

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"

Gonçalo Nuno Dias¹

1. Polytechnic Institute of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal

Cover Letter to the Authors – Review Feedback

Dear Authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to review your manuscript.

Your study addressing the implementation of a mindfulness-based intervention (MBI) in the Brazilian Paralympic Boccia Team explores a highly relevant and timely topic, with clear practical implications for enhancing well-being and performance in adaptive sports contexts.

After a detailed analysis of the work, I would like to offer the following constructive suggestions to improve the clarity, methodological transparency, and overall impact of your study:

General comments:

1. Clarify the Study Design

The term “longitudinal case study” could be made more precise by specifying whether it involved a quasi-experimental or intervention-based design, which would help readers understand the level of rigor and methodological framework applied.

2. Define Participant Groups More Clearly

Please elaborate on the criteria used to distinguish “ATHLETE” and “NON-ATHLETE” participants. Clarifying their roles (e.g., staff, coaches, etc.) would provide better context for interpreting the findings.

3. Refine the Description of the Intervention

The current structure describing “eight one-hour sessions,” “4-hour cycles,” and “10 maintenance

sessions” is difficult to follow. Consider reorganizing this section in a more linear or itemized format for greater clarity.

4. Specify the Nature of Performance Outcomes

The term “performance” is somewhat vague. Indicating whether this refers to sport-specific skills, cognitive performance, or competition results would strengthen the impact of your findings.

5. Include Quantitative Indicators of Results

Where possible, provide key quantitative data (e.g., effect sizes, p-values, or percentage changes) to substantiate claims related to improvements in quality of life and attention.

6. Clarify the Role of Attention as a Mediator

The phrase “mediated by a significant increase in attention” implies a mediation analysis. If such an analysis was conducted, please specify the method; otherwise, consider rephrasing to avoid misinterpretation.

7. Expand on Feasibility Criteria

It would be helpful to detail how feasibility was assessed — for instance, through adherence rates, participant satisfaction, or logistical considerations.

8. Avoid Redundancy in the Conclusion

The final sentence of the abstract largely reiterates previous points. You may consider using this space to highlight broader implications or propose directions for future research.

9. Specify the Nature of Approval Measures

Replace general phrases like “received significant levels of approval” with a clear explanation of how approval and recommendation were evaluated (e.g., survey instruments or qualitative feedback).

10. Enhance Grammar and Flow

Improving sentence structure for conciseness and flow will enhance the professionalism of the abstract. For example, consider using “pre- and post-intervention assessments” instead of “evaluations before and after applications.”

Major Comments and Questions

1. Title and Abstract

- Could the abstract briefly mention key technical components or platform features?
- Consider clarifying the specific benefits or learning outcomes observed in the results.

2. Introduction

- Please integrate more recent references (2020–2024) on mobile learning in engineering or STEM education.

- What specific research gap does this platform aim to address?
- Is the solution scalable to other disciplines beyond digital electronics?

3. Objectives

- Make the objectives more operational or measurable — what specific knowledge or skills were targeted?

4. Methodology

- Provide more detail on the evaluation instrument: number of items, types of questions, and validation procedures.
- How were participants selected? Was any form of random sampling used?
- Clarify the duration of platform use during the study period.
- Was a pre-test/post-test design considered or applied?

5. Platform Development

- Include more technical details: development stack, architecture, or frameworks used.
- Was a specific design methodology followed (e.g., ADDIE, Agile)?
- Briefly discuss how user data is managed in terms of privacy and security.

6. Results

- Please provide descriptive statistics or graphs to support claims of user acceptance.
- Were any statistical analyses performed to assess significance?
- Did user background (e.g., experience level) affect platform reception?

7. Discussion

- Strengthen the discussion by connecting results to relevant educational theories or mobile learning frameworks.
- Discuss limitations such as infrastructure challenges or device accessibility.
- Elaborate on implications for curriculum design or educational technology policy.

8. Conclusion and Future Work

- Include specific next steps (e.g., integration of adaptive learning, gamification).
- Is the platform accessible to other institutions? Consider including access information if applicable.

Language and Presentation

- Several sentences would benefit from improved clarity and conciseness.
- Ensure consistency in verb tense usage and consider professional proofreading for enhanced readability.

Overall Evaluation

Your manuscript addresses an important topic and presents promising initial findings. With revisions that improve methodological transparency, theoretical grounding, and clarity of presentation, the manuscript has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the field of mobile learning in higher education.

Sincerely,

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.