




The Future of AI in Healthcare: A Survey of Medical Professors' Opinions

Sara. Montazerian¹, Yousef. Mehdipour^{2*}

¹ Department of Health Information Technology, Torbat Heydarieh University of Medical Sciences, Iran

² Department of Health Information Technology, Paramedical School, Health Sciences Research Center, Torbat Heydarieh University of Medical Sciences, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: yas532004@gmail.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Mehdi Purmohammad  Department of Cognitive Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada purmoham@ualberta.ca	Reviewer 1: Hooman Namvar  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Saveh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Saveh, Iran. Email: hnamvar@iau-saveh.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Farhad Namjoo  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: farhadnamjoo@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This paragraph provides a good global overview but would benefit from more recent references (post-2023) to reflect the accelerating AI adoption in healthcare, particularly generative AI and clinical decision support systems.

The transition between international examples and the local Iranian context is abrupt. Consider adding a linking sentence summarizing the global trend before narrowing to the regional gap.

This paragraph effectively defines the research gap. However, the final sentence could be strengthened by explicitly stating your research questions or hypotheses—e.g., “This study aimed to examine (1)... and (2)...” to clarify focus and replicability.

Consider justifying the use of a convenience sampling method. Reviewers and readers may question representativeness; a short explanation of why probabilistic sampling was not feasible would increase transparency.

It would be valuable to specify how adaptation affected construct validity—did the Persian version undergo confirmatory factor analysis or expert panel validation beyond Cronbach’s alpha?

While reliability values are acceptable, the “Awareness” domain ($\alpha = 0.69$) is below the recommended threshold (≥ 0.7). You should discuss whether this slightly low reliability affected subsequent analyses or interpretation.

You correctly identify design limitations. However, it would be beneficial to also mention potential response bias—particularly social desirability bias—given that professors may provide favorable responses about AI.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The English expression in this sentence is awkward (“the attitude of nursing managers in the use... has been made”). Please rephrase for grammatical clarity, e.g., “A study examined the attitudes of nursing managers toward the use of AI systems...”

This citation is well-chosen, but it would help to clarify whether that study’s findings were based on qualitative interviews or quantitative surveys to better compare methodological alignment with your study.

While Chi-square results are provided, please include degrees of freedom for transparency (e.g., “ χ^2 (6, N=152) = 15.82”). Additionally, reporting confidence intervals for effect sizes would improve statistical rigor.

This is a strong opening but could be more analytic. Explicitly connect each comparative statement with your findings’ numerical evidence (e.g., “In our study, 88%... compared to 72% in Sassis et al., 2021”).

The interpretation about doctorate vs. master’s degree holders is interesting but speculative. You could strengthen this by referencing similar hierarchical patterns in educational technology adoption studies.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.