



Paper: “Beyond Therapy: A Conceptual Review of Emotion-Focused Coaching for Mental Well-Being”

Submitted: 26 June 2025

Accepted: 11 September 2025

Published: 30 September 2025

Corresponding Author: Valeriya Kovbuz

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n25p53

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Raúl Rocha

Autonomous National University of Mexico, Mexico

Reviewer 2: Felix Senyamator

Department of Education and Psychology, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Comments: The title aptly summarizes the main focus of the study, effectively conveying the essence of Emotion-Focused Coaching (EFC) about mental well-being.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The ABSTRACT

Comments: The abstract is concise and provides a good overview of the study's aims and framework. However, it could benefit from a more explicit mention of the implications of EFC based on the literature reviewed to illustrate its practical relevance. Furthermore, the author should provide the method employed in this study and a summary of some major findings on EFC in the literature, and give one or two major recommendations based on what was gleaned from the literature.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Comments: Several instances of punctuation and phrasing could be revised for clarity. For example, "self-reflection" is often used interchangeably with "self-reflection practice," and clarity about these terms would enhance understanding. A few grammar errors have been highlighted in the abstract for the author to address.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Comments: The methodology is described effectively, detailing the literature review approach and theoretical framework. However, specifying the criteria for the selection of literature could provide additional rigor to the methodology section. "Conceptual Framework" under this section is misplaced. The issues addressed there did not reflect this heading. The author should create a section on the conceptual framework under the literature review section, and extensively discuss the EFC. Address what it is, how it works, the processes involved, and how long it could be applied, subject to the type of emotional problem. This will help carry readers along, particularly non-psychologists.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain major errors.

Comments: The main body is well-organized, with coherent sections that flow logically from one to another. It provides a thorough examination of EFC grounded in theoretical and empirical literature; however, the integration of some statistics or quantitative results, where available, could substantiate the claims made. Some restructuring is also required.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Comments: The conclusion effectively synthesizes the main findings and emphasizes the significance of EFC in promoting emotional awareness and resilience. It nicely ties together the implications for practice, suggesting areas for future research.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate.

Comments: The references include relevant and respectable sources that support the development of the paper's arguments. Each reference is properly formatted and appears to be pertinent to the topic at hand.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article provides an insightful exploration into the role of Emotion-Focused Coaching in enhancing emotional well-being. While the conceptual approach possesses a strong foundation, consider refining phrasing for clarity, especially regarding technical terms. It would also be beneficial to elaborate on the implications of the findings within the abstract to enhance its richness. Further integration of quantifiable outcomes, where appropriate, could help in demonstrating the effectiveness of the EFC more robustly.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is fine.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is fine, but it indicates that it is a literature review and therefore does not offer original data. It also does not indicate that it is a meta-analysis.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The text is well written

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

There are serious problems here. It states that this is a review of existing literature, but the original sources are not identified. Nor is there any mention of the databases, the journals consulted, or the period in which it was conducted.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The article is very sloppy. References do not include the authors cited in the text. Furthermore, it appears very scholarly. There is no structure typical of a scientific article.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The article states that it synthesized the results available in the existing literature, but this cannot be corroborated because it does not mention the original sources, databases, or journals.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

No. Not all authors are cited.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is very sloppy. Not all the cited authors are listed in the References. Most importantly, the original sources are not indicated. The article is very scholarly. It would have been nice to present a genuine meta-analysis, but that's not the case.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Suggestions for increased precision:

A stronger title would emphasize:

that it is conceptual or literature-based,

the emotional focus, and

that EFC is not a therapeutic intervention but a personal development/coaching framework.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Your abstract does present the objectives, methods, and some outcomes, but not in the standard, clear structure typically expected. It would benefit from tighter phrasing that distinctly highlights:

the aim of the paper,

the conceptual literature review method, and

the primary findings or themes.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes — your text is overall powerful, but there are several grammatical errors, awkward phrasings, punctuation problems, and minor style inconsistencies that reduce clarity and academic polish.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Your methods are clear enough to understand the paper's conceptual and non-empirical nature, but they lack the transparency and replicability details typically expected even in conceptual or theoretical reviews.

This is a minor but essential shortfall when preparing for formal academic submission.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body is conceptually straightforward, well-organized, and without substantive errors.

△ It does, however, contain multiple small grammar, punctuation, and style issues that should be corrected for professional publication or submission.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Your conclusion is accurate and well-supported by the body of your paper.

It appropriately synthesizes your conceptual findings on EFC and aligns with your stated objectives, methods, and literature themes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Your reference list is substantively appropriate and academically credible for a conceptual paper on EFC, emotional intelligence, and well-being.

It is not fully comprehensive in terms of direct EFC empirical studies, but that reflects the limited state of the field, which you acknowledge.

It does have some internal consistency issues (missing final references for works cited in the text), and would benefit from adding a few more recent sources to show scholarly currency.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a strong conceptual paper, consistently around 4 out of 5 — very good for a non-empirical academic piece.

It demonstrates solid scholarship, appropriate conceptual frameworks, and logical organization.

The main areas limiting its consistency as a 5-star rating are language precision, the absence of methodological detail typical even in conceptual reviews, and minor inconsistencies in references.
