

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

Bruno Santucci de Oliveira<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade do Vale do Itajaí (Univali)

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

In the first paragraph, "The relationship between emotional intelligence and cybervictimization is extensively documented in the scientific literature," this is a strong statement and is the topic of your work. I know Rueda et al. 2022 is a systematic review on this topic, but I suggest that you develop this a bit more to make it better supported, considering the relevance of this sentence for your paper.

**In the objective paragraph, it says something** "We propose to find out the differences in the relationships between the individual variables and cybervictimization within each of the strata-El" **and in the following paragraph, another objective is written** ("The main objective of this research was to analyze the impact of stratified emotional intelligence on the probability of suffering cybervictimization, considering the effect of different individual variables in the analysis"). It's confusing; I suggest reviewing these two paragraphs and the main objective.

The introduction should make more explicit the research problem and justification of the study.

Regarding the methodology, I recommend that you develop a more robust methodology, explaining the use of AI and justifying this choice for using a tool that creates a sample, not real data. As it stands, the explanation of the methodology is weak and can compromise your paper.

Furthermore, some tables and information from the methodological section could be included in the results; it would make more sense.

The results need further discussion. The tables are presented, and the text only discusses the content of the tables themselves. An analysis of the results is missing. For example, in item 3.4., "the training and risk-behavior variables did not have significant t-values", but what does this imply? What possible explanation, based on literature and research, justifies this? Bringing this discussion is essential so that your results are not just descriptive.

Item 4. The discussion seems to be a synthesis of the results, rather than a discussion itself. What are the findings in the literature of other authors on this topic? The authors you presented in the introduction, for example, do not appear in the results section or in the discussion. To make your work even better, I recommend that you expand the debate about your findings with previous studies.

For example, "For sexual orientation, being heterosexual is a protective factor for all strata", this was one of your findings. What is the discussion about this? Do other papers corroborate this statement?

Another example: "[...] which is consistent with what was found by Romera et al (2022), that "social anxiety did not significantly affect victimization" (p. 114)." This is the type of discussion that can enrich your work, and I recommend that you expand this to other results.

Check references and citations, as some are missing, e.g., Campo, A. (2000). *Descobrimos estatísticas usando SPSS for Window: técnicas avançadas para iniciantes*.