicals used identified precisely, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?
- 22) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? Yes
- 23) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? Yes
- Results
- 24) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables and Figures? Yes
- 25) Are results presented in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings? Yes
- 26) Duplicate data in graphs and tables? No

• 27) Are technical terms used as non-technical terms in statistics, such as “random” (which implies a randomizing device), “normal,” “significant,” “correlations,” and “sample”? Yes
• Discussion
• 28) Conclusion justified & substantiated? Yes
• 29) Analysis supports Conclusion? Yes
• References
• 30) Proper Writing of the References? Yes
• 31) References for the last five years? Yes

Editor-in-Chief MINOR REVISION 5 May 2025

Public Comment:
• Subject
• 1) Is the article within the scope of the journal? yes
• 2) Does the article have novelty? yes
• Title
• 3) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? It is better to write: Investigation of the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and academic performance among medical students
• 4) Is there any abbreviation in the title? No
• Abstract
• 5) Is there a structured Abstract? yes
• 6) Are Keywords (3-10) selected from MESH? yes
• Introduction
• 7) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) yes
• 8) Does the Introduction include “What we know,” “What we don’t know” and “Aims”? Start with an introduction to artificial intelligence and then discuss the education of medical students and its problems.
•
• Materials And Methods
• 9) Is the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls) clearly described? yes
• 10) Study Design Described Sufficiently? A cross-sectional descriptive-analytical study
• 11) Adequacy of the sample studied? yes
• 12) Subjects Representative of Target Population?
• 13) Is a sample size calculation or justification provided? No
• 14) Control Subjects Appropriate?
• 15) Power of study declared? yes
• 16) Reported actual P values for primary analyses? Yes
• 17) Blinding of Investigators (if applicable)?
• 18) Blinding of subjects (if applicable)?
• 19) Are the methods and apparatus identified (give the manufacturer’s name and address in parentheses)?
• 20) Are procedures identified in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?
• 21) Are all drugs and chemicals used precisely identified, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?
• 22) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? Yes
• 23) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? yes
• Results
• 24) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables and Figures? yes
• 25) Are results presented in a logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most

important findings? yes

- 26) Duplicate data in graphs and tables? no
- 27) Are technical terms used nontechnically in statistics, such as “random” (which implies a randomizing device), “normal,” “significant,” “correlations,” and “sample”? yes
- Discussion
- 28) Conclusion justified & substantiated? yes
- 29) Analysis supports Conclusion? yes
- References
- 30) Proper Writing of the References? yes
- 31) References for the last five years? Yes

Decision:
Minor revision

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reply to Reviewers

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the esteemed reviewers for their thoughtful and constructive feedback. Below, we have provided point-by-point responses to each comment. Revisions made in the manuscript have been highlighted accordingly.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. I accept your valuable work

- Thank you very much for your kind and encouraging comment. We truly appreciate your positive feedback

Reviewer 2:

• Subject

• 1) Is the article within the scope of the journal? Yes

- Thank you for confirming that the article is within the scope of the journal. We appreciate your support.

• 2) Does the article have novelty? Yes

- Thank you for recognizing the novelty of our work. We are grateful for your positive evaluation.

• Title

• 3) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? It is better to write: investigation the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and academic performance among medical student

- Thank you for your suggestion. We agree that the title should clearly reflect the content of the study. However, we noticed a minor grammatical issue in the suggested version. We have revised the title to: “Investigating the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Academic Performance Among Medical Students”

• 4) Is there any abbreviation in the title? No

- Thank you for your comment. As you mentioned, there is no unexplained abbreviation in the title. "EI" is defined in full as "Emotional Intelligence" at its first mention.

• Abstract

• 5) Is there a structured Abstract? Yes

- Thank you for your confirmation. We have ensured that the abstract is structured according to the journal’s guidelines.

• 6) Are Keywords (3-10) selected from MESH? Yes

- Thank you for your comment. We confirm that the keywords have been selected from MeSH

• Introduction

• 7) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) yes

- Thank you for your positive feedback. We are pleased that the objectives of the study are clear and well-stated.

• 8) Does Introduction include: "What we know," "What we don't know" and "Aims"? Start with an introduction to artificial intelligence and then discuss the education of medical students and its problems.

