

Peer Review

Review of: "Evaluation of the Mindfulness-Based Wellbeing Enhancement Program: Effects on Wellbeing Outcomes"

Meera Neelakantan¹

1. School of Psychological Sciences, Christ University, India

General Comments:

This study addresses a relevant topic and identifies a clear gap in the literature regarding the application of mindfulness-based interventions (MBIs). The distinction drawn between traditional and contemporary MBIs is particularly commendable and provides a valuable contribution. However, several methodological and theoretical aspects require significant revision before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

Specific Comments:

Theoretical Framework: The manuscript uses the terms "human flourishing" and "well-being" seemingly interchangeably. To enhance the theoretical grounding of the study, a clear and concise definition of the chosen construct (either human flourishing or well-being) is required. Furthermore, the authors should explicitly situate their work within a relevant theoretical framework from the existing literature on well-being (e.g., PERMA model, Self-Determination Theory, hedonic/eudaimonic well-being). This will provide a stronger foundation for the research questions and interpretation of findings.

Recruitment Strategy: The description of the recruitment strategy as "convenience sampling" lacks sufficient detail. The authors should provide a more precise description of the recruitment process, including where and how participants were recruited (e.g., specific online platforms, community organizations). This will allow readers to assess the potential limitations associated with the sample's representativeness.

Intervention Details: The description of the MBIs (both online and hybrid) needs substantial clarification. The authors must specify:

- The precise format and content of the sessions.
- The duration of each session and the overall program length.
- The frequency of sessions (i.e., consistency of delivery).
- Whether the interventions were standardized or adapted.

Measurement Instrument: The manuscript mentions the use of a "self-developed questionnaire." This raises significant concerns regarding the instrument's validity and reliability. The authors must provide a detailed account of the questionnaire's development process, including:

- The rationale for developing a new instrument rather than using existing validated measures.
- The process of item generation and refinement.
- Evidence of the instrument's psychometric properties (e.g., content validity, construct validity, internal consistency, test-retest reliability).

Data Analysis: While thematic analysis is mentioned, the manuscript lacks a clear description of the specific analytical process employed. The authors should detail:

- The specific approach to thematic analysis used (e.g., inductive, deductive, reflexive).
- The steps involved in data coding, theme development, and interpretation.
- The rationale for choosing thematic analysis as the analytical method.

Positive Comments:

- The study addresses a relevant research question.
- The identification of the research gap is clearly articulated.
- The distinction between traditional and contemporary MBIs is a valuable contribution.

Recommendation:

I recommend publication with major revisions. Addressing the aforementioned points is crucial for strengthening the manuscript's theoretical grounding, methodological rigor, and overall contribution to the field.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.