

Peer Review

Review of: "Nafas: Breathing Gymnastics Application"

Kinga Skiers¹

1. Keio University, Japan

The paper is well-structured and effectively highlights the importance of breathing exercises. However, while it provides a strong argument for the benefits of breathing exercises, it lacks a literature review on existing tools and systems designed for similar purposes. A more in-depth discussion of prior work would strengthen the paper's contribution by situating Nafas within the broader context of well-being tools for developers.

Related Works

Section "Well-being Tools for Developers" should be expanded to include a more thorough analysis of related works. While the authors briefly mention tools such as Stretchly and Workrave, their comparison is limited and does not provide sufficient context to justify Nafas' claims. A more detailed comparison through a literature review with such tools, especially those that incorporate breathing exercises or other stress-reduction techniques, would provide stronger justification for why Nafas is a unique and necessary addition to this space.

Furthermore, while the paper argues that a command-line interface (CLI) is a non-intrusive and effective method for delivering breathing exercises to developers, the authors provide no evidence or user feedback to support this claim. Without usability studies or even informal user testing, it remains unclear whether developers find CLI-based breathing exercises engaging, effective, or preferable to other methods. Including data such as user studies, surveys, or even user feedback would significantly improve the paper's credibility and demonstrate the real-world impact of Nafas.

The authors can support their claims with pre- and post-usage surveys measuring stress levels, focus, and usability, or a comparative study between Nafas and GUI-based tools. Additionally, qualitative feedback from developers on effectiveness and non-intrusiveness would strengthen the paper's credibility.

The discussion and limitations are well-written, demonstrating that the authors understand the constraints of their work, which adds to the paper's credibility.

Overall, while the paper introduces an interesting and potentially valuable tool, strengthening the literature review and providing user data for its claims would greatly enhance its quality.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.