We appreciate your insightful feedback. We were unsure whether the reference to "artificial intelligence" was intentional or a typographical error, as our study focuses on emotional intelligence. Assuming the intended focus was emotional intelligence, we revised the final paragraph of the introduction to more clearly outline the knowns, unknowns, and the aim of the study. This addition highlights the research gap and states our objectives explicitly.

• Materials And Methods

• 9) Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls) ?yes

Thank you for your positive comment. We are glad that the description of participant selection was clear and satisfactory.

• 10) Study Design Described Sufficiently? A cross-sectional descriptive-analytical study

- *Thank you for your comment. the study design has been revised and clearly described as a cross-sectional descriptive-analytical study in the main text. We have highlighted this change in the text for your convenience. We appreciate your feedback.*

• 11) Adequacy of the sample studied? Yes

- *Thank you for your positive feedback. We are pleased that you found the sample size adequate for the study.*

• 12) Subjects Representative of Target Population?

- *Thank you for your comment. While the reviewers did not specifically address this question, we would like to confirm that the subjects in our study are representative of the target population, ensuring the generalizability of our findings.*

• 13) Provided sample size calculation or justification? No

- *Thank you for your commentIn response to your feedback, we have now added a justification for the sample size in the relevant section of the manuscript and highlighted the revised parts for your convenience. We appreciate your valuable input.*

• 14ontrol Subjects Appropriate?

- *The reviewers did not provide any specific comment on this item, and it does not apply to our study, as control subjects were not relevant to our research design.*

• 15) Power of study declared? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We appreciate that you acknowledged the power of the study was declared.*

• 16) Reported actual P values for primary analyses? Yes

- *Thank you for your observation. We have ensured that the actual P values for all primary analyses are clearly reported in the Results section.*

• 17) Blinding of Investigators (if applicable)?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 18) Blinding of subjects (if applicable)?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 19) Identify the methods apparatus (give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses)?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 20) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 21) Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 22) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We are pleased that the inclusion and exclusion criteria were found to be clearly explained in the manuscript.*

• 23) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? Yes

- *Thank you for your positive comment. We are glad that the statistical analysis used in the study was deemed appropriate.*

• Results

• 24) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables and Figures? Yes

- *Thank you for your feedback. We are pleased that the tables and figures were found to be appropriate, clear, and adequate in presenting the study findings.*

• 25) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings?yes

- *Thank you for your positive comment. We are glad that the results were presented in a logical sequence, highlighting the main and most important findings effectively through the text, tables, and illustrations.*

• 26) Duplicate data in graphs and tables? No

- *Thank you for your comment. We confirm that there is no duplicate data in the graphs and tables. Each element is presented uniquely to avoid redundancy.*

27) Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as "random" (which implies a randomizing device), "normal," "significant," "correlations," and "sample."?yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We have ensured that technical terms such as "random," "normal," "significant," "correlations," and "sample" are used appropriately and clearly in the manuscript, while making them understandable for a broader audience where necessary.*

• Discussion

• 28) Conclusion justified & substantiated? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We are glad that you found the conclusion to be well-justified and substantiated based on the study's findings.*

• 29) Analysis supports Conclusion? Yes

- *Thank you for your feedback. We are pleased that the analysis was found to support the conclusion drawn in the study.*

• References

• 30) Proper Writing of the References? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We are glad that the references were found to be properly written and formatted according to the journal's guidelines.*

• 31) References for the last five years? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We have ensured that the majority of the references used in the manuscript are from the last five years to maintain the relevance and currency of the study.*

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

• Subject

• 1) Is the article within the scope of the journal? Yes

- Thank you for confirming that the article is within the scope of the journal. We appreciate your support.

• 2) Does the article have novelty? Yes

- Thank you for recognizing the novelty of our work. We are grateful for your positive evaluation.

• Title

• 3) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? It is better to write: investigation the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and academic performance among medical student

- Thank you for your suggestion. We agree that the title should clearly reflect the content of the study. However, we noticed a minor grammatical issue in the suggested version. We have revised the title to: “Investigating the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Academic Performance Among Medical Students”

• 4) Is there any abbreviation in the title? No

- Thank you for your comment. As you mentioned, there is no unexplained abbreviation in the title. "EI" is defined in full as "Emotional Intelligence" at its first mention.

