Review of: "Emotional Intelligence and Cybervictimization: Stratified Multilevel Analysis With Synthetic Data"

Bogdan Zadorozhny[1]

1 University College London, University of London

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article; I appreciate the invitation. I believe that this paper has the potential to constitute a constructive contribution to the extant literature, following a round of revision to address the following points, listed below in order of appearance:

- **Abstract:**

  - Precisely what is meant by synthetic data should be clarified straight away
  - Specifying that it was done in SPSS is, on the other hand, probably unnecessary in the abstract
  - The predictive variables that are described as "eleven level 1" and "seven level 2" are completely mysterious
  - "Being men" is not well-worded grammatically; ought to be amended to "being male" or "being a man"
  - The strata-EI that are utilized are not sufficiently explained to be understood

- **Introduction:**

  - In general, the introductory session flows rather poorly and is difficult to read and follow due to the large number of small paragraphs that do not flow well into one another
  - I would recommend introducing the definition of cybervictimization before discussing its prevalence – just makes more logical sense that way
  - Rather than stating "cybervictimization has been explained by variables," it would be preferable to state that said factors have been found to predict its occurrence (if that is indeed the case, it is not clear from how this is written)
  - What is the relationship between cybervictimization and cyberbullying? Are the two concepts distinct or does one subsume the other?
  - How exactly is cyberbullying related to risk perception? The positive association between emotional intelligence and better risk perception is self-explanatory, but the relationship between cyberbullying and risk perception is not and should be explained
  - What is a victim-aggressor? This needs to be explained as it is not immediately clear
  - To be clear, is it being argued that higher level of understanding and regulation of both being a victim and an aggressor? In other words, if it is in fact being postulated that higher levels of EI reduce both the levels of aggression and victimhood, this is a point that should be made much more clearly
  - It would be helpful to list out the 27 resultant clusters that were produced, even if only in an appendix

- In the hypotheses section, what is meant by "risky internet behaviors"?
- I found the diagram within Figure 1 to be almost indecipherable as currently presented

- **Methods:**

  - I am not certain that synthetic data can truly be treated as a like-for-like replacement for genuine data for a variety of reasons. At the very least, it would be necessary to furnish some evidence that the two are comparable even with a *novel* smaller sample size
  - Multiple Imputation by Chained Equations should be abbreviated MICE, not MYCE
  - Figure 2 is rather confusing and messy, and the reader would be well-served by a cleaner outline of the different variables involved and the calculations that were utilized. As is, the information is rather undigestible. It is entirely unclear why it is necessary to provide the internal names of the variables, for instance
  - The Intraclass Correlation Coefficient is not sufficiently described. There are a variety of different ICCs that can be utilized and the type that is utilized, therefore, must be clearly stated. I urge the authors to refer to the papers by Koo and Li (2015) [A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research] and Qin et al. (2018) [Assessing test–retest reliability of patient-reported outcome measures using intraclass correlation coefficients: recommendations for selecting and documenting the analytical formula]
  - While the VIF procedure seems satisfactory, its description is not easy to follow as written. I recommend amending this section for clarity.

- **Results:**

  - If the ICC results indicated that 5.9% of the variability in cybervictimization corresponded to the difference between the means of the strata-EI, this seems to indicate that the overall effect of EI on cybervictimization is marginal at best, no?
  - As mentioned above, I would urge against using the full variable names in-text as this is distracting and unhelpful for the reader. Instead, I recommend using the friendly names throughout
  - If it was found that a far higher proportion of non-heterosexual individuals suffered cybervictimization than heterosexuals, this seems to be something that needs to be explored in great detail

- **Discussion:**

  - To reiterate, I am not certain that the rather low obtained value of the ICC (the form of which needs to be specified) justifies the rest of the analysis
  - There is an extreme lengthy paragraph in this section (starting with "Model 5") that really needs to be broken up for readability

- **Limitations:**

  - The key limitation of this study is not its use of self-report data but its use of synthetic data, the nature of the relationship of which to real data is far from certain

- It is not the case that EI is transitory in nature – rather, EI literature typically reports EI as a stable personality trait throughout the (adult) lifespan
- A great deal of research exists that explores the development of EI from a multitude of different perspectives and approaches

Overall, I feel that the paper requires a rather extensive rewrite and re-organization. It is quite difficult to follow at many times and makes assertions that are not necessarily supported by the analyses or the extant literature.

I do hope that this feedback is helpful and constructive, and I would like to wish the authors the best of luck with their revision and future efforts.