

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_127911
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Mindfulness Meditation: A Hellenic Experience - A Quantitative and Qualitative Study</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	Despite the evidence accumulated in recent decades about the positive effects of mindfulness as a therapeutic technique, there are still gaps in the scientific literature regarding the standard protocol to be used. The present study discusses interesting data comparing the possible effects of a mindfulness meditation program with fortnightly sessions and another with weekly sessions. Furthermore, it presents a possibility of mixed research, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches in the context of clinical research.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	In part. Due to methodological limitations, this is a study that explores the research questions. There is no control group, sample randomization or triangulation of different sources of qualitative data. In this sense, I suggest reducing the title to Mindfulness Meditation: A Hellenic exploratory research.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	It is important to clarify the objective of the study, research design, sample size and the main conclusion.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The Method and materials section needs to be reformulated. At the beginning of the section, it is necessary to indicate the research design: this is an exploratory research, with quantitative and qualitative stages of data collection and analysis. In 3. Qualitative facet of the study, some sessions of the meditation protocol need to be briefly described, such as Sitting Meditation, Meditation of Repeated Thoughts, Mountain and Lake Meditation. Also, statements from participants are presented, which are results and should be indicated as such. In 5. Discussion, several paragraphs are written as a new literature review. I suggest that such information be moved to the introduction and only returned to in Discussion to explain the results found by the authors.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Less than five references are publications from the last five years (2019-2024). I suggest an update to the literature review on mindfulness.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	It is necessary to do a grammatical review and check repeated paragraphs in the manuscript (page 4, for example, and others). In 2.2.2 The Duncan's General Questionnaire, the authors refer to characteristics of the parents and not the participants.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This is an interesting study from a methodological point of view, but it needs to be better written to make its procedures and results precise.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mariane Lima DeSouza</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Espirito Santo, Brasil</b>