Review of: "Research Trends in Mindfulness for Adolescents: Based on CiteSpace Visualization Analysis"

Richa Goyal[1]

1 Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript is written in a very well-written manner and covers an innovative area of research. But it has several weak points that need to be addressed to improve the overall quality of the manuscript. These are as follows:

1. In the introduction section, authors should give the definitions of the terms 'mindfulness' and 'adolescents'. This will help readers get a better understanding of the topics under study.

2. The authors should justify why they have limited the research to 'articles' only in the methodology section. Why were the book chapters, conference papers, or review papers not included?

3. The authors should explain why they have used the term 'mindful' and not 'mindfulness' in the search string. They should also consider including 'mindfulness' in the search string, as its inclusion might also help in getting more relevant research articles in this domain. Also, other related keywords like 'awareness' and 'consciousness' should also be included in the search string.

4. Authors should use standard bibliometric terminology. For example, significant authors are prolific or most productive authors, etc.

5. The quantitative analysis has been mostly performed competently, but the qualitative bibliometrics analysis is missing. The study is poorly quantitative; modern bibliometrics is also qualitative.

6. The authors should more extensively and formally analyse the keyword networks and use a combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis to analyse the clusters, identify hot spots, etc. They should use, for example, synthetic knowledge synthesis to perform this task (described in "Machine Learning on Small Samples: A synthetic knowledge synthesis"). Namely, the most popular or cited keywords are not automatically topics or hot spots. They can be defined only by the analysis of the associations of more keywords presented on bibliometric maps or networks. In general, the results are not well presented.

7. There are several mistakes in the referencing style; kindly check it and correct accordingly, for example:

Kabat-Zinn, J. (2003). Mindfulness-based interventions in context: past, present, and future. Clinical Psychology Science & Practice, 10(2):144-156.

In the aforementioned referencing style, a comma should be there instead of a colon.

Authors are suggested to incorporate the above suggested changes into the manuscript.