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PART 1: Comments

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | | | | Author’s Feedback (It is mandatory that  authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|  | Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments | |  |
| are strictly prohibited during peer review. |  | |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the  scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | From my perspective, this manuscript offers valuable  insights into teacher leadership styles within medical universities in China, a context with minimal attention in educational leadership research. The importance of this manuscript to the scientific community can be drawn from the following areas;  By applying the CIP (Charismatic-Ideological-Pragmatic) leadership model, the manuscript provides a multifaceted understanding of how English teachers’ leadership behaviours are perceived by students, bridging gaps in higher education and interdisciplinary (medical-English) settings.  The findings highlight the dominance of charismatic and pragmatic leadership, suggesting their relevance for fostering student engagement and critical thinking in specialized curricula.  This study also contributes to global teacher leadership literature by contextualizing Western frameworks (e.g., CIP) in a non-Western educational system, offering practical implications for teacher training and policy in similar institutions. | | | | Thank you for your valuable comment. |
| Is the title of the article suitable?  (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The current title “Exploring Teacher Leadership Styles in  Guangxi Medical Universities: A Student Perception Study Based on the CIP Model” is clear but could be more concise. An alternative could be “Student Perceptions of English Teachers Leadership Styles in Chinese Medical Universities: A CIP Model Analysis.” | | | | Thank you for your valuable comment.The title has been revised to be “Student Perceptions of English Teachers Leadership Styles in Chinese Medical Universities: A CIP Model Analysis” |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Is the abstract of the article  comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract of the manuscript is detailed but could be  further refined for enhanced suitabilitity wih the suggestions below;  The term “undergraduate students” in the 4th line of the abstract appears redundant, undergraduate also implies students, I will suggest for only the word “undergraduate” to be used since the context is within a university.  Specific statistical results could be included, example, the mean scores and standard deviation for the leadership styles that were examined.  Redundant phrases like the “results highlight” in the 12th line of the abstract could be removed and replaced with “the research outcome implied…………….”, this is because it is already captured/implied in the findings. | Thank you for your valuable comment. “undergraduate students” has been revised to be “undergraduates”.  Thank you for your valuable comment. Specific statistical results have been added.  Thank you for your valuable comment. “Results highlight” has been revised to “the research outcome implied”. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically,  correct? Please write here. | From my perspectives, the manuscript is scientifically and  methodologically correct, its strengths lies in its validated instruments, roburst statistical analysis of (mean and standard deviation), and CIP theory.  The limitations of the manuscript lies in its single province sampling of only three universities, and reliance on students perception only. |  |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional  references, please mention them | The references are sufficient and recent, they cover a  blend of local and global authors content which makes it to be relevant. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| in the review form. |  |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the manuscript is  sufficient for scholarly communication, however it needs minor edits of the points noted above and the examples given below;  1. “The interaction between my teacher and us in the classroom is good”(as found in TLS1), should be modified to “my teacher’s classroom interactions are good.”  2. “It is pleasure to get along with my teacher” (as found in TLS4) should be modified to “it is a pleasure to get along with my teacher.” | Thank you for your insightful suggestions – your modifications are indeed improvements. However, because these items come directly from Tsai (2017) and students have already responded to them, I must report the original wording. |
| Optional/General comments | The novel application of CIP model and its clear  implications for teacher’s development are strengths for this manuscript.  Accept with very minor revisions in the aspects of abstract refinement and language modification. The study’s theoretical strength and contextual quality outweighs its minimal erros/limitations. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |