

Peer Review

Review of: "Acceptability, Feasibility, and Effects of a Mindfulness-Based Intervention on the Quality of Life and Performance of the Brazilian Paralympic Boccia Team: Mixed Methods Case Study"

Juan Leandro Cerezuela¹

1. Psychology, Universidad de Almería, Almería, Spain

Dear authors,

I would like to begin by congratulating the authors on the work carried out. This research addresses a highly important topic from a perspective that can provide a wealth of necessary information to foster social change in the fight against stigma and in the improvement of mental health among Boccia athletes.

The article adopts a mixed-methods approach, which I consider highly valuable, as it applies a qualitative method that allows us to understand firsthand the experiences of the participants and sheds light on how mindfulness practice can affect them from a holistic and personal perspective.

However, while I believe the work is of high quality, there are certain details that I think could be reviewed or improved, as there appears to be some confusion regarding the organization of information in certain sections.

First, in the second paragraph of the introduction, the term "people with disabilities" is described in general terms, and in the following two paragraphs, the sport and the inclusion of individuals with motor impairments are discussed. It might be advisable to include a mention or explanation of the BC1, BC2, BC3, and BC4 categories to help readers unfamiliar with the sport understand how it works and how athletes are classified. This could aid later understanding of the participant population, especially since these categories are mentioned later in the Methods section.

Regarding the objective, from my point of view, it would be necessary to reorder it and begin directly by stating the general objective and explaining how the implementation of mindfulness was evaluated. As currently written, it is somewhat confusing.

In the hypothesis and later in the Methods section, it would be clearer to state that the total number of sessions was 18, even though they were divided into two groups of 8 and 10 sessions. This clarification would help avoid confusion throughout the manuscript.

Within the Methods section, under Participants, it is stated that there were 29 participants. However, in the Results section, some participants are said to have dropped out for various reasons at different stages of the study. This should be clarified in the Methods section: How many completed the full study? Did some only participate in the quantitative part and not the qualitative part? This is not entirely clear. It would also be advisable to specify the average age and gender of the participants. Later in the Results section, it is mentioned that most were 37-year-old men, but this should be stated in the Participants section.

It would also be helpful to include a separate Procedure section detailing how the researchers approached the team, how participants were recruited, how they were informed about the nature of the study, etc.

Regarding the inclusion criteria, the exclusion of "NON-ATHLETES" is explained, but for the rest—could any team member participate, or did they need to be in a specific classification? In the exclusion criteria, individuals with SMD (Severe Mental Disorders) undergoing initial treatment were excluded, a group not previously mentioned—are they also included in the general description of "people with disabilities"?

In the quantitative data analysis section, SPSS version 23 was used. I recommend updating to version 30.

In the qualitative data analysis section, the software used for data categorization is not specified. I assume it was NVivo, as shown in Figure 1, but it would be helpful to clarify this in the text.

Regarding the qualitative results, it would be highly advisable to include a table specifying the themes, subthemes, and meaning units used as a reference for identifying the themes. This would make it much clearer for the reader to understand the different categories of the study and the sources for each, facilitating the description in the following sections.

In the Discussion section, it would be advisable to begin by restating the study's objective to contrast it with the findings of existing studies.

Finally, it would be important to clarify the possible limitations of the study.

Once again, I congratulate the authors on this work. I believe that, with the appropriate revisions, it could become a high-quality study.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.