• Abstract

• 5) Is there a structured Abstract? Yes

- Thank you for your confirmation. We have ensured that the abstract is structured according to the journal’s guidelines.

• 6) Are Keywords (3-10) selected from MESH? Yes

- Thank you for your comment. We confirm that the keywords have been selected from MeSH

• Introduction

• 7) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) yes

- Thank you for your positive feedback. We are pleased that the objectives of the study are clear and well-stated.

• 8) Does Introduction include: “What we know,” “What we don’t know” and “Aims”? Start with an introduction to artificial intelligence and then discuss the education of medical students and its problems.

We appreciate your insightful feedback. We were unsure whether the reference to “artificial intelligence” was intentional or a typographical error, as our study focuses on emotional intelligence. Assuming the intended focus was emotional intelligence, we revised the final paragraph of the introduction to more clearly outline the knowns, unknowns, and the aim of the study. This addition highlights the research gap and states our objectives explicitly.

• Materials And Methods

• 9) Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls) ?yes

Thank you for your positive comment. We are glad that the description of participant selection was clear and satisfactory.

• 10) Study Design Described Sufficiently? A cross-sectional descriptive-analytical study

- *Thank you for your comment. the study design has been revised and clearly described as a cross-sectional descriptive-analytical study in the main text. We have highlighted this change in the text for your convenience. We appreciate your feedback.*

• 11) Adequacy of the sample studied? Yes

- *Thank you for your positive feedback. We are pleased that you found the sample size adequate for the study.*

• 12) Subjects Representative of Target Population?

- *Thank you for your comment. While the reviewers did not specifically address this question, we would like to confirm that the subjects in our study are representative of the target population, ensuring the generalizability of our findings.*

• 13) Provided sample size calculation or justification? No

- *Thank you for your commentIn response to your feedback, we have now added a justification for the sample size in the relevant section of the manuscript and highlighted the revised parts for your convenience. We appreciate your valuable input.*

• 14ontrol Subjects Appropriate?

- *The reviewers did not provide any specific comment on this item, and it does not apply to our study, as control subjects were not relevant to our research design.*

• 15) Power of study declared? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We appreciate that you acknowledged the power of the study was declared.*

• 16) Reported actual P values for primary analyses? Yes

- *Thank you for your observation. We have ensured that the actual P values for all primary analyses are clearly reported in the Results section.*

• 17) Blinding of Investigators (if applicable)?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 18) Blinding of subjects (if applicable)?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 19) Identify the methods apparatus (give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses)?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 20) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 21) Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 22) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We are pleased that the inclusion and exclusion criteria were found to be clearly explained in the manuscript.*

• 23) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? Yes

- *Thank you for your positive comment. We are glad that the statistical analysis used in the study was deemed appropriate.*

• Results

• 24) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables and Figures? Yes

- *Thank you for your feedback. We are pleased that the tables and figures were found to be appropriate, clear, and adequate in presenting the study findings.*

• 25) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings?yes

- *Thank you for your positive comment. We are glad that the results were presented in a logical sequence, highlighting the main and most important findings effectively through the text, tables, and illustrations.*

• 26) Duplicate data in graphs and tables? No

- *Thank you for your comment. We confirm that there is no duplicate data in the graphs and tables. Each element is presented uniquely to avoid redundancy.*

27) Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as "random" (which implies a randomizing device), "normal," "significant," "correlations," and "sample."?yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We have ensured that technical terms such as "random," "normal," "significant," "correlations," and "sample" are used appropriately and clearly in the manuscript, while making them understandable for a broader audience where necessary.*

• Discussion

• 28) Conclusion justified & substantiated? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We are glad that you found the conclusion to be well-justified and substantiated based on the study's findings.*

• 29) Analysis supports Conclusion? Yes

- *Thank you for your feedback. We are pleased that the analysis was found to support the conclusion drawn in the study.*

• References

• 30) Proper Writing of the References? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We are glad that the references were found to be properly written and formatted according to the journal's guidelines.*

• 31) References for the last five years? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We have ensured that the majority of the references used in the manuscript are from the last five years to maintain the relevance and currency of the study.*

EIC Decision:

Public Comment:

• Subject

• 1) Is the article within the scope of the journal? Yes

- Thank you for confirming that the article is within the scope of the journal. We appreciate your support.

