

Review of: "Impact of Emotional Intelligence on the Well-being of Teachers and Students"

Santhosh Kareepadath Rajan¹

¹ Christ University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I've read through the manuscript. I am sorry to inform you that the manuscript in its current form does not meet the standards for publication. The authors may consider the following comments to revise the manuscript before another submission.

Abstract

The first statement, while not necessarily hyperbolic, could benefit from a more neutral tone. In scientific articles, our aim is not to persuade but to present information objectively.

"Research studies have reported a high prevalence of stress" is redundant because the authors already mentioned it in the first statement.

"With this background, this study examines the association between emotional intelligence and well-being..." Why, if there is a high prevalence of stress, is there a need for a study on emotional intelligence and well-being? Inadequate justification.

Introduction

In many areas, the expressions tend to be hyperbolic. Request to set a neutral tone.

"The National Crime Bureau Report of India shows that suicide rates among students are alarmingly high." This is a serious claim. Needs citations as shreds of evidence.

"The review shows that..." Which review? Not clear. We need citations.

It would be good if the authors began with emotional intelligence and well-being, as these are the major variables. From the initial few lines, it looks like the study is about stress.

"...Tamil Nadu where student suicides are high." Claims should be supported by shreds of evidence.

"The outcomes of this study could throw light on the feasibility of using **emotional intelligence as an effective intervention** to enhance the well-being of teachers and students." Emotional intelligence is a variable. How do the authors consider it as an intervention?

Review of Literature

I recommend that the authors revise the literature review by presenting how the chosen studies (in the literature) contributed to the background of the present study. In the present form, it is an accumulation of various observations placed unfiltered.

Method

I wish to see the methods in the following pattern.

1. Sample and procedure
2. Measures or tools
3. Analysis used in the study.

Why is the sample limited to 100 + 100? Is there any rationale behind deciding the sample?

The method section looks incomplete as the procedure is not well explained.

The authors have not reported on the maintenance of ethical standards.

I would like to see more details about the psychometric tests. For instance, there are five levels of EI. What do these levels indicate? I mean, what does it mean if an individual has low EI? What is the reliability of the DKEIT and the GWBS? What is the internal consistency of these scales in the present sample? I would also like to see the validity details. If there is not much information in the literature about the validity and reliability of either of the measures, it has to be clearly reported.

Results

The authors have given the results under the heading "Analysis." Hence, the report looks different from the usual format.

The results look mixed up with the discussion. I wish to see "Results" and "Discussions" separately.

"Association between EI and Wellbeing...established in previous studies." Then, what is the novelty of the present study?

Overall, the results do not give anything new, even if there is scope. Recommending to rework the manuscript to enhance its standard as a scientific article.