



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 22263

Title: Breath-based meditation: A mechanism to restore the physiological and cognitive reserves for optimal human performance

Reviewer’s code: 03361483

Reviewer’s country: Italy

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-09-08 10:42

Date reviewed: 2015-09-22 03:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors are describing and discussing a specific breath-counting meditation technique. I think the manuscript focuses on a very interesting topic, namely the connection between meditation on physically and mental well-being. In general I think the manuscript is well written und easy to follow. Formally, the authors should check their figure, at least in the doc version it text is cut of. Also, the referece list is inconsistent, some references ont list the title of the cited paper while others do. PLease check. Regarding the content of the manuscript I am a bit ambivalent, not because I have a strongly different opinion, but rather because the paper reads a bit like an advertisement for SKY. I think all arguments are convincing, but the way everything is presented, it seems somehow incoherent, what the rationale actually is. The manuscript appears to promote SKY as better than other meditation or more specifiically other breath-counting techniques. This focus on SKY is not really clear. The authors claim that breath counting is easier due to the guide wire, but is there also supporting data? Is SKY better than other breath counting techniques? For me this focus on SKY is confusing. I would appreciated justification for it or an less focused approach.