• 2) Does the article have novelty? Yes

- Thank you for recognizing the novelty of our work. We are grateful for your positive evaluation.

• Title

• 3) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? It is better to write: investigation the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and academic performance among medical student

- Thank you for your suggestion. We agree that the title should clearly reflect the content of the study. However, we noticed a minor grammatical issue in the suggested version. We have revised the title to: “Investigating the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Academic Performance Among Medical Students”

• 4) Is there any abbreviation in the title? No

- Thank you for your comment. As you mentioned, there is no unexplained abbreviation in the title. "EI" is defined in full as "Emotional Intelligence" at its first mention.

• Abstract

• 5) Is there a structured Abstract? Yes

- Thank you for your confirmation. We have ensured that the abstract is structured

according to the journal's guidelines.

• 6) Are Keywords (3-10) selected from MESH? Yes

- Thank you for your comment. We confirm that the keywords have been selected from MeSH

• Introduction

• 7) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) yes

- Thank you for your positive feedback. We are pleased that the objectives of the study are clear and well-stated.

• 8) Does Introduction include: "What we know," "What we don't know" and "Aims"? Start with an introduction to artificial intelligence and then discuss the education of medical students and its problems.

We appreciate your insightful feedback. We were unsure whether the reference to "artificial intelligence" was intentional or a typographical error, as our study focuses on emotional intelligence. Assuming the intended focus was emotional intelligence, we revised the final paragraph of the introduction to more clearly outline the knowns, unknowns, and the aim of the study. This addition highlights the research gap and states our objectives explicitly.

• Materials And Methods

• 9) Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls) ?yes

Thank you for your positive comment. We are glad that the description of participant selection was clear and satisfactory.

• 10) Study Design Described Sufficiently? A cross-sectional descriptive-analytical study

- *Thank you for your comment. the study design has been revised and clearly described as a cross-sectional descriptive-analytical study in the main text. We have highlighted this change in the text for your convenience. We appreciate your feedback.*

• 11) Adequacy of the sample studied? Yes

- *Thank you for your positive feedback. We are pleased that you found the sample size adequate for the study.*

• 12) Subjects Representative of Target Population?

- *Thank you for your comment. While the reviewers did not specifically address this question, we would like to confirm that the subjects in our study are representative of the target population, ensuring the generalizability of our findings.*

• 13) Provided sample size calculation or justification? No

- *Thank you for your commentIn response to your feedback, we have now added a justification for the sample size in the relevant section of the manuscript and highlighted the revised parts for your convenience. We appreciate your valuable input.*

• 14ontrol Subjects Appropriate?

- *The reviewers did not provide any specific comment on this item, and it does not apply to our study, as control subjects were not relevant to our research design.*

• 15) Power of study declared? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We appreciate that you acknowledged the power of the study was declared.*

• 16) Reported actual P values for primary analyses? Yes

- *Thank you for your observation. We have ensured that the actual P values for all primary analyses are clearly reported in the Results section.*

• 17) Blinding of Investigators (if applicable)?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 18) Blinding of subjects (if applicable)?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 19) Identify the methods apparatus (give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses)?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 20) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 21) Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?

- *As appropriately noted by the reviewers, this item is not applicable to the design and methodology of our study.*

• 22) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We are pleased that the inclusion and exclusion criteria were found to be clearly explained in the manuscript.*

• 23) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? Yes

- *Thank you for your positive comment. We are glad that the statistical analysis used in the study was deemed appropriate.*

• Results

• 24) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables and Figures? Yes

- *Thank you for your feedback. We are pleased that the tables and figures were found to be appropriate, clear, and adequate in presenting the study findings.*

• 25) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings?yes

- *Thank you for your positive comment. We are glad that the results were presented in a logical sequence, highlighting the main and most important findings effectively through the text, tables, and illustrations.*

• 26) Duplicate data in graphs and tables? No

- *Thank you for your comment. We confirm that there is no duplicate data in the graphs and tables. Each element is presented uniquely to avoid redundancy.*

27) Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as "random" (which implies a randomizing device), "normal," "significant," "correlations," and "sample."?yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We have ensured that technical terms such as "random," "normal," "significant," "correlations," and "sample" are used appropriately and clearly in the manuscript, while making them understandable for a broader audience where necessary.*

