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

Chien-Po Liao

This article attempts to shed light on the research trends in adolescent mindfulness, a topic I find compelling. However, it is evident that there is still substantial room for improvement and greater clarity in the current research presented.

Introduction

Inconsistency between Objectives and Methods

In the introduction, the article discusses the importance of mindfulness for adolescents, but the following questions seem to be justifying the reason for conducting a literature review. These include: How should we evaluate the effectiveness of mindfulness interventions among adolescents? What topics do adolescent mindfulness studies focus on? What interaction areas are sources of information for youth positive thinking research? What are the contraindications to adolescent mindfulness training?

However, these questions seem to differ from the functionalities of CiteSpace. Features like keyword networks, time evolution, author networks, and institutional networks cannot directly answer these questions. This would be true unless the article explains how to systematically find answers to these questions after categorization.

I suggest emphasizing the main purpose of the article and reinforcing why such an analysis is conducted. If it is mainly based on CiteSpace functionalities, discuss in the introduction why it is necessary to compare Eastern and Western perspectives, including why understanding the development status, research hotspots, and evolutionary paths is important, and how such methods can enhance scientific guidance for adolescent mindfulness research. Otherwise, the rationale for conducting such research seems insufficient.

Methods

In the methods section, it should be clarified whether the approach adheres to the literature metrology steps accepted in academia. The author mentions that the volume of Chinese literature is lesser, hence including conference papers, but I would not recommend this as a reason for including conference papers. The discussion in China started later than in the West, and this lack of explanation from the beginning makes the data analysis awkward.

The use of keywords such as "Child," "Adolescent," or "Student" may vary significantly in terms of the life stages and environments they face. Confirm whether such comparisons are reasonable in the relevant field and clarify the approximate ages involved; otherwise, the research context may seem incomparable to readers.

It seems that after deciding on the keywords, there was no filtering process. Normally, many articles deviating too much from the topic would be filtered out. If following the steps of literature metrology, this stage should be included. Also, how the merging of similar conceptual keywords was conducted should impact the presentation of the analysis results.

Analysis Results

The analysis results seem to quickly produce tables and text descriptions, but still lack well-structured statements. The comparison of Eastern and Western differences also lacks a direct presentation method. On the other hand, the data lacks clear numerical values, although I think this can be temporarily overlooked as the focus is still on the need for structural expression to be re-planned.

Regarding the comparison results, the article only mentions that domestic literature primarily focuses on emotional and attention issues, while foreign literature is more clinically and therapeutically oriented. This seems too brief; perhaps more suggestions could be made for Chinese academic discourse or practice.

In the "General Discussion," these results seem to be discussable directly without CiteSpace. Explain how such segmented discussions are integrated into the research, what the bases and perspectives of these categorizations are, and how knowing these issues helps. Also, remember to review their relevance to the original purpose of the article.