	Editor's comment	**Author's comment***(If agreed with the editor, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)*
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes. This manuscript is important because it explores the feasibility of integrating mindfulness practices into occupational therapy for upper extremity orthopedic patients. Given the increasing recognition of psychosocial aspects in rehabilitation, this work provides valuable preliminary data that can inform future large-scale studies and protocol development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	The title is generally suitable as it reflects the focus on feasibility and mindfulness practices. However, it could be made more specific by including the patient population, for example: 'Exploring the Feasibility of Mindfulness Practices in Occupational Therapy for Upper Extremity Orthopedic Rehabilitation'.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The abstract summarizes the purpose, methods, and findings, but it could be more detailed. Specifically, it should briefly state the sample size (n=4), the mixed-methods design, and note the limitations such as small sample size and short duration. This would improve transparency and scientific rigor.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	Appropriate	

Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	Yes	

PART 1: **Article Title:** Exploring the Feasibility of Mindfulness Practices in Enhancing Mental Health Outcomes for Patients with Upper Extremity Orthopedic Conditions

PART 2:

	Editor's comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	No major ethical concerns are evident. The manuscript states that IRB exemption approval was obtained and informed consent was secured. However, it would be useful to specify how confidentiality and data protection were maintained during audio recordings.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No competing interest issues were identified.	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	No.	
Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)	No	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Editor:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer" I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) **Guideline:** Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	**9**