Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Latin Partnered Social Dance and Well-Being in the Qualitative Literature: A Framework-Based Scoping Review"

Sawsen Ayari[1]

1. Université du Sud, Toulon et Var, France

Thank you for this kind invitation to review the article intitled "Latin Partnered Social Dance and Well-Being in the Qualitative Literature: A Framework-Based Scoping Review".

Sorry for the delayed response.

This manuscript represents a valuable and original contribution to the qualitative literature on dance and well-being. The topic is important, the writing is generally strong, and the qualitative orientation is thoughtfully developed. However, significant revisions are necessary to strengthen methodological rigor, temper interpretive claims, and improve reflexive criticality. I therefore recommend major revision.

Firstly, the terminology surrounding "well-being," "health enhancement," and "flourishing" occasionally overlaps conceptually and would benefit from tighter definitional consistency.

The manuscript would benefit from clearer differentiation between "well-being," "flourishing," and "health enhancement," as these concepts are sometimes used interchangeably despite reflecting distinct theoretical constructs. Additionally, the authors should further discuss how they minimised interpretive bias given their insider status, for example through reflexive auditing, consideration of disconfirming evidence, or external analytic triangulation.

Secondly, some parts of the discussion repeat concepts already covered in detail in the analysis section. Greater conciseness would improve readability.

A specific table summarizing the limitations of the included studies would enhance transparency.

The manuscript would benefit from a clearer explanation of how studies using mixed methods were handled analytically.

doi.org/10.32388/KSAMV5

Some statements occasionally suggest a causal relationship despite the exclusively qualitative and interpretive nature of the available data. A more cautious wording is recommended throughout the text.

This article addresses an original and topical subject, offering an in-depth qualitative analysis of Latin social dance for couples and well-being, using an exploratory review methodology. The article is generally well-written, theoretically coherent, and demonstrates a strong commitment to constructivist qualitative research and the PAGER framework. The authors also demonstrate commendable transparency regarding their positioning, stakeholder involvement, and methodological procedures.

However, despite these strengths, several significant methodological and interpretative issues currently limit the robustness of the conclusions.

1-) The manuscript bases its conclusions heavily on Seligman's PERMA model, even when the included studies did not themselves explicitly focus on well-being or use frameworks from positive psychology. In several sections, the interpretation appears to be guided more by theory than by the data, which creates a risk of confirmation bias and over-interpretation.

The authors should distinguish more clearly between:

-conclusions directly supported by the included studies,

-on the one hand, and interpretations retrospectively transposed into the PERMA model, on the other.

-Greater caution and critical reflection are required when attributing specific PERMA dimensions to qualitative findings drawn from heterogeneous epistemological traditions.

2-) The authors acknowledge that they chose not to conduct any form of qualitative assessment; however, the absence of even a minimal assessment of methodological reliability considerably weakens this review.

Even within constructivist qualitative paradigms, exploratory reviews often include an analysis of the following aspects:

credibility,

reflexivity,

generalizability,

methodological rigour,

or the limitations of the included data.

At present, studies of very different methodological quality appear to contribute equally to the synthesis. The authors should either:

provide a more robust methodological justification for this decision,

or incorporate a qualitative evaluation framework appropriate to interpretative research.

3-) The statement of position is well-received and transparent. However, both authors are heavily involved in the Latin social dance community and are also the authors of several of the studies included.

This creates a significant risk of interpretative bias, particularly as the review systematically emphasises positive, fulfilment-oriented outcomes, whilst paying relatively little attention to contradictory, neutral, or potentially negative experiences.

The manuscript would benefit from:

a more in-depth reflective discussion regarding potential confirmation bias,

an explicit explanation of the safeguards used to minimise interpretative subjectivity,

and a stronger acknowledgement of the implications of research conducted by insiders.

4-) The included literature spans anthropology, sociology, philosophy, psychology, and health sciences. While this interdisciplinarity is valuable, the manuscript tends to synthesise these traditions into a relatively unified narrative despite major epistemological differences between them.

The authors themselves acknowledge this difficulty. However, the analysis would benefit from:

- clearer differentiation between disciplinary approaches,
- more discussion of how interpretive synthesis was conducted across divergent paradigms,
- and greater caution when drawing overarching conclusions.

5-) This analysis presents physiological and biochemical mechanisms (endorphins, serotonergic systems, endogenous opioids) to explain the effects on well-being. However, none of the qualitative studies included directly examined these mechanisms.

These sections go beyond the scope of the scientific evidence in this review and should either be significantly toned down or be clearly identified as speculative theoretical extrapolations rather than evidence-based conclusions.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.