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**Reviewer's report:**

Is the question posed by the authors well defined? – No.

In the conclusion section, the authors state “The purpose of this paper was to provide an outline of the PPD program (completed in the paper) and to demonstrate how the content of EI can be included in a course (completed in the paper)...” However, the data and results presented were not related to the effectiveness of the implementation of the principles but focused on the EI inventory scales at T1 and at T2. The data did not indicate if the changes in scores were tied to the implementation of the PPD – in other words, were the changes in scores at T1 as compared to T2 related (or not) to the content of the course?

The authors state “the implementation of the new PPD program confirmed the EI principles were easy to integrate”. How as this ease of implementation measured? There was no faculty feedback and/or student feedback to back this assertion.

The EI measurements did seem easy to integrate in that the authors had students complete the EI inventory scales at T1 and T2.

Are the methods appropriate and well described? No

The evaluation of the PPD was very limited in detail – “Students receive a feedback questionnaire by email” which allows students “the opportunity to rate their experience”. The questionnaire was not described in detailed that made it difficult to relate the students’ evaluation of the program to pertinent information about the content, delivery, and effectiveness of the content. The questionnaire only had the students rate the PPD program as they compared the program to the other new initiatives in the curriculum. I would have liked to have seen students respond to specific questions about the course content, the effectiveness of the content, how would this content change (or not) their future behavior.

Are the data sound?

There were several references to the EQ validity scale scores, composite scale scores and 15 EQ subscales scores. It would have been helpful to have these scores listed in a table form for reference. Many of the scales were referenced throughout the description and data reporting sections but the data was hard to follow.
Does the manuscript adhere to relevant standards?

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes – if the focus of the manuscript is on the results of the EI scales at T1 as compared to T2.

Are limitations of the work clearly stated? yes

Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? yes

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

From the title, I was anticipating more information on how Emotional Intelligence was incorporated into the Professional Development Program and the evaluation of those efforts.

The abstract conveyed the background of EI and the methods used to evaluate EI but did not expand on the implementation of EI in the PPD program, through the results (from the abstract) indicated the “EI principles and measurement are easy to integrate”.

I felt there was not a tight connection between the title, the abstract and the content of the manuscript. The manuscript spent a large section describing the EQ-I and the questions explored:

• Is there is a gender difference?
• Does self-rated emotional intelligence change?
• Are self report EI scores associated with the ability EI scores
• Is there a relationship between EI and academic achievement?

These are good questions to raise, but I found it difficult to relate this directly back to the purpose of the paper The purpose of this paper was to provide an outline of the PPD program (completed in the paper) and to demonstrate how the content of EI can be included in a course (completed in the paper)…” What is the educational link between the content and teaching of the course and these differences that were found? Would these difference have been found regardless of the content and implementation of the program?

Is the writing acceptable? There were a few awkward sentence structures but I attributed that to American English styles vs. British English styles.

Discretionary revisions - none

Minor revisions – I recommend reviewing the focus of the manuscript to tie more closely with the data presented.

Major Compulsory Revisions - none
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