

# Review of: "Student's Well-being and Academic Performance"

Anum Sarfraz<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National University of Science and Technology

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I am happy to see MBI RCTs being conducted in diverse cultures. This is an important area and much needed work, however, the write up does not seem to do justice to the work done.

I am providing some of my major observations below. I hope they will help you improve the manuscript.

The abstract states a lot of general information and is in future tense. We use future tense for protocols, however this RCT has been successfully completed, therefore it should be in past tense. Make your abstract rich in information specific to your study. What do you mean by student "psychology"? for instance and better to state the outcomes assessed rather than stating "various psychological measures".

The introduction needs more substance with up-to-date referencing. The theoretical framework, conceptualization and literature gaps are missing.

Null hypothesis is not required. The objectives and hypotheses should not be redundant and repetitive.

When you say "To contribute to the growing body of knowledge on the use of mindfulness interventions in an educational context, potentially providing guidance to institutions seeking to enhance student mental health and academic outcomes" was this explicitly done or an implication of your research findings?

The qualitative objective is not mentioned in abstract or introduction?

What is your rationale for dividing students into study major strata?

Which MBSR program are you using exactly. A reference with clear details of the intervention needs to be provided in RCTs.

The baseline and post intervention assessment points need to be stated in terms of weeks before the start and end of the intervention.

What is the midpoint of assessment? Be specific

When will the qualitative data be collected?

Why is academic performance and GPA not assessed at midpoint? And how will these two be assessed exactly?

When is the intervention being delivered, the start of semester?

Who will be randomizing and carrying out assessments? If it is the researcher, then there is a high probability of researcher bias that might contaminate the results.

Who is providing the intervention?

The academic performance questionnaire: when you ask students, each might have a different standard for academic performance, this needs to be measured objectively. Or you could modify the outcome measure as self-perceived academic performance?

The results need to be consolidated more comprehensively to support understanding which reflects the findings and not just numbers on a survey. Questionnaires can be given in supplementary material, not in main text.

The discussion section is descriptive narration of the results from the study which are already stated above. Whereas discussion includes situating the results in the larger context of literature and critically understanding the findings.

I wish you all the very best with your work and manuscript.