

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_94212
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF LOCUS OF CONTROL ON EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE: A STUDY OF COLLEGE STUDENTS
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Initially I will report what was described by the authors in the ABSTRACT. If the authors report that the research is a sample. What is the justification for taking samples of 100 boys and 100 girls, if they did not present the profile of the school and if it was a random survey, it is probabilistic, if it is probabilistic it needs a calculation of the sample size from a sampling error.</p> <p>As for the INTRODUCTION, updated authors were not cited, the most current one is from 2005, 17 years ago.</p> <p>In the METHOD, the authors report Sharma (2011), from 2011 onwards, no author was cited who studied and could contribute to the article.</p> <p>Returning to the METHOD, no theoretical details of the instrument used, its formation (likert scale), the author's proposal on how to analyze it descriptively (by the average, or by the sum of the indicators, etc.) were found. Also, the analysis techniques that would be used by the authors (statistical tests) were not observed in the Method. And finally, the ethical issues of research involving human beings were not observed.</p> <p>As for the RESULTS, I suggest that the profile of the students be initially described so that later the comparative research between genders can be carried out. I also suggest showing the statistical characteristics by Dimension and then doing the appropriate test to buy the groups. Another element not reported by the authors concerns the presuppositions of the t test (homogeneity test and normality test), remembering that non-normality refers to the non-parametric test, in this case the Mann-Whitney test, which in my view is much more suitable for this type of data.</p> <p>And finally, I would bring some authors cited in the discussion for the theoretical foundation, it was very funny in terms of updating the citation in the introduction.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luis Felipe Dias Lopes
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Santa Maria, Brazil