

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_127911
Title of the Manuscript:	Mindfulness Meditation: A Hellenic Experience - A Quantitative and Qualitative Study
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

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>It is absolutely conceivable that the paper is well-organized and clearly written, demonstrating excellent integrity at first glance of reviewing. However, few grammatical and spelling errors are evident in sections other than the introduction, which are minor and do not impact the overall submitted paper. There are also a few states that might be caught by flaws, which can be dismissed as they are not substantial errors and are inevitable in the process of writing and organizing such a profound academic publication. As a reviewer, I found the paper compelling and am generally pleased with it.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The paper's title is appropriately selected; nonetheless, it would have been stronger for the authors to change the title from</p> <p>"Mindfulness Meditation: A Hellenic Experience - A Quantitative and Qualitative Study"</p> <p>to</p> <p>"Mindfulness Meditation Effective Approaches Based on Hellenic Experience - A Quantitative and Qualitative Study,"</p> <p>As it would have been more advantageous in terms of supporting the paper.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>I assert to give a score of around 79 out of 100 for the abstract since there are at least about 4-6 grammatical issues being found in the abstract, such as "to accept", "and acknowledge", "It we conducted", "On the FFMQ" and "well being" to be corrected as "accepting, and acknowledge, It was conducted, Of the FFMQ, and well-being".</p> <p>It is prudent to utilize a better structure of written format for the abstract so as to be more integrated rather than dividing the abstract into four separate parts, which seems to feel uncomfortable while reading which can be replaced with the appropriate alternative of a unified abstract; however, this is also a part which can be considered not a significantly problematic issue and can be passed and ignored.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The structure is well-written and seems to be OK, in my opinion.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are OK. However, the number of outdated references being used could be less, and more importantly, it could be replaced with newer, updated references; however, this will absolutely affect on the overall score of the reviewing procedure of the paper.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it seems OK, and the language is completely academic based on the observation.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>-</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	----- Mohammad Mahdi Marvi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran