

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

Jinyan Yang¹

¹ University College London, University of London

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear author,

Thank you for providing the opportunity to review this manuscript.

Overall, there is an absence of theoretical grounding and a lack of justification for both hypotheses and statistical analyses. The structure of the results and discussion section is unclear and confusing, which needs major edits or rewriting. The manner in which the findings and methodology are reported does not adhere to standard publication practices. The language and structure of this manuscript should be improved to adhere to a more academic style. Proofreading is needed to improve readability.

Moreover, this study relies on "synthetic" data, which suggests that you have opted for simulated data instead of gathering empirical data from actual participants. This approach deviates significantly from the norms of empirical research and raises serious questions about the study's validity. As a result, this manuscript is not suitable for publication in a peer-reviewed professional journal.

I have also listed some specific issues for each section, which you could consider and address in the future:

Introduction

1. Some sentences need clarification. For instance, in the sentence 'The intention of the harasser is to do harm, and he or she does so from a position of power (Nixon, 2022; Pérez-Gómez et al., 2020) that feeds back, with an increase in popularity (Wiertsema et al., 2023).', does it mean that harassment leads to increased popularity for the harasser?
2. "Cyberbullying is related to risk perception and the performance of online behaviours (Graham & Wood, 2019)." -- Could you please explain more? It is unclear to me how risk perception relates to cyberbullying. Additionally, it is unclear what 'performance of online behaviors' refers to and how it relates to cyberbullying. For instance, does it refer to the frequency of online behaviors or the engagement in specific online activities related to cyberbullying?

Method:

1. My main concern is that this study utilized a synthetic sample generated by AI, which may threaten the validity of this study. Additionally, although you have compared the sample characteristics between the primary sample and the synthetic sample, there is no information regarding the source of the primary sample.

2. “The sociodemographic variables considered were sex (1: male, 2: female), sexual orientation (1: heterosexual, 2: non-heterosexual), and age (age-centered), and as school variables, final performance or grade-centered and whether any grade had been repeated.”— This sentence is confusing and requires clarification.
3. Although you mentioned that ‘Categorization was performed according to the authors' indications, taking into account score and gender’, it’s still unclear how you determined the levels of each EI factor (e.g., the cutoff scores you used).
4. As I’m not an expert in multilevel analysis and neural network analysis, I’m unable to provide suggestions regarding the statistical analysis methods. However, I found the analysis procedure section confusing and difficult to follow. Therefore, I suggest providing more details and clarifications regarding the methods you used to improve readability.

Results section:

1. “The statistical description of the predictor variables for each of the strata-EI showed that the cases with low attention, clarity, and regulation were not those with the least parental control; with a mean of 13.74 (mean between strata: 13.94)”—according to Table 6, the mean for category 111 should be 13.64 instead of 13.74.
2. In section 1.3.3, 'Importance of independent variables in cybervictimization,' I'm confused about the meaning of 'importance' since you mentioned 'The normalized significance ...'. Does 'importance' in this context refer to the significance level? Please clarify and ensure consistent terminology usage.
3. “They were not significant in the 2-simplified model and were relevant as a research hypothesis.”, “Small estimates were obtained that were not significant for parental contro”. These sentences are confusing.
4. “In this stratum, the regression equation for risk factors in cybervictimization (independent variables) (Alvarez-García et al., 2015a) and average-cybervictimization (dependent variable) had an R^2 value of .944.”— It’s unclear which stratum you are referring to.
5. Overall, the presentation of results (both the text and the tables) needs to be improved, and clarifications are needed. I also suggest improving the structure of the results to make them more understandable.

Discussion

The current discussion section is more like a result section instead of a discussion of your findings. Much of the content simply describes the results without providing a thorough interpretation. I recommend reorganizing the results section and completely rewriting the discussion section.

In the discussion, you should summarize your findings and explain your findings—why you obtained these results and what they imply for the broader context.

You should also indicate the implications of your study, both theoretical and practical. It's essential to clarify how your study contributes to its field and which research gaps it addresses, which is unclear in your current discussion.

Furthermore, it's important to address why you opted to use a synthetic sample instead of primary data. Discuss the rationale behind this choice and whether your findings are generalizable beyond the synthetic sample.

Additionally, consider discussing potential future research directions based on your research questions and findings to

provide a comprehensive overview of the study's implications and potential areas for further exploration.

I hope these comments could be useful, and I wish you good luck with the revision and future research.