




Comparison of the Effectiveness of Emotional Intelligence Training and Spiritual Intelligence Training on Executive Functions in Students with Learning Disorders

Fateme. Ghasemi Bakhtiyari¹, Habibollah. Naderi^{2*}, Reza. Donyavi³


¹ Department of Psychology, Sar.C., Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

² Department of Psychology, University of Mazandaran, Babolsar, Iran



³ Department of Psychology, Nek.C., Islamic Azad University, Neka, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: h.naderi@umz.ac.ir

Editor

Asoke Kumar Saha
Professor Department of
Psychology, Jagannath University,
Dhaka, Bangladesh
drasoke@psychology.jnu.ac.bd

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani
Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Abolghasem Khoshkonesh
Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

While this definition is appropriate, the manuscript lacks a clearly articulated theoretical framework linking executive functions specifically to emotional intelligence and spiritual intelligence. The authors should explicitly integrate a theoretical model (e.g., neurocognitive regulation model, self-regulation theory, or dual-process framework) to explain mechanistically how emotional and spiritual intelligence influence executive functioning. Without this theoretical integration, the rationale for comparing these two interventions remains conceptually underdeveloped.

The manuscript discusses emotional intelligence and spiritual intelligence sequentially but does not sufficiently differentiate their neurocognitive mechanisms. For example, the authors state:

Although session content is described, the manuscript does not explain how intervention fidelity was ensured. The authors should clarify:

Executive functions are typically assessed using objective neuropsychological tasks (e.g., Stroop test, Wisconsin Card Sorting Test). Self-report measures are subject to response bias. The authors should justify the use of self-report and acknowledge its limitations more explicitly.

The authors must explain why two subscales were excluded. Removing subscales may affect construct validity and factorial integrity. The rationale must be explicitly justified.

However, CFA results (factor loadings, fit indices such as CFI, RMSEA, TLI) are not reported. These must be included.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The authors should clarify whether spiritual intelligence operates through affective regulation pathways, existential cognition, or metacognitive reflection. The manuscript would benefit from a conceptual comparison table or explicit differentiation of underlying neural, psychological, and cognitive pathways of both constructs.

However, participants were randomly assigned to groups, which suggests a randomized controlled trial rather than a quasi-experimental design. The authors must clarify whether true randomization occurred at the individual level or whether quasi-experimental elements (e.g., non-random sampling, intact groups) justify this classification.

Convenience sampling significantly limits external validity and generalizability. The authors should explicitly discuss sampling bias in the methods and explain why probability sampling methods were not feasible. Additionally, demographic representativeness should be reported.

The manuscript does not provide basic demographic information such as gender distribution, socioeconomic status, educational level, or diagnostic subtype of learning disorder. These variables can significantly affect executive function performance and intervention responsiveness. The authors should include a demographic table.

However, no details are provided regarding randomization method (e.g., computer-generated random numbers, sealed envelopes). The authors should describe the randomization procedure in detail to ensure internal validity.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.