• Discussion

• 28) Conclusion justified & substantiated? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We are glad that you found the conclusion to be well-justified and substantiated based on the study's findings.*

• 29) Analysis supports Conclusion? Yes

- *Thank you for your feedback. We are pleased that the analysis was found to support the conclusion drawn in the study.*

• References

• 30) Proper Writing of the References? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We are glad that the references were found to be properly written and formatted according to the journal's guidelines.*

• 31) References for the last five years? Yes

- *Thank you for your comment. We have ensured that the majority of the references used in the manuscript are from the last five years to maintain the relevance and currency of the study.*

Decision:
Minor revision

Uploaded Files by Reviewers/Associate Editor/ or EIC: Below, you can find the list of files attached by reviewers or associate editor or EIC during the review process (if any).

No file

Reviewer Assistant Comments:
These comments were generated by AI based on your manuscript. Please review them and consider incorporating the suggestions to enhance your article.

- Thank you for your feedback. The authors have reviewed the comments generated by the AI, but no specific comments were identified under this title. We will continue to carefully review the manuscript for any further necessary improvements.

4o mini

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 1 Jun 2025 – 2 Aug 2025

Referee 3 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 1 Jun 2025

Dear AE,
Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to review this revised manuscript.
This study examines the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and academic performance among medical students at Zabol University of Medical Sciences. Using a cross-sectional design, the authors assessed EI via the Schering questionnaire and analyzed its correlation with GPA, while exploring demographic influences (gender, age, education stage).

@ Key strengths include:
* Robust methodology: Stratified random sampling, validated EI tool, and clear statistical analysis.
* Comprehensive demographic analysis: Insights into gender, age, and clinical-stage differences in EI components.

@ Key limitations:
* Null finding: No significant correlation between overall EI and GPA, contrary to some literature.
* Self-report bias: Reliance on self-reported EI and GPA may introduce measurement error.
* Cultural specificity: Findings may not generalize beyond Iranian medical education contexts.

@ Review Notes
# Major Concerns
* Interpretation of Null Results:
1. The absence of an EI-GPA correlation contradicts prior studies (e.g., Chew et al., 2013). Potential reasons (e.g., cultural differences, curriculum demands) are underexplored. Expand the discussion to address why EI might not predict performance in this context (e.g., high-stakes exams overriding EI effects, or EI's role in clinical vs. preclinical success).

* Measurement Limitations:
2. Self-reported GPA and EI are subject to bias (e.g., social desirability, recall inaccuracy). Acknowledge this limitation and suggest future studies use institutional GPA records and observer-rated EI tools (e.g., MSCEIT).

* Cultural Context:
3. Gender differences (higher male social skills) may reflect Iranian sociocultural norms. Cite studies on EI gender gaps in collectivist cultures (e.g., Gunkel et al., 2016) to contextualize findings.

Minor Concerns & Edits
* Clarity:
4. Abstract: Specify the EI subscales (e.g., "social skills") where gender/age differences were significant.
5. Results: Clarify why clinical-stage students outperformed preclinical students (e.g., maturation effects, curriculum design).

* Statistical Detail:
6. Table 3: Report effect sizes (e.g., Cohen's *d*) for t-tests to clarify practical significance.
7. Sample Size Justification: The post-hoc addition of G*Power parameters is helpful, but the achieved power (e.g., 0.90 for ES=0.4) should be noted.

* Discussion:
8. Reconcile conflicting literature by highlighting methodological variations (e.g., EI instruments, sample

characteristics).
9. Address the paradox of older students' higher social awareness but no overall EI-GPA link.

@ Author Revisions Assessment
* Title: Revised per reviewer suggestion (grammar corrected).
* Sample Size Justification: Added G*Power details (adequate for medium effects).
* Introduction: Enhanced clarity on research gaps.

Overall, the manuscript is well-structured but requires deeper discussion of null findings and cultural context. No additional data collection is needed.

Final Decision: Minor Revision

Kind Regards | Publisher Supervisor

Associate Editor ACCEPT 31 Jul 2025

I accept your valuable work.

Editor-in-Chief ACCEPT 2 Aug 2025

Accept